

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
51st Day

Thursday, April 5, 1973.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS

GLOBAL BUDGETING CONFLICT IN REGINA MEDICAL CLINIC

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health.

Over the past few weeks and even months now there is news indicating that there is conflict of interest in the Regina Community Clinic. Initially, I thought it was one of their own problems to settle. But it appears that the basis of this conflict is the introduction of global budgeting for the clinic. And since the Minister of Health gave birth to this idea, I was wondering if he could tell us whether this conflict is restricted to the Regina Clinic or whether it is happening elsewhere. And what, if anything, he is doing or can do to try and reconcile the conflict between the interested parties?

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, the reported conflict that the Hon. Member refers to is not a matter for the Department of Public Health or the Minister to deal with.

As I understand it there are some differences of opinion between board members and the medical group on some philosophical points. And that is a matter for them to resolve.

The question of global budgeting, I don't think is an issue that is in dispute. Certainly it is not my understanding that the global budget is in dispute.

Mr. Grant: — A supplementary question. The question of global budgeting does seem to enter into it because that seems to be the start of it. It started at the time that global budgeting was introduced. So I think the department does have an interest in it.

Mr. Smishek: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true that we have an interest in the global budgeting. But I might remind the Hon. Member in case he is not aware that it was at the request of the community clinic organization — they wanted to enter into an arrangement other than fee for service. The global budget was something that they suggested. The formula had been worked out. The formula is still in its experimental stage, being assessed. It has had one year of operation. We as a department are very much concerned about its success. And I think the community clinics are interested that an assessment is being made. I have not had any direct representation to say that as a result of the global budget there is a difference of philosophical viewpoint. That is not an issue.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES INCLUDED AS INCOME

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services.

I have had some calls from welfare clients in Regina indicating that there has been a change in policy of the Government relating to the inclusion of family allowances being calculated as income for welfare clients. And that there has been an attempt to make some kind of adjustment to personal allowances and so forth. There is a great deal of concern because of the implications it may have in relation to changes in Federal legislation changing family allowances. Has there been a change in policy, if so, what is that policy and why was there no announcement made in the paper in a public way?

Hon. A. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, in relating to the announcement I suppose I had not thought in terms of making an announcement because there is no change in finances.

There was a change in policy some time ago to consider family allowances as income and at that time the allowances for children and personal allowances were increased to equal or go beyond the family allowances. Almost all recipients are now receiving more under the assistance program than they were receiving with the family allowance before that change in policy.

It seemed to us that it was a logical move since it has always been the case to include such items as, Old Age Security Pension as part of income. Indeed everything was included as income except family allowance to people on total welfare. If a person was working and receiving some assistance from us, the family allowance was always included as income. And it seemed to be somewhat unfair to them. And so it was just a matter of bringing the program into line. Family allowance for the total welfare group was the only item that was not counted as income in the past. Yes it has been changed. It was some months ago and allowances were adjusted.

Now, as far as the Member's comments relating to future increases in family allowances. I have no awareness of that. There may be some. I haven't heard anything recently about this coming about. There is a conference at the end of this month. And we certainly would look again into that point.

Mr. MacDonald: — Well first of all that is rather a dramatic change for the NDP. Because in the past any time in the GIS or . . .

Mr. Speaker: — These are questions and not debates.

Mr. MacDonald: — Of course, Mr. Speaker. All right. Would the Minister please mind forwarding to us any changes in the allowance. I find it extremely difficult to see how all the allowances can be equalized and yet you can have a standard schedule. Would you as the Minister please forward to us or to me the copy of the new schedule of allowances?

Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, we shall be happy to forward to the Hon. Member the list of allowances. The allowances are standard. They take into account as income such items as the salary a man makes; the Old Age Security. These things have always been included. Family allowance was always included as income for those who are on marginal income. The only group that were excluded were those on total welfare. They will not be included. But I will be glad to forward that to the Member.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting Dental Nurses

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 72 – An Act respecting Dental Nurses be now read a second time.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — The other day before I adjourned debate I pointed out that the Bill that is in front of us is not really as important in this discussion as the dental health scheme that the Minister proposes. I should like to direct my remarks towards this proposed dental scheme for children three to twelve.

First I want to say that I am in favor of a dental plan for children. Second, I'd say that the dental profession is also in favor. Thirdly, I would say that the general public is in favor. And of course fourthly, the Government appears to be in favor.

I feel certain that neither myself nor the profession or the general public are in favor or will support the plan as proposed by this Government.

I also support the use of dental nurses in a plan for children. I support their use and I support the program for their training. A program without dental nurses and dental assistants would be both inefficient and unnecessarily costly. My basic concern is for the supervision that the dental nurses will receive.

The plan proposed by the Government opposite is a plan that provides for functional supervision. This means that a dentist would visit a dental nurse once a week for a couple of hours or so. This in my mind is not supervision at all, but could more accurately be described as a consultation for a couple of hours once a week. This would amount to a short consultation about administration and technical matters.

Each dentist would have at least 10 dental nurses in his region. And these 10 dental nurses would be spread over a fairly large area. The dentist is expected to give an initial examination to each child that enters the program. It can therefore very easily be seen that if the dentist has 10 dental nurses spread over a large area and if he has a responsibility to give these initial examinations to each child that the dentist will not be able to provide any meaningful supervision of dental nurses. Dental nurses are therefore going to become glorified dentists, but won't have near the expertise or training of a qualified dentist.

An objective of the plan is supposedly to give and I would quote, "The type and quality of dental services of the Oxbow project." The Oxbow project, although not complete, has appeared to give excellent results and service. This project, however, utilizes experienced people and also uses meaningful supervision by a dentist of the dental nurses.

I should like to make my position very clear on the program. A dental plan would only be completely acceptable to me if it is a plan that utilizes dental nurses for performing treatment under direct supervision.

There are several reasons for this. Direct supervision is the best method to ensure quality control. Direct supervision would also mean better and easier access to treatment, and it would mean fewer visits and less referrals. Direct supervision will assist in the continued up-grading of abilities by the dental nurses.

The handling of emergencies will be greatly improved with direct supervision. These emergencies are unavoidable and they must be handled immediately with sound judgment and proper knowledge.

A dental nurse with two years of training is unlikely to have this expertise. We must remember that dental nurses are involved with potentially lethal drugs. They are involved with surgery, with respiratory obstructions, allergies, hemorrhage and so on. Qualified practitioners must be present to handle these medical emergencies. Direct supervision will ensure greater productivity. And therefore, an economic advantage as well as a medical advantage. Likely the most important advantage of direct supervision is so that the public will fully accept this program.

The Oxbow project is accepted by the public. The Oxbow project utilizes direct supervision. I think it will be proven that this is a major reason for public acceptance and for the success of the plan.

It is my contention that our children deserve the best in quality. We must not begin a program that has anything but the highest of standards. It is a mistake to start a program that is substandard in any way, with the hope of up-grading the program as finance and personnel become available. I would much rather begin the program cautiously than to rush in with a substandard haphazard plan.

Another important feature of a successful dental plan for children is that the plan must have the co-operation of the dental profession. In order for a dental plan to be successful it must have the co-operation of the Government, the dentists, the training institutions and the public.

I should like to give an example to back up this assertion. Britain has had a dental scheme for many years. The scheme employs dental nurses. And yet Britain has the worst dental health record of any country in the civilized world. The reason or at least the most important reason is that the British Government acted without the full co-operation of the dental profession. It will not work without the full co-operation of all segments of the public and most importantly the dental profession.

April 15, 1973

The dental profession is not happy with the proposal of the Government opposite. I should like to just quote from a clipping the comments of the president of the Canadian Dental Association, Dr. David Peters of Newfoundland, just to illustrate the point:

... proposed Saskatchewan Denticare Program for children appears to delegate too much responsibility to dental auxiliaries and doesn't include adequate provisions for preventative dentistry programs.

Dr. Peters told the Manitoba Dental Association that the \$5 million Saskatchewan Dentacare Program for children aged 3 to 12 allows too much leeway for dental auxiliaries to diagnose and make judgments which should be made by a dentist.

Dr. Peters said the plan appears to allow nurses or dental assistants to make the first diagnosis of a child's dental health, a task he said should be done by the dentist. The nurse or assistant might also be in a position to decide what is to be done. He said the Canadian Dental Association agrees with delegation of responsibility by dentists to assistants under supervision. But the first diagnosis and judgments for treatment must be done by dentists. If the Saskatchewan plan includes proper supervision of assistants it would meet the Canadian Dental Association's approval he says.

I should like to quote from the Saskatchewan Dental Association. They prepared a brief, a Dental Care Plan for the children of Saskatchewan, Principles and Concepts. It was prepared by the College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan, and given to the Minister. I quote from page IV of this document.

The College is unhappy with the way in which planning on the Dental Care Program has been carried out up until now.

We would like to have been consulted on basic decisions that were made in April of 1972 when we were presented with a fait accompli. We would like to have been consulted on a more basic level in plans for the School of Dental Nurses and to have acted as consultants in each of the courses, etc. We wish teaching positions would have been advertised so that we could be sure the best qualified people available were teaching the nurse students.

After studying the department's proposal it seems obvious that some consultation should have occurred with the profession in formulating its proposals.

We want to co-operate with the Government in this endeavor. This brief is proof enough of that. But we must stand firm on our principles, standards must be maintained. The profession won't settle for a substandard plan for Saskatchewan children. We want the best. We want a plan that is so good that it can and will be adopted as a model by other provinces and countries. In short we want the best for our children and will not rest until it is attained.

I should like to refer to the comments made by the Minister when he introduced the Bill. He said that the Hall Commission recommended that a program employ the skills of dental nurses

and auxiliaries to assist with the services. I want to make it absolutely clear that I agree with the concept of dental nurses and it has my full support.

The Minister talked at length about the Oxbow program. And he indicated that this project shows conclusively that the new proposed concept is viable. He pointed out that in the Oxbow project there were two dental nurses and three dental assistants under the direct supervision of the dentist.

This type of personnel arrangement is the very reason that the Oxbow project is successful. I don't think it is accurate to suggest that the proposal by Mr. Smishek, which does not include direct supervision would have the same effectiveness as that at Oxbow.

One other very important feature of a good dental health plan is that the examination, diagnosis and treatment planning should be carried out by qualified dentists. The dental auxiliaries can then carry out the treatment services under direct supervision. May I point out that by direct supervision I do not mean that a dentist is watching over the shoulder of the dental nurse; I mean basically that the dentist is on the same premises and is available to a dental nurse on an immediate call. I would suggest that one dentist could give direct supervision of this type to a number of auxiliaries, likely more than five as we have it at Oxbow.

Let me say that my concept of an acceptable plan and the concept of the Minister of an acceptable plan are not very far apart. The basic difference is the type of supervision, to me it is a vital ingredient of a good plan. I am sure that the Minister sees direct supervision as being desirable. After all, he seems pleased with the results at Oxbow. I sincerely ask that the Government opposite consider the matter and to consider changing the proposal in order that the dental plan is assured of success.

There is one additional point that should be raised. The Minister did not comment on it and Mr. Smishek's proposal did not mention it, and this is the question of fluoridation of communal water supplies. Certainly the most important aspect of a dental program is prevention. Research has proved that dental disease is to a very great extent preventable. From an economic rather than a health standpoint we should also be aware that a strong preventative program is in itself relatively inexpensive. I am sure that no one in this Assembly wants to see a purely dental treatment plan. We all recognize that prevention of disease is the basic objective. Fluoridation is likely the most important feature of preventing dental disease. It has been proven conclusively that fluoridation is very safe and there is no basis for contradiction of this fact. I think that it is unthinkable to institute a costly dental care plan for children without instituting a very effective and economical fluoridation program.

I am delighted to live in Moose Jaw which is a community enlightened enough to have instituted fluoridation. I am grateful that my children have had the benefit of growing up with fluoridation. I am at a loss to know why fluoridation was not included in the proposal by the Minister.

Mr. Romanow: — You people didn't vote for it last year!

Mr. MacDonald: — I know that Mr. Smishek is aware of the benefits of fluoridation. The facts are conclusive and he has access to the facts. I don't like to put words into the mouth of the Minister of Health but I think it is safe to say that he not only is aware of the tremendous benefits of fluoridation but strongly favors the implementation of fluoridation. I am sure past records will bear this out. I should also like to go on record as saying that fluoridation should be an integral component of a dental care plan. I feel sure that the Minister agrees with this and that he intends to proceed with fluoridation as part of the program. I hope he will assure us of this as he closes debate.

In closing I would say that the difference between what the Minister proposes and what will actually be successful is very minimal. However, just because the difference is minimal it is no reason to believe that the plan will work effectively. The reason it won't is because the 'minimal difference' is vital. The slight modification of their proposal may well be the difference between success and failure. For the well-being of our children, I would urge that the Minister consider my remarks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this Bill I gather that the Members of the Opposition are going to support the Bill. The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw raised a number of points in his discussion of the Bill.

After I spoke he raised the question of the lack of consultation between myself and the dental profession, in respect of this Bill and presumably in respect of the program that we are trying to develop. May I remind the House and the Member that during my discussion I set out the communication and discussions that have been held. Mr. Speaker, in trying to develop a program the Member says that the dental profession was presented with a fait accompli in April of 1972. I don't know what he is referring to because there is no program . . .

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — On a Point of Privilege I should like to point out that I didn't say that, I was quoting from the dental profession, when I made that remark.

Mr. Smishek: — If he wants to become a mouthpiece for the dental profession, fine, he's got to live with it because the dental profession has not been presented with a fait accompli, there is no program in effect yet.

Let us look at what has happened? Last fall I met with the dental profession, we talked about establishing an advisory committee on dental care. I invited the dental profession to submit a name to me, I invited them to consider having their president act on the advisory committee; they named a person to the advisory committee, their president, Dr. Geisthardt, acted on the advisory committee. We established an advisory committee consisting of three dentists and three non-dental people, three

lay people. The chairman of the Dental Advisory Committee is Dr. Payntor, Dr. Lewis who is working in the Department of Public Health and is a dentist, and Dr. Geisthard are the three members on the advisory committee. Of the three lay members one is a school teacher, because we see the program operating through the school system; the second lay member is a trustee from the Oxbow Unit where they have had the experience with a dental plan and the last non-dental person is a housewife with a number of small children and who does have the problem as a mother of looking after the dental care of her children.

We haven't presented the committee with any fait accompli. What the department has done is present a suggested research paper to the committee. The Hon. Member talks about the profession not being happy with the Government's proposal. I don't know what he is talking about. The Government has not made a proposal and he knows this. I don't know what the dental profession is talking about. I ask him, does he want to become a mouthpiece for the profession or does he want to be a spokesman in the Legislature? I would suggest that he ascertain his facts. He quotes somebody about a \$5 million program. The estimates that were made by the department when the program is in full operation looking after all the children until the age of 12 would amount to perhaps \$5 million. Mr. Speaker, the Government has not determined a program. I have now received the report of the advisory committee just yesterday, I have not had a chance to read it. As soon as copies can be reprinted I will be releasing the report to the public and will be providing Members of the Legislature with copies. I am advised that some time next week copies will be available for Members of the Legislature.

The Hon. Member talks about the dental profession presenting me with a brief. I haven't seen a brief from the dental profession. I don't know what he is talking about, because the dental profession has not presented me with a brief. What they have presented, as I understand, is a brief to the advisory committee. I would suggest to the Hon. Member that he get his facts straight. In the case of the supervision of dental nurses I would hope that I will get some advice and guidance from the advisory committee that has been set up. As I said I have received their report yesterday and have not had a chance to read or study it.

Our intention is not to train, in the case of the dental nurses, junior dentists, they will be dental nurses trained to do the job in their field. He talks that the quality of care will be substandard. I can assure the Hon. Member it is not my intention to develop a substandard dental program. Our intention is to establish a high quality good dental care program. If he is truly interested and in favor of establishing the dental program, I then expect that he will be supporting this Bill and will be supporting the basic principle and concept of the plan that we propose.

I don't know what evidence he has that in Britain they have the worst dental situation in the Western civilization. I would challenge the proof of that. My understanding is that the dental program in Britain has been in operation 10 years, it has been a good program and it has received the co-operation of the dental profession and has received the support of the public at large. During the last 10 years there have been changes in governments in Britain and I am sure if the program

was that bad the new government would have taken steps to change the plan. If the program is that bad why would the people in New Zealand keep the program in operation for over 50 years. I am satisfied that the people in New Zealand and the people in the countries that have used the dental nurses are satisfied that this is a way to implement a program of prevention as well as restorative care.

I want to assure the Members of this House that our intention is to establish a first class program and to use the dental nurses as well as the dentists to have a good program. The Hon. Member in his closing remarks made reference to fluoridation. He regrets that there isn't a fluoridation proposal in this Bill. Well, I regret that the Member makes that kind of a reference, because it is not in this kind of a bill that you provide for fluoridation, and I am sure he is aware of that. He is interested in a program of fluoridation, I am equally as convinced as he is that fluoridation is an effective preventive measure. Regrettably there are those who feel otherwise and there are strong opinions on the matter on both sides of the House on this particular question. The Hon. Member will be aware that last year I did try to bring in a bill to provide for grants for fluoridation and received a fair bit of opposition from both sides of the House. In fact, we offered a free vote as he will recall and the Members on the opposite side didn't want to participate in that kind of a free-wheeling approach to that. They indicated that they would not give the Government assurance that they would not vote in a block in opposition.

Mr. McPherson: — I can name . . . 10 or 15 . . .

Mr. Smishek: — The record will show what developed, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Grant: — Chickened out . . .

Mr. Smishek: — . . . Well the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park says, we chickened out. He didn't have very much courage when he was the Minister of Health to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Bill is a good bill for the establishment of the registration and procedure for the dental nurses and to get our program started which we expect will be in the fall of 1974. I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 45

Messieurs

Dyck	Owens	Feschuk
Meakes	Robbins	Kaeding
Wood	Tchorzewski	Flasch
Smishek	Cowley	Steuart
Romanow	Taylor	Coupland
Messer	Matsalla	Loken
Thibault	Richards	Guy
Larson	Faris	Grant
Brockelbank	Cody	Boldt
MacMurchy	Gross	MacDonald (Milestone)
Pepper	Feduniak	

Michayluk
Byers
Thorson
Engel

Mostoway
Comer
Rolfes
Oliver

McIsaac
Weatherald
McPherson
MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Wiebe

NAYS — NIL
Messieurs

The Assembly recessed from 12:30 until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — I should like to introduce a group of students in the west gallery, 16 Grade Nine students from the town of Goodeve, the home of the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk); their teacher Mr. Bohay, and their bus driver. They all have had a tour of the building and I shall be meeting them later this afternoon. I am sure that all Members will join with me in wishing them an educational afternoon and hope this may be a help to their Social Studies and wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I too, through you, would like to welcome the students and the teacher Mr. Bohay and the bus driver Kenny Rathgeber from the village of Goodeve where I live and with whom I have had a very close association with these people. As I stated yesterday, I have been chairman of the School Unit Board for a great number of years. We built a new school there, Mr. Speaker, together with the Indian people from Little Black Bear Reserve. You will notice that some of the students up there are from Little Black Bear Reserve. I have stated before we are very proud to have them in the integrated school in Goodeve. I say, 'welcome to this House,' and I hope you have a very enjoyable time this afternoon and a safe journey back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my colleagues in welcoming the students to this Chamber this afternoon, and particularly the 35 Grade Ten students who are here this afternoon from the Monastery School in Muenster. Mr. Speaker, Muenster is the home of St. Peter's College which has long been known for its importance in the academic world as well as the sports field. These students I know have toured the Museum of Natural History and the RCMP Museum and Barracks and they have toured this building. I want to invite all the Members to join with me in welcoming the students from Muenster and hope that they will have a good and worthwhile experience in the House this afternoon and wish them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, Sir, and to the Members of the Legislative Assembly 50 students from St. Gerard School in the Speaker's Gallery. St. Gerard is, of course, in Saskatoon and the 50 students that we have with us today are all in the Grade Seven class. They are accompanied by Mr. Carl Melnyk and by Miss Budz, two of their teachers. Did I mispronounce the name? I hope it is right. I am advised that they are getting a bit of a tour of the buildings, perhaps also one or two other parts and sights of Regina. I hope they find their stay here very entertaining and enjoyable. I wish them a safe journey back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act, 1968, be now read a second time.

Mr. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't too much more to say on this. I am wondering though if the Minister could give us the answer to the question the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) asked.

I should like to know how many claims have been heard by the board in each year from 1968 to 1972. I think he did explain why a mediation officer hadn't been appointed. He can probably mention that again.

I am wondering if the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) is giving any serious consideration to redrafting this whole Act to make it easier for interpretation by all those concerned.

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few additional words to what my colleague from Meadow Lake said.

Our understanding is that the amendments were moved last year, and I am not suggesting that they were moved for any reason other than to try and improve the working of the Act, which didn't solve the problems that were then obvious. And our information is that the amendments that are before us here today are not in any way going to make procedures that much easier, particularly easier to understand let alone easier to follow. I have no intention of holding up second reading of this Act. I think we can discuss some of it in Committee, although it is a bit of a legal hodge-podge. I would ask the Attorney General to consider the complete rewriting of the Surface Rights Act prior to the next session. I think it would be advantageous to all concerned with surface rights legislation.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to apologize to the Member from Athabasca and the Member from Meadow Lake. I did not get the information because it simply slipped my mind. But I will undertake to provide that to you either publicly or

privately as soon as I obtain it from my officials. I am pleased that we can get the matter through second reading.

On the question of rewriting the Bill, let me just make two observations if I can in that regard.

Firstly, if by rewrite it is meant to produce a consolidated version of the legislation so that it exists in one compact piece of legislation, as opposed to have to come to the '68 Statutes and the '71 Statutes, the '72 Statutes and now the '73 Statutes, then certainly we will very seriously consider that. Because I personally believe in the merit of consolidation. It is easier for people to understand and it is much simpler for all to operate under the law.

If, however, we are talking about a rewrite of the Act in the sense of rewriting the principles of the Act, rewriting the principles of compensation or the principles of determining that the compensation i.e. through the board or something along those lines then I should be very reluctant to consent to that. Because as the Members will know, prior to the Friesen Commission when the law was really a hodge-podge, it was resented deeply by our farmers and I think by our oil operators who didn't understand it then. At least the Friesen Report was able to produce a consolidated Bill and all we are doing is basically like every spring season, like the road people in the city of Regina, perhaps not doing a good job of it, but we are trying to patch up the holes that crop up as a result of a winter's use of the Bill.

We think and the advisers to my department say that this set of amendments should produce the results namely, of having hearings determined on the five-year review principle enshrined which is now the practice with the majority of the oil operators. It deals also with one or two other matters that have been raised with respect to this Bill.

So, to sum up, I can say that we will consider the business of consolidation of the Act. I should like Members not to consider a rewrite of the principles of the Act because I think the Act is good. But I will undertake to provide the information to the Members opposite which they requested. We can discuss this further in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Bill No. 80 — An Act respecting the Negotiation of Collective Bargaining Agreements for Teachers

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 80 — An Act respecting the Negotiation of Collective Bargaining Agreements for Teachers be now read a second time.

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday before adjourning debate on this particular Bill, I was pointing out the history of the strength of local government in Saskatchewan and particularly the history and development of the School Trustees' Association which represents the active school boards of the province.

I was pointing out and asking why or what has happened somewhere along the line to that particular group, the SSTA, representing one of the bulwarks of local government in the province. What did they ever do to bring this kind of action

April 15, 1973

that we see evidenced in this Bill? They have been pushed under the bargaining table, they have been removed from any rights to bargain for the salaries of the teachers whom they employ.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer for a few moments to the so-called Toombs Committee Report on trustee-teacher bargaining, the Minister's advisory on teacher contract bargaining. The Committee in the early pages of the report set out the kinds of questions that they were going to go about trying to answer. On page two there are three headings that I think are worth noting, Mr. Speaker, in this debate.

The Committee therefore addressed itself to these kinds of question.

Firstly, what should be the design of a collective bargaining system that will foster improvement in Saskatchewan's educational system, and give priority to the well-being of students within that system?

Secondly, they went on to point out, is it not possible at the same time to create a situation where such bargaining could be carried out so that it does not become the major annual confrontation.

And thirdly, they say:

Is there a design for collective bargaining which would recognize local government in education and the role of the teacher? Should these two concepts be an important consideration for the Committee?

Now obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Committee felt that they should be important. But obviously the Government opposite thought not.

I refer you to page three of that Committee report, Mr. Speaker. The Committee throughout its deliberations arrived at several major points of reference on which its recommendations and its views are based.

The first one that they set out, Mr. Speaker, is local government in education. The Committee has adopted the view that local government in education is an essential and critical aspect of the educational process in Saskatchewan. I quote:

The Committee concurs with the following concept of local government which was presented to the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association in 1969 by a research and evaluation committee.

I want to quote that, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is fairly critical to this debate.

Local government in the Saskatchewan educational program is based on the deeply embedded concept that each parent must have a voice in the education of his child. And the fact that this voice is today one of a majority or a minority in the community does not alter this primary parental right for decisions. Nor is this parental prerogative altered when educational systems become bureaucratized when the provincial or national demands on educational program content increase or when the expertise

of the professional educator, the technician or the philosopher appears to shape objectives and programs.

If the choice is to be made the democratically expressed wishes of the parent must be predominant. In order to carry out his right and responsibility to educate his child a parent has delegated authority to the provincial and local governments. He has invested economic resources in the provision of facilities, equipment and people. He has allowed his child to be taught by teaching professionals and paraprofessionals. But the parent has retained the right to be represented in local school affairs at the local level by the school trustee and at the provincial level by his representative in the Legislature.

I will read what the Toombs Committee has to say with respect to the school board itself.

The school board performs a unique function. It is responsible to the members of the community for an effective educational program for each child. It is responsible too, to the Government of the province which is the final authority for education in Canada. The uniqueness of this intermediate level of government stems from his role relative to the child. Now unlike municipal councils and other agencies of local governments, school boards have a role which affects the growth of the child, of the community and the nation.

At the end of the quotation, Mr. Speaker, they go on to point out that any collective agreement arrangement must involve, in the committee's view, trustees of fiscally responsible boards of education in the province.

Mr. Speaker, on page five of the Toombs Committee Report is another statement by the Committee that makes an interesting point, number 3, dealing with the role of the Provincial Government in the bargaining process. And they say:

It is clear the Provincial Government through implicit or explicit communications does have an influence on the perimeters within which teacher salary increases have been determined.

The Committee is convinced that such involvement by the Provincial Government need not take place, particularly when the Government is philosophically committed to the principles of free collective bargaining. (They are speaking now of the Government opposite.)

And again the Bill before us goes completely against that recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other instances in the report which indicate the Government has paid absolutely no attention to the report that did the recent study on negotiations at this time in Saskatchewan.

I will read you what the Committee has to say with respect to the bi-level concept. Page 21 of the Report.

The bi-level concept which the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation supports, suggests negotiations encompassing a wide range of topics and suggests that they may well negotiate with the Government on the provincial level on monetary matters and with local boards on matters relating more directly to the management and the operation of the schools. The Committee does not accept this suggestion that the two levels of negotiation should take place.

So once more one of the backbones, if you like, of the Bill that is before us was one that was looked at, one that was studied by the Toombs Committee and one that was completely rejected by the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of comment from Members opposite in this debate and indeed in other debates with respect to the phrase that is bandied about so much today, "free collective bargaining." The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that collective bargaining in this country and indeed in the world has been sick and is getting worse over the last number of years. It is neither free nor collective nor is it bargaining. Because it has developed in most cases wherever you look at the system into open warfare and power politics back indeed to the old warfare techniques of the battering ram. Collective battering is a much more descriptive kind of term for what passes today as collective bargaining.

Now there may be a greater degree of sanity and reality coming back, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). I think if you pay attention to the news, you will note that in Britain the workers themselves are showing a good deal more sanity than the kind of leadership they have been getting. This I think is going to develop and spread to a greater extent than it now has and we will see a gradual return to sanity in collective bargaining procedures.

I say at this time, Mr. Speaker, I have said before that no legislation in and of itself will resolve the possibility of problems and conflict and confrontation in the bargaining process.

And this Bill 80 because we start out with more points of conflict, we have two levels today, we have three sides, this Bill builds in more possibilities of conflict than ever existed before.

Now I hope those conflicts do not arise, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope they don't. I hope this is an improvement. But I say now, I regret that any improvement that may arise in teacher-trustee negotiations under this Bill, that it does so at the expense of parental rights and the rights of local autonomy of the school boards.

Certainly there are unique problems with respect to bargaining for the working conditions and salaries of teachers. And that certainly isn't the fault of either teachers or trustees. The trustees are not an industrial employer per se. The whole enterprise as someone pointed out earlier in this debate exists not to build cars or tractors or anything else but it exists for the children.

This is my one major concern with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that everything that teachers may wish to bargain for isn't really up for bargaining. And that is still recognized in this

Bill that parental rights I do say, parental rights and local autonomy have not been protected in this particular Bill, that is why I think it is a bad Bill, Mr. Speaker. That is why I will oppose it but at the same time I will tell the Minister that if the Bill passes I will not work to destroy it as he did the previous Bill, we will work within the confines of the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I will not speak at length the way the Member for Wilkie did. I don't have as much as he has to answer for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I think if I had to get up and defend area bargaining I could speak for several hours on it. I note though, with some interest, that this is one of the few times that the Member from Wilkie hasn't claimed that the Bill was a Liberal invention and I am glad to see that we are going to get credit for introducing something new into this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the question of teacher collective bargaining has been hanging fire ever since the inception of area bargaining in 1968. Area bargaining didn't work partly because, in spite of what the Member from Wilkie thinks, an area had no social economic or geographic reality and it is hard to determine a settlement or reach any agreement at a level that has no basis in reality. It didn't work either, partly because of the continued interference by the Liberal Government of the day in the collective bargaining process. Now when we look back at the New Deal for People, the Liberals I am sure if they read it, will note that we promised before June of 1971 that we would introduce some legislation to replace area bargaining and we have fulfilled that promise with this Bill. Mr. Speaker, I give credit to the Minister of Education for having the courage and the determination to introduce this Bill in the face of all the opposition he encountered.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — That opposition, Mr. Speaker, came from many sources and one of them, of course, one of those groups is the Liberal Opposition across the way. The Liberals are like the dog in the manger. They don't fulfil election promises and they don't want anyone else to, either. They don't like the rules of the new political game we play in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Steuart: — That's for sure!

Mr. Flasch: — Oh, the Member from Prince Albert says "That's for sure." He's a critic you know; he's a real critic. That's all he can do; he is never constructive though. You know I read the definition of a critic, I think it was in one of our high school English texts and it defines a critic as a legless man who teaches running. Now you might say, Mr. Speaker, or the Members might say that the Leader of the Opposition isn't exactly legless, but I think you'll agree that his legs are pretty short

April 15, 1973

and his criticism is accordingly irresponsible.

Mr. Steuart: — Feet are made for stamping . . .

Mr. Flasch: — They won't reach very high!

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals threatened boards that grants would be cut off if settlements weren't satisfactory and they threatened the teachers with being placed under The Essential Services Emergency Act if they didn't fall in line with Liberal thinking. And, of course, under the guise of pretending to fight inflation, they introduced the 6 per cent guideline and demanded that all salary settlements fell within that guideline.

Well, let's take a look at that guideline, and how it was implemented by the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac). First of all, as you will recall he had a great deal of difficulty defining that guideline. He couldn't make up his mind as to what 6 per cent was. He defined it and he redefined it. In Saskatoon, Area 6, the pattern was something like this, after the board and the committee had agreed to a settlement of 6 per cent, they brought it in. The Minister looked at it and said, "That's not 6 per cent." I don't know what figure he put on it, 7 or 9 or something like that, and he said "Back to the bargaining table." So, back the groups went. They came in again with another settlement and he looked at it and he said, "That's not 6 per cent," of course it wasn't; it was only about 5 per cent. But he said, "Back to the bargaining table." So, back they went. Finally the third time they came in, Mr. Speaker, they came in with a settlement of 4.2 per cent. And the Minister with his fuzzy Liberal arithmetic looked at it and said, "That's 6 per cent," and they settled. So you have the peculiar case, Mr. Speaker, of what was 6 per cent wasn't 6 per cent and what wasn't 6 per cent finally turned out to be 6 per cent because the Minister said it was so.

Generally speaking, I can't say that the amount of the settlements reached under the Liberal Government were unjust when they were finally arrived. But money, Mr. Speaker, doesn't satisfy all wants. It was the Liberal attitude towards teachers in general, towards education and the collective bargaining process, that aroused the anger of the teaching profession and of all people. They refused to recognize that a problem existed. As the Minister said the other day, the Liberals were like an ostrich with its head in the sand; but while that Liberal ostrich had its head in the sand, the people of Saskatchewan and among them many teachers, sneaked up on the ostrich and kicked it in the behind so hard that not only its head lifted out of the sand but the bird was lifted right out of office, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Now I can't put all the blame for the interference in bargaining, on the shoulders of the former Minister. I suppose if one could say anything about the Member from Wilkie at that time it would have to be that he had a case of stomach trouble, Mr. Speaker — he lacked guts. There was a little man from Prince Albert who was constantly looking over his shoulder, maybe he had to stand on a chair to do it, but he was there nevertheless calling the shots, Mr. Speaker. He was manipulating the Member. He and the then Premier were making all kinds of threatening speeches and finally, of course, the Member from

Wilkie got into it too. He decided to take out his frustrations on the teachers. It reminds me of an old German story that is told about a hen-pecked man who got in wrong with his wife and his wife chased him under the table. While he was sitting there, sitting out his punishment, his neighbor came along and he said, "What are you doing under the table?" He said, "I am the master in this House, I can sit where I want." I think that was the case with the former Minister.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) was rather subdued in his remarks the other day. With the galleries full of teachers he was caught between the devil and the deep blue sea. He was suddenly something less of a Liberal than he has been on many occasions before. He was afraid to 'politic' as he was used to doing. He referred to the Bill as a piece of "insidious legislation" and he predicted that it would haunt both the teachers and the Government in the years to come. I think that the only haunting that will be done, Mr. Speaker, is that the ghost of area bargaining will haunt the Liberals. He hinted that somehow local autonomy would be lost.

I should like to know what this Bill takes away from the local level that was negotiated there previously. He criticized the absolute powers of the Teacher Relations Board and in reality now, that Board has been reduced to pretty well the role of a referee.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, calls for bi-level bargaining in negotiations and that's the way it should be. Things like the salary grid, group insurance, superannuation — these are rightfully placed at the provincial level and everything else can be settled locally. Minor working conditions certainly vary from one school to another. I am sure that conditions in Miller Collegiate in Regina are not the same as are conditions in the little school where I teach or in most of the country schools in smaller centres in Saskatchewan. Bi-level bargaining recognizes that fact.

Section 8, subsection (2) I think is important because it assures that if a local board and a committee reach agreement on a certain matter — say educational leave for instance — then negotiations with regard to that item at the provincial level don't contravene the provisions of that local agreement.

The Bill, of course, provides for conciliation or arbitration procedures right down the line. Settlements of disputes over salaries will thus be resolved more quickly and the process will be less drawn out.

Now the Member from Wilkie went to great lengths to talk about the Toombs Report and he was almost saying that the Minister should have taken the Toombs Report and introduced it as it was. I remember when that report came out and so do some of the Liberal Members sitting across the way. The Minister looked very favorably on that report. How did the Liberals look at it? How did the Member from Milestone look at it? I remember before the Orders of the Day, in the question period, how he took the Minister to task and how he criticized the powers of the Teacher Relations Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, was he speaking for the Liberal Party? If he wasn't then it was the

April 15, 1973

responsibility of somebody over there to muzzle him, Mr. Speaker. He should have either said what their position was or said nothing.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — I don't remember that.

Mr. Flasch: — The Toombs Report was a deliberate attempt to depoliticize the whole question of teacher collective bargaining. The STF criticized it; the SSTA was certainly against it and the Liberals were against it too. You just can't have it both ways. You were not satisfied with it. The Minister, in order to appease, bent over backwards and brought in something else and he had to. I mentioned the criticism before. The record of this Government is such that none need fear that the Government will interfere continuously in the collective bargaining processes as the former government did. Before this Bill was drafted, the Minister made attempt after attempt through meetings between himself and the STF and SSTA to arrive at some legislation that would be acceptable to both sides. The SSTA, of course, had two sacred cows right from the beginning. There would be no deviation from area bargaining, and secondly there would be no bi-level bargaining. There was no possibility of negotiation after they established that position from the beginning. I have one of their pamphlets, there are a few of them around, Mr. Speaker. For the most part, what they contain is sheer baloney. I might say that it is not the kind you would get at Intercon, either, I think it's the Byrnes variety and I think that's the type the Members opposite prefer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — The STF has accepted this legislation, Mr. Speaker, with a few reservations about what should be implemented in 1973. Mr. Speaker, this is a new Bill. There may be some kinks in it that will have to be ironed out. I think that it is a Bill that will go a long way toward settling the impasse that has existed up to now in connection with teacher collective bargaining in this province. I will certainly support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments on Bill No. 80, The Teachers Collective Bargaining Act, I would first congratulate the Minister of Education for placing this Bill before this Legislature at this time. It is my hope that this piece of legislation will remove from the negotiation of teachers' salary agreements many of the frustrating problems associated with the procedure in the past. The great concern of Saskatchewan citizens over this problem resulted in the New Democratic Party including in its pre-election pamphlet, The New Deal of People, a promise to introduce legislation to restore free collective bargaining to teachers and trustees and this Bill is the promise kept.

Seldom, if ever, does legislation satisfy all parties. This Bill is no exception to the rule. It is workable but it will depend on the persons involved as to whether or not it will work.

Mr. Speaker, I should like further to commend the Minister on his total approach to the whole knotty problem of teacher

salary negotiations since his appointment to the important post of Minister of Education. Although he has been accused of arrogance and a dictatorial attitude, especially by the School Trustees' Association, to my mind he has used every avenue of approach to the problem available to him . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — . . . with an open mind and a receptive mind to reach the conclusions he has now presented to this Legislature. It should not be necessary to reiterate to this Assembly the many and various means he has used to glean and gather information from all sectors beginning with the establishment of the Toombs Commission to the more recent meetings with those persons in key positions of responsibility in the education field.

Some of the comments I will make, Mr. Speaker, will stem from my personal experiences as a school trustee. Having had the privilege of being a member of negotiating teams and finalized 15 agreements, one for a two-year period. I retired as a school trustee prior to the time of area bargaining just before it was foisted upon us, so I have no experience in this style of negotiating. I should like, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to make just a few comments on area bargaining as I see it from outside the sphere of a school trustee.

The effect of area bargaining mainly changed the number of bargaining units from approximately 100, or at least one for each school jurisdiction to approximately 13. It removed from the local unit board the authority to bargain directly with the teachers in their employ, for salaries. It took one long stride towards provincial bargaining and placed negotiating teams in positions of easier oversight and control by central authority. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if school boards had their powers eroded as they claim, it was at this point in time that it happened. It would only be fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that area bargaining did result in teachers in the rural areas in Saskatchewan receiving salaries more in line with those of urban areas. Mr. Speaker, during my time of office I witnessed the growth of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association from reasonably small associations to large, highly organized structures of power, with very effective voices for their respective members. I witnessed the gradual but definite change from the local school unit level of bargaining where the local unit board bargained directly and solely with the teachers in their employ to the point where bargaining was carried on at the local level but no agreement was ever signed by either party without presenting the terms and conditions to the provincial office for ratification. I recall, Mr. Speaker, attending trustees meetings at the provincial level in Regina and Saskatoon that were called to discuss and decide on strategy and acceptable salary increases. I also recall, Mr. Speaker, the reaction if a unit board defected from the salaries recommended being requested to justify their actions. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this procedure was in effect provincial bargaining to a large degree. I further submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is much the same today, so I cannot therefore agree with the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association in their claim that provincial bargaining will drastically erode their authority as unit or local board representatives.

April 15, 1973

The negotiating of teachers' salaries is only one of the responsibilities or duties of a school board although this area of oversight in most cases requires the largest percentage of financial expenditures, with the exception possibly of capital costs. It should not receive the priority in decision-making time that it does receive from most boards. In my opinion the main concern of the trustees should be in the administration of the school plant, with emphasis on the curriculum and program offered.

With the move to provincial bargaining for teachers' salaries a big burden should be removed from the shoulders of the local board and they should be freer to spend their time in matters of more importance for the education and future well-being of the students in their classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, during my term as a trustee (and I think my feelings were similar to others of the day), I looked forward to salary negotiations as a tough challenge, but yet, with a good deal of apprehension.

A comment I made while speaking to a superintendency teachers' convention about ten years ago would sum up my feelings at that time. While suggesting to them that a better way should be devised to settle salaries, I said I was fed up with salary negotiations as they were then done. I was ready to accept provincial bargaining at that time, and I believe a good many other trustees were as well. In fact, Mr. Speaker, trustees are on record as being in favor of provincial bargaining at one time in the past.

With the move to area bargaining accepted by the trustees, it is impossible for me to rationalize their adamant opposition to the position they held previously; unless, Mr. Speaker, it is because the Teachers' Federation have moved from their original position of local bargaining to support for provincial bargaining. Surely men of the calibre of school trustees have more logical reasons for their present stand.

One other point that disturbs me is the trustees' dogmatic position on area bargaining with the only indication of change in that position, a weak suggestion to move back to local bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, if trustees were serious in this regard they leave the impression with me that they have lost contact with reality and the trends in our society. The move to area bargaining did not solve teacher-trustee relations. The suggestion to revert to local bargaining would be utter chaos.

I do not oppose the attitudes and some of the actions of those supposedly responsible people over the past several months. I believe their approach in refusing seriously to consider such recommendations as contained in the Toombs Report (to mention only one example) is a serious reflection on their credibility as true representatives in charge of education in Saskatchewan.

Having made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that given a new set of rules, trustees would see the need to accept responsibility legislated to them, namely negotiating teachers' salaries at the provincial level. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with section 3 of Bill 80.

I support provincial bargaining, but do not agree with the proposed personnel of the negotiating teams as it is written into this Bill. I would suggest that the negotiating teams be teacher and trustee appointees. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that trustees, as representatives of the local government, should be assigned the responsibility of negotiating teachers' salaries at the provincial level.

Trustees are elected representatives of the local government and local taxpayers expect them to accept their responsibilities and act responsibly. Failure by the trustees to act would necessitate the appointment of a team of negotiators by Cabinet and negotiations would proceed without trustee involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this change in the Act would remove the most contentious section. The Bill would be as workable and as effective as now written and the Bill should be then acceptable to all parties concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with this one reservation I am pleased to support this piece of legislation.

If teachers and trustees hope to retain the confidence of the people they represent they have no alternative but to support it as well. These people can make this legislation a masterpiece in the trustee-teacher relationship. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will accept this challenge and do just that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — I rise just to have a few remarks today to this Bill. It is quite obvious to me that the Government does not have nearly the confidence in the Bill that the speaker and notably the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) would have us believe.

It is so structured that the Government will not in any way have any difficulties on its hands when another election rolls around.

Section 5 of the Act states that the first agreement shall cover only one year, despite the fact that the rest of the Act is entirely structured to have two-year salary agreements. The Government, however, is not prepared to risk any negotiations just prior to, or at the time of, a coming election. Now that is hardly a lot of confidence in the Act. I refer the Hon. Members to Section 5 of the Act, which says that negotiation for the conclusion of the first collective agreement shall start within the period set forth therein and shall end by the 31st day of December, 1973, and Section 9(2) which says that negotiations for conclusion of the first local agreement to be concluded under this Act shall commence not later than the 15th of September 1973; negotiations for the agreement should not become effective before the 1st of January 1974.

What these two sections are telling us is this: that the first two-year agreement begins January 1, 1974 and runs through until December 31, 1974, after the next provincial election which may be expected to take place in the spring or fall of 1975.

April 15, 1973

What I am suggesting to the Government, to the people, is this, that if they had adequate confidence in the Bill they would be prepared to start a two-year period, let it be retroactive to January 1, 1973, which is just a brief period in the past, and have it end December 31, 1974. The result of that of course would be that the Government might well find itself in the midst of negotiations at the time of another provincial election, or just before the next provincial election. Despite the confidence that the Government exudes about the Bill, it does not have enough confidence to put it to the test of a negotiation prior to an election, unless that period is well prior to the election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also suggest . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — It's good strategy!

Mr. MacLeod: — Yes, the Hon. Member says it's good strategy. Good strategy it is, but hardly the kind of confidence that I would have believed the Government had in the Bill listening to the Hon. Minister of Education.

One thing about the Bill, with all of its numerous committees and its possibilities and its options, it will make a lot of work for lawyers. When I first became a school teacher when I graduated from the Saskatoon Normal School and went out to my first school (it's quite a while ago now, I was seventeen years old at the time), I do not know if the Teachers' Federation had one lawyer on call. I do not believe they did. I do not see how the teachers or the trustees or the Government can go into this kind of thing without a whole battery of lawyers and if I were to speak on behalf of the legal profession I would thank the Government for bringing us such a collection of junk, because it will clearly make a lot of work for lawyers. And, of course, it will clearly assist legal business. The Hon. Roy Romanow — is he the one whose firm handles the business for one or more of the parties? It does seem to me that we should congratulate the Government in its effort to reduce unemployment in the province.

Another part of the Bill for example, and this is merely an example, one part of the Bill that seems unclear to me is the question about arbitration as opposed to conciliation. One would think that the two would be different. But on a closer examination of arbitration as it is spelled out in the Bill, it does not make it clear at all that any award would be binding upon parties. It does provide that The Arbitration Act, which has similar provisions, does not apply. So, therefore, arbitration so far as it applies to teachers in Saskatchewan, is encompassed entirely within the provisions of Bill 80, but it does not provide that the award will be binding upon the parties. Despite the fact that the provisions of The Arbitration Act, which relate to other arbitrations, are similar to Bill 80, The Arbitration Act has something extra. Schedule A to The Arbitration Act and part 11 of it says this:

The award to be made by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, or by the umpire shall be final and binding on all the parties.

That provision exists in The Arbitration Act.

Last year this House amended the schedule to The Arbitration Act and it strengthened it by saying where more than two arbitrators hear and determine the matter, the decision of the majority of them shall be valid and binding on all parties, and the person claiming under them respectively. In the absence of a decision of the majority or if one arbitrator has been designated as a chairman, the decision of the chairman shall be valid and binding on such parties and the persons involved. The Arbitration Act, with similar provision as Bill 80, finds it necessary to spell out in Schedule A the absolute necessity that the award be binding on all the parties. Bill 80 does not make it clear, with the result that the Government is saying interpret arbitration as you see fit. So if you think that it is binding, you may so interpret it as binding, and if you think it is not binding you may so interpret it, but I assure you that there is much yet to do to determine what the real rights of the parties are under this Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want briefly to comment on two of the previous speakers. And I should like to comment on them in comparison.

The Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) made remarks which are interesting but of no use whatsoever to this debate. One might well refer to it as the Eugene Flasch Sick Comedy Hour. Now it may be entertaining, but the students and the people who come to this Legislature surely expect to hear legitimate, reasonable debate and not the kind of chippy-choppy sentence after sentence that we got from the Hon. Member from Maple Creek.

On the other hand I should like to express just the opposite viewpoint on the Hon. Member for Elrose. He made a very credible and creditable contribution to this debate and I was much interested to listen to each and every word that he expressed. He limited his political commentary to the earlier part of his speech and, of course, every Member in the House will from time to time give a little political speech. Surely that's all right and I have no quarrel with the amount given to us by the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Owens), but I can assure you that most of his speech was a bona fide and definite contribution to the debate in this House and I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member. I suggest only, again referring to the Hon. Member for Maple Creek, that when he talks about baloney in the Burns variety as compared to the Intercontinental variety it is already apparent to me that a good deal of prejudice is creeping into the speeches of some Government Members. Apparently Intercontinental baloney is now good baloney and that Burns baloney is bad baloney and that's exactly what we were saying right along, that the Government would soon begin to attack other corporations. It is a shameful thing that that should occur.

Mr. Speaker, this Act will undoubtedly require some further study to find out its additional weaknesses and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1972

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 amendment thereto by Mr. MacDonald (Milestone)

Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — I haven't spoken on the Bill at all, Mr. Speaker. May I speak on the two concurrently, the Bill and the amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I presume since the hog producer from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) has had comments on the Bill that I should represent the hog producers from Nutana Centre in this debate as well. I am sure Albert Park constituency is so small that you couldn't even build a hog barn in it in any direction. Now Nutana Centre isn't wide enough to build one in, I admit, but long enough. It's about 4½ miles long.

The Liberal Opposition, Mr. Speaker, doesn't really oppose this Bill, it obstructs. They say that the House is slow in conducting the business of the House yet they have adjourned this Bill, I believe 9 times, Mr. Speaker. That borders on the ridiculous. They, Mr. Speaker, say the producers should have a vote. In the election campaign in 1971 we clearly indicated that we would introduce orderly marketing programs for agricultural products. They have been attempting to whip up a frenzy of opposition to this Bill. The KOD committees of 1962 are to become the KOP of 1973. KOP committees are really 'KOP out committees', Mr. Speaker. Plebiscites are really 'kop-outs' in many respects. Only rarely is it considered necessary, under a democratic structure, to hold plebiscites at the provincial and national levels. A government is elected on the platform of promised programs. Naturally enough it must show sensitivity to the needs and wishes of people, but it must also have the intestinal fortitude to proceed with programs, which in its judgment are of benefit to the majority. And it must not bow to local well organized pressure groups.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, if the Government adopted the Liberal rationale, if they have a rationale, we should hold a plebiscite among the executives of corporate entities in the province on whether or not they favor an increase in corporation taxes. It would be just as logical.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board was made a compulsory marketing agency without a plebiscite. It became a compulsory marketing agency in 1943 under a Federal Liberal Government. In fact, all producers are licensed under the Wheat Board, which is similar to the proposals in terms of the Hog Marketing Commission. From the standpoint of over all volume of production and economic return, the Canadian Wheat Board obviously has much more impact on Saskatchewan farmers and residents generally than will the proposed hog marketing commission.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason Members opposite want a vote is to find a handle they can grasp to create dissension, doubt and fear in the minds of the producers and defeat the establishment of orderly marketing. They oppose orderly marketing. They are philosophically opposed to it. We plainly have evidence of this. The MLA for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) says boards are not the way to handle marketing of farm produce. He said he was opposed to that approach and he included even the Wheat Board. Other MLAs, notably the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), have

stated their opposition to the Wheat Board on many occasions. Liberals really long, Mr. Speaker, for the return to the open market system. The open market system is fine for the big operator, the speculator, the guy who can afford to dabble in the market. Meanwhile the little guy goes broke.

There is pretty clear evidence, Mr. Speaker, that we need orderly marketing in terms of perishable products and the reality is that Saskatchewan urgently requires an orderly marketing approach in relation to the production of hogs. Adjoining provinces have established regulatory bodies to enable them to bid on overseas contracts, in Japan, in the United States and other Pacific rim countries. The key to long-term success in producing, processing and marketing more livestock, lies in continuity of supply. We must reasonably ensure that farmers will agree to produce and deliver hogs on a reasonably stable and continuous basis. This will lead to the second objective, the processing of livestock products in the province. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals do not oppose that approach. Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, should really not have to be reminded that hog prices, as is the case in perishable products generally go from a boom to bust situation over relatively short periods of time. It is only one and a half years or so ago that hog prices in this province were \$18 per cwt. Today, according to the daily paper, they are around \$42 . . . a week ago they were around \$48 or \$49. Wide wings occur in these markets and we are particularly damaging to the industry in terms of reliable and stable production of the product. Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote from the President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, Mr. Boden. Mr. Boldt, the Hon. Member for Rosthern took exception to some of the remarks of Mr. Boden but in any bouts between Mr. Boden and Mr. Boldt, whether it is a preliminary one or the main bout, I'll put my money on Mr. Boden every time. I am quoting directly from Mr. Boden:

It is about time Saskatchewan hog producers, both commercial and otherwise woke up and did something effective in the marketing field. We are getting somewhat tired of the very obvious political manoeuvring aimed at obstructing the creation of a more rational marketing system. I want the actual producers of this province to know we recognize the real motive of certain groups who want to scuttle this plan. Lack of knowledge and apathy of people is one of the real problems in all this. If there is need for a wholesale educational program to tell the full story then we will be able to go to work on behalf of the producers.

That's the thinking of Mr. Boden, the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. He concludes his remarks with these words:

The Pool official said that the Pool, and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture strongly support the idea of co-ordinating the hog commission in the three Prairie Provinces.

And here is the final quote:

This move would achieve more effective marketing both domestic and export. The latter is the most challenging possibility. Saskatchewan hog producers better get with it or lose out by default.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my brief remarks with respect to this particular bill, I should like to make a few comments in relation to some of the comments made by Opposition Members in earlier debates. I believe it was the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who remarked that the Government was simply bringing a lot of problems upon itself. If this is so he should support it because it would automatically, therefore, help the Liberals. That is really not their real concern, Mr. Speaker. Their real concern is that the problems attendant upon the success of the proposed program will create lots of problems for Liberals. That's the basic reason why they exercise so much energy and concern with respect to this particular Bill.

I believe it was the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) who made some comment about this being the worst Bill ever introduced in a Parliament which followed the British Parliamentary System other than the Land Commission Bill in British Columbia. I would remind him of the Land Bank set up in Prince Edward Island. I happened to be in Prince Edward Island last summer and had a long discussion with officials in terms of their Land Bank. To buy 10 acres of land in Prince Edward Island one must have the permission of the Executive Council or the Cabinet. It happens to be a Liberal Government. I think he should send a copy of his speech to the Premier of Prince Edward Island.

I should also like to make a very brief comment with respect to the coupons that come in. I have one, one only. There aren't many hog producers in Nutana Centre. But at the top he has stroked out, "I would urge the implementation of the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission be delayed until a democratic plebiscite of all Saskatchewan hog producers is held to indicate support for this plan." He has stroked this out and he says, "This is a lot of B.S., I support the plan."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Now, I don't know what he means by a lot of B.S. I'll have to ask the Opposition Members to interpret that for me. I know that the Hon. Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) has a bull, but I won't make any further remarks with respect to it.

A number of Members in the Assembly have also had photostatic copies of letters. I got a few of these myself, addressed to the Legislative Assembly saying they were definitely against Bill No. 50 etc. Here are two of them, attached side by side, they are dated March 16th, they don't say where they come from. It could be from Madagascar or Middle Lake or Michilimackinac. No postal address at all. You know, of course, you could run off thousands of them and shoot them out all over the place.

The Act before, us, Mr. Speaker, will tend to diminish the wide price swings and from this point along bring a measure of stability to the industry and therefore should be supported. I don't think it will solve all the problems related to hog production and hog marketing. Obviously that is not possible in terms of any Bill but it will, I believe, at least tend to diminish to some considerable degree the wide price swings that to occur and the instability that is quite apparent in terms of marketing this product. On this basis alone, I think Members should support Bill 50 and I certainly shall do so, and vote against the amendment.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 14

Messieurs

Steuart	Boldt	MacLeod
Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Loken	McIsaac	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Guy	Gardner	Wiebe
Grant	Weatherald	

NAYS — 39

Messieurs

Dyck	Pepper	Matsalla
Wood	Michayluk	Richards
Smishek	Byers	Faris
Romanow	Thorson	Cody
Messer	Whelan	Gross
Snyder	Kwasnica	Feduniak
Kramer	Carlson	Mostoway
Thibault	Engel	Comer
Larson	Owens	Rolfes
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Lange
Baker	Tchorzewski	Oliver
Brockelbank	Cowley	Kaeding
MacMurchy	Taylor	Flasch

The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, first I should like to thank the Member from Hanley (Mr. Mostoway), he's certainly thinking right and it is good to see that we have one over there who is coming around to think the proper way. I want the Minister of Agriculture to pay particular attention today because I have a few remarks directed directly to him after visiting and buying a couple of animals last week. I had a chance to talk to the hog producers up in the barns, they had a big sale on. I have a message for him and I'll bring it out later.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 50, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act to me is the most vicious Bill that has ever been introduced in this Legislature or any Legislature in the world. The NDP Government is saying to the farmers of this province, you do not know what is good for you but we, as the Government, know best and we are going to legislate for you whether you like it or not. The Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, are saying that they have the divine right to guide the destiny of all the people of this province. We, as the planners in Government, are going to make decisions for you whether you like it or not. First you brought in the Land Bank designed by a host of socialist planners, no consultation with the people, just bring in the Bill and make the people like it. Then the Foreign Ownership Bill, Mr. Speaker, designed again by the socialist planners, passed by caucus, no consultation, passed by Cabinet, brought to the House and introduced here. Remember that people spoke out against that Bill very loudly in all parts of the province and in Canada. What happened, Mr. Speaker?

April 15, 1973

The Government received so much abuse that they withdrew the Bill. Again there is no consultation with the people and the cries from the farm people echo through the halls. Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to that very Bill No. 50, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act. Again, no consultation with the producers.

Mr. Speaker, a natural product is defined in Section 2, clause (j):

Any product of agriculture, of the forest, lake or river, animals, including poultry whether alive or killed, skins and pelts of the fur bearing animals, meats, eggs, wool, dairy products, grain seeds, vegetable and vegetable products, fruit and fruit products, honey and any article of food wholly or partially manufactured or delivered for any such products.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will cover every producer in this province. First he must get a licence to sell any of his products. If he doesn't get a licence what will happen to him? He can be fined not more than \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding three months or both a fine and the imprisonment. Big Brother is sure going to look after every producer in this province. Not only in a fine and imprisonment but listen to this, the onus of proving that a licence is not required shall be upon the accused. Mr. Speaker, this Government that is supposed to be for the people is proving what it thinks of the farmers. He is guilty until he proves himself innocent. Think of this, Mr. Speaker, a small farmer who is shipping milk to the city decides he wants to sell a few cows. He has not obtained a licence under Bill 50 and sells his cattle, he can be fined and imprisoned for three months; just remember that, a farmer of this province. Mr. Speaker, what kind of a country are we living in that would allow this young farmer to go to jail and prison for selling a few cows.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in this province and I am very proud of it up to this time but more and more I find that this Government to your right wants to control every citizen in the province in every phase of his or her life from the cradle to the grave. It seems they have great hast, Mr. Speaker, to pass this Bill. The Hog Commission chairman has been appointed and the Premier has stated that the Commission headquarters will be in Saskatoon. Why doesn't the Minister and the Commission put forward a good proposal with some helpful answers with details spelled out clearly to the hog producers. Then he could come back with some helpful answers from the hog producers' meetings, with good ideas for a good plan. I can tell the Premier that the rural people are not going to be pushed around by a Minister who completely ignores them. Let us ask why, Mr. Speaker, the Bill does not allow a provision for the producers to elect their own representatives on the Commission? Instead the Government will appoint all of them. The Bill should be withdrawn as the Foreign Ownership Bill was and a new Bill presented after giving the producers an opportunity to vote and to be heard.

On the new Bill 80 re the negotiations, Teachers' Collective Bargaining Bill, the Government spent 18 months consulting with teachers and trustees throughout this province. The Government spent many months with labor and management before they brought in The Trade Union Act. The Minister of Health spent months with

the chiropractors before he brought in the Bill. It is really a little hard to understand from the Blakeney Government, who shout from the roof tops, a New Deal for People. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, why is this great haste by the Minister of Agriculture. The way he acts he wants to get this Bill through without consulting anyone. Not one of the hog producers in this province wants to be pushed around by this Government to enter into a Hog Marketing Commission before he has an opportunity to vote for or against it. The NDP Government opposite intends to control the farmer, tell him where he will ship, tell him when he will ship, tell him how many he will ship, tell him who will pick up his product. Control, control, control that is all they seem to know! The Government to your right having purchased 45 per cent of Intercon, a bad deal as we have all pointed out, with a socialist approach, will direct all the produce, hogs and cattle to the Intercontinental Packers.

A complete socialist circle is now being completed. Control the land, control the meat industry and now control the farmer and his products. This Bill takes away the basic rights of every farmer in this province. This Bill is even more vicious than the Foreign Ownership Bill. If the Minister thinks he had trouble with the Foreign Ownership Bill he had better pay attention to what is going on in the province over the Natural Products Marketing Bill.

In the past week there were thousands of farmers in Regina for the Spring Bull sale. Along with the bull sale the hog producers had their sow and boar sale. I did not meet one hog farmer who was in favor of what the Minister was doing and I tell the Minister all the farmers want is a vote, and they want input. The cattlemen are worried and well they should be, they feel they will be the next ones to be crucified under this Bill. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Members who sit to your right who come from farming and ranching areas in this province cannot meet the their constituency and say, "I allowed the Natural Products Bill to pass, giving the Minister of Agriculture the power to control every farmer in this province." I would think every farmer in the province, Mr. Speaker, who has enjoyed a basic freedom up until now will be wondering what has gone wrong. Until this Bill was introduced he could buy and sell where he wanted to. He did not have to have a licence, he was not told where, what number or when he could sell his produce. His basic rights have been completely eroded and now he is directed by the state and the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move an amendment which I think is the proper thing to do. I want every Member of this House to have a good look at a cooling off period so that hog producers of this province can have a vote as to whether they want a commission or not. It has been said that a vote would take a long time. A vote could be put through in two weeks, Mr. Speaker, and this would be a great thing if done democratically and supervised by a commission and every farmer and hog producer would get a chance to vote on this issue. I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member from Rosetown (Mr. Loken):

That the word 'now' be deleted and the words 'six months hence' be added to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to this amendment, the amendment asks for a six-month cooling off period. It means that this Bill, or something like this Bill, could not be considered until a fall session, if we have one.

The Member from Regina Lakeview who introduced this motion said, let's have a cooling off period. Let's give the farmers a chance to be heard. Let's give the hog producers a chance to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake the real hog producers in this province want to be heard and I am not talking about that hierarchy the Wheat Pool, the hierarchy of the Farmers' Union or the leadership of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. I don't doubt they have been heard. I don't even doubt that some members representing Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association or the Swine Breeders' Association have been heard. I have held meetings in almost every part of this province, and we have had record attendance. The hog producers of this province have not been heard on this Bill, on this compulsory Hog Marketing Commission and they want to be heard.

I tell you that we have evidence that they haven't been heard and we have evidence that they want to be heard. So what is the rush? Why not give our farmers time? Why not give the people who actually base their entire livelihood, on the production of hogs on the facts and then give them a vote?

We went around this province, Mr. Speaker, we went outside of this province, we went outside of this nation and we listened to people about the liquor laws; we listened to people about welfare; we listened to people about business, and I say that if anything comes out of those hearings that is a good thing. But here when we are going to move in on the livelihood of our basic industry, first hogs, next sheep, next cattle, suddenly our NDP Government and our Minister of Agriculture and the Premier himself says, "We haven't got time to listen to the farmers. We are not interested in what the farmers have to say." What the Government is saying is that the farmers haven't got enough knowledge, they don't know enough, they are too stupid to stand up and vote on the future of their own industry.

Mr. Messer: — You said that, Davey!

Mr. Steuart: — No, you are saying it, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. I challenge you right now to get up and support this amendment. I challenge you to get out and give the facts first — and you haven't given the facts — nor have your high paid bureaucrats given the facts to the farmers of this province and the hog producers and given them a vote.

If the Commission is such a wonderful thing then why not give the people that live by producing hogs a vote?

We have heard a great deal about these coupons and I have them here. You think there aren't very many of them. Well I will tell you how many there are — over 1,400 of them. I have heard the smart remarks on that side saying we are getting coupons from people who are dead. Well I am answering every one of these and I am sending them a letter and saying, "I am pleased

that you took the time to write in and I am sorry that the Government won't listen to you."

You will find out in 1978, and I say you will find out before, whether these people are dead. Fourteen hundred and most of these people are hog producers. When 1,400 of them take the trouble and the time and their own money to fill them out and sent them in, you refuse to listen to them at your own peril.

Politically I am pleased that you refuse to listen to them. I suggest you to come over and examine them. I challenge you to come and take a look at them. Here they are and where are they from? Main Centre, Lorrie Spencer, Kinistino; Roberts . . . by golly they put jackasses under the thing and they are all in trouble over there aren't they? Russel Neilson, Ridgedale; Ray Baumgartner, Ridgedale . . . Some of you fellows ought to feel a little twinge when you hear this. Ken Eagen, Shell Lake; A.L. Hodgins, Manor . .

Mr. Romanow: — Any from Saskatoon Riversdale, Dave?

Mr. Steuart: — No, they didn't write in from there. There are not too many hog producers up there and I don't suppose they are too interested and neither are you and it is too bad. But just remember this, there may not be many in Saskatoon Riversdale but I tell you there are lots in every other constituency.

Edwin Scheme, Balcarres, Saskatchewan; George Walsh, Stewart Valley.

Mr. Messer: — How many hog producers are there?

Hon. Mr. Steuart: — You tell me how many there are, Mr. Minister of Agriculture. How many have you listened to? Andrew Leaden, Kelvington; R.G. Olifam, Eston; Glen Radloff, Star City. Radloff, as a matter of fact, it is the brother of Frank Radloff, and he is a farmer. I don't see how it is so humorous that the brother of Frank Radloff who is a farmer, should write in and say that he doesn't want the NDP to put him into a straitjacket, that he wants a chance to vote on his own livelihood. You think that it is a big joke that, Dave D.J. Burrows of Endeavour has written in? Maybe that is funny. Roy Wilson of Lashburn; Mr. Reed Ougre of Admiral; Ronald Lange of Lorlie, Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — How about Jules Leibert?

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, I suppose Jules Leibert. He is a farmer isn't he? Maybe he is an Aberdeen Angus man, but he is next. One thing about you school teachers over there, you got what you wanted, or you are getting what you wanted, but you insist in putting the hog producers, the cattlemen, the farmers and the producers in a straitjacket.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, there are over 1,400 and they are still coming in. You people say that they are dead.

An Hon. Member: — How about Joe Bishop?

April 15, 1973

Mr. Steuart: — No, we didn't hear from Joe Bishop. Joe Bishop is on welfare and I will tell you why Joe Bishop is on welfare, because you laughing hyenas paid \$6 million to cancel a pulp mill that would have given Joe Bishop a job. But instead of that your answer to Joe Bishop is to rot on welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What did you give Joe Bishop? What job have you given him? You haven't given him any job.

It is very interesting that the Members on that side, the Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody), the Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris), sit in their seats and giggle and jeer. How many of those Members have had the fortitude to stand up and make a speech? Not very many. Well there is lots of time. Get up this afternoon and show us your real colors. Get up this afternoon and tell us what you think about it.

I say the sheep are next and I tell the sheep in the back benches that they will be next to be led to the political slaughter if they haven't got the intestinal fortitude to stand up and oppose this Bill. I ask the Members over there, the back benchers, because there is no hope for the front benchers. They are arrogant, they are swell headed, and they are determined they are going to put this through. I ask the back benchers this: Anyone who has seen the regulations, let him stand up. Let him stand up! There isn't anybody who has seen the regulations. I say this to you, Mr. Feduniak, that the regulations when they appear . . .

Mr. Feduniak: — Can't pronounce an Irish name . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Sorry! I was watching some of those Irishmen pronounce some of those names over there and they don't do any better than I do. I am sorry, Mr. O'Feduniak.

I say this, why hasn't the Government, why hasn't the Department of Agriculture made public the regulations? Because I predict that there will be at least as much law, or more law in the regulations than is contained in the Act.

In other words if the hog producers of this province are upset now — and they are upset — and the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) is waving around some information we sent out and I will tell this House what we sent out. We sent out 75,000 copies of the Bill. We sent out 75,000 of the speech by Mr. John Gardner explaining the Bill. I am going to tell you that the farmers are phoning in now and they are asking for hundreds and hundreds, in fact thousands, more copies of the same Bill.

Print the regulations! The regulations are all set. I will ask Mr. Messer to tell the truth, if the truth is in him, are in fact the regulations set right now? Are the regulations finished?

Mr. Romanow: — The Bill hasn't been passed.

Mr. Messer: — Never mind, the Bill has not been passed, Mr. smart Attorney General. You have the regulations set right now.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has asked me a question and if it will enhance his speech I will answer it.

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, are the regulations set?

Mr. Romanow: — How can they be set when the Bill isn't passed yet?

Mr. Steuart: — Of course they are set. They are not passed yet, but you know exactly what regulations you are going to have in connection with this. So you tell me what is wrong with printing the regulations and making them available to the farmers. I tell you that there will be more law in those regulations that are contained in the Act, more compulsion, more regimentation, more dictatorship in those regulations than the farmers have ever seen.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, why the Government hasn't put the regulations out. Because they are afraid to put the regulations out! They know what is just a real upset among hog producers today, will almost be a revolution if they saw those regulations.

I say again, if the Commission is so good, if this is going to do such wonderful things for the hog producers, then why not give those same producers a vote? If you don't give them a vote you are saying one of two things — either you are afraid that this Commission is not a good thing, you are afraid to give them the facts because they will vote against it on the substance of the Bill and the regulations. Or the other thing you are saying is, 'we have no confidence that the hog producers know what is good for them. We, the NDP know what is good for them'.

In other words you are saying to the hog producers, 'you haven't got brains enough to vote on the future of your own industry'. And make no mistake, that is the conclusion that the hog producers and the cattlemen and the sheep ranchers in this province are coming to.

I say, give this the six-month hoist. Make public the regulations, then give the farmers all the facts and give the bona fide producers a vote as has been done by the former CCF, as was done by our Government. There hasn't been one board, whether it is a board for the sale and control of honey, or poultry, eggs or turkeys, where the producers of that product were given the facts and they voted overwhelmingly in favor of it . . .

Mr. Messer: — . . . vote on the honey board?

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, there was a vote on the honey board. There sure was back in the days of the CCF. You better talk to some of the old Members. And this is a further indication of how the Party opposite changed since the labor bosses took it over lock, stock and barrel. There was a vote for the honey producers and they

voted in favor of it. There was a vote for the turkey producers, for the broiler producers and also for the egg market.

Every one of those people were given the facts and they voted in favor of a board. It was one other detail, a board means that the producers themselves will control the board. But a commission means that Mr. Blakeney, Mr. Messer and the NDP will control the marketing. And that is the big difference. As Mr. McPherson says, big brother knows best.

You are the hypocrites, we are not the hypocrites. We are saying exactly now in Opposition what we said and did when we were in the Government. You said one thing when you were in the Opposition, you said another thing when you were on the hustings, and you are acting totally different now that you are the Government. And if you are not doing that, if you are not afraid of this commission, if you haven't already sold out some interests that are not mentioned here, then give this thing a six-month cooling off period; give the farmers the facts and give them a vote.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent when the Members have finally been flushed out of the weeds here, that when they ask for the six-month hoist they don't want a referendum, they don't want to know the farmers' opinions. What they want to do is stall and if possible destroy the Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — It is a well known fact that the Liberal Party and several Members opposite have stated quite blatantly and openly that they are opposed to the Wheat Board, they are opposed to all sorts of marketing boards, they are opposed to orderly marketing. And if they were to stand up and say what they really believe, that is what they would say.

Now the Leader of the Opposition has spoken of the meetings that he has held throughout the province and he said that he has held a lot of meetings. They have tried to stir up a lot of trouble and they have certainly stimulated their Members to send in quite a few of these little coupons here. And now he wants a cooling off period so that he can hold more meetings.

Well when he finally finds out how many of those coupons are from hog producers, you bet he will want to have some more meetings. In order to assist the Member for Prince Albert West in conducting his public education program, I have noted that they have been running out of press releases. We have seen the kind of press releases that run along the line of his speech here today. "Most Vicious in Canada" referring to the legislation and so on. Well I have prepared one for the Member.

Most vicious in Canada, Liberals, Wadena Special. Opposition Leader D.G. Steuart today described The Natural Products Marketing Act as the most vicious piece of legislation in Canada. Addressing the three Liberals at a rally held outside Wadena, he said that it could be used as a means of birth control. The fiery Leader said that the Bill clearly covers both birds and bees. Not

only that, but if children are not natural products I don't know what they are, Mr. Steuart added. Quite clearly people will have to buy a licence to produce a natural product. Will the NDP license Liberals?

Mr. Steuart declared that both production and marketing of children could be interfered with. Before being led away, Mr. Steuart said, 'I don't want to alarm people, I only want to be Premier.'

Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that they do want a cooling off period so that they can go around and make their inflammatory speeches from one end of this province to the other. When we finally take a vote on this today, when you finally get information concerning the very small percentage of people, particularly of hog producers, that have written in concerning this matter, I think you will soon change your tune.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support this Bill to try to bring stable and rising prices to hog producers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, this motion for a six-month hoist is really nothing more than irresponsible obstructionism by the Liberal Party opposite. Now we on this side of the House are aware that there is some opposition to the Hog Marketing Commission, but when we examine where it comes from we really understand what the Liberal Party is up to. Now the Liberal Party opposite doesn't want to believe and doesn't want to look at history which proves without a doubt that orderly marketing is vital in order to receive the best price for the products. And the Wheat Pools and the Wheat Boards and the United Grain Growers all prove this without a doubt. Now, Mr. Speaker, Alberta and Manitoba already have a hog marketing commissions and they are both waiting for Saskatchewan to get on with the job so that the three provinces can combine their forces to have some control over the markets, instead of the huge packing companies playing one province off against the other suppressing prices in Saskatchewan by importing and these types of manoeuvres. Members opposite don't want to listen to that, they don't want to face the facts at all.

What about the situation just in case Japan should demand much more pork than is available and said to Saskatchewan or any province for that matter, we would like a guarantee of a million hogs a year and here we are sitting in Saskatchewan, we have no mechanism with which to guarantee Japan a million hogs a year. That is one way whereby we can stabilize prices. We get a contract signed for a million hogs a year for five or six years and we know what the price is. We don't have to worry about the daily fluctuations inside the province. That is what this hog marketing commission is all about but the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) he just can't seem to see beyond his nose and the cheap political gain that he hopes to make out of this thing.

Now the Hog Marketing Commission has the support of several farm organizations given to us in writing. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers' Union, we have verbal agreements from the Swine Breeders' Association, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is behind the Hog Marketing Commission 100 per cent; and you sit there and say everybody is against it, give them the plebiscite.

April 15, 1973

The Leader of the Opposition — oh, I'm sorry to say that he is gone — made his little contribution.

An Hon. Member: — He's gone to a meeting!

Mr. Kwasnica: — He made a big issue about the number of clippings that he got.

Mr. Wiebe: — On a Point of Order. The Member from Cut Knife said he had signed statements of support from these organizations and I would just ask if he would be willing to table those statements please.

Mr. Kwasnica: — That's not a Point of Order. I thought you didn't have one to begin with. You've made three speeches already, do you want to make a fourth? Go right ahead.

Mr. Lane: — Table them!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Now the Leader of the Opposition made a great big to-do about 1,400 clippings which he received opposing the implementation of a hog marketing commission. Mr. Speaker, I got some clippings too. I got the fantastic total of 23 and it is interesting that when we examined these 23 clippings what the state of affairs was. Out of these 23, two of them were definitely in favor of the Hog Marketing Commission and they said from the clipping, "I would urge the implementation of the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission be . . .", and they struck out all the rest of the garbage and then they said, ". . . proceeded with immediately." Absolutely, there it is. Point blank, two of them said we are in favor of it 100 per cent. Then I got 19 others and I looked the names over very carefully and lo and behold almost every one of them were well known Liberals in the area. A well planned campaign. Absolutely, we know where they are coming from. But then I got two other clipping and I replied to everyone of these. I have a form letter, the same as everybody else has and I sent them a letter and I comment about the Hog Marketing Commission to anybody who sends me a clipping. I sent everybody an answer and lo and behold, last week after all the clippings had ceased coming, I got two back from the postmaster in the area. On the clipping is the name and the box number and the one says, "Return," this person is unknown to the postmaster in the area. Never heard of him. The second one I have here says, "Deceased, return to sender." Now there you have it, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. That's what you brought in that pile of 1,400 of them, that's what you got, a bunch of garbage in there. I would say that 50 per cent of them are nothing but fakes or they are Liberals over and over again, repeating themselves. How ridiculous can you get and that's the kind of a campaign you are mounting in this province and it's nonsense. The majority of farmers know what a hog marketing commission can do for them. This is the type of thing that we see going on in this House day after day in the last eight days. Absolute nonsense, trying to build a case out of nothing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't see where a six-month hoist will do any good. All we'll get is more of this type of thing. We've had enough from you fellows opposite, you don't seem to

understand, you don't care about the farmers. All you care about is two-bit politics and that is all that these letters prove, two-bit politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of a hog marketing commission. The majority of the farmers in my constituency have told me that it is high time we put some order into the system of hog marketing. The majority of them have told me this. These are small type farmers, not the big operators. No sir, the majority of them are small type farmers who sell 20, 30, 100, 200 hogs a year. That's where it is at, gentlemen, but you don't want to see the light. You want to oppose, that's fine. I am in favor of the Commission, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, this long drawn out debate perpetrated by the Leader of the Opposition and the Members opposite is nothing else but 'hoggish' talk indicating to the Saskatchewan farmers that the Liberal Party is against orderly farm marketing and against progressive farm programs. The people of Saskatchewan know well why they elected this NDP Government in the last provincial election of June 1971. Before casting their vote on election day they knew the election program of the Government and they knew that this Government would work in the interest of the farmer. At the same time the people of Saskatchewan not only knew the broken down and empty program of the Liberal Party, but they also lost faith and confidence in its leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic Government received an overwhelming mandate from the farmers of this province to carry out this program of stabilizing the agriculture industry. One of the major steps towards this is to provide the hog producers the vehicle for orderly marketing. Support for the provincial hog marketing agency came from various farm organizations including the Saskatchewan Hog Producers, the Swine Breeders' Association, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers' Union and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I might say, Mr. Speaker, these organizations are very representative of the hog producers of this province, and they do speak in their interests. They know and understand that orderly marketing is essential to give producers collective marketing power in order to establish markets and price stability. The farmers of this province know and understand this as well. About the only people who lack this understanding is the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Members to your left, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Leader of the Opposition said that he and his colleagues went around this province talking to hog producers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe they were around the province, but I don't believe they spoke to too many hog producers. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) set up a wine and cheese party in Preeceville to try and attract farmers and hog producers to a meeting. Do you know how many people attended the meeting — 25 people. Only 25 people and this was a wine and cheese party. Besides that, we had a meeting in Preeceville as well, an NDP smorgasbord and a public meeting. There we had at least 200 people attending and we had no wine and cheese. Now when the Leader of the Opposition says that the farmers are against orderly marketing of hogs, he is so wrong. For his information and the information of this House, I received nine coupons only. I might say that

none of these had any comments. Certainly this can't be an indication that the farmers want a vote or that they don't want orderly marketing.

The stalling and the delay tactics of the Leader of the Opposition is very unfortunate. It is damaging and could cost the hog producers of this province a loss of literally thousands of dollars. The hog producers of this province remember very vividly the days of the 18-cent and 20-cent hog marketing. These were days of only several years ago and these were days during the seven years of Liberal regime of the Members opposite. Surely the hog producers don't want to return to that kind of a market and surely, I would hope, that the Members opposite could understand and realize that.

Mr. Speaker, the sooner we get through with the passing of this hog marketing Bill, the sooner this Government can proceed to establish a hog marketing agency to help stabilize the prices and expand markets for the hog producers of this province. Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal to the Opposition. Let's quit this hoggish talk, this politicking at the expense of the hog producers of this province, let's get on with the business of the House as responsible legislators.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy (Athabasca): — Well, Mr. Speaker, since the afternoon seems to be taken up so far with preachers and teachers, municipal secretaries, and the farmers back there are afraid to get up and speak because they know their words are going to be carried back to their constituents. I guess I have some reason for entering the debate. I am a citizen who is concerned with the people of this province. I am a person who is concerned with the direction that the Government opposite is taking. I am also concerned about the stories that they can tell over there, because the Member from Canora said that we had a wine and cheese party in Preeceville the other night. We did. He said we had 25 people. Well, he knows that he is telling a lie. He knows that there were 100. So he says there are 25, we had 100. He said he had 200, and using the same type of arithmetic divide it by four and you get 50. I think that is about the figures there were. We had 100 and they had 50 and they were giving supper away with it too. We couldn't afford supper, we had to give them a little piece of cheese, Kraft cheese it was too, but it was pretty good cheese. They gave the NDP a free meal and they still couldn't get them into the hall.

You know, it is funny this afternoon after we moved this motion, a reasonable one, to take a six-month period to consider the legislation again that all those on the other side who are not farmers, hog producers, are up saying that it is irresponsible to hold it up. The trouble is those are the very people who don't understand the significance of this legislation. Well, I'll tell you how this Bill does affect my constituency. You're not going to like the story I am going to tell you. It was before your time but it was your party that carried it out in regard to the fish and fur marketing board, so just don't be too smart Mr. Minister of Health. You are going to hear a story that you are not going to have any answers for and you are not going to like it. But before I do that I am going to answer a couple of questions that have been raised by some of the other Members.

The Member from Cut Knife, a school teacher (Mr. Kwasnica), talks about obstruction. Well he ought to know about obstruction. If anybody obstructed anything he obstructed the Salary Negotiation Act of 1968. He is a past master of obstruction, so he should know. But what he doesn't know is that he is not talking to the people in his constituency who are concerned with this legislation. I'll tell you he made some very relative statements of the thinking of Members opposite this afternoon. He talked about the coupons and he said they come from Liberals. In other words, because we had Liberal farmers or Conservative farmers or Social Credit farmers or any other political party who are farmers in this province then you shouldn't listen to them. The only people you should listen to are the NDP and that is exactly what they are doing. They are listening just to their own little group of farmers who probably are some of his friends out there that keep running to him. They maybe raise about two hogs a year, that's all they are capable of. Why, if they are Liberals or Conservatives shouldn't they be listened to? Why shouldn't they have the opportunity to have a vote?

Then he said and this is a dandy, we got only 1,400 coupons. But this is a significant statement, he said, "50 per cent of those people are fakes." That's what you said, you said 50 per cent of the coupons that have been sent in, that the Leader of the Opposition showered up in this Legislature, you said were fakes. Well I am sure that the people who took the time to send those coupons in didn't want to hear statements like that by Members opposite, that they are fakes. Because that's your attitude, you won't listen. That's why you won't give them a vote, you won't give it a six-month hoist to let them make their views known because you go around with your head in the sand. You have two principles, one, you listen to nobody but NDP. If they are Liberal they shouldn't be saying anything, they haven't got a right to speak up. If they are Conservative or Social Credit or anything else. Your second principle is that everybody that doesn't agree with the NDP is a fake, that's what you say. All right, but if I had to agree with the NDP I sure would be a fake. I'll tell you that, I sure would be!

Well then we come to some of the associations that are supporting it, that are supposedly supporting it. He mentioned the NFU, Mr. Atkinson. You know, Mr. Speaker, I just hope that he is more sincere about that than he is about the boycott of Kraft cheese. You know the other night I was in Saskatoon at a Transportation Conference and I was sitting at the next table to Mr. Atkinson. We had a lovely dinner up there put on by the Province of Saskatchewan. For dessert we had apple pie and cheese. I watched because I was interested, I had heard all the these statements that Mr. Atkinson had been going across Canada, "Don't ever touch Kraft cheese. Boycott them, they're terrible people, they put out a terrible product, never touch it." We watched him — the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) will back me up, he was at the same table with me — he took the cheese and he ate it. I called one of the waitresses over and I said, "Would you please tell me what kind of cheese we are eating tonight?"

Mr. Smishek: — On a Point of Order. Are we debating a resolution or a Bill of Kraft cheese or are we debating a resolution on the Hog Marketing Board. I believe that the Hon. Member is straying far away and I suggest that he be brought to order.

April 15, 1973

Mr. Guy: — Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, under this legislation it says every product of the farm. If that doesn't include cheese, well then of course, the Minister doesn't know what comes off the farm.

Here is a man that is boycotting Kraft, supposedly so, sincerely across all of Canada. The waitress came back and said that what we were eating tonight is Kraft Canadian Cheddar. That was at 8:20 March 23rd in the Bessborough Hotel.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — So if he has not more sincerity as far as the Hog Marketing Commission than he has as far as boycotting Kraft Cheese goes I don't think you want to count him on your side. You had better get somebody else to back up your arguments that there shouldn't be a vote for the farmers.

Well then the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) and the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) said we are going to maintain prices. Well, of course, if we had an example where hog commissions or boards can't maintain prices it was only a few days ago that the prices of hogs dropped fairly significantly. In Alberta they have a hog marketing commission and in Manitoba and the prices went down just exactly as much in Calgary and Winnipeg as they did here in Regina. In fact I think they went down even more.

So that argument doesn't hold water. So you haven't got an argument for at least not letting the farmers come in and tell you the reasons why they want a vote and tell you what is wrong with this Natural Products Marketing Act.

Now for the Members opposite who have been here only a short time, I want to tell you how they used The Natural Products Marketing Act in the past.

This is the real reason why I am speaking today, because if there are any two products that are going to be involved, or could be involved under this Act, it is the fish and fur of northern Saskatchewan. It is not under this Act yet, thank heavens, not yet, but it will be if we just give them time. Fresh Fish Marketing Board didn't have any vote by the producers. Well that of course isn't true. The co-op Fisheries went to every member of the co-op and every local co-op and asked them at their annual meetings, by a referendum whether they wanted to be a part of this Fish Marketing Board. The same principle was there and they voted on it through their local organizations whether they wanted to be a part of the Fresh Fish Marketing Board.

You know back in 1945 they set up the Fur Marketing Service and for 10 years . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . fish already . . .

Mr. Guy: — If you will only sit over in your own seat and keep your mouth shut I will tell you. You are another one of those who wouldn't know a hog from a bale of hay. In fact I doubt if

you would know a hog from a fish.

Mr. Speaker, we do have a rule in this House that when you are in your Chair, that anybody who makes comments at least makes them from their own seat and not from another Member's seat. I think that this is a rule that should be followed and it is a well known one in this Legislature.

Mr. McIsaac: — Well known to everyone but him.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, that is right. We had a Fur Marketing Service for ten years and it was compulsory for beaver and muskrat and it wasn't successful. They created dissension among the producers and dealers and the operators. There was almost a revolution in northern Saskatchewan because the CCF Government at that time tried to force the fur producers to sell their furs through the Fur Marketing Service.

And in 1955 under that pressure the NDP saw the light. They took the compulsion away. Did it hurt the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service? No, it made them better; they got a bigger percentage of the furs than they ever got before, than they would have got normally. The private dealers were happy. They were allowed to compete. The producers got a better price through competition and the whole thing worked out for the betterment of everyone concerned in the fur industry. And the same thing will happen if you will keep your fingers off the hogs, the cattle and the sheep. Get away from compulsion! Don't try and force them to sell to Intercontinental Packers, give them a chance to sell where they can get the best price, and transport at the least distance. Don't use force to try to bring the farmers into line when you know they don't want to, or at least you have never given them the opportunity to vote as to whether they want to be treated in that manner.

So the Fur Marketing Service was a good example where compulsion does not work and as soon as the CCF got away from that, threw it open to private dealers, to co-ops, to the Fur Marketing Service, everyone competed and they all got a reasonable share of the market. The producers were the ones that benefited from it.

Then we had the Fish Marketing Service and at the beginning it was non-compulsory. It was up to the producers whether they wanted to sell to the Fish Marketing Service. It worked well. But then in 1961 the Fish Marketing Service didn't think that they were getting the fair share of the fish. In other words they wanted to get it all. So what did they do?

Well, I tell you it was an interesting Order-in-Council they passed in 1961, Number 2128, December 1961. It said that they were going to amend the regulations under The Fisheries Act. Again it was an example of what we see almost every day. It says, "Where a group," it doesn't say of producers. It doesn't say whether they are active fishermen or fishermen that were fishing this year or a year ago, or five years ago. It says,

Where a group of fishermen have in the Minister's opinion a common interest in commercial fishing in any water or part thereof the Minister may permit the group to call

all or a specified amount or portion of the total limit prescribed to commercial fishing in any water, and, upon the request of the majority of the group (not of the producers but of the group) cause every commercial fishermen's licence issued to a member of such group to contain a provision requiring that all fish caught under the authority of the licence shall be marketed through a specified dealer, agency, or co-operative association.

There is the old compulsion creeping in again. And how did it work? Then it went on in Section 26 and said:

No person who holds a commercial fishermen's licence . . .

And I want all Members to relate it to what you have in front of you today in The Natural Products Marketing Act.

No person who holds a commercial fishermen's licence which contains the provision inserted therein, pursuant to Section 25, shall sell, barter or otherwise market any fish taken under the authority of such licence otherwise to or through the dealer, agency or co-operative association named in the licence.

So that tied up the producers. Now what about those who wanted to purchase? Well, at that time the Government I guess didn't have \$10.2 million to buy out all the dealers and force the producers to sell directly to the Government, which they are doing by buying Intercon, so they said:

No dealer, agency or co-operative association shall purchase or solicit the sale of any fish taken under such a licence.

So they nailed them both. They made the producers sell to the deal that they specified and then they told the dealers if you buy one fish that is marked for somebody else you are going to find yourself in court. And, of course, that is exactly what did happen. Some of the fishermen were taken to court. And if there was ever a smelly affair — and the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) should know because I think he was part of the Government at that time — it smelled to high heaven and it wasn't the fish that was smelling, I will tell you that.

Of course, after we became the Government, this section was repealed. And, again the freedom of marketing fish has proven beneficial to those producers who are now marketing in freedom which we are trying to tell Members opposite should be involved in all natural products.

I want to remind you of another reason why I am concerned. I want to just list some of the men who were involved when this nefarious order-in-council came in 1961. There was G.R. Bowerman, Supervisor of Commercial Fisheries, he has now advanced to become the Minister of Natural Resources; J.W. Churchman who was the deputy minister and has since moved up to northern Saskatchewan and taking control, not only of the fisheries, but has taken control of the social and economic industrial life of every human being up in that part of the country. And then there was A.C. Towill who is now the deputy of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Those were the men who brought in this nefarious compulsory legislation and that is why I am concerned today that with those same men tramping through

northern Saskatchewan with the Natural Products Marketing Act under their arm, that there is not going to be any freedom left again. And that is why we are fighting it so hard on this side of the House. And that is why we are saying that if you are going to treat the hog producers like that, it is obvious that you are going to treat the cattle producers and the sheep producers. Then you are going to pack up your little bags and move up north and tackle the wild rice producers, the fur producers, the fish producers, the timber producers. You are going to put every single person in northern Saskatchewan who markets any product at all, or produces it, into a straight-jacket. And it is already underway with the same men heading the same department that brought this legislation in over 20 years ago now.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, that I am concerned because as I said it did have a serious effect upon the people of northern Saskatchewan. We all remember back to 1962 when the great people's government, the CCF, well I guess they changed their name to NDP by then, labor had taken over control by then and they said let's get some of those fishermen, let's show the strong arm of labor and the strong arm of the CCF combined, what we can do to the poor little fishermen in northern Saskatchewan.

So they went over into the Beauval area and my friend for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) recalls that very well. They hauled some of these fishermen into court because they had the nerve to sell some fish where they could get a higher price when they had a licence stamped on it, "This fish must be sold in the co-op in such and such a place." And the fishermen said to themselves, we have lived in this country a lot longer than these men who stamped the licences. These are our fish and we are going to sell them wherever we like. And that is the kind of freedom that they should have had, but oh no, the strong arm of our friends opposite, hauled these innocent fishermen into court. Took them into court! They couldn't afford lawyers, they couldn't afford to put up the fight against the former Attorney General, Mr. Walker, and the Member for Estevan (Mr. Thorson) might have even been there at that time, another one of those corporate lawyers. The couldn't stand up against them and they pleaded guilty because they didn't have an alternative.

But thank heaven our judicial system was fair enough and said, you don't have to plead guilty even if you can't afford a lawyer. And it went to the Appeal Court on the basis that they shouldn't have pleaded guilty and the Appeal Court found them not guilty. And that was a mark for freedom in this province against the iron fist of socialism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And this is why, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned today and why I am speaking on this Bill, because I don't want to see the fishermen and the wild rice growers and the fur trappers in northern Saskatchewan forced into court because they don't follow one of the little provisions and the regulations that are going to come out under this Act. That is why we are all fighting on this side of the House, for the freedom of the producer, whether he is in northern Saskatchewan or whether he is in southern Saskatchewan, whether he is of Indian or Metis

April 15, 1973

ancestry, it doesn't matter what it is, he has the right to sell his product where he can get the best price and wherever he wants to sell it. And that is what we are standing for on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And this is why we can't go along with this Bill.

Mr. Cowley: — Are you against the Wheat Board too?

Mr. Guy: — I am against, Member from . . . where is he from? He never lived in Biggar did he? Oh, the Member from Biggar, the one that gave the Budget from the third row, for the first time in the history of this province. He is the one. He doesn't know a hog if it walked down the road. Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, those are the reasons why we can't support this legislation on this side.

You know, Mr. Speaker, compulsion has become the trademark of the Government opposite. It is obvious that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson), the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and the Financial Secretary or whoever he calls himself (Mr. Cowley), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) have lost touch with the people.

Look at the Minister of Agriculture, the Land Bank, Foreign Ownership, now The Natural Products Marketing Act, The Hog Commission. One of the wealthiest farmers in this province and yet he says that those less fortunate than himself, we don't care what happens to you, I am going to grind you under my heel. Not only am I wealthy, not only am I one of the wealthiest farmers in Saskatchewan today, but I have also been given additional power. I am now the Minister of Agriculture. I can tell you farmers what to do and I am telling you to sell your hogs to the Commission. I am telling you where to license it, where to distribute it and I am even going to tell you what kind of truck you are going to haul it in to the market.

An Hon. Member: — He wouldn't do that!

Mr. Guy: — Oh, yes he would! His power has gone completely to his head and he is completely out of touch with the farmers of Saskatchewan, which he supposedly represents.

Then we have the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson). He showed through the Intercontinental deal how much he has lost touch with the people of Saskatchewan. He lost touch with the people of Saskatchewan once and they showed him what they could do to him, and I suggest that they are going to show him again after a very short term in this House what can happen when he loses touch with the people.

And then we have the Premier, Mr. Blakeney. He came from outside of the province. He was a civil servant and one of the biggest bureaucrats this province ever saw. He never did have the feeling for rural people in this province. And the result is that these three top men in Government are showing complete callousness, their hunger for power, their trampling on

minority groups, their complete incompetence to look after the affairs of the province which has been shown through all their dealings in the last 19 months, but specifically in the legislation last year that set up this Natural Products Marketing Act and the amendments which we are debating at this time.

They are not carrying out the mandate that was given to them in 1971. They talk about the NDP program. There is nothing in their 1971 program saying that they were going to establish a Marketing Commission without a vote. In fact they went out on the hustings and said, we are going to listen to the people. Even this wealthy farmer, the Minister of Agriculture, from the Tisdale area, was going around telling those people and some of them were at the wine and cheese party at Preeceville the other night. They said, you know, Mr. Messer never used to be like that when he was campaigning for election, he never trod on us then. He was asking us, "What do you think? What do you think about this, what do you think about that?" Today, they said, "We can't even call him on the phone. He won't answer any letters that we write to him. He has set himself above us. He is wealthy and he is rich and now he is trampling us into the ground."

That is what they say about the Minister of Agriculture up in his own area where he comes from.

Well, it is unfortunate that the back benchers over there, who are involved with the farming industry, or with any natural product, will not stand up and take a stand for freedom. I will tell you that you will regret it in the next election, because the people of Saskatchewan are sick and tired of having the force and the weight and the compulsion of 45 Members on that side of the House, 30 of them who are afraid to speak up to their masters in the front row, and tell them what is right. They are the ones that are not going to be back four years from now.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a reasonable one, it's one that will give the people an opportunity to try and get through the thick shells of the Minister of Agriculture, the Premier, the Attorney General and the Minister from Estevan. And it's going to take a lot of time and I think in six months they probably could do it and that's why we ask that they give it the six-month hoist and I certainly support the amendment, but I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, much has been said regarding this Bill No. 50, not only in the Legislature here, but also it is the main topic of conversation throughout Saskatchewan, especially in rural Saskatchewan. I'm concerned with this hog commission because of my involvement with six other farmers in a hog raising enterprise. It's not a large operation, Mr. Speaker, but we do sell approximately 2,500 hogs per year. We shall now be told where to sell our hogs. No doubt this will be to Intercontinental Packers. We shall be paying the same commission, handling charges as we are paying now and in addition to this we'll have the cost of the operation of the Hog Commission. Now this is just another vicious tax on the producers added to the already heavy tax burden on producers in this province.

April 15, 1973

Mr. Speaker, the only thing this Government has done for the hog producers since they were elected in 1971 was to remove the \$2 premium per hog paid by the former Liberal Government and doing this while the price was declining in a declining market. This was another disaster for the hog producers. Now the Minister showed no concern whatever for the producers when hogs dropped to \$18 per 100.

Mr. Speaker, a writer of a recent editorial in the Prince Albert Daily Herald said:

We cannot believe that Saskatchewan voters gave the NDP a mandate to govern in a manner which has an underlying philosophy that the state will direct the affairs of every individual and business concern.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that statement sums up the fears and thinking of thousands of people throughout this province. Saskatchewan has come to a sad state of affairs when its people are afraid of the Government.

This Government was not given a mandate to have the NDP Cabinet rule the province yet in Bill after Bill passed through this House that is exactly what is happening and that is what is essentially wrong with the establishment of the Hog Marketing Commission and Bill 50.

Democracy stands for participation by people in Government. Where is the people's participation in Bill 50? It is wrong for a government to give itself the power to arbitrarily inflict marketing commissions on any product of agriculture for no other reason than to gain total control over that aspect of agriculture.

We are not against orderly marketing systems, but we are certainly opposed to marketing commissions or boards that are imposed upon farmers without their consent or say in the matter.

It is bad enough that farmers are being injured by this Government's strangling of their freedom but in the same Bill 50 they are adding insult to injury by invoking the reverse onus clause. To consider a man guilty until he proves his innocence is contrary to British justice and further to that it is a personal affront to every farmer in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when we are considering Bills that legislate marketing we must have producer participation in the preparation of the legislation. In this vital area of participation the Government has failed miserably. What is wrong with a producer vote to determine the future of marketing commission? It is a democratic procedure and it gives those directly affected, the producers themselves, freedom of choice.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to this House that there is only one reason why a producer vote is not to be allowed. The Government is afraid of the results. We now have more than 1,000 letters mailed to us urging a democratic vote on the issue of the Hog Marketing Commission. We know that the farmers in the Marquis area voted 84 to 3 against the passing of Bill 50 in this House. We know that the majority of farmers in Saskatchewan are against this legislation. We know that we represent the people of Saskatchewan when we say we will continue to fight Bill 50 and will most certainly vote against it and vote for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm the first farmer to speak. I don't raise any more hogs than my friend from Nutana does but I'm interested in some of the comments that were made this afternoon and I felt that some of his Liberal mathematics should be questioned.

I too, was at Preeceville the night our friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was there. I drove by the building he was at. I see he's not in his seat. I wish he were. I'd like to see his comment or hear the reaction. The Member whom I was with said there were about 200 people at our meeting, which was a good meeting. We charged \$1.50 a plate. We didn't give away a free meal. We raised \$350 from the meals, you can add to that the workers in the kitchen and the other people who were there working. I think his mathematics is all wet. If, according to his calculations, he said we had 50 at our meeting, I am wondering how accurate he is in some of his other statements that he makes, and how sincere he really is when he talks about some of the things he talked about, as far as hog marketing is concerned.

He said, and he was waving a Bill that was introduced in 1961, "20 years ago," that's the mathematics he used. I'm quoting him and he just finished saying that. For 20 years this thing has bothered his fishermen up north. 1961 isn't 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker. There are many of his statements that I know are inaccurate, so how accurate is he as far as his other statements are concerned? I'm really wondering.

Mr. Lane: — How are you going to vote?

Mr. Engel: — The Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) made two statements that I really wanted to talk about. I've known the Member and I've done business with him for a long time and he's always been fair and sincere. He talked about this Bill being vicious and dealing viciously with some of his friends. I really believe he was sincere, but who is this Bill vicious with? I'd really like to ask him. I don't think he has as many friends among the farmers as he has among people that own packing plants and are shareholders in packing plants. If there's any vicious blow dealt it will be to the people that like to buy hogs at 19 and 20 cents a pound. Sure they bring the peak up to 40 cents once in a while to get a few people back in, or to even keep our Member from Morse in hogs. If the price would stay at 19 cents I'd guarantee that our Member from Morse would have burnt his barn down because it would be no use to him. He can't make money at 19 cents and he knows it. So they bring the price up to 40 cents and he's gullible enough, it's going to be good for a while so he stays with it. But just as soon as he's in it, bang, down will come the price and he'll be selling his meat at 19 and 20 cents. The price is always intended to stay down there.

If we have this Hog Marketing Commission and it will work together with Alberta and with Manitoba, that we can have a unified attack, I know we can maintain an equitable price. My farmer friends back home are urging me to get behind and support this Bill. They are happy with it. They like what it is going to do.

April 15, 1973

I too, got nine coupons in the mail. I answered these nine. I answered one to a 'Mr.' — I could give you his name — then I answered the other one to his wife and then I answered two to their children. They happen to be people that are close enough that I know who they are.

An Hon. Member: — All in the same envelope?

Mr. Engel: — You put them all in the same envelope, I didn't.

I got them in separate envelopes and I answered them in separate envelopes. So I want to say that as farmers and representatives of a farm community we are happy to support this kind of vicious legislation. We're happy to support legislation like we have introduced in the past that the Members opposite opposed just as viciously.

When I had intentions of going into politics quite some time ago, we were working out at Southey and a fellow from down there told me, "You'd better go in to a session and just see what is happening." And I was sitting up there in the Speaker's Gallery when two Members were kicked out of that side of the House and I knew the one Member. I was here when they were so viciously opposing this Medicare Bill and I wondered why they would be against something that would help so many people. I am wondering the same thing today, especially when it is people that are in the hog business. I just can't understand why they are against programs that are for the benefit of the majority of the people.

But maybe if we question their support, I imagine the legislation we are introducing as far as controlling their expenses in political campaigns, maybe it will show through that those two things might be related. I am not going to question them on that at this time. But I should like to say that I am pleased to support the Bill and I certainly won't support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on getting into this debate. As the Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) said, I had already spoken twice in this debate. I am awfully pleased that he's at least favored us with his second speech for the entire Session. I must make some comments on the Member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel). From his comments it certainly proved that he's inexperienced in hogs as well as being inexperienced in politics. If he feels that the people of his constituency are supporting Bill No. 50, he's more naïve than I thought he was.

One thing we must point out in Bill 50 — all we seem to be talking about this afternoon is hogs — Bill 50 covers each and every product that is produced by a farmer in this province, whether it is hogs or whether it is cattle or whether it is wheat, oats or barley. That's what we're discussing. That's what we are discussing this afternoon. I might point out to the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody), that is the third time that I have spoken. I am now speaking on the amendment and Members from the opposite side have brought up various subjects and I can speak and reply to their concerns.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Wiebe: — I am wondering as well the computation he had regarding a free meal. Does he mean that at the meetings which Liberals have, that everything is free, that we don't charge for them? He also had some, what I felt were unkind remarks, for the Member from Regina Lakeview, Mr. McPherson. He comes out and says that Mr. McPherson has more friends among the meat processors than he does among the farmers. I should just like to mention to the Members opposite that Mr. McPherson has done more for the Aberdeen Angus industry in this province than anyone on that side of the House. And you talk about him not having friends amongst the farmers. That's why I say, Mr. Member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch, you must be more naïve than I thought you were.

As well, he mentioned burning my barn down. Why in the Heaven's name would I want to burn my barn down? I must point out as well that when I started in hogs, Mr. Speaker, when I started in hogs, prices were selling for \$18 a hundred. I knew exactly what I was getting into when I started in hogs. And one thing that you must remember, hogs in Saskatchewan have paid off more mortgages than any other type of livestock. And if you are going into the hog business it's not for one year or two years. Those are the people who have had their fingers burned in hogs. You go into hogs for a five-year period. You have got to look at it over the long run.

If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) feels that he can stabilize the prices of hogs by this Bill, he's more naïve than I thought he was. Hog marketing commissions in Alberta, in Ontario, when the price fell to \$18 here in Saskatchewan, it was just as bad a drop in those provinces. The only way that he can stabilize or equalize hog prices in this province or any other product in this province is by his Government's willingness to pay a subsidy. If he's prepared to pay a subsidy he can then stabilize the price of hogs or any other product in this province. You look at any marketing board or marketing commission or marketing organization throughout this country today, the ones that are successful, the ones that are able to stabilize the market and stabilize the price are those which the Government subsidizes. I call on the Minister of Agriculture when he closes debate on this Bill that he does tell the people of this province and this Legislature, 'Yes, this Bill will stabilize prices. I, as the Minister of Agriculture, am also prepared to say that this Government will subsidize that price when it is low,' because that, Mr. Speaker, is the only way it is going to be done.

As well, I must comment on remarks made by the Member from Cut Knife. He talked about signed statements by the organizations in this province which support this Government on that legislation. I challenge that statement. I don't think that he's got signed statements from these members. And if he's got signed statements by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Saskatchewan Hog Producers' Association, the National Farmers' Union, let him table those statements so that we will know them as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — It is this kind of rubbish that is spread around this province that causes mistrust throughout this province. I must

comment as well on the Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla). He says why don't we on this side of the House show more concern for the producers? Why don't we try and help the producers? All right, if they have that much concern for the producers, why didn't the Minister of Agriculture and why didn't they implement their campaign slogan in 1971? At that time they campaigned that it would be a board, producer-controlled and operated and it would be a board, not a commission. You people have had 19 months to organize a hog marketing board in this province. What have you done? You've done nothing. Because a hog marketing board requires, first, that the farmers become informed about what it will do. It requires, next, that a vote will be held and that a board be producer controlled. You people didn't want that control in the hands of the producer. You wanted that control in your own hands so you ignored your own campaign promise. You ignored the requests of the people. You put in a commission, the commission now dictates, the commission now says, no vote. The Minister of Agriculture as well . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Why didn't you vote for it?

Mr. Wiebe: — I'll get to you yet, Mr. Attorney General.

The Minister of Agriculture announced the Hog Marketing Commission last November. And yet he had the legislation on the books from last April to implement a hog marketing commission. He says we've got to bring it in now because we haven't got the time. My goodness, we've spent a whole year since he had that power. He's had over a year to inform the producers of what the Hog Marketing Commission will do. He's had a year to ask them for their support. He's had a year to get their votes for it. Mr. Speaker, he didn't take advantage of that time. Instead he has decided to ram it down their throats and I am sure that every Member on that side of the House is going to stand up against this amendment which requests a six-month hoist.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — They want . . .

Mr. Romanow: — They want action not obstructionism!

Mr. Wiebe: — They want action, Mr. Attorney General that is going to benefit them. They don't want action that is going to put them in a straitjacket like you people have done in every piece of legislation that you have introduced in this House.

The Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris) and the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) stood up and said that Liberals on this side of the House are against orderly marketing. This, Mr. Speaker, is the type of rubbish which we heard last night from the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) and this afternoon from the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica). I say it is just rubbish. Because if he will go back and look at orderly marketing in this province under his Government there was one marketing board put in. When we were the Government in just seven years there were three marketing commissions for natural products brought into this province, rather marketing boards brought in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — And you have the guts to accuse us of being against orderly marketing. One in 20 years, one marketing board for the farmers of this province by the CCF-NDP. In 20 years that is the only concern you people had for orderly marketing. When we were the Government for seven years there were three marketing boards established. Each one had a vote and each one was producer controlled and producer operated. That's where the concern for orderly marketing is in this province, Mr. Member for Canora. If the Member thinks I am not telling the truth I wish he would stand up in this House and challenge me and tell me that I am a liar.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the comments that I wanted to make this afternoon. I should just like to say in closing that if the Government opposite is concerned about the freedom of the farmers which they govern in this province, if they are concerned, and if they are convinced that a commission for the marketing of hogs is the best thing for the hog producers in this province, if they are sure of that, then accept this amendment, vote for a six-month hoist. Allow the farmers in this province to find out exactly what the regulations are, pertaining to this.

Mr. Romanow: — Irresponsible obstructionism!

Mr. Wiebe: — I don't say it's irresponsible obstructionism if you have got six months. What is six months? Six months in which if you people are convinced it is the best program that could — ever be implemented — six months shouldn't bother you one little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to enter as a former hog producer. I say former hog producer because I went out of hogs when the price dropped to 18 cents under the former administration I also went out of hogs because I didn't like to handle manure. But after hearing the opposition enter this debate, I am afraid I am still handling it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — I should like to inform the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that I do indeed know the front end of a hog from the back end. And I know them both from a bale of hay. And if any of you have ever raised hogs, you know that hogs like to root around in the dirt and that they like to wallow in their own mud. And after listening to the Member for Athabasca, I am very much reminiscent of raising hogs. In fact, I considered it a real 'bore'.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — I think this debate — I think the fact that the Liberals have chosen this item with which to attack the Government shows how low their arsenal is for an issue.

April 15, 1973

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — As a matter of fact this debate has run pretty well the full gamut on boards and commissions.

First we heard from the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) who shot his bolt so to speak and talked about putting the hog producer in a strait jacket. But he didn't seem to think the hog producer was in a straitjacket a couple of years ago when hogs were at 18 cents a pound. And the only reason that hogs were at 18 cents a pound at that time was because the two bordering provinces had commissions and boards and we did not have one.

Where was the Liberal Government at that time? He also said that he was a proponent of free enterprise, being the right wing free enterpriser that he is. About the fact that he is right wing, I have no doubt, but about the act that he is a free enterpriser, I have some doubt; because free enterprise as he knows it does not exist in this society any more! No longer can the barefoot boy with cheeks of tan rise from rags to riches simply through his own initiative. We don't have that sort of a society any more. Rather than free enterprise, we have collectivization of enterprise. And the job of governments is to become intermediaries between corporations and the individual. And that is the purpose behind a hog marketing commission.

It is to be an intermediary sponsored by a government between the individual and buying agencies. He also pointed out that compulsory marketing boards have done very little. And he attacked the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Canadian Wheat Board, the Saskatchewan Pool. And anyone who knows anything about the history of these organizations, knows that they have done a great deal for the farmer.

He cited the fact that flax is worth \$5 a bushel as an example of having no board. But I am afraid he only sees himself as selling flax and he doesn't remember that flax is \$5 a bushel today because it was hedged in the Edmonton area several years ago after being bought at \$2.32 a bushel. I should like to ask him if it cost the person who sold it for \$2.32 a bushel any less to grow it than the individual who sold it for \$5 a bushel? That sort of thinking means that you can get as much as you can for yourself with positively no regard about anyone else.

We heard from the Member of the farming community of Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). He talked about the commission being an infringement of democratic rights in eliminating the initiative of a producer. But 18-cent a pound hogs did not eliminate the initiative of a producer?

We heard from the gardener from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). He said that this Act gives the Government too much power. And he substantiated this with several examples. All of these examples were either in the Bill prior to 1963 or they were introduced by the Liberal Government when they were in or they were voted on unanimously last year by the House.

We heard from the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), at some length he waxed eloquently about destroying people's rights and destroying democracy.

Bill 2 of course didn't destroy democracy. Deterrent fees and utilization fees didn't destroy people's rights. And I believe he was also the member of the committee which was responsible for the former gerrymander. That didn't destroy democratic rights!

He was particularly worried about where we will market, how we will market. He was worried about compulsion, about regimentation. The farmers have been dealing with compulsion and regimentation and orderly marketing for some time now. And I cite the Canadian Wheat Board and the PFRA as examples of this. And it hasn't been particularly oppressive for farmers. It is true that the Canadian Wheat Board has some distance to go before it is an adequate marketing agency but it is better than having no Canadian Wheat Board.

And finally, the Member from Prince Albert West charged that we were not producers. Well I would assure him that some of us were producers before. But now I believe that everyone on this side of the House can say that he is a producer. Because after hearing the Members from Athabasca and Prince Albert West running over at the mouth during this debate, I am afraid each and everyone of us can be a producer, because we have all had to shovel our way out of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SPECIAL GUEST

NATIONAL MINISTER OF HEALTH AND WELFARE

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Personal Privilege or Order, I am not sure exactly what the procedure is. We have in our presence a very distinguished visitor from Ottawa, the Hon. Marc Lalonde who is the National Minister of Health and Welfare, I believe that is his correct title. He is seated in the back. He is holding a series of consultations with Ministers of the Crown in the Province of Saskatchewan. I am sure that all people would welcome Mr. Lalonde to the Province of Saskatchewan. I am sure that it may not be of much help to him — this debate — on health and welfare matters, but it certainly will be of interest to him, I am sure, as Saskatchewan politics.

We welcome Mr. Lalonde to Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I want the Members to your left to note that he is on the right side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, if I may comment on the Attorney General's remarks. We on this side certainly join in welcoming the Minister here. We hope that of course he will not spend too much time over there that he becomes inundated in some of the stuff emanating from that side in this debate. But it will give him an appreciation of the province. We are glad to

April 15, 1973

see him here and welcome him to the Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS (Continued)

Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 50 — An Act to amend the Natural Products Marketing Act.

Mr. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments regarding some of the comments that were made in this debate this afternoon.

The Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Lange) said only a few moments ago that the reason the hogs were 18 cents in Saskatchewan was because Saskatchewan didn't have a hog producers' board. But Alberta and Manitoba had hog producers' boards and I should like to ask him whether he knew what the price was in Alberta? What was the price in Manitoba? The price of hogs in Alberta, where they did have a board, was lower than the price in Saskatchewan.

I also take exception to the remarks made from the Member when he stated and I think I quote him right when he said, "If hogs were 18 cents a pound, the Member from Morse would burn his hog barn."

We heard remarks from Members opposite when we were reviewing Government Insurance in Crown Corporations that the reason there were so many hog barns, so many losses in hog barn fires was because the farmers had deliberately set fire to the barns. That was one of the reasons why the increase of the insurance premium to hog barns had increased by 400 per cent. It was denied at that time. Now here a Member stands up in this House and says that there is every reason to believe that even the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) would burn down his barn if the price was only 18 cents a pound.

We have had some meetings in the province. The Leader of the Opposition has been in the southern part of the province and he came back to Regina and reported that there were 200 to 300 farmers out at these meetings, very interested in the hog board and hog commission and also in the Land Bank.

I found it very difficult to believe that meetings of that size could be held at this time of year. So I thought to myself maybe if that is the case in southern Saskatchewan why not hold a meeting in Waldheim in my constituency where only a few weeks ago the hog commission people from the Department of Agriculture had held a meeting at Laird.

This meeting was only advertised a few days before through posters. This is an area where I have never been able to get more than 25 people out. There were on Saturday last, 125 people present. I was the speaker. I want to inform the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) that there were people there from Blaine Lake, there were people there from the Biggar constituency and of course there were a good number of people there from the Rosthern constituency. It was attended by farmers and business people that were concerned about the Land Bank and concerned about the Hog Commission.

The reports from that meeting — there were people there from

Aberdeen, and there were people there from Langham and they want me to hold meetings in their communities. I will be holding a meeting in Aberdeen on Saturday next, and one in Langham a week from Saturday. They are so keenly interested in these meetings. And what are the questions that these people are asking. First, they want a vote. It is very, very simple. Second, they want farm representation which this Government does not want to provide for them.

When listening to the Member for Athabasca, this afternoon I certainly don't want to repeat what he has said, but for all the junior Members that have come in in the last couple of years to this House, it must have been a real eye-opener to show just how dictatorial the CCF prior to 1964 were with the fishermen in the North and the fur farmers in the North.

This is the thing that the farmers are afraid of. That we don't want this kind of dictatorship in our midst. I want to tell the Government, as a Member of the former Government we made mistakes and the people told us on June 23, 1971. But certainly you are going much, much more farther, much more drastically, much more viciously than the Liberal Government was doing between 1964 and 1971.

And of course we know that the Minister of Agriculture and the Government is determined to bring this Bill through.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — They don't care what the farmer says. You are determined to bring the machinery Act in, you don't care a hoot what the machine people say, what implement dealers say.

You don't care what the trustees say, you are going to bring in that Bill on teachers' negotiations. You don't care what the universities say and those that are concerned with the university. You don't care you are just going to push those bills through.

If I was convinced that my talking would convince you to change your mind, I might not tell you. But one thing I am going to tell you, you are not going to be the Government in 1974. That much I know because we are still in a free country. When we look at other countries, when we look at the United States election in this last year in November, the people turned to the right not to the left, and there is a trend. The two by-elections in Ontario where the NDP had a tremendous chance to pick up two seats in the city, where did they go? They went to the Liberals, not the NDP. Here in Saskatchewan where you have David Lewis sitting beside Trudeau supporting him in every measure which he said he wouldn't do prior to the election. We don't know who is the Government, whether it is Trudeau or whether it is Lewis. We got a socialist Government in Ottawa, there is no argument about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — But the people are going to turn to the right.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Boldt: — I don't care who sits behind

April 15, 1973

me. I am a free enterpriser. I don't care who sits beside me and I can tell you that the Government in Ottawa is not a good government when you have a minority. I can tell you that.

The only reason we have a minority government today is because Mr. Lewis is afraid that if there is going to be an election called, every NDP is going to be wiped out of the country. That is the reason.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to detain the House too long. I want to tell this House that I support the amendment. I believe that this Government should give the farmers an opportunity to voice their opinion. It wouldn't take six months to get an idea from the farmers that are concerned whether they want a commission or a board. Given that opportunity we are telling this House that this amendment, or this resolution asking you to give it the six-month hoist, will give you this opportunity. I will support the amendment but not the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, this is the third amendment to this Motion that we have asked the Government opposite to consider. They have turned down both of the previous amendments to the Motion. At no time in the defeat of those amendments did the Members opposite, any of them, give us any reason as to why they turned these amendments down.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment to the Motion that is now before us, that we are debating, is one that the Government opposite will consider and will support, for the simple reason that it will give them an opportunity to get around the rural parts of the province, back to their own constituencies (and obviously the rural Members have not been doing that) because there has been concern for this legislation from the very day that it was introduced into this House, Mr. Speaker. That concern is growing among the rural people of the province. They don't like the powers that the Government is seeking and will indeed have over farmers if this Bill is passed.

Now I suggest to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and I suggest to other front benchers over there, most of whom have no real feelings for rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that they take a little time and get out and have a look and see what the people really do think of this Bill and why they don't like it. They don't like it, I suppose, for the very simple reason the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and no Member opposite has yet told us why the Government is insisting and why they are seeking the powers that this Bill will give the Government.

Mr. Romanow: — We did in second reading but that was so long ago!

Mr. McIsaac: — He did not, in second reading, Mr. Speaker. He got up in second reading and talked about what a great thing a commission would be. Talked about what a great thing it was that the Government, the day before, had bought an interest in Intercontinental Packers. Indeed, the most of his speech in second reading, was about him telling us what a wonderful thing that the farmers now have an opportunity to market their hogs and

process them through Intercontinental Packers. He hasn't told us why he needs these powers.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he has not yet announced the scheme and the plan insofar as hog marketing is concerned. I am convinced, and we are convinced on this side, and many others that they have no plan. Indeed the chairman of the Commission has said publicly on the air and in the Press that they do have the details of a scheme but they are not able to tell us until this legislation is passed. Mr. Speaker, that has to be ridiculous.

He introduced this Bill a month ago, Mr. Speaker, which will give the Government opposite complete control of farm produce, farm production and marketing. Not only marketing, which powers were there before, but, Mr. Speaker, I am very amazed that the Members opposite, the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Lange) and the Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) think this question is not a serious one and so far they have treated it in a very cavalier kind of fashion. They think the farmers appreciate that this Government knows what is best for them and I would suggest that this Government does not know what is best for the farmer. We asked them to consider an amendment that would allow the farmers a voice in whether or not they wanted a plan, what kind of plan they did want, how much involvement the commission was going to have in it. We asked them also to consider at that time amending this legislation to allow for producer representation on that commission, a similar kind of plan to the one the Province of Alberta has and they turned that one down, Mr. Speaker. They turned down the opportunity to take the Bill back and make amendments to it that would make it a fair and democratic Bill.

There is one other very repulsive clause in this Bill that they have said they are not concerned about and that is the one which now assumes, if this Act passes, that a farmer is guilty of an offence and he has, himself, to prove his own innocence in that respect.

We say now, Mr. Speaker, if the Government doesn't want to amend this legislation, assure the producers a right to a vote and a say in the marketing of their products, if they don't wish to refer this Bill to a Legislative Committee or indeed set up an Intersessional Committee, as they have done for much less vital issues, that have come before this House before. Well then, we asked them to consider deferring the subject matter of this Bill and that it not now be read a second time, but indeed be read six months hence.

This plan, Mr. Speaker, should not be proceeded with . . .

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. McIsaac: — Before we adjourned for the supper hour we were discussing Bill 50 and as I was saying we would ask the Government to take this Bill back, to put it off for six months and to go out and consult with hog producers and devise a plan and devise a proposal that will be saleable and give those producers the right to vote on what kind of plan they are going to proceed with.

I think, Mr. Speaker, farmers have every right to decide for themselves the kind of scheme that they want. The NDP

Government and the Minister opposite does not believe so. They don't think that farmers should in essence have the same rights as other citizens.

The Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch got up earlier in this debate this afternoon and said he was happy to support this kind of compulsion as far as the farmers were concerned. Mr. Speaker, I tell you we'll have a copy of Hansard of his speech, that's all we really need to go out there and defeat him in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He talked about 18 and 20-cent hogs. Well, Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard from him or we haven't heard from the Minister or any Member opposite what the establishment of a commission will do to help stabilize that hog market. No question that Members on this side are not happy with the kind of fluctuation that has taken place in the hog market over the years, but there were hog marketing boards and there were commissions in practically all Canadian provinces when that very fluctuation downward occurred a few years ago. They are unable to do that much about it and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a commission in the Province of Saskatchewan, where we have something around 1 per cent of North American hogs, is not in and of itself going to help stop those fluctuations. There's no question about it.

Nobody has told us what this commission will indeed do to stabilize hog prices. I think the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) put the case this afternoon if the Government opposite wishes to try and do any stabilizing as far as hog prices are concerned, the one way they can do it is with a subsidy. And it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that when the prices for pork did go down, and they went below the cost of any production so far as the farmer was concerned, the Liberal Government at that time in the province put in a \$2 premium for hogs, which this Government, last year, scrapped, Mr. Speaker. They put it in the Budget and then in turn discontinued that particular payment.

It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite in this debate, whether they be from farm areas, active farmers or not, they show absolutely no appreciation and no understanding of the feeling of the Saskatchewan stockmen. They forget that he is an independent man, regardless of his political faith and he doesn't need to be told what's good for him by this Government or by any other government and they don't like being pushed around. He doesn't need, and he doesn't want, the stockman of this province, any government, particularly the NDP Government taking over complete control of the marketing and production of his animals.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest again — I have been out to a variety of meetings, I have been out through my area, I have been home on the weekend, talking with farmers every Friday, Saturday and Sunday, and I can tell the Members opposite that regardless of political allegiance and political faiths, the farmers of the province, and particularly the hog producers at this point in time, do not like the kind of legislation that's now before us. They do not like the kind of legislation that's before us.

Now if the Attorney General, or the Minister of Agriculture would take a day or two off from the House and get out and talk to some farmers, get out and talk to some hog producers, they'd find out what this Bill is doing for them politically in the eyes of the farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a six-month stay in proceedings would give this Government opposite a chance to set out a plan and a proposal. It would give them a chance to change this legislation and provide for a vote.

It's funny — the Attorney General is great for a Human Rights Commission. He's very concerned about legal rights for almost any group in the province, except the farmers in this case. Except the farmer being denied any right to a say in the kind of a plan that is going to be developed and devised and implemented, supposedly on his behalf.

I find it very hard, Mr. Speaker, to believe that the Government opposite, that they have lost any sense of feeling for the thinking of rural Saskatchewan. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they have an opportunity here to recognize the evil of their ways in this respect. They can regain some credibility in the eyes of rural Saskatchewan by taking this Bill back, by deferring it for six months and then coming back with legislation that will provide and guarantee some basic democratic rights. The very kind of rights the Government opposite is so proud of talking about, and in this case, in completely denying to the farmers of the province.

Now, I urge the Attorney General and the Minister to support this amendment and do exactly this on behalf of the hog producers, the cattle producers and the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to have an opportunity to speak on this Bill 50 on second reading and now feel obliged to speak on the second amendment that has been moved by the Opposition. The first amendment was . . .

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Third.

Mr. Michayluk: — Third, probably, yes. The Hon. Member for Wilkie who has just taken his seat mentioned that he was out in his constituency talking to farmers. I feel I am a rural farm representative and that my constituency is mainly rural. I was home over the weekend. We had a Party function with attendance from diverse occupations — I didn't count the number of people we had, but no one there was concerned with the Natural Products Marketing Act or hog problems. As a matter of fact a good number of farmers came to me and stated that they supported the Bill and were behind the Government in respect to the setting up of a hog marketing commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — These are genuine hog farmers and a number of them have been in hog production for some time.

April 15, 1973

The Hon. Member who has just taken his seat spoke about the independent position of the farmers. Well, I know of scores of independent farmers that because of up and down prices of hogs, and cattle and in the feed grains until lately, have left the land because of their dependency on the laws of supply and demand. We are proposing to spend \$16 million in the FarmStart to give young farmers an opportunity to diversify or to go into livestock and hog production. Likewise we want to give these farmers stability and security of prices. The purpose of the proposed hog marketing commission is to create stability and orderly marketing.

Over the weekend too, when I was in my constituency a number of my constituents received a letter from Room 259, Legislative Building, Regina, March 1973. It is under the signature of the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Dave Steuart. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the liberty to read this letter to the Hon. Members of the House. I may be the first Member to have received a copy. It states:

Dear Sir: The Provincial Government has introduced to the Legislative Assembly amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act. These amendments contained in Bill No. 50 should be of vital concern to every farmer in Saskatchewan.

The Liberal Members are opposing Bill No. 50.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are not only opposing the Bill they are obstructing its passage. That's what the Hon. Members have been doing — 10 adjournments, 3 amendments, and now they are requesting a six-month hoist. He goes further:

And we would like to take this opportunity to explain our position.

Well, has the Opposition any position? No!

To quote further:

Enclosed is a summary of a speech made by John Gardner, Liberal agricultural critic on this important matter. I am also sending you an actual copy of the Bill for your study.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are only sending amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act. You are not sending the entire content of the Bill as amended. Then he states:

Please write me if you have any questions or comments on Bill 50.

Then follows that famous speech by the Hon. Member for Moosomin and he used a typical imaginary Saskatchewan farmer, and he uses fictitious circumstances and he states a number of fictitious ideas which he purports to be fact. Let me quote some of those assertions that the Hon. Member for Moosomin is making. First of all, he gives an imaginary small farmer near a typical Saskatchewan town. That's nowhere. Then to quote the Hon. Member:

Joe Stevens is a mixed farmer. He keeps about 20 cows and each fall he sells 15 calves (Not pigs, but 'calves')

at the local auction market. He has farmed for 25 years and has marketed his cattle this way for the past 10 years. How could the powers of the Act affect Joe Stevens? Well, he wouldn't be able to sell his calves where he wants to.

This is fictitious nonsense, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about a hog marketing commission. That's what Bill 50 says. It says nothing about cattle. Then he goes on to quote:

Recently, we received some very disturbing news from the NDP Government. We were informed that they had purchased a large share of Intercontinental Packers of Saskatoon.

This is a fact. We just bought in part ownership. To quote further:

Thus the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture are announcing an agreement which would have the effect of putting this socialist Government in the meat packing business in Saskatchewan. They are going to force the hog producers to market hogs to Intercontinental Packers.

Now this, Mr. Speaker, is guilt by association. This is scare tactics. You are trying to scare the unsuspecting farmers. This is why the delay. You are hoping that by receiving answers or replies, your Leader will walk in with another bag with all the letters.

I too, have received some of these clippings and I received 16 of them.

Mr. Guy: — Table them!

Mr. Michayluk: — I have received 16 and your Leader didn't table them, he gave some names. I'll give you some names too. I have one here A.E. Pirot, a genuine hog producer on the shore of Jackfish Lake. He also runs a summer resort and a business until recently as a special liquor vendor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — There are not only problems at Bruno but also at Cochin. He is concerned about the hog commission and he wants to make sure that he gets the vote. He doesn't know a hog's head from its tail. I wonder whether he knows a pork chop from a beef steak. But he's a good Liberal. Oh, yes and you know I don't want to accuse these people because of their political affiliations, this is a democratic country, everyone adheres to what he believes and believes to what he sticks. But these Liberals are going to stick to the hog producers of Saskatchewan. Every form that I received is from a Liberal, Liberal, Liberal, Liberal, Liberal, Liberal, Liberal. Only one genuine hog producer, Mr. Alf Dyck who produces registered stock. He is a genuine hog producer, he produces hogs for resale to breeders. This is another KOD tactic. The Opposition wants to misinform the people of Saskatchewan and try to stampede them in making objections, Mr. Speaker. Let me warn those gentlemen opposite, the people of Saskatchewan wiped your feet and cleaned your noses in 1971. You keep on acting irresponsibly the way you act at

April 15, 1973

this time you will get a better cleaning in the future than you got in June of 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and maintain my calm, cool, collective, normal way . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, somebody suggested that we were obstructing this Bill, somebody suggested we were using scare tactics. I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture that we are trying to obstruct this Bill and I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture we would like to obstruct it forever. Not only that the farmers of this province would like us to obstruct it forever and the hog producers and the cattlemen and the sheep men would like us to obstruct it forever. Unfortunately we can't do that, because you've got 45 Members and we've got 15.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will the Hon. Members maintain their quiet, please.

Mr. MacDonald: — I should say, Mr. Speaker, they don't have any manners! You know the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) said, you know they are using scare tactics. I want to tell him the only scare tactics you need to use in this Bill is to read the Bill. Every farmer in Saskatchewan has read this Bill and they are scared, and they are frightened and that is exactly the reason. The unfortunate thing, Mr. Michayluk gets up and he says, there was only one hog producer. The Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel), the hog producers, the Member for Bengough (Mr. Lange) says I'm a hog producer. That's the problem, you fellows have missed the whole point of this debate. This has nothing to do with hog producers. The hog producers got the immediate concern. What is the whole nuts and bolts of this particular Bill is it makes Jack Messer, the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan a virtual dictator over the agricultural enterprise in this province. Read the Bill, it doesn't mention the hog commission, already Mr. Messer has sent a letter to the sheep men, telling them that they are next . . .

Mr. Speaker: — . . . you are not to mention names. I've read the ruling but I think . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I will try to refer to them as Members from their specific seats and I do agree it's used in the breach much more than in the observance.

I want to tell the Members to examine carefully the wording and the concepts and the philosophy of that Bill. It does not specify hogs. It does not specify any specific natural products. In fact, if it did specify hogs and limited itself to one individual commodity there would be much more justification for the Bill. But in no way does it limit itself to any agricultural commodity. It gives blanket dictatorial powers.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I may stand to be corrected but I assume the Member from Milestone has already spoken to the main motion and he's talking about the Bill. That is all he has talked about to this point in time. He should be containing his remarks to the amendment with regard to the six-month hoist. I would appreciate it if you would bring to his attention what he should be debating and what he should not be debating at this point.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I understand why the Minister of Agriculture doesn't want to talk about the Bill.

Mr. Messer: — On a Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, is he able to speak to the entire motion?

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the amendment states this very specifically "The subject matter of this Bill shall have a six-month." and I am speaking on the subject matter of this Bill. I can understand the concern of the Minister of Agriculture about anybody talking on this Bill, because every farmer in Saskatchewan is talking about the subject matter of the Bill. Every farmer in Saskatchewan is frightened and scared of this Bill.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I would appreciate your ruling. I understood that this House allowed the Member to speak on the main motion once and then he would have to contain his remarks to amendments after that, if there were amendments brought forward. The Member opposite is now speaking about the Bill and the main motion and he has said nothing about the amendment to this point in time.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the ruling has always been that when an amendment comes like this that the clauses of the issue can not be discussed but the subject matter of the Bill is before the House, the subject matter can be discussed plus the amendment. But I have asked Members not to get discussing Land Bank or other Bills because that is not before the House, nor is the Bill of last year. It is just Bill 50 that is before the House, the subject matter of that Bill, plus the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much and that is exactly what I have been attempting to do, to tell the Minister of Agriculture that I can understand his concern and I can understand the concern of them all over there. But it is disappointing to me that the Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Flasch) in the cattle country doesn't get up and express his opinion. It is disappointing to me that the Member from Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) in the cattle country . . .

Mr. Oliver: — I spoke on it.

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh, I apologize if you did. I am glad to hear that because the cattlemen of this province are just as concerned as the hog producers, in fact more concerned than the hog producers because this Bill and the subject matter of this Bill

in no way restricts it as I said, to one agricultural commodity. It has blanket and sweeping powers to give the Minister of Agriculture and the dictatorial power to do what he wants in establishing a commission which will have no producer representation, no producer control, nothing, and that gives him the power and that's why this Bill is a concern to every farmer. The Member from Redberry stands up and says, why there was a businessman who expressed concern and sent in a coupon. I should hope that every businessman in rural Saskatchewan that does business with the farmers of this province would send in one of those coupons, because they know that the subject matter of this Bill can affect every farmer that does business with him. That's the reason that the farmers of this province are concerned and that's the reason we are asking the Members opposite to reconsider and I am appealing to them to stop and consider once and for all the implications of what you are doing. You will rue the day that you ever pass this Bill, you will rue the day and I am going to suggest to you that you consider carefully that this amendment . . .

Mr. Snyder: — Churchill didn't go to Hitler . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — That's right and Churchill is trying to go to Hitler. That's the problem with this Bill, it gives the exact dictatorial powers to the man whom you are talking about. That's exactly what this Bill does.

Mr. Speaker, there are two arguments that I want to deal with very briefly that the Government has used. They keep talking about orderly marketing. The subject matter of this Bill is orderly marketing, Mr. Attorney General.

Mr. Romanow: — Stick to the point!

Mr. MacDonald: — When you take over for the Speaker, I will be glad to abide by your rules. Stand up and make your objection.

Mr. Guy: — On a Point of Order. I think if the Attorney General has a point to make that he knows the rules of this House and that he should stand up and make his Point of Order. He shouldn't be trying to interrupt the Member when he speaks. If he has a Point of Order, let him state it instead of sitting there chewing his gum and saying, Point of Order, Point of Order, Point of Order and never getting up and stating it. The rules of the House are if you have a Point of Order, you make your Point of Order the way I am now. If the Attorney General has a Point of Order let him stand and make it.

Mr. Romanow: — Sit down, I don't need your lecture.

Mr. MacDonald: — As a matter of fact you do need a lecture and I agree with everything the Member from Athabasca stated.

There are two arguments that the Government has used in trying to justify or vindicate the position they have established on Bill No. 50. The first one is orderly marketing. This Bill has absolutely nothing to do . . .

Mr. Speaker: — We are getting too many interruptions. I think the ruling which has always been established in this House and I have said it before that the subject matter is before the House when the amendment is moved and it does allow a fair amount of latitude. You can't go into the clauses of the Bill or of any other Bill which is tied with it. That has been one of the reasons throughout the years that Members move a motion this way to give them another chance to debate the Bill. I think that as long as the Hon. Member stays to the subject matter of the Bill plus the amendment then he is in order because the two are debated concurrently. It is not debated separately.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, again we thank you for your ruling. Again I would draw your attention to keep the Attorney General in order and prevent him from interrupting and allow the Member from Milestone to carry on with his argument.

Mr. MacDonald: — Well, that's typical of the Attorney General. He has been interrupting and telling people ever since he has become a Minister of the Crown exactly what to do. Now the Minister of Agriculture is following your example. That's why the farmers don't like it. You know this orderly marketing that is their only justification. This Bill has nothing to do with orderly marketing. Nothing whatsoever! This Bill is establishing a commission with dictatorial powers. You can put in a marketing board without this amendment, you can turn around and establish a commission with a vote, you can establish any kind of orderly marketing that you want and that is not the principle of debate of the Opposition or of the farmers of this province.

The second argument they are using is that it is going to stabilize the price. You know we did a little survey on this side of the House. We did a tabulation of the price of hogs in Winnipeg, Saskatoon, Swift Current and Regina for one week. In the Province of Manitoba where they have a hog marketing commission a comparison of the price of hogs with Saskatchewan for one week averaged more than they did in Manitoba. We also took a survey to check what has happened to the prices of hogs in Calgary and in Winnipeg when the reduction of price occurred here a few days ago and they went down in exactly the same proportion as they did in the Province of Saskatchewan. Stabilization of the price can be done with a hog marketing board, with a producer vote, with producer control and with producer representation.

Now I am going to make one last appeal to the Members opposite. I am going to urge you to reconsider your position because I don't think there is a Member over there who wants the Minister of Agriculture to get him in trouble with his own farmers. I don't think there is a Member over there who wants the Minister of Agriculture to be able to destroy his constituents' respect for him as an individual. I don't think there is a Member over there who wants the Minister of Agriculture to destroy the confidence of his political party because that is exactly what they are doing in this Bill and I urge you to support this amendment. Give it a six-month cooling off period. Give the farmers an opportunity to learn what is going on in the Commission, how it is going to run, what the operating costs are going to be, what kind of marketing promotion you are going

to undertake. If you do that I suggest that in the fall if you come back and give them the vote they will give you their support. I urge you to support this amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard about a lot of letters, people who have apparently written in to both sides of the House and coupons. We are still suggesting a six-month delay. I think the only person we haven't had a letter or a coupon from is Mrs. Henry. Now apparently in the last election we understood from the television and the media that Mrs. Henry wasn't feeling well but we are expecting a letter any day from her saying that now she is really sick and I believe it.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, this Bill has been in second reading for some time now. We regret that it may soon become law in this province and we regret this because it should not become law in any free country. The duty of an Opposition is to bring undesirable legislation such as this to the attention of the public and we have done this in the last weeks to the best of our ability. People in the province are certainly going to remember this Bill and the contents of the Bill that we are discussing today. We still feel that they are entitled to a chance to appear before a committee or a commission, some legislative committee, which would give them an opportunity to make their voice known. The undesirable features in the Bill, of course, are well known and well publicized. The fact that there has been no vote, the way in which the Minister has put this across, 'Messer says no dice to vote', has been quite a common saying around the province and it is a headline that we have seen in the paper, the fact that we don't have a producer controlled board, the reverse onus clause and the other undesirable parts of this Bill.

But the long-term possibilities of this Bill are even worse. We are not talking of course, about a hog marketing Bill. The school teacher from Redberry gets up and says we are talking about a hog marketing Bill. There is no place in this Bill that says anything about hog marketing and he should know it. If he wants to read the Act, read the list of products that could be included, take everything, fur, fish, wheat, ham sandwiches, anything you want to mention. It is certainly a natural products Bill, it is not a hog marketing Bill that we are discussing or the amendment to it that we are discussing today. The long-term possibilities, of course, include cattle, barley and other products and once this Bill is passed these commissions can be put in at any time. The legislation is already in the books. A commission could be set up without a vote to control any of these, it could be done between sessions of the Legislature and cattle farmers, people who trap furs up in the North or anyone else, could find themselves under these severe restrictions that we find in this particular Bill and this of course if why we are so concerned.

The farmers have made their opposition clear and I am sure they want it delayed, they want a six-month cooling off period to take a look. The NDP Government have refused to listen to them and we are sure they will regret their refusal. I am sure that the Minister is well aware of the meetings, the letters, the coupons. Sure, they may have one or two that one of their own NDP friends sent in, someone that was deceased or something

else and they can get up and read it that one of their own friends sent to them, or perhaps they got up themselves and read the names off a couple of tombstones in a rural area and sent it in just so they would have something to read in the Legislature. We are sure that they are quite capable of this and this is a possibility. They can't deny the fact that there has been an overwhelming response to this and when you get 1,400 people who are concerned enough to spend their own time and money to send these in, then I think that everybody should listen to them.

We have had indications that there were requests, someone even mentioned today they had a request from Alberta and Manitoba to put this in so that we would be consistent. I am sure that when the Minister closes the debate which he will be doing very shortly he will be prepared to table any material of this nature. He will show us the correspondence from Alberta and Manitoba where they have asked us to put in a board. He will show us the correspondence from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Federation of Agriculture, the Hog Marketing Commission, all these people whom he claims have asked for this legislation. I am sure that he would be glad to provide this to justify his position. He will also probably tell us in closing the debate why he feels that it would delay the commission a year or more, as he says in his letter, if they had a plebiscite. No one certainly believes that it would take a year or more to have a plebiscite on this particular subject. The meetings around the province have been spontaneous. They have been well attended; they have been promoted by small people — farmers — who wish to have their views known.

And, again, the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) spoke in a very derogatory way about the small farms. He said, here is a farmer farming for 15 years and he has only 20 cows. Well, so maybe that is all, so maybe he has a family to feed; maybe he has a lot of expenses. Farming hasn't been that good. And I wouldn't speak in that way about a farmer who only has 20 cows. He is important to me whether he has two cows or 100 cows.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — I can't agree with the Member that here is a farmer that has only 20 cows and it does not matter.

Mr. Speaker, the meetings that were held, and I might say that my colleague from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and our Leader are going out to a meeting at Kipling tonight, which is not too far from where I live. I should have liked to have been there because this is the subject that is being discussed. I might also say that I have no idea how many they will have at that meeting. Kipling has the reputation of not having people turning out in very large numbers to meetings, but I predict that it will be a good meeting and a good turnout. I shall be interested to see tomorrow how many they had at that meeting and what the results of it are.

I don't doubt at all if someone phoned down and checked they would find that it is a very successful meeting. This has been indicated on the hotlines and I am glad that the Member from Redberry brought up the fact that we have sent out some information, because, of course, this is the job of the Opposition to try to get the farmers as well informed as possible when something like this comes up.

April 15, 1973

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to deny the Minister the opportunity to close the debate. I again, say that I feel that the amendment is a logical one under the circumstances. There has been precedent for it where a Bill such as this could be delayed for six months. They are talking about a fall session, and if this is a possibility, this could be brought up again. In the meantime everyone would have an opportunity to take a look at the consequences of this and perhaps amendments could come in that would partially at least, satisfy the people of the province, the producers. And for this reason I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 14

Messieurs

Steuart	Boldt	MacLeod
Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Loken	McIsaac	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Guy	Gardner	Wiebe
Grant	Weatherald	

NAYS — 39

Messieurs

Dyck	Pepper	Matsalla
Wood	Michayluk	Richards
Smishek	Byers	Faris
Romanow	Thorson	Cody
Messer	Whelan	Gross
Snyder	Kwasnica	Feduniak
Kramer	Carlson	Mostoway
Thibault	Engel	Comer
Larson	Owens	Rolfes
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Lange
Baker	Tchorzewski	Oliver
Brockelbank	Cowley	Kaeding
MacMurchy	Taylor	Flasch

The debate continued on the motion.

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Members from this side of the House who has been accused of not getting up to speak, in fact accused of not taking the message, not stating it in this House and not also taking it back home. I should like to inform this House and you, Mr. Speaker, and everybody else that because I have not spoken in this House is not because I don't take a stand. I have my Melville Advance here and I have taken the stand two weeks ago and I am not going to take the time of this House to read it but I could read it for you stating my position as to the position I took.

I have never been afraid to take a position when it comes to defending the freedoms of the farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — And when I say this, and before I proceed in making a number of other comments regarding Bill 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act, I want to make reference to the statement that the Leader of the Opposition made, that the filibuster on their part in regard to the passage of this Bill so that the farmers can have their say in regard to their rights and freedoms. That is what he said.

All people are entitled to their rights and freedoms, Mr. Speaker. I wonder just whose rights and freedoms is the Leader of the Opposition and all the Members, including the Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) talking about. Whose rights and freedoms are they talking about that must be protected? Is he thinking of the rights and freedoms of the producer, the hog farmer or is he thinking of the rights and the interests of those vested interests, the corporate friends of theirs? Is he thinking of the rights and interests of the Grain Exchange?

That's right. You can laugh Mr. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) but the people of Saskatchewan know the Grain Exchange. They know that that gambling house has done to them in the past years.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe in the rights and the freedoms and the interest of farmers, but we believe that these rights and interests should be for the benefit of the farmers. How about the rights of the farmer to have stabilized hog markets? How about the rights and the freedoms of the farmer against more than 50 years of exploitation, exploited by those money changers and those who took their produce?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — In fact in many cases they stole their produce for nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — How about the freedoms of the farmer, Mr. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), who would have the farmer kicked off the farm put on relief and sometimes didn't get any relief? What about the rights and freedoms of these people, Mr. Speaker. How about the rights and freedoms for a fair return of the produce produced on the farms? The rights and freedoms for a fair return on those hogs that the farmer raises?

You never hear Liberals, particularly Saskatchewan Liberals, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, talking much about these rights. The Liberal Leader through the gusty rhetoric and outright deceit, uses these clichés to protect the very people, his big corporate friends who are out to pluck and gouge . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — . . . all that, that should accrue to the farmer, yes, including the hog farmer, Mr. Speaker, they are not there to protect him.

April 15, 1973

Yes, by hysteria and propaganda and misleading statements and distortion, the Leader of the Opposition, who is noted for this kind of political trickery, is willing to use the farmer's difficult position strictly for political gain.

Mr. Speaker, all the evidence as to what we have heard in this House for the last number of years, not days, and in this debate points out that it is a fight against the Canadian Wheat Board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — It is a fight against orderly marketing. Yes, it is a fight that the Liberals are willing to sell the farmers to their big friends, their big corporate friends. Their whole record has been, in this House and outside this House, all talk, talk of freedom, talk of rights. But their motives are always to protect the big boys.

Yes, I believe in protecting the rights and freedoms of people. By the debate on The Natural Products Marketing Act up 'til now, every Liberal has shown that he is not for orderly marketing of farm products. When the Liberals urged them in 1969 and 1970, the farmers borrowed thousands of dollars for the purpose of building hog barns. Yet, when the price of hogs went down to \$18 a hundred weight, did they lift one little finger to help out, except for the premiums? Otherwise, did they lift one little finger to help out those people who were in trouble? Yes, lots of people went into the hog business and they were in a very desperate plight, a very desperate financial situation in those years, and did the Liberals do anything?

And today, some of the comments made in this House, Mr. Speaker, in regard to these very farmers, someone brought out about the number of hog barns that were burned. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame any farmer, I don't say that he is responsible for any of that. All I am saying is that the Liberals are responsible for putting these people in that position . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — . . . by begging them to diversify, by saying, borrow get big, and some of the boys did get big. They got so big that the Land Bank had to save them to keep the land in their possession. You Liberals said to diversify and these boys diversified. The finger is on you people, on the Liberals, because these people were in such a desperate situation. The records prove that in those years bankruptcies occurred to these people when hogs were selling at 18 cents a pound. The Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) says that he started at that time.

I don't know how he started, but I know that some of these people who started at that time didn't get any grants, and the only way they got the money was by borrowing. Mr. Speaker, I had a lot more to say.

We believe in the New Democratic Party that the Government's responsibilities go a lot further than just assisting the producers of farm products. A conscientious people's government must legislate the machinery by which the gamble must be taken

out of any area of food products, as much as the Government is able to take out, that continual fear of boom and bust, that the farmers in western Canada have been subjected to for the last half century.

Then you hear, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals talk about a plebiscite. They talk about holding committee meetings for six months, the hoist for six months. Now when your house is on fire and whether it is in the attic or not you don't call for a six month hoist, you call a fire brigade, you get to the root of the problem. And irrespective what was said this afternoon by one of the Members opposite, he said, "Why didn't you do something 18 months ago."

In my opinion, why didn't we do something 18 years ago, or 18 months ago, or 18 weeks ago, the problem is today. We need the Hog Marketing Commission and therefore that does not answer the question as to why we didn't do it. We have to do it now, because in my opinion, the other day when the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) waved the Leader-Post and said, he quoted the article, about the United States hog and cattle prices dropping fast. If anything this article serves to boost our arguments, not the argument that he used.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Because if we get another two or three such articles in this paper and heaven forbid that, but suppose we do and we get 18 cent hogs again, I can imagine then what it will be like if we hadn't introduced some form of legislation like this. The Liberals would be the first, and Mr. Steuart would be the first out in the country to say these NDPers didn't do anything. They didn't move in any direction to assist the hog producers. I say that this legislation is moving in a good direction. We are going to help to finance the young people through FarmStart, putting out a lot of money. I say, not like the Liberals did when they offered the money for the hog barns — and that is all they did. We say that we should back up these kinds of loans with this kind of legislation to support and stabilize, not only the hog industry, but other agricultural industries as well.

I certainly shall be supporting the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E.L. Mr. Cowley (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to speak in support of Bill 50.

I want to start off by commending the Minister of Agriculture for bringing forward this Bill to this House, and for bringing forward the Hog Marketing Commission which Saskatchewan has sorely needed for a good many years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, if anything has disappointed me in this debate it has been the Opposition. I have been disappointed by their attempts to cloud the issues, to becloud the issues, or 'MacLeod' the issues totally, to talk about freedom to talk about

April 15, 1973

dictatorship, to talk about arrogance and ignore the Bill completely.

It reminds me very much of the years 1961, 1962 and 1963 in this province. It reminds me very much when the then Liberal Opposition went up and down this province, and I had the fortune or the misfortune as the case may be of being quite active in politics at that time and listening to Liberals telling people all over Saskatchewan that when we had Medicare we would all lose our freedom. That the dictators were taking over. And three years later they were the Government and said that Medicare was the best thing this province ever had.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that in three years those same Members who sit in the Opposition won't even be sitting in this House but they will be singing praises for the Hog Marketing Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, they talk about the great ground swell of opposition in the country to the Hog Marketing Commission and to this Bill. They talk about this Bill and they say it doesn't have anything to do with the Hog Marketing Commission but all the evidence they brought in, all the evidence that the Leader of the Opposition brought in, was directed at the Hog Marketing Commission. And that is what he used against this Bill. They use one argument one day and another argument another day. And then they say that the two arguments are different and we are not to confuse them. They are the ones who are confused, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, seven people have taken the time to send me a coupon from the back of the Western Producer. I might say that a great many more people than that have taken the time to write me or to 'phone me or to talk to me and tell me that they support this Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — I want to tell the Members opposite I got a letter from the Catherwood Wheat Pool Committee in which they unanimously endorse the Hog Marketing Commission. I want to tell the Members opposite that of those seven people who sent me coupons, I had a pretty good batting average. I had three of them that were hog producers. I don't need to tell you about their politics, I am sure all Members on both sides of the House would be aware of that.

I want to tell you about a Wheat Pool meeting in Subdistrict 5 of District 13 that was held just the other evening in my constituency. I wish the Member for Rosetown was here because it borders on his constituency. They had over 150 people at the meeting, and they were farmers. Those 150 farmers voted for a Resolution in favor of the immediate implementation of the Hog Marketing Commission and, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one dissenting vote. Not one!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, those who stand on the opposite side of the

House and say, every farmer has read that Bill and every farmer is scared, can hardly be able to look in the mirror and call themselves honest. Every farmer scared!

I will tell you the farmers that are scared are so because those on the other side of the House have misled them and misinterpreted the Bill to them. They are using those people out in the country, many of them their own supporters, to try and stir up a hornets' nest where there is no hornets next in the country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a great deal of pleasure in voting for this Bill and voting down their amendment. I am sure that the Members opposite will look back on this debate in two or three years, in fact in two years when we will likely go to the country, and wish they had never taken part in this debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say, that as far as I am concerned, in 1975, there is no issue I would rather go to the people out in my constituency on more than this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I must take five minutes only to record my views on this Bill to this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan on the extreme irresponsibility of the Leader of the Opposition and on the Liberal Party opposite.

The Liberals have been totally irresponsible on this issue as they have been on almost every issue that has been presented; every major issue presented in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, every Member in this House remembers for example, how the Liberals got up and opposed the committee system for awhile. I recall during the Speech from the Throne and the Budget Debate how the Liberals were condemning all the MLAs traipsing around at the expense of the public. They were condemning the committee system. They thought it wasn't going to work. They thought that it was strictly a tool for politics and what do you think they do now, they get up and they have the audacity to move an amendment to this Bill 50 saying they are in favor of the committee system.

Mr. Speaker, it is hypocrisy of the highest order that the Liberals opposite have done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the people of this province that this Bill has been adjourned 10 times, 9 by the Liberal side. Nine times by the Liberals! This Bill has been on the

April 15, 1973

the Order Paper now for over two months, Mr. Speaker. For over two months! And 15 irresponsible MLAs opposite have delayed the people's business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that those 15 irresponsible MLAs have delayed the business by repetitious and phony arguments. They delayed the business of the people by repetitious and phony amendments. They have delayed the business of the people of the province and thereby the farmers by every little political connivance that is in the book. And the Liberals will stand condemned for it when the people remember two years from now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are masters at playing politics with the farmers. They play on fears and prejudices. They walk around, they try to scare farmers. I know farmers of my origin, my background, Ukrainian farmers. I remember in the 1940s they talked scare tactics, the slogan Tucker or Tyranny. They said this is a matter of liberty, a matter of life and death. And they scared some of the poor, perhaps not well educated farmers who came. They didn't succeed in doing it. But what kind of cheap and hollow politics can you wallow in, Mr. Speaker? And here we see it again in 1973. The Liberals are trying to do it all over again. This time it is Steuart or Slavery. This time it is the same old nonsense of the Liberal Party about freedom. Mr. Speaker, every Liberal opposite ought to hang his head in shame for his position on Bill 50.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to say if the Liberals think this is an issue that they want to go to the country on, I stand with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). I think the Minister of Agriculture will go down in the books of this province as the best Minister of Agriculture we have had.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I will tell you, I will see the Member for Lakeview in two years after an election vote. I certainly will. I will tell you something Mr. Member from Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) if you have . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Can we have a little order please.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I knew the Member from Regina Lakeview was allergic to the truth but I didn't think it was almost fatal, the allergy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina Lakeview and the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) if they think 1,400 coupons clipped by their Liberal Party supporters is a show of a political ground swell, I'd be pleased to go to the election fight any day. Coupons clipped out by 1,400 people! If they think that the issue of 1,400 coupons manufactured by the Liberals in their backroom and their party hacks is an issue, they have got another think coming.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I close by simply saying this, Mr. Speaker. Make no mistake about it, I am not a farmer. But I was born and raised in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I think I know a little bit about what makes the province tick. And I want to tell you what this issue is all about. When these Members are asked to stand on this Bill in a few minutes, what they will be standing for or against is the principle of orderly marketing. Make no mistake about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I say — the Member for Wilkie says nonsense — I say make no mistake about it. I say to the Member for Wilkie when he gets up and he votes against Bill 50, I am going to say over and over again to all of Saskatchewan that he and the Liberals are against orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Because that — and it should not surprise the Member for Wilkie that I say that, because it has been the traditional position of every Liberal since I have known Liberals to be against orderly marketing. Like the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) says they are prepared to be against orderly marketing. They are prepared to be against orderly marketing. They are prepared to play on the prejudices and fears and all the while see family farmers disappear. For seven years you Members sat on your fannies and you did nothing for the farmers of Saskatchewan. Nothing whatsoever! I say again to the member for Morse who smiles, and I say again, in 1975, like the Minister of Finance, I am with him and the boys on this side, in 1975 we will fight this issue. We are going to fight it now and the issue will be orderly marketing. I am asking you boys to reconsider once more to stand with the farmers and stand for the principle of orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.R. Mr. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, one certainly can't say that there has not been considerable debate about Bill 50 in this Legislative Session.

Mr. Speaker, the Members to your left have been using inaccurate information and have been attempting to mislead the public in Saskatchewan ever since I introduced this Bill some months ago.

April 15, 1973

Mr. Speaker, I think if a government should ever be commended for sitting back and sanely and logically following the democratic practice while the Liberals, the Members to your left, hysterically went about the province trying to mislead farmers, it has been this Government this Session, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — They have, Mr. Speaker, led by the Leader of the Opposition been attempting to hold meetings across this province to talk about Bill 50 and orderly marketing and in doing so have attempted at every one of these meetings to mislead farmers in Saskatchewan. Mislead farmers, Mr. Speaker! They have used tactics and used fear and mistrust and misrepresentation of what this legislation is really all about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — They have rumored at all of those meetings powers that they know full well are not going to be given to the Commission, nor are they included in Bill 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go into some detail in regard to what some of those Members opposite have said in this Legislative Assembly and what they have said in the Province of Saskatchewan since I introduced this Bill.

But firstly, I want to stress one thing because it can be summed up in a nutshell that the Members opposite and those that support them are against orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Against orderly marketing! Mr. Speaker, it is clear from their remarks, clear they are against the Wheat Board; it is clear they are against the orderly marketing for wheat, oats and barley in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, it is clear that they don't want rape seed and flax seed included in the orderly marketing system.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Even though they know that the major farm organizations in Saskatchewan as in other prairie provinces as producers have voiced so often in the past that they want those products included under the orderly marketing system, the Opposition in their ignorance pursue the defeat and the destruction of orderly marketing in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, they in fact, from those actions have never so clearly indicated to farmers in Saskatchewan that they

are against the very thing that farmers stand up and ask and fight for, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — They have been spreading nothing, nothing but vicious and unfounded rumors in relation to Bill 50, The Natural Products Marketing Act, and lying about it, Mr. Speaker!

But it's not working. It is not working, Mr. Speaker. It is not working because farmers in Saskatchewan as do farmers everywhere in the free world want and work for orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — We've seen orderly marketing practised for a good many years under the Wheat Board. We see farmers asking for the inclusion of rape seed under the orderly marketing system. We can go to nearly any other province in Canada, and we see orderly marketing agencies handling commodities that are grown by farmers. Manitoba, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec, they all have orderly marketing systems, Mr. Speaker. Some of them for in excess of 15 years. Yet the Members who sit to your left are so ignorant of that that they still — and have given evidence here in this Session at this Legislative Assembly — said that they are against it and farmers do not want orderly marketing.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) said it best and he certainly said it for all of those who sit to your left. He said in his remarks in regard to Bill 50 on March 26. He got up and he said, "I wasn't going to say much on this, but I couldn't let it go by." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is right, he didn't say much but I do want to quote some of what he did say. I now wish to quote from that Member — I wish he was here, I am sorry he is absent — he said:

I can tell you that all the time that I was raising hogs and poultry (and apparently he was at one time raising turkeys) there was no way that I wanted a marketing board. In fact, when they brought in the egg marketing board, I was raising 1,000 laying hens. Producing eggs from my own hatchery. When they got the board (and I stress the board, Mr. Speaker) I don't think the board did anything for the egg business in -Saskatchewan and I got out.

Mr. Speaker, that is an admission that they are not for boards. They say they are not for commissions but they are for boards. There is the Member from Meadow Lake saying it is not the commission he opposes, it's orderly marketing boards he opposes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The same as every other Member who sits to your left opposes them, Mr. Speaker. Against orderly marketing!

He went on and said and I quote:

So it doesn't help the farmer. For goodness sake (he says) it is a funny thing you know. You bring in these boards (he never once mentioned commissions) you bring these

April 15, 1973

boards and all the board have to be compulsory. There is no way they can operate without compulsion. This to me is a sign that a board (and again I stress board not commission) is not the proper method of marketing. I don't mind saying this.

He was speaking for every Member of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan when he said that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Every Member of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker!

And an Hon. Member on this side of the House interrupted and he said "Even the Wheat Board?" And the Member for Meadow Lake replied and I quote, "Yes, even the Wheat Board."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have been saying that there has been no consultation on my behalf or on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan in regard to this Commission. They know full well, Mr. Speaker, that I indicated to the hog producers and the swine producers when I talked to them in the spring of 1972, that our plan was to introduce boards and commissions where we felt they were necessary. That was the start of our plan for orderly marketing in Saskatchewan. I remind them that at that convention, the hog and swine producers in Saskatchewan set up a committee. And it was from that committee made up of not only those two organizations but the Wheat Pool and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the National Farmers Union and on the recommendation of that committee that I struck a hog marketing commission in Saskatchewan in November of 1972, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, they discussed for six months with myself and my officials in regard to whether they wanted a commission or a board. And they ended up recommending a commission, Mr. Speaker. Not a board, a commission!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, since that commission was structured we have had in excess of 40 meetings in Saskatchewan telling producers what the commission wants to do. Asking them to contribute their ideas to the plan that has to be submitted before the commission can become fully functional. Mr. Speaker, 40 meetings, that is the kind of communication and that is the kind of dialogue that this Government has had.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The Members opposite try to tell people in Saskatchewan those that don't really know what has happened, that we haven't gone out and tried to communicate with them. The evidence shows that we have!

The Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) says, "Why haven't you told them with precision, with precision what the Commission is going to do?" We have said at those meetings and he knows full well that we say we have a plan, here it is but before we say this has to be the way it is going to be implemented, we want your ideas your contributions and your input. That is what we said to them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — And that is the way it should be, Mr. Member for Wilkie. That is the way it should be!

On the other hand some of the other Members get up and I think even the Member for Wilkie when he was speaking on other occasions says that we don't allow the Members to do anything. We simply shove it down their throats. Now, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. We have had the meetings. We have told them what our intentions are as far as a Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission. We asked producers to contribute to that plan. That is the way this Government operates and we have shoved nothing down the producers' throats, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Instead, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have continued to mislead the Saskatchewan farmers and especially the hog producers.

They say that we are going to take over the collection of hogs, and that we haven't with precision told the farmers how we are going to do it. Of course we haven't because we wanted to get their input first. They say that all the hogs are going to be shipped to Intercontinental Packers and they use that when they are in one part of the country, but when they go to another meeting they admit openly and freely that there is going to be a new hog processing plant in Regina. Intercontinental has already announced that.

The Leader of the Opposition, and I am sorry that he is not here, he says that it is not unlikely that there is going to be an announcement that Burns will build a new plant. He also said, and I think some other Members have reiterated it, that there is going to be an announcement of Canada Packers in Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker, the probability of three new plants in -Saskatchewan and every one announced since we announced the Commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — They are trying to say with this Commission, Mr. Speaker, that there is not going to be any more processing in Saskatchewan only Intercontinental, because it is all going to go to Intercontinental Packers. Well, for goodness sake, why are all these packers going to come to -Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Even the Member for Lakeview

April 15, 1973

(Mr. McPherson) he has confidence in the livestock industry in Saskatchewan. He goes to the bull sale just a week ago and pays the highest price for a bull there, because he knows that with the kind of programs that the Government of Saskatchewan has it is going to be a good investment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Yet that same Member, Mr. Speaker, has the audacity to get up in this House and say that we are doing the wrong thing. Why is he not selling his livestock, why buy?

Now the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and he was here briefly and he is off watching the hockey game, and I am sorry that he is not here to hear my closing remarks. He said, you know this debate has nothing to do with hogs, it has nothing to do with the Hog Marketing Commission or a board. In fact, it has nothing to do with orderly marketing. That is how much he knows about the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

He knows that he crossed the threshold and that the farmers of Saskatchewan branded them and know them for what they really are. Now he wants to say, we weren't really talking about marketing commissions or orderly marketing. I don't really know what we were talking about but it wasn't that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — They know, Mr. Speaker, that they have gone too far.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) made some remarks. He said that you can't assure, a commission in Saskatchewan can't assure by only handling two per cent of the hogs in the world, can't assure better prices for Saskatchewan hog producers, unless it is by a subsidy. Mr. Speaker, I hope that he is around in the near future when the Government announces programs in regard to guarantees to hog producers because I don't think it is too far away, and this Government is more or less committed to do that.

But outside of that they have continually tried to avoid the fact that a commission can sign long-term contracts at set prices, at prices that if we had had this commission in effect six weeks or two months ago, that it would have been somewhere around 46, 47 or 48 cents per pound.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — We lost those, Mr. Speaker. Pork is selling for 40 cents per pound. If we would have signed those contracts we could have had maybe 20 or 30 per cent of the Saskatchewan hog marketing production committed to better prices than we now are receiving.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — That is what orderly marketing does for you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when he spoke and he attempted to leave the impression in the House here as he did at meetings

throughout the province, that nowhere else in Canada do they have marketing agencies that weren't brought in by a vote. That is what the Member for Morse said. He says they brought in the agency in Alberta by a vote . . .

Mr. Wiebe: — On a Point of Privilege. At no time did I say that there were any boards brought in to the other provinces in Canada without a vote or with a vote.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a Point of Order.

Mr. Wiebe: — And I would like you to prove that I said that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is a debating point.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, he said that they were brought in by votes in Canada and everywhere else. I should like to bring to not only the Member for Morse's attention but to the Members that sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, that the province of Alberta, Conservative Alberta, has a marketing commission for potatoes, brought in in 1966 and there was no vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they have a commission for fresh vegetables brought in 1971, no vote. They have and the Members to your left have been mentioning sheep and wool in the last couple of days, they have in Alberta a sheep and wool commission brought in in 1972 and no vote, Mr. Speaker.

They all have been talking about cattle and the next thing in Saskatchewan is going to be a cattle commission. Well for their information, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Alberta in 1969 they brought in a cattle commission and there was no vote, Mr. Speaker.

Now those are the facts. Commission after commission not only Alberta but in the provinces of Manitoba and Liberal Quebec and they have been brought in without votes. Yet they try to mislead the farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan that only agencies that are now structured in Canada have been structured by a vote. They have deliberately attempted to mislead the producers in this province, Mr. Speaker. And the Member from Morse should know better.

I am sorry again, the sometimes agricultural critic from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) is not here, because when he 'MacLeoded' the issue as the Hon. Member for Biggar said, he was talking about the compulsion. Compulsion, my goodness, the Government shouldn't be as compulsive as this in regard to dictating to producers.

Certainly no Liberal Government would ever do it. He went as far as to say that they never did it when they were in power for those seven years. Let me give them two examples.

There happened to be a cattle checkoff brought in under the Liberal regime, a checkoff which farmers did not have an opportunity to express whether they wanted it or not, no vote, Mr. Speaker. The last session they brought in a compulsory

April 15, 1973

checkoff for hogs, a checkoff that this Government has never brought into operation, Mr. Speaker. No vote! And yet they say and criticize this Government for doing and taking the action that it has taken.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think we can get along better if only one person is speaking at one time.

Mr. Messer: — I have been listening to them speak for two months now all in unison. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), as I think has been expressed by some of the Members of the Government side of the House, has made the most blatant attempts of any Member opposite in order to confuse and mislead people in regard to Bill No. 50.

They have all been fiction, misleading and unfounded, Mr. Speaker. They have all displayed that they will go to any lengths to convince the public that this Act is not in the best interest of Saskatchewan hog producers and Saskatchewan farmers as a whole.

It was reported in the Press that on radio a program some weeks ago, that this, this legislation, was going to be imposed on all agricultural commodities without consultation. There would be commissions for literally everything when they woke up the next day. In fact there were callers who called in and said, “Now Mr. Gardner is it correct to assume that if there is a cattle commission . . . “ And there is no such cattle commission nor has there been any announcement that the Government is in the future going to establish a cattle commission. Nevertheless, callers call in and they don’t know what is going on and they are seeking information and I like to see that. But they call in to Mr. Gardner when he was on the hotline and they say in fact, “If there is a cattle commission is it right that I can’t sell a steer to the neighbor across the road for his own use?” And Mr. Gardner has the audacity to sit on that radio program and say, “Yes, that is right.” There is no legitimate reason for him to say that because he knows full well that there is absolutely no truth in it whatsoever.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we go back to the Leader-Post of March 24th, even they have the intelligence to point out that the Members opposite, and especially the Member for Moosomin, had been attempting to mislead and confuse the farmers and the producers in this province, because they say, and I will quote from that March 24th issue Under The Dome, where they say and I want to quote:

He has also sent out copies of amendments to 76,000 farmers in the province plus copies of his speech about marketing boards and commission, by John Gardner the agricultural critic.

I am sorry, but I think this was the Leader of the Opposition referring to Mr. Gardner. The article Under The Dome says:

Farmers may find parts of that package confusing however, since Mr. Gardner’s speech refers in several places to specific clauses or sections of the original 1972

legislation that are nowhere to be found in the Bill containing the proposed amendments.

Again, blatant evidence that they will resort to absolutely anything to try to deceive the public in the Province of Saskatchewan.

This new Natural products marketing legislation was brought in in 1972 and there wasn't a comment from the Members opposite outside of the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who made a short two minute speech. Not one comment! And every one of them stood up and supported that legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Most of the powers that are in the Bill that we are talking about now, were incorporated in the original 1945 legislation and they have been there for some 25 or 30 years.

When they were in power for those seven years they administered the same legislation that they are now saying is dictatorial yet they didn't change it, Mr. Speaker. They have just been playing cheap politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members, the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe), the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) have said that the reasons that they didn't debate the Natural Products Marketing Bill when I brought it in in 1972 was that I deceived them when I brought in the second reading speech. Well, that is a pretty weak-kneed argument, Mr. Speaker. Whether I deceived them or not is rather irrelevant, which I did not, they should have been responsible enough to take a look at that legislation and read it for what it really was.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — If it was something other than what I said, they should have had the courage and the initiative to get up and say so at that time and not in this particular session, Mr. Speaker.

But to show them that I did not deceive them — and the Member for Wilkie mentioned it several times — I want to read back to him some of the things that I said in the 1972 second reading speech. Mr. Speaker, I said that I wanted to give a brief history to the Members of the Assembly in relation to hog marketing legislation and I said, and I quote:

Mr. McIsaac: — Take it as read.

Mr. Messer: — Yes, you would like to take it as read because you don't like to be reminded that you deliberately overlooked this speech that I gave in 1972 in order to mobilize the kind of campaign that didn't work for you in the country in regard to orderly marketing.

I said, Mr. Speaker, and if I may quote:

April 15, 1973

The first Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Act was passed in 1945 and the last review of amendments was in 1967. The activity under the Saskatchewan Act since it was passed in 1945 shows that we now have five marketing boards operating within the confines of that Act: The Broiler Chicken Producers Marketing Board; the Turkey Producers Marketing Board; Commercial Egg Marketing Board; Honey Producers Marketing Board and the Canada Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation which operates in Saskatchewan through a delegation of provincial powers using Section 11 of The National Products Marketing Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I went on to say:

One may ask at this time as to why we need to regulate marketing. In the past years, indeed some years ago, there was some considerable difference of opinion in regard to the need for regulation of some agricultural products. But during the past few years I think there has been a general tendency throughout Canada, for producers have vigorously pursued in many areas, regulated marketing through the use of marketing boards and/or commission.

I went on to say, Mr. Speaker:

This approach differs with the previous trend of almost exclusive use of co-operatives if there was any use available to them at all. In order to protect individuals and family farms, producers now contend in some cases, and in many cases, that they must control all of the product. There have been situations where the five or ten per cent surplus, or for that matter even a threatened surplus, has reduced the price and reduced the price drastically for all of that product.

Giving indication that we would be leaning towards the formation of boards and commission.

It went on to say, Mr. Speaker:

Producers have been facing rising costs and in many cases the price of their own product has declined. They quite rightly feel that since the vendor of their supplies sets his price to cover costs plus a reasonable return, that producers must also do the same to be successful. Since there are many producers facing fewer and fewer buyers individual producers are in a weak bargaining position. Individual producers fear the advance of horizontal and vertical integration and corporate farming and see marketing boards as a useful farm organization to curb such developments. Programs of regional development have resulted in the loss of traditional markets through their subsidized production. Individual producers cannot regulate total production without organization. Nor can they as individuals determine what the local market for them really is. Individually they do not have the resources to accumulate sufficient market knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I went on to say:

Part three, introduces a new basic principle in the Act by providing (I was going into the parts of the Bill)

for the establishment of marketing commissions. These agencies, Mr. Speaker, are basically government appointed marketing bodies as compared with producer boards where the members are elected. They will have many of the powers of the producer boards but will not have any power in relation to supply control.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on showing them that there was no attempt at deceiving the general public in Saskatchewan last year when I brought in The Natural Products Marketing Act. None whatsoever!

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition launched this campaign that has been termed so vicious in regard to what this Act is going to do to hog producers and farmers in Saskatchewan.

I want to refer to . . .

Mr. McIsaac: — Read the Act!

Mr. Messer: — No, I am not going to read the Act. I am going to refer to an editorial in the Western Producer, March 29th. This is an unbiased newspaper, the Western Producer. It is a good newspaper and the Members to your left agree with that.

I want to quote from this editorial and it is headed “Orderly Marketing for Income Stability” and it says this:

The time has come for a sober assessment, drained of emotion of the hog marketing commission in Saskatchewan. The positions of the opponents, and of the enthusiasts, should be well known by now and accepted as such. The cold fact is that Saskatchewan now has a marketing commission and it should be the responsibility of the producers to play their part in making it a success of its operations. Indeed, they are not in a position to refuse to take part in the commission's activities because the commission is a fact. However, the lack of a vote does not suggest that such a vote would have been a negative one. Using just one example, the membership of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has expressed majority approval over a long period of years of orderly marketing principle for hogs. Such a policy reaffirmed by delegates at a long series of annual meetings, if there was widespread opposition to the orderly marketing principles for hogs, it should and would have surfaced in the Pool organization at such annual meetings.

Now what that is saying is that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has supported the orderly marketing of hogs for years and there has literally been no opposition, until the Liberal Party to your left decided to play cheap politics with this commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — This editorial goes on to say:

And such approval was forthcoming under different political regimes so that the political view is not a valid approach.

April 15, 1973

Apparently the Members to your left don't agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

It is obvious that the provincial government took a reading of the situation and was satisfied that the majority of the producers were interested in income stability as it would be reflected in the objectives of a commission. Of a commission, Mr. Speaker! Until opposition is marked by evidence rather than isolated objections, it must be assumed that the approval is present, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I want to go on to further quote:

It should be equally obvious . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . newspaper?

Mr. Messer: — Are you back again to saying that this is a biased newspaper. One of your colleagues was just saying that it is not. In fact, it is the farmer's voice in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say:

It should be equally obvious that the province could not live in isolation with marketing boards or commissions in neighboring provinces. The obvious conclusion is that activities of the three provincial organizations could be meshed in the interests of the producer to ensure that the provinces are sharing and developing markets for hogs, rather than competing with one another.

I just want to make a couple of other short references to this editorial. It goes on to say:

As commission chairman, Harry J. Elder, told a recent meeting, the best time to bring in a commission is when prices are good and sales are good, to be in a position to meet tougher marketing conditions.

He's the same speaker who noted that the majority of the producers attending public meetings were not there to oppose or encourage, but to find out more about commission operation and plans to advance their ideas. The view appears to be a logical one. The only people who were trying to promote and develop and instil opposition, Mr. Speaker, was the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The editorial goes on to say:

The logical way to look at the commission is to see it in a reflection of producer views and goals. Their input will clearly direct commission operations and ensure the best possible conditions for themselves.

As we noted earlier, this is the time to think hog marketing, not politics, not politicians, not personalities, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the Members opposite to heed that. But I wouldn't be surprised if the Liberal Party, the 15 Members to your left

continue to pursue this destructive motive of their in regard to orderly marketing in Canada today.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial goes on to say:

There must also be an awareness of the customer. It has already been indicated that Japanese buyers, as an example, look at a guaranteed supply as the main ingredient to continuing trade. Is not the commission assembly system the most logical one?

Certainly it is, Mr. Speaker. The Government of Saskatchewan knows it, the producers in the Province of Saskatchewan know it, the governments and the producers in the Province of Alberta and Manitoba and Ontario and Quebec know it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Only the Liberal Party doesn't know it, Mr. Speaker. Only the Liberal Party.

Now, there was in the later days of debate, some reference made in regard to a sheep and wool commission. And in fact the Leader of the Opposition referred to a letter that I sent to all sheep and wool producers in the Province of Saskatchewan. When I asked him to read it he referred to only one sentence in that letter. I said it was out of context and I said, "Why don't you read the whole letter?" "No," he said, he wasn't about to read the whole letter. Well I am going to read some of that letter and it will be perfectly obvious to the Member of this Assembly, as it will be to the people of Saskatchewan, why the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't read that letter. Because he wanted to take deliberately one sentence out of context in order to use it to his best advantage which was not the intent of the letter at all, Mr. Speaker. This letter was sent to all sheep and wool producers on March 13 of 1973 and I open by saying this, and I quote:

As you know, I have recently been asked to establish a sheep and wool producers' marketing commission. If you are currently a member of one of the six sheepmen's mutuals in the province, you have no doubt been invited to attend meetings held to discuss the matter and to vote as to whether or not you favor establishment of a marketing commission.

I was asked, Mr. Speaker. They have been discussing this for some months and they asked the Government to form a commission but before I want to do that I wanted to notify each and every sheep and wool producer in Saskatchewan what these organizations that speak for them were asking the Government for. I go on to say:

I recently received a number of enquiries requesting clarification on certain matters. As a result of these questions I thought it important that I send a letter to all sheep producers currently on our departmental mailing list, in order to explain what has taken place today and to explain what would happen once a commission is formed.

Again, attempting to create dialogue and harmony in regard to a proposed or perhaps an announcement of a sheep and wool commission, Mr. Speaker.

April 15, 1973

I went on to say in this letter:

The Committee that I referred to earlier met on a number of occasions. It held discussions with representatives of the Alberta Sheep Producers . . .

For the Member of Morse's information, Marketing Commission, not board. Marketing Commission, not board! Another commission not voted on in the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker.

. . . to determine how the Alberta commission operated. It studied the Saskatchewan Natural Products Marketing Act to determine what powers are available to the marketing boards and commission established within the province.

So they look in Alberta, they looked at the legislation here to see in fact what a commission would do, to be knowledgeable of what a commission would do in comparison to a board. Yet they chose a commission.

I want to make one last reference to this letter, Mr. Speaker, and I quote on page 2, third paragraph:

The meetings have now been held and I have been advised of the results. They have all replied that there was virtually unanimous support — unanimous support for a sheep commission.

Unanimous support, Mr. Speaker! The Southeastern Sheepmen's Mutual was the one organization where there was some opposition, where 7 out of 22 producers were opposed to the commission. They favored a voluntary affiliation of the existing mutuals over a commission. But all six, in total asked for and supported a commission. Only in the southeast were there 7 out of some 29 producers who voted against the commission. Yet the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has attempted not only to deceive the Members of this Assembly saying that I am trying to push a sheep and wool marketing commission down the producers throats, but he has attempted to tell producers in Saskatchewan that we are doing that. Yet, this letter which was quoted from out of context, made it perfectly plain that I was only doing what the six organizations in the province requested me to do as Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have a few more moments to talk.

Mr. Guy: — Oh, go on!

Mr. Messer: — Oh, I could go on for a long time. We could go on for hours trying to clear up the innuendoes and the deliberate misinterpretations that you Members to the left of Mr. Speaker, have tried to convey to producers in Saskatchewan. But I don't think I have to take all that time, Mr. Speaker, because I went out in the country, probably more than any of the Members opposite. Unfortunately I missed some of the proceedings of the Legislature. I even missed one or two debates with regard to The Natural Products Marketing Act and I feel very badly about

that, Mr. Speaker. However, I'm told that I missed nothing, but I still feel badly about it. I wanted to hear all the comments that the Members were making in regard to the legislation because I want to remember so that when I go to the country and go to the boondocks in 1975 and start telling the people of Saskatchewan just where the Member for Wilkie and the Member for Moose Jaw and the Member for Morse and the Member for Regina Lakeview, just where they stood in regard to the commission, Mr. Speaker, I want to be able to speak with precision and I want to be precise in the facts as to what they said. That's why I'm sorry that I missed some of the comments that were said. However, I'm sure that if I look into Hansard I'll be able to find time between now and then to implant in my mind what they tried to do to defeat this most progressive and most needed legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — But before closing, Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Just tell us about the Act!

Mr. Messer: — . . . I have been talking about the Act all the time, just like the Members opposite.

You know, as I said, this Government was to be commended for the way it patiently sat here and watched the Members opposite strain and stretch the rules of parliamentary procedure, while each and every one of them four or five times debated the main motion. You know, Mr. Speaker should be commended also for allowing them to do that. That's the kind of benevolent government that this province has now which it hasn't had for some good time, Mr. Speaker.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I can turn my attention to my closing remarks, and I refer to the back page ad of the March 15th Western Producer which every Member, every Member to the left, has made reference to, one or two or three or four or five times in the Legislature and they certainly have been making all kinds of reference to it in their meetings that they have held out in the country. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they are coupon clippers.

Anyway, the Leader of the Opposition and some other Members opposite have said, "You know, this in fact is the plebiscite." The Leader of the Opposition, for a long while, was coming in here and saying, "I got another 100 today and I got 150 yesterday and I'll get 200 tomorrow." He's saying, "There's the plebiscite, all opposing the commission. How many did you get Mr. Minister of Agriculture?" Well, in the final result he got more than I did, but I haven't counted his, he can count mine. I haven't got the time to count his, but he can count mine. We went through this exercise for some three weeks or so, every day he was coming in and saying he got another 100 opposing the commission.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if in fact, we assume and I think probably we can, that "this is a plebiscite," he said. "There," the Member for Rosthern, "there, there's the producers, these coupons we're getting, they're saying we don't want a Commission." That means that the Government has to start paying attention to

those. Those are hog producers speaking. That's going to be the majority of the hog producers in Saskatchewan saying 'No' to this Government, "We don't want a commission." Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) he agrees. He says, yes, yes, that's right. These coupons tell us whether we should have a commission or not.

Well, Mr. Speaker, firstly I should like to express my thanks to the Saskatchewan Hog Producers and maybe the Liberal Party who it is rumored subsidized them on this \$1,800 ad here, or whatever it is, in conducting the plebiscite if they want to refer to it as a plebiscite. Thank you very much.

I want to refer to the coupons that I got. I note the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and the Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) and the Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) have referred — some Members never even got any — but anyway some of my colleagues here have referred to some of the coupons they got. They tried to contact these people, sent letters to them, some of them were returned, 'deceased', a tombstone coupon or whatever you want to call it, some of them were 'no such person' and it's returned. One wonders, you know where these coupons were coming from and when it came out in total — at least the Leader of the Opposition says 1,400, it almost relates to the total Liberal membership in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I am wondering if that isn't in fact who sent all the coupons in, Mr. Speaker. But anyway, I don't know whether I got the same coupons that the Leader of the Opposition got, I got as of . . .

Stick around, Mr. Member for Milestone. This is the interesting part and you are going to have to bear with it because you are going to have to tell the people of Saskatchewan what the facts really are and I don't want you to misinterpret them by being in the lounge when I convey them to the House.

. . . But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I got, as of April 4, 1,212 coupons. Now the Leader of the Opposition he got 1,400. I don't know, he has trouble counting on his fingers. He misses one there every once in a while. I don't know whether he makes up for it by saying two or three when he goes across the gap. I don't really question his 1,400. I'm only talking about the 1,212 I got.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I got 1,212 coupons from 'supposed' hog producers in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow: — That's a plebiscite?

Mr. Messer: — Now, that's a plebiscite as the Attorney General said.

Now, I go to a document that one could, I think, refer to as the agricultural livestock and poultry census on farms.

Mr. Wiebe: — 18,000 hog producers!

Mr. Messer: — Well, the Member for Morse says 18,000 hog producers. Just a moment I want to clarify it for you. This is a Federal Liberal document. You are the same bed fellows you know. They put this out. I am not questioning how many hog producers they say there are. They say that, well, in Saskatchewan we have I am sorry not 18,000 hog producers, but this census book here

says that in Saskatchewan there are 26,075 hog producers. 26,075 hog producers! The Leader of the Opposition gets 1,400 coupons and he says that's enough to constitute the government to throw out the legislation, because there are 1,400 people who say you should not have a commission. What's that, five per cent or something like that? That's the plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, five per cent say no, we don't want a commission. Then he says, "no, no, you can't do that when five per cent say no democratically you can't go ahead with the Commission." That's ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, and he knows it. But then, Mr. Speaker, I thought because my colleagues over on this side, the Member from Biggar and the Member from Redberry and so on were saying, we're getting some sort of tombstone coupons and I think you should try and investigate that. We don't know whether these are really hog producers or not. The Member from Kinistino said the same thing. He tried to have some correspondence with these people who sent out these coupons so he could clarify any misunderstanding they had. God only knows there was a lot of misunderstanding because of the attitude of the Members opposite. So I went to the census that shows, not only the 26,075 producers in Saskatchewan but the one that names every producer, Mr. Speaker. So I got 1,212 replies, out of that Mr. Speaker, there were 656 who ended up as producers. Out of the 1,212, Mr. Speaker, 646 were producers of hogs. Some plebiscite, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Romanow: — The country's afire with this issue!

Mr. Messer: — Afire with this issue says the Attorney General. You know we got them from the guy that's got the business on the shores of Jackfish Lake and we got them from the tombstones from some cemetery from I don't know where, but 646 were producers, 566 had no indication of raising hogs in Saskatchewan. They had no relation to hogs. Mr. Speaker, that is 47 per cent non-producers from that 1,212 response that I got, Mr. Speaker. 646 producers said, "No, we don't want a commission." I am sorry about that, Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't say that because that is not quite correct, because a number of those said that we want a commission and we want it right now, Mr. Speaker. But in total, I don't want to separate those who said yes, we do, and no, we don't. All I want to say is that 646 were concerned enough about this plea of the Liberal Opposition. It was not the hog producers who changed their minds, not the Hog Producers' Association but the Executive of the Hog Producers' Association, who, strange enough, are card-carrying Liberals at the same time, who wanted to go back on their recommendation. But out of all those 26,075 producers in Saskatchewan only 646 were concerned enough to say yes or no, we do or do not want a commission. Two and one-half per cent, Mr. Minister of Finance, say we don't want a commission. Two and one-half per cent, Mr. Speaker!

Now as I said when I began to close my remarks, I thank the Leader of the Opposition and the Members opposite for that plebiscite because once and for all it is resolved here and now whether we move ahead with the Commission or whether we do not, with this indication, Mr. Speaker, we move ahead without any hesitation . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — . . . with orderly marketing for hogs in Saskatchewan.

April 15, 1973

We move ahead and we stand for orderly marketing for all farm commodities in this province. And I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that when I say all commodities that are produced in this province, I mean all commodities and if the situation arises in this province that we need a commission for cattle, yes, there will be a commission for cattle, Mr. Speaker. And I wouldn't be the least bit surprised, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the rumblings that come from the Members opposite that we end up forming a cattle commission perhaps sometime in the future at the request of the cattle producers, Mr. Speaker. They'll never believe that! At their request, the cattle producers themselves, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be the least bit surprised. Because they tried to tell us that the sheep and wool producers didn't ask for one, and they did. Vegetable producers have already started investigating an orderly marketing agency. Now Mr. Speaker, what it means is that these people are so far out of touch, so far out of tune with the times that they don't even know that some of their own Members want orderly marketing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — You know, I guess God has even provided Liberals the opportunity to change their minds because some of them have come to me and said, I am glad to see that there is a Government that's got guts enough to bring in a commission, that's got guts enough to come and stand for orderly marketing. I think that with the evidence that we have brought forward in this debate to the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that they will have some second thoughts when we vote on these amendments, Mr. Speaker, because if they do not they are going to have to answer for it in 1975. They will have to answer for it then. So, Mr. Speaker, I simply close in saying, making a plea because I am, as is this Government, benevolent to the end, even with Liberals, I ask them to reconsider the position that they have taken. I ask them to realize that producers of hogs, because that is what we are most concerned about now, want and asked for a commission.

An Hon. Member: — Repent!

Mr. Messer: — Repent, yes, repent and forgive. Admit that you have been playing cheap politics but let bygones be bygones and support the amendments of Bill 50, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 37

Messieurs

Dyck
Meakes
Wood
Smishek
Romanow
Messer
Snyder
Bowerman
Thibault

MacMurchy
Pepper
Michayluk
Thorson
Whelan
Kwasnica
Carlson
Engel
Owens

Matsalla
Cody
Gross
Feduniak
Mostoway
Comer
Rolfes
Lange
Oliver

Larson
Kowalchuk
Baker
Brockelbank

Robbins
Tchorzewski
Cowley

Feschuk
Kaeding
Flasch

NAYS — 11
Messieurs

Coupland
Loken
Guy
Grant

Boldt
MacDonald (Milestone)
McIsaac
Gardner

McPherson
Lane
Wiebe

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