

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

May 26, 1978.

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

STATEMENT

NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC — PICTURES

MR. SPEAKER: — I will ask the members of the Assembly to give me a brief moment to depart from the usual proceedings today. I think it will become readily apparent the reason for it after I tell you what it is about.

I have been approached by people from the National Geographic Magazine to photograph in the Assembly during the sitting of the Assembly. I wanted to obtain (since this is a special occasion) some consensus from the members of the Assembly for proceeding with this operation. I have been assured that the person who is here to take the pictures will be taking them for the first half an hour or an hour this morning in and around the Chamber. There will be no flash since he uses natural light. I am assured by him that no pictures would be used that would personally embarrass or embarrass the province in any way in the publication, which may come about in the National Geographic Magazine. I want to find out from the members if I have a general consensus of agreement at this time.

I would like, because of the agreement, to introduce Mr. Craig Arnus in the Speaker's Gallery. I would authorize him to proceed at the earliest opportunity to take whatever pictures he desires.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G. McNEILL (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, by leave, through you and to this Assembly, I would like to introduce a group of students.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will just go down the routine proceedings right now. Sorry to throw the member off.

MR. McNEILL: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague Mr. Fred Thompson I would like to introduce a group of students in the Speaker's Gallery from Ile-a-la-Cross. They are 12 and 13 year old students, ten in number, from the Rossitnol School at Ile-a-la- Cross. They are accompanied by their teachers Andre Au and Faye Lawton. I hope their stay here is educational and I hope they have a good trip home. I will be meeting them right after they leave the galleries to have pictures taken and to have drinks in the member's lounge. I will be meeting them on behalf of Mr. Thompson.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

INCREASE LEGAL AID ASSISTANCE

MISS L.B. CLIFFORD (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services. Employees in the Legal Aid Services have indicated that there might be some cutbacks, laying off about 17 legal assistance clinic workers and this will negatively affect the service they are now presenting. Would the minister not agree that many of these people who are being served will likely be from the same area that his department serves and have you met with the Attorney General to review the situation and possibly decide that these cutbacks will not occur?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — We have had some discussions, yes.

MISS CLIFFORD: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you indicate what the nature of the discussions was and what progress you are making?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, let me again indicate to the member, as the Attorney General, I think, has indicated to the House, there have been no cutbacks. In fact the legal aid assistance has received, I believe, 8 per cent and it may even be a 10 per cent increase and I think the circumstances pertaining to what the member says is a cutback, have been explained by the Attorney General's Department.

The nature of our discussions has been, what effect, for example, it will have on the people my department deal with and certainly people on low income. I think it must be remembered that they have received an 8 per cent increase and as I say, the circumstances surrounding the situation in legal aid, were explained fully to the House by the minister responsible, the Attorney General.

MISS CLIFFORD: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Surely the minister is not denying that these cutbacks are imminent in the near future. Do you not agree that this discrimination will be affecting the people on low incomes which in turn will only allow the people responsibility to protect the people your department serves?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker. I will ask the Minister of Health to supply the member opposite with a hearing aid. I have indicated to her that there were no cutbacks. How can she possibly claim that there is a cutback when the legal aid assistance people are receiving an 8 per cent increase for the last year and they may have received a 10 per cent increase? The Attorney General . . . (inaudible interjection). They have received an 8 per cent increase.

MR. MERCHANT: — That's not enough.

MR. ROLFES: — I hear you say it's not enough but you would be the first people to accuse this government of overspending. Now, every member over there has his particular pet project that he wants increased over 10 per cent and yet they are quite prepared to come into this House, each and every individual, claiming that they want more of an increase but each individual goes out and criticizes this government for overspending.

Let me ask the member opposite what . . . I'm not persistent but what did you provide when your party was in government? There wasn't one red cent offered . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order!

MR. W.H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I brought this

particular matter to the attention of the Attorney General and at that particular time he indicated that there was some gross exaggeration. I think anybody realizes that the Minister of Social Services, this morning, is really in effect, playing with words and that the cutbacks are going to be effective at the end of this month.

My question is to the Minister in charge of the Treasury Board. Has the Treasury Board at this time considered the request, which I believe, will be approximately \$ 1 million and the Attorney General indicated the Treasury Board would be considering the request to increase the funds above and beyond the 8 per cent or 9 per cent that they presently have been given?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, I must apologize. I wasn't quite listening to the question. Is it in respect to legal aid?

MR. STODALKA: — Yes, have you . . .

MR. SMISHEK: — If it is in respect to legal aid I think I know the general area of the question. The matter is currently under review by the Budget Bureau and will be considered by the Treasury Board as soon as the department and the Budget Bureau are ready to present their submissions.

MR. STODALKA: — Just a comment on these matters just before the final question. What I would like to ask the minister is this. I am sure . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I cannot allow the comment.

MR. STODALKA: — Supplementary question then. Will the ministry give us a more precise timetable as to when this will be considered and when the Legal Aid people will have some concrete information as to whether or not there is going to be an increase and how much it will be?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, we have provided in the Budget an eight per cent increase for legal aid. May I again restate what the Attorney General advised this House sometime ago. What happened over last year is that the Legal Aid Clinic built up a surplus in excess of one-half million dollars. As a result of that, they hired additional temporary staff. They are now saying that we have a responsibility to expand the program and provide over and above the surpluses that they had accumulated. I can advise the House that when the legal aid program was being reviewed by the Budget Bureau and the Treasury Board, we did provide for an increase based on normal growth, but not over and beyond that. Since then, there have been requests by legal aid clinics. The matter is being reviewed by the Attorney General's department, the Budget Bureau. As soon as the department is ready for a submission and the Budget Bureau reviews. Treasury Board will review it. It will be a matter of days or short weeks, not a long period of time.

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Speaker, would the minister not agree though, that in fact, if there is not an increase in funds above and beyond the eight per cent, there indeed will be a cutback from services that are presently being offered?

MR. SMISHEK: — I do not believe that to be the case.

EXPROPRIATIONS — CORNWALL DEVELOPMENT.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications. I ask the minister whether it is not in fact the case that in the Cornwall Development, though expropriations are proceeding, expropriations that are taking retail space out of service, that the expropriations are solely for the purpose of the government then, building new buildings which will be rented for retail space? I ask the minister whether you feel it appropriate for the government on the one hand, to be by compulsion, expropriating and forcing people out of retail space solely for the purpose of the government then moving into the area to build new retail space and provide the same kind of service but provide it under government auspices?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No. it is not clear.

MR. MERCHANT: — They will like to know that there is slum clearance,

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, it is our hope as a government, (and incidentally, for the information of the hon. member, the whole Cornwall area development is under my jurisdiction at the present time. We are making certain expropriations that have been agreed with the city of Regina that that area ought to be upgraded in the interests of the city. We are committed to the spending in the order of \$100 million to upgrade the downtown core. The proposal has been well received by the city of Regina as well as many people from the outside believing that that is a good concept, that the downtown areas need upgrading. This, in fact, is stage one, as the hon. member is aware, that in the whole downtown area, the rail line relocation is a matter of consideration and it is necessary in order to upgrade the area to expropriate if you can't reach agreement by negotiations. Incidentally, in a number of cases, it isn't a question of the people not being interested in making the land or place available, it is to their advantage because of the income tax laws to expropriate rather than to acquire through negotiations because of the capital gains provisions that there are under the current income tax and other taxation provisions.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister adopt the words of his colleague, the Minister of Highways, when he calls this program slum clearance? Is that what you mean when you say up grading', that the province has decided that this is slum clearance that has to be done? And do you believe that it is appropriate that the government of Saskatchewan as a sort of a big daddy around the province, should decide which areas are now requiring upgrading and which areas are down to such a level, your colleague calls them slums, that they require takeover by this government?

MR. SMISHEK: — No. I do not consider them to be in that particular area, that that was any kind of a slum area, far from it, but there were old buildings. A quite a few of them were inadequate. They served a very useful purpose. The question was, where is the best place to start the upgrading area and, through negotiations and an agreement with the city of Regina and because of trying to redevelop the whole downtown area or to make the beginning in the redevelopment it was decided that those two blocks would be the appropriate place to provide the upgrading in the city of Regina.

MR. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, rising from the minister's answer to my colleague's first question, you indicated that the present owners of the property being expropriated would prefer the government to go on the expropriation route rather than on a negotiated settlement because of certain taxes added that would accrue to them. Do I take it from your answer, Mr. Minister, that you are a party to this arrangement, and are accommodating the owners of this property so they can avoid paying proper taxes to the federal government?

MR. SMISHEK: — The answer is no. There are at times no options. We prefer negotiations and agreement after having an appraisal as to the value of the property. In some cases there are two and three appraisals before we are able to determine the proper value of the property.

MR. SPEAKER: — I will take a new question.

CATTLE CHECKOFF BILL

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, there has been quite a bit of controversy this past week over a bill known as Bill No. 73 in this Legislature, which has some very severe ramifications for the cattle industry.

You have been asked to pull this bill as long ago as last week. You have been asked several times in the question period if you would pull this bill, and certainly you have been asked in debate if you would pull this bill. You received phone calls from the industry to pull this bill.

Again, Mr. Minister, today I will repeat the question. In light of the reaction in the cattle industry, from requests from legitimate people in the cattle industry, will you again consider pulling this proposed legislation?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Minister, since you once again have reaffirmed the doctrinaire philosophy of your government, are you ready to consider very serious and very consequential amendments to the existing legislation? For instance, will the minister state categorically whether he —

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I will take the next question.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a new question. Is he currently considering any amendments to that act, which might accommodate all the interested parties with respect the passage of this legislation?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any amendments which are being proposed at the present time. If there are amendments proposed in third reading, which we can accommodate, we will see whether we can accommodate them. Certainly at this point in time I am not giving away any amendments, but if there are good arguments put forward we might look at some.

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister responsible for the —

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I will take the member for Nipawin.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the PC Opposition): — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Agriculture —

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I will take a new question.

FUNDING TO THE CANADIAN CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, one of the main bones of contention in Bill 73 is the fact that funding to the national cattlemen's organization will be curtailed or restricted, if not completely eliminated. Will the minister seriously consider an amendment which would allow funding to continue from the cattle industry in Saskatchewan to its national organization, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, in one form or another.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I think we have indicated in the past that one of the major sections of this bill is the section dropping the funding of the cattlemen's association as a national organization. That does not preclude the possibility of a request from the cattlemen's association to the Checkoff Board for projects which they may want to fund. As you may know, the National Beef Information Centre is being operated out of the cattlemen's association and there are funds provided in this year's Budget for that and that will be subject to the desires of the incoming board. If they wish to continue funding in those kinds of projects, that will be up to the board to make those decisions. The intent here in the bill is to remove the administrative funding of the cattlemen's association which has been a very sore point with a lot of people in the province of Saskatchewan. Because of that, we are making that change in the amendment.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister since you have now stated categorically that you are going to reject the right of the cattle industry to have a national organization represent the producers of this province, will the minister consider a second amendment, an amendment which would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the next question.

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I take from your answer to the member for Kindersley and, indeed, your answer to the member for Thunder Creek, that you are, indeed, prepared to consider amendments in third reading, coming from the opposition, to facilitate some of the positions we have been putting to you on this particular bill and to accommodate some of the people who are objecting to the bill. My question to the minister at this time and perhaps to the house leader at this time is, are you prepared to stand this bill today to allow negotiations to take place between all three parties to see if an amendment can be worked out to alleviate the situation as it presently stands? I mean later today.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker. I find it rather unusual to be negotiating across the floor in this manner. However, I have already had some discussions with a number of the opposition members and have indicated those areas in which I was prepared to entertain amendments.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Supplementary. Mr. Speaker. The thing is that you are prepared to entertain amendments. You just said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take the next question.

ROYAL INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for the

downtown development. I would like to ask the minister if his government has decided that, intact, should the expropriation go through with respect to the Royal International Inn and other related properties downtown that you will be razing those properties and in fact eliminating the potential for that site to be preserved in some respect as a historical site?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, in case of the Royal International property, there was a parking lot there that they have had that we have tried to acquire. We were not able to reach agreement on that parking lot area and as a result it went into expropriations. In the case of the International Inn there have been some discussions between Sask Tel and the Royal International people. At this, stage no agreement has been reached and no decision has been made as to what may happen with that property because we are still in negotiations with other groups and the total development has not been finalized.

MR. McMILLAN: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that you have already reached a conclusion that you feel you cannot afford to dismantle the facade of the Royal International Inn and relocate it? Rather the entire building will have to be completely removed and replaced with new structures? Is it not a fact that you have already decided that that frontage cannot remain and cannot be removed and restructured elsewhere?

MR. SMISHEK: — The answer is no.

MR. McMILLAN: — Have you discussed, in way of supplementary, this situation with the Regina Historical Association or those people that are interested in trying to preserve historical landmarks in the city of Regina?

MR. SMISHEK: — Not with respect to the Royal International.

MR. McMILLAN: — My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, I will take the member for Nipawin.

AMENDMENTS TO BILL 73

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Is the Minister of Agriculture considering House amendments to Bill 73, the Cattle Checkoff Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, I will take the next question.

CORNWALL DEVELOPMENT

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister in charge of Cornwall Development. Is it not your intention, if you expropriate the Royal International, your intention in terms of the negotiations for the Royal International, to tear down essentially the Royal International or so completely reconstruct it as to constitute tearing it down, solely for the purposes of then going into the hotel business and building a hotel there so that the government of Saskatchewan will have torn down and replaced retail space to establish retail space and torn down or replaced a hotel to go into the hotel business?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the question is completely hypothetical. We have not acquired the Royal International Inn and no decisions have been made.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary. What is the purpose then of the continuing negotiations to buy the Royal International, other than the fact that you intend to either go into the hotel business as a government, or tear down that hotel and build another hotel moving as a government into yet another field of socialist endeavour in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will take the next question.

CATTLE CHECKOFF BILL

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): —A question to the Minister of Agriculture. Other than the list of House amendments you indicated by letter to the Agricultural critics of the various caucuses, have you discussed further House amendments with any member of the opposition? If so, whom and when?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, our discussions were simply on areas in which there might be some possibility of members moving amendments to the existing legislation.

MR. LANE: (Qu'Ap): — Supplementary. Can you tell us the areas where there might be agreement reached so that we can be informed? Secondly, would you tell us . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order . . . Member for Wascana. Order!

CABLE TELEVISION

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Sask Telecommunications. The minister said some days ago in this House in response to a question that was posed regarding problems which exist with hookups in the Glen Cairn area principally, that the hookups in multi-unit dwellings were being treated, as the minister put it, as individual residences. I ask the minister whether it is not in fact the case that what you do is you hook up a multi-unit hookup into one residence and then connect each condominium residence to that multi-unit dwelling. The results of that is that it has greatly delayed all of such hookups and that it may be months before those people get Sask Tel hookups and then get cable and CPN.

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment): — Mr. Speaker, the system being used is very simple—only those with crossed wires perhaps fail to understand it. Each unit in a condominium will be treated as an individual residence. There will be a coaxial drop cable for each unit in a condominium. With respect to an apartment, there will be one drop for a central location within the apartment. The hon. member will appreciate that if you have one single drop for a condominium, that any technical or other problems which arose whichever resident or occupant of the condominium that the drop came into would be bothered on behalf of all the other members of the condominium unit. There is more to this than just the drops, Mr. Speaker. Sask Tel is working very closely with Cable Regina to get all this hardware into condominiums. They are installing the mounting board and giving the Cable Regina licensees access to that. They are co- operating with them in the installation of the splitters and the amplifiers as well.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary. The minister makes it sound as though the

condominium units are treated exactly as individual residences while in fact they are treated more like an apartment than an individual residence and the result is that Sask Tel is not installing the condominium units at the same time and as quickly as they are installing the units in single family residences. Obviously the minister doesn't appreciate the way the thing is working from what he has been saying in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I will take the next question.

CABLE TV – CONVERTERS

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — A question to the Minister in charge of Sask Tel.

I wonder if the minister would be prepared to tell us at this time how many converters have been installed, to date, approximately, to facilitate the reception of the CPN signal, how many have been ordered and when you expect the program to be completed?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I do have those numbers available. I don't have them right at my fingertips. I wouldn't want to give the number unless it was right up to the minute.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

He said: Before Orders of the Day I want to deal with two items. The first one is a statement.

A point of order was raised on May 23, 1978 that Bill 75, an Act to Protect Senior Citizens on Fixed Incomes from Inflation, was out of order on the grounds that it was a money bill and, therefore, required to be recommended by the Crown.

The rule applicable in this case is Rule 30 which is derived directly from the British North America Act and reads as follows:

Any vote, resolution, address or bill introduced in the Assembly for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever, or to impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people, or to release or compound any sum of money due to the Crown, or to grant any property of the Crown, or to authorize any loan or any charge upon the credit of the province, shall be recommended to the Assembly by message of His Honour, the Lieutenant- Governor, before it is considered by the Assembly.

The principle underlying this rule is fundamental to our constitution and that is because the Executive of Government is held strictly accountable for all public expenditure. It must also be solely responsible for initiating legislation involving the imposition of new or additional charges upon the public revenue or upon the people, through taxation.

The question to be answered here is whether Bill No. 75 authorizes or imposes any new or additional charges upon the public revenue or upon the people. The bill provides for the reduction of rates charged to senior citizens for various goods and services provided by three Crown corporations. The reduction of rates to be paid by citizens for certain services does not in itself impose or authorize any payment out of public money.

The point of order raised by the Hon. Attorney General quite accurately points out that the releasing or compounding of any sum of money owing to the Crown creates a charge on the public revenue. This is rule 30. This phrase however has always been interpreted, in a strict sense, that money owing to the Crown refers to money owing to the Crown through actual debts, loans, contracts and guarantees and has never been interpreted to mean in a general way any money which may be owed to the Crown through charges for services or even taxes.

While a private member may not introduce a resolution or bill to increase a charge or impose additional burdens on the public purse or impose increased taxes, any member may move to reduce a charge, expenditure or a tax.

I refer all hon. members to Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, Eighteenth Edition, page 744, which states that 'no special form of procedure applies to proposals to reduce existing charges, and they may be moved in the House or in Committee without a royal recommendation.'

A ruling of the Chair, dated March 30, 1965, states as follows:

I am satisfied that an appropriation of public funds within the meaning of our constitutional principle means an authority given by this Assembly to the Crown to pay money out of the consolidated fund. (Journals of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, March 30, 1965, page 162.)

I do not find any such authorization in Bill No. 75. The argument that a reduction in revenue is equivalent to an expenditure of public funds in requiring the Crown recommendation is not supported by precedent or by the parliamentary authorities.

I therefore rule that Bill No. 75 is not a money bill and it is in order . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Concerning a point of order raised by the member for Regina Lakeview as to when a point of order should be raised on a bill, I refer all hon. Members to Rule 30 which states that: 'a bill must have the money recommendation before it is considered by the Assembly'.

The practice of this Assembly has been that a member may raise a point of order any time after the bill has been introduced and distributed, right up to second reading, in fact, during debate of second reading.

The Chair may also rule a bill out of order after the distribution of a bill but the usual practice is that the Chair makes a ruling if the bill is out of order when the bill is first called for second reading. I stress to all hon. members that there is no deadline at which a point of order must be raised.

The second item that I want to raise is a request to the members of the Assembly, not in connection with this but in connection with something else. I had not anticipated the resilience or the ability of the members of the Assembly to stay here as long as they are here and I had taken upon myself to allow the use of the Assembly this Sunday, to the Girl Guides of Canada, for a cord presentation ceremony. Now they have traditionally had this ceremony in the Legislative Assembly. I want to ask members to co-operate with me and with the House and remove at the conclusion of today's sitting, papers

from the tops of their desks, put them in the drawers (I anticipate that the staff will lock the drawers if they are not already locked) and in genera I, tidy up their desks so that the ceremony can take place this Sunday. I would ask members to agree with that.

Agreed.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Kaeding that Bill No. 73 - **An Act to amend The Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act, 1970** be now read a second time.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, the bill in question was dealt with for some time last evening and I confess to getting a little excited about a bill I like this. As a matter of fact, early this morning I happened to make a stop out to my ranch and took a look at some cattle and I got upset all over again when I thought about it. So if I happen to get a trifle repetitive, then I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that you can bear with me.

Mr. Speaker, again, as I indicated last night, I think it is a real tragedy that we are even debating this bill. We are debating this bill, make no mistake about it, because of the theatrics and the gestures and the actions of my former colleagues to my right. (inaudible interjection) Well now, to the member for Kindersley, very shortly we shall see just who the maniac is and when you are accounting to whatever cattlemen you may have in your constituency, I sincerely hope that you can hold your head high.

Mr. Minister, Bill 73 is a totally unnecessary bill. When the Minister of Agriculture conjures up the allegations that it is a hot topic of resentment throughout this province and in the northern half of the province, the minister is misleading this Assembly and any other adjectives that you would care to put on it because that is unadulterated nonsense. The only people who are upset about that bill are those who have always been upset with the cattle check-off because they don't control it. It is the likes of the National Farmers' Union and the NDP types.

Mr. Minister, this entire bill is an attack on the concept that a livestock organization or a commodity group can have a national organization. Mr. Minister, there is nothing compulsory about the present system. A producer delivers his cattle into the yard and there is an automatic ten cents per head taken off. At the end of a year, if he sort of requires his money back or desires it back, he must only apply for it. Mr. Minister, last year I believe, about \$ 140,000 was collected. I believe the grand total in dollars for producers requesting back was less than \$ 1,000. Now you tell me where your ground swell is. Your ground swell is only within your executive assistants —

AN HON. MEMBER: — And in his head.

MR. THATCHER: — And in your head, right. It is total and unadulterated nonsense!

What is the minister proposing now? The minister is proposing a system where a producer will deliver his animals and he will then be asking the question, do I pay the checkoff or do I not?

Now, Mr. Minister, you know very well what is going to happen. Well maybe you do not

May 26, 1978

know what is going to happen because probably you and a few like you have not really delivered very many cattle to a stockyard, so maybe I should just tell you what that is like. It is something perhaps . . . (interjection - inaudible) . . . We will get to you legal types in a few moments, so just sit tight.

Mr. Minister, when you are delivering your cattle to the stockyards you have got to hassle to load them, probably, and you are in a line up, and you back up to that chute and you throw open that end gate and you may get kicked or something on the way by. You unload your cattle and it is not exactly the most pleasant experience in the world. The last thing you need to do is to be asking, am I going to pay 15 cents a head for these when I already had this kind of trouble. The odds are that you are going to say no.

Consequently, Mr. Minister, the amount you are going to collect in your checkoff fund is going to drop to one-half or one-third under this system. If it is taken on a basis where they can retrieve it at the end of the year, you can see what the result is. It is such an inconsequential amount to a producer that he is not even going to bother with it. But give him a chance right then and there, far and away the percentage is going to say. The heck with it. Why should I? I have enough costs right now, and maybe legitimately so.

Mr. Minister, these funds are necessary for the livestock organization just like similar funds and similar procedures are necessary to fund grain organizations or other commodity groups. But most important is that the national organization of the cattlemen, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, requires these funds to be a national body.

Mr. Minister, you know fully well that the cattle industry is big, big business. It is hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars. That is across Canada. You know fully well that an industry of that magnitude must have representation at the national level.

The Canadian Cattlemen's Association, whether you like it or not, is all that you have. Frankly, Mr. Minister, it is a pretty top-flight organization.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You pay for them.

MR. THATCHER: — Well you know, actually we do pay for them. How much have you ever put into it? I have probably put into that fund umpteen more than you will ever think about. But we will get around to your philosophy.

Mr. Minister, I think the tragedy of this is that any organization, whether it be grain or cattle, must have a national organization, and obviously any organization must have funds.

Now the type of organization that you people, with your philosophy, like is one that receives all its funds directly from you so that you can just press your thumb on them and you can screw them any time you want. Just turn the thumbscrew any time you want and they will knuckle under. That is the kind of organization you like.

The National Farmers' Union, \$25,000! They crank you into 'leadership training', I think they term it. Well that is fine, but has the Canadian Cattlemen's Association ever asked you for \$25,000? Hardly! All they ask from you is legitimate funding from the cattle population that is marketed in this province. There is nothing wrong with that. They do not come to you and ask you for an outright grant. Of course, that is what you people want. You want them to come to you. You want the funding to come directly from you because when that happens you can tighten those screws on them whenever you choose.

Under the present system, Mr. Minister, you cannot control them. Basically, when it comes down to it, what is it about that organization that really and truly upsets your government, aside from the fact that you cannot control them? It is because they will not accept your dogmatic philosophy that a marketing board is not in the best interests of the cattle industry. They make that assertion, supported by the vast majority of cattlemen, and that has been proven on many occasions. It was proven in Manitoba when an NDP government ran the most horrendously, corrupt, rigged election that any government could set up. It was a horrendous thing that you had to go through to become a voter in that particular little referendum or plebiscite. Mind you, if you were tied in to some government program and if you were getting a government grant or you were applying for something from the government, you are automatically a voter on that one. But if you weren't, then you had to go through a hassle of registering and writing in and filling out affidavits and yet, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows very well what the result of that election was. In that election the NDP government got a kick in

the teeth that it never recovered from. They got a kick in the teeth that may very well have played a significant role in the downfall of that government.

Mr. Minister, if you are so sure that cattlemen want a cattle marketing board in this province then Mr. Minister I defy you to put such a vote as was held in Manitoba to the cattlemen of this province, right now. Never mind the philosophical barbs from your side. Never mind the nonsense coming out of your off ice and from your backbenchers. I challenge you, not particularly as a backbencher and MLA over here, but I challenge you as a cattleman. Put it out front, left and centre and let's have a vote. Mr. Minister. I will make a little prediction for you that the cattle producers of this province, even though you will try and rig it just like the Schreyer government did in Manitoba, even though you will try and rig it in the most horribly, terrible fashion that they did, you will get kicked in about the same proportion as they did. And they had about 68 to 70 per cent of the cattlemen say an emphatic 'no', and that's an incredible figure. That's an incredible figure in almost any vote, but in a vote that was rigged like that one it is an unbelievable figure. Mr. Minister, I will say categorically you would be rejected in the same sort of a situation right here. You want to call me on that. I defy you to do it. But you won't, you won't Mr. Minister because you and your people aren't really all that big. You know, you are really very little people deep down and you haven't got the guts to do it.

However, Mr. Minister, how does your government do it? What do you do .. you are coming in the back door, sneak in the backyard, come down the back alley, sneak in the back door and come in with . . . (as my colleague for Moosomin says-just like Halloween, sneak in the back door and holler 'trick or treat'), very quietly and then nobody answers the door because they didn't hear you, then we start the tricks.

Mr. Minister, I would like to tell you a little bit about the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. You know the Minister of Agriculture should know all about them, but apparently you don't. Mr. Minister, even someone as limited as some of the people that are on that side of the House must recognize this cattle business can only operate on a North American market. If your philosophy of supply management and cattle subsidies was ever put into actual practise in this country then we would lose access to the most affluent market in the world, which is the American market. I'm sure even the Minister of Agriculture must know that not every American cattle group and every American agricultural group is particularly overjoyed . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — You said that last night.

MR. THATCHER: — I have some other things I am going to repeat too so if you are bored why don't you simply leave. If you are bored, or if it is really over your head, whatever the case may be, why don't you do it?

Mr. Minister, I am sure you are aware that not every American agriculture group is overjoyed at the prospect of Canadian cattle coming into the United States. I am sure that even the minister is aware that many of these groups have had very strong representations to Washington, to American sub-committees to bar Canadian cattle. Mr. Minister, I am sure that you are aware that with the situation as it is under supply management or subsidized beef, I am sure that many Secretaries of Agriculture, Mr. Berglund and his predecessor, stated categorically that subsidized beef (or what they viewed as subsidized cattle) would never be allowed on the American market.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Ah!

MR. THATCHER: — Well now, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan can holler like that all he wants and he is merely showing his ignorance. That is public record and I invite you to take a look at it. They have said categorically that they would never allow subsidized beef on the American market.

Mr. Minister, in this industry in Canada we cannot lose access to that American market. We don't have the kind of access we would like. The ultimate and the most desirable situation would be a completely open border with the Americans. Because, grant it, even the Minister of Agriculture, who finally broke his silence and said, what about American beef coming into Canada. Of course there is American beef coming into Canada. Where do you think much of your beef comes from into the hotel trade, where they want that fine cut that we don't even have a grade for up here. Obviously, it comes in from the United States and it has for 30 years. If the Minister of Agriculture didn't know that, well, among other things perhaps he didn't, but certainly, Mr. Minister, there must be a free flow back and forth. Sometimes it works to our advantage, sometimes it works to our disadvantage. Overall, year after year, it works to the advantage of the Canadian producer.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you that much of the work done by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association in Washington - the only group I might point out that was ever down there putting forward the Canadian case. The federal government wasn't appearing in front of that subcommittee. The provincial government of Saskatchewan wasn't down there and the provincial government of Alberta wasn't down there. The Ontario government wasn't down there. There was only the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. They were represented very capably by a Saskatchewanite by the name of Boyd Anderson. Unfortunately, they didn't get what they wanted but nonetheless we at least still do have some sort of access to that market.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people at this point in time want to take credit for the corporate roll over of provisions which are now going into effect in the present federal budget. The amendments are before the House. This is something that everybody jumped on the band wagon. Mr. Minister, at the time that I spent a year as a director of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, some years ago, the initial contact of what ultimately resulted on this corporate roll over came from a meeting of two people. Actually there was more than two. I've forgotten exactly who was there, but two of them I recall very well. A meeting was arranged between Johnathan Fox, one Boyd Anderson, with his own Minister of Finance, John Turner. That was the first time this corporate roll over, this capital gains exemption which is now being proposed and is now before the House of Commons, was ever presented. It didn't come into being very quickly. It took a lot of years but that is where the initial contact came from. Now, a lot of people are taking credit for it right now but Mr. Turner was the first one to hear it. Mr. Macdonald killed it and Mr. Chrétien has apparently looked at it very favourably.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one organization which has ever tried to negotiate rates with the railways for the transportation of cattle. Lots of people try and do it for grain but there is only one organization that has ever tried to negotiate with the railway for cattle. They haven't always had their way but they have been there attempting to make some sort of a negotiation. That, again, is the Canadian Cattlemen's Association.

Mr. Minister, surely I don't have to tell you about Can Fax. Surely, I don't have to tell you about Beef Watch. I am sure I don't have to tell you about the Beef Information Centre.

They were the first organization to really pinpoint what was going on with the importation of Oceanic beef. They were the first people to purpose to the federal government, to another socialist by the name of Mr. Whelan, the prospect of having a meat import law. Not a quota system as we presently have but a meat import law. Mr. Minister, these proposals didn't come from your government or from any provincial government. These sorts of proposals must come from a national organization and consequently, just like any other commodity group, the cattle industry must have a national organization.

Mr. Minister, I respectfully suggest to you, that it is essential that we have a national voice in the cattle industry and that you do a very grave disservice to the industry and the producers in this province, who, I might point out, are some of the great beneficiaries of some of the actions of this national organization. Mr. Minister, there is only one thing the Canadian Cattlemen's Association does that offends your government and that is they are opposed to the concept of marketing boards. That is the only thing. The rest of it is pretty well straightforward. They have never intervened in any provincial issues as such. They stayed out of that Manitoba affair. They stayed out of the hassle we had here in the business four or five years ago. I don't think you can document a case where they have ever intervened in any provincial issue. Certainly provincial members or provincial boards of directors or members which may be from that province, certainly they may get involved, as is their right. As an organization they have never intervened in provincial affairs. I am sure they never would. Frankly they have no right to, were they to do so, I am sure they would get flak from their own membership. The only thing that they have ever done to you is to oppose the concept of marketing boards. Mr. Minister, again I say, the vast majority of cattlemen oppose the concept of marketing boards. If you dispute that, again if you dispute that, I challenge you to take it to the producers!

Now, Mr. Minister, I suppose we are into the tragedy part and the part that really upsets me. At least let the people across the floor — I know where you stand philosophically, I don't agree with it but I respect your positions on it. As much as I may disagree with you, philosophically, at least I know where you stand. We know that you are of dogmatic, socialist, Trotskyite philosophy; we know that you want to control everything; we know that you would destroy anything that would stand on its own feet, anything that you cannot control by putting your hands and tightening the screws on them you oppose. From you we expect this sort of stuff. Bill 73 coming from a government like yours— fine, I can accept that, I know where you stand. I suppose I should expect that.

Mr. Minister, since I have been in this Assembly in 1975 there have not been very many times that I could do very much about the legislation that comes from that side of the House. You have always had a majority of about 39 to 22. We can't change that; there are only 22 of us on this side. What you really decide to do you can do. That is, unless the people up on top who sit above the Speaker, unless they really let you have it, you have a licence to do whatever you want.

Mr. Speaker, last week was a unique situation, at least for those of us on the opposition side, certainly for me on the backbenches.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're sick!

MR. THATCHER: — My goodness, goosey gander is here, isn't he!

Mr. Minister we had a chance to kill a bill, an opportunity that doesn't come all that

often. Mr. Minister, when it was proposed to this caucus that the business of the entire Assembly could be expedited by extending the hours, putting in a little extra time and effort in the process, that we might get out next weekend in exchange for dropping Bill 73, the prospects sure appealed to me as a cattleman who is very strongly and violently opposed to everything that this bill stands for. Obviously I had to be pretty excited about that. When you looked on the order paper, what was left? We had a little bit to do on the Heritage Fund but basically what had been said had been said. There really wasn't a great deal to do that we couldn't have done very quickly had we taken a little bit of rhetoric out and gotten down to brass tacks, we could have done that. There was the Executive Council and the Premier. Well, normally that one doesn't take all that long; there really isn't all that much to do there unless you really want to. Then there was the Attorney General's department — certainly there are some things to do there I'm sure, but nothing that would have taken a tremendous volume of time, nothing that we couldn't have accomplished by sitting a morning, extending an afternoon, extending an evening, if really essential to perhaps have gone into a Saturday. So Mr. Minister, when the opportunity was there to drop Bill 73 and one looked down the order paper — (Interjection, You forgot the Provincial Secretary.) Oh, excuse me, I apologize, the Provincial Secretary was left. That one may have taken some time. I am sorry. Nonetheless when that opportunity was there, Mr. Speaker, very definitely this caucus looked favourably on that, to pull this bill. Then, Mr. Speaker, the unbelievable happened. I really wonder what went on in the inner workings of that party? Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) didn't want to get that bill pulled. I cannot believe that my colleague from Shaunavon (Mr. Anderson), a cattleman and a respected member of the stockgrowers didn't want to get that bill pulled. I can't believe that my former colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, frankly, one of the better MLAs in this Assembly, and a cattleman and a man who has a lot of cattlemen in his constituency, I can't believe that that member didn't want to see that bill pulled. Mr. Minister. I find it very difficult to believe that these three MLAs didn't want to see that bill killed.

Then, Mr. Speaker, something very strange happened. The friends on my right would simply not agree to expediting the House business in order to get this bill killed, killed, pulled, excuse me, killed, pulled, killed.

MR. KRAMER: — Too bad your mother hadn't been on it!

MR. THATCHER: — You know, to the Minister of Highways, if you were about 20 years younger I would make you pay for that one. I am sure that you think that is funny, don't you? You are a pathetic individual that is nothing worse than scum. You are the rottenest individual, with the foulest mouth of anybody I have had the misfortune to meet in that Assembly, and ask me to withdraw that! You are a scum!

Mr. Speaker, returning back to my individuals to my right. I really don't know what happened when the people to the right, when they refused to pull that bill. Mr. Minister, I can only speculate knowing some of the individuals rather well, I can only speculate that what happened was that these cattlemen were overruled in that caucus by those who wanted to make some political propaganda off of taking some strips off the Premier. They wanted to go head to head against the Premier, or wanted to score some political points for some sort of another campaign by going head to head against the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what has happened in this Assembly this week, and what has transpired and really, not a great deal has happened. The Premier brought in his

Estimates and certainly it is fair game, go after the Premier, on his Executive Council . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I have been following the member for Thunder Creek and I have followed him through Manitoba, Oceanic beef, and now we are on the Premier's Estimates. I want to caution the member that he is obliged to speak to the bill before the House. The Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act. 1970. He should confine his remarks to that in order to be in order.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker. I shall certainly restrict myself to the guidelines that you have put down.

Mr. Speaker, again, I believe it is a tragedy that when this bill could very well have been pulled, a bill that we do not really have to be dealing with and it has to be a tragedy. I can only speculate and the reasons why it was not, was that, perhaps, those who chose to use this week for other campaigns, other than the duties of this Assembly, perhaps, came to rule this caucus to my right.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to the cattle industry, to the members to my right, that the cattle industry will not forget the events of last week.

Mr. Minister, we in this caucus, would like to end this session as quickly as possible. Certainly we want this bill pulled. We have asked you to pull this bill on numerous occasions. We asked you in the question period. You have refused. Again, I will ask you, please pull this bill and let's get on with the business of the Assembly.

Mr. Minister, there are two main provisions of this bill that we simply can't accept and we propose these as amendments and we will make them in the Committee of the Whole, if it must go that far.

1. We, in this caucus, cannot accept the concept that there will not be funding to the parent organization of the cattle industry. We simply cannot accept the concept that we do not have the right to a national organization. We cannot accept the concept that it is in the best interest of Saskatchewan producers to eliminate the direct funding to that organization under the provisions of this bill as it now exists. It is certainly contrary to the interests of every producer in this province.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, we are going to put an amendment to that effect in Committee of the Whole if, in fact, we go that far.

Mr. Minister, secondly, we cannot accept the make-up, the concepts and the powers that are being removed from the former board and being placed in the board which you are now setting up. Certainly I think it was a step in the right direction when you proposed to restore the stock growers to their former place; that is having two members. To some extent I questioned the representation by the cow-calf group solely on the basis that I do not think they have had sufficient time to demonstrate that they are a bona fide and long-lasting organization. They may very well be at some point in time, but I will point out to you that last fall when they had their annual convention and they had the federal Minister of Agriculture as a guest speaker, they had less than 100 people in attendance. I suggest to you that that is really not a bona fide organization at this point in time. They may very well be so, and if they are representing some cattlemen with a diverse point of view from the Saskatchewan Stock Growers, then very definitely give them a seat on that board. But again I suggest to you that at this point in time I think

such a move is premature. In six months or a year, it may very well not be.

Mr. Minister, basically then, let me make it very clear to you that one of our primary objections to this bill that we cannot accept the concept of no funding to the national organization. This we contend, in the strongest possible terms, is completely contrary to the interests of beef producers, no matter where they may be in this province.

Again I point out to you that the only thing wrong with the Canadian Cattlemen's Association as far as it pertains to the ND Party is that they reject the concept of marketing boards. That is all. Other than that they are basically a-political, as far as the provincial government is concerned.

Secondly, Mr. Minister, we believe that the dollars involved in this fund must be controlled not by the government but by the people who sit on that board. In other words, the board must be restored to its former powers.

In order to expedite the work of this Assembly and to proceed in other areas and perhaps wind down this Assembly as quickly and as expeditiously as possible, I urge you, Mr. Minister or somebody from the Treasury Benches, as soon as I sit down, to respond that you can accept the concept of the two suggestions that I have made to you. If you can accept the concept of those and if somebody can respond to that, then Mr. Minister I suggest to you let's get on with the business of winding this Assembly down and getting where we should be, which is out of here.

Mr. Minister, again I am going to sit down and hopefully if you can respond to those two particular items, then let's get on with expediting the process of getting out of this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS): — Hear, hear!

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by directing a few comments to the member for Thunder Creek, who is so badly misinformed or has such a serious lack of understanding about the processes of this Legislature, the responsibilities of members of this Legislature and the kind of work that opposition members can hope to do in the Legislature.

The member for Thunder Creek has a serious problem personally and that is that his mouth is generally in road gear and his brain is generally in neutral.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I would ask the member to withdraw any personal remarks he makes about other members, since the level of debate in the House is to be on issues and not on personalities. I will ask the member to withdraw the comments.

MR. CAMERON: — Where were you when he was called a scum?

MR. McMILLAN: — Mr. Speaker, I withdraw absolutely any personal remarks I would have intended to make towards anyone. I would like to speak for awhile about some of the positions taken with respect to this bill by different members of the Legislature and different caucuses in the Legislature because the positions that have been taken have led us inevitably to the position that we are in today with respect to this piece of legislation.

The member for Thunder Creek (and I hope that is not being too personal about the

member because some would argue whether in fact he is a member for Thunder Creek) makes the point that, had the Liberal Party agreed to have the bill withdrawn last week, this debate would not be necessary today. I genuinely feel sorry for the member for Thunder Creek in his apparent lack of understanding about the procedures that take place in this Legislature and his apparent lack of understanding about the situation that exists with this piece of legislation and any other piece of legislation that might be introduced in this House.

The entire question of the kind of negotiations that were going on, though generally private negotiations that go on to try and improve the position (in this case of the cattle producers in Saskatchewan) by the opposition, the fact that those were made public at a very indiscreet time, that may not even become the question of the debate here. The question is that certain members of the opposition (and none of those in the Liberal Party I might add) were completely prepared (and I repeat this) completely prepared to sell out the public's business in this Legislature for a three or four month delay in the introduction of a piece of legislation and I hope the member for Thunder Creek isn't leaving because he may learn something about this if he sticks around. I guess he doesn't intend to raise his level of knowledge, so I will proceed in any event.

The minister has stated that he was prepared (I suspect at the insistence of the Attorney General) to withdraw this piece of legislation if the members agreed to an early prorogation of the House. By early I assume that the minister responsible for the Attorney General's department and the House Leader, by early I assume he meant proroguing before we would normally have prorogued. What does that mean? That means in order to have an early prorogation one must sacrifice some of the things we would normally have done in this Legislature in order to get the business of this Legislature done in a full and complete manner. The member for Thunder Creek was completely prepared to accept that early prorogation, that elimination of doing some of the House business, in order for a three or four month delay in the implementation of this legislation. I will tell you why. The Minister responsible for the Department of Agriculture, in this piece of legislation in the newspaper, Leader Post, when asked about withdrawing the bill, gave an indication that the bill could wait until the fall and that he suspects that's what we will do. So, did members in the Legislature really gain anything by caving in and not going ahead with business in this House that should have been done for a three month or four month delay in the legislation? I say, no. The Leader of the Liberal Party said that in some respects the advances made to our caucus by the Attorney General bordered on blackmail. That the Attorney General came to the Liberal caucus and said that if you will give in on the Premier's Estimates, on my Estimates and on several pieces of legislation, then we will pull the cattle bill. Now I don't know if that's blackmail or not, but it's certainly indiscreet coercion.

Now what was the position taken by the Liberal Party? Well we very much, very much want to see this piece of legislation removed from the books, the proposed amendments in Saskatchewan. We very much wanted to see that piece of legislation removed, not for three months which would satisfy the member for Thunder Creek and his questionable colleagues. That wasn't enough for the Liberal Party. We wanted to see this legislation removed with some degree of permanence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — Well, what were we faced with? We could have laid down in the House business. We could have succumbed to the kind of blackmail that the Attorney General wanted to bring into this House. We could have done that, but I tell you

something right now our members were not prepared to forego the public's interest in this House for a three month delay in a piece of legislation. Some argue that the Conservative Party's principles have (and you listen to this really good, because I always thought you a man of principle), some people really questioned whether or not you people had any principles in this House. What your motives really were. But I will tell you something. You are off the hook now because they don't question that any more. They don't question it any more. The fact that you would give in, you would shirk your responsibilities to do the public business for a three month delay and your own supposed, conceived political advantage on this issue, explains very clearly to the people of Saskatchewan what kind of principles you have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS): — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I can forgive the member for Thunder Creek his decision because his lack of discretion with this matter may be consistent with his approach to all legislation that we face in this House. The strange thing is that the cattle producers whose interests we are really here to protect, it is very uncharacteristic of the cattlemen in this province who have developed the tenacity over years of highs and lows in the market and struggles with the cattle industry who have developed the utmost principles in their operation, it is really strange for you people to think that the cattle producers could buy the argument that a three-month hoist on this bill was sufficient if you people would sell out. .

Now I say that you people have finally developed a plank in your platform as a result of your position on this bill. It is called the 'Conservative philosophy' — sell out and get out. (inaudible interjection) Well that's fine. That may be the way you operate. That's not the way the cattle producers in Saskatchewan operate and it is not the way the Liberal caucus operates in this province.

We were very, very interested in the Attorney General's offer to have this bill withdrawn and we sort of came to the conclusion that if the government was prepared to withdraw this bill simply by having the House adjourn a few days earlier, or prorogue a few days early, then they couldn't really have had their teeth and their spirit behind that bill in the first instance. That was the conclusion we came to and we felt that where there was a little smoke there might be a lot of fire and we should maybe pursue this entire question a little more strenuously so that we might get more than a three-month delay in this piece of legislation which would satisfy the Tories short term political interest but would not solve any problems for the stock growers.

Well, we decided that we wouldn't sell out the public's interest in this House because we are not ashamed of the money we get paid as MLA's because we are here to earn it. I don't doubt that some members of this Legislature feel guilty about the salary that they take because perhaps they're not quite convinced in their own minds that they are here to do the public's work. They recently proved that. There is an old saying that the proof is in the pudding and I have been confident since the day I got elected that the position you take on other pieces of legislation, and particularly on this piece of legislation, will, in the long run, sell in the country, not sell in the way that you people wanted it but sell — people are going to get the idea of exactly what you are all about, particularly with respect to this piece of legislation. You had the opportunity to get in here with the Liberal Party and fight this piece of legislation and make some worthwhile changes. Not a chance! The member for Estevan and the member for Moosomin are quite prepared to sell out the Premier's Estimate, the Attorney General's Estimate and several other

important pieces of legislation to have this bill pulled for three months.

I say, if that's your philosophy — sell out and get out; well you might as well get out because you don't do a bit of good for the people of Saskatchewan in here. Some of the opposition members don't feel that the role of opposition members is worthwhile and some of the members, one in particular, have said that you don't accomplish a thing in here as the opposition. Again, I say, get out if you don't feel you are doing anything. Get out!

The member says that the only reason that bill wasn't pulled was because of the Liberals. There may be some truth in that. I know that the member hesitates to go on and explain why or explain what the alternatives were. He knows himself what the alternative was — a nice three-month delay in this legislation and a commitment from the Minister of Agriculture that the bill would be re-introduced in the fall. Maybe it is difficult for you to understand. I don't know. I'm quite confident that we can, through a concerted effort in the opposition, reasoned arguments and applying what pressure we are able to apply from the opposition, get some worthwhile changes to this bill.

I expect that if the Conservative Party now sees that there may have been in fact, a better opportunity to bring changes in and simply pulling the bill for three months, that they may have second thoughts about it and decide that might be the route to go. I hope so. It would be politically wise for them but if that is the case, then they will probably do the opposite.

The other question is of course, and the member for Thunder Creek pointed out that if we had had this bill pulled, we could have had it pulled last week. I asked the member for Estevan who is one of the few people with the courage to sit in his chair and break the decorum of the Tory Party with his heckling, I ask you if we would, today, have the opportunity to amend this bill to better suit the needs of stock growers in this province if we had had it pulled? That is a very difficult question perhaps for the member for Estevan, and I'll answer it for you. The question — the answer is, no. we wouldn't have the opportunity to amend it. We wouldn't have the opportunity to amend it and we don't need your misguided help in getting this bill amended. I think we are going to be successful at it. I really think we are going to be successful. We don't need your help at it. I want you to appreciate the fact that we still have the opportunity today to make some worthwhile changes in this bill because the Liberal Party wasn't prepared to sell out the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — I expect maybe there is something for you to reflect upon.

MR. KATZMAN: — Neil, why do change the . . .

MR. McMILLAN: — O.K. I'll repeat it once more, maybe the members to my left consider it a real victory to have the bill pulled for three months. I don't know, maybe you do. I wouldn't be surprised if you considered that a real victory. If that is all you are interested in, then fine, pull the bill for three months, that's your position. The stock growers know that today. They know that you wanted to postpone that battle for three months. That's fine, that is your position, you are welcome to it.

There are some fundamental problems with the bill, some fundamental reasons why we don't want to see this same piece of legislation re-introduced in the fall. There are some

problems with this piece of legislation. The principle behind the bill, the principle of a voluntary checkoff, or at least in the words of the hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale when he was in the House, the voluntary refund, that principle is a good principle — primarily because it is voluntary. Secondly, because those funds are put in the hands of a board which I say honestly represents the interests of the cattle industry and those funds are designed to be used to promote the beef industry in this province and in every manner that is possible. I say that is a good principle. We don't want to change the principle of that bill. It was brought in by a Liberal Party in 1970, there were amendments made to it by the hon. member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) in 1972 which even expanded the possibilities of those funds being used in the good of the beef industry. We come today with a piece of legislation that we say will hamper the good work that can be done by that checkoff. We are putting our resistance to that. We don't want to see the good work that can be done by those representatives of the cattle industry hampered by your amendments. We want to see those amendments changed at least in spirit so that the cattle industry and their representatives can continue to do the good work that they have done in the past.

What kind of good work have they done? Well, they have funded in the past special projects carried out by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and very recently I understand, at the suggestion of the government representative on the board, they have decided to make a blanket payment to the CCA instead of several payments to the CCA for special projects. What did they do with the money that went? Well, first, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association had two separate budgets; they had the beef information centre budget which funds the Beef Information Centre in Toronto, Calgary, Montreal and Vancouver. These centres are staffed with home economists and these offices carry out consumer education and education in schools and the media, extension work to promote beef as a food product for consumers. Well I say that is good for the beef industry. It is darn good for the beef industry in Saskatchewan. The Beef Information Centre discusses with government such regulations affecting beef products, as bacterial levels in food, packaging regulations, labelling of products and general beef promotion. Now they do work on behalf of beef producers to try to see that our product is put before the public in as honest and open a manner as possible, that we provide as beef producers the best possible product. I say that is good work for the voluntary checkoff fund.

The CCA budget is used for the following purposes: Canpax, market information program; a beef watch program, a new program managed by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association which does comprehensive studies about the numbers of beef cattle in production and the projected demand etc. Good information, it assists beef producers in doing some planning of their own industry. It allows a cattleman, like the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and myself to get some help when deciding what percentage of your cow herd to cull, what our levels of production will be within our own special requirements. It helps us in that respect. The CCA is also the only organization that represents beef producers that carries out negotiations at an international level for the promotion of the Saskatchewan and Canadian beef industry. I say that is worthwhile, our own vested interest working on our behalf to try to improve international relations and bring to fruition some desire by Canadian cattle producers to have an equitable system of imports and exports. I say that's money well spent. The CCA also acts as the only beef representation on the Transportation Committee that discusses and recommends freight rates and handling procedures for live cattle. With the railroads, yes, but also with the trucking companies. I say that's money well spent on behalf of Saskatchewan beef producers and I don't want to see that come to an end. The CCA, as well, is the only recognized spokesman of the beef industry to the federal Department

of Animal Health which sets the regulations regarding imports and exports, sets the regulations regarding transportation of livestock from one province to another and sets the general health requirements of our beef cattle in Saskatchewan and in Canada. I say that's money well spent on behalf of the beef producers of Saskatchewan and it is no wonder that these beef producers want to leave their money in that fund to work for them.

The CCA in conjunction with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has been responsible in large part for the changes in tax regulations as they affect producers in Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada, particularly the changes in the capital gains tax. These are worthwhile changes, work well done by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association on behalf of Saskatchewan stock producers. I say money well spent by the Saskatchewan stock producers.

It is interesting to note, and I pointed out a few moments earlier, that this is a voluntary program. The producers in Saskatchewan have the option of funding these projects. If they don't think that the funds that went to the Canadian Cattlemen's Association were worthwhile, or those funds that supported the Beef Information Centre or the Beef Watch Program, or the Canpax Program or the work we do on international relations, transportation, animal health or taxation, if those beef producers don't think that work is worthwhile what option do they have open to them? They can ask for their money back. That is a luxury that most taxpayers in this country don't have. We have that with our voluntary checkoff and I say that should be preserved in principle as well as practice. Those people have the opportunity to show the board that administer that fund whether they are in favour with the payments that go or not.

Let me tell you what happened in 1977 with respect to the checkoff fund. Mr. Speaker, \$147,845 was paid in by Saskatchewan producers, a substantial amount. That money was used to help with the kind of projects that the CCA administers and other organizations. Do you know how much of that money was refunded at the request of the producers? Mr. Speaker, \$951 out of a total of \$150,000. I think that says a lot about the kind of programs that the administrative board was recommending our expenditure of funds on. I say it says a mouthful about it. And those producers in Saskatchewan, the minister says they may be a majority, if they don't like what's going on let them apply for their refund. It's a simple process.

I'll tell you where the anomaly lies, the real question in my mind. The minister is opposed to this board using voluntary funds to fund national organizations. That may very well be the case. I say if he is opposed to it he should go out and tell farmers that our money is being poorly spent and ask them to submit for the refund at the end of the year. That's fine, that's his option. Farmers now have that choice. They don't need you to make that choice for them.

But I'll tell you what happens on the other side of the coin. I just pointed out that it's a luxury to be able to pay a tax and voluntarily have the option of getting it back if you didn't like the way your tax dollars were spent. I think that's a great system. Do you know what the people of Saskatchewan and our producers have been doing for the last four years? They have been paying an involuntary tax to the National Farmers' Union, a national organization which many, many producers in Saskatchewan don't necessarily agree with, but do we, as livestock producers, have the option of getting a refund on the money that we spend in taxes that goes to support that organization? No, we don't. That's too bad. There are two different sets of rules. One set of rules for people whose money is used to fund worthwhile projects, some of them administered by the CCA and

another set of rules for producers whose money is used to fund the National Farmers' Union. That bothers me. Mr. Speaker, \$100,000 in the last four years in direct grants to the National Farmers' Union. I'll tell the minister right now, as a cattle producer and as a farmer, I don't want my tax dollar going to the NFU. I tell you that very openly. Not today, I don't. I would love to have the option of going and reclaiming my portion of that \$100,000 because I don't consider it well spent. Maybe many people in Saskatchewan do, but I don't. I have the option with the voluntary checkoff of going and asking for my tax dollars, 10 cents a head, to be refunded to me. I say that is a good thing and that in itself is opportunity enough for producers in Saskatchewan to disagree with that program. I hope you don't intend to change the thrust of that situation. I really hope you don't. Let the board that represents those producers - and I say it is adequately representative of the producers in Saskatchewan - let that board make that decision. You don't give us the opportunity to make the decision with respect to the NFU. At least give us the opportunity to make our own decisions with respect to our voluntary checkoff fund. That is not asking a lot.

The minister has pointed out his quarrel with the funding of the national organization, in his speech, and I won't pursue it any further. But I would like to ask him one thing and I hope he will be agreeable to providing me with the information that I request.

When this bill was initially introduced in 1970, the Minister of Agriculture made one thing very clear to the Legislative Assembly and I hope the minister listens to this.

D. T. McFarlane, the Minister of Agriculture, moved second reading of the bill, then numbered 69, an Act respecting Voluntary Deductions made for the Marketing of Cattle. Here is what he said. He said, in many respects, the same thing that the Minister of Agriculture said.

I have had many representations, repeated resolutions and requests for this legislation have been presented to myself . . .

All right, that is what he said. Now, you got up in this House and you said, I have had many, many people ask me to bring in these changes. Many, people. We said, O.K. tell us who they were. Give us some indication. And I don't believe the minister agreed to do that. O.K. I say, tell us who, give us some evidence. Tell us when and where and how and what form that resolution came in.

Do you know what the Minister of Agriculture did in 1970? He said, 'I will tell you who wants this piece of legislation. I will tell you who.' And he told you. He said, 'Requests for this legislation has been presented to myself by the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association, the Saskatchewan Cattle Breeders' Association and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture which have been supported by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Saskatchewan Holstein Friesen Association, the Saskatchewan Livestock Board and several other organizations. Resolutions and briefs were received as follows..', and then he proceeded to outline the requests that had been made to him for the past three years by agricultural organizations asking him to bring in legislation of this kind. I say, good. That is what a minister should be prepared to do, give the people that he represents and the people of Saskatchewan some indication of the motivation for this act or the changes to this act. That was given to him December 1967. Agricultural Extension District Board No. 3, January 1968 - Saskatchewan Cattle Breeders' Association, February 1968 - Saskatchewan Holstein Friesen Association; March 1968 - Saskatchewan Stockgrowers; January 1969 - Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture; January 1969 - Saskatchewan

May 26, 1978

Stockgrowers' Association, again; January 1969 - Saskatchewan Livestock Board; January 1969 - Saskatchewan Cattle Breeders; February 1969 - Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Make note of that! April 1 1969 - Agricultural Extension District Board No. 9; June 1969 -Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, again; January 1970, again, from the Saskatchewan Livestock Board.

Now he told the members of this Legislature what prompted him to bring this legislation in and he gave documented evidence. We have asked the Minister of Agriculture to give us some indication of by whom and when and how you have been motivated to bring in these amendments and you have refused to do that.

I am a little sceptical about the motivation you have received. I think it came, primarily, from your NFU supporters and that is the end of it.

I would like to think that in final reading, your final debate, that you would be prepared to offer those things to us.

The other question that needs to be answered is, who represents the board that makes the decisions about where the money goes?

Well, firstly, that is the government's decision because they drew up the act and they said who shall sit on it. The SSGA (Saskatchewan Stockgrowers) has two members. I believe, currently, Parrin and Anderson, Don Parrin and Boyd Anderson. Parrin, of course, well respected, long time involved in the Saskatchewan Stock Growers' movement and other related associations.

Boyd Anderson. who was an avid stock grower supporter, who is also currently the president of the SARM, who is also quite a notable organization and one that I think has and deserves a great deal of respect in this province. There were two members. One member of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture who happens to be Bill Marshall, Vice-President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which supposedly represents over 70,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, many of them cattle producers. He is a well respected man in the Wheat Pool. One member from the Cattle Breeders Association is Frank Ednoste, a well respected cattle breeder in Saskatchewan, a pure- bred man, highly respected by cattle producers of all political stripes. One Consumers Branch, the NFU . . . Fine. She was there. Maybe she made a real contribution, I don't know. The NFU apparently wasn't interested in sitting on the board because they didn't support the principle of a checkoff. That's fine. One government representative is Ernie Spence from the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture. This board took funds from producers and this board collectively decided where that money would be spent, which projects would be funded and which organizations. For anyone in this province to get up and overrule the decisions of that board or attempt to emasculate the direction in which they sent those funds is almost bordering on heresy. Do you know what you have said, firstly, to the SSGA representative? Your government has said to the cattle producers that SSGA represents that their representative on the board doesn't know what he is talking about. It's pretty serious. You said to the cattle producer, the other one, stock grower Boyd Anderson who also happens to represent the rural municipalities in Saskatchewan, that he doesn't know what he is talking about, that he is wrong. You said to Bill Marshall of the Wheat Pool, that he doesn't know what he is doing with his voluntary funds from producers. That's what you said to him. You said the same thing to Frank Ednoste, a man who knows the cattle business and who knows what is good for the cattle business and you said the same thing to those other board

members who are involved. I say that is shameful. We had the luxury here of having a voluntary tax administered by ourselves, a fine situation and you people set out to destroy that. I say that is shameful.

We feel, and I have stated earlier, we felt that a simple three month withdrawal of this bill would not accomplish anything. We felt that; I think the other members of this Legislature understood that. It's too bad that the Conservative Party has decided to try to make political gains with the stock growers at our expense and certainly at the expense of the Saskatchewan stock growers and the board that represents cattle producers in this province. I say that's too bad. We have come to expect it from the Conservative Party and it wasn't really a surprise. But I say that is shameful. We weren't satisfied with the three months withdrawal and I have explained to you why. It wouldn't solve anything. What we would like to do is see some changes made in this act which would allow the board that represents the cattle producers, some independence about where they apply those funds. I'd like to see some changes and I'll tell you, we are going to be making some amendments.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Are you?

MR. McMILLAN: — And I know the Minister responsible for the DNS is quite interested because there are a lot of cattle within the purview. I know that. I know that for a fact and I know that is why you have remained in your seat while I was speaking, aside from the fact that you are generally enthralled with my remarks because the subject interests you.

We will be amending the act and I read the following amendment that we will be bringing in.

That subsection (1) of section (3) be amended by striking out the word 'fifteen' where it appears in the fourth line thereof and substituting the word 'twenty' therefore.

And what this would do would be to raise the limit that could be deducted as a checkoff from 15 cents to 20 cents. All right, it simply gives the board that represents these producers more room. Producers don't like it. If they don't like 20 cents a head being deducted, if in fact that's what happens, if they don't like 15 cents a head being deducted, they can apply for a refund. That's their right.

We would also like to make the amendment that section 4 of the printed bill be deleted and that the following sections 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 be renumbered, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 respectively.

This change would put the board in a position again where it was not strictly advisory but where it could, in itself, administer that fund within the regulations set down in legislation or within the legislation.

If we can accomplish those amendments, I think we will have made improvements to this amending bill, improvements that are far, far more worthwhile than a simple three month hoist on the bill. I think anyone who would approach this issue with any semblance of common sense would have to admit that those changes would do the cattle producers of this province far more good than a simple delay in the legislation.

I hope, when we get to Committee of the Whole and when we introduce our amendments, that all members of this House will accept them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. McMILLAN: — The Minister of Agriculture has stated that he will give serious consideration to some of the amendments that are put forward by the opposition. I ask him to watch for our amendments because we are really serious about getting them through. We think it would be a good improvement to your bill and we ask for your support and the support of all members of this Legislature at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. N. VICKAR (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House this morning a group of students from the James Smith School in the Melfort constituency. Mr. Speaker, we have about 15 students accompanied by their teacher, Miss Debbie Zazelenchuk, from Beatty and their bus driver. I am sorry I didn't get their bus driver's name this morning. They have been on the road now for at least a couple of days. They have been camping and touring and they are on their way home this afternoon. I want to welcome them to the House this morning and I hope they find this morning's business in the House interesting and educational and I wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, Bill 73, when you first look at it, indicates some very drastic changes and one of the most drastic changes obviously will be the funding and the administration of how it will be spent.

Most members of this House, from the speakers previously, realize that the funds have been spent on programs to benefit and promote the livestock industry within the province of Saskatchewan and outside its boundaries, where we in this province will benefit because of that enterprise, be it the Beef Information Centre in Montreal or be it the trip to some other parts of the world to promote our cattle. In fact, in the last year, I happened to see a group of swine leave from my constituency for Mexico and it was developed because of a grant given by the cattle checkoff.

Now it is interesting to note that the cattle checkoff even arranges for some assistance for swine. Then it is interesting to notice that in the Hog Marketing Commission, I understand that they pay 80 cents on each animal and some of that money is given for promotion, both inside and outside of the province of Saskatchewan. But I note that the producers there don't have the right to ask for some of their money back. I understand, as I say, the figure is 80 cents and I understand that you can't ask for your portion back because you don't like the way they are advertising or doing the program. So by comparison there we are very democratic, we allow you to claim your money back if you so wish at the end of the year, and I think all members who have spoken so far have alluded to the figures. It is a nominal amount that is being asked back. The programs are very beneficial.

One of the questions that I ask myself is, as I look to see where some of the money is being spent by this board, one of the areas comes very strongly and it is called Canada, or Canadian Western Agribition. Well we all know we are pretty proud of Agribition here in this province and I think that maybe some of the credit goes to a former government

which was led by the father of the present member for Thunder Creek. Agribition is our show place for cattle and you notice that since 1971 approximately \$150,000 has gone to Agribition from the cattle checkoff. I'm certain anybody out in the industry has no hard feelings about his three or four or five dollars that might have gone to assist one of the greatest promotions this province has got for the livestock industry.

I'm also certain that none of us were concerned about the Cattlemen's Association having an office in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver to explain the benefits of eating beef which is produced in western Canada and other areas. The amount that we contribute is proportioned to the amount we receive. Therefore, why are we arguing against the using of the funds by the cattle people to promote our beef, our cattlemen in other areas of this country? I'm surprised that the minister so strongly feels that we shouldn't do that. I think this is one of the good concepts that the Canadian Cattlemen's Association has done by promoting our beef, be it Montreal, but remember we don't eat everything that we produce here. We are exporters of our beef and, therefore, we must sell our product as anybody else does and one of the ways to sell our product is a checkoff, which gives 10 cents to a group. They take the funds, a group of men and one lady, I understand, and decide where best to spend this money by the applications they receive. If they don't receive any applications for funds, the funds can't be spent. But when people apply they consider the application and will allot funds along that line. Some programs, I understand, are turned down. Some programs are accepted. The key is the value to the industry.

As some of us may know, several years ago, I believe 1975 was the year, there was a book produced by the Saskatchewan Department of Industry and Commerce. It was called The Saskatchewan Livestock Buyers Guide. In it it indicated all the areas and people that you could talk to about different breeds of cattle. This is sponsored by the government and sent to many areas of the area so people who were looking for purebred livestock would get involved and come and see these people. Another piece of literature that was put out was, Saskatchewan Livestock for World Markets. Now, I'm sorry I can't read Chinese, but there was Chinese edition as well put out as the English edition. Therefore, we are now going into the world market promoting our beef and our pork and our sheep in this brochure. Yet, you are saying to the Canadian cattlemen, you have no right to do this. You have no right to promote our beef in other countries, in other areas from this checkoff. Only, we, the government of Saskatchewan has that right. That's wrong. That's producers' money. The producers put it into a fund. If they don't want to spend for that group they'll take it back. They can apply but the producers leave it there for the board to decide where to spend this money. They chose projects; let's look at some of these projects. Information, the Beef Carcass Grading System. I think we all know, any of us that are in the industry that several years ago the carcass grading system was changed. Some of us may not agree with it. Some of us may agree with it. It has been a benefit to the industry and who worked for this to make sure it came about and where did they get the funds? Well, they got \$5,000 and the stock growers are the people who did the work. Now, are we telling them that they can't do work for the betterment of all of us within the province. If it so happens that they combine with Manitoba or Alberta or Ontario to work together, to work as a stronger unified group, are we telling them that they can't have money from our checkoff That seems to be what the minister seems to be indicating. I don't think that's what we want to do. We want to make the best markets available to our cattlemen. The way to do it is by having an organization that can get out and lobby to make sure that that happens.

As the member for Thunder Creek said earlier today, the only group that went before

Washington to argue Canada's case was the Canadian cattlemen. Therefore, that must prove something in that alone. Past history proves that these people are doing a job on behalf of all of us. The governments weren't there, as the member for Thunder Creek indicated, so, therefore, why are we starting to say, no? Something that bothers me when we look at the checkoff, I keep thinking of another fund that is around that is administered the same way. It's called the Horn Fund and I think the minister knows the fund I'm referring to. I'm always concerned that the next change we'll see is that the Horn Fund will not be able to be used by the producers for research and so forth. I think earlier in this debate one of the members referred to a program done by the University of Saskatchewan, referring to scours. Now I know the Minister of Agriculture (yesterday I understand) bought a calf from the Premier. As the minister may know, scours was a problem for many years within the livestock industry and was very costly because a lot of our calves were getting scours, and treatments were not available to readily solve the problem. Therefore there was a grant to the University of Saskatchewan, the veterinarians, who went out and spent time doing research. Today, most of us who have any problems with scours can readily go to the university or to our veterinarians to get the findings of this research and the cures that they have recommended, that will help us carry the problem that we have to a good solution which is the lives of the calves who remain, because without our calves we have carried a cow for nothing all winter and therefore would be losing funds.

Let's go to the bill itself, Mr. Minister, for a moment or two. I gave a member of the Checkoff Board a copy of the bill and I said, tell me what bothers you about this, without doing very much research.

He said to me, I read this bill and I wonder, first of all, why they want to make it an advisory board. Do they think we have not spent our funds wisely in the past years? They have never told us we have not spent them wisely. We have only had one interference from the Minister of Agriculture in the past (so the Minister of Agriculture states), so why? Is the problem maybe that these people are not of the political leanings of the government? Well I would not think that a government would think that way, but some people do think that. Maybe the reason they want it moved to an advisory rather than to the board that makes the decision itself is that the government might not like the things that they are funding. They may not think that the Canadian cattlemen have the right to do something. Or maybe it is because the government of Saskatchewan and the Canadian cattlemen last year got into a bit of a disagreement on something which referred to the marketing of cattle.

With that point, let's look at the bill again. It says in the bill, under 6(2)(v), that the reduction of costs or losses incurred in the raising and feeding of market cattle is one of the areas that the funds can be allotted for.

Now, first blush says, hey we have got cattle stabilization coming in the back door. But you go back to the old bill and that's there too, so if it has been in the back door it has been there for awhile.

So let's go to the second thing that you think of. Has it ever been used before? No, it has never been used for cattle stabilization before. When the prices drop, we will dig into this fund for money.

But, hold it! Neither was it ever used before by the Minister of Agriculture to say, no, money cannot go here or there. So we are now having a change of thought within the government of Saskatchewan, saying what we used to do and what we are going to do

may be different.

So I have got to go back to my first blush and be concerned. Certainly I remember that the first bill that came in had that in it. I then look further in this bill and I first blush again: 6(b)(ii), the reductions for losses caused by disease, insects or parasites.

Well, with that I immediately think of a problem we had in the area that I live in and that my cattle run in. Several years ago we had a bit of blackleg. Some of the neighbours lost a considerable number of animals and I myself lost one or two, even though we had inoculated for it; it was the way it happened.

Does that mean that I can come to the government of Saskatchewan, to the minister now who is going to decide where the money goes, not to the board who used to say we will give that man so much or we will not, but now to the Minister of Agriculture, who might say to the board, advise me, should I give that man some money or shouldn't I? Well, that is basically what you might be able to do by this clause. Now the board is not concerned with the politics and that is the key word. They are not concerned with the politics and with the government they are. Every one of us in here is basically supposed to be a politician and, therefore, we have to be concerned with the politics of the thing. But they are not concerned with the politics, so they make their judgment on what is best for the cattle industry. Will the funds being used here best help the cattle industry?

Obviously, they might suggest, well, there is SGIO for insurance on losses of cattle or other. But just for a passing comment, SGIO doesn't cover black leg. But what else is new? When you buy an insurance policy you should check it carefully because it never seems to cover everything you think it is supposed to cover.

One of the most silly parts of this bill (and I have been having some fun and my sides hurt a little bit when I read it) is section 5. Let's assume that some member of the House (we will take a member that can't possibly be that person. Mr. Banda, I assume) has a farm on the border, part in Alberta and part in Manitoba, and part in Saskatchewan. Do you realize that every time Mr. Banda wants to take part of his cattle from his Saskatchewan pasture to his Alberta pasture or his Manitoba pasture, he has to go through special check points? He can't just open his gate and chase them through. That is not the way 5(1) reads. He can't drive, on foot, cattle to any point outside of the province except at an approved inspection point. I realize it was there. As I say, it makes my sides hurt, but it does say something similar to that in the old act. I agree with the minister who has just yelled that across the floor.

So maybe while we are at it, we should be cleaning up these funny little situations, hopefully, we don't get into this bill and I hope it never goes past second reading but if it has to we maybe have to clean up that little mess. You know it would be very funny if Mr. Banda's bull pasture is in one province and his cow pasture is in the other and he can't take his cow over to visit his bull. Well you would think that you were in the Legislative Assembly with the bull all left to yourself, because there is quite a bit of that discussed, it seems, in this place at times.

We talk about check points. Now, in the old bill there was reference to selling of the cattle in other points in Manitoba and Alberta and the deductions were being made. I say to the Minister of Agriculture there were other organizations considering checkoff in this province and applying for checkoff but most of them have backed away for one reason, the Minister of Agriculture interfered. Now he claims he has the veto power under the present law. I won't argue that with him. But it was never used until he used it

himself.

But other groups were thinking of asking for checkoffs or to be included in checkoffs so that they could fund the promotional activities out of the fund. I think the Minister of Agriculture realizes that in the race track business, today, part of the pari-mutuel money goes to the prize money which causes funds to be drawn to cause promotion. And call it checkoff, if you wish, it is the bettors, money and it goes towards the prizes and so forth.

Mr. Minister, when you are closing debate, which I hope you never do, I would like you to make some reference to why I keep finding that the Minister of Finance will be looking after the funds. I haven't quite figured out why the Minister of Agriculture is not capable. It is also interesting to note in another part they say that a member of the Executive Council will be responsible. They don't say the Minister of Agriculture again. I realize he is a member of the Executive Council. How come are we taking this out of the Minister of Agriculture? I have to go back in time and remember before I came into this House, and remember as a person of a horse organization I wanted some information. I went to the minister of the Agriculture Department. Obviously that is where you would go, if you want information on horses or agriculture, at least I understood they were. Well, I got the sounding shock of my life when I was told horses aren't part of agriculture. So I asked who looks after them? Well, to make a long story short, before I was done, I found nobody did.

There was a survey, a questionnaire produced within the province on the industry. The minister's people have a copy of it. I happened to be head of an organization that did it at the time. The key thing here was, we found out how much money was invested because of it and it is a large industry within the province of Saskatchewan. It is a pittance compared to the cattle industry, just pittance in comparison. But the Department of Agriculture wasn't going to look after that. Now I notice that the Minister of Finance is going to look after the funds. I understand, if I remember correctly from one of the amendments, from the Minister of Agriculture, it says here, under Section 7(f), two persons appointed by the minister, when he is going to make a change. I am wondering if he is suggesting the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Finance. He doesn't make it clear in his amendment. It isn't too clear on the original motion, the original bill. I am wondering if once again the government of Saskatchewan has no faith in the Minister of Agriculture. They are saying that the Minister of Finance was now going to start appointing, the Minister of Finance was going to look after the funds—it makes you wonder.

Let's go back into the spending of this fund.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The board decides that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, it is interesting to note that the member, who is the Minister of Telephones says that the board decides where the funds are spent. Let me correct the minister and suggest to him, that has always been the practice until the past short while, with the present minister. He has vetoed what their decisions have been. You tell me, that the board decides. Mr. Minister, you better go back to the government and when you have your Cabinet meetings, tell them that that is the way it is supposed to be, and there will be a lot less argument in this House on this bill. But that is not what happens. Mr. Minister. It is not the way it is being done. The people on the board may make recommendations as to what this new bill is saying. They don't make the decisions any more. It now comes back to the political people to make the final decision . . .

MR. BYERS: — Isn't that what we are elected for?

MR. KATZMAN: — The member says, are we elected? We are elected to make some decisions. But were we elected under the present cattle checkoff to make the decisions or the board that is appointed, representing people such as stock growers, Federation of Agriculture, cattle breeders. They appoint their person to represent how their money will be spent. They recommend (I understand the minister Just signs the approval with no problems, that has always been the practice) — they set the recommendations but— do you suggest that the minister is not a rubber stamp or do you suggest that he is a rubber stamp?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He wouldn't want to have to run against him. I can tell you that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, let's go back into some of these funds as I was indicating before I was interrupted by another member of the House. As was indicated earlier by several members, the amount of money coming in and the amount of money going back but I notice that nobody has talked about what seems to be the top line from a report. 'Cattle Checkoff Trust Account, March 1 978, balance February 28, 1978 in the bank in the cattle checkoff, is \$449.66.

Now there is a sizeable bit of money there which has been placed there at ten cents a shot and so forth, of that fund they are spending it for the betterment of the industry.

Now, let's look at some of the suggested areas where they are spending it may be. Saskatchewan Voluntary — Canadian Cattlemen's Association . . .

MR. BOWERMAN: — How much longer, Ralph?

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, about an hour. The clock won't last that long. Sorry, Ted. You've only got 45 minutes more, Ted.

If you would like a copy of this, Mr. Byers, I'm certain that the Minister of Agriculture, who gave it to me, would be willing to give you a copy of it. I'm certain he would be that obliging, (inaudible interjection) Well, I like the member's comment. At least I earn my money there which I don't think you are earning your money in the back bench.

Let's look at the Canadian Cattlemen. It is indicated that they got \$28,000 for one project and for another project, the report policy study, they got \$3,633. Now, let's look at what the cattlemen have been doing. If you remember correctly when this bill came out, it was shortly thereafter that the cattlemen suggested that their beef information centre in Saskatchewan which assisted all the fair boards in this province, were going to have to withdraw their support. They didn't have the funds. Well it wasn't many days later that I heard that the Minister of Agriculture had changed his mind. He is going to give them the rest of the funds. But listening to the news report last night, I understand that the Canadian Cattlemen, Saskatchewan Cattlemen I guess is what we are referring to here, are having their meeting next week and they are going to make their decision next week on what they are going to do regarding this problem.

One of the suggestions is they may, because they have the funds, start up again. The second thing is that they may just say, Mr. Minister, you are playing games with us; we don't want any more. Well, that is the decision they will make next week at their

convention. It is interesting to note that since the bill has come up and the debate has started in the House, that the minister has agreed to send the funds back to these organizations. Not all the funds yet that were approved by the board but the majority of them seem to be coming for the projects that are being done within the province of Saskatchewan. So, that still leaves one outstanding amount of money which is the, money that they use to fund the Toronto, Vancouver, Calgary situation. Now, the concern is that they may say, you can have this but you can't have that. They are saying, you destroy the good work we do outside the province and, therefore, we don't think we can do the work within because there is no ultimate solution to the total problem. Therefore, the suggestion is, we go back to the same thing again, that the board has got to be given the power to decide where the funds are to be spent, not the minister but the board the people put there by the people who put the money in there.

There is some concern over the changing of who gets to vote, the new people, the numbers. There are some amendments the minister has suggested that he is willing to accept. Some of them I agree with. Basically what he is suggesting in his amendments, there is some indication of one new group being put on the Saskatchewan Dairy Association. They have a lot of cattle that go to market that pay the 10 cents and I think it's a good thing that they are put on the group so that they can assist in making the decisions on where the money is spent. One of the other interesting clauses is, I noticed the member from Kindersley made one suggested amendment today, that we are going to bring it to 20 cents from the 15. It is interesting if you look at first blush again you look at 13(b). It suggests that there can be a change of the amount of funds and with first blush I say, now does that mean up to the 15 or the 20 cents as being suggested or can the minister, by regulations, seem to change it even more. I'm not sure.

Another one under the same area is exempting certain persons or classes of people from this act. Now how do you exempt certain people and not others and what qualifications do you have to have to be exempt from this act? Do you have to be a member of the NFU or the cattlemen or something? Is that what you're going to recommend? How do you get exempt from this act? Who gets exempt and why? Why would you not just let them apply for their funds back rather than exempt them?

Another portion down here, we noticed, the financial statement will be produced. Well, the financial statements in the past history of the cattle checkoff have never been done at the proper time when the Department of Agriculture has been asked to do them. They are always a little slow and delayed for some reason. I'm hoping that you are suggesting by this that you are going to get them ready on time and we won't have any problems that way.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as I say, seems to be aimed at one area more than any other. It seems to be aimed directly at those appointed to the board and says to you and to them point blank that the government of Saskatchewan has no faith in them and in their decisions. Therefore, for the first time in history when the Minister of Agriculture overruled their decision he is now saying, because I don't want to have to overrule you I would rather have you just advise me and I will make the choice from now on because it is more politically acceptable. So he is suggesting he is going to make them an advisory committee rather than a board that makes sound suggestions based on sound reasonings and on sound proposals put before them.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill, the way it sits now, without drastic amendments, really I cannot support and will not support.

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the proposed changes to the Cattle Voluntary Checkoff Act and I welcome the opportunity to voice my support. In listening to the members opposite and their debate last night and today, and especially the remarks made about the Session being fruitful, I begin to realize and believe why it isn't fruitful when we listen to that continuous garble from across there.

I'm completely satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with these amendments in the act, which will be truly voluntary. Previously there was no provision to allow a producer to opt out initially and that is now being corrected. The act did have a provision for return of moneys collected but it still required the compulsory collection at the time of sale. The producer will now have that option to not participate and if the producer so indicates he will not be required to do so.

Now I am pleased to see the removal also of the funding from the national organizations.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents that are cattle producers have been strongly opposed to funding of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, especially when they do not agree in any way with the stand taken by that organization. Mr. Speaker, there isn't one cattle producer in my riding that belongs to the Cattlemen's Association and yet they are compelled to put into a fund or take cattle checkoff to fund the basic part of that funding to this national organization. It angers them extremely to be involuntarily funding an organization that allies itself with the philosophy of those members opposite and particularly with the philosophy of the Tories. My constituents will be pleased, extremely pleased Mr. Speaker, to now have a choice, a choice that the opposition would like to see them denied. They don't want to give them a choice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the Canadian Cattlemen's Association or them putting forth their point of view. What I do object to is having individuals fund that organization against their will.

MR. THATCHER: — You can get your money back.

MR. BANDA: — If that organization wants funding for their national interests then let them fund it from their pockets the way the other organizations do.

The member for Thunder Creek tries to misinform the people of Saskatchewan in saying that the Farmers' Union gets \$25,000 from this government and somehow saying it comes from the checkoff. I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that that organization . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I will ask the member to bring himself to order.

MR. BANDA: — That organization gets funding from this government, yes, but not from the checkoff fund. And any other organization in this province, if they have a worthwhile project, can get funding from this government. But if they want to fund their national organization, let them pay like the National Farmers' Union members pay, \$100 per year, to belong there and fund their organization. For a change, let them put their money where their mouth is and not depend upon every person and cattle producer in this province to take a checkoff fund one national organization.

Mr. Speaker, that sort of abuse will now be ended by the amendment of section 6 in this act.

May 26, 1978

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite true to their usual form are trying to twist and misrepresent the facts in this matter. The members opposite would have us believe that they are the saviours of the cattlemen when in fact the opposite is true. To prove my point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from Hansard, May 16, 1978. The hon. member for Morse stated, and I quote:

What you have done is taken away the freedom of the cattle producers in this province to determine for themselves their own destiny.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can that be, when in fact what the amendments are doing is giving freedom, freedom of choice, something that was not allowed when the Liberals originally drafted this bill. They called it voluntary. I call what they designed compulsory. You have to have 10 cents deducted, no choice. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they can say that you could apply for a refund. If they intended the act to be voluntary, they would have allowed the opt out provision initially.

The hon. member for Morse went on to say and I want to quote again.

My telephone just about rang itself off the wall, not only here in the building but also at the farm when I was home for the weekend. I can certainly find not one supporter as yet who contacted me saying that they approved of this thing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that really strange for two reasons. I spoke with the Minister of Agriculture. He has told me that in total he has not received more than 25 phone calls. Of that 25, two were totally opposed to our amendments. Of those two, one of them stated that they were also opposed to the Canadian Wheat Board. Now I wonder how many farmers would agree with that? The balance of the callers thought that the legislative amendments being proposed were either fair or not strong enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems strange to me that these so-called hordes of non-supporters would phone the member for Morse and not the Minister of Agriculture. I also know that the Minister of Agriculture makes himself available to all farmers of this province with his rural tours; that is what his decision is based on — grass roots, Mr. Speaker, not what the members opposite wish to consider a handful of supposed calls.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could come to the ramblings of particularly the member for Shaunavon during this debate. I tell you I really cannot comment on his accusation and misleading remarks. I feel that to do that would lower myself to his level. I also noticed that the press ignored his comments. I am sure they have placed the same value on what he said as my colleagues on this side of the House have placed on what he said, and the people of Saskatchewan have placed on what he said. The member's remarks for Thunder Creek will be taken in that same light.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the comments of the member for Moosomin. In case you don't know, he is one of the many who line up for the Minister of Agriculture's portfolio which has been promised by the Tory Leader. I wonder which end of the line he is on.

Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at what the Conservative Party is doing in Manitoba as a government. They have just introduced a bill of similar nature, at least that is what the Tories say. Let's look at what the Conservative philosophy is on this matter. The Tory bill called. The Canadian Cattle Producers Association Act,' if passed, could force cattle

producers to go to jail for refusing to follow prescribed bookkeeping methods or for failing to provide records on demand. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba Cattle producers under the Conservative philosophy would be put in jail for trying to keep their freedom. The Conservatives are working to form an association in this bill, an association that will tell its members who will vote, how they will vote and who may hold meetings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one has only to read the papers to see what a horrendous scheme has been contrived by the Tories in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Opposition is merely putting up a smokescreen, but what the Opposition doesn't realize is that the prevailing winds are moving their smoke and soon they will be standing naked alone and unwanted.

Mr. Speaker, it has been proven time and time again that members opposite have only one point of view and that is their own narrow-minded one. They do not consider the views of the farmers in this province, the farmers who operate mixed farming enterprises. These are the farmers who produce the majority of beef in this province. These are the farmers that I represent, Mr. Speaker. These are the farmers who wanted the changes to this act and these are the farmers who I am supporting.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate, but I want to make it quite clear that the people in my constituency support the government on this act; they support this government and I am pleased to stand up and support the amendments to this bill and I will ask all members to do the same.

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, indeed. I didn't think I would have to be here at this point in time, this hour and this day, to discuss this bill which is an amendment to the Cattle Checkoff Fund. I think the most interesting part of it is that the Minister of Agriculture agrees with me that, intact, it is a sad day. There is nothing that he would like more than to be out of this mess that he got himself in.

Mr. Minister, your own government advised you not to introduce this bill. You failed to take those recommendations and, furthermore, your own government, your own people, advised you to withdraw the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the minister that whenever, in the future, he is considering introducing a bill of any description from the Department of Agriculture that he should listen to some of the advice which was given to him by his colleagues. I think that the advice that the House leader, the Hon. Attorney General, former Minister of Agriculture and now Minister of Mineral Resources would have for the Minister of Agriculture, would be good advice.

As I have said, many times before, in this Assembly the Minister of Agriculture is an ordinary person. He has been a farmer for many years and, in fact, the Minister of Agriculture is an individual outside of the political arena, is an honest and good individual. Outside of this Legislative Assembly the Minister of Agriculture and myself can get along very nicely. It's the pressures, in part, of the philosophy of an NDP government which has in fact changed the character and personality as a total whole of this individual from a decent citizen of the province of Saskatchewan, as a farmer, to what he is now known as a political animal, trying to further the philosophy and policies of an NDP government, which is a total disrespect for the wishes of the people that they are governing on behalf of.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Talk about the bill.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I'm talking about the bill. The hon. Minister who is responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan hardly knows what a bill is.

MR. BOWERMAN: — We have cattle up there.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Not too many. But nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan knows what it's like to take power under his own hands. He knows all about it and he's turning around and he's talking to the Minister of Agriculture and he's saying, you carry on and get this bill through. I want you to have as much power in your hands as minister as I have. The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Minister, is not like that.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Who said that?

MR. BIRKBECK: — That's what you are saying, that's what your intentions are. So I am talking about the bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about the centralization of power again in another government bill. Centralization of power and that's how it pertains to Bill 73 in this House. There is a removal of power from the board to the hands of the minister.

MR. BOWERMAN: — Have you read the bill?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, I've read the bill. Obviously a lot of cattlemen have read the bill. There is no question; the cattlemen see what's happening. They see what the Minister of Agriculture and this NDP government are doing. They see that they are trying to take the power away from them. They are trying to get a situation where they have got a taxation, a straight taxation system on the cattle producers of this province by which they themselves can control as government and further their own doctrinaire attitude about their policies and their philosophy. As I said before when I spoke about this bill, I have searched high and low to try to find reasons why the Minister of Agriculture would introduce such an onerous piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, to date, at this point in time, I still don't know, other than the only reason could be that the Minister of Agriculture is looking for support in his own particular constituency and he needs it. He needs all the support he can get and this is the one way that he could do that, to utilize the power of a majority government to further his own means as an MLA in this House and as a minister of the government. Now, that's what the Minister of Agriculture is attempting to do through this bill. He is attacking organizations which he feels are opposed to his philosophy and, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I would tell you and the members of this Assembly that cattle producer organizations only represent their membership, the wishes of their membership. So to lay charges that the Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association or the Canadian Cattlemen's Association as organizations are opposed to a National Beef Marketing Board is totally absurd. You know what the point is. The point is, the opposition of the minister of the government to the philosophy of other cattle organizations. When I say that the opinion of those organizations is absurd, taken by the Minister of Agriculture, I say that on this basis that those organizations are more democratic than this government. This government could take a lesson from cattle organizations in this province because at least they represent their membership and this government does not represent the wishes of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. They have turned a blind eye and turned their backs on the cattle producers at a time when they needed help like no other time in the history of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those organizations are not opposed. It is their membership that is opposed and they as an organization, are only representing their membership's wishes. Now then, if you doubt what I say when I say that the majority of cattle produced in this country, let alone this province, are opposed to a National Beef Marketing Board, I say it on the strength of a senate study done by none other than Hazen Argue, a 20-year CCF member.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who is he?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Who is he? Well, it's strange, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the House wouldn't know who Hazen Argue is. I suppose they are denying his identity at this point in time because he turned Liberal. He didn't have to go far from CCF to become Liberal. There is no question about that because the Liberals and the NDP, as we all know, are very close together. But nevertheless, he was appointed to the Senate as most Liberals are. I'm sure that the Leader of the Liberal Party is looking for a senate appointment. It is his only salvation. I don't know what else he is going to do because as the government has stated, the Attorney General, and I couldn't agree with the Attorney General more on that point, the Leader of the Liberal Party will not likely be re-elected in the next election. Now, Mr. Speaker, apparently that just kind of hit a sore nerve with the leader of the Liberal Party because he couldn't help cracking back at me a little. Mr. Speaker, there are a few members calling for order over there.

I was talking about the marketing boards and the concepts and I was in a discussion about Hazen Argue and a report he had done regarding cattle marketing. I might just bring it to your attention that it is a beef import policy for Canada; it is a Standing Senate Committee on agriculture; the report was published in October, 1977. I'm sure that any hon. member in this Legislative Assembly could have that report. It is likely in the library, but the one thing that was consistent, the one very outstanding common factor in that report, was that the cattlemen of Canada did not want a national beef marketing board. Cattle organizations are not trying to influence their membership one way or another. They are not trying to do that. Their membership may have a policy. The National Farmers' Union has adopted a policy by its membership. They would like to see a national beef marketing board. I recognize the National Farmers' Union and I commend the National Farmers' Union for having taken a stand on an issue that they firmly believe in, as I recognize the Saskatchewan Stock Growers and the Canadian Cattlemen's Association for standing for what they believe. But at least they do not, deliberately, as an organization, influence their membership.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, and members of this Legislative Assembly, that it is wrong for a government to influence, in this case the cattle industry, in which direction it should be going. Surely that is a decision that should be left to cattle producers and cattle producers solely.

Mr. Speaker, why the Minister of Agriculture has jeopardized his seat in this Legislature and why he has jeopardized totally this government's hope of ever getting back into this Legislative Assembly after the next election with an onerous piece of legislation like this, is totally beyond me.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is in enough trouble now. Why they want to make further attacks on the cattle industry and further dig themselves in (and thank goodness, they are dragging what is left of the Liberal Party with them), is beyond my comprehension totally.

MR. LARTER: — They are all the pipe, Larry.

MR. BIRKBECK: — They are all down the pipe, as the member for Estevan has suggested, totally! Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the members of the House, surely in particular the government members, must realize that this senate report should be considered at least to some degree, in particular since it was a 20-year CCF member who made that report up. Surely, surely the Liberal Party will not deny the report either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to just a few of the comments made by the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan). He suggests that —

MR. BYERS: — Talk about the bill.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Well, the Minister for Telephones says, well talk about the bill. I am talking about the bill and the Minister of Telephones knows it. I know that what bothers the government members most of all is that they can jibber and jabber over there all they like and they know that it does not bother me and that is what is bothering them. I welcome the Minister of Social Services, maybe he would like to get in. Have you got a few cat calls that you want to throw across? Tell us about the skiing and all that up at the penitentiaries and how good you treat the prisoners. If I am ever off the bill, Mr. Speaker, you will know why. You'll know it's because those government members across the floor are leading me off the bill. I will stay on the bill as long as they are listening because if they listen they might just possibly learn something. They've led that poor Minister of Agriculture astray to the point where he wishes he could just disappear on this bill.

The Minister of Agriculture, by influence from his own government, senior members in this government, said, look Edgar, we didn't want you to put that bill in, we knew you'd get in trouble on it, we think we'd like you to get out of it. And those arrangements were made.

The member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) has suggested that the Progressive Conservative Party was prepared to sell out the business of this Legislative Assembly in order to have a bill withdrawn from this current session for maybe a three or four month period. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that has got to indicate very bluntly, the ignorance of the member for Kindersley. Does he not understand any proceedings in this House? He is no more a new member than I am. I can see the situation the Minister of Agriculture is in on this bill. That's not too difficult. He sees that there isn't the ground swell that he maybe thought there was. He sees there isn't the support. As the member for Thunder Creek suggested, maybe the only swell is in his head. Well, he's feeling that swell now and it's hurting. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I have concern for the Minister of Agriculture as an individual and I would do what I could from this side of the House and for the cattle producers of this province to see that that bill is taken out of this Legislative Assembly. The member for Kindersley doesn't understand that logic. He says, we're prepared to sell out the business of the House, the business of the people to have a bill withdrawn for some three months. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is totally absurd, totally. He suggested that there is Premier's Estimates and there is AG's Estimates. What we were suggesting was that we could ask pointed and direct questions that had to be asked. There were good questions asked in the Executive Council with regard to the Crown corporations and the expenditures that were made. Those were good questions. That was only our suggestion, that we could restrict our questioning in those Estimates to those questions which we felt had to be asked. We knew what questions we wanted to ask. We were prepared not to get into any more political debate on philosophy which would

take up a lot of time of the House in order that this bill would be withdrawn. Now, Mr. Speaker, unlike the member for Kindersley, I have confidence in the cattle producers of this province, that given three months time they would mount an attack on this government and this minister to such an extent . . . yes, and the Leader of the Liberal Party laughs . . . he knows that's hurting and he's in a box on this one and he can't get out of it and he is in it with his whole Liberal caucus. Now, Mr. Speaker, they would mount that attack with the help of the Progressive Conservative Party. It's a sure thing they wouldn't get any from the members to my right.

It has been the members to my right who have jeopardized totally the well-being of cattle producers in this province. Now those arrangements were there; they were in place, and none other than individuals with good suits and poor principles were able to destroy it. And they did.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You are talking about Collver are you?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that they wanted to sit for another two weeks. We would have sat for maybe 30 or 36 hours to finish the work of the House. I think that's a valid point, Mr. Speaker, to make. We weren't prepared to sit for two weeks. We are not prepared to eat up taxpayers' dollars in here (as the member for Thunder Creek has suggested) on total unproductivity. Well obviously, Mr. Speaker, I am getting sidetracked from the bill again because we are getting it from both the front and the back and that's good because they know how they are hurting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I still say that the member for Kindersley would not have directed a tirade on the Progressive Conservative caucus if he wasn't hurting and if his whole caucus wasn't hurting on the position that they have taken on this bill.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, I know that you agree with me. I know that you know that it's the Liberals in this province of Saskatchewan that have upset the apple cart on this bill. You started it and it looks like the Liberal Party has finished it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I totally disagree with the comments made by the member for Kindersley. He has no confidence whatsoever as I have suggested, no confidence in the cattle producers. I am confident that they would have mounted an attack (as I have suggested with our assistance) with the co-operation, which I think we would have received at that time of the Minister of Agriculture to have that bill kept out. Let's face it, the Progressive Conservative Party in this Legislature, on a bill which quickly comes to my mind. The Snowmobile Act, we mounted an opposition against that. There was a swell out in the hustings on it. The minister who introduced the bill realized that, took it out of there, re-introduced it in a better form which was acceptable to the members of the opposition, in particular the Progressive Conservative Opposition and it was accepted. Now we are suggesting the same thing on Bill 73, that that bill could be withdrawn, pulled from this session, let the cattle producers have their say which I am confident they would surely have and you would find, Mr. Minister, that there would be no need to introduce this bill.

If I might talk just briefly on why, Mr. Minister, you would want to take the power of distribution of funds from the board into your hands is beyond me. I do not understand that, Mr. Speaker. Why you would take the allocation of funds not only out of the Minister of Agriculture's hands and out of the Department of Agriculture and into the Department of Finance is, again, something that I do not understand. Now, then, what

does this mean? Surely, it doesn't mean that the Minister of Finance could take those funds which were drawn from cattle producers . . . Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Minister of Finance and his control over the funds of the cattle producers, I would like to have some response from yourself to know just what would be the intentions of the Minister of Finance? Would you have to go to him as the Minister of Agriculture and have an argument or debate with him as to whether or not you could get moneys out of that fund for allocation or just what would you have to do? Why does it have to be put into the Department of Finance? Surely, I don't understand that. So you didn't just go one step, you went two steps. You went from the board into your own power and then you went out of there into the Department of Finance. That's why I suggest that it's not a fund anymore as it used to be and was working well as the cattle producers would confess but that it be taxation. Now, there is no question. Mr. Speaker, that the government is short of money and I guess they are looking for money from all sources. I find it hard to believe that they would want to go after the cattle producers for money to further their own ends or to promote more government programs when the industry is down and out as bad as it is now.

Mr. Speaker, the minister apparently has had only 25 phone calls. Well, I can understand that. The member who spoke previously to myself said, well, there can't be anything to it. There can't be anything to it at all. You only had 25 phone calls. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you were as mad as the cattle industry in this province, what would you achieve by calling the Minister of Agriculture, who introduced the bill in the first place? Would that really do any good? Has it ever done any good, at any time, for the people of Saskatchewan to call any department or any minister on a piece of legislation and say, hey, we don't like that, we want it changed?

MR. ROLFES: — Are you stupid, sit down.

MR. BIRKBECK: — The Minister of Social Services says, well are you stupid. The Minister of Social Services can say what he likes but he knows that there is no reason for the people of Saskatchewan to call the Minister of Agriculture on this bill, no reason whatsoever. There was no reason for them to call the government with regard to seat belt legislation. No reason to call the government with regard to potash legislation, because they know that it won't do any good.

The people that are getting the phone calls on Bill 73 are the Progressive Conservative Party because they know that that is where they can get some support. They know that that's the only party in Saskatchewan right now that is listening to them.

MR. MALONE: — I think you protest too much Larry.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Leader of the Liberal Party is sitting alone, plus one lady. He hasn't got anybody with him. He hasn't got any support in this House or out of this House and that's his problem, Mr. Speaker. He knows he is in trouble and I am really not too concerned about it.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to direct our attack on the government on this bill. We are trying to negotiate with the government on this bill, talk to them if we like behind the bar or wherever we have to, but to stop this legislation here and to stop it now.

Mr. Speaker, the position taken by the Liberal Party is not that position. They want this bill before the Legislative Assembly so they can play their political games with it to try to make some miles. Obviously, that has not worked. Obviously, because the member for

Kindersley would not stand in his place and turn about face and direct about three-quarters of his speech at the Progressive Conservative Party. Does he not know that we are not the government yet, that it will only be just a very short time, but we are not the government, that you are? You are the Minister of Agriculture; there are no ministers of Agriculture over here yet. Why the member for Kindersley would want to direct his attack on us I don't know, except for one reason. That he is hurting. He knows the Progressive Conservatives have taken a good position, a responsible position, and Mr. Minister of Agriculture you know we have.

Furthermore, Mr. Minister, the former speaker suggested that cattle producers funding this organization were not necessarily in favour of it. That is what he said. He said that they did not like to put money into a fund which would be furthering the ends of organizations which maybe were not in agreement with what they believed in.

Now Mr. Minister, you know that there is one easy answer to that. The minister knows that at any time they are delivering their cattle, if they do not want to make any contributions to this fund — formerly they could ask for a rebate, but now with the amendments they can have it at the point of sale or the point of delivery of their livestock. So that is not a valid argument made by the deputy house leader (or whatever he is, the deputy whip or something like that).

There is support for the Cattle Checkoff Fund. There needs to be support for the Cattle Checkoff Fund because it is the only way. Mr. Speaker, that the cattle producers can promote their products.

Now I would like the Minister of Agriculture, and he has made notes on that comment that I have made before, and he is making notes again — I am interested in hearing what his response is going to be when I say we do not have people in government, either federally or provincially, who are promoting agricultural products. The best example is, if we had the promotion for milk (as an example in the province of Saskatchewan) that Pepsi Cola gets, we would not be able to produce near enough milk. We would not have to be paying heavy levies for overproduction or surplus. We would not have to do that.

So the governments, both federally and provincially, are not promoting agricultural products. They are not doing that and the cattle producers are left with that responsibility. They are prepared to accept and pass for that responsibility. I think that we should commend them for it. For you, Mr. Minister, to interfere with this bill in those responsibilities in which they have accepted to fund their own industry and to promote their own industry at their expense and not at the expense of the taxpayers (which is admirable to say the least) is just disgusting, Mr. Minister. You realize it now. I can accept your apologies or accept your understanding that you had some bad information or the bill was not drafted just right, know you prepared to accept amendments, when I spoke on this bill the first time before I adjourned it. There were a number of things I talked about and there were three recommendations I made, and I thank you for accepting those three recommendations. I have a letter from you that says you have the House amendments prepared, to introduce, and I know that unlike the Liberals you are prepared to accept amendments. You already have, from the Progressive Conservative caucus. I know you are prepared to accept more amendments and if you are determined to force this bill through, you are going to accept amendments from the Progressive Conservative caucus.

The Liberal caucus says, well they have got amendments. Well, I don't know what amendments they have. Whatever they are they are going to be to further their own

political means.

I see the member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) is in the House and it is not too often that the member for Morse is in the House. I see him out of this House so often. We were discussing agriculture.

MR. MALONE: — . . . more than you are?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Now the Leader of the Liberal Party says that I'm out more than he is. Well, the Leader of the Liberal Party doesn't know too much. He doesn't even know when the members are in the Legislative Assembly. I might inform the Leader of the Liberal Party that I have not missed one day of this session, not missed one day. So, again, the Leader of the Liberal Party makes a statement that he can't substantiate. As so often the members of the Liberal Party do, they can't substantiate any of their comments at any time. But the member for Morse has sunk to an all time low as a member of the Legislative Assembly in my opinion. He is doing, in fact, the same thing that the Minister of Agriculture did when he introduced the bill, the amendments. He is using the amendments and using the bill to further his own means out in his constituency because he knows that he is in trouble out there. He's in trouble.

MR. ROLFES: — Sit down.

MR. BIRKBECK: — The Minister of Social Services says, sit down. Well, there were a few points I wanted to make and, Mr. Speaker, I've made them and I was just going to suggest that I am about to conclude my remarks. I don't think there is an awful lot more that can be said about the bill, about constructive changes, that has already been said by the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Minister, I am going to ask you on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party to answer a few of our questions that we have put to you on this debate on second reading. In third reading I am going to ask you to accept some of our amendments in Committee of the Whole. I want you to accept some of those amendments. We will propose responsible amendments on behalf of the cattle producers which will have nothing to do with our political philosophy as a party of Saskatchewan but the wishes and the desires of the cattle producers. Those will be the amendments which we will put to you. So, Mr. Minister, I only ask that you accept our recommendations as you have done in part at this point and I ask you to accept further recommendations on behalf of the cattle industry. I am sorry that you ever introduced this bill in the first place and I hope that we never see an onerous piece of legislation affecting agriculture whether it is cattle producers or grain producers to hit this province ever again.

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

YEAS — 24

Pepper	Mostoway	Cowley
Bowerman	Banda	Shillington
Smishek	Whelan	Vickar
Byers	Kaeding	Skoberg
Kramer	McNeill	Nelson (Yktn)
Baker	Feschuk	Allen

Matsalla
MacMurphy

Paris
Rolfes

Koskie
Johnson

NAYS — 15

Malone
Wiebe
Merchant
Cameron
Anderson

Stodalka
McMillan
Clifford
Collver
Larter

Lane (Qu'Ap)
Birkbeck
Berntson
Thatcher
Katzman

MOTION

EXTENSION TO SITTING HOURS

HON. G. MacMURPHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): —By leave of the Assembly I move, seconded by the hon. member for Kelvington-Wadena, Mr. Byers, that on Friday, May 26, 1978, Rule 3, subsection 3, be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 2:00 o'clock p.m. until 10:00 p.m. and that there shall be a recess from 1:00 o'clock p.m. until 2:00 o'clock p.m. and from 5:00 o'clock p.m. until 7:00 o'clock p.m. and that notwithstanding Rule 3, subsection 4, on Saturday, May 27, 1978, this Assembly shall meet from 10:00 o'clock a.m. until 10:00 o'clock p.m. and there shall be a recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:00 o'clock p.m. and from 5:00 o'clock p.m. until 7:00 o'clock p.m. and that the order of business shall be the same as on Friday.

Motion agreed to.

MR. MacMURPHY: — Mr. Speaker, before calling it 1:00 o'clock, I wonder if all of the members would agree that instead of coming back at 2:00 o'clock, we would come back at 2:30 p.m. There has been a Special Committee on the Provincial Auditor meeting to be held at 1:15 p.m. and this will give the members of that committee time to get the meeting over with and I am suggesting to the members that they pick up some lunch and convene at room number 30.

If all members are agreed, perhaps we can reconvene at 2:30 o'clock rather than at 2:00 o'clock p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think with unusual arrangements like this, we would have to have unanimous consent of the House.

Agreed

The House adjourned until 2:30 p.m.