

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session – Seventeenth Legislature**  
**48th Day**

**Monday, April 2, 1973.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. E. Kaeding:** — (Saltcoats) Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Legislature, 45 students from the High School at Saltcoats in my constituency. They have come here today under the direction of Mr. Farquharson, the principal. Mr. Farquharson not only is the principal of the school, he is also a Minister in the United Church and he carries on a dual role in the town of Saltcoats and does a very good job of both. I sincerely hope that the students this afternoon will enjoy their observations of what we do here. I hope they will be impressed and certainly wish them a good tour of the buildings and wish them a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**

**Under the Dome**

He said: The "Under the Dome" report in the Leader Post of March 31, 1973 reports an interview with the writer and myself as Speaker.

I feel a number of the comments in this article are taken out of context and does not report the tone of my interview.

I regret very much the portion dealing with the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod).

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I had no intention to embarrass any Member of this House.

It is the right of any Member to question the ruling of the Speaker. The House makes its decision on the Rules by majority vote when necessary.

I regret very much that this has happened and I realize that in the future I must refuse to be interviewed by the Press.

**CONDOLENCES**

**Mr. Oliver:** — (Shaunavon) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day it is with regret that I bring to the attention of the House the passing of Billy Bock, MP for Maple Creek from 1927 to 1930, who died last Wednesday, March 28, in Eastend.

Billy was a noted historian in the southwest. He contributed a great deal to the recording of the rich history of the southwest, especially the Cypress Hills district, the North West Mounted Police post at Fort Walsh, all about the Cypress Hills massacre, the Chimney Coulee incident, Life on the Turkey Track

and 77 Ranches. These were, of course, brought into focus in the books that he wrote. He was also a major factor in the setting up of the museum in the Eastend school.

Now this museum contains some of the world's best specimens of dinosaur skeletons in the world. It also has many Indian and pioneer artifacts known nowhere else.

Billy was instrumental in the establishing of the PFRA pastures and also of the irrigation project on the White Mud River.

In his later years he turned to writing his memoirs and ballads about the early days and songs that he composed and sang himself.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to the family.

**Hon. R. Romanow:** — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Member from Shaunavon on behalf of the Premier and the Government to extend our condolences and sympathy to the family of Mr. William Bock. Mr. Bock was born in 1884 in Bruce County in Ontario. At the age of 18, 1902, the late Billy Bock went West to what is now Saskatchewan and proved up a homestead in the Stony Beach district.

He apparently moved on from there to a number of endeavors one of which was to take a job as lumberjack in the Canadian Rockies. He even prospected for gold in the Yukon. In 1908 he came back to Saskatchewan, to Regina, to work as a farm machinery salesman. I guess the lure of the land was too much and subsequent to that he acquired a section of land in the Palliser Triangle near Eastend, Saskatchewan.

Billy Bock has had a very considerable life that has been certainly rich and varied and very experienced, Mr. Speaker. I have in front of me a book called "The Best of Billy Bock", edited by John Archer and Robert Peterson in 1967. The preface of the book, I think, sums up the man very accurately from what I have been able to determine about this very interesting person. It says:

Bill Bock is no run of the mill mortal, miner, Member of Parliament, PFRA fieldman, author, songster and potter. What other man can boast of such a variety of skills?

Billy Bock, with a good sense of humor, had all of these and as the Member for Shaunavon pointed out, Mr. Speaker, he was in fact a Liberal Member of Parliament being elected in the election in 1927.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by reading one small passage from the foreword of the book, written by the later Mr. Billy Bock, which I think all politicians would find a great deal of interest in. It is simply entitled "Skeletons". This man obviously had a very good sense of humor. He talked about what skeletons were, something to hang in closets and then he said in the introduction, in his own words, Mr. Speaker, as follows:

If in the following pages I happen to release a few members of the skeletal fraternity, the reader will find that in most cases they have been inhabiting my

April 2, 1973

own personal closet and that I released them only in order to make room for more. If any of my progeny find that my revelations have cost them grave concern, I trust that it may be a warning and discourage them from following too closely in their grandad's footsteps.

I am sure that Saskatchewan will sorely regret the passing of this very memorable person, Mr. Bill Bock.

**Mr. D. G. Steuart:** — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Members opposite and on behalf of this side of the House join with them in paying a tribute to the late Billy Bock.

He was, as was pointed out, not only one of the great pioneers in Western Canada and in Saskatchewan in particular, he not only helped to make history in this province, he also wrote about that history. He wrote in an interesting and humorous way.

I never met him, but I have heard about him and I recall listening one time when he was interviewed by the CBC, and I think it was about an hour program, they had on his life and times and his writings and I remember that he sang and recited some of the ballads that he wrote about the early days in that part of Saskatchewan where he lived, where he homesteaded and that part of Saskatchewan that he represented in the House of Commons.

Certainly he was an outstanding figure in the history of our province. I should like to join with the Members on both sides of the House in paying a tribute to his memory and passing on our condolences to his family.

**Mr. E. F. Flasch:** — (Maple Creek) Mr. Speaker, I did not know the late Mr. Bock personally. Apparently he lived all of his life in Eastend. However, the present Maple Creek provincial constituency is a part of the old federal riding of Maple Creek which he represented. I was not familiar with his works but I did have occasion to visit the school at Eastend and to see the museum which he apparently helped to set up. It is certainly a credit to him to have worked in that connection.

I should like sincerely to offer my sympathies to the family.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### **Dr. Hodgins New Chairman of Cancer Commission**

**Hon. W. E. Smishek:** — (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make an announcement which I believe will be of interest to the Members of the Legislature and the public at large.

You will recall the House, last week, gave third reading to Bill No. 67 to Amend the Cancer Control Act. This Bill proposed changes in the structure of the Cancer Commission and will broaden its scope and functions to make it more concerned with the program development and improvement of cancer services in

the province.

As the first step in this reorganization, Mr. Speaker, I have asked Dr. Ken Hodgins to assume the duties as the new chairman of the Cancer Commission. This will be in addition to his duties as Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan.

Dr. Hodgins is a native of Saskatchewan and holds degrees in pharmacy and medicine as well as a diploma in hospital administration. He joined the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan in 1965 and was named the Executive Director in 1968.

Dr. Hodgins will be succeeding Dr. Wigmore of Moose Jaw who has been chairman of the Commission for the past 8 years and prior to that served as a member of the Commission for some 10 years.

I should like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Government and the people of Saskatchewan to thank Dr. Wigmore for this extended period of dedicated service. During the period that he was chairman, the Cancer program continued to function at a high level and the Commission contained a highly respected position as one of the health administration bodies in the province.

I am sure that Dr. Wigmore's term of office as both member and chairman will be remembered by the citizens of the province as a true example of faithful and devoted public service. Although all of the details have not yet been worked out, I anticipate that a new Commission to help Dr. Hodgins implement some of the recommendations of the Johnson Commission Report, will be appointed around the middle of this month.

Again, may I pay tribute on behalf of our Government and the people of the province to members of the outgoing Commission, many of whom have served with dedicated and distinct service over the years.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Tom Barkley has requested that he be allowed to relinquish the position of Director of Cancer Services for the province which he has held since 1966. Dr. Barkley will continue in his position as Acting Director of the Saskatchewan Cancer Clinic on an interim basis at the conclusion of which he will take up other duties on the Cancer Commission.

Again, on behalf of the Government and the citizens of the province I should like to pay tribute to Dr. Barkley for his dedication and personal commitment to the Cancer Program that he has so freely given.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main recommendations of the Johnson Commission was the strengthening of the administrative organization of the Commission. To implement some of the changes that were suggested, I am pleased to report the establishment of the position of Executive Director, Saskatchewan Cancer Commission. This position will be advertised in the near future and it is our expectation that we shall be able to recruit an individual with considerable administrative experience in a health related setting and with academic training related to the administrative requirements who can provide

April 2, 1973

adequate administrative support for the Cancer Program.

Dr. Hodgins will be fulfilling this position on a temporary basis until a full time person can be recruited. However, it is our intent to recruit a non-medical person into this position as we feel that medically qualified people should be free for the medical work for which their training was intended.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my speech in support of the amendments to The Cancer Control Act, these organizational changes are only the first steps in implementing some of the recommendations of the Johnson Report to improve our cancer control program in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. G. B. Grant:** — (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, commenting on the Hon. Minister's remarks I want to commend him for his quick action on making a start in implementing the Johnson Commission Report.

This report did take some time to complete but it is a voluminous and complicated report and it is nice to see that the recommendations are receiving attention.

I would appreciate the Minister clarifying the position of Dr. Hodgins. It seems to me that this man is going to be busier than the Minister himself with all the other duties he has taken on. He is involved with the Grey Nuns' Hospital and the management of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, and now he has assumed other duties. Will he be relieved of some of his present responsibilities?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hodgins has no special responsibilities in the Grey Nuns' Hospital. He did act as a director on a pro tem basis until we made a decision to have the Grey Nuns' Hospital under the jurisdiction of the South Saskatchewan Hospital Board.

He will continue as Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. As the Hon. Member may recall that until Dr. Wigmore was appointed, the chairman of the Cancer Control Commission had always been a senior civil servant within the Department of Public Health. For a long time it was the Deputy Minister of Health who was chairman.

Yes, we will be giving some additional support and assistance to Dr. Hodgins, so that he can fulfil this role. We believe that he can carry on as Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and with some additional help which he may need, he can also very well carry on and do the work as chairman of the Cancer Control Commission.

## QUESTIONS

### Intercontinental Packers

**Mr. D. G. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson).

In the purchase of 45 per cent of Intercontinental Pork Packers, did the Government buy, was it included in the deal,

any portion of the F. Mendel ranch, or any portion of the F. Mendel Holdings Limited?

**Hon K. Thorson:** — (Minister of Industry) Mr. Speaker, the Government purchased 45 per cent of the shares of Intercontinental Packers Limited.

I don't know what he means by the reference to pork packers. We did not purchase any shares or interests in any ranching operation.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Or the Mendel Holdings Limited?

**Mr. Thorson:** — Or Mendel Holdings Limited, that is correct.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Or Western Livestock 1958 Limited?

**Mr. Thorson:** — No interest purchased there either, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Steuart:** — It is better than I thought.

### **Program for Dental Auxiliaries**

**Mr. Grant:** — About six weeks ago in reply to a question I directed to Mr. Smishek, he indicated that by the end of March he would probably have available the program for the dental auxiliaries, who are being trained in the new Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science, in Regina.

The program that will involve the utilization of these people when they graduate from that school. I don't believe it had been established at that time but he felt that it would be established by the end of March. I wonder if he has that at this time?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received a report of the advisory committee on Dental Care. It was the expectation of the Committee to have the report tabled with me by March 31st. My information is that the committee has completed its duties and hearings. They are in the final stages of preparing their report and it is expected that their report will be in our hands within the next couple of weeks.

### **Report of SEDCO**

**Mr. A. R. Guy:** — (Athabasca) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

I should like to ask him if he is aware that his colleague, the Minister-in-Charge of SEDCO is contravening the Crown Corporations Act by not having the SEDCO report tabled in this Legislature. It may be a minor point but I think we all recognize that we don't certainly wish our Legislature to be in disrespect of the law. There is enough of that today without

April 2, 1973

the Government being placed in that position. Could we have that report tabled as early as possible.

**Hon. R. Romanow:** — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Minister that the report will be tabled by tomorrow. The reason for the delay has simply been a matter of printing, I am advised.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Provincial Intermediate B Championship — Shellbrook Elks**

**Hon. G. R. Bowerman:** — (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan) Mr. Speaker, I couldn't let the opportunity go by without commenting on the 1973 win of the Shellbrook Elks Hockey Club.

This will be the fifth consecutive time that I had the privilege of congratulating the Shellbrook Elks Hockey Club in winning the Provincial Intermediate B Championship.

The win was last night, in the PA Communiplex, when the Elks met the Leader Flyers in the series which is a two game total goal series. It was won very narrowly by the Shellbrook Elks. I suggest to you that I have been informed this is the fifth straight annual win and is a winning record within the Intermediate B Series.

May I say that during the season the Elks Club was not able to become one of the continuous hockey clubs playing in the league, but in the absence of playing within the Intermediate B League, they played against the Intermediate Double A Clubs meeting with such teams as the Lloydminster Border Kings, the Kindersley Clippers and the Rosetown Club. May I suggest to you, Sir, that even in this league they met with considerable success. I'm sure that all Members of the House would want to extend congratulations to them. I would so ask you to do so.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **MOTION FOR FURTHER ESTIMATES**

**Hon. E. L. Cowley:** — (Minister of Finance) Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 84:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending the Thirty-first of March, 1974,

be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

## **MOTIONS**

### **Additional House Sittings**

**Hon. R. Romanow:** — (Attorney General) Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Health):

That notwithstanding Rule 3, this Assembly shall,

commencing Wednesday, April 4, 1973, meet at 10:00 o'clock a.m. each sitting day and there shall be a recess from 12:30 o'clock p.m. until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Members of the Assembly would agree to passing this motion. This would enable us to go ahead to passing this motion. This would enable us to go ahead with morning sittings starting on Wednesday at 10:00 o'clock. If, however, we have not completed the matter of Crown Corporations which is the SEDCO one, or if we have yet to do some work with respect to the Public Accounts Committee, we cannot go ahead necessarily with the morning sittings unless we make sure that the committee work is well n hand. We simply think that it's important to proceed at this stage in the game by getting this motion before the House and having the Members approve of it. So, with those brief introductory remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move the motion that I have referred to.

**Mr. D. G. Steuart:** — (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, we haven't really caucused on this one so we'll caucus right out in public, but I presume we intend to support this motion. As usual the Opposition is always ready to do anything to speed up the proceedings in the House and help the Government along on its chosen task of grinding the people of Saskatchewan under their authoritarian heel as quickly as possible.

I find it very interesting though, Mr. Speaker, that this was introduced after we have started to do everything we can, and I make no apologies because we intend to continue to do everything we can to hold up Bill 50, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act because we think it's a bad Bill and we want the farmers to be able to rally so they know what is happening to their freedom and their independence by this Government. So it was very interesting when we held this up, and when you look at the time table, we only held it up about the same length of time that the Government had in getting around to introducing it and giving it second reading, but we evidently interfered with one of their time tables which was to have the Bill in operation maybe April 1. It was then in sort of a fit of temper that the Government decided to show us and use their majority and say, okay, we'll show you, you'll start sitting mornings, and that great, wonderful, sort of new look the Government introduced to say we'll give the Opposition all kinds of time, we won't sit at night, we won't force them to sit in the mornings, went out the window. They didn't stand up to the acid test. As soon as the Opposition got a little obstreperous and took their democratic right to hold up a Bill to give our farmers or any other group in our society a chance to rally around, to look at the Bill, to make their wishes known one way or the other, then suddenly this very, very democratic attitude of the Government opposite disappeared.

And now when we have such Bills as the Teacher-Trustees to consider, The University Act, which incidentally I understand was talked about in The Star-Phoenix today. An Act, that if it goes through the way it's painted in today's issue of The Star-Phoenix, I'm told, that any autonomy and independence the University had won't last very long. A very important Bill, the Teacher-Trustee relationship, a very important Bill. I understand there's a Bill to come in yet to talk about the controlling of election expenses, another very important Bill.



April 2, 1973

So, we've got a very thick Order Paper. We've got, I don't know how many more Bills. The Attorney General hasn't told us what other legislation is coming in.

I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that we're on the down slope now and now they're going to dump the really important legislation in and now they say we'll work the little, fighting, fearless band of 15 over here morning, noon and night if they dare to show their courage and their strength to try to hold back anything, hold up anything that we want, we'll use our steam roller.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — The Sask. Oil Bill.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I'm not crying. I'm just pointing out what happened to you fellows and your wonderful, great democratic move, it suddenly went out the window. However, we're not going to oppose this. It wouldn't matter anyway if we did because the Government would use their steam roller to pass it. But I want to go on to say very clearly, to point out to the public of Saskatchewan how long the Premier's word, the Premier gave his word to the public and said, "We do not intend to steam roller this Legislature. We recognize the Opposition have a limited number of Members and we're going to give everyone lots of time to look at Bills, discuss Bills so there can be full participation by the public, by themselves and through the Opposition." But the minute their little plans didn't go quite the way they planned, as long as we were sitting here passing Bills, doing like their back benchers, not quite as bad, rubber stamping them, moving them right along, we were fine fellows and they were prepared to give us lots of time. But as soon as we showed some courage, as soon as we fought the bill then what happened. Morning sittings, night sittings. Fine, okay! All I want the public to know is what they should know already in 19 or 20 months, exactly how Members on this side are finding out daily and have found out every day since they sat here, how much value and how much worth you can put on the word of the Premier and the Government opposite.

**Mr. E. F. Gardner:** — (Moosomin) Mr. Speaker, if I may just say a word in connection with this. I should certainly like to go on record as indicating that we haven't been holding up the work of the House. We've talked about one particular Bill. I'd like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that The Natural Products Marketing Act which we have been debating for about the same time as The Agriculture Machinery Act has been sitting on the books waiting to get second reading. It was brought in on March 5, introduced by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). We thought it was a very important Bill. We thought it would take considerable time in second reading, debating in second reading, and we have been waiting from March 5, and now it's April 2, for the Minister of Agriculture to give this Bill second reading. It's been on the Order Paper every single day since that time. So when the people opposite indicate that The Natural Products

Marketing Act which we have been actually debating for about the same length of time that they are holding this up, I think they are a bit ridiculous in this attitude.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to know precisely how to respond to remarks such as those made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) with respect to the business of the House. First of all, I want to make it absolutely clear that this motion does not have the effect of steam rolling the Opposition, none whatsoever. The simple fact of the matter is that when we move out of committees I think the people of Saskatchewan expect us as MLAs to make full use of our time. They are paying all of us, including the Liberal Members opposite, a very handsome salary indeed as MLAs and when we're finished Crown Corporations and finished Public Accounts to fail to move into morning sittings would, in my judgement, be irresponsible and would be a denial of the responsibility that the people of Saskatchewan expect of all of us as MLAs of this Assembly. That's what this motion is simply doing. And for the Leader of the Opposition to get up and to say that somehow this is steam rolling, I say with all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition he's merely politicking with that statement.

With respect to Bill 50, Mr. Speaker, which has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, I want to draw to the attention of the House that Bill No. 50 was read for the first time and capable of being read a second time in and around February 2, I'm not sure of the exact date but it was around that time. It sat on the Order Paper for about a month till March 1. Why? So that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Moosomin and all the Liberals opposite could have a good opportunity to study the Bill. Well, the Leader of the Opposition laughs, laughs at that. We left it around so they could study it, left it around so they could consult with any farm organization that they wanted to. We left it around so that they could start to petition and put out 18,000 letters throughout all the Province of Saskatchewan in trying to foment trouble on Bill 50. They had every opportunity during the evenings when we didn't sit, every opportunity during the mornings for those who weren't on committees to study Bill 50 and to restudy Bill 50. And I say in all seriousness that certainly is an adequate amount of time.

Now on March 2 the Minister of Agriculture goes ahead and moves it for second reading. Today is April 2, Mr. Speaker. From March 2 to April 2 there have been 10 adjournments of Bill 50. Of the adjournments, nine, Mr. Speaker, are by the Members opposite, one on March 8 was by the Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody) and there wasn't a Member on this side who moved to adjourn that Bill since that time. No one denies anybody the right to adjourn but can it be said from the period of February 2 to March 1 that they were rushed in their understanding of the legal and political and other implications of Bill 50? Can it be said from March 2 when the second reading was made to today, April 2, that they had insufficient time to study Bill 50 from a legal or political implication. Mr. Speaker, none whatsoever. What the Opposition wants to do is, of course, to bring the entire proceedings of Bill 50 and the proceedings of this House to a halt. Everybody has the right to criticize and to oppose, but I say, Mr. Speaker, do so responsibly and not irresponsibly as the Opposition has been handling itself with respect to this Bill 50.

April 2, 1973

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — At one time, Mr. Speaker, you could go around the country and there would be people asking questions about Bill 50. Now the questions when I travel around the country are: “Why is the Opposition acting so irresponsibly with respect to Bill 50?”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — That’s the question that’s coming out over and over again! And I say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Bill 50, if they use that as an example of the Leader of the Opposition is when he is getting up with his 1,200 clipout coupons, 1,200 from people who are now dead and people who are unknown on the returns, and he says that is an attempt to spank, then I say the Leader of the Opposition is purely and simply politicking.

Now one final comment with respect to this resolution. There are some important Bills to come forward yet before this House. We will, like we have up to now, give the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan every opportunity to study the Bills, oppose the Bills, make suggestions for amendments and ask us to reconsider the Bill. We will grant adjournments, we’ll give the Opposition every opportunity they can to act responsibly and respond to any of the legislation that is put before the House.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that the public is saying now to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Liberal group that it is time to stop acting irresponsibly and get on with the people’s business which we were elected to do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

## **SECOND READINGS**

Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 72 – An Act respecting Dental Nurses.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce second reading of The Dental Nurses Bill. This Bill is a major step forward in our Government’s program to provide and ensure dental care service for all Saskatchewan children under the age of 12. The Saskatchewan dental nurses will play an important part in this program.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the Hall Commission on Health Services recommended that the Department of National Health and Welfare in conjunction with the provinces set up a program to provide dental services to children. The Hall Commission recommended that the program employ the skill of dental nurses and auxiliaries to assist with this service. Since these recommendations were made, Provincial and Federal Liberal Governments have done nothing to implement such a program. The latest health survey shows that the need for such a program is still just as great as it was 10 years ago. In 1961 a Canadian Dental Association survey reported that at age 14 the existing

backlog of untreated dental decay was, on the average, 3.4 teeth per child. In 1971 a survey of six school units in Saskatchewan revealed that on the average each child had four defective permanent teeth at age 11.

Our Government recognizes that dental disease is one of the most prevalent forms of ill health among our children and our adult population. We made a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan to establish and ensure dental care service initially for those under the age of 12. We are now taking steps to fulfil another commitment made in our New Deal for People.

There are many reasons why so many of our children have poor dental health. First, there are simply not enough dentists available in Saskatchewan. There are approximately 208 practising dentists resulting in a dentist population ratio of roughly one dentist to 4,500 people. This ratio is the second worst in Canada. Saskatchewan dentists are rather poorly distributed geographically. About one-half of the dentists are practising in Regina and Saskatoon. They are serving only about 30 per cent of the total provincial population.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that in the case of the dental profession we have the second worst situation as to the number of dentists to population. In contrast we have the highest number of pharmacists, in fact twice as many as the national average. Somewhere this indicates a disparity and the weakness of our training programs over the years.

Mr. Speaker, on the average a Saskatchewan child receives only a fraction of the time needed for dental services. Data from the Oxbow project reveals that each child accepted into the program requires an initial three hours treatment. By contrast 70 per cent of persons 18 years of age and under in Saskatchewan are receiving approximately one-half hour of dental care annually according to the Canadian Dental Association Report, 1968. There is a vast spread between the amount of dental service time required and that which can be obtained.

It is estimated that we would require at least a 50 per cent increase in the number of practising dentists to provide the treatment service required annually for children ages 3 to 12 in Saskatchewan, not to mention the rest of the population which would continue to be partially unserved. At present only 40 per cent of our children receive dental care on a regular basis. Our Government believes that the best method of dealing with the dental health problems of our children is to set up a comprehensive program financed from public funds using auxiliary dental personnel to augment the services of the dentist. The results of the Oxbow project confirmed that belief.

I want to tell you a bit about the Oxbow project, Mr. Speaker. It was started by our dental health division with financial assistance from the Federal Government. The project is in its third year of operation. Some encouraging results have been received. The dental team consists of a dentist, two dental nurses, three certified dental assistants and a secretary-receptionist. The team operates out of a 62 foot trailer which has four dental chairs. The trailer can be parked right beside a school whose children are being seen. Services are offered to all children in a test area from ages 3 to 12. Once enrolled in the program the children are eligible for continuing

April 2, 1973

care for the duration of the project. Between 91 per cent and 96 per cent of all those eligible have registered in the program. The typical child after enrolling in a program would receive X-ray screening, a complete oral and dental examination by the dentist, followed by diagnosis and delegation of treatment responsibility as appropriate. Also chair side and classroom dental health education such as how to brush teeth and what foods to eat, scaling and polishing of teeth, individual treatment as required.

The functions of the dental auxiliaries in this program are similar to those envisaged for our dental nurses, that is providing dental education to children and parents, both individually and in the classroom, simple drilling and filling of teeth where necessary and limited extractions. The more complicated cases are handled by the dentist.

The prevention services and X-rays are done by the certified dental assistants. Preparation work for the project in the case of Oxbow began in the fall of 1969 and by March 31, 1970 some \$34,000 had been spent for equipment and supplies including the specially designed trailer which was built here in Saskatchewan. The project itself commenced in September of 1970 and by March, 1971 a further \$51,250 had been spent in operating costs. For the period April 1, 1971 to March 31, 1972, the project cost \$80,250. Costs for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973 are estimated at \$75,000. As of April, 1973, the Provincial Government will assume responsibility for the project. In fact I might say that we have been assuming the responsibility for the project since September 1st, 1972 because it was at that time that the Federal grant research money ran out.

The project has demonstrated that the use of auxiliary dental personnel can cut costs and extend services. There are marked improvements in the dental health under a regular preventive and treatment program directed to children. There are some 3,500 children who have been in the program over three years that it has been in operation. The average cost per child has been \$35. To give some estimates of comparative costs the project data reveals that the initial period of care in Oxbow averaged \$37 per child. Under the 1972 Saskatchewan College of Dental Surgeons' fee schedule the services would have cost \$69.98, almost exactly double to what the Oxbow project cost per child. Not only that but the average cost per child after the initial period was over, that is the \$37 figure that I reported, the figure for the service cost thereafter dropped to just under \$29 and therefore giving us the average cost of \$35 that I have mentioned. Our latest figures aren't in yet but I am told that they are expected to drop even further so as the service continues we are able to keep up with providing service to the children and the cost over a period of time reduces itself.

There has been no sacrifice in the quality of work done by the dental nurses to achieve these lower costs. In fact a continuing assessment of the actual work done is carried out by the College of Dental Surgeons, two independent appraisers, Dr. Carl Bolen of Regina and Dr. Wayne Brattley of Assiniboia, who regularly assessed the quality of the restorative work done by the dental nurses. Their reports indicate that the work being done is excellent. The Oxbow project shows rather conclusively that the concept we are examining is viable. We have laid out broad guidelines for this program.

Like the Oxbow project, the program will provide preventive and basic restorative dental care for children up to the age of 12. It will encourage parents to take a greater interest in their children's dental health.

We are also taking steps to train more dentists in the province by extending the College of Dentistry in Saskatoon. I might report that of the ten members of our first graduating class I am pleased to see that nine have remained in the Province of Saskatchewan. The tenth was on an Armed Forces bursary and was transferred to Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to spend an additional \$2 million on expanding the teaching facility of the College of Dentistry. We have begun to train Saskatchewan dental nurses at the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science in Regina. We have developed a departmental proposal of how a dental care program for children could be implemented and publicly funded. The department's proposal is being examined by the six-member Advisory Committee made up of the Dean of the School of Dentistry, past president of the Saskatchewan College of Dentists, a public servant who is a dentist, a school trustee, a school teacher and a housewife with three school-age children. The Advisory Committee had its initial meeting with me on December 6th, 1972. The Committee decided to distribute the department proposal widely and sent out some 600 to 800 copies of the departmental proposal. Then the Committee advertised in every weekly and daily newspaper in the province and sent an invitation to all interested individuals, groups, organizations and providers of dental services to submit briefs. If a person appeared before the Committee and wanted to have a hearing, this opportunity was provided for him.

Some 37 briefs or letters of comments were received by the Advisory Committee. Both the Saskatchewan College of Dental Surgeons and the Canadian Dental Association presented briefs to the Committee and appeared in person. Three members of the College of Dentistry, Saskatoon, presented oral submissions. Five persons were interviewed at the request of the Committee. As well the Committee Secretariat had undertaken a number of studies on behalf of the Committee. We had hoped that the Committee's report would have been in our hands by March 31st. The Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) raised a question on the Orders of the Day. I indicated to him that at my meeting with the Secretary of the Committee this morning I was advised that the Committee's report is well advanced and is in the final drafting stages and we should be receiving it within the next couple of weeks.

I might report that by the end of March the Committee held a total of nine meetings. The Committee's report will be in our hands shortly. You can see that we have provided a good opportunity for the public and all interested persons to make their views known on this important matter of provision of dental services for our children. There has been direct consultation with the dental profession on The Dental Nurses Act on which I am going to give second reading.

I met with the officials of the College of Dental Surgeons on February 7th. I had previously sent a copy of the draft Bill in confidence so that they could comment on our proposal. The representatives of the Council were in agreement with the principles of the proposed Bill. They suggested some minor

April 2, 1973

draft changes which we took under advisement, such as their suggestion that the draft Bill should authorize a dental nurse to provide services to patients while receiving clinical training. Clause (h) was added to Section 16 of the draft as a result of that suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it fair to say that as a result of this consultation, the Bill before you has the endorsement of the dental profession. We think that is an important consideration. The Saskatchewan Government is going to implement a first class dental program for your children. At the last session of the Legislature, this House passed a new Act to provide for the education of ancillary dental personnel. This Act allows us to set up an education program to train Saskatchewan dental nurses for the dental care program. At the 1972 fall session, 36 students were enrolled at the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science, Regina, in a two-year dental nursing program. There will be some 60 students enrolled next year.

The curriculum involves academic study, pre-clinical and clinical experience. A Curriculum Planning Committee has been set up to set out the details of the course that these students should follow in the two-year training program. The Committee has on it representatives from the University of Saskatchewan College of Dentistry, the College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan, the Department of Public Health and the Department of Education. The graduates of this course will be well trained in such dental procedures as drilling filling, extractions, X-rays, cleaning and preventive dental work. The intention is to produce well-trained Saskatchewan dental nurses, not semi-trained dentists.

Mr. Speaker, it will be of interest to note that South Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand and England have had similar training programs in effect for some time. In the case of New Zealand I understand that their program has been in effect for almost 50 years. The Oxbow project has demonstrated quite clearly to us to be a satisfactory program providing good services. Our local dentists are being used as well as the dental auxiliaries and the kind of training that they have had makes it possible to provide good services to people.

The dental program is expected to begin, that is the full program based on our new graduates, in the fall of 1974. That date will be another land-mark in Saskatchewan's history of pioneering in the health field.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a part of a Government that has such a pioneering spirit in the health field. In general The Dental Nurses Act will provide for the licensing of graduates for our new dental program. It will set out the machinery to regulate the conduct of the Saskatchewan dental nurses in the children's dental care program. The Act proposes the formation of the Saskatchewan Dental Nurses Board. This Board will be in charge of registration of Saskatchewan dental nurses and will prescribe a code of conduct for these nurses. It will also serve in an advisory capacity for the making of regulations. The Board will be made up of both health professionals and lay members. A teaching member of the College of Dentistry at the University of Saskatchewan and one dentist engaged in private practice will be selected by nominations to the joint board. An official of the Department of Public Health, along with the person employed in the ancillary dental education program will

also be board members. There will be three Saskatchewan dental nurses on the Board. We must not lose sight of the fact that this is a regulatory board and our Saskatchewan dental nurses, like any other occupational group, have the right to a significant voice in matters relating to their own professional conduct. The remaining two to five members will be laymen representing the public interest. These lay members will play an important role in ensuring that the program is responsive to the needs of the public. Allowances have been made in Section 3 for a regular turnover of board members. The members will be appointed for three-year terms. A third of the membership will be subject to re-appointment every year.

In summary, the Saskatchewan Dental Nurses Board provides for the appointment of seven professionals and up to five members of the general public, maintaining an effective balance between the providers of the service and representatives of the public. It is intended that each Saskatchewan dental nurse shall be registered and shall be in receipt of an annual licence. The Secretary of the Board will be responsible for maintaining the register of dental nurses. The Board also has the authority to remove the name of a Saskatchewan dental nurse from the register for contravention of the Dental Nurses Act.

The House will remember that at the last session of the House we introduced an amendment to Section 50 of the Medical Profession Act, to improve the appeal procedure for persons whose names have been removed from the register. Historically, it has been found that recourse to the courts has not been the most effective method of handling complaints against decisions of Regulatory Boards. I am confident that the three-man tribunal made up of a Judge of the Queen's Bench, an appointee of the Dean of the College of Dentistry, and an appointee of the Minister of Public Health, will provide the necessary safeguard for the interests of both the Board and the complainant. An annual report of the activities of the Dental Nurses Board will be tabled in the Legislature. As I have said before, the Board represents the public interest and an annual report will be one means by which to monitor the activities of the Board.

Finally, I should like to draw your attention to Sections 20 and 21 of the Act. The existing legislation relates to the dental profession, in effect, grants the College of Dental Surgeons the right to regulate their own affairs and to oversee the professional conduct of dental auxiliaries. This regulatory authority should not be confused with that of The Saskatchewan Dental Nurses Board. The Saskatchewan Dental Nurses will be regulated by the new Act and not by The Dental Professions Act.

I might add that the College of Dental Surgeons has concurred in these sections of the Act. Passage of this Bill will allow us to give the dental care program for children past the formative stage and into the implementation stage.

Saskatchewan dental nurses are being trained at the present time and we should like them to gain some field experience later this year. The dental care program for children is being heralded across Canada as a pioneering effort. Under the headline, "Denticare Another Saskatchewan First."

Mr. Nick Hills of Southam News Service wrote and I quote:



April 2, 1973

Saskatchewan NDP Government is returning to its pioneering role in the field of state medicine with a province-wide 'Denticare' program that by the end of the decade will provide treatment for more than 140,000 children.

We are pioneers, Mr. Speaker, because this will be the first province-wide dental scheme in North America. It will place an equal emphasis on both preventive and treatment dental care among our children.

Mr. Speaker, I might suggest and point out to the Members that the proposal that we have made and the training program that we have started, has received wide interest. We have now had people from Newfoundland visit us, including the Minister, who has been giving special attention, special study as to how our program is developing. Just last Friday I received a telegram from the Minister of Public Health in the Province of Nova Scotia who wants to come to Saskatchewan on April 18th to take a look at our proposal and at our training program. It seems to me that it is only a matter of time before other provinces will be trying to duplicate and copy the proposal that we are making here for a dental care program. As I said earlier, the Saskatchewan proposal for the program is still being examined by our advisory committee. The final program plan will not be available until later this year. However, as the department proposal stands at the present, we should like to see each child registered in the program receiving dental check-ups twice a year. The proposed program covers a wide range of dental services emphasizing prevention such as cleaning and scaling of teeth and basic restorative procedure such as simple fillings. It is proposed that the basic services will be provided by Saskatchewan dental nurses and certified dental assistants, under the supervision of the dentist. More complex services would be provided by dentists through a referral system.

I want to stress that a dental care program for children will be innovative. We will be tackling one of the most neglected areas of health among the children of Saskatchewan. We will be setting up dental teams to make the most efficient use of very expensive, but skilled dental professionals. Our program will emphasize prevention, as well as restorative care. I am confident that with the introduction of this program, we will see marked improvement in the dental health of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Member to support this Bill so that Saskatchewan may take another giant step forward in the health field as we have done in the past and as we propose to continue in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to move second reading of the Bill, and after second reading our intention is to have this Bill referred to the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

I now move second reading of this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D. F. MacDonald:** — (Moose Jaw North) Mr. Speaker, I am going, after a few remarks, to ask

leave to adjourn this debate. I'm sorry but I had difficulty hearing the Minister. I have a bit of a cold and I just didn't hear all of his remarks.

I'm not adjourning it because of any desire to oppose the Bill. To the Bill, as set out, on dental nurses I cannot object too much. Really what we are talking about is the entire dental program for children. The Bill sets out some stipulations for dental nurses, but we are really talking about dental care for children, and I think it will be the last opportunity that this House has to discuss this dental plan. And I do have some concerns about the dental plan for children that will be implemented at some time in the future.

The Minister indicated that he has consulted with the profession and that he has the endorsement of the dental profession. Well, I don't really understand it. I don't understand what the Minister means by consultation because certainly he has talked to the profession but he has not written to them. He hasn't asked them really to have any input into the proposed dental plan. I don't know whether he means the dental profession is in favor of this Bill. I don't think that the dental profession has indicated any endorsement of the program, or the program as I visualize it, or the program and the profession visualizes it. I'd say they are very apprehensive about what they think the Minister has in mind and what the Minister has so far indicated. I don't think that we can rely on this endorsement by the dental profession. I don't think they have given it.

I think we also have to consider some of the remarks of the Minister. He talked about preventive and restorative measures. I don't know whether when he is talking prevention whether he includes the fluoridation of water that the dental profession thinks is necessary. I expect that when he talks about prevention he does include fluoridation. This is something I should like to find out before passing this Bill.

I think the other thing is that the dental plan (as I visualize it and as the profession visualizes it) will have a detrimental effect on the dentists in rural areas. I think the rural areas need the dentists they have and if the plan is not going to utilize both the dentists and the facilities in rural areas then certainly rural areas are going to suffer because of losses of these dentists.

I think that every Member in this House and all members of the public support the concept of a children's dental plan. I don't think that's in question at all. I think that, certainly speaking for myself, that I endorse it but I only endorse it if the plan is of the highest standard and one thing that I would demand and would only accept if the plan for dental nurses has the direct supervision of dentists and I think this is a must. This takes place at Oxbow and as I understand it this is not part of the plans of the Minister of Health for his proposed plan. I cannot accept the plan if it does not have direct supervision of dentists. I don't think that the public will, nor the dental profession will accept anything else.

I should at this time like to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

April 2, 1973

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 63 – An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act — Bill No. 63.

At the last session of the Assembly The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968 was amended in several important respects.

For the purposes of the Bill now before the Assembly, it is necessary to refer only to three major parts of that 1972 Bill. Before dealing with the Bill itself, I should perhaps report to the Members of the House that late last fall the Board of Arbitration, The Surface Rights Arbitration Board, was increased by two members so that it is now composed of six members. The appointment of all members to the Board expired on January 11, 1973 and I am pleased to report to the Members of the House that all members of the Board have been reappointed for a further period of one year from that date.

Now about the Bill and the amendments. As I have said, they basically affect three parts:

1. One of the definitions of 'owner' in Section 2, (3) of the Act was found to be too narrow and to possibly exclude owners who might be entitled to compensation with respect to surface rights or to have such compensation reviewed. Section 2 of this Bill has been revised so that the definition of 'owner' will include those who might have been excluded from the benefits of the Act by virtue of the 1972 amendments. I don't think there is anything too controversial or too major in that amendment.
2. Next it was found that the procedural provisions of the Act with respect to applications to The Surface Rights Arbitration Board were not entirely satisfactory. They required amplification and they required simplification. Section 3 of this Bill which is before the Members of the House will add a new section providing for service of notice by an owner or occupant of his application to the Board of Arbitration for a hearing with regard to compensation to be paid by the operator for surface rights acquired under the Act by filing the said notice with the Board. The Board will then send a copy of it to the operator. In this way, any possibility of a dispute as to the mailing or receipt of the notice will be avoided and I do believe that it will improve the matter procedurally.
3. The third aspect of the Bill – one of the problems of complaints that has arisen with respect to the Act itself, arises in this way. If the owner and operator fail to agree upon the surface rights to be granted to an operator, and the matter was dealt with by the Board of Arbitration under the Act, and the Board granted the surface rights and fixed compensation to be paid to the owner, the Act in Section 32 provided that the operator could apply to the Board every five years for a review of that compensation. But, in many instances, the owner and the operator had agreed upon the surface rights to be acquired by the operator, by an agreement in writing and in that agreement the compensation was very frequently fixed. Some of these agreements also provide for a periodic review of compensation, either by agreement, or if necessary by the Board. Many

of the agreements contain no such provisions.

Section 26, therefore, of this new Act will be amended to provide for a review of the compensation, not only where the Board of Arbitration has determined the amount, but also where the amount of compensation has been agreed to in writing, between the parties themselves. Such reviews may be made at five-year intervals and the Board is given jurisdiction to deal with them in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other parts of this Bill as well which require just a brief mention.

4. Section 5 of this new Bill simply corrects an error made in Section 51(f) of the 1972 amending Act. I think no further comment needs to be made there.
5. With respect to Sections 59 A and 59 B as enacted in last year's 1972 Act. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should try to explain the situation with respect to this part as it existed before last year's 1972 amending Act was passed, which Act included these two sections, namely 59 A and 59 B.

Now ever since the discovery of oil and gas in this province took place, commencing about 1953-54 or thereabouts, a large number of what are called surface leases for well sites and access roadways have been entered into between owners of the surface and the operators. Most of such surface leases, so far as can be ascertained, contained a provision fixing the compensation to be paid by the operator to the owner, and contained also, provision for periodic reviews of the compensation at seven year intervals. Some of such surface leases did not contain such review provisions. Then in 1965 a Royal Commission was appointed – The Friesen Royal Commission to study the whole field of surface rights. That Commission made its report to the Liberal Government of the day in November of 1966. The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968 was passed at the 1968 session of this Assembly and received Royal Assent on April 13, 1968 to come into force on a date fixed by proclamation, and in fact it was proclaimed on May 23, 1968. Now between the dates the Commission was appointed in July, 1965 and the time that the Act was brought into force in May of 1968, a period of a little over three years, operators had acquired surface rights from owners either by agreement, or under authority of the Minister of Mineral Resources under the then Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulations in force. Since it was not known what recommendations the Commission might make in its report, or what action might be taken by the Government on the report of the Commission (when it was finally dealt with) the matter of compensation was left open (or at least not determined). After the Act was passed in 1968 it was found that no provisions were made in it to deal with matters of compensation for surface rights acquired before the Act came into force in 1968. Further in many instances, a Board of Arbitration, established under the Petroleum and Natural Gas Regulations, from time to time in force, had made orders awarding compensation but those regulations appeared to make no provision for a review of compensation unless the operator voluntarily agreed to do so.

In order to bring all these matters within the jurisdiction of the new Board of Arbitration established under this Surface Rights Act, the 1972 amendments contained Sections 59 A and

April 2, 1973

59 B. As a result of a hearing before the Board of Arbitration of applications based on these two sections 59 A and 59 B, it's been argued that they are not as clear as they should be to define the rights of the owners, the occupants and the operators. It is, therefore, proposed that the 1972 sections 59 A and 59 B will be repealed and a new section 59 A to 59 D, as set out in the printed Bill, will replace them.

One of the main purposes of enacting the new sections mentioned is to remove any uncertainty that may appear in the old sections 59 A and 59 B. Further, to separate matters of compensation and review of compensation that arose before May, 1968, when the Act came into force, from all those matters with respect to compensation and review of compensation that arose after the Act came into force in May 1968, this confusion has been eliminated. Then it was felt that there should be uniformity at least in principle, particularly with respect to review of compensation to be paid by operators to owners and also to occupants of land where the latter was entitled to it. As already mentioned, some surface leases contained seven-year reviews for compensation provisions, others contained no such provisions. The regulations mentioned did not contain proper provisions for review of compensation where that has been determined by the Board of Arbitration under them.

I think special mention should be made with respect to surface leases granted prior to May, 1968, which contained a seven-year review of compensation provisions.

Many of our farm owners felt that this term was far too long and apparently many of the operators have also agreed. Many of the operators have voluntarily agreed to review compensation at five-year intervals and have substituted voluntarily the five-year intervals in new agreements in place of the seven-year review provision which had been written into the leases. But there are always, of course, as Members know, a few operators who refuse to change the terms of the surface leases in this regard. We believe that there should be uniformity in the laws as much as possible between the owners or occupants on the one hand, and the operators on the other hand particularly as to the period when reviews of compensation should be required. New sections 59A and 59B in this Bill before you will therefore adopt the policies of those operators, I believe that is the majority of them now, who have voluntarily agreed to a five-year review period in place of the seven-year provision contained in the earlier surface leases. At the same time for those operators who have refused to adopt the policy of providing for the five-year review provisions it will nullify the seven-year provisions in their surface leases.

The new sections, Mr. Speaker, also provide for the procedure to be followed to bring such matters of review before the board of arbitration. A new Section 7 is included in the Bill.

I am advised that the number of applications made under the old Sections 59A and 59B are presently still pending before the Board of Arbitration. It is felt that these applications should be dealt with by the Board under the present law. Whatever problems arise from the interpretation of those sections by the Board or by the court on an appeal will be binding upon the parties. But if the court or the Board on appeal should hold the sections to not apply to the applications pending then

the owner or operator or occupant will be entitled to make application under the new section for the relief for which he considers he is entitled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the 1972 amending Act contained a new Section 9. This section deals specifically with pipe lines, flow lines, gathering lines and other facilities in connection with those lines. The Pipe Line Act of this province deals with pipe lines generally but specifically excludes flow lines, gathering lines and other facilities usually installed in connection with them, as well as the land required for purposes of laying such pipe lines. Under Section 26(2) of The Pipe Line Act the Minister of Mineral Resources could make an order that the Act shall apply to those pipe lines mentioned. If the parties cannot agree upon the compensation to be paid the district court is then given jurisdiction to determine the compensation. Section 9 of the 1972 Act made provision to the effect that where such compensation had not been determined by agreement or by the court the owner or occupant could apply to the Board of Arbitration within six months after the 1972 Act came into force to have that compensation determined. It may be remembered by Members that there was a long delay between the time the Bills passed at the 1972 session of this Assembly and the time that they received Royal Assent and the time that finally the Bills were printed, published and distributed among the people. As a result, the six month period provided by Section 9 had expired before many owners became aware of their new rights under Section 9 of the 1972 Act. We feel this has to be remedied, accordingly the new Sections 8 and 9 of the Bill will repeal the old Section 9 of 1972, it will re-enact it in substantially the same terms but will extend the time to make application to the Board of Arbitration for a period of one year from the date that the Bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of this is very technical I realize, perhaps highly legalistic, perhaps more detailed questions can be answered in Committee of the Whole. With those few words of explanation I move second reading of Bill No. 63.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. R. Guy:** — (Athabasca) Will the Member allow a question before he takes his seat. Could you tell me how many claims were heard and awards made under the 1972 amendments and whether a mediation officer has been appointed as allowed in that legislation?

**Mr. Romanow:** — I will have to provide that information with respect to the numbers of cases under the 1972 amendments later, I don't have it handy, perhaps I could do that in Committee of the Whole if the Member would agree. If not, I will try and get some information beforehand. With respect to the mediation officer, no mediation officer has been appointed to date to the best of my knowledge. I am advised by the chairman of The Surface Rights Arbitration Board that an offer has either been made within the last several days, or is about to be made to a person who resides in Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan. It will be, I am advised, on a sort of per diem basis whenever he is required to go out and mediate. We shall see how that operates because it may not be a full time position. I don't think I am at liberty to reveal the person's name because he may refuse the terms and conditions, or whatever, but I'll be pleased to

April 2, 1973

advise the House the moment a mediator is appointed.

**Mr. H. E. Coupland:** — (Meadow Lake) Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney General has already mentioned there were some amendments made to this Act last year in the 1972 session of the Legislature. The Government introduced Bill 27 to amend this Act. In that Bill the Government introduced a number of innovations such as the tortious acts claims section and the provision for appointment of a mediation officer. At the same time an attempt was made to introduce the principle that every agreement or award for surface rights should have a provision that it can be reviewed every five years for a re-adjustment of compensation. However, the Bill was so badly worded that it was subject to so many interpretations that it caused a great deal of confusion.

Bill No. 63, this one before us, seems to be an attempt to clear up this confusion. However, as it seems in most cases when one attempts to amend original principles of an Act and then again amend the amendment, the resulting patchwork becomes so complicated that it becomes a nightmare of interpretation. If one accepts the principle that no matter how a right of entry for a petroleum well, flow line, service line or power line was acquired that is, by agreement, by board award or by ministerial order under the various acts and regulations throughout the years covering this subject these are now not valid in two respects. These are the amount of compensation paid originally and the right of periodic review for compensation. Then one cannot quarrel with the principle of Bill No. 63. The main thrust of the Bill is to ensure that every situation is covered to provide that the original amount of compensation must be reviewed in each period of five years.

Accepting this principle it still leaves some mammoth problems. For example, Section 6 of the Bill provides a new Section 59B. This, in effect, provides for the right of review for compensation of an agreement made prior to April 15, 1968 for a period of five years after the agreement was made. Suppose then an agreement was made in 1954 and there are many, the owner and operator are now supposed to consider what adjustment or compensation should be made as of five years later, 1959, failing that, an application can be made to the Board. Given the criteria of Section 24 of the Act it seems it will be a most difficult task for the Board in 1973 to adjudicate what would have been a reasonable compensation 14 years ago, that is in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if anyone could attack the principle of the Bill. However, any lawyer, farmer or petroleum employee would agree now that its amendments are a mishmash and most are difficult to interpret. The best thing that could happen would be for the Attorney General to scrap the whole thing, repeal this Act and bring in a properly written one so that farmers and industry alike would be able to know precisely where they stand.

In view of the comments made by the Attorney General I should like to go over some of them and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. W. E. Smishek (Minister of Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 74 — An Act to amend The Medical Scholarship and Bursaries Act.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief remarks regarding the amendment to The Medical Scholarships and Bursaries Act.

At present, the Act authorizes the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission to provide up to \$150,000 per year to support two programs, bursary awards for Saskatchewan undergraduate medical students and research money for projects directly related to the provision of insured medical services in Saskatchewan. Since this legislation was enacted in 1963, 231 medical students have received medical bursaries; total disbursements from this fund have reached over \$1 million. There is a service requirement of six months with each bursary unit. A bursary unit is valued at \$700, a student may apply for one or two units but must establish his financial needs in order to qualify for a second \$700 unit in any one academic year. To qualify for a bursary a student must agree: 1. To continue his studies as a medical student. 2. Immediately take all steps necessary to become qualified to practice medicine in Saskatchewan. 3. Immediately practice medicine in Saskatchewan for a period of six months for each bursary unit received. 4. Repay to the Commission the full value of the bursary unit plus interest at 7 per cent per annum accruing from the date the bursary was awarded if the obligations are not met.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972, 149 bursary units were awarded; 130 were for \$700 each, while 19 units were for \$1,400 each. The total amount awarded was \$117,600. This compared with \$98,700 awarded in 1971. Over \$31,000 was expended in 1972 on research under the Act, an increase in excess of 50 per cent over 1971. In the past the research funds have been used, for example, for the purchase of an electron microscope by the Department of Pathology and Anatomy in the College of Medicine and for the conduct of the pilot study on automatic interpretation of electrocardiograms as well as other projects. Total expenditures under the Act in 1972 were just under \$149,000. Since the ceiling is close to being reached under the existing program, we have begun to question the value of maintaining this statutory ceiling on the bursary and research fund. The \$150,000 ceiling was placed on the fund in 1963 but since that time as we are all aware inflation has reduced the value of our dollar. Even at a five per cent average inflation to have the equivalent purchasing power would require about \$257,000 in today's dollars. Money is needed to give medical students some financial support and research money serves a useful function in upgrading the quality of our health care programs.

I have therefore asked for the removal of the budgetary restrictions and for a review of the existing bursary awards and research schemes. As we are all aware a long period of training is required to become a medical doctor, a minimum of seven years is required; one year pre-med, five years in medicine, the sixth year is a full 12-month study, one year of internship before a licence to practise is granted. In addition those students wishing to become specialist require a further period of training of up to four years. Other provisions have been made for financial assistance to students in their sixth



April 2, 1973

year because they are working a full 12-month period and while they are in training they are also providing a service to patients. The bursary program is designed to help the students during their first four years of college at the College of Medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that regardless of whether or not there is a ceiling in this Act, the Saskatchewan Medical Insurance Commission is effectively controlled in the payments it may make under this Act by the amounts of money appropriated annually by this Legislature. This is an opportunity to review the operation of the bursary payments.

I have on earlier occasions indicated my concern about the retention of Saskatchewan trained physicians. We in this province spent \$7.2 million on medical education in the fiscal year 1972-73. This means approximately \$120,000 in public funds for each graduate of the College of Medicine. I am sure everyone in this House can agree that these are substantial sums of public funds that are being spent on medical education. What is of primary concern is that from this expenditure we are receiving services from only about one third of the students we train. The other two thirds leave Saskatchewan for the United States or other parts of Canada. The total number of graduates from the Saskatchewan College of Medicine is 556, this is for the period since our first graduating class of 1957. Of these graduates some 200 are now taking additional training to become specialists or to fulfil their internship requirements. This means that there are approximately 350 Saskatchewan trained doctors practising, however, we have only 105 of these doctors in active practice billing through the Medical Care Insurance Commission, 1972. A few others are providing service in Saskatchewan as administrators or with agencies that do not bill the Medical Care Insurance Commission. That is, only one-third of the doctors who are trained in Saskatchewan have, in effect, elected to practise in this province.

If we are to pro-rate this on the basis of the cost of their education it means that along with the two-thirds of the medical graduates who leave Saskatchewan there is a corresponding loss each year of something in the order of \$4.8 million of costly medical education. This is a matter of grave concern, concern I have expressed before. At that time I was accused of advocating totalitarian tactics to retain medical graduates. Mr. Speaker, I note in the January 1973 issue of the Medical Care Review, an American publication, a similar concern is expressed by a medical doctor. Let me quote:

He urged consideration of a plan to ease the maldistribution of health care providers by requiring certain physicians to practise in needy locations. The plan would train a government subsidized medical education for three or four years of practice in a medically deprived community. The practice requirement would be written in an unbreakable contract and would be enforced through a temporary licence, specifying the indebted physician's place of practice.

This is a quotation, Mr. Speaker, from a medical doctor. In fact, from the president of the American Medical Association. They are not noted to be a radical left-wing group. The man in question is Doctor C. A. Hoffman. Let me quote him again:

In urging new approaches to the physician maldistribution

problem the AMA president noted the lackluster record of so-called forgiveness loan programs. These programs while commendable have met with limited success, he said, primarily because the young physician often elects to practise in a location of his choice and then repay the loan instead of fulfilling his original agreement to practise in a deprived area. Dr. Hoffman said his required practice proposal, a modified version of some European approaches should not be viewed as regimented or coercive, since the original commitment by the student would be completely voluntary. Once that commitment is made, however, the student would not have the option of cash repayment as with the forgiveness loan, Dr. Hoffman said.

He went on and said:

To control this sort of program, he said, medical societies and licensing boards would work together granting new physicians temporary licences permitting them to practise only in designated communities. This proposal admittedly is a drastic change from our previous concepts, said Dr. Hoffman, but I ask you, before you condemn it, consider it and consider it carefully.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hoffman's concern is one that I share in many ways. This loss of our medical graduates concerns me because in order to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people, we have to recruit physicians from other countries, particularly for service in smaller communities. Recent studies show that 53 per cent of all general practitioners in Saskatchewan are graduates of non-Canadian medical schools. In rural communities under 3,000 population the percentage of non-Canadian trained general practitioners was 63 per cent compared to 13.5 per cent Saskatchewan trained physicians in these communities.

Mr. Speaker, not only did I express this concern. I want to advise this House that the national conference of Health Ministers was held in this province in early October. And while I placed this item on the agenda for discussion by the Ministers, it was interesting to note that this kind of concern is being expressed by every province. That we are losing too many of our Canadian trained physicians and particularly the young ones that we are training who, on graduating, leave the provinces and do not return anything in service and particularly when this is perhaps the most costly education we provide.

Not only are we as Provincial Ministers expressing concern, there are also other people. I can tell you that this concern is expressed by our new Dean of Medicine. I can tell you that this concern is being expressed by our own medical students. I have here a letter dated March 25, 1973 from Dr. T. J. McHattie who is the President of the House Staff Association. He is in his fourth year of residency. He is going to get his full qualifications as a specialist and will be practising in Regina within another few weeks. He writes me this letter. This is following a meeting that I had with him. He came to Regina specifically to express concern and to discuss with me the development of a bursary and scholarship program which will help us retain the Saskatchewan trained physicians in the province. He says.

Further to our conversation of March 19, we would like

to clarify and expand some of the points we discussed.

This is a quote from his letter:

We would like to emphasize the primary stimulus of our Association is a concern over the lack of local graduates who remain in Saskatchewan. It has been shown that physicians tend to practise near the place in which they complete their training. It should follow then that we should devote our efforts to have as many local graduates complete their training in Saskatchewan as possible. If one wishes to increase the number of general practitioners, then we should encourage local graduates to do their rotating internship here. As I mentioned to you, there are a number of things which when taken singly appear to be trivial but when taken together serve to discourage our graduates from remaining.

He then goes on and outlines some of the things that we might be doing by way of developing a program which will help to keep our Saskatchewan graduates in the province. But I particularly want to stress his concern and the concern of the Association that he represents – the money that we are spending on medical education and the few physicians that we are able to retain in the province after they graduate.

Mr. Speaker, let me say also this, that I appreciate and our Government appreciates the contribution that non-Canadian trained doctors have made in this province and continue to make. This is no criticism of the non-Saskatchewan trained or non-Canadian trained physicians. In fact, if it were not for them we would not be able to provide the high quality of care that we are providing in this province and throughout this country. However, I believe we should as much as possible meet our own needs with our own local people. Particularly at a time when employment opportunities for young people are at a premium and in the light of the very substantial amount of money we are spending on medical education, I think that we are training an adequate number of physicians to meet our needs, if we can encourage them to remain in Saskatchewan after they have graduated.

One of the programs that is designed to make it possible for young people with limited financial resources to become doctors and to encourage the graduates of our medical schools to remain in the province is our medical bursary program. In recent months we have been studying the medical bursary program to see if it can be improved. The College of Medicine has submitted a short brief regarding the medical bursaries which contains the opinions of both professors and students of the school. After reading the brief I know that we share many common concerns. I hope that a program can be developed with the participation of all of these involved which will more equally share the needs of Saskatchewan people. The proposal from the College of Medicine has many innovative ideas. For example, they had provisions to encourage graduates to practise in particular areas of the province such as northern Saskatchewan. Also to encourage those students who are going into specialty training to specialize in those areas in which the manpower need is greatest such as psychiatry and other areas where we have shortages.

Students and the professors were concerned with the amount of bursary support which is available in any one year. The

present maximum of \$1,400 per year per student is possibly not realistic in terms of the high cost for students undertaking medical education. It should be kept in mind that the school year for a medical student covers a longer period than for other university students. This means that they have less opportunity to augment their income with summer jobs. Not only that, but most of the good summer jobs are gone by the time the medical student is available for employment. Furthermore, their tuition fees are higher and their personal expenses for purchasing necessary equipment and supplies are also higher than for the other classes of university students. We will certainly be taking this into consideration in our review of the medical bursary program. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that a better bursary program can be introduced for the medical students this year. For this reason I am asking that the statutory financial ceiling in the Act be removed. This amendment will give us the flexibility to meet the future needs of medical scholarships and bursaries.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

**Mr. G. B. Grant:** — (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, on the Bill itself I don't think anyone can take exception to the removal of the limit of \$150,000. It serves no practical purpose really because as the Minister points out the real control is the Treasury Board and the Cabinet where his budget has to be approved.

The Minister has taken advantage of this opportunity to delve into a larger field, a problem area that has existed for some time. I'm sure there is no one in this House who has served a stint as Minister of Health who can't sympathize with him. I concur in most of what he says. It's a problem, as he has pointed out, that is not restricted to Saskatchewan. It's widespread throughout North America. I would hope, and I gather this from his remarks, that any restriction on the export of doctors would be done by co-operation rather than by direct control because Saskatchewan by itself cannot do this except on a voluntary basis and with the co-operation of the College and the Saskatchewan Medical Association. I doubt whether even improving the bursaries is going to overcome that problem. It's certainly going to make medicine maybe a little more attractive and thereby maybe attract more people and hopefully because you have more people graduating you're going to keep more bodies, but percentagewise I don't know that it's going to make that much difference, but every bit helps. There are so many other factors that enter into the decision-making of a doctor as to whether he continues to practise here in Saskatchewan or go elsewhere that the bursary program is only a small part of it.

I would hope that the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Medical Associations would really be the spark plugs in this type of thing because it does require a lot of co-ordination and co-operation across the country. Because one province or one state I don't think can do it in isolation to any advantage. I suppose if there is a surplus of students and they can't get into the other colleges then a province could resort to this and get away with it. But if restrictions are put on here in Saskatchewan and there is capacity in the other medical schools to take our students, I think that you would find that they would move to these other schools so it's pretty important to do it on a co-operative basis.

April 2, 1973

Mr. Speaker, since the Bill itself has no direct relation and only an indirect relation to the problem we have no desire to hold it up and we will support the Bill. I urge the Minister to try to overcome the other problems by co-operation and I certainly wish him success because I know it's a real toughie particularly with the psychiatrists.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, may I express my appreciation to the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park for expressing his support for the Bill. It is true that in my remarks during second reading I dealt more than with the bursary program but I felt it was important to bring to the attention of the Members of the Legislature as to how much money is being spent on medical education and the difficulties that there are in the retention rate.

May I say this in closing. I'm not suggesting that in this province there is a shortage of medical manpower. There is not. We have plenty of doctors to provide good care for the people. We do in some particular areas like psychiatry have a shortage and that has been something that we have had a problem with for many years. It seems to me that in this area our medical program, our education program has failed and has not provided the doctors that we need. And I think in this area I want to see us work out a program with the College of Medicine to start providing those doctors that we are short of.

I know also that in the case of the cancer control program in recent months we have seen some difficulties of getting radiotherapists and chemotherapists and other highly specialized groups. Again, I think that we can be training these people in this province but for some reason or other we have failed to do this. In Saskatchewan there is no overall shortage of medical manpower. I think we are fairly fortunate. But there are areas where there are particular shortages.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that since I've raised this question publicly last October, it is interesting to note that whenever I visited rural communities who over the years have had difficulties recruiting physicians, they said, good show, it's time somebody raised this question and that we have some public debate on this question because, if we, the public are spending this much money on medical education, we are entitled to get some reasonable return. I think this is an area where there is a good deal of public concern as well as there is a need to develop a program which will meet the needs of Saskatchewan and particularly start training those doctors in areas where we do have a shortage.

I'm glad to hear that we are going to get the support of the Opposition on this Bill. I can agree with the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park that if the program is to be effective in keeping our Saskatchewan graduates here it does require co-operation from the SMA and from the College and particularly of the University. May I say this, that in Saskatchewan the number of applicants that we get every year is in the order of 250 or 260 and we are only able to accommodate 60 each year. That's the intake to the school. I'm sure that if we develop an effective bursary and scholarship program and perhaps encourage them to stay here following graduation, I think it can be successful. I don't think that we have really tried up until now to develop that kind of program.

Motion agreed and Bill read a second time.

Hon. A Taylor (Minister of Social Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Public Service Act

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 68 contains only one amendment. It may be that some will attempt to see in this some sort of ulterior or hidden motive but I should like to assure you, Sir, there is no such motive or design. Indeed, as I see it, this particular amendment is more of a housekeeping nature.

You will remember that in an earlier session of the Legislature the requirement in The Public Service Act of being a British subject in order to obtain a job in the Public Service of Saskatchewan through the regular job channels was removed. I'd like to review with you, Sir, the reasons for this because they are directly related to the present amendment.

One of the main causes in the past for Order-in-Council appointments, particularly among professional groups, has been because the individuals involved were not British subjects. Not being such subjects it was impossible for them under the old Act to obtain employment in the normal manner. Now people today have far greater mobility than they ever had before. It is not unusual for men and women to move with fair frequency from one country to another, not only in search of employment but also for a change in living and working experience. It has been said often that the world as we know it has shrunk, and this is true. There are a growing number of people who want to have an opportunity of living in various parts of that world. I am convinced that in the years ahead there will be an increasing number in this category. Many people are no longer satisfied to stay in one place or in one country for life. Although at times this can create problems, it is my belief that in the long run this type of movement of population will be beneficial to us all. There will surely result from this a greater understanding among people of the world. At the same time professionals and others who have come to us from other parts of the world will bring to us new ideas and concepts. They offer us new insights into other ways of doing things.

Another problem we face, and I am sure that those who have been in Government before and sat on the Treasury Benches will also recognize this problem, is that from time to time we cannot find the qualified personnel we need within our own country. We then have to reach out and bring them in from other places. Occasionally this happens in reasonably short term appointments where for a period of just a few years the Government may need a highly skilled individual in a particular branch of technology or professions. The same thing, of course, happens in the case of employees that we hope will be permanent. For these reasons the requirements of a person being a British subject was removed from the Act some time ago. It seems to me only logical then that the Oath of Allegiance should also be removed.

The Oath itself is often as much of a block as the previous requirement was. Members will recognize, I expect, that in a number of countries the taking of an Oath of Allegiance in our country would cause the individual to lose his previous citizenship. If he has not then already become a citizen of Canada he becomes a man without a country. It may also be, as is sometimes the case, that a person has come to work for a specified period of time, at least in his own mind, and he intends to return to his native land. I suggest that this type of thing will be happening more frequently in the years ahead. When this

is the case he certainly does not want to take any action which might deny him his previous citizenship. Now I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't believe there is any danger from this or from any other subsequent government using the repeal of this requirement to deliberately fill the Public Service with non-citizens. I'm certain this is not our intention and I cannot believe it would be the intention of any future government. Indeed, I suspect that the reverse would be true, that wherever there is a reasonable choice a Canadian citizen, and preferably a citizen of Saskatchewan, would receive first preference. Our aim in this amendment is to reduce the necessity in such cases for Order-in-Council appointments. Rather than an amendment which might undermine anything; I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will strengthen the normal recruiting process in the Public Service.

I would therefore, at this time, move second reading of a Bill to amend The Public Service Act.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. K. R. MacLeod:** — (Regina Albert Park) Mr. Deputy Speaker, I only have a few remarks to this Bill but I should like to express to the House my own unhappiness with the decision to eliminate the Oath of Allegiance and I do oppose the Bill although I recognize the reasoning given by the Minister and the sincerity with which he has approached this matter. Nonetheless we have had numerous civil servants or public servants in the past who have not been Canadian citizens, and it has not been too much to ask of them that while they are employed here they should give an Oath of Allegiance to Her Majesty. In my judgement there is today too little respect for the traditions of our form of government. And I believe as long as we have our form — the democratic or constitutional monarchy with the trappings and the form, the Lieutenant-Governor coming to us and all the rest — with the traditions that we have, it is not inappropriate that each person who comes to take our money and serve us, for which we thank them, should, in fact, take the Oath of Allegiance. I do not believe that any person is belittled in any way taking that Oath of Allegiance nor is that Oath of Allegiance an opposition to any other country. An American citizen or a French citizen or a German citizen may well come to Canada to seek employment in Canada and come to work for our Government without in any way speaking in opposition to or swearing an oath which will in any way betray his own loyalty to his own country. I understand the remarks of the Hon. Minister but I do not believe that it is necessary to make Order-in-Council appointments of every non-Canadian citizen who comes to work for the Government of Saskatchewan through the Public Service Commission. I do not wish to make this a major issue, but I speak for myself. I rather hope that other colleagues of mine in opposition feel about this the same as I do. I regret that the Government has seen fit to bring this kind of a Bill to the floor and I regret that I must oppose it.

**Mr. A. R. Guy:** — (Athabasca) I should just like to say a word or two. I appreciate, like my colleague, the comments that the Minister made while he was introducing the Bill but I feel that at this particular time that this is not a good piece of legislation. After all we are still a part of the Dominion of Canada as a province, we are a

member of the British Commonwealth of Nations as a country, the Queen is still the sovereign head of our country. And to introduce legislation at this time which would eliminate the need of taking the Oath of Allegiance I don't think is a good step for the province and it wouldn't be a good step for the country as a whole. When we are trying to bring unity in the world and in the British Commonwealth of Nations it is not wise for a province in the middle of this great country to pass legislation that would eliminate the requirement for people who come to work for the province, to take the Oath of Allegiance. We do have the British system of government, we do have the judicial system so why should we be hesitant to have members who are under this system take the Oath of Allegiance to Her Majesty? I don't wish to suggest the Government has any ulterior motives but we saw in a previous Bill where the basics of our judicial system have been turned around and the innocent are now guilty until they prove themselves innocent as under The Natural Products Act. I think this is another step perhaps to wear away some of our British judicial system that we are proud of in this province and therefore on that basis I do oppose this Bill.

**Mr. P. Mostoway:** — (Hanley) Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief comments in regard to this Bill which I wholeheartedly support. I think, and I don't want to get into an argument here, that the correct terminology is "The Commonwealth of Nations." I believe this is the terminology used by the Prime Ministers when they meet. Another thing that I wanted to point out is that the Oath of Allegiance can have some serious implications for those who might be forced to take this Oath of Allegiance, serious implications for those people when they return, if they do, to their own countries. So, just for the record, I wholeheartedly, support this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. J. G. Lane:** — (Lumsden) There is a great deal of indication that the Government opposite has many steps involved in and this particular amendment is just one indication. We had a federal election campaign where three Premiers of Western Canada took a very pro west stand in an election where the Premier went around the country demeaning Saskatchewan Cabinet Ministers in the Federal Government by saying there were no Cabinet Ministers of any note from Western Canada. We are very concerned about the amendment. We get different speeches from the Government opposite in Halifax than what we hear in Saskatchewan. And we are not all too sure just where the Government opposite stands in this particular scheme of Confederation. We are going to ask for leave to adjourn this debate for further comments, Mr. Speaker.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Wood that Bill No. 70 – An Act respecting Urban and Rural Planning and Development be now read a second time.

**Mr. J. C. McIsaac:** — (Wilkie) Mr. Speaker, when this was



last before the House I asked for leave to adjourn the debate on this particular Bill in view of the size itself of the Bill, 70 odd pages, 208 different subsections. I think, upon reading the Bill and studying some of the subsections and the many related powers, I am going to go briefly through them, Mr. Speaker, to try and make the point in opposing this Bill as it's presently written, opposing it for the reason that it gives, as I read the Bill, almost complete power over the municipal planning process to the Provincial Government. And I would agree with the Minister, when he introduced the Bill, that the Province does have a responsibility in planning. Surely, it doesn't need to have complete power and complete responsibility as it would appear to me that this Bill will give the Provincial Government.

Section 30 of the present Act reads as follows, Mr. Speaker:

The Minister may after consultation with the Council of a municipality direct the Council to prepare or amend a municipal development plan for all of or any part of the municipality.

In short, the Government can order any rural municipality, any village, any town, any city to prepare a development plan. Section 30 goes on to say that, in effect, municipalities have up to two years to get such a plan developed and implemented. If the Government should at that time decide to do it for them, of course, another section states that municipality shall pay the Government for that.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Minister and other Members opposite that for hundreds of Saskatchewan towns and villages it's a little too late to get excited about formal development plans. Plans now are not really going to change the future. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the larger urban centres are concerned and I speak here of the cities and, of course, the majority of the major towns in the province, they have development plans which have been approved by the Department of Municipal Affairs. And may I suggest that the Government opposite might better be spending time on planning in a broader sense, studying what can be done to bolster and enhance rural and rural-urban life, I speak of urban in the sense of the urban communities centred in rural Saskatchewan, to try and maintain and expand the viable urban communities we have remaining in rural Saskatchewan. And certainly if changes in development plans for individual communities, if they are desirable, there's no one I think in a better position to recognize those needs, to develop the changes and implement them, than the local people themselves.

This again, as I say, is one of the reasons why I don't like the powers that are being, in essence, taken away from municipal governments.

Section 60 is another section in the Act that sets up a zoning appeals board. Such decisions may then be appealed to a provincial board. Section 87 is another section, the Minister may direct the commission to prepare or amend an approved district development plan. As I understand it, any particular plan may be amended by ministerial or by departmental order. Another section, and I should perhaps take more time to expand on these, but another section, Section 97:

No sub-divisions of land may be made unless in accordance with this Act and the regulation and with plans and specifications submitted to and approved by the Minister.

I doubt if that section is really required, Mr. Speaker. As I read it, it's a new power and I suggest an unnecessary power in all cases. It's another illustration, I think, of the growth of bureaucracy and I would ask the Minister to look at some of these things himself.

Section 122 . . .

**Mr. Wood:** — Excuse me, I don't know if it is in order that we go into sections at this stage of the debate. I didn't catch the number of the section, Section 66 or 87, I didn't catch what the other one was.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Section 97. I list a few of these sections, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate that I believe the principle of the Bill is not in the best interests of the municipalities of the province, greater and greater government control and government involvement in community planning affairs.

Section 122:

Any person who is aggrieved by a decision of an approving authority may appeal therefrom to the provincial planning appeals board in accordance with various procedures that are set out.

Mr. Speaker, in short terms what that means is, if the municipality or any resident of it and landowner gets by all of the roadblocks the Government can throw in its path, it is still subject to having its moves appealed by anyone who feels aggrieved and that could be anyone as I read the Act.

Section 124 then increases the membership of that appeals board and I think probably rightly so because it will certainly be more of a full time tribunal if all of these changes are proceeded with.

Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the Press reports and some personal contact I've made with municipal officials clearly indicate that municipal officials generally, both here and in Saskatoon, and other points, have opposed this legislation. The Minister told us in the introduction of the Bill that the draft of it had been worked on by staff in the department when the former Liberal Government was in power and that is true. I know that to be a fact. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this bill needs more working over yet. It never was presented to even the Minister in the former Liberal Government let alone the Cabinet. The Bill along with the powers that pertain to controlling municipal planning in general, I suggest, is an indication of the Government's lack of concern or lack of consideration for municipal councils in this province and as such I will be opposing the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. I. Wood:** — (Minister of Municipal Affairs) I should like to have an

April 2, 1973

opportunity to say a few words concerning what has been said by the Hon. Member who has just sat down.

May I submit it is slightly irregular that we should be going into the clauses of the Bill at this stage. I do submit, Sir, that my opportunity to bring forward arguments in regard to those that have been mentioned by the Hon. Member opposite are a little restrained by the ordinary procedures in this debate. I will however, endeavor to mention some of the ones that have been set out.

In regard to Section 30, the Hon. Member has pointed out that the Minister under this Section is able to require that a municipality may come forward with a municipal development plan after due consultation with the council of the municipality. He indicates that he feels that this is something that should not be. I believe when I introduced this Bill I indicated that we did feel that there was a responsibility upon the Provincial Government to accept the responsibility for planning in the province. And I think the Hon. Member opposite who has been a former Minister of Municipal Affairs will recognize that there is this responsibility upon the Provincial Government, the Department of Municipal Affairs will recognize that there is this responsibility upon the Provincial Government, the Department of Municipal Affairs, to see that proper procedures are carried out in all municipal councils in the province. He is well aware that the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Municipal Affairs has the authority to move in and regulate what is done in any municipality in the province in case — in his opinion — that the municipal council duly elected is not fulfilling its obligations. I think he is well aware that this is just not done very many times. Although it has been done and from time to time it has been found necessary. There is a similar section in regard to planning, that the province has a responsibility for the planning of the province. And if we find places where municipalities are just ignoring or not living up to their responsibilities it does say that the Minister can — he has this power.

We are not saying that there has to be a development plan in all municipalities. The Hon. Member indicated that he thought that we were behind, that we're much too late in suggesting that there has to be a development plan in hundreds of towns and villages in the province.

We are not saying this, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly not the intention of the Government that we should be insisting upon development plans in hundreds of towns and villages. These things are left entirely up to the village or the town. But if, Mr. Speaker, there are cases — very infrequent I am sure — but if there are situations where the municipalities are negligent of their responsibilities in this regard even after consultation with them, the powers are put into this Act that we can move in that direction. I think it is justified and it is not expected that this will be a power that will be abused by any Government. But it is simply an opportunity to do what we feel should be.

The Hon. Member has said that the local people themselves are best suited to know what is desirable and what is good in that community. And with this I certainly wholeheartedly agree. I think that this is only right and it is to be expected that the local people are the ones who should move and will be expected to move in regard to these matters.

This Act does place very squarely upon the local people the responsibility for planning in their areas. And it is only in cases where this is not lived up to by the local people that there would be the necessity of anything being done under these sections of the Act.

On some of these other matters I am afraid I have not had the opportunity to go into it in detail. But we will have ample opportunity to discuss the sections in detail when we get into committee.

I should like to point out one thing that has been said in regard to Section 97, that this is a new section. I think that the Hon. Member will find that this is where we are dealing with subdivisions and what was in the old Section 72 of the Act, whereas this is reworded, the authority was there before. Old Section 72 reads:

No subdivision of land for the purpose of sale or transfer or for building purposes shall be made unless in accordance with plans and specifications committed to and approved by the council under regulations approved by the Minister under Section 79 or submitted to and approved by the Minister under regulations made by him in the case the council has not adopted regulations.

Well that gave the power directly to the Minister under the old section of the Act and I don't think there is any departure in principle from that in the present Act.

The Hon. Member mentioned the ability to appeal to the provincial appeals board. I think that this is a good feature of the Act. In fact in this Act even the actions of the Minister may be appealed to the provincial appeals board.

This Act does not make the Minister supreme in planning in the province. It will be the provincial appeals board which is the supreme body in that regard. I think this is a good thing. I think that it allows anyone to appeal the Provincial Government or the actions of the local authorities to the provincial appeals board. I think this is a good feature of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think that any Act dealing with the planning has to be a certain degree autocratic. I think that in this Act we have bent over backward to endeavor to bring in as much as possible the application of the principle of consultation with local people. The principle is there that everything has to be advertised and well known by the people in the area before action can be taken upon certain things by the municipal council or by the Minister.

I feel that the principle of this Bill throughout has been to democratize the action of community planning and bringing it more to the attention of people and involving more people in it than what there has been in the past. I think there are sections in the Act as there have been in any community planning Act that have to be enforced by the province. There have been certain places where those in authority have to do the planning. Planning is something that is a little hard to do by strictly democratic measures. But having said that, I think this Act brings in as much democracy as it is possible to have in such

April 2, 1973

an Act. I think in the overall viewpoint that it is a good Act based on sound principles which I submit have been under consideration by community planning people in the province for many months.

I would thus, Mr. Speaker, move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 50 – An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972 be now read a second time and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. MacDonald (Milestone).

**Mr. J. G. Lane:** — (Lumsden) I wish the Members opposite would have enthusiasm for the resolution as they do for the remarks that I am going to make today.

I think that the matter under discussion, Mr. Speaker, about whether or not the particular Bill would go to the committee is one that I touched on, I made it quite clear the other night why we are proposing the amendment. We feel that the Bill is just as important as any that has come before the Legislature in taking away the rights of the farmer to operate in his own way and make his own decisions as to what type of operation he wants to make without a vote. Never in the history of this country has there been more iniquitous legislation as the proposals of the Government opposite.

We can quite easily compare this legislation to the infamous padlock laws and any other type of iniquitous legislation that has been proposed in this House.

We make it quite clear that it is our intention in the Opposition to try and get the Government to change its mind and give to the people and the farmers and the hog producers a vote. A very, very simple procedure.

Now the Member opposite has repeated that they don't want one. He has said that the hog producers don't want one.

It took the CCF 20 years to get out of touch with the people. The Government opposite accused the Liberals of seven years of being out of touch with the people. Even when the hog producers put a full page ad in the Western Producer it is shown that the Government opposite has taken 20 months to get out of touch with the people.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — How much did you pay for the ad?

**Mr. Lane:** — We didn't pay for that ad because we didn't have to pay for that ad.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Lane:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But it was quite clear that a principle was involved in the amendment that was made. The credibility of the Attorney General, the credibility of the

Government, the credibility of their arguments for the committee system are all at stake on the voting of this particular amendment. What we have done as I have stated, Mr. Speaker, is merely proposed that the Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act go to a committee.

Now the Attorney General has stated and has given some very cogent reason for the committee system. I repeated some of them the other night, unfortunately Members opposite saw fit to ignore the arguments of the Attorney General. We find it very hard to believe that the Deputy Premier would be so cut off from his own back benchers that they would completely ignore the arguments that he gave to this House a year ago.

We find it very, very surprising that the Attorney General would have his credibility ride on this particular issue. We note the accusations of the Attorney General earlier today that the Opposition is playing politics. We are not playing politics with the farmers. We are demanding that the Government opposite give to the producers of Saskatchewan a vote. We don't know why the Government opposite fears a vote. Is it because the Minister of Agriculture wasn't telling us the truth when he said that the hog producers wanted a Hog Marketing Commission without a vote?

That is what this vote is going to determine, the vote on this amendment. Whether or not Members opposite feel the Minister of Agriculture was telling the truth. But above all on this particular debate which is the principle about whether or not the amendment should go to committee, I can only urge that the Members opposite reconsider what the Attorney General has said in the past. As I stated we had a very — in the words of the members opposite — vital issue come before this House last year. A Bill was prepared so there is ample precedent for a Bill being taken after it has been prepared and given to a committee. I think that there are many reasons for putting this in a committee and I should like to remind them because the Members opposite were urging me to take it as read. If I could be assured that it could be taken as listened to, I wouldn't have to repeat what the Attorney General said last year when he was urging a Bill that had been prepared to go to committee.

I think it was very interesting to note what the Attorney General said last year. And he is referring to the Foreign Ownership Bill. He is referring to why that particular Bill went to a committee:

I don't know what the Government could do more than it has done.

We ask you to apply this same criterion at this particular time. We ask you to take every one of the reasons that the Attorney General and just show that you believe what the Attorney General said last year. Let's see if you really believe and really meant what you said about putting the Foreign Ownership Bill to committee or whether you were playing cheap partisan politics, with an issue last year that you knew had gone too far and was contrary to the wishes of the people.

I urge the Members opposite to tell the Attorney General his credibility still is high within his own caucus. We know that speech number five that he gave today probably won't get

April 2, 1973

too much Press because the Press has heard it before. All the Government has to do with the Natural Products Marketing Act is place it in committee and give the hog producers a vote. Obviously that may be too much to ask of the arrogant 45 Members of the Government opposite. But I think that the reasons given by the Attorney General – unfortunately he is not in his seat, he doesn't want to hear his own words thrown back at him. He has now left the House, obviously some of the Members opposite don't want to hear what the Attorney General said in urging, a very pressing and a very vital issue, that it go to the committee.

Now one of the main reasons for the committee and the reasons for placing a Bill – and I might add for the edification of the Members opposite that the Bill had been printed last year, it was all prepared for the House, we were all prepared to discuss it. But no, you took it out and you put it into committee. The Attorney General states that the reason it went in Bill form, and he states.

Here is a Bill as a proposal. Here is a committee that is going to study it as the Minister of Agriculture has said.

Now these ringing words of course will apply to the conscience of every Member opposite.

Let's get to the task and solve the problem for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

These are the words of the Attorney General in urging a Bill to go to committee.

“But now the Member for Wilkie gets up today and says that he doesn't blame the Minister of Agriculture for introducing the Bill and for saying that it is going to be the subject matter of review. He says that he doesn't blame the Minister of Agriculture, he blames our Leader. I can say to him that I don't necessarily blame him for the tenor of his remarks today, because I think that the tenor as set by his leader, who was never convinced that this matter is a serious political discussion and debate in the Province of Saskatchewan.”

A failure of the Government opposite to place this particular Bill into committee, is an indication that the Government opposite is not convinced that the matter of compulsory marketing commissions without a vote, is a serious matter of political discussion and debate in the Province of Saskatchewan, and a vote against the proposed amendment is an indication that you are not taking this problem seriously. You don't take the issue of a vote seriously, and you don't think that the people of Saskatchewan should discuss your actions in this regard.

He goes on:

If the Leader of the Opposition was genuinely concerned about this problem, (I refrain from referring to foreign ownership) as the Member from Cannington suggests at any rate, I won't even say that he indicates it's a problem because maybe he doesn't believe it is a problem, but he clearly left that impression on me and I think Saskatchewan.

Surely the Members opposite don't want to leave the impression the people of Saskatchewan and on the Members opposite, that they don't think that a failure of the vote is not a pressing problem. And yet that is the impression that you are leaving with the people of Saskatchewan and it is the impression that you are leaving with the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan when you say that there will be no vote, no committee, to discuss this particular Bill.

And again some very famous ringing words said from the depth of his heart:

If the Leader of the Opposition was sincere in saying that this was a problem he wouldn't have gotten on national television the day the Bill was introduced and tried to make big political mileage of it as he did.

Surely, if the Premier is sincere, really sincere about giving the farmers a voice in their own affairs, that this Bill would go to a committee.

And then he goes on:

Because as we said there is no power until the Bill becomes law and we said the Bill wouldn't become law. And we said the Bill wouldn't become law until there was a committee studying it. So why does the Leader of the Opposition and why does the Member from Wilkie chastise the Government about taking powers unto itself when there are no powers until the Bill becomes law.

We ask you: Why do you want to take the powers upon yourself? Why not give the powers to the Committee to review this question of voting? Why do you want to take upon yourselves and upon your conscience the fact that you have failed and refused to give the farmers, the hog producers, a vote to decide what they want to do?

There are many reasons for the Bill going to Committee. As I say I am using this as a precedent:

The Member from Wilkie asks why did the Government bring in this Bill. If I haven't made myself clear now then I will never make myself clear to the Liberal Party opposite. Sometimes I am convinced that I never will.

The credibility and the ability to clarify is certainly going down the drain and out the window if the Government opposite votes against the amendment.

The Minister of Agriculture and I repeat again the thrust of his remarks. The purpose of this Bill is to put forward a subject that can be the subject of debate and study and consequent recommendations by a Standing Committee or Special Committee of this House, (He didn't know which, but he was getting it to a committee) the basis of which could be possible legislation at the earliest opportunity available by the Government of Saskatchewan. This is in effect the purpose.

Why do the Members opposite not hold these words dear to their hearts this year, when we ask that a Bill of much greater importance than foreign ownership, and that is the right of the farmers to decide their own future goes to a committee? Why



April 2, 1973

does the Attorney General's words have no effect on the Members opposite? Why don't they listen to the Attorney General's words this year? Because perhaps he was playing cheap partisan politics when it came to the Foreign Ownership Bill? No, surely our Attorney General would not do that. Surely our Attorney General would not stand up in this House and urge a study and a listening post for the people of Saskatchewan when he is talking about foreign ownership, a man who is responsible for the administration of justice, fail to do what he demanded earlier, when it comes to the right to vote and the right of the farmers to make their own decisions.

Now we are surprised because every one of the Members opposite, is going to decide by the vote on this amendment, whether or not the Attorney General was telling the truth when it came to the Foreign Ownership Bill. And this is precisely what this is about.

They say no, no he wasn't telling the truth, that means that they are going to vote against the amendment. Is that what the Members opposite are saying? Because I think that it is worth repeating, for the Members opposite, the purpose of this Bill is to put forward a subject that can be the subject of debate. Surely the right to vote can be the subject of debate. If you are going to take it away it shouldn't be the subject matter of a debate as it should never arise. But you insist on putting it before this forum and surely it should be a matter for a subject of debate for every citizen in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Surely the right to vote and the farmers to decide whether they want a compulsory marketing scheme is a subject for study. And surely the right to vote and the desire, or the lack of desire, for a compulsory marketing scheme is subject for subsequent recommendations by a committee or a Standing Committee in this House.

To paraphrase what the Hon. Member said last year – the basis of that committee and why we urge the Members opposite to vote for this amendment, is that we could have the best possible legislation at the earliest possible time to take to the people of Saskatchewan. And that is what we are urging with this amendment. And that is why we urge the Members opposite to vote for this amendment. To paraphrase again the Attorney General – so that we can get the most acceptable legislation and the best possible legislation for the people of Saskatchewan. And that is the purpose of the amendment.

But we were accused of not accepting that by the front benchers opposite.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — What are you on, Gary?

**Mr. Lane:** — Page 2057 and moving right along.

**An Hon. Member:** — What year?

**Mr. Lane:** — It is an amazing thing that the Government opposite, when they make a drastic mistake with a Foreign Ownership Bill that didn't have the support of the people that they can even forget what year they brought it in, and they have only been in

for less than two years, and they are already asking, what year did we bring in the Foreign Ownership Bill? Ask the people of Saskatchewan when you brought it in and they will give you the date and they will give you the time.

The purpose is to have a subject matter of debate. It doesn't matter, I can pick up this debate at any time. The Hon. Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) may be well advised to read it for his own interest and edification. For the simple fact that I can pick this particular debate up at any page and I am struck by the very ringing words of the Attorney General, a different page, a different page picked at random.

I ask all the people of Saskatchewan when I get up in my position and the Minister of Agriculture, we may be politicians, but surely there has got to be some onus of responsibility on it that even you people would grudgingly admit.

Well, surely there must be some onus of responsibility on the matter of giving the farmers a vote, which surely even you people, must grudgingly admit.

The purpose of our amendment is to give the farmers the chance and the opportunity to debate a marketing scheme with all the information available to them. Why is it refused? And that is the question that the farmers are asking. What have you got to fear from a vote?

Now we were accused at that particular point because the Attorney General, as I said, has stated it was a matter of study. He said: "You boys don't want to study this matter seriously." And I think that is worth repeating, we were accused that, "You boys don't want to take this matter seriously." Surely this is the issue here that you people aren't taking the matter seriously. You are not taking the matter seriously of 1,200 farmers writing in, demanding a vote, demanding a plebiscite. Why aren't you taking it seriously?

Is it a fact that the 45 Members sitting opposite are already out of touch with the people of Saskatchewan and are saying to the farmers, "We know what is best. We will make the decisions. We will make the rules and the regulations for the farmers of Saskatchewan."

I can advise the Members opposite that the more notes I get from the Members opposite, the more reading material I have. It may not have much value to it, but certainly it would be worth repeating to the House.

He says that they were elected on the Land Bank. We asked that the Land Bank go to Committee. But the Government opposite, in its very limited wisdom said that they were elected on the mandate. So we don't have to put that particular matter to a vote.

Well, if I remember the New Deal for People it states that there would be a producer control on marketing commissions. And I think those are the exact words, I may have suffered slightly on an adjective, but I think it was producer control. The Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) has seemingly forgotten the New Deal for People, which states that the Government opposite is proposing a producer controlled hog marketing commission.

April 2, 1973

Now if you were prepared to give a producer controlled hog marketing commission, I suppose that you would have some acceptability, if you stood up and said, "But we ran on that issue. We were elected on that issue." But that is not your intention. You intend to give a Government controlled hog marketing commission and that is not what you were elected on, and that is not why the people voted for you, and that is another reason for getting consensus from the public of Saskatchewan.

Let's hear what they say about your plans for a Government controlled hog marketing commission, or is that what you fear? Is that why you are afraid to take this matter to public debate?

**Mr. Cody:** — We will worry about it.

**Mr. Lane:** — Now they say that they will worry about it. I am sure that you should have started worrying about it. I think that it is only the Members opposite who could fall asleep on an issue this vital. And it is a very surprising thing that they are that arrogant and don't care that they would want to sleep in such a particular issue.

I would refer the Member from Canora to The New Deal for People, the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan's program for progress. Number 12 under Agriculture. Agriculture has a picture of a tractor, for all of you have not read this, it has a tractor on the first page and then above the word 'provincial', we discern that it is going over the word 'provincial' and I don't know whether that is an indication of what you are doing to the rights of the farmers of Saskatchewan or not, but we can refer to number 12 under the New Deal for People.

**An Hon. Member:** — Will you repeat the . . .

**Mr. Lane:** — I am now going to do that, Mr. Speaker! The first heading was Agriculture, and then as I say there is a tractor and I suppose it is a farmer — and the word 'provincial' under the word tractor:

The continuing degradation of Saskatchewan agriculture and the related decline of our rural communities are the most critical issues before the people of Saskatchewan.

Now they go on and they are going to chastise — we agree with that:

Liberal policy makers in the name of economic efficiency are doing everything in their power to promote ever-larger corporately managed farms and hasten the depopulation of rural Saskatchewan.

We witness their recommendations of their Task Force on Agriculture. Surely we have heard about that before. Several speakers of the Government opposite discussed the Task Force on Agriculture. We asked them when they discuss family farms and corporate farms to tell us how many family farms there were in the province. Lo and behold, they don't have a number! Lo and behold, then they talk about corporate farmers and now find out that many small families have corporate farms for tax purposes or accounting purposes, or management purposes.

However, that is the type of issue that came up in the New Deal for People. Well, they decided to restrict corporate ownership to family farms and groups of families farming co-operatively, which was completely at variance with the earlier paragraph, obviously written in the hopes that the people wouldn't really read it. When we get to number 12 – the establishment of a provincial producer controlled (maybe I missed a word for the Member from Canora, because he accused me of misreading this). But number 12:

The establishment of a provincial producer controlled hog marketing board.

I think that was the one that was submitted to most of the people of Saskatchewan. The Premier had got up and proudly discussed how many thousands of copies of the New Deal for People were sent out. I think that the farmers and the hog producers are entitled to ask the Government opposite, 'why don't you do exactly what you have written.'

You weren't elected on a Government controlled hog marketing commission and that is all the more reason that we go back to the Attorney General's remarks, all the more reason for sending this to a Committee.

I say to the Members opposite that surely we can bury our political differences in the resolution of that problem. I am sure that if you are really concerned about the democratic process and the right of hog producers to make their own determination, that we can bury our political differences. We can bury our political differences by putting this particular matter before a committee and that is what we urge.

Then just to prove that committees can work, we have an admission from the Attorney General:

I am sure that those Members of the committee on our side will be prepared to do just that.

And that is to make it work.

We had strong differences over The Family Farm Protection Act but that committee worked well. Everybody acknowledges that. This committee can also do the same job very well.

We are inviting the New Democratic Party to join with us in that stated task. That is all we ask, take this matter to the people because you weren't elected on a Government controlled marketing commission.

Now just to make sure that the Attorney General wasn't alone in this because his credibility is an issue and his desire

April 2, 1973

to tell the Members of this House the truth, we will have to turn to another Member of the Treasury Bench about the advantages of committees and starting at page 1903 of the Votes and Proceedings of 1972, April 24, obviously the Members opposite are not following this too closely so I will read it for them.

Mr. Speaker, most of the agricultural land in the Province of Saskatchewan is now operated by family farms. The social life and the community life of rural Saskatchewan depends upon a vital contribution from the families who live on and operate those farms in our province today. The pattern of family ownership of farms is well established and I think has been successful to this point in time.

Completely at variance we might add with the New Deal for People.

In the Province of Saskatchewan where agriculture is by far and away the most important industry the ownership of our agricultural resources is crucial to the economic and social development and well being of the province.

Our towns and cities are, in fact, dependent upon the trade that they enjoy with the rural community for their income and for their stability and/or growth. The churches and social clubs of our rural areas will thrive only if the population they serve does not decrease further. Public investment in recreational and leisure time facilities can be justified only if the use of them by the members of the community is rather extensive.

The pattern of family ownership and operation of farms has become exposed to two important kinds of dangers. One is the danger of the purchase and ownership of our agricultural lands by non-residents. Certainly, we welcome persons who come to Saskatchewan from other parts of Canada and indeed from anywhere in the world, who intend to put their roots down deep into the soil of our province, to reach out to other members of the community and to live as part of an economic and social viable structure. However, the purchase and ownership in some substantial cases of blocks of land by persons or corporations whose intention does not involve Canadian or for that matter Saskatchewan citizenship adds little to the economic stability and indeed in many cases poses a very grave threat to the survival of small business in our towns and villages.

Some Hon. Members agreed because there is a quotation here:

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer continues:

The effect of such ownership is cumulative. These purchases generally involve the sale of several farm units and the loss of population of several farm families from the local community.

**Mr. Gross:** — Four more minutes, Gary.

**Mr. Lane:** — I'm building up to the reasons given by the

Minister of Agriculture, as he did, for sending this particularly vital issue to committee. And I am sure that the Members opposite would feel just as justified to send a problem of a vote for farmers to a committee. Because each one of you will have to stand up and be counted in your constituency as to the powers to take away the right to vote for farmers.

**Mr. Cowley:** — Shut up and let us vote!

**Mr. Lane:** — Well, I would certainly be quiet if the Hon. Members would stand up and give to the farmers the right to vote. And if he is prepared to stand up in his seat at the present time and promise the farmers of Saskatchewan that they can have a vote on whether or not they want a marketing commission, I'll be prepared to sit down and so will every other Member of the Opposition and give that right to vote to the farmers. If they are prepared to stand up and make that commitment to the people of Saskatchewan — no, he's not! Typical arrogance of the Treasury Benches opposite! They talk about vote. They want to keep their 45 ramming things down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan.

Obviously my remarks have not yet convinced and the very timely words of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) have not served to convince the Members opposite. Does that mean that the Members opposite do not believe the Attorney General? Because that is going to be the vote. Because if they believe him there will be no question but they will vote to send this particular Bill to committee. If they don't believe him and we note that he has gone out and has left the room to make sure that the Members opposite have a free vote and that he is not influencing them and they don't feel prejudiced. The Attorney General has left the room so that each one of you can vote with your conscience as to giving the farmers a vote and to send this particular matter to a committee.

But let's go on to the words of the Minister of Agriculture when he was urging a committee because he was establishing, as we have attempted to do, the vital importance of the particular matter going to committee. And he goes on to the reasons for the committee:

The effect of such ownership is cumulative. These purchases generally involve the sale of several farm units and the loss of population of several farm families from the local community. The farm in the usual case is operated with very large equipment and a reduced work force.

Large equipment like that shown on the New Deal for People.

When the exodus of people from the farmland itself is added to the inevitable loss of employment in the shops and stores, a decrease of the dealerships in the local communities, the impact of foreign ownership in the community can be very considerable indeed. The impact obviously is not limited or restricted to economic considerations but extends even more significantly to the entire social fabric of the local community in the province itself.

These words would certainly ring true when we attempt to get to

April 2, 1973

a committee the right of farmers to determine their own type of operation and whether or not they want a compulsory marketing board.

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Lane:** — Mr. Speaker, there have been some good reasons and I have already referred to one of the better ones of the desirabilities of going to committee. One of the better ones was certainly by the Hon. the Attorney General and the Members opposite seemingly have forgotten it this year. We've got another one that's a good one which may be of interest to the Members opposite and that's from another Member of the Treasury Benches. And I'll get to some of the back benches who were very proud of their speeches on, again, the desirability of going to committee. I think that, as again a precedent is ample, the Minister of Agriculture gave a speech last year on the need for an intersessional committee to study the Foreign Ownership Bill. And there was a very dynamic speech made by the Minister of Agriculture last year, again, all with a view to convincing this House of the need for a committee, the desirability of a committee. And I'm going now to refer to page 1904 of the Debates and Proceedings of April 24, 1972.

**Mr. Cowley:** — That's about where your ideas are.

**Mr. Lane:** — Our ideas are very simple, give the farmers a vote and listen to them and don't be afraid to give the farmers a vote and don't be afraid to listen to the people of Saskatchewan and the hog producers of Saskatchewan. Our stand is very simple. Nothing more simple than the idea or a need for a vote.

**Mr. Faris:** — Simple.

**Mr. Lane:** — Yes, it's simple, very basic, very simple. Even the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) can understand the desirability for a vote. He understood it in 1971 and he will perhaps understand better in 1974 and '75. But the Minister of Agriculture argued, as I said, very dynamically for a committee and it was agreed and I think for the interest of the Members opposite, seeing as they agreed with it last year, perhaps they will agree with it again this year as we read it into the record because the committee system was upheld and propounded by the Minister of Agriculture in the following words:

The land that is purchased by non-residents is land that is owned by persons or organizations who in many cases are outside the normal constraints of the democratic process.

Democratic process, by the way, is precisely what we're talking about here and his concern last year is certainly the concern of the Members of the Opposition this year that the democratic processes do apply.

The land that is purchased by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission is land that will be held by the Crown or by the Land Bank . . .

He didn't know, himself, at that point.

. . . and therefore it is land that is subject to the will of the people of Saskatchewan.

Now Members opposite may be very interested in this phrase of the Minister of Agriculture when he refers to the Saskatchewan Land Bank and the land that it holds. He says:

The land that is purchased by the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission is land that will be held by the Crown or by the Land Bank and therefore it is land that is subject to the will of the people of Saskatchewan.

Except when you want to get prices on it, I guess.

The option to purchase will be built into the Land Bank Commission. There is no corresponding option to purchase built when Saskatchewan land is sold to non-resident owners or to large corporations. The policies needed for use of land in the public interest require the examination of two somewhat related kinds of ownerships.

Now he says:

I've discussed the problem in the first instance in respect to non-resident ownership but many of the forces operating in respect to non-resident ownership also apply in the case of corporate ownership. Indeed, it is conceivable that corporate ownership may be a more fundamental important question than non-resident ownership.

And I think, without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is setting out very succinctly the importance of the issue before he takes it into the committee argument.

It is essential to realize, however, that the word 'corporation' has a variety of shades and meanings. It is not the intention of the Government to prevent the formation of corporations by families. Such corporation is an option which the family farm . . .

Again, we have asked for the number of family farms and there is a noticeable failure on the part of the Government opposite to tell us how many they have saved. But:

Such corporation is an option which the family farm should enjoy because it may fit the particular needs of the family farm in providing a disposal or dispersal of ownership, a prospect of a smooth transfer of the assets and certain other advantages which the family regards or may regard as important. The corporation which a family owns is a corporation in a legal sense while in the practical sense the family farm and the family that operate it are as legitimate a part of the rural scene as the family farm which has the legal existence of a partnership or co-op or as a single proprietorship.

Then he goes on, Mr. Speaker.

It is our intention to appoint a select committee to consider the questions of foreign ownership and corporate ownership of agricultural lands. The committee will be concerned with agricultural lands and not lands that are within the boundaries of incorporated towns and villages



April 2, 1973

or cities. The committee will travel about the province with a preplanned series of meetings.

Now we argue that in this particular case, the Marketing Bill, that the committee travel around and be concerned with the question of farmers' production and controlling their own means of production. We certainly would hope that the committee will have a series of preplanned meetings and we certainly hope that, as the Minister of Agriculture urges, to paraphrase him again, that the meetings and the committee will hear briefs from interested citizens on the matter of, in this case, a marketing commission. Now we also urge, as does the Minister of Agriculture, that in the committee that legal counsel be attached to the committee because the Minister of Agriculture certainly urges that and we can see an awful lot of benefits. I have no doubt that Members opposite, if a committee is established, and again we urge them to establish it, and send this Bill to the committee, that legal counsel be attached to the committee because I am sure there are some NDP lawyers who need all the help that they can get, all the work that they can get and this would be an excellent opportunity for the Members opposite to give some work to NDP counsel who are, without a doubt, having very trying times in light of the corporate climate in Saskatchewan, and for that reason and other reasons give some work to some of your legal friends who without a doubt need the help at the present time. But again, he suggests that legal counsel be attached to the committee.

If it believes that such a venture will be a wise use of its time and its resources, the committee may choose to visit some of the adjoining states along the US-Canada border.

We would certainly have no objection to such a committee being established to hear the farmers' views on marketing boards, marketing commissions to go to the United States if there are any states that have done this, that have done it without a vote. We would certainly urge that the committee travel to the Province of Alberta where a vote was given and to Manitoba where a vote wasn't given and to Ontario where a vote was given. There may be some reason or some suggestion that perhaps it's only in NDP provinces that a vote is not given. I leave that to the discretion of the Members of the House to make their own decisions taking into account the bare facts that face them.

In the course of meetings that the committee will be holding in Saskatchewan, . . .

And this is vital and I certainly urge the Members opposite to take this into consideration.

. . . the opinions of the people of Saskatchewan will be brought to light.

I think that is worth repeating:

In the course of the meetings the committee will be holding in Saskatchewan, the opinions of the people of Saskatchewan will be brought to light.

I ask the Government opposite how they, when they talk about being the more open party and the more open Government, can refute the argument of the Minister of Agriculture, their own

Minister of Agriculture, when he wants to hear the views of the people of Saskatchewan, when he wants to get the opinions of the people of Saskatchewan. Certainly, if that is a legitimate and an accurate concept, then surely if it was applicable in 1972, it's applicable today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — And we agree with the Minister of Agriculture that the committee system in case of the Foreign Ownership Bill was an excellent opportunity to hear the views of the people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — Because now I'm going to come to some of the back benchers opposite. This may take a little time because most Cabinet Ministers had something to say urging a committee for the people of Saskatchewan. The Members opposite, I think some of them went so far as to say, now that there was an issue, now was an ideal time to have a committee and surely when the Members opposite and the Members of the Opposition are getting coupons by the hundreds and phone calls by the hundreds and the producers themselves are crying for a voice that now is an ideal time to have a committee while the issue is right.

These are your arguments, gentlemen. I urge you to follow them, but to repeat, because it is vital, to repeat what the Minister of Agriculture said, "In the course of the meetings the committee will be holding in Saskatchewan, the opinions of the people of Saskatchewan will be brought to light," and above all (these are my words — 'above all') because I think it deserves emphasis to quote again:

The final form that the legislation respecting The Foreign and Corporate Ownership will take will reflect the view and the concerns of our residents of this province.

How can the Members opposite go against their own Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) when he has made such glowing words about the need and the desirability of a committee and surely it applies in this case, or was it that the Minister of Agriculture was playing cheap partisan politics this year and his word is no longer credible?

Surely the Members opposite are not going to say to the Minister of Agriculture, "We don't believe you, you were playing politics last year — we back you, we're going to play politics with the farmers of Saskatchewan this year and we're not going to give them a vote," because that is what the Members opposite are saying if they vote against the amendment proposing that this Bill go to a committee. But the Minister of Agriculture goes on adding to the argument, adding weight to the argument that there be a committee because (and I'm assuming that this is accurate), quoting the Minister of Agriculture:

Briefs will be presented, not only by individuals . . . and surely when individuals by the thousands . . .

As the Hon. Member says:

April 2, 1973

by the thousands want to have their voice heard.

The Government opposite with its so-called New Deal for People, with its anti-corporation bias, with its anti-large bias (whatever large means), surely the fact that a committee is going to hear from individuals is another argument in favor of committees.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Telephone call for you, Gary.

**Mr. Lane:** — Would you get it for me, please. But also by farm organizations so surely the Minister of Agriculture was not going to rule out the voice of the people and he has referred to them:

but by farm organizations and I feel certain by local Chambers of Commerce.

Now surely the Chamber of Commerce have not presented a brief or have they had the opportunity to present a brief on the question of compulsory government controlled marketing commissions. Here is an ideal time to back up the Minister of Agriculture when he talks about wanting to hear from the Chambers of Commerce. It's an ideal time to put it to committee and I think that the committee would be proper and it would be in order for the committee to invite the Chambers of Commerce to give their points of view. And I am sure too, that when the Minister of Agriculture expresses a desire that we hear from individuals, that the committee would be an ideal mode of determining what the individuals want to hear or want to say and to get the feed-back to get the best possible legislation for the people and the Province of Saskatchewan.

I am sure now that the Minister of Agriculture (who has now just arrived in the House) has reread and reread and reread the speech he gave last year, because he was so convinced last year that there be a committee to look into the question of foreign ownership of land and he's got it. I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture is going to sit down tonight and read along with me as we go into those glowing words that the Minister of Agriculture gave on April 24, 1972, and for the interest of the Minister of Agriculture we are presently at page 1904, and also the Minister of Agriculture he goes on for several pages. He wanted to hear last year, he made a great hue and cry about hearing from individuals and hearing from Chambers of Commerce and hearing from farm organizations. Now the question is, was he telling the truth last year, or is he telling the truth this year when he says, 'I don't want to hear from farm organizations, or individuals, or Chambers of Commerce, or the hog producers themselves.' Surely his credibility is at issue — his credibility is just as much at issue as that of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and we are going to find by the vote that the Members opposite just whether or not they are playing cheap partisan politics with the farmers of Saskatchewan, with their vote on the amendment as proposed by the Opposition.

But the Minister of Agriculture goes on and urges that other civic organizations will recognize clearly the importance of stabilizing the population of rural Saskatchewan. Now surely, other civic organizations would utilize the committee system to get their voice across, to get their voice heard, to make their arguments and proposals to the Government of

Saskatchewan as the Minister of Agriculture says:

To ensure that we have the best possible legislation for the people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

He goes on and he wants the church communities to be heard and their views and surely the church communities could be welcomed to the committee and be heard by the committee. It's just as valid now as it was last year.

The Minister of Agriculture has just held up his 2,000 coupons for the House to see.

We also note that the Minister of Agriculture suggests that social and leisure organizations and associations have a voice in the committee and have something to say and I am sure that they do and if the Minister of Agriculture wanted to hear them last year, surely he will want to hear them this year. He'll want to hear all of the individuals whom he spoke about last year. He will want to hear all of the farm organizations that he wanted to hear last year. He'll hear all of the local Chambers of Commerce that he wanted to hear from last year and the other civic organizations that he wanted to hear from last year. He will also want to hear the towns and the church communities that he wanted to hear from last year and every one of the social and leisure associations and organizations that he was so worried about making sure that they had a voice last year.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — And the temperance league.

**Mr. Lane:** — And the temperance league, there's another great reason. The Member from Hanley suggested the temperance league perhaps would like to be heard or make a presentation to the proposed committee.

Now if, Mr. Speaker, if the temperance organization as suggested by the Member from Hanley, that they want a voice, I hope and urge that he will stand up and vote for this amendment and give them a voice that he is now ordering from the back benches.

But, we are now going to the words, and I think that the Attorney General may have had something to do with this, because it is on the same grand eloquent type and manner that the Attorney General used when he was arguing for the committee and this is the same Minister of Agriculture who this year would not give a vote. He says:

No dice on a vote for the hog producers.

Here's what he said last year:

But in terms of democratic process itself, our commitment is to an involvement of the grassroots of the province.

I find that I'm going to have to reread this, Mr. Speaker, because the difference between April 24, 1972 and April 2, 1973 — there's an amazing difference. Last year when he was arguing for a committee the Minister of Agriculture says:

But in terms of democratic process itself, our commitment

is to an involvement of the grassroots of the province.

There is a singular lack of enthusiasm for that commitment this year, Mr. Speaker, and it is unfortunate that the people of Saskatchewan are now getting rammed down their throats a government controlled marketing commission. I urge the Minister of Agriculture to be counted when it comes to a committee system. Reassert and re-emphasize his commitment to the democratic process and that's what the Minister of Agriculture should be doing in this debate. He should have stood up and said, 'I agree with the idea of a vote, I agree with the democratic process', but what he has said, he has said, 'No dice for the farmers and no dice on a vote.' Obviously there is a big difference. Obviously a Government with 45 Members has let its arrogance take root where the grassroots were supposed to once be, we have the roots of arrogance in the Government opposite.

He argues for a committee by saying that the committee then will go to the grassroots and that's precisely what we are arguing, is sending this committee out, let it go to the grassroots. Recommit yourself to the democratic process and go out and go to the grassroots to find and report what the people on the farms and in the towns of Saskatchewan believe and what the people on the farms and the towns of Saskatchewan really do want and that's precisely what we urge you to say today, is reassert your commitment. Listen to what the Minister of Agriculture says. Don't let him tell you that he has changed his mind about democratic process and that he no longer believes it. Listen to what he says. He wants a committee, a committee, a Select Standing Committee of the Legislature, which is exactly what our amendment says, to go out to the grassroots. These are his words:

... to hear what the people of Saskatchewan, in the towns and in the villages, want to say about Saskatchewan.

I don't know why — maybe it was the first touch of arrogance and the first example that he was out of touch and that he ignored the hamlets last year, but I'm just sticking to what the Minister of Agriculture said and he wants to just go to the people on the farms and in the towns of Saskatchewan and see what they believe. These are his words:

To see what the people believe and really do want in this vital area in the case of land use and community well-being.

But he gives another argument. He follows this up with argument upon argument, upon argument in favor of the committee system and then he goes and he refers:

It may well be, Mr. Speaker, in fact I think it will be the case, they will lay down (referring to that very committee that we were arguing for) they will lay down and give us the recommendations that will be needed in regard to the Orders-in-Council and the regulations that will have to be passed pertaining to this legislation.

Surely, this very committee that we are proposing can do exactly the same thing. It can give us the regulations, the recommendations that will be needed in order to pass the Orders-in-Council

and the regulations necessary to give effect to the legislation. But here is the expectation of a committee and our expectation is just as great as that of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. It's fully expected that through the series of meetings and briefs that they will be receiving during their discussions, they (and referring to the committee) under the proposed legislation, will suggest amendments to be forthcoming and I can assure the Members opposite that if they have a committee and if they go around this province holding hearings, that there will be amendments forthcoming, because the hog producers and the farmers don't want compulsory licensing and they don't want a government controlled marketing commission and they will tell you that and they will tell you that loudly and clearly. Surely if you are listening to the people and if you believe in the democratic process, you'll bring in amendments to this legislation because that's precisely what they will tell you to do.

Now, there's a very interesting comment in that the Minister of Agriculture went so far as to give me the opportunity last year when he said:

You'll have your opportunity to get up and talk on the Bill, Mr. Member from Lumsden, and I want you to listen carefully to what I have to say so that you're not confused when you get around to making some remarks if you have any intentions of doing it.

Well I am going to urge the Minister of Agriculture to listen carefully to what I have to say; to reassert your commitment to the democratic process that you urged upon the House last year and to go around and give a committee that will hear from the grassroots, that will hear from the towns and villages and in your own words:

The church organizations and the Chambers of Commerce and the towns and social and leisure organizations and other organizations and the farm organizations above all.

"Listen carefully to what I have to say," because those are your words Mr. Minister of Agriculture and if you weren't telling the truth and you firmly believed and you really believed what you were saying last year, surely the same thing applies this year.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture didn't quit with these very glowing words. He insisted on giving us many more arguments and he goes on to discuss, "the seriousness". In the words of the Minister of Agriculture and surely the question of whether or not a farmer can make his own decisions, or if he seriously wants to give up his rights and privileges, and his decision-making abilities to the Government, surely that's got to be a serious problem. He has now given notice that the legislation which will be enacted and he went on at that point to go into the question of retroactivity and he used a very important date because the Minister of Agriculture has gone back and forth across this province saying, 'come hell or high water there's going to be a hog marketing commission, government controlled, on April 1, 1973.' What did he do at that point? He promised that it would be retroactive, the legislation that he was proposing last year would be retroactive to April 1st. Surprise: Mr. Speaker, last year he picked April 1st for his Foreign Ownership legislation. Surely, it is not

April 2, 1973

surprising that he picked April 1 for his iniquitous, government controlled hog marketing commission. But he makes it quite clear that with that type of statement that it will be retroactive; that nobody will be confused and surely the same principle can apply here if the Minister insists on a starting date for his hog marketing commission. Surely he can go around and he can make it effective April 1, he can tell the people that it will be effective – it will be retroactive and then go and hold his hearings. This is what he did last year. Why can he not and why does he refuse to do it this year?

He again makes it quite clear, as of April 1, 1972, he then believed in the democratic process and he believed on April 1, 1972 and I make it clear for the record that this was in 1972, that he believed this:

The responsibility for social and economic policy rests on any democratic system with the Legislature. (That was last Year) It is the responsibility of Legislatures to enact a legal framework in which the social and economic policies continue to be made in the best interests of our province and without restriction or limitation that would be a consequence of (in this case the committee on the hog marketing studies).

But he goes on and he reasserted his faith in the committee, in the ability of the committee by saying:

The legislation that will be enacted on the basis of the report that will be submitted by the committee will be legislation that will assure an active and rewarding social and economic life for all of Saskatchewan.

What better reasons for a committee! What better reasons for a committee than the very words of the Minister of Agriculture when he said last year that the legislation that will be enacted, and surely he can stand up now and make a commitment that there will be legislation resulting from the committee that we are proposing. Then he can say that the legislation that will be enacted on the basis of the report that will be submitted by the committee will be legislation, “that will assure an active and rewarding social and economic life for all of Saskatchewan.”

I suggest to the Members opposite that if you really believed those words last year, if you were sincere in those words last year, if you backed up the Minister of Agriculture in his sincerity, surely we can make the same statement when the Minister of Agriculture proposes that there be a committee this year, that the results of the committee and the legislation that comes from the committee that will have heard from the farms and the people and the individuals of Saskatchewan will ensure an active and rewarding social and economic life for all of Saskatchewan.

The interesting thing is that the Minister of Agriculture last year was so committed to the committee system that when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was speaking the Minister of Agriculture proposed to interrupt him on several hundred occasions just making it clear that at that point he really believed in the committee system. During the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition we have statements by the Minister of Agriculture when we criticized the Minister of Agriculture he

interrupts and it is in Hansard, page 1908 of April 24th, 1972, again when he still believed in the democratic process at that point, he said, "It's before a committee", when there was criticism of his position. He immediately used this committee last year to get out of any further arguments and discussions in the House. Surely, if the Government Members opposite wish to avoid further discussion and debate on this particular issue, they could do that by putting this to a committee and then the Minister of Agriculture could interrupt any speaker from this Opposition and say, "It's in the committee."

He denied last year when the committee matter was presented to him by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that we are going to set up a committee, a Select Standing Committee, he was accused of making a mistake on the committee. But what did he say last year and again, assuming Hansard to be correct which I think we safely can, "We haven't made any mistake at all", is what the Minister of Agriculture says. Now he didn't want to simply maintain silence when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the debate and he then proceeded to make, and he obviously got his procedural training from the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) because he stood up and made a Point of Order which wasn't a Point of Order, which the Attorney General is known to do on occasion, and he says when being criticized at that point as follows:

Mr. Speaker, if I may on a Point of Order, for the clarification of the Members opposite. I may be at fault in this. I endeavored to give an indication that we were, in fact, going to refer it to a special intersessional committee but I apparently did not make it clear that it will be my recommendation on closing of second reading that it goes to a committee before it goes to Committee of the Whole or before it gets to third reading in this House.

Now surely that is a great stamp of approval to the committee system when the Minister of Agriculture places so much importance on this matter going to a committee that he wanted to make it clear when another Member of this House was speaking. He wanted to make it absolutely and abundantly clear that he was going to have a committee, no matter what happened before third reading and before it goes to Committee of the Whole.

We have heard a lot of talk about the Liberal rumors that are running rampant around the province as the Minister of Agriculture and the Members opposite have stated. This is an excellent argument again for a committee because the Minister of Agriculture states:

So in fact a lot of things that the Leader of the Opposition has said, will not be legislated but they will first of all be scrutinized by the committee to have third reading at some later date and some later session.

Now maybe you understand, very interesting, you can use the committee system in the very words of the Minister of Agriculture to put an end to rumors, to put an end to stories. Why don't we have a committee in this case if the Government opposite is so concerned about rumors and stories and speculation. Here we have an ideal method, suggested by the Members opposite, to put an end to the rumors that you are so critical



of. The Minister of Agriculture has an excellent argument in favor of the committees and I am glad that the Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan agrees with me. I am sure that if he took those arguments last year at full face value, which I am sure he would want to do from the Minister of Agriculture, then he will take them again this year because these are the very words of the Minister of Agriculture when he argued for a committee. I can assure the Members opposite that they, too, are going back and getting the words of the Members opposite what they said in this House in favor of committees last year, to remind you and in order to restore your credibility on your words of the committee system.

Do you know what the Minister of Agriculture did last year? He went so far as to accuse the Liberals of making a political issue out of this particular matter. Now it is a surprising thing, it is a very surprising thing that when we have in the debate the Attorney General arguing that, 'let's get it out of the political arena, let's take it to the people and get the best possible legislation for the people and for the Province of Saskatchewan,' the Minister of Agriculture got up and accused, blatantly accused, the Opposition of making a political issue out of this. Now surely, surely no words today ring more hollow in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan, when they look around and see the hue and cry that went up last year on this matter going to committee, that it was such an important issue that it go to a committee, that it was so important that everybody be heard, that all the towns and villages and the farmers and the individuals and the farm organizations and the social and charitable organizations and the church organizations, all have an input into this because it was such an important and pressing issue. Surely when one party stands up in this House proposing to take away the right to self determination of an issue, and to take away the right to vote on the type of marketing agency that a farmer wants, it is even more important, more pressing and more vital than any question of foreign ownership of land, last year.

As I say, the Minister of Agriculture made the statement that the Opposition was making a political issue out of it. The Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) said that the Attorney General made a weak defence last year compared to what we are presenting in this Bill. Now unfortunately the Member from Wilkie and I disagree because I thought that the Attorney General made a very strong defence of putting this matter before a committee last year. Such a strong defence that I urge the Members opposite to reread and if it doesn't sink in the first time, read it again. If we could get a commitment from every Member opposite to read, read very carefully the words, and then would vote according to exactly what they argued last year, I think we could safely ride on the fact that they would read it if we gave them the book, but I think what would happen is, because they are playing cheap, partisan politics with this issue, I think they would hide it. If the opportunity ever happened in five years, if they are still around in five years from now, they may pull the book out and look for something in there that they may have said that may or may not have been wrong.

Now we were accused, and I can assure the Members opposite that the accusation will not be made if you put this particular Bill to a committee, the opinion that Members of this House, we

were accused of leaving this impression and I checked the Press releases at that time and I can assure that no members of the Press gave the impression – as a matter of fact if we went by the indications in the Press last year and the indications this year – there is a big difference. Last year the Government proposed and organized a committee, a special committee to study foreign ownership plans. Now what happens when the Opposition filibusters the issue and demands a committee the headline is, “Marketing Bill delayed again”. It will be delayed again and I hope again and again and again and again until the Government mends its ways and sees the error of its ways and the wisdom of listening to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. But we were accused of leaving the opinion with the Members of the House and with the people of Saskatchewan that the Government got weak, that the Government chickened out when they introduced the Bill. I can assure you that if you are prepared to put this Bill to a committee, not one Member of the Opposition will accuse you of chickening out or weakening. I will be the first to give you credit if you have got the courage to do it. I don’t think you have, but I will be the first.

The Minister of Agriculture went on and just for the edification of the Members opposite this is page 2061 for anyone of you that do wish to read the particular speech because I do think it has some merit. I think the argument was valid then and is just as valid today assuming, that is if we can safely assume and there is some doubt, if the Minister of Agriculture still believes in the democratic process. He then went on to repeat just to make it abundantly clear to the Opposition, he went on to repeat for I believe the third time the motion that he was proposing that the matter go to committee. But then, because at that point he still believed in the democratic process and this was a year ago, he went so far as to repeat what he said, what he had said in the earlier debate. He was so convinced that what he was doing was right, so convinced in the democratic process, he believed in the democratic process, he repeated those very famous words of his when he stated again for the second time in the House to make sure that there was no misunderstanding on anybody’s part. He went on record for the second time last year, stating:

I expect that briefs will be presented not only by individuals but also by farm organizations and I feel certain by local Chambers of Commerce and other civic organizations that will recognize, recognize clearly, the importance of stabilizing populations in rural Saskatchewan and to provide the economic basis for the survival of towns, and the social basis for thriving church communities, social leisure organizations and the like.

Surely, we can use the Minister of Agriculture’s argument that these social and leisure organizations do have an input to make. Now is an opportunity for the Government opposite to reinforce and to restate its commitment to the committee system and the democratic system, because right now the credibility of the Government opposite, and the credibility of the committee system and your use of the committee system are obviously becoming cheap, partisan political purposes and it is becoming evident to everyone in Saskatchewan. When you get a very contentious issue as you did last year and you immediately moved it into committee, surely if you are going to be consistent and rational and logical when you get a contentious issue like a compulsory,

April 2, 1973

government-controlled marketing commission you should put it to committee this year. Either that or it means that you played cheap politics with the committee system last year.

But again, the Minister of Agriculture really believed in what he had said a year ago in the first debate because he repeated again, he repeated again some words that:

In fact, I think it will be the case that they will lay down and give us recommendations that will be needed in regard to the Order-in-Council and the regulations that will have to be passed pertaining to this Legislature, saying to those people . . .

And this is quoting the Minister of Agriculture.

. . . Mr. Speaker, that we are not by any means conclusively decided in our minds that we are going to pass regulations or legislation without contacting and conferring with the farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan.

If it was right to do it then, why isn't it right to do the same thing now. If it wasn't wrong in conferring with and contacting the farmers of Saskatchewan in 1972, then why is it wrong in 1973. Surely it is right in 1973 in light of the fact that you have been in office for nearly two years, it is time to rededicate yourself to the democratic process and go out and hear the people of Saskatchewan and listen to the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lane:** — Obviously the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) was not convinced about what the Minister of Agriculture said last year assuming he was in the House, he heard him twice last year. But he is still not convinced and he has just asked me, Mr. Speaker, to repeat what the Minister of Agriculture said. This is what the Minister of Agriculture said, again for your interest page 2062 of the Debates and Proceedings, April 27, 1972:

It is fully expected that through the series of meetings, the briefs that they will be receiving . . .

'They' meaning the committee.

. . . during their discussion of the proposed legislation, that amendments will be forthcoming, amendments that will be attached to this Act at a later date.

And he also said for the interest of the Minister of Labour:

We are not going to pass legislation without contacting and conferring with the farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan.

He goes on again to give a further argument for the committee. The arguments came by the hundreds last year when a committee was desired. I am quoting from the Minister of Agriculture:

This will give us an opportunity to look at the people who are domiciled in Saskatchewan and make exemption for those that we think are not domiciled here but are not

in any way restricting or causing hardship in regard to transfers of land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

A committee system in this case would be an excellent opportunity to look at the hog producers in Saskatchewan who are no longer certain of your Government controlled Hog Marketing Commission. "An excellent opportunity", it is your argument, it was valid April 27, 1972. Surely if you still believe in the democratic process that you argued in favor of last year, it is as valid today. Because that is going to be an issue on your vote on this particular amendment.

He went on, not convinced that he had made his point either to the Opposition or the Government opposite by stating:

On three or four occasions, I attempted with all the clarity possible to try and define what we were doing by bringing this Bill in at this time, then structuring a committee to go to the people of Saskatchewan to find what amendments it should contain and what it should contain in the regulations and the Orders-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite made a great to-do in April of 1972 about the value of the committee and the desirability of putting a contentious issue before the committee.

The Attorney General and the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and several other back benchers, the Member for Arm River got up in this House and told this House, I believe with all sincerity that they were intending that this committee go out to hear the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan. And that is what we urge this House do at this particular time is put this Bill before a committee.

Go out again and hear the farmers and listen to the hog producers who have made it quite clear to you that they want a plebiscite. And they have made it clear to the Government opposite that they are not satisfied with the way that you have handled this matter and the way that you have handled this matter and the way that you are trying to ram this down their throats. It is your chance by your words to reassert your belief in the democratic process and in the grassroot's politics that you were proposing a year ago. And if you still believe that, you have no alternative but to vote for the amendment proposed by the Opposition.

I support this amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe:** — (Morse) Mr. Speaker, just a few words tonight. I intend to keep my remarks rather brief. I must compliment the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) for the enlightening words which he gave us all tonight.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — I am sure that everyone in the Legislature has learned a considerable amount on the value of committee work in going out to see the people.

We have before us this evening an amendment that is asking

April 2, 1973

this Government to go out and talk to the people. Gentlemen, I see nothing wrong with this.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Especially, Mr. Speaker, after one takes the opportunity of reading plank No. 12 in the NDP election platform. No. 12 in the NDP election platform. No. 12 for the Members opposite I will read again:

Establishment of a provincial producer controlled Hog Marketing Board.

Now this is what they promised the people of the province back in 1971. I might mention here there are two key words in this very promise. One of them is 'producer controlled' and the other is 'board'.

The farmers of this province when they went to vote in 1971 (if that is the criterion that they are using for putting in this board in that they have the support of the hog producers) certainly they may have supported the board. But I think it is essential that this Government accepts our amendment and goes out to the people and tells them why they are not implementing their promise. Why they are not putting in a board but rather a commission.

Possibly the main reason why they are not doing this might be illustrated in an editorial which appeared in the Leader-Post and if the Members wished I can give them a copy of it. First of all, in essence, Mr. Attorney General:

A marketing board is a creation of the producers. It is run by them under a legislative umbrella provided by the Government which ensures enforcement of marketing provisions that are agreed upon voluntarily.

A board allows the producers the right to vote. It allows the producers the right to make that decision and this is what the NDP promised the hog producers in 1971. They promised them that right to vote. I think it is essential that that party opposite go out to the people with this committee to tell them why they are going to deny the hog producers of this province the right to vote.

Let's look at what the editorial gives as a definition for a commission:

A marketing commission on the other hand is a creature of the Government which requires producers to submit to mandatory regulations over which they have no control.

Mr. Speaker, this is the key to the entire amendment which we have before us tonight. We are asking this Government to go out to the producer, ask them if they want this Government to implement these types of control.

We have spent a considerable amount of time dealing with just hog producers. But you must remember as well that we must go out into the country and ask the cattlemen. Do they want their product under a commission? We have to ask the sheep breeders as well if they want a commission to market their

product? Or would they prefer a marketing board? Would they prefer a marketing board which would allow them the right to vote?

One interesting point (I am sorry that the Premier has left at this moment) but they seem to think that what they are doing with this commission is popular. It is up to them to go out — I feel — to see the people and find out just how popular it is. An example of this might be in the constituency of Morse. I believe it was on March 14, that I held a public meeting in the town of Herbert regarding the Hog Marketing Commission. During the by-election I was fortunate to get 50 people out to a meeting in the town of Herbert. That night I got 168 people out.

I might point out as well that the next night the Premier of this province held a meeting in the town of Morse which is nine miles away. During the by-election the Premier had around 200 people out to his meeting. At this meeting it was lucky if he had 110 people out.

Now, I tell you gentlemen there is something completely wrong if a Member of the Opposition can outdraw the Premier of this province at a public meeting.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — As well, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is essential that they go out and talk to the people of this province regarding this commission because the Minister of Agriculture has stated that there are some farm organizations which had indicated their support for such a commission.

First of all he cited the Saskatchewan Hog Producers Association as having their full support. Yet if the hog producers are supporting this commission why did they place that full page ad in the Western Producer? As well, Mr. Speaker, he also mentioned that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was endorsing his actions in this regard. And I have to read a direct statement by any member other than Mr. Boden saying that they want the Hog Marketing Commission. As well he says they have consulted their membership regarding the Hog Marketing Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I attended two meetings last fall of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. At both of those meetings there was no questionnaire asking me what my opinion was regarding a Hog Marketing Commission, nor was it brought up at that meeting. I might point out as well that I am chairman of the local Wheat Pool Committee . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — And at no time have I, as chairman of that committee, been asked to discuss that with my committee members or to the membership at that point. At no time has the Wheat Pool in my estimation ever asked me, nor has there been anyone that I know of that have asked whether they want a Hog Marketing Commission implemented in this fashion. At times I wonder whether it might be just in the mind of Mr. Boden as to whether the Hog Marketing Commission is backed by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

April 2, 1973

As well, talking about — here again I was saying earlier that we have received coupons from people throughout the province, from hog producers. But this legislation as well affects other producers of other products in this province.

Some of the Members on this side have read from the coupons which they have received. These coupons, I am positive, the ones that I have received from my constituency, a little over 80 in number, I have checked them out and they are all hog producers in the Morse constituency. I received, . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Did you check the tombstones?

**Mr. Wiebe:** — . . . and I might point out to the Minister of Highways that each one is alive and kicking and feeling very good. But I might point out some of the letters which I have received . . .

**Mr. Romanow:** — Are you speaking to the amendment?

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Yes, Mr. Attorney General, I am speaking on the amendment. I am trying to convince the Members opposite the need for setting up a committee to go out and listen to the people, and find out what their views are.

Here is a letter I received from someone who is not a hog producer. Someone who produces cattle for example. I will just read this letter to the Members opposite:

I am writing you concerning Bill 50 — an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972. I feel that this Act will take away the incentive and free enterprise of every rancher and farmer in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** —

With the purchasing of 45 per cent of Intercontinental Packers and the compulsory selling system this Bill would bring, a farmer and a rancher, a situation no better than living in a communist state.

As my representative of the Saskatchewan Legislature, I hope you can fight this Bill and prevent it from passing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — I might point out that this individual who wrote me, and I will be quite willing to table it, does not have a membership in the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — As far as I am concerned I don't care what membership he has got. Really, I hope that he has a membership in the New Democratic Party because from this letter I am certain that he will be supporting me in 1975. Here again I think is possibly another one of the reasons why we should have a

committee set up and go out through the province.

Here is another letter from Brownlee, another town in my constituency. This is from someone who is not a hog producer. Someone who raises cattle:

Dear Sir: I have studied Bill No. 50 and disagree with the amendments of The Natural Products Marketing Act for any farm produce. I hope they will delay the Bill until a democratic plebiscite of all the Saskatchewan producers is held to indicate support for this Bill.

And here is the key sentence, Mr. Speaker:

Why was this Bill not brought out before the producers earlier? This is not fair to the people of Saskatchewan.

And this is quite evident, if I may be permitted to wander off the amendment, when the Minister of Agriculture introduced this Bill he talked about everything else but what was conveyed in Bill 50.

Members opposite are enjoying these letters so much I may as well read you a few more. This is one from Marquis, Mr. Speaker:

I strongly urge the delay of Bill 50 – An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972. As we are a democratic society and therefore are entitled to a democratic plebiscite for all natural products produced without interference from Government or anyone else. Why should we be forced to buy licences for growing or selling our own products.

Another letter from someone who I don't know what particular membership he holds in what party or whether he even belongs to one.

Just a note to urge you to fight against this marketing commission. Let's keep our country democratic one way or the other.

I could go on all night if you fellows want me to.

**An Hon. Member:** — Go ahead.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Okay. Now this is a letter I like to receive.

Thanks for the fine job you are doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — The rest of the letter is too complimentary gentlemen so I won't bother reading it to you. Here is another one. This one is from Mortlach, Mr. Speaker:

Just a line to say that we are against Bill No. 50 and sincerely hope that by some means or maybe by an act of God this will not come to pass.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



April 2, 1973

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Here is another line I enjoy.

Even the NDP supporters around here can't believe it and say they can't do that. I am afraid they can and probably will. Freedom is a precious thing when you see it slipping away. We are behind you.

Here is another letter which I received and this deals with something else as well as Bill 50. If you want to hear it I can certainly read it to you. First of all it starts out:

We object to the Land Bank and we object to the Marketing Board Bill No. 50. I would like to have Bill 50 sent to me in print. I am certain 90 per cent of the people in this area are against the marketing board, Bill 50. This was fought out before and the same opinion is still there. Why must it be brought up again. A bad weed never dies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — "A bad weed never dies." Here is another letter which I received after a meeting which was held in Marquis on March 15th by interested producers in that area regarding Bill 50.

On Thursday, March 15, there was a meeting held in the Marquis Community Hall by farmers of the surrounding districts to discuss the amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972, Bill No. 50. The hall was filled to capacity.

I might just mention to the Member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) that if he reads the paper he would have realized that this meeting at Marquis was formed by producers from that area and had no sponsor whatsoever.

**An Hon. Member:** — Ohhhh!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Continuing on with my letter:

And at the close of the meeting a vote was taken for or against the amendments to this Act. Out of a possible 100 people who almost totally rejected this Act there was only three people who stood in favor of it.

Throughout this meeting which at the start was called for nonpolitical opinions, these three people were very obviously NDP agitators.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** —

Being farmers themselves, you would wonder why they would vote for an Act that can only restrict the farmers to more rigid controls (total controls) and less money for the product which they produce and hope for a reasonable price in selling. I would certainly ask you, Mr. Wiebe as our MLA of Morse, to vigorously fight against this Bill. Thank you for your support.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — These, Mr. Speaker, are just a few letters which indicate the need to adopt the amendment which we have tonight and go to the people of this province and ask them for their opinion. I think what we have to do is go to the people of this province and ask if they want every possible product that is included in this Bill brought in. I think we have to go out and ask them whether they like the idea of registering and purchasing a licence. I think we have to go out and ask them if they feel that the Government and the commission can tell them where or when to market their product. I think we have to go out and ask the people of this province if they agree that the Government itself through this commission can tell the producer how his product will be transported.

There are many other things which I would like to cover, Mr. Speaker, regarding this amendment and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I believe the Hon. Member already had one adjournment. The Hon. Member adjourned the debate on March 5th and resumed the debate on March 8th. The Hon. Member cannot adjourn the debate.

**Mr. G. B. Grant:** — (Regina Whitmore Park) Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that my contribution to this subject is received with such enthusiasm, because I am sure I can add considerable light to the haze that is being cast over the Session about hog production, hog marketing and control of same.

Just in case, Mr. Speaker, that any of the Members opposite feel that I don't have the background that enables me to speak on this subject, I want to produce evidence. Everybody in the House has been speaking on behalf of the producers or on behalf of themselves, but I am probably the only one in the House that has received recognition from thousands of hogs as being responsible for their being here in the world. I want to show a picture — I'll leave it here so they can get a first hand look at it — I'll read it for your edification.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — He's a bore, but I didn't know . . .

**Mr. Grant:** — Now, the Hon. Members might just as well save their remarks, because I have the old Walter Smishek device turned down, while I hope you can hear me, I am missing quite a bit of what they say over there. I am going to read what it says here. I am pictured standing among a lot of — they are pigs, I'm not sure of the breed — it says:

Presented to the Hon. Gordon B. Grant (this is while I was still a Minister so I was entitled to use that) on the occasion of his retirement as chairman of the Board of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, by the 60,000 hogs he helped bring into the world.

April 2, 1973

Just lay that on the table in case somebody doesn't believe me — I'm not filing it with the House, it is just an exhibit. I might want it back.

**Mr. Steuart:** — The one with the hat on is Gordon.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, every day in every way the New Deal for People seems to be working its way around to a Bad Deal for People. I don't know of any session that I have been in where there has been so much evidence of a desire on the part of a government to acquire control of everything that is going on in the province. Now the session last year indicated some trend toward this because there were certain pieces of legislation brought in that indicated that the Government of the day had a desire to get their finger in on every possible phase of our lives. While I should like to confine my remarks to the amendment suggesting that this matter be referred to a committee, I haven't as yet spoken, so I believe, Mr. Speaker, I am wide open, I'll have considerably more scope than some of the other members who have spoken. Last year we had the indication from the Members opposite of their desire to get into business by the Consumer Affairs legislation; this year their desire is evidenced once more by the purchase of 45 per cent interest in Intercon, and an acquisition of still further interest in the IPSCO and every indication as evidenced by remarks made by the Premier of getting deeper and deeper into the business life of this province.

Not being satisfied with that phase of operation, they are jumping into the farming operation in a \$30 million way, acquiring farms that in my opinion they have no desire or no intention of ever disposing of. They are getting into conflict with the teaching profession and the trustees, making inroads into the rule of local authorities. This is evidenced by the Community Planning Act and there is no doubt in my mind that later on this Session we will have a Bill that will ram the ward system down the throats of people in Regina and Saskatoon. Cable TV control, the distribution of TV equipment to schools whether they wish it or not. Evidence that there is likelihood of some move in the direction of a press council. It was interesting last year, they made a little bit of a plunge into foreign ownership, but there was considerable noise raised and they backed out of it, this is why I can't understand their stubbornness in connection with this piece of legislation because it is quite evident to us on this side of the House that there is considerably more resistance to this piece of legislation right now than there was to the Foreign Ownership Bill last year.

Members on the other side have indicated their desire for government participation and government ownership of business, they want to get into the oil exploration business, they are already advertising Saskatchewan Oil. In tonight's paper we will read about Mr. MacMurchy's attitude as far as The University Act is concerned. He summed it up when he was asked to withhold it or delay it by saying that there is a commitment, I don't know to whom the commitment has been made, but there is a commitment made to bring this legislation in and come hell or high water it's going to come in. It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that long, long ago prior to when this Bill was introduced I believe back in early February, the Government had

made up its mind that they were going to bring in this legislation and this Commission by April 1st. Their minds were made up and they had no intention of being deflected. They remind me a bit of Mr. Barrett out in British Columbia who in spite of all the farm protest that he is receiving comes out in pretty strong terms and says he has no intention of changing his direction and whether they like it or not, it is going to come in. A month ago they were advertising for a director for this hog commission. As Mr. Steuart pointed out, even advertising down in Des Moines, Iowa. The handwriting was on the wall, there was no doubt that they intended to bring it in.

Actually the whole thing has been rushed from the start. I personally feel there was no need for the haste that is being demonstrated. It is quite evident from communications read by the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and by other Members on this side of the House that there is a lot of resistance to it. The setting up of a hog commission is not going to solve all the problems of the industry, if they have that many problems. The biggest problem recently seems to be the high prices which isn't a bad problem to have. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I feel they should take the sensible attitude that they took a year ago when they backed off the Foreign Ownership Bill and referred that to a committee and gave people an opportunity to speak and express their views.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the NDP right from the start have taken the attitude that in June of 1971 they received a mandate from the people of this province to do almost anything they wished. Well, the Hon. Member from Morse pointed out, if they had this mandate then they should immediately implement plank No. 12, the establishment of a provincial producer controlled hog marketing board. But apparently they have decided to sidestep that one because they are afraid that the vote would go against them if they did take a vote, and they can't establish a board without taking a vote. It is quite evident that is why there is no vote being taken, they are just afraid to do so. But why they are so bull headed I can't understand. There is only one plausible explanation that it is probably two years before an election and they feel by that time everybody will simmer down and this will be accepted. They don't intend to have a vote even after the Hog Commission is in operation, I daresay, until about three years from now, until after the election is over, they'll know whether they are in the clear or not. There have been a lot of precedents for the request of the Opposition, as evidenced by other marketing boards where votes have been taken and the votes have been favorable. I really can't understand why they are so fearful of taking a vote in this case.

It seems to me that once again they only listen when it serves their wishes and for some strange reason that may involve the Land Bank, the purchase of Intercon. and many other schemes that apparently are up their sleeves, they do not want to listen at this time. I can't understand the Hon. Member from Regina North East, the Minister of Health, sitting idly by and allowing this to take place, because he at least voices his opinion about listening to people. Today he gave evidence of listening to various groups as far as the dental nurses were concerned and he claims that in discussing the matter of medical personnel in this province he has discussed it with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the University people. He for one appears to be ready to sit down and listen to people, but for some strange reason the Minister of Agriculture has no desire to listen to these people.

April 2, 1973

What is going to happen as I see it, they are going to have so many controls in this province that we are going to end up in the same quandary that they have so frequently experienced south of the line. They have so many subsidies and so many controls and so many departments climbing over each other that sometimes they get a little confused. To show you how the ridiculous lengths to which controls can go, I should just like to read a little story and it is entitled, "Hogwash." It is written by a hog farmer down in the United States and it is to, "Dear Uncle Sam."

My friend Bill Jones here in Chattanooga County received a \$1,000 cheque from the government this year for not raising hogs. So I am going into the 'not raising hogs business' next year. What I want to know is in your opinion, what is the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on and what is the best kind of hogs not to raise. I would prefer not to raise razorbacks, but if that is not a good breed not to raise, I will just as gladly not raise any Berkshires or Durocs. The hardest work in this business is going to be in keeping an inventory on how many I haven't raised.

My friend Bill is very joyful about the future of the business. He has been raising hogs for more than 20 years and the best he ever made was \$400 in 1918, until this year when he got a cheque for \$1,000 for not raising hogs. If I can get \$1,000 for not raising 50 hogs, then will I get \$2,000 for not raising 100 hogs, etc? I plan to operate on a small scale at first holding myself down to about 4,000 hogs which means I will have \$80,000, then I can afford a boat.

Now another thing, those hogs I will not raise will not eat 100,000 bushels of corn. I understand that you also pay farmers for not raising corn, so will you pay me anything for not raising 100,000 bushels of corn, not to feed the hogs I am not going to raise. I want to get started as soon as possible for this seems to be a good time of the year for not raising hogs. Yours truly. P.S. As so often happens, people don't want to get caught in these schemes, can I raise 10 or 12 hogs on the side while I am in the not raising hogs business, just enough to get a few sides of bacon to eat?

Mr. Speaker, that is the ridiculous stage that government control can reach. I daresay that there is a possibility of this happening under a hog commission run by the Minister of Agriculture and his cohorts.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Government opposite are heading up the wrong road in so many respects as far as business is concerned and now as far as the farming population is concerned. Why a government wants to annoy so many farmers as this Government is doing and the Government in British Columbia similarly, I don't know. It seems that they have suddenly developed an insensitive attitude to so many things. They seem to be ready to implement certain legislation regardless of the will of the people and I feel that this is another step in that direction. I would hate to take up too much time this evening because I know there are some other gentlemen interested in speaking and

dealing with other subjects. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.