

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

May 27, 1978.

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

QUESTIONS

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY STRIKE

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. It would appear, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, that today may be the last day of this session and accordingly I would like to direct a question to you about the current labour management disruption in the construction industry.

I asked the minister. I believe on Monday, whether or not any initiatives would be taken by the government to get the parties back together to end the current situation. At that time the minister indicated to me that in his view both parties were in an ugly mood and nothing would be proved by getting them back to the bargaining table.

My first question to you now, Mr. Minister, is how long do you intend to let this situation drag on without you or your department taking some initiative, notwithstanding the moods of the people who are involved, and getting them to the bargaining table to see if something can be arrived at to end this strike? It is my view (and I think it is shared by the minister) that there is only one hang-up and this is the business of new labourers getting paid less than experienced labourers, which seems to be an issue that could be easily resolved if somebody would just bang the heads together of the parties involved.

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Well I think, first of all Mr. Speaker it has to be said that the member for Lakeview over-simplifies the situation if he believes that just bringing the parties together and banging their heads in a public way accomplishes the objective.

Just to update the hon. member I can tell him that, with respect to the operating engineers, the parties met on Thursday last in Saskatoon and some progress has been reported with respect to the negotiations between the Labour Relations Council of the construction industry and the operating engineers. The only question remaining at this point in time, having swept away the other contract matters, is wages.

The bargaining teams are still, at this point, reviewing their positions with their principals, and following that they will probably be meeting again tomorrow I understand (notwithstanding the Sabbath) that they will be meeting again tomorrow.

With respect to labourers we are maintaining frequent contact with both parties. The Director of Industrial Relations met informally in Saskatoon on Friday with representatives of the Labourer's Union. Both sides continue to be dug in on the matter that the member for Lakeview draws attention to, so that matter fundamentally remains unresolved.

With respect to the bricklayers we have been in active consultation with both parties. They will be meeting again at 1:00 o'clock this afternoon and we think the prospects are

very good for settlement with the bricklayers, later today.

With respect to the insulators, which is the final union without an agreement, there is only a minor language problem remaining. The monetary issues have all been settled and the remaining issue is the language with respect to a subsistence clause and we are very hopeful of a settlement during the weekend, today or tomorrow, with respect to the Labour Relations Council and the insulators.

This remains, of course, an issue which is not completely settled to our satisfaction. We do believe however that in the event that the operating engineers or bricklayers and insulators are out of the way, obviously this is going to apply additional pressure to both parties in order to resolve the labourer's dispute. I am not prepared, in answer to the hon. member's question, to indicate how long it will go because I think that that would be speculation on my part. We are doing everything possible in the meantime to maintain contact in an attempt to resolve the problem. Obviously, with the passage of time, and we hope it shall not be too much longer, there will be additional pressure both on the Labour Relations Council and the construction industry, and on the labourers, in the event that they are the last to hold out with respect to all of the construction contracts, some 13 or 14 of them.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am interested in the minister's last remark about pressures being put on the parties involved. The other day he indicated that there would be no pressures being put on because the government did not think that was appropriate.

I would like to ask the minister what pressures are being put on, and secondly, to determine from the minister, if I can, the position of the government on the announcement by the construction association that there will be a lock-out on Monday.

It is my understanding that most of the construction projects involved are government oriented, the Cornwall development, the building south of here, and so on. Do you have the power as being the person paying the bill, to direct the contractors not to lock out the employees? If indeed you do have that power, are you considering making moves in that way if the strike is not settled over the weekend?

MR. SNYDER: — The member, being a learned legal person, is very much aware of the fact that we do not have the power to instruct the Labour Relations Council on the course of action which they choose, anymore than we have the power at this given moment to instruct the trade union groups as to the course of action that they will take during the labour disputes. We regard this as unfortunate, and at the same time we are doing everything possible in a very private and sometimes in a public way, in order to resolve the difficulties.

I think the member labours under the illusion that somehow or another you have to be flapping your arms vainly and doing it in a very public way in order that it is seen that you are accomplishing something or attempting to accomplish something and this frankly is not the case. The public kind of dialogue that the member seems to advocate oftentimes is more aggravating to the situation than any purpose that it could possibly serve in resolving the difficulties. We are leaving no stone unturned but, in answer to the question, no we do not have the power, nor do I believe we should have the power, to direct the principals in a dispute as to the course of action that they should follow.

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — I do not know whether the minister is correct that 'flapping your arms', as he put it, will accomplish something but beyond any doubt, doing absolutely nothing is not accomplishing anything either. I ask the minister whether, on the job of the construction of the new office building, you do not have the power there to continue with your own work in the capacity as a general. I realize that there are certain people working there on subcontracts but that that job site could at least stay open, demonstrating some leadership I suppose, in what is a bad strike and perhaps a stupid strike in some ways, from the management side.

I ask secondly whether you have any special plans regarding the Roughrider problem because, as the minister knows, they face very shortly their first exhibition game and massive losses if they cannot get people into the stands: they cannot get the lighting up: the bathrooms are not ready, or the seating is not ready: massive losses for a community operation.

MR. SNYDER: — Well I think the hon. member for Wascana is attempting to direct a question more specifically, that was directed earlier, by the member for Lakeview.

With respect to the provincial office building in Wascana Centre, I think when the Minister of Government Services had his Estimates before the House he indicated that the problem was not a major one in the event that completion did not occur on time. We are anxious to see construction proceed, but for the suggestion to proceed with portions of it and further inflame the issue by supposedly bringing people in across the picket line, I think the member really begs a question when he suggests that this somehow presents leadership as our flag.

I think, quite frankly, it does the opposite in the event that we should take that position. Obviously there may be some instances where some work may proceed. If it involves bringing contract employees over a picket line, oftentimes this serves to aggravate and inflame the issue rather than to pour oil on troubled waters.

With respect to the construction of the bleachers, everyone I think, who is a football fan and who is closely associated with the Rough riders, is exhibiting a similar concern. We do not however, at this point, look upon that construction strike as being separate or distinct or apart from the other construction strikes. Obviously our objective is to solve the problem and have work resume in a normal fashion as it we would hope it would in the not too distant future.

ADVERTISING BILL 73

MR. R.N. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture. On the education Bill No. 22, the government advertised extensively with a full page newspaper ad and so forth. We were told that that was the policy of this government to inform the people regarding legislative changes. I am wondering if the Minister of Agriculture could tell us now how he publicized the information on Bill 73 to the cattle organizations and the cattle people in Saskatchewan?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is no secret to the cattle people of Saskatchewan that there has been some difficulty with regard to the legislation which is now in effect, with regard to the cattle checkoff. That has been under discussion on many occasions. On a number of occasions, I had an opportunity to discuss with the stock growers and with other people in the cattle industry some of

the concerns I had about the existing legislation. Certainly, it should have come as no surprise to them that there were amendments, because I advised them that there were likely to be amendments.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact that the checkoff committee in January of this year sent a letter to the minister asking to have the levy and the checkoff bill raised from 10 cents to 15 cents per head which can be done within the old act and that the minister has yet to answer that letter?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman. I did not reply to that particular letter because we were at that point in time considering whether there should be changes in the legislation. Therefore, I did not wish to reply until we had made a decision as to whether legislation was coming forward or not.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that on March 6, 1978, a meeting was called so that the minister could discuss the proposed changes with the checkoff committee and that the minister cancelled that meeting?

MR. KAEDING: — Yes, I had set up a couple of meetings with the checkoff committee. On each occasion, the amendments had not been approved in Cabinet and through our caucus and therefore I felt it was not a worthwhile effort to call the committee to discuss something which we didn't have resolved in our own circle.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — New question. Mr. Speaker. It is also a fact then, that on April 7 a similar meeting was called and cancelled. Is it true that the minister did not meet with the checkoff committee at any time to discuss Bill 73?

MR. KAEDING: — Yes, that is true.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — It is true. Did the minister yesterday for the first time meet the chairman of that committee, Mr. Boyd Anderson? Did Mr. Anderson not ask for a copy of Bill 73 at the minister's office, because he had not until that time seen the bill?

MR. KAEDING: — I had a number of telephone conversations with Mr. Anderson, in which he was expressing to me some of his concerns about the bill. He of course, as you indicated, came to my office yesterday and received a copy of the bill. It is not my obligation I don't think, to provide copies of the bill to everyone.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister know that his office did not, in fact, have a copy of Bill 73 to show the chairman of the checkoff committee yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take a new question. The member for Wascana.

CONSTRUCTION STRIKES

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I ask a question of the Minister of Labour regarding the labour dispute. I gather, or assume, that the government in its capacity as a general contractor is a member of the council. What is your view as a member of that council of the labour strike? What is your view as an employer of the proprietary of the management position taken in relation to the labour strike?

MR. SNYDER: — I think the hon. member puts a rather weird construction on the whole

question of who is, or who is not a member, first of all, the government per se is not a member of the Labour Relations Council of the construction industry. I don't know where he gains that impression. For me to express my position publicly in an attempt to attach blame, I think I could probably do so fairly frankly and I don't propose to do so at this time because I believe it would be inappropriate for me to be making utterances here and attaching blame to one party or the other. I have some rather distinct ideas of my own which I believe would serve no useful purpose for me to express them at this point.

MR. MERCHANT: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the government is the largest — many of us would say that it is inappropriate — but probably the largest single unit of the construction industry, a very large employer in itself through Government Services. Mr. Speaker, am I correct, and I address this to the minister, am I correct you are saying that as a very large employer, both directly and indirectly, you don't think that it is appropriate that you express your view over this very crucial issue at a time when the whole construction industry is threatening to come down, with the threat of a lockout on Monday. You are not prepared as the largest single employer to show any leadership in that area by indicating your view of the direction in which the council should move.

MR. SNYDER: — We are not signatories to any agreement with the Labour Relations Council and the trade unions involved. I suppose from that point of view, we are a consumer of the product that is produced by these two people when they finish a construction project. I repeat again, I do not believe that any useful purpose would be served by my expressing an opinion as to whom is marginally to blame or who is not as much to blame as the other party. I think if the member believes that this a route to amiable settlement by putting the Minister of Labour between the two parties and declaring that one is wrong or one is right: if he is to suggest that this somehow is a conciliatory move on the part of the Department of Labour, then I think he is being a little facetious in making that suggestion. I really don't think he believes that to be the case.

MR. MALONE: — Would the minister not agree, however, that—you have reviewed for us this morning the other collective bargaining agreements that are just about to be signed or at the level of being signed — would you not agree that when one union of about 16 or 17 can tie up the whole construction industry like it has for the past week and which it is in danger of doing for the foreseeable future, would the minister not agree that it brings into disrepute the whole system and that the government should be looking for some device to prohibit this type of thing happening again in the future. One union of a limited number of employees can put the whole construction industry, secondary industries, related industries in a period of disruption?

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, multi-trade bargaining in the construction industry probably represents the most complex and the most difficult of any set of bargaining procedures which are carried on anywhere, not just in the province of Saskatchewan but across the entire country. I think the hon. member recognizes some of the difficulties that are involved. That is why commissions have been set up and there have been hearings and a host of other inquiries into the construction industry dating back since time immemorial. Obviously this represents a very difficult problem. I think, quite frankly that with the construction labourers, perhaps the only holdouts after this week end, and that is a real possibility, that some additional pressures are going to be exerted upon them. I see right at this point in time no option is open to the government except to take the kind of arbitrary action that the Thatcher administration took during its point in time, to pass a piece of legislation giving the authority to the Lieutenant-Governor in

Council to declare any dispute, any dispute at all in an emergency and therefore have the heavy hand of government descend upon the parties involved. And I just don't think that that works. I think it created problems for us and I can tell you, again, as I have indicated in this House before that that was a major cause for a construction strike that took place in 1974, it was unavoidable. It was a kind of direct action that was taken by the government of the late hon. Premier Ross Thatcher of some years ago.

BILL 73 AND DRAFT AMENDMENTS

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday, when Mr. Anderson was in your office and he wasn't able to get a copy of Bill 73, he was provided with what was to be Bill 73 and explanation notes. Does the minister know that what was provided to Mr. Anderson was in fact not the amendments shown in Bill 73 and does he know that many of the clauses have different information in them than is shown in Bill 73?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate that when Mr. Anderson was in my office yesterday morning, I was in a hurry; I was leaving the office. He asked me if he could get a copy of the bill. I said, I don't have a spare copy but I can give you a copy of this working document which I have been using and I can provide you with that immediately and so I did that and went on to my meeting. I suppose what I should have done is gone to my staff and said to give him an actual copy of the bill which I didn't do and I have to acknowledge that.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, this paper given to Mr. Anderson which he was told was Bill 73 and the explanation was in fact Option 1, Draft 4, listing proposed amendments. Will the minister tell this Assembly if, intact, it was a mistake or was it a deliberate attempt by the minister and his staff to misinform this man so that the minister could ram through Bill 73 before even the checkoff committee knew what was happening. I will table this and I would appreciate if the page would take it over to the minister so that he knows in fact it is misinformation.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I will acknowledge that it was an honest mistake on my part. I thought that that particular document was the latest document when I handed it to him. It was not and I regret that it was not. It was certainly not a deliberate attempt to mislead Mr. Anderson.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister tell this Assembly if he did not, in fact, inform the chairman of the checkoff committee, Mr. Anderson, by telephone that there would be only one additional member to the checkoff committee in the proposals in Bill 73?

MR. KAEDING: — No, I did not. I informed Mr. Anderson that we would be making some amendments which I indicated to him, and I indicated to him again yesterday, the house amendments which we are bringing forward. I never at any time indicated that there would be only one more. I told him exactly the people that I intended to put into the new proposal.

LABOUR STRIKE - TAYLOR FIELD

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour regarding the labour strike. The minister has indicated that you do not believe that the difficulties with

Taylor Field are, in your words, special or distinct from other labour sites. I ask the minister whether he would not agree that it is special in the sense that it is not hurting private enterprise or government but, in fact, hurting the community as a whole, the community at a time when the Roughriders are trying to raise money and are hard pressed to raise money and involved in a very crucial time in their history and distinct in the sense that the losses will be far greater because of the loss of seating revenue? It is not a question of delay but an absolute loss which can never be recovered and a loss in a very massive way.

MR. SNYDER: — I think the hon. member is expressing concerns that I share with him but I think it is obvious also, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a mechanism available to us that allows us to single out a particular construction strike and to somehow, by waving a magic wand of some sort, provide that one construction strike will continue to have work done upon it and others not be treated in the same way. I don't have an answer for the hon. member except to share with him his concern and our anxiety to have the strike in total settled in the not too distant future. I recognize everything the member has said and if he is expecting a pat answer to the question that he raises, of course he is overextending himself in expecting that I can provide that kind of an answer.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, share the concern but do nothing. I ask the minister whether it is not, in fact, true that frequently the trade union movement will make exceptions, exceptions for hospitals, exceptions for crucial sites and crucial operations? I ask the minister whether it would not be appropriate for you to use your good offices to go both to the unions and also to the management council and say, look, this is special and distinct. The losses are greater. It is special and distinct because it's a community project. It is special and distinct because there will be no recovery and ask for an exception because those exceptions are very frequently given in labour-management matters. I ask the minister whether you would be prepared to become involved in that way over what I suggest to you is a very important matter for the Roughriders, the community and a Saskatchewan operation?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that this is a matter that has been discussed internally with the officials with in the Department of Labour. It remains a possibility and one that we are prepared to explore at this particular point in time. Whether it will be fruitful or not I don't know. I can't give the member any assurances as to what may come about as a result of contacts which we may have.

LAND BANK LAND

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Last week we were all quite pleased with the fact that the government has finally decided to sell some of the Land Bank land in the province of Saskatchewan. I asked a while earlier in Estimates if he would provide me with a copy of some of the agreements and so on that are being formed. I hope that that is still forthcoming. My question today is, what are some of the details, not this particular deal, but the guidelines on which the government does follow? Is it a cash payment? Who determines the value of the land and does the purchaser pay for any of the evaluation of that property in the event that a purchase does take place?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, the procedure is that when a lessee requests to purchase the land, he makes a request to the Land Bank Commission. The Land Bank Commission then sends out a land evaluator, the same as he would if we were going to purchase land. He will go through the area using the same criteria that he uses in terms

of purchase, where he takes existing sales which have taken place in the last three or four, let's say, in the last 12 months in that area, depending on where the sales have taken place in that area, and from that arrives at a market price which is done through the evaluation process. We have evaluators who know how to do that. He is then offered this price and the proposition that we are prepared to sell it to him for this particular price. That is the same process that we use when we purchase land. There is no charge to the purchaser, to my knowledge, for evaluating that property.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it then the intention of the government that the funds to purchase the land must be, in effect, raised by the individual who is making application to purchase? The reason for my question on this is that I believe that while there has been a purchase made there will not be very many future purchases made because the problem still is there and that is obtaining the finances that are required to purchase by our lessees. Will the government consider accepting our recommendation that if someone does qualify to purchase land after five years and has a good record and abides by all the aspects of The Land Bank Act, provides a guarantee of this government to a bank or to a credit union which will then allow that individual farmer to obtain the money with which to purchase that land. If this suggestion is taken I am sure that many more farmers will be buying land in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, you will know that our regulations now indicate that a lessee purchasing from the Land Bank is eligible for a 20 per cent reduction on the home quarter up to a maximum of \$5,000. That is knowledge to the financing institution as well. They can very well use that as a basis for getting the credit to make the down payment on that farm. Talking to Farm Credit Corporation, they indicate to us that they are prepared to accept that kind of security for a down payment. They will at least take that into consideration as a benefit.

MEETING WITH CATTLEMEN - CHECKOFF COMMITTEE

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — A question of the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Anderson was under the assumption that you had said that there was only one addition and he told me he was going to your office to clear that yesterday with you. Will the minister, knowing that he did not inform the cattlemen, knowing that he did not meet with the checkoff committee to discuss Bill 73 and knowing that on different occasions, certainly to the chairman of the committee, gave misleading information, will the minister agree to amend this act to follow the information that he himself gave to Mr. Anderson, the chairman of that committee?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I gave the chairman of the Checkoff Committee no other information than that which was in the document. We discussed with him the possibility of changing the proposed amendments with House amendments, I advised him as to the changes that we were going to make in the House amendments. I don't know where he could have got the impression that we were removing one person from the proposed board because we were not. We are in fact adding a person to the stock growers list of members.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you as chairman of the Rules Committee might be prepared to reconvene the Rules Committee to take into the account the de facto operation of question period and that the rules be amended, the practical rules

that you have given us so that we could receive in the next session, notice at the beginning of the week of the question during the week that the Conservatives propose to ask so that they won't interfere with a whole series of days of question period. Then we could know whether they were going to ask their question of the week on Monday, or Tuesday, or Wednesday or Thursday and then plan accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: — I would like to think the member for Wascana was serious but I can hardly believe it.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 73 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CATTLE MARKETING VOLUNTARY DEDUCTIONS ACT, 1970

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Chairman, I have with me Ernie Spencer, from the department and Harvey Felt who is manager of the act (?).

ITEM 1

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Chairman, the act which we have before us today has been one that appears to have developed into a bit of controversy throughout the province. It is not my intention to delay the proceedings of this House by a lengthy debate but there are a few comments that I would like to make in introduction on this particular bill.

What has become evident during the past week and one-half is that a certain party in this Legislative Chamber has decided that in the interests of their own caucus . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order please! If I could have a little better attention. I find it very difficult and I would ask the members on both sides of the House to please confine their remarks to a low whisper while the member is on his feet please.

MR. WIEBE: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I was having a difficult time even hearing myself. As I was saying a development had occurred in the Chamber in which politics appeared to be taking the front line and centre in regard to this particular bill. I thought that this was very unfortunate because the only one that is going to lose by politicians, which we are, attempting to play politics with a piece of legislation as important as this one, is the cattle producers. The cattle producers throughout the province are the ones that could stand to suffer in regard to this particular thing.

I didn't want to lower the value of this particular bill by allowing myself the luxury of dealing with some of the comments made by the members to my right but I feel that some comment is certainly necessary.

When it appeared that politics was going to be front line and centre to the members to my left, I felt that it was important that some form of mediation take place, in that all members of this Assembly look upon this piece of legislation not for the betterment of ourselves but for the betterment of the cattle producers throughout the province of Saskatchewan. After last Thursday night, I received numerous phone calls, I should say a week ago Thursday, numerous phone calls from presidents, secretary-treasurers of some of the farm organizations involved with this particular bill. I received phone calls from members who are on the advisory board or the checkoff board. Their concern at that point in time was, why is there politics being thrown into this entire question and why is the opposition, particularly, playing politics with this particular bill and why,

May 27, 1978

particularly, have the Conservatives decided to interject that line of politics into this particular piece of legislation?

It is a time when opposition parties, whether they be Conservatives or Liberals, set aside these kinds of indiscrete methods and get together to respond, in this Legislature, on behalf of the cattle producers in the province.

As a result of those phone calls that night I made a phone call to the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher), who I felt had as much in stake in this bill as did the cattle producers in the province and was a member of that particular caucus who, I felt, some reasoning could take place. The purpose for my call was at the suggestion of some of the cattle organizations throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

They suggested that we get together and that, possibly, we meet with them the following morning, either in person or by telephone. I conveyed this message to the member for Thunder Creek. We were on the phone, long distance, for little over an hour and 10 minutes. He agreed, that evening, to meet with me at 8:30 the next morning to place phone calls, some of them long distance, to some of the other cattle organizations throughout Saskatchewan.

The unfortunate part about this whole thing is that the member for Thunder Creek was so concerned about the cattle producers of this province that he failed to show up at 8:30 the next morning. He failed to show up, so that the only thing that I can take from that, is that the Conservative caucus is not concerned about the cattle industry in this province: they are concerned only about politics and how they can attempt to get some gain out of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — And it is very discouraging for me to see any political party, or any individual, who puts his goal, to the fact where the means justifies the end and they will sacrifice anything to obtain whatever political ends they may have in regard to this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very important piece of legislation in front of us as far as the cattle producers in this province are concerned.

For the last week and a half, I and other members of my caucus have attempted a fairly vigorous lobby within these Chambers, not only with the members to my left, but to government members as well. It is our belief that meaningful changes should be made to this legislation, meaningful changes that will benefit the cattle producers in the province of Saskatchewan; meaningful changes that will not add to some political whims of some of the members of this Assembly may have. This bill is too vital and too important for that.

We have tried, through our lobbies, to present the views of the cattle producers and the various organizations in the province of Saskatchewan. At the completion of Committee of the Whole, today, we will find out whether those lobbies have been successful or not.

I have proposed a number of amendments to this particular bill. The Clerk has already laid copies of those amendments on the tables of the Minister of Agriculture and, I understand, the opposition critic for the Conservative Party. These, we feel, on behalf of

the cattle industry in the province of Saskatchewan are important amendments.

Let me, before I take my seat and we get into the clause by clause study of this particular bill, outline, briefly, some of the concerns which we have in regard to this particular act and some of the areas where we would like to see changes made.

There are four areas of concern. Let me begin with section 3, subsection (1). The deduction of 15 cents per head, at present, that deduction is 10 cents a head. There is still leeway room for an extra 5 cents so it could be raised to 15 cents. Our feeling is that the maximum should no longer be 15 cents, but that maximum should now be increased to 20 cents a head. We are not recommending that that 20 cents be applied immediately, but that would then leave an additional room of an additional 10 cents per head at the discretion of the board and the Minister of Agriculture to determine at some future time when the necessity arose, to increase the amount of checkoff from 10 cents to either 15 or 20 cents. It is our feeling that that additional nickel should be there and for that reason we are presenting an amendment to change that particular section of the act.

Section 3, subsection (2) deals with the option that the producer now has to sign a declaration at the time that his cattle are sold, that the deduction not be taken off. We have not decided to amend this particular section of the act. Our reason being, that it is that we feel that in two years, or even a year, the Minister of Agriculture will be back in this Assembly, asking for an amendment to that particular section of the act. The reason we say that is that there is no way, in our mind, that this section can adequately work. What is going to happen is that it is going to be a nightmare for every cattle dealer and every cattle buyer in the province of Saskatchewan.

Take for example, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool stock yards in Swift Current. On any particular day there may be upwards to 120 different individual farmers bringing their cattle into be sold. That then means that the brand inspector, or the cattle buyer, or the dealer involved, has to contact each and every one of those 120 producers and get them to sign a declaration, or ask them, whether they wished to have the checkoff taken off now, or whether they wished it not to be deducted. It is going to cause a paper nightmare. It is not going to be acceptable by the dealers and the stock yards and the brand inspectors throughout the province of Saskatchewan, I am sure that once this area of operation has been in effect in this province for one year or more that the representations made to the minister, on behalf of those organizations, will clearly demonstrate to him that that particular section should be amended.

We go on a little bit further to section 7 of the particular act, which outlines the persons who will be appointed to the Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Advisory Committee. The minister, I notice, has agreed to the recommendations which I included in my opening remarks on Bill 2 in regard to some of those members on that particular committee. I wish to take, at this time, the opportunity to congratulate him on some of the proposed amendments which he has made and I refer especially to the first two, the one being the representatives of the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association. We are very pleased that he has agreed to raise that back to where it was before from one to two.

Part of my reason for saying this, is that there is a myth developing throughout the province of Saskatchewan that the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association only represents large producers and this is certainly not the case. When you look at the membership of the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association, you will realize that the

average amount of livestock, or cows, pardon me, that the membership of the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association has is around 50 head. I think this clearly indicates that the Saskatchewan Stockgrowers' Association does not represent the big producers, but it does represent the small and the average producer in the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is important to know, as well, that in that organization certainly there might be half a dozen operators that do have over 200 head of cows and so on, 400, 500 and 600, but that figure is included in the average. So you can rest assured that while the average may be 50, there are many, many producers who are under 50 and who do represent, I think, a very clear cross section of the cattle producers in the province of Saskatchewan. As well the area of the nomination of the Saskatchewan Dairy Association I think is a welcome one and the fact that the minister has agreed to appoint a representative from the Western Canadian Cow-Calf Association and ensure that that member would be appointed from the Saskatchewan section only.

The only criticism I have in regard to this particular section now with these proposed amendments is that there will now be two people appointed, as was in the previous act, by the Minister of Agriculture. I would have liked to have seen this cut down to one. Let me give you my reasonings for this. The minister has decided in these amendments that a consumer will not be spelled out in the legislation. So in effect, he is replacing that consumer with say a representative from the Dairy Association or vis-à-vis a representative from the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association.

I think it's important to note that we should be very careful that this particular committee does not become too large, but it's also important for us to recognize the fact that the committee must still represent a very broad section of the cattle industry in the province of Saskatchewan. It's our feeling that the amendments which the minister has made by adding the Dairy Association and the Western Canada Cow-Calf Association has certainly increased that representation on the board and I think they have done an excellent job by taking that action. There is a need for a representative on the board from the Department of Agriculture; there is no argument there. But in terms of trying to keep that board down to a manageable level, I am making this suggestion. I am making the suggestion that the minister consider reducing the members appointed by the minister from two down to one. It is not my intention to introduce a sub amendment to that particular section. It is just my intention at this point in time to raise that question with you and ask you for your consideration.

I think finally, the criticism which we have in the act and the one which has caused us the greatest amount of concern the one that really is the key portion of the particular act, as far as our caucus is concerned and as far as the cattle producers in the province are concerned is section 4 of the act which is before us. We are introducing an amendment to this particular act and let me just read that amendment to you. Our amendment reads that we would strike out section 4 of the printed bill and substitute the following. Let me explain to members what happens by the effect of our amendment by striking out section 4 of the bill which is before us, the old section 8 of the act that was passed in 1970 and then continues in effect. The amendments which we are making to section 8 of the 1970 bill are minor amendments which must be made to allow the old section 8 to coincide with some of the changes that have been made in the new section or the new legislation. We strike out the word 'board' in the first line and substitute 'committee' because under the old legislation, the organization that was appointed was called a board. Under the new legislation they have decided to name that as a committee so that that particular change was necessary. Our second amendment to section 8 would be striking out the word 'trust account' in the second line and substituting 'fund'. This again is only a means to make that particular act

coincide with the changes that have been made in the act before us, because now it is no longer called a trust account but I understand it's called a fund. So that particular section would have to be changed. As a result of the amendment which we are proposing, section 8 of the final bill will read something like this, 'Subject to section 6, the committee shall administer the use of the fund and authorize all expenditures there from except refunds of deductions as provided for in section 9.' We feel that this particular section of the act is very, very vital. It's one that we would certainly hope that the government members opposite would support us in; it's an amendment that we sincerely hope that the members to my left will support us in as well.

Mr. Chairman, I have already taken up close to 25 minutes on this particular bill. I do not wish to delay proceedings of the House and I would sincerely request that the government members opposite and the members to my left accept some of the proposals which I have made this morning. Thank you.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the member for Morse, we have looked at some of the amendments which he has proposed to put forward and we will be looking with favour on at least one. The proposal that the deduction be raised from 15 cents to 20 cents creates some problem for us, to the extent that because of the controversy around this act, there is a sensitivity out in the country with regard to anything which we might do in the act which might indicate that we were going to raise the level of the checkoff. Because we are only using 10 cents out of a possible 15 at the present time. I think that there is room yet to increase by 50 per cent the allotted checkoff. That provision is in the old act. We think that that is adequate for the time being, has not been agreed to at the present time and so we would likely not support that particular motion.

With regard to the opting out procedure, the members feel that there will be a real problem in the country with regard to handling the opting out process. I would say to him that the intent is to have on the manifest a section which would allow you to checkoff whether you wish to have a checkoff ticket or not and that manifest will follow through the procedure with an animal as it does now. The same kind of administrative activity will take place as it now takes place with the horned cattle fund. They have to also come through that same process and through the computerization which we have in the department. It will be possible for us to arrive at the figure which the Auction Mart should be paying to us according to the checkoffs on the manifest slips. So we would be able to make that procedure without very much administrative difficulty.

With regard to the membership on the committee, I have indicated of course that we are going to make some changes in that membership. I am not critical of the SSGA with regard to wanting to have additional membership on there because they did sponsor this particular bill. However, I think we have to recognize that SSGA has only an actual membership of about 1,200 to 1,400 people, varies between 1,200, 1,400 or 1,500 and an affiliate membership of another 3,000. You take that in context of the entire beef industry where we have something between 35,000 and 40,000 farmers, it seems to me that that is a more than adequate representation from that particular group.

With regard to the two people to be appointed by the minister, I think you will recognize that up to this point in time, one of the appointees of the minister has been for secretarial purposes, for administration purposes. We are removing the consumer representative because I do agree that there is at this particular point no reason why there should be a consumer representative on this board. We would like to be able to

appoint a representative at large which could represent a wider community of livestock producers.

I want to make one thing clear and that is when we appoint this producer we will make sure that he is an actual producer, that he has an interest in the livestock industry. We would also want to make sure that he is using the checkoff provision, that he is letting his money stay in the fund. We certainly wouldn't want to have somebody on that board who is not contributing to the fund. So we would ask, before we appoint that person, if he is prepared to say that he is going to keep his money in the fund. As I said we don't want somebody in there who is not contributing.

The change in section 4, we feel in the department and I feel personally, is a hang-up on words. In drafting of the bill it was decided that we would make the wording identical to, or at least make it more consistent with the argument that we have an advisory committee. There was no intent at that point to reduce the power of the board. We would agree that we can return that back to old section 8; we can agree to that. I am sure it will not make any difference to the administration of the fund or to the power of the board. So I think we are prepared to accept that particular recommendation.

MR. WIEBE: — Just one brief comment and I think that my comments for today will be over. Just let me say that I appreciate very much the fact that the minister has agreed to accept my amendment on section 4 which I felt was a very vital and a very important part of it. I and the cattle producers in the province do not feel that it is a play on words; it is a very vital and important aspect of the particular legislation. I think it is important to note that this procedure has certainly demonstrated my belief in the parliamentary and the legislative system. When MLAs decide to put the interest of their constituents and the organizations in the province ahead of politics and do decide to do a meaningful and constructive job on lobbying and so on, things can be achieved on behalf of the producers. Again let me say I am very pleased that the minister has agreed to accept that suggestion.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Chairman, I feel I have to comment on some of the remarks made by the member for Morse. I wasn't in the House when the remarks were made earlier but I understand that he had some arrangement with the member for Thunder Creek on Saturday morning, last. I have no knowledge of that. I don't know what went on. . . Friday morning. If the member for Morse thinks for a minute that this mess could have been salvaged on Friday morning, he is sadly mistaken. It was Wednesday, during question period that I got a note from the Attorney General, saying the Liberals will not agree to withdraw the bill. Bill 73 is back on the order paper and I think the member for Morse is sadly mistaken if he thinks that anything was going to be salvaged as it relates to pulling Bill 73 on Friday morning. As it relates to section 4 in the amendment being placed before the House today by the member for Morse, I think if I was the Minister of Agriculture, I would be ecstatic that an opposition party would lobby for an amendment such as this in light of the fact that the producers of Saskatchewan are considering a class action to try to salvage what is in the fund prior to the introduction of this bill and by placing that amendment on the books, it virtually destroys their case.

Mr. Chairman, we will be offering amendments as we step through the bill item by item. I just want to put on the record the fact that the Liberals were sadly derelict in their responsibility a week ago and if anybody is playing politics with this thing, it is the Liberal caucus.

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK(Moosomin): —Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I know you realize that I know that the member for Morse doesn't realize which opposition party in this Legislative Assembly has made substantial changes at this point in this bill. Obviously he doesn't know. It is not too hard to understand because the member for Morse really doesn't understand all that much. Mr. Chairman, the member for Morse stands in his place and cries and wails on the Progressive Conservative Party for having played politics with this bill. He knows very well that it is the Liberal caucus that has been attempting to play politics with this bill and they played it up until as recent as yesterday or the day before when we defeated them in a vote in this House to have this debate adjourned. They don't want it adjourned; they want it prolonged. They want it before this Legislative Assembly and if they had their wish they would debate this bill for the whole summer for their own political means. The member for Morse can't seem to get that through his head. It is because of them and no one else that we are even debating this bill in this Legislative Assembly today at all. The member for Morse would be made aware and I will make him aware once more (I have already) the Progressive Conservative Party was successful in acquiring one more member of the Stock Grower's on the committee, not the Liberal Party.

The Liberal agriculture critic, the member for Morse, when he was debating this bill said, well he didn't see why there needed to be the Western Cow-Calf Association on this at all, not at all. Yet, he says that he is for the cattle producers of Saskatchewan. I said to you, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, that we had to have the Saskatchewan branch which represents the Saskatchewan cattle producers and I don't trust in that organization. I thank you, Mr. Minister, for making that change and it is the Saskatchewan branch of the Western Canadian Cow-Calf Association. That shows the hypocrisy of the member for Morse, when he says he is for the cattle producers of Saskatchewan because he is not, not in the least!

Mr. Minister, there were other changes. I made opposition to you that there was consumer representation on this board, on the committee. I said, I do not see why there needs to be consumer representation. I do not want to see a situation like the Canadian Egg Marketing Association whereby, they allow for 2.25 cent profit per dozen of eggs. I don't want to see a situation like that. Mr. Minister of Agriculture, I don't want the cattle producers' industry in this province being run by consumers. I have more confidence in the cattle producers that they can get that information through the Beef Information Centre to the consumers of this country. They were doing that job until these amendments took away their funding and stopped them from being able to do it. Mr. Minister, you realize that and as I understand it at this point, you are not prepared to increase funding or make funding available so that that Beef Information Centre and the work of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and Stock Grower's can continue to feed good information to the consumers. They are responsible for that and are prepared to accept those responsibilities.

Mr. Minister and for the member for Morse, it was the Progressive Conservative Party Opposition in this Legislature that was able to remove that consumer representation, at least in part, Mr. Minister. You say there will be two members appointed by well, I'm not just too sure who they're going to be or for what function they will serve. Mr. Minister, I am sure that you will elaborate on that. If you give me the slightest indication whatsoever that they're representing consumers, then I'll be opposed to even that change. As I've said before, and I'll tell you again, the producers can adequately feed that information to the consumers. Now surely, Mr. Chairman, the member for Morse has got his head straight now. I don't know what it takes but I have surely tried this morning. He can't seem to understand but the cattle producers understand. Mr.

May 27, 1978

Minister of Agriculture, you understand. I hope, Mr. Minister, as I've said before, that you'll be prepared to accept some of the amendments which we have, as we go through this bill, clause by clause.

Item 1 agreed.

ITEM 2

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — I wonder if the minister would mind taking a look at the particular papers, option 1, draft 4, April 19, 1978 on the third page that he gave Mr. Anderson. I wonder if he would just read the proposed amendment that the department or the minister or his staff proposed? In that section 3, item 1:

Every livestock dealer who purchases cattle shall deduct from the purchase price of each head of cattle purchased a set sum of money as may be specified in regulations but in no case shall the deduction exceed twenty- five cents per head.

So the minister who is certainly contemplating a raise in that particular item and I see in the reason for it in the department or the minister's reason provisioning the maximum deduction approved in legislation is increased to twenty-five cents a head to remove necessity of legislative review for increases if inflation continues. I wonder if the minister would comment on those remarks?

MR. KAEDING: —Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to comment on those. You'll also notice on that copy that the word 'twenty-five' was stroked out and the word 'fifteen' was written in. In the original draft the request was for an increase to twenty-five cents per head. The decision was made that, as I indicated earlier, that because of the sensitivity out in the country about the checkoff program in general, it was felt that we were better off to leave that particular section as is. Therefore, as I indicated earlier, we do feel that there is a sensitivity out there. We don't want to ruffle any more feathers on both sides of the fence. So we have decided that we will continue to stay with the fifteen cents a head and I will recommend to my colleagues that we not support this amendment.

MR. NELSON: — I wish the minister would just sit down and talk to his colleagues about that. There are several of them that would like this supported, certainly, a portion of it. If the amendment was supported, it would mean splitting the difference between the fifteen and the twenty-five cents which you did think about. I wonder if the minister wouldn't stop to think about the fact that it was back in 1970 that this fifteen cent was put into that act and also that the entire committee have recommended at this time already to him . . . he has the letter on his desk . . . that it be raised to the maximum of fifteen cents. He doesn't at any time have to change the particular figure except if he feels that it should. I think he should give himself some leeway over and above what the committee has already requested, which is fifteen cents by going not to the twenty-five but to the twenty cents. I think it's more than reasonable. I'll be very disappointed in the minister if he stays tough and doesn't give on this because he has the authority to hold if deems that it isn't wise to go to the twenty cents.

MR. KAEDING: — Well. Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated that we in our discussion made the decision that we thought fifteen was the maximum amount which we should be putting in at the present time. There's no reason why as we've indicated now. We are now at ten cents. We've still got a 50 per cent increase that we can add on. It would stir up a greater controversy in the country, because if we were to raise it to

twenty cents immediately a lot of people out in the country would say well, they're doing that because they're going to raise it next year to twenty cents and a lot of people are saying they don't like the checkoff now. They say if we raise it to twenty cents that will just make them all the madder and we just feel at the present time, we have a leeway yet to go from ten to fifteen. We think that's appropriate that we can allow that to continue. There's nothing to say that two years down the road if the determination is that we should go higher that another amendment can't be brought in for that purpose.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr): — The minister's arguments, Mr. Chairman, are absolutely hollow. He says they will complain if there is 20 cents in here. He doesn't have to put it to 20 cents and if he does he knows that he is putting in here and we can immediately withdraw from that. They can withdraw on the spot on that. Why would the minister attempt to brainwash us on that type of an issue when certainly all he needs to do is stay tough on it if he feels it should stay at 10 cents but he says it was agreed and discussed. It wasn't discussed with the committee of the checkoff bill itself. The entire committee want it raised. Now why does the minister not sit down and talk to the former Minister of Agriculture about it? We really feel it's not a big deal on his part. Why is he hung up on this 15?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what I can add to what I have already said. The decision was made by our caucus and in discussion with a lot of people and we felt that there is room now for further increases under the existing act and there is really not any reason at this point in time why we should be increasing that figure and I simply am not recommending it.

Section 3:1 as amended negated on division.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Well, I don't know whether you done it deliberately and I see that my colleagues to the right have fallen into your trap but one of the very, very key points is whether or not these moneys constitute a trust fund. If they are just a general fund, then the government has the discretion now built into the proposed amendments to allow them to do with the moneys, basically, what they want without any recourse by the cattlemen. However, if they are designated specifically as trust moneys, then the cattlemen who have contributed to the trust fund will have a legal right to insist that these moneys be spent for the purposes for which they contributed the moneys. There is a fundamental legal difference between saying a fund and between saying a trust fund.

I suggest to you that your definition refers only to the designated name. But in the amendments through the bill you have very deliberately struck out the words 'trust account,' struck out the words 'trust fund' and substituted therefore the word 'fund.' I say that the reason you have done that is so that the cattlemen are cut off from any legal recourse to insist that the government do with the funds contributed what the cattlemen are contributing the funds for. You are taking away that legal right and I say you are doing it deliberately and I say you are doing it maliciously. We were shocked when we saw the Liberals join with you on that and their proposed amendment referred to by their agricultural critic, the member for Morse when he is amending section 4 of the printed bill amending section 8. I say that the hon. member has made a fundamental error and by putting that amendment in will, in fact, prejudice those cattlemen who have indicated to the Premier that they intend to take action because that will take away their right to, in fact, commence that action and will undercut the very basis of their court action. I suggest that to the hon. member that that is what he has done. So that legally, we have seen the Liberals join with the NDP to undercut the legal

underpinnings of the cattlemen in this by deliberately weakening and taking away the very specific — and I know that the Leader of the Liberal Party would agree — onerous provisions that exist when you have trust moneys as opposed to general funds.

I suggest to you that, in fact, you are taking away the legal rights of the cattlemen by your shifty definitions right through the act and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will in section 2, agree that the definition of 'fund' meaning the Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act trust fund established under section 6 should in fact. . . . you totally misread it again my friends, that, in fact the minister will agree that the definition should be amended so that in all cases reference to the fund means trust moneys and trust account. Will you agree with that?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know who is trying to confuse who here. If you read section 2, it says: 'Fund means Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act Trust Fund', established under section 6. Section 6 says. The minister of Finance shall establish a trust fund, to be called The Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act Trust Fund, being a chartered bank or credit union.' I don't know what it is in that particular wording that creates a problem for you because it certainly indicates a trust fund as you have indicated.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I will give you an example. For example, just looking at section 5 of the printed bill, where you have deliberately struck out the words 'trust account' and substitute 'fund'. I suggest that that has serious legal implications for the position of the cattlemen. I think you know that. I say that you have done it deliberately because this is the last source of funds left over from 1971 that you haven't got your hands on and haven't put into general revenue. Section 9 proves my point further that you have specifically weakened the position of those being trust account moneys so that they are general fund.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, I think the member knows better. I think he knows that section 2 under interpretations of the wording it says, 'fund means . . .' and it goes on to say what I accorded to him earlier. So any place in the act where the word 'fund' is used, it means exactly what is laid out under section 2.

Item 2 agreed on division.

ITEM 3

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Just one question, what two persons do you have in mind, Mr. Minister? Whom would you appoint yourself and what purpose will they serve on this committee?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, one person will continue to be a member who will act as an administrator in an administrative capacity as secretary to the board. The other one will be a representative of the livestock industry at large and we will attempt to get someone there, as I indicated earlier who is a producer, a true producer and somebody who is contributing to the fund. We would request at that point in time for him to indicate to us that he is a contributor to the fund because we wouldn't want to have somebody on there who is not contributing to the fund.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I thank the minister for that answer. Mr. Chairman, you are saying there would be one administrator or someone to act as secretary then to the

committee. The other person you are saying will be someone who represents the cattle industry at large. Now I don't know just what your definition of 'at large' is in this particular instance. Are you suggesting that it is going to be someone who is contributing to the fund and is not a member of any of the organizations which are represented on the board? Is that your position?

MR. KAEDING: — Not necessarily so, because it will be pretty hard to find anybody in this province who didn't belong to some organization. Unless you went out into the boondocks, you would hardly find anybody who doesn't belong to either the Stockgrowers or the NFU or the Cow-Calf Association or the Wheat Pool or all of those organizations.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Just one final question. Mr. Minister, since you are suggesting that it won't necessarily be a neutral contributor to the fund, would you answer this question? Will it be a contributor to the fund, that is, of any organization in particular and an active member of any particular organization? Can you tell me that?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, at this point in time I don't have any thoughts in my mind about who that person would be. Really we have not made that decision.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Except that if you are going to appoint someone from an organization other than the one set, should you not declare it to the House?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No

MR. LANE: — I'm sorry I woke up the hon. member because he contributed about as much today as he has in the rest of the debate. Now, should you not be declaring to this Assembly if it's from another organization as you have indicated, from outside the list that in fact you prepared to say today, either that it's not from an organization not on the list or that it will be from an organization not on the list?

MR. KAEDING: — Well, Mr. Chairman, how could I make that indication now, because as I said at this point in time, we have not even looked for anybody to go into that particular position. We are certainly not going to be looking to give somebody a duplicate membership, but it's going to be almost impossible. It may end up that he may be a member of Stockgrowers or he may be a member of the Cow-Calf Association or some other member. We want to pick someone who will represent an area which is hopefully not at the present represented.

MR. LANE: — I suggest you are in the impossible position that you don't really know what you are doing, and you don't need the two persons appointed by the minister. You obviously don't need them: you have not got anybody in mind: you don't know what you are going to do. I'm sure the hon. member wants to be as precise as possible in the interests of the cattle industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Rather than be so imprecise and unsure and uncertain as to what exactly he is going to do, will the minister withdraw the amendment so that we can keep it for the people that we specifically have indicated in the Assembly.

MR. KAEDING: - Mr. Speaker, there may well be in the group of livestock producers, segments which are not represented in this list which we have here. I think that we should have a little bit of running room to provide some representation for those kinds of people.

MR. LANE: — Well, the devil you know is probably better than the one you don't know. I have every confidence that everybody listed on the list is quite happy to ride with what they have got, rather than have two people appointed by the minister who may be detrimental for all we know to the operations of the committee. I'm suggesting to the hon. minister that because he is so imprecise and so unsure, so uncertain of himself, that he should in fact, withdraw the bill. I'm going to urge that the hon. Member withdraw the amendment to section 3 of the printed bill amending section 7, wherein he attempts to insert two persons unknown, not considered appointed by the minister.

MR. KAEDING: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have the post to withdraw the bill because of the provisions which are now there. As indicated earlier by members on both sides of the opposition, there was objection to the consumer representative and so we indicated O.K., that person didn't need to be a consumer representative, so we would just leave it and say two other persons appointed by the minister. I think it is most appropriate that we should have an opportunity to find someone who may not be represented by some of the people who are on this list.

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Just one small comment in regard to this. As I mentioned earlier in my opening remarks, we of course would like to see section F changed to only one representative from the government. I voiced that opposition to it. I just want to reinforce my opposition to the fact that there are two members being appointed by government and not one. We would like to see it changed. It is clear that the minister is not intending to make that change, that may be it, but certainly I want to make it know that we are very much opposed to the fact that the board is becoming too large. We feel that you have adequate representatives there from a broad sector of the livestock industry in the province of Saskatchewan. In order to keep the board within a more workingful and meaningful relationship, our recommendation was that it be dropped to one. I would just like to reinforce that at this time.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, these two people whom you intend to appoint, Mr. Minister, all are fine and dandy; you have accounted for one. And with regard to the other one, we are telling you, Mr. Minister, that we are not prepared at this point in time to take the chance as to whom you intend to appoint. Now we feel that surely you must know and you don't; you are indicating to us that you don't. You don't know who it's going to be; you don't know whom they are going to represent; you don't know what they are going to do on the board. Now we just have no idea. We feel that it's your responsibility, Mr. Minister, to tell us, to tell this Assembly what the function of that second person is to be and who it will represent, because otherwise, it seems very obvious that you are attempting to dilute this board and the powers of the producer board with these two representatives whom you are appointing, whom you have control of. Now when you get up to answer my statements, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you this one further question. With regard to the consumer representation that was on there before, were they? Were one or two or both members of the National Farmers' Union?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, again I simply have to indicate that we are talking about the appointing of one person as in the administrative capacity. The other one will represent cattlemen at large. I have indicated to you that that person will be, that we will require him to be a producer and will require that he is contributing into the fund. It seems to me that there is a broad community which may need some representation which at this point in time isn't here and we would like some room to be able to appoint a member at large. I think that is particular sense.

With regards to the National Farmers' Union, he made some remarks about the National Farmers' Union. At this point in time, officially they are saying that they are not interested in a checkoff in any way. So if they are not contributing into the fund they certainly would not be able to be represented on this board.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — Let's just get positions clear in the House, that the party to my right welcome one political appointment and say that that is all right. We want to make clear that we oppose the power to appoint both people by the minister. The minister has stood up in this House and said he doesn't know who they are going to be. He has no idea. He has not considered them: in fact they can be political input by the government opposite and for that reason we oppose this proposed amendment.

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Chairman, I just want to add one question.

I have been a partner in the Estevan Cattle Auction Market since inception and I can assure you that any part of what you are trying to propose right now is not acceptable by the cattlemen, particularly, when you tell me there is going to be one or two people appointed by you. I think that is very much interference into the cattle people in our area and they are going to resent that very, very greatly.

Clause (a) agreed to on division.

Clause (b) agreed to.

Clause (c) agreed to on division.

Section 3 as amended agreed.

Section 4

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I referred in section 2 that we oppose most strongly the proposed amendment of the Liberal Party because it further dilutes the legal position that these moneys are, in fact, trust account moneys.

If the words 'trust account' were left in as they are presently, then the amendment, of course, would be a minor house-keeping one substituting 'committee' for the board that existed beforehand and have had no value whatsoever. But removing the words 'trust account' we are of the opinion, in the Conservative caucus, that the legal position of the cattlemen who contribute to this fund, is seriously prejudiced and seriously weakened. We are on record as opposing it for that reason.

MR. WIEBE: — I am not a lawyer and I don't propose to know anything about the legal niceties of the court, but I think that as a farmer I am intelligent enough, after having spent seven years in this Assembly, and the member for Qu'Appelle having spent the same amount of time in this Assembly, to be able to read a piece of legislation.

Their argument, in my mind, is just unbelievable. The definition of funds, as stated in the act, means the Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act trust fund. So that every time the word 'fund' is used in the bill, this is definition, Mr. member for Qu'Appelle. Every time that the word, 'fund' is used in this particular bill that means The Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act trust fund established under section 6.

Now, why are these definitions put in there? If they weren't you would have a bill that

May 27, 1978

would be twice as long. Let me read what my amendment will sound like if that definition weren't there.

Subject to section 6, the board shall administer the use of The Cattle Marketing Voluntary Deductions Act trust fund established under section 6 and authorize all expenditures there from except refunds of deductions that are provided for in section 9.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, what can be more clear. It is a trust fund. The fund is in trust for the cattle producers of this province and for anybody to try and misinterpret that, I just can't understand it and I challenge, I challenge the Conservative members on a standing vote to vote against this amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 31

Blakeney	Kaeding	Allen
Bowerman	McNeill	Koskie
Smishek	Feschuk	Johnson
Romanow	Rolfes	Malone
Messer	Cowley	Wiebe
Byers	Tchorzewski	Cameron
Matsalla	Shillington	Stodalka
MacMurchy	Vickar	McMillan
Mostoway	Skoberg	Nelson (As-Gr)
Banda	Nelson (Yktn)	Clifford
Whelan		

NAYS — 7

Collver	Lane (Qu'Ap)	Berntson
Larter	Birkbeck	Katzman
Bailey		

Section 5, section 9 amended.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — We want a designated trust account, in all cases. The Conservatives oppose the proposed section in the bill.

Section 5 agreed on division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I have to inform the members that if you want to say on division, you have to rise and say on division.

Section 6, new sections 10 and 10(a)

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): —Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, of course what this particular section allows you to do is to set up another bureaucracy of inspectors hired under the provisions of The Public Service Act which will be first of all, probably unnecessary and will be more government interference in the cattle industry. Secondly, as well will be a serious drain on the funds contributed by the cattlemen through the provisions of this act. What you are forcing by this section 10(1) is the cattlemen to a pay for their own government bureaucracy to interfere in the operations of the cattle industry. You are setting up a slate of full time civil servants. Now we are going to suggest and I want the minister's comments first, that section 10(1) be amended so that if there are any full time civil servants hired for the operation of this particular act, that it be the committee that appoints them and not the minister and not the government. You will notice first of all that there is a severe drafting error in that you have no provision in your section 10(1) for anybody appointing them and secondly, they should be appointed by the committee if the committee decides there need be any and not by the government. So I first of all want the minister's comments and then I have a motion which says:

That section 6, section 10(1) be first amended by inserting after the word appointed where it occurs in the second line of clause 1, the words 'by the committee.'

So that, in fact, it is the committee that makes the regulations and makes the appointments of any officials needed, not the minister. Secondly, in clause 10(a), we are the only party in the opposition that has obviously indicated that we are opposed to section 10(a). Section 10(a) allows the instructor who happens to be appointed by the government to go into any farmer's yard, and this is the second bill that we have been through this debate, except for this case, a house, and take any records, any documents of any cattlemen, any man involved in the beef industry and the cattle industry in Saskatchewan. And we note that the government (and I say with the support of the members to my right) because they didn't object to this provision, that's without any warrant. In other words, the Minister of Agriculture can have one of his little inspectors, if he appoints them, go into any cattleman, any stockyard, any auction yard, without a warrant and examine any records, any documents, any books if he believes there may be a violation no matter how slight. I suggest to you that if you insist on that type of Gestapo authority that you should insist at least on a search warrant before you have your inspectors going into the cattle business and into the personal records of the cattle industry of Saskatchewan.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, this particular section, simply what it does. it provides the inspectors who are already out there, inspectors under The Brand Inspection Act and under The Animal Products Act, these are the same inspectors who will be dealing with inspections under The Cattle Checkoff Act and this provides them with a parallel level of powers so that they aren't in every case involved in a different set of regulations, so that they have the same set of regulations under this act as they have under The Brand Inspection Act, as they have under The Animal Products Act. They don't have to carry a whole pocketful of different instructions wherever they go, so that in this case I have these powers and in this case I have those powers. The powers are not overly broad. The same powers are in many of the other acts and it provides a standardization whereby the same inspector doing the same kind of work is operating under the same regulations.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — I move, seconded by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck):

That section 6 of the printed bill be amended by inserting after the word

May 27, 1978

'appointed' where it occurs in the second line of clause (1) the words by the Committee' and by repealing section 10 A.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, I think we have to oppose the amendment on the grounds, in the first place, on the first part of the amendment where he proposes to appoint by the Committee. I think you will recognize that this act is being enforced by the government. The government has to provide the collection process for the collection of this money and for the Committee then to appoint people under The Public Service Act, would just not be a practical possibility. With regard to section 10A, I want again indicate that it has already been agreed in other legislation that these particular powers are not over broad. In fact, they will reduce this year. The old act indicated that we could enter a dwelling place without a warrant. The new act does not permit you to enter a dwelling place without a warrant. So I would indicate again that these powers are not overbroad. They are simply giving to the inspectors, who are already there dealing with other acts, giving them the same powers that they have under the other acts so that they don't have a whole confusion of different regulations.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS-13

Malone	Clifford	Lane (Qu'Ap)
Wiebe	Collver	Birkbeck
Stodalka	Larter	Berntson
McMillan	Bailey	Katzman
Nelson (As-Gr)		

NAYS-24

Blakeney	Mostoway	Cowley
Bowerman	Banda	Tchorzewski
Romanow	Whelan	Shillington
Messer	Kaeding	Vickar
Byers	McNeill	Nelson (Yktn)
Baker	Feschuk	Allen
Matsalla	Faris	Koskie
MacMurchy	Rolfes	Johnson

Section 6 carried on division.

Section 7: Section 12 amended agreed.

Section 8 agreed.

Section 9 coming into force, agreed.

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee report the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It has been moved by the —

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap): — That was not agreed to.

MR. COLLVER: — That last one was not agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The motion that was put was that the committee report the bill . . . (Interjection - inaudible) . . . Well, the other is not a motion. It is moved that the committee report the bill with amendments.

Amendments were read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time on the following recorded division.

YEAS—27

Blakeney	Matsalla	Rolfes
Pepper	MacMurchy	Cowley
Bowerman	Mostoway	Tchorzewski
Smishek	Banda	Shillington
Romanow	Kaeding	Vickar
Messer	Dyck	Nelson (Yorkton)
Snyder	McNeil!	Allen
Byers	Feschuk	Koskie
Baker	Faris	Johnson

NAYS-12

Malone	Nelson (As-Gr)	Bailey
Wiebe	Clifford	Birkbeck
Stodalka	Collver	Berntson
McMillan	Larter	Katzman

The Committee reported progress.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL - VOTE 10 (CONT)

ITEM 1 (CONT)

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition): — Mr. Premier, when we ended on Thursday, I believe it was Thursday afternoon, you indicated you would provide us with some information today about the family of Crown corporation advertising. I would be pleased if you would send it over before we get going.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — I understand that the provincial secretary tabled the return yesterday (that is what I am advised) and that the information is available. I wonder if the clerk or someone can confirm that for me. Perhaps we can get copies and provide them for the hon. member.

May 27, 1978

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I understand it has been distributed.

MR. MALONE: — Well, it is certainly correct that the order for return that was put on the order paper by Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap) has been answered. I received this morning the answer in my office but I point out that.. The Premier remains, standing. I am not sure whether you are going to say something or whether.. That return is effective up to Nov 15, 1977. Now, my distinct impression of our final remarks of Thursday last was that we were pressing the government for information on a current basis. Now I realize that you cannot give it to us today but we ask you for your Budget, for the estimated cost of the Crown corporation advertising plan for the rest of the year.

Now I hope we do not have to go through another two and one-half hour harangue on this but my understanding from the Premier was that our questions in this regard would be answered. Certainly the return filed — We thank the Premier for using his good office to get it filed but it is hardly an answer to the questions that we have been pursuing them with. Now are you prepared to give us the information that we have asked for on an up-to-date basis?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I will try. I am sorry if I got the impression that what was wanted was the information that was asked for, and with all deference I think that is a pretty reasonable interpretation of what went on. But if I misunderstood you, we will have another whirl here and see whether I have got some other information.

MR. MALONE: — Well surely there is a figure you can give us covering production, Budget and so on.

MR. BLAKENEY: — The family of Crown corporations figure in 1977, and hold for those because I will see if this .. The costs of the family of Crown corporations series was \$172,000; it was \$172,247. So, \$172,000 was for production costs and \$65,000 for media costs, making a total of \$237,000. These figures cover billings to the end of November.

The next billing in March of 1978 covers the period from December 1, 1977 to February 28th, 1978. Now this is a total of \$93,000 so that makes up until the end of November a total of \$237,000 and then up to the end of February is another \$93,000. Those are the totals . . . that makes a total of \$331,000. I don't know whether we have anything here prospectively. This is up to the end of February 28, covering the billings which were received in March when this material is now three weeks old, some of it. With respect to budgeting for the future . . .

MR. MALONE: — Those figures breakdown to about \$30,000 per month for family of crown corporation advertising. Is it fair to say for the continuance of that particular series of advertising to whatever date it ends that your Budget is about those figures, the figures you have given us?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think that the belief is that there will be about another \$170,000 spent in total, and that would be . . .

MR. MALONE: — \$500,000.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Right.

MR. MALONE: — Now let me ask you again, how long is the program to go? Is it done on

the fiscal year or have you set an arbitrary date as when it's to end?

MR. BLAKENEY: — It's designed to end before the summer, so sometime in June I would think it would end before the summer doldrums in television, if I may put it that way.

MR. MALONE: — Can you tell me, over what period of time and I should know this but I can't remember over what period of time has this program continued? Was it 18 months if I recall?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I understand that it started in the late summer or early fall. I think it started in September, September of 1977, right.

MR. MALONE: — So what you are saying to us in effect is that for about 9 months, 10 months to be fair, is that you have budgeted in your department, \$500,000 and not your department, the government has budgeted \$500,000 to be spend on what you call institutional advertising for Crown corporations and we call political propaganda.

Now let me make two points, two points. Firstly it is my belief that having shared by members, all members on this side of the House, shared by editorial writers, shared by many people who have phoned me and written to me, that this is a dreadful misuse of a taxpayer's money. And I point out to you that those ads do not talk about a service that SPC is offering in a specific area or indeed to the whole province of Saskatchewan, that does not warn on possible hazards of digging and breaking telephone lines or power lines. It does not in anyway give out information as to the services in a specific way that those Crown corporations offer to the people of Saskatchewan. The whole background for the advertising is to blow up the NDP philosophy on the goodness and value of Crown corporations. Beyond that, what it really is an attempt to do is to convince the people of Saskatchewan there is no difference between the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and Sask Tel. There is no difference between Saskoil and SPC. And I think everybody in this province is now aware that there is a very distinct difference between those two corporations. I say to you Premier, I think you will acknowledge this, that all that program is set to do is to try and convince the people of Saskatchewan that the Potash take-over is worthwhile.

A secondary importance was that the Saskoil program is no different than any other Crown Corporation in this province. It just won't wash. You put in the potash takeover without the permission of the voters. At no time did you ever come out and say to the voters in the campaign of 1975 or events leading up to that campaign there was going to be intention of your government to spend up to \$1 billion to buy the potash industry.

What you are doing is using the advertising technique in a very devious way, in a very subtle way, to try and convince the people of Saskatchewan that the potash takeover was worthwhile.

Now I'm not going to go into the debates that we have been going through with the Minister of Finance and the minister in charge of the potash corporation, the Minister of Mineral Resources as to the return to the people of Saskatchewan on that \$500,000,000 to \$700,000,000 that has been invested to date. Suffice to say we received nothing to date from that investment.

So that's one point, a misuse of a taxpayer's money to simply disseminate NDP political propaganda. That's bad enough as it is. But at the same time you come in here and you

put in an Elections Act, an Elections Act that we say does two things. It's not dealing with elections; it's dealing with periods other than election. It tries to restrict the amount of money that we can spend in non election years, and secondly it's an act that tries to pry into the affairs of the Liberal and Conservative party.

That's not bad enough. But you allow us through your great generosity to spend in one year the magnificent sum of \$50,000; if the Attorney General can be trusted enough to believe that will be increased to \$75,000 fine and dandy. But one government program, one government program using the taxpayers money, to disseminate what we believe is political propaganda spends as much in one month as you allow us to spend in a whole year, \$500,000 in less than a year, to get across to the people of Saskatchewan your ideas about Crown Corporations, and I say that is shameful. You say, you will get up and say that program is institutional. It's a program that has nothing to do with the philosophy of the NDP. You will get up and justify it by saying that CN runs ads, that other federal government Crown corporations run ads and they do. I don't particularly agree with them but they do. But the point is Premier, that there is certainly a significant volume of opinion in the province of Saskatchewan that's not aligned to the people who sit to my left, and not aligned to your party, but take very great exception to their money being spent in this way. Now you can get up and be personally convinced. I don't think you are convinced in the righteousness of what you are doing. But that really does not matter because I believe that most people in Saskatchewan look at this program as nothing more than political propaganda. You get up to try to justify the expenditure in less than a year of \$500,000 of the taxpayer's money. You say to us as a political party that if we can raise the money, we can only spend \$50,000 in an entire year. I point out again that this is not all government advertising. This is not the ads that are run separately by SMDC or the Potash Corporation or Saskoil. This is just one small part of government advertising. (You certainly know how to destroy a person when he gets wound up). It is simply one small part of the government's misuse of the taxpayers' money to get across their message. So I ask you. how can you as a government get up and justify restricting opposition parties and your own party to the spending of \$50,000 a year as the bill currently stands, while at the same time one program of the government spent 10 times as much in less than a year?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the advertising, I think that the advertising is institutional advertising and is proper institutional advertising designed to do the same sorts of things as advertising by corporations of all stripes, public and private, in Canada. I have looked with some care at the CP ads, the ones that say, 'Why shouldn't it be called Canadian Atlantic?' and 'It's a worldwide company, Sam' and I have seen them run that roller up and down the walls and run it over people's hands and that sort of thing. I know that at least about 50 per cent is certainly being paid for by the public of Canada. I have noted many more ads, Noranda and others, which are blatantly, I think so . . .

MR. MALONE: — Who pays for them?

MR. BLAKENEY: — We pay for half of it out of tax funds because that is certainly deducted as an expense. I have not heard members opposite take the position that money which is laid out by a public corporation or money which is laid out by a private corporation and claimed to be a deductible business expense ought not to have any ideological content, because I see that that is manifestly not true with respect to, let's say Noranda's, or the private insurance companies where I see them referring with some precision to . . .

MR. LANE: — You are putting yourself in the same position as the multinationals.

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I looked at our ads and I say that they are genuine institutional advertising. They are obvious . . . (Interjections- inaudible) . . . Well I am, I think, well aware of the Bishopric story, very well of the Bishopric story. I will not recount how that plant was acquired from a defunct private industry called Natural Sodium Products Limited; I will not go into that story,

The Englebright plant set up by the government which preceded us, without doing quite enough research, obviously has some problems but, on the whole, we are not in any way dissatisfied with the general operation of Saskatchewan Minerals. If any corporation could yield to the people of Saskatchewan in employment and in returns what Saskatchewan Minerals has done over its 28-year history, I would be absolutely delighted.

If the issue is whether or not we should operate the plants when there is no market, I take the view that we have to operate as any other corporation does. . . . (Interjections - inaudible) . . . I think perhaps the debate on whether or not Sask Minerals is doing its job might be conducted somewhere else. I will just turn my mind, if I may, to the advertising.

I think the advertising is designed to do what any institutional advertising does, certainly to make the corporate identity known . . . (Interjection - inaudible) . . . Well because we want people to feel favourable towards SPC . . . (Interjections - inaudible) . . . for precisely the same reasons that the Air Canada management wants people to feel favourably towards Air Canada.

The Assembly recessed until 2:00 o'clock p.m.