

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
11th Day

Thursday, February 18, 1965.

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

CONGRATULATIONS ON BIRTH OF TWINS — MR. WALTER SMISHEK, (REGINA EAST)

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to call the attention of the members to the fact that you have cigars on your desks and the reason for them is that the wife of the member for Regina East presented him with twins yesterday morning . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and Mr. and Mrs. Smishek already have two children, a boy and a girl, and now they have two more, a boy and a girl. The boy is Timothy Nye, and the girl is Erica Kirsten. I am sure that we all wish the twins and Mrs. Smishek the very best, and we will take care of the father right here.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate this side of the house with the remarks of the Acting Leader of the Opposition and I can assure the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) that our opinion of him has gone up somewhat today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to your attention, Sir, and to all the hon. members of this house, a fine group of grade twelve high school students, from Hafford High School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Krynowski and his wife, together with Mr. Jerry Grabowski and Pat Bohun, the bus drivers. This group has travelled some 230 miles to be here. This is one particular school within my constituency that makes an annual trip. I, personally, am happy to welcome them this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and I am confident that their stay in the legislature and in the fair city of Regina will be a profitable and educational one.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to this assembly thirty-one students from my riding. They attend Thom Collegiate and belong to a special group which is interested in parliamentary procedure. They are grade ten students and their teacher, Miss Kirby, is with them. I am sure that all members will join with me in expressing the hope that their stay with us will be pleasant and informative.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

Mr. George Leith (Elrose) moved:

That this house strongly urges the government of Canada to permit no abandonment of rail lines that are essential to the communities they serve, and to assure that this objective is obtained, this house further urges that the power of the Branch Rationalization

Authority be broadened to include mandatory public representation.

He said: In rising to speak to this house about the issue of rail line abandonment, I think that we are dealing with a matter of urgent public importance, a matter that is not in our power perhaps to do anything very concrete about, but a matter which is before the House of Commons in Ottawa and a matter which concerns us particularly in Saskatchewan.

The issue of rail line abandonment is of very great concern to all of the people of the west, and especially to Saskatchewan people. To date, the railways have made application for abandonment of 3,797 miles in Canada, 89 per cent of which are located in the prairie provinces, and 51 per cent, or 1,946 miles in Saskatchewan.

I want to first draw the attention of this legislature to what the people of Saskatchewan and the government of Saskatchewan have already done in this regard. The transportation branch of the Department of Industry and Commerce has travelled over 50,000 miles in the last two years throughout the province, assisting to organize local retention committees. Ninety-seven public meetings and 144 committee meetings attended by over 14,000 people were addressed by representatives of the branch. Over 1,200 farmers and businessmen are organized in 65 local retention committees on 45 branch lines. Sixty-two hundred questionnaires have been completed by farmers alone from which information in regard to the economic consequences of abandonment has been summarized. This massive organizational campaign would not have been successful without the co-operation of 204 towns, villages and municipal councils.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the North West Line Elevator Association, the United Grain Growers Association, the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, and the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, have all contributed very greatly to the work of these committees.

Mr. Speaker, Elrose constituency has particular concern regarding the intentions of the railway companies. We are served by two branch lines of the C.N.R. called the Elrose sub and the Beechy sub. There is also a short branch line of the C.P.R. We don't know what the intentions of the C.P.R. are, but we do know that the C.N.R. has asked for permission to abandon their lines in Elrose constituency. These proposals are absolutely unthinkable to the people of that area. If the C.N. lines come out of our area, some farmers would have to haul grain at least 36 miles, the cost of which, added to the already high cost of farming, would be completely prohibitive.

Then there are other costs which are not so easily foreseen but which must be anticipated in abandonment of any branch line. These costs perhaps should be called losses, because they will represent the direct and abrupt slashing of property values. Even the elevators that must be moved and the ones that are being moved now will be immediately worth much less if the track beside them is taken up. Businesses and homes will suffer the same overnight depreciation. This situation is not peculiar to Elrose constituency. It is common to the whole of Saskatchewan if abandonment is allowed to take place on the present terms.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this is not just abandonment, it is desertion. Both the railway companies were chartered as instruments of national policy to tie this nation together and to help populate the prairie region. Their achievements in these two fields of national policy have been tremendous, but they have a continuing responsibility to provide transportation.

I believe that the management of the C.N.R. realizes its responsibility in this connection. Mr. W.C. Bowra who is Vice-President of the Prairie Region of the C.N.R. said in part in a recent speech in Saskatoon and I quote:

But in addition to being part of each community in which it operates, the C.N.R. is part of a national transportation system, the objective of which is, or should be to provide Canada with efficient transportation at the lowest possible social, and economic cost, and as part of this system C.N. shares a responsibility to co-operate with other elements

of the system for the overall advantage of the nation.

Here again he goes on to say:

I think it is fair to say that the C.N. is trying, sometimes against great difficulties, to discharge its responsibilities.

Now, Mr. Bowra has emphasized the railroad's responsibility to the nation. However, it is certainly our responsibility to demand that our regions should not be made to suffer undue penalties just because the railroads think they are losing large sums of money on their western branch lines.

Mr. Speaker, our position in this matter of urgent public importance must be made very clear. We believe that no branch line should be abandoned that is socially and economically necessary to the people that it now serves.

On May 12th, 1964, the Minister of Transport, Mr. Pickersgill, introduced a resolution into the House of Commons dealing with the proposed legislation. The resolution read in part:

To establish a branch line rationalization authority and a branch line rationalization fund to be continued for fifteen years to assist in the establishment of an orderly program for the improvement of the efficiency of railway branch lines.

The government of Saskatchewan supports the establishment of a branch line rationalization authority, but we feel that bill C 120, which has had first reading in the House of Commons in Ottawa is drafted to abandon lines rather than to rationalize them.

Rail rationalization should work toward achieving the most efficient grain gathering network for the prairies. Rail rationalization must be based upon examination of all lines, with reference to all relevant economic factors and not simply on the cost to the railways of operating the present system in this regard. Mr. Speaker, we believe that there should be one authority with the power to rationalize lines. This authority should be the proposed branch line rationalization authority. As it is now designed, it has neither the function nor the power to effect rationalization. This authority must have the power to grant or withhold subsidies from the railways if they refuse to co-operate with the rational plans that clearly serve the public interest. This authority must have the power to require early abandonment where lines are shown to be nonessential for the continued well-being of an area or a community.

The public must be able to make representation to this authority, to make sure that no community is deserted by a railway before a complete study of all the social and economic factors has been made. Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this branch line rationalization authority should have its headquarters here in Saskatchewan because this is the centre of the area which would be most affected by any abandonment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member from Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle):

That this house strongly urges the government of Canada to permit no abandonment of rail lines that are essential to the communities they serve and to assure that this objective is obtained; this house further urges that the power of the branch rationalization authority be broadened to include mandatory public representation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larochelle (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time that I rise to address this legislature, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment

as Speaker of this house. I believe this house has made a very wise choice from my observation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on a matter which is causing a good deal of concern among my constituents, a concern which I know is shared by the majority of the people in this province. I have reference to the contemplated abandonment by the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. of many miles of rail lines in Saskatchewan.

The recommendation of the MacPherson Royal Commission on Transportation, that the Canadian railways divest themselves of thousands of miles of so-called uneconomic branch lines, has created great concern in western Canada. To date, Mr. Speaker, as the previous member mentioned, 1,946 miles or 51 per cent of the national total have been applied for in Saskatchewan. While I am sympathetic to those in other parts of the province, who will be affected by these abandonments, I wish to confine my remarks to the plight of my own constituents.

As the house will appreciate, Shaunavon constituency, which I have the honor and privilege to represent, is in the extreme south corner of this province. This constituency abuts both Alberta and the United States. The Canadian Pacific Railway have made application to the Board of Transport Commissioners to abandon that portion of the Leadwood sub-division between Manyberries, Alberta, and Notukeu, Saskatchewan, a distance of 52 miles. For those who do not know this part of the province, the line starts at Weyburn, continues to Assiniboia, Shaunavon, Lethbridge and on to Vancouver.

Now, if you look at the map, you might get the impression that there are only two hamlets within our province that would be affected, Senate and Govenlock, and that the problem is perhaps a minor one. Let us examine the situation. Bear in mind that grain from this area is shipped to Vancouver for export. With the direct link severed, the mileage to that port will increase by some 249 miles and because the shipment will need to be directed back around by Moose Jaw, the Vancouver rate on grain will increase from 24 cents per hundred to 28 cents per hundred. True, if the grain is shipped to the lakehead, the rate would remain the same, 24 cents per hundred. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that should this grain be shipped to the lakehead then, in order to fulfil the bushel requirements of the Vancouver port, a comparable volume will have to be gathered up for Vancouver, and this can only be done by extending the gathering area with, undoubtedly, an increase in mileage and a rate per bushel which other farmers will have to pay.

It can be seen that these farmers are going to be faced with a problem, should permission to abandon this line be granted. Not only will the freight rate they pay be increased, but they will have added cost involved in making delivery of their grain over the extra miles to the nearest marketing facilities.

Now we believe, for instance, that the C.P.R. hopes eventually to achieve abandonment of the Val Marie-Notukeu portion of this line, a distance of 105 miles, all of which is located in my constituency. Now, I can see that this Val Marie-Notukeu portion is not yet slated for abandonment but since grain from this whole area is presently moved over the portion of the Manyberries line that is up for abandonment, the farmers along that line will be immediately affected. If we examine the map of that area, we realize at once that a good number of producers would be faced with substantial trucking costs in order to get their grain to the nearest elevator. Some of them who now haul six to ten miles to town, will have to truck grain as much as 40 to 60 miles, and I am sure that the hon. members will have a good idea of what it costs to truck a bushel of grain 40 to 60 miles.

Those people who homesteaded and pioneered that section will be cut off from their normal market outlets without any consideration, we have to remember that they settled in that area and stayed there, persevered, partly because of the fact that they had a rail outlet to world markets for their produce. One might say that they will still have such an outlet, though in a different direction, but I emphasize that the extra cost they will have to shoulder may well be the difference between keeping their heads above water and sinking. The margin has always been a narrow one in this area, and, as proud as these people are of their holdings, and their homes, and their farms, they would be forced to admit that, one year with another, it is a grim, tough struggle to make things go. I believe very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that in determining this admittedly complex question of abandonment, we have got to use some yardstick other than a simple profit and loss position of the railway companies.

The movement of grain over long distances to export position is a very vital factor to the grain producer and is a substantial element in his total cost picture. Any increase in his initial cost of production and marketing, whether it be in the railway or in his local transportation costs, can have a very serious effect and must receive careful consideration before being imposed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

To throw up our hands and to say that a line will be torn up, just because the rail operation is not profitable, is surely not the attitude to take. The overall picture must be taken into account. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with regard to this matter of rail line abandonment and especially as it applies to my own constituency, the expression in the public interest must be carefully weighed. Let us be thorough in our examination of this question, thus ensuring that full consideration is given the alternatives. Mr. Speaker, the people I represent are quite concerned with this rail line abandonment, and, therefore, I would recommend that bill C 120 be amended so that the determination of whether or not a branch line is uneconomic and should be abandoned rests solely with the branch line rationalization authority. In this context, the role of the Board of Transport Commissioners should be to assess the actual losses of the railways and to verify their costing procedures. It should be clearly understood that the branch line rationalization authority should determine whether or not a railway line is socially or economically essential to the users of the line and to the communities which may be affected before any order of abandonment is issued. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion introduced by the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) this afternoon, I would agree with him first of all that the question of rail line abandonment is one of greatest concern to all people in Saskatchewan. It is a question which affects Saskatchewan profoundly and merits the greatest degree of consideration by this legislature, and also, Mr. Speaker the greatest degree of unanimity of the members of this legislature in our efforts to prevail upon the federal government in this matter. I trust, Mr. Speaker that the government opposite does not share the view of the mover that nothing can be done by us here.

Due to railways primarily, our agriculture resources were developed almost to the maximum extent in a remarkably short span of years. Immigration from other countries was quickened and Saskatchewan, thanks to a combination of soil and climate suitable for wheat production, and to rapidly expanding transportation facilities, soon became the bread-basket of the world. Subsidies were given by the federal government to encourage railway expansion and under the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement, subsidies helped to stabilise rates for transportation of grain. The C.P.R. alone, before 1914, received cash subsidies of \$119,000,000 and land grants of almost 37,000,000 acres. By 1917, the C.P.R. had sold 16,000,000 acres of land for \$123,000,000 while the remainder of their holdings was valued at \$119,000,000.

Mineral rights went with the federal grants of land and in 1960 alone the C.P.R. received royalties on production of oil and gas of \$5,000,000. Valuable concessions such as these, Mr. Speaker, to the C.P.R. and other railways certainly should be taken into consideration when rail line abandonment is being considered.

The competitive drive of the rival railway companies compounded the problems of the railways as they built into every possible area of the country, often duplicating facilities in an endeavor to corner the major share of the traffic for the greater profit of their shareholders.

With revolutionary changes in transportation, with the rise in importance of the truck and the automobile, with the building of pipelines and the wide-spread use of aeroplanes, the railways found themselves in a competitive squeeze.

The Diefenbaker government appointed the MacPherson Royal Commission to study the whole transportation picture and to make recommendations to relieve the situation. In its report, the Royal Commission found that 8,600 miles of branch rail lines in Canada were uneconomic and possible

candidates for abandonment. It is known further, that half of these are in western Canada. It was recommended that abandonment take place over a period of fifteen years with the federal government providing subsidies to compensate the railroads while our economic lines were still in operation.

The Commission recommended the formulation of a rationalization policy of rail line abandonment by the federal government to prevent large scale piece-meal abandonment. Even before the report of the Royal Commission was finalized, the railroads took action to begin abandoning economic lines in Saskatchewan. The Board of Transport Commissioners granted an application to abandon the Reston-Wolseley line, and then soon after, the Rockglen-Kildeer branch line. Three more applications for abandonment were quickly made by the C.P.R. The Saskatchewan CCF government was concerned about the effects of large scale piece-meal abandonment and made representation to the MacPherson Royal Commission when it met in Regina in 1960. Concern was expressed to the commission that economic factors affecting only the railroads were being taken into consideration in granting abandonment.

It was pointed out that abandonment merely transferred costs to the railroad to the residents, mainly farmers in the area affected. To document this claim, the Department of Industry and Information produced figures from the study of the effects of the proposed abandonment. In twenty-four railway subdivisions here in Saskatchewan, it showed that the cost to farmers hauling grain to alternative delivery points would increase. It is further estimated that losses in the market value of the land belonging to farmers in these twenty-four subdivisions would be more than \$20,000,000. The municipalities, too, would suffer, the department said, from a reduction in the assessed values of land by about \$6,600,000.

This, in turn, Mr. Speaker, would lead to higher rates of municipal taxation to pay for services required. There would be a greater demand on municipalities for roads as a result of the changed pattern of travel. The Municipal Road Assistance Authority estimated that in the Bengough subdivision alone, 91 miles of additional high grade roads would be required as a result of the abandonment proposed by the railroad. This would cost the rural municipalities concerned about \$700,000 to which would be added maintenance costs of \$18,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, there would be other costs to farmers, and to other residents in communities left high and dry by rail line abandonment.

Following the report of the MacPherson Royal Commission, the Board of Transport Commissioners requested the railways to submit a list of proposed abandonments throughout the country. Eighty applications were received, affecting some 3,400 miles of rail lines and 411 railway stations, here in western Canada alone. Saskatchewan would be affected most adversely this, as 46 branch lines, comprising about 2,000 miles are in our province. The former CCF government, doubly concerned by the indicated number of future applications for abandonment, and by the applications actually before the board, called a special conference which met in Regina on December 20th, 1962. Manitoba and Alberta governments and non-governmental organizations from the three prairie provinces were in attendance. As a result of pressure brought to bear on Ottawa by this important meeting, the Board of Transport Commissioners refrained from processing abandonment applications until new legislation regulating abandonment was passed by parliament.

Mr. Speaker, two years have gone by, Sir, since the Regina conference was held. Today there is on the order paper in the House of Commons a bill respecting rail line abandonment. This, as the mover of the motion mentioned, is bill C 120, which has been under intensive study by various provincial governments and non-governmental organizations since last fall. It has been found wanting in several aspects.

A cabinet committee of the Saskatchewan government has heard briefs from various Saskatchewan organizations and the government in turn will make a representation to the federal government as to their views on Bill C 120. In this regard, there should be widespread agreement with the submission, as outlined in the policy statement which was tabled in this house a few days ago. An objection I have to the policy statement is that it is not strong enough in its recommendations. The cabinet committee agreed mainly with the organizations which submitted briefs, and here in this regard, with the views of the former CCF government, that social costs as well as economic costs, should be factors considered in any decision for abandonment. A federal Minister of Transport is quoted in the submission

as saying that "the first purpose of the railway is to serve the communities they serve, and your balance sheet must be put in second place."

Unfortunately, bill C 120 is not as explicit. The government of Saskatchewan says almost the same thing, on page 4 in the submission, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, where the submission says:

There can be no question that the abandonment of a branch line will shift transportation costs from the railways to the grain producer. Secondly, there may be direct economic losses to communities that lose rail service. Rural municipalities will be forced to shoulder increased expenditures for new roads and the maintenance of existing roads. Grain elevators have to be moved or rebuilt. These factors must be weighed by the branch line rationalization authority in determining the economic and social cost of abandonment.

The government of Saskatchewan believes that any legislation dealing with rail rationalization in western Canada, must take note of these factors and suggests . . .

And note, Mr. Speaker, the submission says:

suggests recognition of them be made in the legislation.

The wording, Mr. Speaker in this regard, should be stronger than 'suggests'. On page five, it is noted that bill C 120 recognizes the possibility of greater efficiency arising from the use of joint facilities by the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. and by transferring lines from one company to the other. The government of Saskatchewan believes that the branch line rationalization authority should be should be given the power to recommend this kind of rail organization in western Canada and to direct it if necessary. This certainly should be done, Mr. Speaker, and done before any branch lines are abandoned.

Above all, bill C 120 should be amended to make mandatory public-hearings on any application for abandonment. This is of paramount importance. However, in principle, we agree with the policy statement. I sincerely congratulate the cabinet committee on its submission. I trust this government will strengthen it, as suggested, and will strongly press on the federal government the necessity of amending bill C 120, so that the people of Saskatchewan can have some assurance that large sections of our population will not feel the devastating effect of having their community lives torn up by the roots, without due regard for social consequences.

I will adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTION RE CURLING RINK POWER RATES:

Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch) moved:

That this assembly requests the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing the rates of electrical power for skating and curling rinks, which are community owned and operated.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak to this resolution, not only as a member of this assembly but also as an executive member of the Saskatchewan Curling Association.

At every annual meeting of the Saskatchewan Curling Association, the subject of reduced power rates are requested. Committees have been formed to discuss this with the officials of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I am pleased to report that last year they showed some indication that possibly this request had some merit. I also know that an association of skating rinks has been formed and that they have presented similar requests. How they have fared I do not know.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this resolution receives the support of this assembly, every urban community in this province will benefit, especially those in the smaller centres. Anyone who has lived small rural community in Saskatchewan will know full well that, during the winter months, the skating and curling rink becomes the community centre. Here, young and old alike assemble to participate in the sport of their choice, be it curling, hockey, skating, as spectators, or just to visit with neighbors. In this day and age, when we are constantly being reminded by the Department of Physical Fitness that we are fast becoming a nation of softies with a physical rating inferior to that of many nations, it becomes absolutely essential that these services be maintained and extended.

In Saskatchewan, with its months of inclement weather, which are not conducive to outdoor activities, we must provide our younger generation with the means of working off their excess energies in good, wholesome, sports activities. Mr. Speaker, it would not hurt any of us, who have reached the age of non-participation in strenuous sports, to get out and enjoy the exercise which curling provides.

Today, the centralization of services has affected the smaller communities to a greater extent. The burden of keeping these rinks operating is falling on the shoulders of too few. The buildings themselves are often badly in need of repair, and the actual cost of operation is threatening to cut off these services.

Mr. Speaker, the largest single cost of operation is electrical power. Many of the other costs can be borne by volunteer labor but there is no substitute for electricity. This must be paid for in cash. Many of these rinks are able to remain open only by curtailing the use of electricity. And this has two decided effects. It is dangerous for young people skating or playing hockey without adequate lights, and it also distracts from the game of curling when one can hardly see the other end of the rink.

A reduction in power rates would not only help these people with their financial problems but it would give them added incentives to maintain and improve their services. Let us look at the position of the urban centre which has increased its population due to the centralization of services. In most cases the citizens have found their rinks inadequate to serve their communities. Many have built new skating and curling rinks at a large capital expenditure. Most centres have installed artificial ice plants in their curling rinks, greatly increasing their power bills and adding to their operating expenses.

The cities, with their explosion in population, have over-crowded existing facilities, and new curling clubs have been built to meet the increased demand for ice. The season for winter sports has been extended so as to increase the revenue to meet the payments on capital expenditure and operating costs.

Mr. Speaker, to meet the high cost of construction and operation, curling fees have had to be increased to a point where many people, who would like to participate, cannot do so because of financial reasons. In the studies we have made in many cases, the cost of electrical power amounts to approximately one-third of the operating costs, leaving two-thirds to take care of interest on capital investment to reduce the loans and to take care of the day-by-day maintenance.

I may say this one-third applies to the town that I come from, Lafleche, and just before the meeting started, I was handed this by the hon. member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker). May I read a small part of it:

In reply to your request by phone, I am enclosing a financial statement of rink operations and a summary of the rates for power for 1963-64 season. The demand charge, in each case, is exorbitant, and almost prohibitive to use. The artificial ice plant, for instance, when used for the shirt sleeve bonspiel for three days, cost us \$430 in demand charges. This does not include the lights. It would help if this could be changed.

This is just a request from one place. I do not intend to go into many figures, but I think this applies throughout the province.

We also know that we have many people who can well afford to pay

but we also know that we have many who cannot, and I do not think these people should be deprived of the chance of participating in one of our favorite sports.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to this assembly a few statistics to show how many women, men and children participate in curling in this province. In the men's division we have 540 clubs affiliated with the Saskatchewan Curling Association. Twenty thousand individual members are affiliated. In the ladies division, we have 288 clubs affiliated, with some 6,000 members affiliated. We also know that many clubs in the province do not register their memberships. So it would be reasonable to assume that we would have possibly 30,000 to 35,000 men and women curling in this province.

In the high school boys division, there are no records, but practically every high school in the province curls in school competition as part their athletic program. Practically every high school enters a team in the Saskatchewan Play-offs. Thirty-six rinks entered the provincial round robin play-offs. We know that there are 400 high schools in the province. Assuming that we have four rinks per school, we have some 6,000 boys participating.

In the high school girls division, here again we have no records but if we took one-third of the number of boys rinks participating, it should give us a reasonable figure. Adding the number participating at all levels, we have approximately 48,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan who enjoy the game of curling.

Mr. Speaker, I have only spoken thus far, of provincial competition. We now have no less than seven annual dominion finals. We have the British Consuls Competition in which the players compete for the world's championship. I am happy to say now, that every time Saskatchewan has competed they have won that championship. This year the dominion finals are played in Saskatoon, commemorating our Centennial Celebrations. May I add the best wishes of this assembly to the Harold Worth rink of Delisle and Saskatoon, Saskatchewan's representatives.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — We know they are worthy representatives and will bring honor and recognition to this province. In the ladies dominion finals, the Saskatchewan representatives this year are the members of the Barbara McNiven rink playing out of Saskatoon. We also wish them every success.

We have the boys dominion finals and our Saskatchewan representative is the Fink rink of Regina, they are presently competing in Fredericton, and doing very well. We extend them our best wishes.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — Other dominion finals to be played this year, are the Canadian Legion competition, the mixed competition, which was started last year, with rinks comprising two men and two women, the senior competition for men over 55 years of age, the Massey-Ferguson competition, which is confined to farmers. We should hope, before long, that the high school girls will have an opportunity to compete in dominion finals.

This, Mr. Speaker, gives us some idea of the way that the winter sport of curling is becoming Canada's national sport. I have confined my remarks mostly to curling rinks, because I know the seconder of this resolution will be giving you the story on the skating rinks.

We also know that the reduction of electrical power will not solve all the problems, but we feel it is a step in the right direction. Mr. Speaker, if the government of this province can spend millions over the years on parks and on related projects, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the government can also spend thousands of dollars on White Track ski slopes for benefit of those that ski, then I say we should give due consideration to the thousands of men, women and children, who participate in curling, hockey and skating.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this assembly would give unanimous approval to this resolution, and I take pleasure in moving, seconded by the member for Milestone (Mr. C.P. MacDonald):

That this assembly requests the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing the

rates of electrical power for skating and curling rinks, which are community owned and operated.

Mr. Fred A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

AGRICULTURE MACHINERY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cut Knife) moved:

That this legislature regrets that the testing services of farm machinery as provided under the provision of the Saskatchewan Farm Implement Act is to be discontinued, and recommends that the government give consideration to continuing this service under the provisions of this Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution requesting that the government give reconsideration to its decision to abolish farm machinery testing under the Agricultural Machinery Administration, I should first of all like to ask, why was independent testing of farm machines requested and provided for by an amendment to the Saskatchewan Farm Implement Act in 1958 and passed unanimously by the legislature at that time? Why was provision made for the administration of the act by an independent agency?

This was done, Mr. Speaker, because of numerous complaints by farmers, over the years, regarding rapid wear, breakage and poor functional performance of many implements and machines under actual working conditions. I would cite one particular machine, a swather that came into this province just about that time. It was completely valueless. The farmers of this province spent some \$350,000 on this machine and it was proven completely unworkable.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, it was done to encourage manufacturers to improve machines and implements for greater farm productive efficiency. All major farm organizations in Canada asked for it, approved it, and asked that the independent testing service be continued as at present. In Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, at its annual convention, passed a resolution, calling upon the government to continue this service. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture is on record similarly. The Saskatchewan Farmers Union have also passed a resolution and made direct representations to the government asking them to reconsider their action in this regard. But all of this, Mr. Speaker, was blatantly ignored to date and I hope this is not going to be the case in the future.

I should point out too, that as far back as 1952, a select special committee of the Saskatchewan legislature recommended to the legislature the creation of a farm implement board to test, inspect, and certify under the actual working conditions, farm machines and implements sold in Saskatchewan, and that facilities at the university, and, if possible, federal experimental farm facilities at Swift Current, also be utilized in this regard.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation was passed unanimously in 1959 without dissent, from the Liberal opposition. Saskatchewan was the first and only province in Canada to set up an agency of this kind. Farm organizations across Canada, when submitting briefs on the subject, have overwhelmingly supported an independent government testing service for farm machinery.

In 1962, the government of Ontario set up a committee to accept briefs and to hear representations from various organizations regarding the sale, distribution and testing of farm machinery in that province. It is significant to note that the larger portion of the briefs placed at the top of their priority list, a request for independent testing of farm machinery in that province. This committee held hearings, made a report, and made certain recommendations. However, the government did not implement the request of the farm organizations there. They did set up a sort of a watered-down organization that would mediate, that would evaluate certain machines, and advise farmers. Mr. Speaker, farmers in this day and age don't want advice any more. They want facts in regard to the expensive machinery they are being called upon to purchase.

A.M.A. testing has been in operation for six years. Farmers throughout Saskatchewan have come to appreciate the value of this service

The test reports serve, not only as a guide in purchasing costly machines but as a source of reliable, technical information in the operation of implements and farm machinery generally.

The Agricultural Machinery Administration did considerable practical work for the Family Farm Improvement Branch on machine items, and materials provided by this agency. The work and advice of A.M.A. in the drought year of 1961, when information was made available, regarding the best methods of handling short crops and salvaging fodder supplies was of inestimable value to the farmer of this province at that time. A.M.A. was destined to become the farm machinery extension arm of the agricultural representative service.

All of this has been abolished, Mr. Speaker, without regard to the expressed wishes of the farm organizations in this respect. It was abolished, primarily, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, because of the objections to this service by the now Premier of this province. In my recollection, he was the only Liberal member in this house, who made a forthright statement, that the testing services should be abolished.

To say that this independent testing service is redundant because big companies do their own testing, is invalid. A.M.A. reports clearly indicate that many defects and faults under actual field conditions occur and many of which were gladly corrected by the manufacturers when brought to their attention by A.M.A. A number of companies voluntarily submitted machines and attachments to this agency for testing with beneficial results to themselves and the farmers of our province. A good example of the work of the A.M.A. — the most valuable contribution it made — solving the problem of rocks being picked up while combining.

The view that independent government testing is redundant is completely opposite to the view held by farmers and farm organizations right across Canada. It is not too late, Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely ask the government of this province to reconsider this drastic decision to abolish this service. This service has been and can be, on an expanded basis, the most practical and beneficial money saving service the government could possibly provide for the agricultural industry of any province.

Machinery is a great and growing cost item in the farm budget. In 1963, new farm machinery purchases, excluding repair parts, amounted to over \$97 000,000 or 26.3 per cent of Saskatchewan's realized farm net income. Among the provinces of Canada, Saskatchewan is the biggest purchaser of farm machinery and repair parts. I point this out to indicate the great importance of an independent machinery testing organization of items that are so costly and that have become such a large part of the farmers' budget.

The Minister of Agriculture, in his own words, on January 4th, 1965, according to the Leader Post, made clear that independent field testing on behalf of farmers has come to an end in Saskatchewan. This is a report appearing in the Leader Post, January 4th, 1965, and it states:

Saskatchewan's Agricultural Machinery Administration will be moved to the University of Saskatchewan, to act as a modern research and development unit in the Agricultural Engineering Department, it was announced Monday morning.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture was quoted as saying:

The government was pleased to be able to contribute in this way, to the establishment of a modern research and development unit in the Agricultural Engineering Department of the University.

he went on

On the other hand we do recognize the need of a competent research unit that can direct its energies to fundamental problems in the whole agricultural machinery field.

and then, Mr. Speaker

they can advise farmers in machinery use and also provide a needed advisory service to the

manufacturer of farm implements and equipment in the province.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, these farmers do not want this kind of advice. They have never asked for a research unit, and Mr. Speaker, while I recognize that research activities of the Engineering Department in the University of Saskatchewan should be expanded, this is a mighty poor way of expanding those services at the university, when it is at the expense of a most valuable service that has been painstakingly built up in the past six years, in an area where it is very difficult to obtain competent and trained staff that specializes in this particular field, and obtain the necessary complimentary equipment that goes with a trained staff for this specific purpose.

I agree, as I say, that the university requires expanded research facilities but it should not be at the expense of this most valuable service. I have, Mr. Speaker, in my hand, the final and I hope, not the last report of the A.M.A., for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1964. May I quote some excerpts from this report . . .

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Where did you get it? What year?

Mr. Nollet: — . . . on testing farm machinery. This report represents the last fiscal year in which I was Minister of Agriculture in this province.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if I could ask where the minister got these copies that have never been tabled.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister must be dreaming. This particular annual report of the Department of Agriculture was tabled two or three days ago in this house . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — It has never been tabled . . .

Mr. Nollet: —: . . . and I am quoting from it, Mr. Speaker. I am quoting from the A.M.A. section of that annual report. I know the hon. minister is a bit squeamish on this subject and as I said before, I do not blame him entirely for the liquidation of this valuable service. I think he wanted to maintain it, but I think for some particular reason some people on the government side of the house thought this would be a good move, perhaps an economy move, but it is going to be a very expensive move for the farmers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — In regard to extension, here is an excerpt from the annual report of A.M.A., regarding field days held, they say:

The A.M.A. staff took part in a variety of extension programs. We are rapidly moving in this particular area, having held seven field days, twenty-three machinery extension meetings, eight radio programs, three television programs, one 4H field day, three student tours and lectures. The machinery testing program in 1963-64 included twenty-two machines, the same number as in the prior fiscal year. Programs, however, were enlarged as more complex and important machines were included. In addition, all machines were evaluated for both functional and durability performance. Better staff techniques, durability performance, instrumentation allowed the inclusion of more complex machines. Included also for testing during the year were three prototypes on a fee-for-service basis . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I informed the house that the annual report for the Agricultural Machinery Administration in March, 1964, has not been tabled to date, I would like

to know where the ex-Minister of Agriculture got this copy.

Mr. Nollet: — I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, from the annual report of the provincial Department of Agriculture as laid on the table in this house.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Where did you get this one?

Mr. Nollet: — This is it. Is the man blind? Can't he see? Do you not know that the report you have in your hand is contained in the annual report of the provincial Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not taking my time, he is taking his own.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if the ex-minister wants to quote from the annual report of the Department of Agriculture, I have no objection, but he is not to quote from anything that is reported in this document that I have in my hand, it has not been tabled.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am speaking from the annual report of the provincial Department of Agriculture and I think I am perfectly in order in quoting from it. Mr. Speaker, for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1964.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Okay, go on.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, and they go on,

the mailing for test reports was increased by slightly over 2,000, as a result of written requests from farmers asking to receive reports regularly. On March 31st, 1964, there are very nearly 15,200 farmers on the mailing list.

So there are nearly 16,000 farmers who voluntarily asked that their names be placed on the mailing list so they could receive these reports regularly.

It goes on to say

the reports were supplied to agricultural representatives for distribution in their areas (and they say) over 300,000 reports were distributed during the year in Saskatchewan.

It goes on to say

the Alberta Department of Agriculture again ordered substantial quantities of test reports for distribution to farmers in that province. An appreciable number of requests for reports continued to be received from other Canadian provinces. Some farmers and dealers in the U.S. have also asked for the reports.

In my mind, Mr. Speaker, there is no question at all as to the value of this service. Certainly the farmer of this province and right across Canada have asked for this kind of service, and we established this service six years ago in Saskatchewan. We led all of Canada and to me this was a tremendous forward step.

I watched this organization grow, together with many other new services in the provincial Department of Agriculture. With the abolition of this service, Mr. Speaker, a most vital service will be taken out of the provincial Department of Agriculture, a service which on an expanded basis would have rendered a very practical and most valuable service to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I implore and I beg, if necessary, yes, on my knees, I beg the government to reconsider this drastic action.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Pelly, Mr. Larson

That this legislature regrets the testing services of farm machinery as provided for under the provisions of the Saskatchewan Farm Implement Act is to be discontinued and recommends that that the government give consideration to continuing this service under the provisions of this act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leonard M. Larson (Pelly): — In rising to second this motion, Mr. Speaker, I do so for some very special reasons. I want, therefore, to address myself for a few moments to these reasons.

In the first instance, the services of the Agricultural Machinery Administration was a very unique and valuable service. It was unique because, for the first time, farmers had a completely independent organization which compared performances and tested all types and makes of farm machines and farm equipment. Prior to the establishment of this kind of testing and comparison, the farmer was left entirely at the mercy of dealer advertising and had to do the testing in his own fields and on his own farm, at his own expense.

This service is a very valuable one and served to save farmers many thousands of dollars as well as giving them a chance to test the capacity, durability, and general performance and then decide just how well the machine would fit and adapt to conditions in actual service on his own farm. Another very valuable service that the A.M.A. provided was to pinpoint and expose the various weakness of the machines. The farmers welcomed this kind of service. They also came to look upon the A.M.A. as an authority and reliable source of information in helping them decide what sizes and makes of machines to buy.

Another very important contribution of the A.M.A. was the service it provided to dealers. I have yet to go into any dealer's place of business and not find the A.M.A. reports being referred to and used extensively, both for comparison purposes as well as to check whether complaints reported by their customers were legitimate or if they were caused by other factors than the normal use of the machine. These reports were accepted as authentic and reliable. They were occasionally disputed but it was usually found that was A.M.A. was right. If the services of A.M.A. were of no value as a government now thinks, why were they so well accepted, and why were they so widely used and referred to?

The other point I want to make, Mr. Speaker is that there was a general improvement in farm equipment as a result of A.M.A. Reports were made available to the manufacturers and the findings of its tests and comparisons were distributed to them. The reports were all heeded and at least some attention was paid to them. Every report I have seen carried a set of recommendations as well as comments by the manufacturer as to correctional steps taken or to be taken.

I feel that manufacturers, as such, should have welcomed the work of A.M.A. It should have served to add strength to their advertising programs; it should have served as a saving, inasmuch as they would not have to do the same kind of comparative testing. This comparative testing by manufacturers is almost impossible on an independent and unbiased basis. That this kind of testing is to be discontinued is to be regretted very much. This is the kind of savings that the government proposes for the farmers of this province — and I say they are very misleading indeed.

In view of the tremendous amount of money that farmers spend on machinery and equipment, the very least our provincial government could do was to maintain the very limited testing program that was provided by the A.M.A. I do not oppose the research program that will be undertaken by the Agricultural Engineering Department of the university of Saskatchewan, it might well complement the A.M.A. testing program but should not replace it

The need for research and assistance to those who may be interested in developing new kinds and new types of machines is commendable and necessary, however, to clutter up this work with field tests, performances, and comparisons would be highly undesirable.

I think that it should be very simple and easy to understand that there is a vast difference between research and actual testing and comparing performances. To me, the two jobs are entirely incompatible. It is well known that the Engineering Department has been conducting this kind of work for a long time. I think it is equally well known that this work has produced valuable results. What may not be as well known is that it has left very much to be desired in the way of comparisons and actual listing of faults and weaknesses. I can well remember the day when we had only this type of service available to us . . .

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — . . . take it tomorrow, you are taking too much time.

Mr. Larson: — . . . it left very much to be desired, and in seconding the motion, Mr. Speaker, it is . . .

An Hon. Member: — It works both ways . . .

Mr. Larson: — . . . my hope that the members opposite will reconsider the position they have taken and see fit, in the interests of the farmers of this province, to reinstate the A.M.A. and to expand it. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at my friends opposite endeavoring to use as much of the radio time as they can today, because I know they would like to promote their side of the question, and not any one else's.

Most of the balderdash that has been coming from my friends opposite, I am sure, will not convince the farmers of this province of their arguments.

In the first place the statement that was made by the ex-Minister of Agriculture, that this service is being abolished is not a true statement, Mr. Speaker. The services that the A.M.A. have been providing to the farmers of this province are not being abolished, they are being enlarged and the farmers are going to get better services than they ever had in the past.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The amount of money that has been voted over the years for the A.M.A. to use for testing agriculture machinery in Saskatchewan has been less than \$150,000. Now, my hon. friend, the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet), a little while ago referred to the amount of money that our farmers were spending on farm machinery in Saskatchewan, and if he thinks for one moment that an expenditure of \$150,000 by the A.M.A., whether it is a provincial institution run by the Department of Agriculture, or an institution run by our university, is a sufficient sum of money to provide a worthwhile service, then I say he is completely out of touch with reality.

The machine companies themselves are spending over a million dollars in testing and research. How much of this work were they doing in Saskatchewan when he was the minister responsible for this branch of the Department of Agriculture? How many machines were being tested in Saskatchewan during the regime of my hon. friends opposite? Virtually none. Why? Because they refused to be dictated to by my little friend that sits across the way. We have a commitment from the machine companies to greatly increase the number of machines that are going to be tested in Saskatchewan, but there will be virtually a hundred times as many hours spent in testing machinery in Saskatchewan next year as was spent last year and it will not cost the government a red cent to have this testing done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — . . . that is all it will be worth too . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Now my hon. friend from the Battlefords might think it's all it is worth, but if he thinks it was only worth spending •\$150,000 do this job, I cannot agree with him.

Mr. Kramer: — It was a good thing . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — In order to have this job done properly, it would have meant the expenditure of several millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, does any member on the other side of the house believe that testing one machine of any make, or model, will give you a test report that is worthy of very much consideration, do they?

Mr. Kramer: — You said that yesterday . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The A.M.A. has never tested one machine that was manufactured by a major manufacturer that did not test at least six of the same machines prior to their delivery of one to the A.M.A. Do you think that your reports meant anything to them? They didn't mean beans. I asked my hon. friend yesterday if he ever visited the plant of one of the large machinery companies either in Canada or the United States, and the answer from across the way was that none of them have ever seen one. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, they don't know what they are talking about.

An Hon. Member: — Have you ever visited one?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that they don't know what they are talking about. Yes, I visited every one of them since I became the Minister of Agriculture and I am very pleased to have had that opportunity.

Now, my hon. friends opposite suggested a while ago that this A.M.A. was a result of a committee of this legislature, and that A.M.A. was set up in 1958. Apparently he doesn't know the history of this problem in Saskatchewan. The first committee that sat and considered this question was a committee of this house back in 1939. I wonder what the report of that committee was? Did they recommend that we should set up a provincial institution to test farm machinery? No, they recommended that the University of Saskatchewan should do this testing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — The University of Saskatchewan of that day did not agree and did not proceed with the testing of agricultural machinery. This committee of 1939 also made further recommendations, Mr. Speaker, and if you will let your mind go back awhile, you will recall the government of the day. The committee at that time recommended that the Canadian Co-operatives Implements Limited should be established. The company at that time, would like to have gone into the manufacturing of farm machinery, but they were prohibited from doing so because of a federal act that was in effect at that time, which prohibited new companies being formed to manufacture agricultural machinery during the war years. I don't think any of us could quarrel with that legislation at that time, because of the war effort, but as soon as this legislation was lifted in 1944, Canadian Co-operatives Implements Limited came into the field when they purchased the works in the city of Winnipeg.

The recommendation of this committee of 1939 was that if the co-operative movement was to enter into the farm machinery manufacturing industry, that they would have some check on prices and quality of farm machinery, and, of course, we know what has transpired since Canadian Cooperatives Implements Limited came into being back in 1944. However, I want to repeat that the university at that time was asked to conduct this testing but refused to do so, and then, in the report that the ex-minister referred to today, the committee that sat in this house in 1952, of which I was a member, so was he, made certain recommendations. What was done? There wasn't anything done for six years.

This committee recommended in 1952 that a testing program should be carried out. If my hon. friend is so . . . what did he say? He was going to beg on his knees for the continuation of this program. Well, where was he between 1952 and 1958? I suggest he was on his knees at that time.

Mr. Nollet: — Put up your argument . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Well, my argument is that

you did nothing for so long, and you still don't do anything about it, and you would ask me to come into this house and move a motion like you did today which is meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer again to this report of 1952. No action taken for six years, and the ex-minister is now on his knees. Well, I say between 1952 and 1958 he was on his seat and did nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Again, I know part of what he was doing in this interval. He was endeavouring to get the university to do exactly what they have agreed to do now, with no results.

Mr. Nollet: — I must refute that statement completely, as never at any time have we asked the university to take over this testing completely because this is not a function of the university at all, and they recognized that in 1939.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — You are welcome to your opinion in regard to conversations that you held with them, but I have mine too, and my interpretation. Then the ex-minister referred to this document, the report of a committee in Ontario, a committee that didn't sit on their hands in the legislative buildings in Ontario. A committee that investigated the farm machinery industry from stem to stern in both Ontario, throughout the provinces of Canada and in the United States. Did they recommend a provincial organization to test farm machinery? No, they recommended against it and if the ex-minister will turn to page 25 and 26 of this report, he will find the conclusions and the recommendations of that committee.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — As bad as the Liberals.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I give them credit for the recommendations that are contained in their report and I want to suggest to the ex-minister . . .

Mr. Nollet: — That is just what we are getting now.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . if he had had the courage to get out and do what he ought to have done and to have set up a committee in this province to perform the function that they ought to have performed, then their recommendations would have been just the same as the recommendations of a Tory government in Ontario, and I am not going to deal any further with that.

Now, the ex-Minister of Agriculture has made the statement here this afternoon that the Wheat Pool passed a resolution. What did they do with the resolution after they passed it? I wonder if my hon. friend knows what happened?

Mr. Nollet: — You know . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Yes, I know. I don't think you do. The delegates at the last annual convention of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, it is quite true, passed a resolution. What did the Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool do with the resolution? Does the ex-minister know?

Mr. Nollet: — They sent it to the Federation of Agriculture . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — That is right, they sent it to the Federation of Agriculture. they didn't send it to the minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Nollet: — You will get it. You will get it.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — What did the Canadian Federation of Agriculture do after they got it? Well I guess they are sitting on it because I haven't seen it. It has never been presented to the Department of Agriculture, or to any other branch of this government to my knowledge.

It is quite true that the Saskatchewan Farmers Union made representation to me and made representation to cabinet in this regard, but they are the only organization that ever made any representation either to me as minister, or to the government of Saskatchewan. Then the ex-minister went on and he said that this was the first and only province in Canada. How true, and one would have thought, if people from all over Canada were so interested in this program, that they would have been prepared to set up such an organization in their own province.

In the province of Saskatchewan, using the figures that my hon. friend used, there were only 16,000 farmers, out of some 87,500, who ever asked for these reports. Sixteen thousand out of 87,500, then the ex-minister said "Why, the people in Alberta even wanted these reports", and it is true. The government of the province of Alberta gave us an annual grant of \$5,000. One day last summer I was in touch with the government of Alberta and asked them for a larger grant to offset some of the costs that had already been incurred by the A.M.A. with the hope that they would make a larger contribution so that the work of the A.M.A. could be enlarged. The government of Alberta refused to put another nickel in the A.M.A. in Saskatchewan.

In the province of Manitoba, it is quite true, some farmers were receiving the A.M.A. report. I contacted the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba and asked him for a small contribution to pay for the cost of printing and mailing the reports to the farmers in Manitoba and the Manitoba government refused to do so. I don't know why. We even asked some of our friends to the south of us in the United States to make a contribution to help pay for the cost of printing and distributing A.M.A. reports to the United States. They refused to do so. Mr. Speaker, the worth of A.M.A. couldn't have been recognized to the degree that my friend opposite seems to indicate or I would have thought that the governments of those areas would have been willing to pay some of the cost of distributing this very worthwhile material.

The ex-minister has talked about the A.M.A. and the work that they have done in the past for the Family Farm Improvement Branch. This is true but I want to advise my hon. friend, if he is not already aware of it, that the facilities of the Family Farm Improvement Branch have been enlarged since the change of government last May and additional personnel and staff have been taken into the Family Farm Improvement Branch in order to do more work in that branch than we have been able to do in the past. Then the ex-Minister went on to say that all of this has now been abolished. Mr. Speaker, there is only one section of the work that has been done by the A.M.A. that has been discontinued. All of the rest of their service will be continued to be provided through the Family Farm Improvement Branch or through the University of Saskatchewan.

Then he went on and made another statement that is not quite in accordance with the facts when he said that the only Liberal member of the opposition that ever complained about the expenditures was the Premier. Well, he must have been deaf, dumb, and blind. I stated a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that the machine companies were not testing their machines in our province as much as they were in other parts of Canada and I would like to acquaint my hon. friend with a few facts. After I announced that the A.M.A. would be moved from the department to the university, one machine company alone brought 22 machines into the province of Saskatchewan to be tested. One company. Then he went on to say that the farmers in this province had never asked for a research unit at the University of Saskatchewan. Maybe they never asked my hon. friend when he was the minister, but they have certainly asked me since I became the minister. Not only farmers but virtually every manufacturer of farm machines in Saskatchewan have asked that facilities at the university be enlarged so that they could do tests and research for them. These small companies in Saskatchewan are not large enough to establish a test and research centre at their own plant but they have asked that facilities be made available at the university so that their industry can benefit from these tests in research that the university is able to do.

Mr. Nollet: — Everything for the implement companies but nothing for the farmers.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Yes, we have got a lot of good implement companies in Saskatchewan that I think can grow if they are given half an opportunity to do so, and this government is prepared to co-operate with every small manufacturer in Saskatchewan in the hope that he can produce a better machine.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Promises . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Now, there has been a lot of talk in regard to A.M.A. apart from what the two speakers said this afternoon. Not quite all of it is in accordance with the facts. It is not my intention to explain to this house, or to give to this house, the program of the University of Saskatchewan with respect to testing and research in this field. The University of Saskatchewan is autonomous. The previous government to my knowledge did not interfere with the curriculum or type of work that would be carried on in the university and it is not the intention of this government to do so. However, I think I can tell my hon. friends opposite that the work that will be done at the university, in my opinion, will be of much more value to our farmers than anything they have ever received to date from the A.M.A.

I have a list of research programs, Mr. Speaker, that covers almost every farm implement that is used by Saskatchewan farmers today. Work will be done on combines, cleaners, threshing machines, pick-up attachments, straw choppers, straw spreaders, swathers, heavy duty cultivators, one-way disc harrows, rod weeders, packers, grain grinding equipment, haying equipment, drills, tractors, sprayers, and assistance and process development for our small manufacturers in the province. It goes on for several pages, Mr. Speaker. For there will also be some research work done with regard to new machines that we hope will help to reduce the operating costs of our farmers. There will be work done on cone-type cylinders for combines, on drum-type cylinders for combines, on the grain loss problem with regard to combines, on automatic control system for the feeding of combines, on the horsepower per gallon production from our farm tractors, combines and other implements that use motors, multiple hitch arrangements, so that tractors that are now being produced and sold to our farmers can be used to their capacity.

I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, that in my mind and in the mind of this government, the service to the farmers as far as agricultural machinery is concerned, can be much improved through the facilities that will be made available at the university. All of these facilities are not available at the moment, this will mean the construction of some new buildings and the movement of more people into this branch of the university, but given time to expand to the degree to which the university would like to expand, I have no doubt that they are going to provide better services to our farmers than they have ever received in the past, and in addition to this . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — How are the farmers . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that more of our manufacturers of farm machinery are going to do more testing of their own in Saskatchewan. I think it is important to our farmers to have the machines that they are going to purchase in the future, tested in Saskatchewan, rather than some other part of Canada, or some other part of this continent.

My friends opposite have not told you that the largest machine company on the north American continent . . .

An Hon. Member: — Cockshutt?

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . the one with the greatest sales, have refused to have any machines to date tested by A.M.A. Now, the company that sells the most machines of any company, refused to have any of their machines tested, but, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that dozens of these machine will be tested in Saskatchewan during the next season, and I think this is a step in the right direction. There was no compulsion under A.M.A. whether a company wanted to have their machines tested or whether they didn't . . . They were free to submit their machine or A.M.A. could request they submit them. It was entirely up to the company whether they had the machine tested or whether they didn't. I think, in view of the fact that these facilities have been transferred to our university, that this situation will come to an end.

Before taking my seat, I would like to express my thanks as Minister and the thanks of this government to Doctor Spinks and the Board of the university for having taken on this responsibility. I think that, if they are given the adequate facilities from year to year, that they can do a tremendous job on behalf of our farmers, and we appreciate the university having accepted this responsibility. I have enough confidence in our university to believe they will do the job that is necessary for our farmers, and,

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly oppose the motion that has been moved by the member for Cutknife, (Mr. I.C. Nollet).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak about the A.M.A., I want to say that I haven't got anything written out. This is going to be off the cuff. The farmers are concerned about this thing, and I have received many letters from them and I have also had my own personal experiences.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — How many?

Mr. Thibault: — A couple of years ago I bought a grain grinder, and after I pulled the belt on, and started grinding grain, the pulley came off after two loads, and the shaft flew about 200 feet behind the tractor. I got after the machinery company and I could not get to first base with them. They said, "oh, you didn't handle the grinder properly, you must have been doing some tough grain or something". So when I got into the district and started checking around, I found that several farmers had the same trouble. I went to one of the farmers and asked "have you got an International grain grinder? How are you getting along with it?" He said: "come and see, you see that hole through the granary? That is where the pulley went out." Then I asked — "what have you been able to do about it?" "The company doesn't want to listen to me at all," he replied.

When I ran into this trouble I got in touch with the A.M.A. Inside three months the company decided to redesign their shaft and redesign the pulley, and what did they find? They found that when the grinder was operated with a tractor that had less than 40 h.p. there was no trouble, but when the power got over 40 h.p. it shed its pulley, just like a dog sheds his hair in the spring. So what happens? This company now replaces the shafts and the pulley, free, and it is due to A.M.A. Yes, in three months, the A.M.A. had this straightened out. They went out into the country and checked these grinders, and this is the answer they came up with: the tractors over 40 h.p. were too big for that particular grinder that was sold for a high capacity grinder. This sort of news gets around the country.

Last fall a farmer told me he saved \$2,000 on the purchase of a dryer by getting the reports of the A.M.A. I had some good Liberals that wrote to me and told me to do something about saving the A.M.A. I asked "who did you vote for?", he said "I voted Liberal" and I said "well, why don't you vote for yourself when you vote?". That is what I tell these people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — So, I feel that in the past all we have heard when these people were on this side of the house, they opposed the A.M.A. and it was only the payment of a political debt in my opinion. That is why the A.M.A. was discontinued.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now I am glad to hear that the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald) has read the report of the S.F.U., the brief presented to him, and I hope that he will read page nine, ten and the appendix "B", which clearly spells out what they think of A.M.A. They also say in the appendix "B" and I'll just quote a short part of it . . .

Some Hon. Members: — . . . Read your own report . . .

Mr. Thibault: — and I quote:

The real significance of A.M.A. statement is that the manufacturer rarely discloses to the public the limitations of his product. For example, the tests on the report of the McCormick rod weeder attachment 761 stated that the attachment was unsatisfactory in a field containing large or solid embedded rock. The manufacturer's brochures CA373B 25B, describing this attachment, makes no mention of this limitation.

In fact, the only reference is as follows:

independent standards behind each shank provide rock support protection, in light draft

So there you are, they don't disclose weaknesses even if they have their own testing equipment. We cannot depend on machinery companies to do their testing. Now the SFU is concerned and this is an organization of farmers, they have a resolution. This indicates that they are very concerned about the discontinuance of A.M.A. I hope that the members across the way will bear in mind what the people out in the country are concerned about. I am sure that in the Hanley by-election, the discontinuance of A.M.A. had an effect on the results.

I don't want to take too much time, I have had a few minutes, thank you very much and at the same time, Mr. Speaker I haven't had a chance to speak in the debate, I want to congratulate you on being elected to your high office and I wish you well. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cy MacDonald (Milestone): — On rising at this time in this debate, I would only like to take a moment to tell the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) that I think his concern is warranted but his only concern is a political concern. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we must not confuse the issue at this time. The issue of the Agricultural Machinery Research Agency is not a question of abolishment, it is a question of transfer. We have no intention of abolishing this agency at this time but we have plans and have hopes that this will not only be transferred, it will be improved and expanded.

I would also like to suggest, that I have great confidence in the University of Saskatchewan and I have great confidence particularly in the Agricultural Department of that university. Here in the agricultural portion of the University of Saskatchewan we have recognized in Saskatchewan, in Canada, and perhaps in North America, the most outstanding agricultural research agency on this continent, Why not give them an opportunity to expand and go into this field of agricultural research?

The principles of any experimental program, whether it be in agriculture, whether it be in medicine, or whether it be in science depends, of course, upon control procedures and a controlled environment, and if any man can suggest that the reliability and the accuracy of conclusions found in any experiment on one machine whether it be an agricultural machine, whether it be an automobile, whether it be in medicine or any other field of endeavor, I think there is a question as to the accuracy and reliability of these tests. One machine cannot provide an accurate test, and therefore it

is our hope that there is no reflection on A.M.A. and the officials of A.M.A. in this transfer. We consider this an advancement and an improvement in this agency.

I would also like to point out that in the School of Agriculture, or in the agricultural portion of the University of Saskatchewan, we have the top agricultural scientists in the Dominion of Canada. We will provide an opportunity for students taking post-graduate courses in agriculture to search programs into this field. These papers will be made available, not only to this province, but to agricultural institutions right across this nation. I would like to suggest that the members opposite take a year and come back at that time and then give us an evaluation, an analysis, and a criticism of A.M.A. under the University of Saskatchewan. I am confident that if they will give us one year, and give the University of Saskatchewan an opportunity to carry out its program, and to carry out the opportunities that it plans for in this field, that perhaps they may be speaking a little prematurely and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I do not support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of mineral Resources): — As one who sat in this legislature when A.M.A. was discussed quite a few years ago and as one who sat on the legislative committee in 1962 and reviewed the farm machinery position in the province of Saskatchewan, I think I should point out a few things which have not yet been mentioned.

I can recall in 1949 the debates in this session were related to what we termed in those day "fly by night" dealers, coming into the province and selling machinery shortly after going bankrupt. I remember the great discussion that took place about the Etna swather, I think the member Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) will recall it. I was a dealer in those years and I sold swathers and I recall that, shortly after, you couldn't get a belt, you couldn't get repairs and within two years these machines were sitting in fence corners. We were concerned about the farmers' inability to know what type of machine to buy and we said that something must be done that would prevent this sort of thing, and so A.M.A. was not just a testing program, it was a program of licensing and regulating the machine dealers as well.

Another complaint which all farmers had in those days and which has not been eradicated today, was the inability to get repairs for the machines, particularly in the harvest season. In order to overcome this problem, machine dealers were licensed under A.M.A. and the responsibility of keeping repairs was placed on the shoulders of the machine dealers. Under this, the machine dealer had to keep a certain percentage of repairs in proportion to the dollar value of the machines that he sold. This has not solved the problem of providing repairs when the farmers need them. We did complain about A.M.A. then, and I was one who pointed out to the minister then, that he was putting the squeeze on the little machine dealer, and expecting him to do something which he was unable to do — the squeeze should have been put on the machine companies to have a repair depot in the province. The minister never moved in that direction and even under the licensing today, it is the local dealer that is held responsible if the farmer cannot get repairs. The best they could do is to put in their application to the company for repairs. They have a whole host of back orders from the company. Again companies change their machines so rapidly that they become obsolete and they do not carry the repairs and the little fellow cannot do a thing about it. Likewise, we said it was not the big machine companies that were putting the inferior product on the market. It was unknown companies that the farmers had to have protection against.

The A.M.A. didn't test the machines of the smaller companies. This government advocates having the university set up a branch which will be a research centre for actually testing and guiding the manufacture of these smaller machines. This will be of tremendous assistance to the smaller manufacturer of farm machinery. The university moves in this direction to assist them in order that they may put forth a machine that is best suited for conditions in Saskatchewan. What did the former Attorney General say? He said "all for the machine companies and nothing for the farmer".

We have the Anderson Machine Company, with their cultivators. We have the Brandt Farm Machine Equipment producing farm machinery in Regina. We have the McIntyre Company in Swift Current. We have people producing the Morse rod weeder which many farmers here are familiar with. We have a host of small manufacturers in the province producing small farm machines, which are having wide distribution and I think it is time that we turned our attention to helping our own manufacturers within Saskatchewan to develop . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — . . . machines suited to the farming conditions which we have in the province. You say that we removed the A.M.A. and that it has been abandoned. What has been abandoned? The dealers are still licensed, the dealers are still obliged to carry a certain percentage of repairs, likewise there will be no machine that is not being tested that was not tested before. The farmers have invested their money in high priced machines, such as tractors and combines. The A.M.A. were not testing combines and tractors so there wasn't any protection from the Massey Harris Company or the John Deere or Cockshutt, in that regard. On the other hand, we must get assistance to the smaller manufacturers, although the machines are smaller they are vital to our farm operations. That is being improved and expanded. We were concerned about the inability of the farmer in the event that his machine failed in the field and he had no protection, and so we formulated what is known as the form "A" sale form for farm machinery. The "A" for new machines and the "B" for second hand machines which in that form gives the farmer protection so that in the event that a machine is a failure he has some recourse. It gave provisions for the farmer to be protected against the company and against the dealer in the event that this machine did not work. This is not abandoned, it is being maintained. The licensing of the dealers is being maintained. The form of contract is not only being maintained but you will shortly be asked to improve it. The "B" contract will be improved and in addition to this we will assist by research and direction these small manufacturers in the province that are struggling to produce

various machines specially suited to Saskatchewan conditions. All this noise is about one thing and one thing only, namely that we have done away with comparative testing. One item only, the rest of every other item of the A.M.A. is continued and will be expanded. To take the stand that we have thrown out A.M.A., that we have thrown the farmers to the wolves, that we are all in support of the machine companies is some more drivel designed to put fear in the heart of the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I want every farmer to understand, and every farmer to be told that he still has complete protection. In addition to this, we are moving in the direction of assisting rod weeder manufacturers, stone picker manufacturers, grain auger manufacturers, and the host of small farm machinery manufacturers. Machinery manufacturers who pay taxes to local municipalities and the government of Saskatchewan are contributing to the industrial development of Saskatchewan and from this, the farmers cannot help but benefit.

The only exception again, was comparative testing and John Deere, Cockshutt, Massey Harris, did not submit to comparative testing. They are the boys from whom the farmers had to buy the machines and yet they were not tested. So what have you lost? In spite of all the fury of the former Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Nollet), in spite of the member from Kinistino, (Mr. Thibault), only one thing has been removed, the others will be strengthened and expanded and with the University of Saskatchewan behind the project there will be . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . What are you talking about?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . a different story to tell a year from now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, the resolution that has been presented by the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) is somewhat of an admission that he has failed to do what he should have done several years ago.

I would like to read into the records, excerpts from the Select Special Committee on farm implement prices, and distribution in the province of Saskatchewan. If the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) would have read these, at the time that he was the Minister of Agriculture, and paid attention to some of the notes in them, probably we would have had the improved testing of farm machinery in the province that will be conducted by the University of Saskatchewan. It is important to note that, when this committee was established in 1939, the following members of the legislature, Mr. Speaker, were on this Select Committee:

Messieurs Ross, Brockelbank, Danielson, Demers, Donaldson, Hantelman, Herman, Johnson, Knowles, Lang, Peterson, Procter, Taggart, Valleau and Williams.

I am sure that the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are quite aware of the names of several of these people. Some of the recommendations made by the Select Special Committee were that the University of Saskatchewan be requested to test the relative quality and utility of repair parts being offered for sale in this province; that the Dominion Experimental Farm and the University of Saskatchewan be encouraged to test the utility of new implements and to suggest improvements and where possible to encourage standardization of implements and repair parts. If the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) would have taken heed of this report, then this situation that is now developing probably would not have been necessary, but the former administration, Mr. Speaker, were more concerned of using the A.M.A. in some respect as a sort of a political propaganda machine.

Mr. Nollet: — Put up some arguments.

Mr. Cameron: — You had your opportunity. Read the report that was presented at that time, the report still applies today. You failed to put into practice what was recommended. So, I have risen at this time for the purpose of reading into the records the reason why the previous government did not put into effect the recommendations of the Select Special Committee and thus

utilize the university facilities which are available to do a good job for the farmers of this province.

Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words regarding this resolution. I think that the members opposite should probably have read the resolution a little closer. This doesn't mean that we are not for the things that the A.M.A. does besides comparison testing. As a farmer, and as a person who has moved among farmers his whole life, especially the last four or five years, I appreciate the recommendations that are contained in the pamphlets, and changes that are recommended in nearly every pamphlet that comes out on a machine. There are six or seven recommendations on some and maybe only three on others, but on the average there are four or five. You will notice in nearly every case, the machine company makes the change. This is what the farmer has appreciated so very much and when you say that three major companies or the four major companies do not test their machines with A.M.A., you are not right. Their swathers, balers, and combines have been tested by the A.M.A.

I think the farmer feels that this testing needs to be in the hands of someone independent and that the university cannot be as independent as a government agency. The reason I say this is that the university has to depend upon the good will of large companies for funds and for good will all the way across the board and thus could not be as independent as a government agency. I think that what the farmer is concerned about is that he gets tremendous advantages from . . .

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Health): — Will the hon. member . . .

Mr. Broten: — . . . the recommendations of A.M.A.

Mr. Steuart: — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Broten: — Sure.

Mr. Steuart: — Are you insinuating that the University of Saskatchewan because they get some grants from large companies, would not be independent, that they would take this money and then twist the reports to suit this? In other words that you are casting . . .

Mr. Broten: — It is possible, of course.

Mr. Steuart: — You are then saying that — I can tell you that the university will be independent regardless of what you people try . . .

Mr. Broten: — What I think and this is what we have in this resolution is that this is the area the farmers are concerned about, I am sure that my contact with the farmers shows that this is true. Their interest has been tremendous. Sixteen thousand people have received these pamphlets. In every community there are farmers that specialize in reading these pamphlets and other farmers go to them and they discuss them together. I think this is probably a service for which there will be a demand in the coming years, especially for the research end of it and the testing end of it. Therefore, I support the resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena): — I would like to say a few words on this resolution. I do not intend to go over the brief which was presented by the Farmers Union. The member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has done that pretty well. But I would like to say that we all know that a few years ago the farmers had little or no protection for their farm machines. It could well be true that some of these recommendations, as was quoted by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), maybe should have been adopted earlier than they were, but at least something was done.

I was a member of the committee which sat in the early fifties in this legislature inquiring into farm machinery. One of the difficulties we had, Mr. Speaker, at that time was to get the companies to appear before us to inquire into the cost of machinery and what made them tick and so forth. We could not subpoena before our committee any head of a company if

the headquarters of that company was located outside of this province. All members of the committee realized that some federal action was necessary in order to have a proper inquiry, and see what should be done in the interests of the consumer because companies were not selling their products just in the province in which they were produced. A few years ago, near my home, a farmer bought a hay baler which wouldn't work, it was before we had A.M.A. He reported it to the field man, to the agent, to the head of the company in the province, and they just wouldn't do anything about it. It so happened that one of the heads of the company from United States was in Canada, when the farmer came into Regina to see if he could get something done on this baler, which had cost him well over \$1,000. When the head of the company in the States found out there was dissatisfaction over the baler, and it had been going on for 18 months, he issued orders that the baler be taken back from the farmer and paid back his money. But we did not have the authority of the law in those days to demand that farmers have protection. I understand that it was found later on this baler was not a faulty type as far as the company was concerned, but that this particular baler had a fault where measurements didn't show up. It was the main framework that was out. Well, how is the farmer to check these things and why should the farmer be the loser? So, I think it is necessary to have this protection.

I also believe, too, that it is necessary to have the protection of comparative testing. One of the things which the farmer wants is comparative testing because a thing is only good or bad by comparison, and you can get the statistical data on a machine but if you haven't seen that type of machine how do you know if it is good or bad? So I think comparative testing is necessary and, therefore, I believe that the A.M.A. should be continued. If it is going to be transferred to a different location, the farmers wouldn't be so much concerned, provided they guarantee that none of the benefits from the A.M.A. would be taken away from them.

The farmers, to some extent, look upon A.M.A. as a modern Magna Carta for them, because they have been fleeced out of millions of dollars through faulty machines. I knew a farmer a few years ago, who bought a threshing machine which wouldn't save grain whatsoever. This particular farmer was a pretty fair mechanic and he checked and checked the machine and found that it was out of timing. He went back to the company to have them exchange the pulley so that he could retime the machine. The company said "We have the right size pulley to sell you, but we won't allow you anything for the pulley which you have". He wanted to know why not and they replied: "We know those pulleys are of no use and are the wrong size. We have a whole shed full. If you had them, we would not give you 15 cents for the whole works." So the farmer had to buy a pulley for the machine all over again, because he didn't have that protection. These are the things that farmers are objecting to.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) amused me very much in his speech and performance here this afternoon. He has been trying to tell the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) that he didn't know what he was talking about. He was all haywire on his thinking and yet he didn't know that he had tabled a report in this legislature just two or three days ago. Mr. Speaker, he wanted you to call the hon. member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) out of order, because he was referring to a report which the minister alleged had not been tabled when we all had it on our desks. And I can't give . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — . . . much validity to the statements and the promises he has made as to what will be done for farmers when he doesn't even know what is in his own annual report.

The member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) amused me the way he always said "we" and "ours". It is plain to be seen that he assumes that he is already a member of the Cabinet, when he makes statements and promises and when he says "we are going to do this" and so forth. I do not object to the university going into research on farm machines, I think more of this should be done. I do not think the A.M.A. had enough money to do the job which we would like to see them do, but I think the work at the university could supplement the work that the A.M.A. is doing and A.M.A. should be left there. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I hope that all the farmers in this house will support this resolution. The minister also mentioned that when this is transferred to the university it will be necessary to construct new buildings and get facilities there to do this work. That may be correct. I do not know what the situation at the university is at the present time with regard to this type of work. He should know better than I do, but if it is correct that we have to have buildings and other facilities

to do to this work, then let us not discontinue what we have now until we are ready to move to a new location.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Let us not throw the baby out with the bath water while we are looking for a home to put the baby in. So let us support this motion. I am all for improving at the university or any place else, providing we can get a guarantee to protect the farmers from being fleeced in the future as they have been in the past by some unscrupulous manufacturers. I am not saying all manufacturers are unscrupulous, because they are not. Some of the manufacturers aren't aware of the conditions in our province and the conditions vary greatly from one section to another in regard to machinery. It is a big field, it takes a lot of looking at, but let us keep what we have now until they are prepared to give us something better without a period of waiting for buildings and equipment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.J. Trapp: — Mr. Speaker, I regret very much the statements made by the hon. member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) and — I'm sorry, Mr. Thibault (Kinistino).

An Hon. Member: — It is Watrous.

Mr. Trapp: — Watrous, is it?

An Hon. Member: — You better be sure.

Mr. Trapp: — From Wadena, I think it is.

An Hon. Member: — From Watrous.

Mr. Trapp: — Watrous, thanks. I am shocked at the statements which reflects doubt on the integrity of our university. If he thinks the good will can be bought by any machine company, personally, I think he should withdraw those remarks concerning the university because they are . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trapp: — . . . a reflection on this institution in which all of us have had great pride over the years.

Mr. Broten: — Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, I would not want to ask the university to test machinery because of the difficulty it could put itself in with the people of Saskatchewan and machine companies. I think more of my university than to do that, and this is why they refused to do this type of thing in 1939 for the same reason that they refused it before. I would not want to ask them to do that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trapp: — I should think that when the hon. member said that the university gets into difficulty testing these things, he is saying, in fact, that the university is not capable of making up its own mind and of stating the facts of its findings. I have never seen the university when it was afraid to state it as findings, and I am sure it will not be afraid in the future. I am confident that the university in the years to come, under this government, will not be afraid to state its findings, no matter what they are, in any area of research.

I think the hon. members all know that the university for many, many years has had a very strong agricultural faculty. The government proposal is just another way of building up the strength of this faculty. It is extending its area of research and of making the findings known to the people. I am proud that the university has been given this work and I am sure that it will do an excellent job for Saskatchewan.

The university people are especially trained to do research. It takes a number of tests over a period of time to make a fair analysis of the

worth of a machine. I disagree with the motion very strenuously.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I am not a farmer, although I was born and raised on a farm. The lat implement that I remember was a John Deere sulky plow that turned over every time it went around a hill and I would find myself buried in the furrow. However, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — He has been buried since.

Mr. Michayluk: — I am quite concerned about the motion which is being discussed this afternoon. I know that it is of concern to all members representing the rural constituencies and to all the farmers in the province. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the tools of farming are very, very expensive. The largest number of farmers are small farmers who own half-sections or three-quarter sections of land and it is these particular farmers, Mr. Speaker, that are concerned in knowing the type of implements that they are going to buy. These are the farmers that are interested in obtaining as much comparative information about farm implements as is possible. I will agree with some of the hon. members opposite, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) and the hon. Minister for Mineral Affairs (Mr. Cameron) certainly that A.M.A. has been of considerably assistance to the farmers of Saskatchewan. The licensing of the agents and the provision machinery repairs in areas concerned is a benefit to the farmer. The contract "A" has been of invaluable benefit to the farmers of Saskatchewan. My main concern as a member of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, is to give the farmers the necessary information because they are investing money which may have to be borrowed. If I were farming today and if I were to buy a combine, Mr. Speaker, I would want to see comparative tests for Massey-Harris, Cockshutt, John Deere, Case, and every other combine that is on the market in Saskatchewan. The very fact that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald), has removed the A.M.A.'s independent testing means that the farmers will not have the information which they require, because there is . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . what combine . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . no comparative testing. I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether the farmers of Saskatchewan had approached the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) and requested a transfer of A.M.A. testing program to the university?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no, they never did.

Mr. Michayluk: — I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, whether the 16,000 farmers who were receiving information through A.M.A. testing program will be receiving information from the University of Saskatchewan?

An Hon. Member: — They pay for it.

Mr. Michayluk: — I do know, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Saskatchewan Farmers Union were, and are, very concerned with the step taken by the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald). I would like to relate one incident, Mr. Speaker, that occurred after the 1960 election. I was on my way to Regina to attend the first caucus. It was a foggy night, I took a S.T.C. bus — I got on the bus and took a seat and in walked a fine looking gentleman, handsomely clad and sat next to me. He started reading Ben Hur, while I continued reading the Saskatoon Star Phoenix.

An Hon. Member: — A Liberal paper.

Mr. Michayluk: — Now as the bus rolled on, we became acquainted. He asked me what my occupation was. I told him I was a school teacher in the northern part of the province and this is as far as I went. Sometimes it is good policy not to let strangers know that you are a politician. I asked him what his job was, well, he said he was working for the Cockshutt company of Canada. I told him of my locale. I, in turn, asked him where he was working, he said, all of western Canada and all of the United States was his territory. I asked how he managed. He was the number one man representing Cockshutt of Canada. I then asked him how he worked such a large territory.

He replied, it is very simple. When I come to a province, I notify eight or ten blockmen in the province of Manitoba, I call them into Winnipeg and after I speak to them for an hour or two, my job is finished. I do the same in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Well, being a young politician I was particularly interested in the feeling of this representative on behalf of an implement company in respect to their contract "A". Now the Minister of Mineral Resources made particular reference to contract "A" and I wanted to get this company's views. I knew about contract "A" but I wanted to get it from this Cockshutt representative.

An Hon. Member: — Alec you are smiling.

Mr. Michayluk: — Yes, and somewhere between Davidson and Craik I posed a question to this gentleman. I asked: "As a representative of Cockshutt of Canada, what is your opinion as to implement dealings in the three western provinces?" "Oh," he said, "in Saskatchewan we have restrictions." I knew what these restrictions were . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . compulsion.

Mr. Michayluk: — But I pretended I didn't know much about it.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — And you were right . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — Yes, go ahead, laugh, the farmer won't laugh, it will not do you any good, Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) to laugh. Later on, I turned back to him and I said "By the way, what is it that restricts you in Saskatchewan?" He said, "Well, our agents are obligated under the statutes of the province to sign contract "A". He was honest, he told me what contract "A" meant. Well, it's like the rancher who said to the minister "I don't know much about the sermon but when the cow comes to get fed, I throw her a little bit of hay".

Mr. Speaker, this contract "A" protects every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, and I am sure that those implement companies will be on the heels of the present Minister of Agriculture to have it removed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Just hold everything, they will be here to have it removed.

An Hon. Member: — . . . in the campaign . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . but they wouldn't do it right off hand. Maybe they will need a couple of by-elections and possibly they will need an election. They'll have to dilly-dally the whole thing up a little bit. But Mr. Chairman, I am concerned. Mr. Speaker, with the concern that I have expressed and with the episode that I have related, I will certainly support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sam K. Asbell (Bengough): — I am not going to prolong this debate, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to read into the records of this house, an extract from a farm paper. The hon. members of the opposition have read from the Financial Times. The hon. members have read from the Free Enterprise papers, but I bring to you, Sir, for the first time this session, an extract from a farm paper, The Western Producer to be read into the records of the house.

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is . . .

Mr. Asbell: — I would like to read, Sir, this quotation from the August 14th edition of the Western Producer:

Mr. Atkinson, President of the Farmers Union should know that the universities do not accept grants with strings attached. Any commercial

offering, any concern of a grant in exchange for a "whitewash report" on a product or service, knows better than to ask a university research institution to do it.

The principle of academic freedom, cherished by universities, is in itself a guarantee of integrity in a matter of this nature.

Most farmers have ample reason to believe in the integrity of universities generally and particularly that of university departments connected with agriculture. There is every reason why they may confidently expect the "converted" A.M.A. unit will serve their interests as well if not better than a similar unit under government auspices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Fern Larochelle (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words in this debate. I don't pretend to be an authority on any of the subjects as some of my friends across the way have been doing. I can assure them that I know what a contract "A" form is. It is one of the best documents that we have today for the protection of the farmer. When he buys a machine from a dealer, the latter, who represents his company, must sign the contract "A" form.

Now, if that dealer is a responsible person, which he should be, the farmer should have no fear, because he has ways to claim back to the dealer who is responsible. Now as far as the testing of the machines is concerned, I do believe that the university can do just as good a job as the A.M.A. and I believe in the integrity of the university as far as testing machines is concerned.

With reference to testing done by the A.M.A. I can assure you, Sir, that we dealers knew what was wrong with a lot of machines before the A.M.A. did. I have facts to prove that we were advised by the company, to redo a weld on a certain discer, just about a year before the report from the A.M.A. came out. Now, if this was not done, it certainly was not the fault of the company. It was not due to the influence of the A.M.A. It was the manufacturer that told us to do this work.

I believe the A.M.A. has served some good purposes, Gentlemen, let us be reasonable with this. Do you expect the A.M.A. to test your trucks on your farm? Do you expect them to test your cars? You can't expect this. These manufacturers are reliable people. They test machinery and they test them for a longer time than the A.M.A. ever tested them in the fields.

There is a warranty on a machine and we, as dealers, are held responsible for this warranty and the manufacturers are too, if the dealer is responsible. Certainly, gentlemen, you must agree that we are not doing away with the testing of this equipment and that the university is a reliable place to do such work. As far as trucks are concerned, and the machinery would apply the same way, if you buy a truck you must depend on that. You have asked about the manufacturing of this truck and its reliability, so you have no question that if this manufacturer can not afford to take a chance of putting out a product that has not been tested and well tested because people won't come back and buy it. That's for sure. If we have the university behind us, helping in testing machines for the manufacturer, I don't think we have any worry. Therefore, I can not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to enter this debate, but being a farmer and having had some experience with the subject matter, I would just like to add a few words re the debate.

First of all, I would say that the A.M.A. has been very valuable to the farmers. We obtained all kinds of information, which was of tremendous value. For example, I remember, we were able to save money on cultivator shovels by being able to get the information as to which type served best. Now, as far as testing at the universities is concerned, I am not particularly worried one way or the other but I would like to know how the average farmer is going to get the information he needs. Under the A.M.A. he could write to the department, get on the mailing list and obtain information

free. He could get all the reports as they came out. Now, the university will not, I am sure, be in that particular position. I doubt it whether they could give you the information you need, even if you paid for it. If they are going to test certain machines, they will have to advise the company, not the farmer. I don't know whether they will be in a position to say that Cockshutt or John Deere, has "these things" wrong with them. It is not the same as the government which represents the farmers and which has the responsibility to openly advise. The university is not in quite the same position. This is the thing that worries me. It is not that the university will test the machinery, they can probably do it better, as pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture, than we could, because of the fact that this legislature failed to provide enough money. It assumes we failed in that respect. But couldn't it have been done at this session? Couldn't we provide in the next budget, sufficient money to test machines fully instead of turning it over to the university? These are questions that I have to ask myself as a farmer. I say that the A.M.A. has been valuable. It has provided a good service and this service is not in danger of being lost.

Now, the other point I want to bring up is in reference to what has been said on the hustings by certain members of the Liberal party. The member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on many occasions, said that the A.M.A. Act was "compulsion". That is why I am afraid that once you start removing the testing under that act, then the next thing will be removing licenses, because that is "compulsion". So there will be nothing as far as the farmer is concerned. However, it may not matter very much because the farmers are going broke anyway. Let us try and save something that might help the farmers in any way we can.

An Hon. Member: — . . . have yourself . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . stand up and speak up for yourself.

An Hon. Member: — I have said . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Say a little bit about compulsion and licensing, Davey. Like you did on T.V. last night.

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such a demonstration of acrobatics on the part of the hon. members opposite, in trying to defend an impossible action, as I have witnessed this afternoon in this assembly.

I want to make one point very clear that it was not necessary to destroy field testing and reporting on farm machinery, under the provisions of the Agriculture Implement Act, in order to provide research services and other forms of testing services at the University of Saskatchewan. Let that be clear. The hon. members opposite cannot hide behind the skirts of the university by charging that the integrity of the university is at stake, and therefore, that anyone who opposes this move is wrong. We are not doing that. There has been a very good working arrangement between the A.M.A. and the university, and the Swift Current experimental farm, but the kind of testing that is done at the university is a completely different kind of testing to what was done by the A.M.A.

Let that be clear. I am going to see to it that the farmers of Saskatchewan understand this. My friends opposite are not going to go on and try to justify their actions by saying we can get so much more for testing done at the university with more beneficial results. Yes, you can get testing done, and more, if you want to put money in, but you will not get the kind of testing done and above all else, you will not have an agency that can make out a report, a critical report, evaluating the performance of machines, under field conditions or other working conditions. This is the difference, Mr. Speaker. Let us make it clear. This is what is being abolished, what is being taken away. I want the hon. members to know that, in this legislation, we have provided immunity before the courts for the A.M.A. testing personnel, so that they could objectively state the defects in a particular machine. The farmer isn't interested in what kind of combine concaves machines have. What he is interested in is the performance of a particular machine under working conditions. This is what costs him a lot of money. This is what he is interested in. It was in this area that a great need was felt.

I might add that, when I appeared before the House of Commons

Committee that was examining the sale and distribution of farm machinery, and when I asked for federal participation in the testing area, I felt that the committee was very much interested and favorably inclined to farm machinery testing. Yes, and to give us more facilities. We readily admit that to do the kind of job we would have liked to have done for this specific purpose, it appeared that we were going to get some help from Ottawa in this regard. They were very interested.

The provincial Ministers of Agriculture often talked about having a well established testing organization. They felt that the federal government should also do this kind of testing, the kind we were doing here. I was hopeful that this could occur on a regional basis.

Contrary to what the present Minister of Agriculture says, other provinces were interested and very much so, particularly, provincial Ministers of Agriculture. You can't condemn a service by saying that because they haven't got it elsewhere it is no good. It depends on the attitude of governments with respect to protecting the interests of consumers, and in this case the farmer is a consumer. Twenty six per cent of his realized net income in Saskatchewan goes into the purchase of farm machinery. He has a right to know whether that machinery is going to function and operate properly. There is no company, regardless of what has been said opposite, which will object to this. This is the kind of competition they ought to like, an encouragement to constructive competition to put out better and better machines. If they are against this, I can only conclude that they have only one prime purpose in producing machinery and that is to make money, at the expense of the farmer.

I have farmed long enough, as others have in this house. I spent a good many weary hours under, if I may use my farmer expression, a damned old binder, that ought to have been made to work even with the knowledge that we had then. It should have worked properly. But machines are far more complicated now. Not only was this agency testing machines under actual working conditions but farmers had made available to them the experience of the operation of these machines under very carefully measured field conditions by the A.M.A.

This is the thing that is being abolished. Then the hon. Minister of agriculture (Mr. McDonald) says: "I went and saw what the machine companies had. They have huge testing plants. So the former minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) does not know what he is talking about. He never saw all this sort of thing, so he doesn't know what he is talking about."

But this does not prove his contention that this was justification for abolishing this testing service here. Then I say in turn to him: "If this is your argument, why, moments later, did you say 'we are going to expand this research and advisory service at the university, and the implements companies are going to come up here in droves for testing. We are going to have a hundred times more machines tested up at the university', why did you?"

If the machine companies had all these facilities, as he said they had, why would they be coming to the University of Saskatchewan? This leaves me to believe that this service will indeed be for the benefit of the implement companies and not for the benefit of the farmer. Pure nonsense! Invalid arguments from one end to the other, Mr. Speaker.

Then the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Cy MacDonald) gets up and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) attempts to suggest that somehow the integrity of the university was at stake. Well, it is and the university must be independent and it is for this very reason that a university couldn't begin to perform the function that the A.M.A. was performing. For that very reason we kept it independent of the university. We do not want the university to become involved in controversial matters, to make reports . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Go ha, ha, ha! Whenever the argument left they'll "ha, ha!" or they will attribute political motives to the services provided by this government as the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) does. This is the only argument he can put up. He said that it was a little political so we should get rid of it and that it really didn't provide any useful services. Mr. Speaker, it did provide a very useful service that will be greatly missed. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) said that we should abolish this service for sure because it

isn't popular enough. Only 16,000 farmers are getting the report. This is an indication of tremendous support and interest. Where 16,000 farmers in Saskatchewan will voluntarily want their names placed on a mailing list so they can get every single one of those reports on every item of machinery or implement that is being tested by A.M.A. is clear evidence of popularity, and read them too! Believe me, they will read the intentions of this government in abolishing this service. They will wonder why in the world you did it. It didn't need to be done. The implement companies didn't object. The farm organizations all asked for it.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) says "What about the C.F.A.? What did they say on the matter? They didn't make direct representations to us." As though that was an argument! That was no argument. Well, I'll tell him what the C.F.A. said. Mr. Boileau is speaking on behalf of the C.F.A. and he made this statement which appeared in the Western Producer on November 12th. He said:

The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture expressed concern about the possible cutting out of the Agriculture Machinery Administration as reported in the news story in the October 20th edition of the Leader Post.

Machinery, he said, is the major cost of today's farmer . . .

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it not customary for the hon. gentleman when he closes the debate to only answer the question that has been brought up and not inject new material . . .

Mr. Nollet: — No point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I am still on my feet. I can almost tell by the expression on an opposite member's face if he has a reasonable point of order. This hon. member does not have a valid point of order, nine times out of ten.

An Hon. Member: — This could go on forever.

Mr. Nollet: — He says machinery is the major cost. I know you don't like it, but you'll get some more of this rubbed into you at every stage that this legislation goes through this house, you'll get it.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Bad . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Yes, you will get it, and your arguments were less valid than any others.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — This is what the Canadian Federation of Agriculture said:

machinery is the major cost of today's farmer and anything which will help farmers to select and purchase machinery most effectively, should be done.

Mr. L. Boileau, S.F.A. President, said:

The agriculture machinery administration has been and is doing an excellent consumer testing service for Saskatchewan farmers.

This type of service, I say again, the university will not provide. I say again, it wasn't necessary to abolish this service and to expand research services with the engineering department at the at the University of Saskatchewan. You are not going to make that stick with the farmers. I can assure you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — . . . and he goes on to say:

and we hope that nothing will be done to jeopardize the further development of this service.

We all want it expanded. All of us. This is what the farm organization have asked for. Believe me, in my opinion they are the best judges in matters of this kind.

Mr. Boileau noted that the organized farm movements in all of Canada had recognized the value of this program. The delegates to the recent Canadian federation of Agriculture annual meetings overwhelmingly supported the A.M.A. testing idea across the country. Representations have been made to governments in other western provinces and in Ontario for setting up a similar type of service. This possibility is now gone. We were moving ahead. We were leading the way. This valuable protection that could also have been provided by other government jurisdictions has gone. Another example of taking Saskatchewan backward again to the reactionary days of twenty years ago. I feel keenly on this, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister said that he excused this action because I, when I was minister, didn't bring in the recommendations of the select committee report for four years or so . . .

An Hon. Member: — Six . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Six years or so. This was a reason. Why is that a good excuse for you to wreck it? At that time I didn't hear you talk about throwing it out and opposing it before the election. Oh, no, you didn't because you were pretty interested in farm votes. You are in power now but you are going to need those farm votes again.

Then he goes on to say:

the federation noted further that to equate the total cost of A.M.A. to the publication of test reports completely overlooked the extension work done by the staff and the administration of farm implement legislation, both of which have been a part of the Department of Agricultural programs for many years.

This will be done away with now, Mr. Speaker. I plead again. I plead again with hon. members opposite, don't be obstinate in this matter. For heaven's sakes, reverse your decision. The farmers and people of this province will respect you for it. I plead with you to do this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Yes, I know, I feel this very much because we have been doing this for years. I worked for it throughout Canada. The farm organizations said that we did the right thing and they have supported us. I had hoped that this service would expand. I had hoped that the federal government would come into this area and that Alberta and Manitoba would come into it too. Incidentally they were waiting. They were waiting for the House of Commons Committee report which never arrived. A committee established by a former Conservative government at Ottawa never tabled its report. This is the way Liberal and Tory governments deal with farm problems. There is a good contrasting example in this house this very afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly, Mr. Speaker, will support, this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 22

Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Cooper (Mrs.)
Wood
Nollet
Walker
Blakeney
Thibault
Willis

Whelan
Nicholson
Kramer
Dewhurst
Berezowsky
Michayluk
Smishek
Link

Wooff
Brotten
Larson
Robbins
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Pepper

Nays — 31

Thatcher	MacDougall	Bjarnason
McFarlane	Gardiner	Romuld
Boldt	Coderre	Weatherald
Howes	McIsaac	MacLennan
Cameron	Trapp	Larochelle
McDonald (Moosomin)	Grant	Asbell
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Heald	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Guy	Gallagher	Coupland
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	
Loken	Leith	

SECOND READINGS

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of **Bill no. 6 — An Act to amend The Margarine Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am about to move second reading on I think is fairly simple and straightforward in that the bill makes provision for what is commonly referred to as the coloring of margarine. This legislation will bring Saskatchewan in line with our two neighboring provinces, and I think that this is desirable at this time. Undoubtedly there has been some delay in the implementation of colored margarine in Saskatchewan, and probably with much justification, however, I think we have arrived at that point when colored margarine would be in the best interests of Saskatchewan people and this is the reason the amendment to the bill is before us at this time. For the benefit of the house I would just like to show them the color of the new margarine . . .

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — This is illegal . . .

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — This is merely a demonstration, yes, it is illegal, and we have had some problem . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You are immune here though.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . on the eastern side of the province as well as on the west, those communities that are served from wholesale houses in Alberta or Manitoba, as the case may be, some colored margarine has come into the province of Saskatchewan. We have not prosecuted those people who have had it on their shelves but we simply requested them to remove it and this has been done.

The legislation at the moment makes provision for the sale of margarine with a color which is measured on a tintometer scale up to 1.6, and this is the color of margarine that has been sold in the province to date. Virtually a white product, it is more like lard than butter. This is a pound of Saskatchewan butter, good Co-op Creameries, and this is the color of butter that is sold in the province at the moment, and this would measure about 5 on the tintometer scale. The new product that will be allowed for sale in the province, which will be anything over 10.5 degrees of yellow on the tintometer scale will be this color, and I compare the color of butter and the color of margarine that will be allowed for sale under the act in the province. I have another example of a pound of colored margarine by a different company, this is in a package similar to butter, and these two samples of colored margarine that I have shown to the house is about the minimum color that will be allowed under this legislation. In other words, it measures about 10.5 degrees of yellow on the tintometer.

Mr. Nollet: — Would the hon. member send those over to me, I would like to get a close up view of them.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Have you any bread over there?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Bring us a toaster.

Mr. Nollet: — This is rye bread . . . not for margarine.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — . . . and this is what the amendment to The Margarine Act provides for, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think it is necessary to delve into the matter any further, other than would like to repeat this will put us in line with our sister provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, there has been no representation made from farm organizations or the dairy institution that they oppose this legislation being introduced at this time. As a matter of fact, they have agreed that this product, this colored product is acceptable and it is about time that we introduced it in the province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading to a bill to amend The Margarine Act.

An Hon. Member: — Perhaps the house might wish to adjourn for lunch?

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few remarks in this connection. I am fully aware that very gradually throughout Canada the vegetable oil people have been able to win their war waged on behalf of colored margarine.

To understand this properly, I think a person ought to go back somewhat into history. At one time the manufacture and coloring of margarine was banned throughout Canada by the federal government because it was felt that the federal government could exercise some jurisdiction in this field, because it was a matter concerning agriculture — that it was to the best interests of agriculture that this be done.

About 46 years later Newfoundland came into Confederation. As everyone knows, Newfoundland is very short on agricultural land, and the people, because of the lack of a dairy industry, were compelled to use margarine to a large extent and also because of the very low income situation that prevailed in Newfoundland throughout those years.

When Newfoundland came into Confederation something had to be done about this situation and the then federal government in its wisdom, or otherwise, repealed this ban on the manufacture and coloring of margarine to enter Confederation without any great embarrassment. The responsibility then became that of the various provinces, and I think Quebec has still to lift the color ban, and I believe Prince Edward Island, and I am not so sure about Nova Scotia, but I think they still have the color ban, and if they don't have it — (the minister shakes his head). The provinces endeavoured to hold this line on color, but gradually their resistance was worn down, largely because of a campaign carried out by the vegetable oil people.

The vegetable oil people worked diligently over the years on the housewives, speaking of inconvenience and all of this sort of thing, but I somewhat suspect, Mr. Speaker, this wasn't their real intention, that they weren't so concerned about the housewife and the inconvenience of coloring margarine, but that they were interested in larger sales of margarine. This has occurred and margarine has cut very sharply into the sale and consumption of butter to the embarrassment of the federal government. As you know, until very recently, we had record stocks of surplus butter in Canada which were disposed of at a greatly reduced price to England and other countries. This certainly cost the federal treasury considerable money, and this situation could be attributed to the fact that we had margarine in Canada and more and more provinces were permitting the coloring of margarine throughout Canada.

We had held the line in the West right up to the present. At the moment, however, Manitoba has colored margarine the same as this proposed, and Alberta has margarine with the same degree of coloring. Saskatchewan is the one western province where colored margarine on the shelf is banned to the consumer. However, in restaurants colored margarine can be sold in Saskatchewan now, but a restaurant serving margarine must put up a sign that is visible to customers that margarine is sold in this restaurant. This is for the purpose of protecting the consumer.

I am going to argue, Mr. Speaker, that the coloring of margarine under the circumstances outlined presents a danger to dairy farmers and deception, as far as the consumer is concerned. I rather feel that the effort on the part of the vegetable oil people to have margarine colored in the various provinces is only the beginning. The next will be an endeavor to have margarine colored to the same degree as butter.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and ask this house, why do they want to have this product colored the same as butter? The reason is pretty obvious, because historically people are accustomed to butter being colored yellow. This is traditionally the color mark for butter and the vegetable oil people want to imitate that color because butter is a superior product, and people are accustomed to it. It is for this reason they used a hidden persuader. This was an effort to appeal to peoples' status. This was the primary appeal to the housewife. Now actually there is some inconvenience as far as the housewife is concerned to go to the trouble of coloring butter, and again I ask, why does the housewife want to color the margarine that she is feeding to her family, and possibly to guests? Why does she want to color it in the likeness of butter? Because of this appeal to the status symbol. This, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is the hidden persuader of the powerful vegetable oil people such as Lever Brothers, and all the rest of them. Their purpose in wanting colored margarine is to make more money and my fear is that if they finally succeed in having margarine colored similar to butter, then immediately the price of margarine will rise.

I have raised this objection over and over to some of the consumer groups who I think were misled in this regard — that it is to the interests of the consumer that protection be afforded to them so that they may know what they are actually buying.

I must admit that the taste of margarine has been perfected to the point where people do not readily distinguish the difference. The only way that it can be distinguished is by color, and Mr. Speaker, knowing that the other provinces have now removed the color ban, this objection on my part to coloring is made not only on behalf of the dairy industry, but on behalf of consumer protection. On principle, and in principle, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I think I must agree with what the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) has said. When honey is for sale, it is advertised as to how "pure white" it is. It is the same with other products which are used on the table, peanut butter is a nice "golden brown" and if they want to color margarine they could have colored it green or purple, I would have no objection, but I don't see why they should . . .

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Oh, my gosh . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: — If they object to it being purple, then why do they want to color it yellow? It is just to imitate butter, just to be an impostor. There would be more of an argument to it, if there was some guarantee to the consumers that the price won't go up, since cost of coloring is so little. But according to reports throughout the U.S. and the different provinces of Canada, the cost of margarine went up the minute it was colored, and I don't think it is a wise step as far as the dairy industry is concerned.

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this. The member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) has spoken of the vicious vegetable oil people as though they were leading us housewives along by the nose. We have some of these vicious vegetable oil people in Saskatoon. I am interested in their progress and the progress of the people who supply their needs in terms of agricultural products, as well as in the consumer. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the consumer really, and not anyone else, who has forced us along towards the coloring of margarine and I think probably the sophistry on the other side doesn't fool anybody. The idea of the color is, to me, rather a foolish point because it is used as a butter substitute and it doesn't masquerade as anything but a butter substitute, and the very substitution demands the same kind of color.

I would like to say a word about the consumers, because consumers as such have, in fact, pressed for this, and I think the previous government has had representations from the Canadian Association of Consumers in this connection and they have, in making the presentation, pressed for something that would not interfere with the color of butter. They have been quite agreeable to going along with a color range as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) has described, that would not be in any way deceptive as far as confusion to consumers is concerned.

As a matter of fact, consumers, themselves, in surveys have indicated that they would like the color of butter, but the Consumers Association, as an organization has never ever pressed for this, but in 1963 they did make a survey of consumers across the province and this after they had

made some investigations in other provinces, discovering among other things that in the province of Manitoba in 1961-62, immediately after the year in which colored margarine was allowed in Manitoba, that the consumption of butter went up rather than down.

I think probably the fact that our butter surpluses over the course of the last few years have decreased tremendously, while the number of provinces allowing colored margarine have increased, would seem to give the lie to the claim that this will, in fact, detract from butter sales. I would like to give the house some idea, Mr. Speaker, of why it is that consumers want colored margarine. I have here quite a comprehensive survey but I don't want to go into all the details. This survey included not only urban housewives and consumers but rural dwellers as well. It was found that 86 per cent of the people canvassed used some margarine.

Now it goes into the ways in which the consumer uses it for cooking or baking, but of that 86 per cent who use margarine, 76 per cent economic factors for wanting to use margarine, were listed. I think this is a legitimate reason for the housewife to want margarine colored. If 76 per cent of the users find that they can stretch their food budget better by using margarine then I think it is a legitimate reason for them to want it. Thirty-three per cent of the 86 per cent of those using margarine, used margarine for health reasons and it would seem to me that this is another very good reason why consumers should be allowed to have the product in the best possible way and consumers feel that colored margarine is the best possible way.

Of the 14 per cent beyond the 86 per cent of users, of the 14 per cent left that were canvassed, 32 per cent of these non-users suggested that they would like to use margarine for economic reasons. For health reasons they would have used it in any case, but for economic reasons they would like to be able to use it but they didn't buy it because it was not colored and if you do not color it, in this case it would seem to me that you deny the housewife some ability to economize.

Well, now there is a good deal more in the survey that they have done, and I don't intend to bore the house with it because I think that probably there isn't a great deal of opposition to this. It seems to me that I am the only one here who didn't realize that members are supposed to quote from newspapers, so to go along with the gag, here is a clipping from the Leader Post which refers to colored margarine and it suggests that it was not a very contentious thing and that —

most persons appeared to be resigned to the inevitability of maintaining the absurd ban against colored margarine.

I have the feeling in this house that we all feel that it has been absurd and, in a way, I feel as though I am preaching to the converted, and as a matter of fact, I think I know I am preaching to the converted. Last year in the house there was a question asked, regarding the consumption of margarine and butter within government institutions, and I have no intention of boring the house with the results of this, some of them are quite interesting, those places that got butter and those places that got margarine. I'm not going to embarrass anybody by talking about it, but if you would like to look this up, these are in a Return of a Motion by Mr. McFarlane, February 12th, 1964. It does show in general terms that the consumption of margarine within the provincial institutions was immeasurably higher than the consumption of butter, so I don't feel as though I am doing any thing but preaching to the converted. Members on the other side have been margarine users for a long time, and I know that they will support the motion as I will.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hans Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on behalf of the farmer in my constituency who actually "meets the cow". When we drive out through the constituency of Watrous, we meet people who live on sub-marginal land. These are the people who "meet the cow" every morning and night. I have a very strong recollection of talking to these people about colored margarine from time to time. This plan of putting a product on the market that would be a substitute for their own product would be far from popular.

When we look into this matter we see that margarine is going to be colored somewhat the same as the natural color of butter. On behalf of these people who own marginal land and who are in a minority, it is my intention to vote against this bill.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make my remarks very brief tonight. I think one of the reasons why I should speak to the motion is because of the fact that I have always had and still have a dairy herd. My livelihood has been partly made up of the produce from that herd. The second reason I would like to speak to this motion is because over the years I have tried to point out the attitude of the government with respect to the lack of markets for the products of the dairy farmer, as was pointed out by the lady member (Mrs. Merchant) for Saskatoon.

Now, as I said, my income has been supplemented by the produce of the dairy herd and I notice tonight the sample of butter that was supplied to this house by the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was a product of the company that buys my produce and I was very happy to see that.

I would like to point out the attitude of the government in past years when the welfare of the dairy farmer was being considered. I remember on occasions, years ago, when the late federal Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) tried to help out the dairy farmers in Canada by offering to the government of Saskatchewan three pounds of butter for the price of two, provided they used it in their institutions. This was to help the type of person that the member for Watrous just referred to a minute ago, but the government of the day never took advantage of that situation and never tried to help out the dairy farmer.

Then during the past few years as was indicated by the return referred to by the lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) I think the former government purchased about 80,000 pounds of margarine to about 4,000 pounds of butter. For this reason I think any pleadings on behalf of the dairy farmers of this province aren't well taken by members on the other side of the house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because I am in the dairy business and because I believe that it is always "better with butter" and stick up for the dairy producers of the province, still a time has come where the big butter surplus that we had in Canada and in Saskatchewan has disappeared, and I want to give a great deal of credit for that to the present federal Minister of Agriculture, because the Hon. Harry Hays (Minister of Agriculture) himself belonged to one of the most prominent dairy families in all of Canada. They have a very wonderful record as far as the dairy industry is concerned, and because of his efforts and because of his policies the tremendous butter surplus that we faced in Canada a few years ago, has now virtually disappeared.

I believe, as many of you members on the other side of the house, may have read last night (as was mentioned at the Dairy Convention here in the city of Regina) that we may be facing a shortage of butter here in Saskatchewan in the years ahead. Of course, there are many reasons for this, it isn't because the price of butter-fat is too low. It is because the government has subsidized the consumer and helped the price of butter-fat for the producer.

The other thing that has happened, is that the dairy industry has become, more or less, a "family farm" industry at the present time. Most of the dairy people in business today are working on a family unit basis. It is hard to get help in the dairy industry and so, by virtue of that fact, many of the "family farm" herds have disappeared. We face the position today where we may have a shortage of butter, and if the butter situation has been taken care of and because the government is one of the biggest users of butter substitutes, and because the housewives in Saskatchewan feel that they should be given a say in privileges that other housewives in Canada have, then I think the time has come when we should be able to allow these people the services that other people across Canada have.

So, because of those few points that I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come in the interests of the housewives, consumers, and the families who are not in as fortunate a position economically as some other people in our nation, I think that their financial situation should be taken into account too. So on this occasion and as I say being a dairy farmer myself, I believe that I can support the bill as presented by the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. McDonald).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, members of the legislature, I would like to say a few words about the use of margarine. As many of you know, I have been a merchant for many years and I have always been very interested in the sale of margarine and the sale of butter. I have found on most occasions that the people milk the cows and produce the cream, take the cream to the creameries and then come to the stores and buy margarine. I know that these people would appreciate the passing of this bill. I don't think the members of the opposite side of the house are really sincere in their feelings because I know that they would like to see some of the people with lower incomes have the opportunity to make the extra savings that they can make by using margarine. I am sure the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) would like to see the farmers continue to enjoy their curling and fishing and recreation, because I find that many farmers are not too interested in milking cows at the present time.

In the past years, we of Western Canada have been subsidizing the dairy farmers of eastern Canada and the dairy farmers of the coast and we, in this part of the country, now have the prospects of developing a large vegetable oil industry and I think that these people need some assistance at this time. I do think that we should go along with the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) in his bill, and make it possible for the people to use the margarine in every day living.

Now, I would like to just remind you and the members of this legislature, that if the members of the opposite side of the house will go along with our tax reductions, it might be possible for the farmers to return to using butter, but until people are able to have these savings, we should make it possible for them to use margarine. I will support the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. S.K. Asbell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of the bill. Our friends across the way might be interested in some of the figures that they created themselves. I make no reference to the institutions or the patients thereof, but I do quote figures:

The Saskatchewan Hospital at North Battleford, in the years 1961 and 1962, did not purchase one pound of butter, but purchased 45,609 pounds of margarine under the jurisdiction of the purchasing agency, of the last government for a total of \$10,061.47.

Not the same type of hospital at Weyburn did not purchase one pound of butter in 1961-1962 fiscal year, but purchased 29,640 pounds of margarine for a total of \$5,517.26.

At Prince Albert, the other part of the province, where dairy industry may be more in progress, they found time and found the desire to purchase 700 pounds of butter, but they also found time to purchase 8,800 pounds of margarine.

This has been filed on order for return of February 12th, 1964. Further to this, Sir, I think it is high time that our friends across the way recognized the wishes of our housewives in the province of Saskatchewan. As mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) people on both extreme borders of the province can purchase colored margarine. The CCF took it upon themselves to dictate to the housewife by forcing her to buy products not to her preference. Therefore I speak on behalf of the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, just a word. After listening to the arguments of the hon. members opposite in telling us how many pounds of margarine had been used in the various departments of government, it would indicate to me that you don't need to color margarine at all. I mean if it is that popular, leave it as it is. The only argument that they apparently succeeded in putting forward is that we should color margarine so that people and the governments would use less of it.

This is all I wanted to say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two remarks that I would like to make to the member from Cutknife, (Mr. Nollet).

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — . . . go ahead . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Never . . . a day in court, Brock . . .

The member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) mentioned that some of the financial difficulties such as were faced by people in Newfoundland when they came into Confederation might be one of the reasons that colored margarine was allowed in some parts of Canada. I want to remind the hon. member that in 1948, the courts of this country ruled that federal legislation was ultra vires. This was the reason that the provinces were compelled to pass their own legislation with regard to the coloring of margarine. I can sympathize with those members who have expressed opposition to this bill, but I do not believe in my own heart that it is going to interfere with the dairy industry in Saskatchewan. Both in Alberta and in Manitoba, after they allowed the sale of colored margarine, they did not have an appreciable increase in the sales of margarine. The price of margarine remains the same. I sincerely hope that this will be the case in Saskatchewan.

I can understand the concern of my friend and colleague, the member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) he represents a constituency that has a very large vegetable oil industry and, of course, we in Saskatchewan want to see not only our dairy farmers prosper but we want to see areas that produce vegetable oil prosper as well. I can assure the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) that as far as public eating places are concerned, it will be mandatory for those that serve margarine to advertise it. This, of course, will be left in the act and will still be the law of this province. Mr. Speaker, with these few words, I move second reading of the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of **Bill no. 2 — An Act to amend The Public Health Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are only proposing two amendments to The Public Health Act. Both of them are technical. There are no policy decisions involved. Two provisions of The Public Health Act refer to The Liquor Act. The Liquor Act was replaced in 1959 by The Liquor Licensing Act in 1959. The two amendments will remove reference to The Liquor Act and will substitute references to The Liquor Licensing Act, 1959.

I might say these amendments have been recommended by the Committee on Revision of Statutes which this house knows is a committee composed of the officials of the Attorney General's Department and others that are incorporating amendments to the statutes so that all statutes would be republished in one series of volumes and all amendments included. I now move that bill no. 2, An Act to amend The Public Health Act be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Highways and Acting Minister of Industry and Information) moved second reading of **Bill no. 3, An Act respecting the Department of Industry and Commerce.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the principle of the bill pertaining to the Department of Industry and Commerce, let me say that I do not have any props and it probably won't be as colourful as the bill that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) introduced, but I am sure it will be probably of more interest to this house and to the people of Saskatchewan.

The proposed bill would combine the better features of the Industry and Information Act of 1960 and The Trades Services Act of 1953. It gives the department the title in keeping with the objectives and the duties of

the department, and the new act would incorporate clauses and provisions necessary to properly carry out the true purpose of the department.

We consider that these the encouragement and promotion of Industry and Commerce, including the promotion of tourism and trade with other provinces and other nations. The bill will establish a classification system for tourist accommodation but will not dictate any standard of or any degree of standard. We feel that the bill includes provision necessary to enable the department to act as the prime point of contact for industry interested in locating in Saskatchewan. We feel that it will coordinate the government's industrial development activities in the province. It is felt that, rather than building up separate departments providing additional services, that we should use the services already provided in various departments of the government. To accomplish these objectives, the bill divests the department of all functions which were established primarily to service other government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the assembly, that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, being a money bill, recommends it to the consideration of the assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of bill 3.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a couple of comments really in the form of questions in the hope that when the minister closes the debate, he will deal with them.

I refer to section 5, sub-section (b). Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss any of the particular wording, but only the principle involved. The question I direct to the minister is — is it the intention that this department would have the power to make loans or grants to industries on the decision of the minister? The section in its bare form reads:

The department may provide such assistance to industries and individual commercial and industrial enterprises operating or intending to operate in Saskatchewan as the minister may prescribe.

The question I direct is really this — "What is the intent here?" Whether or not the words carry out the intent, we can argue about in committee. But the question I direct now is this: "What is the intent?"

I would also like the minister to comment on whether or not the office of the Agent General in the United Kingdom is meant to be provided for by this act. I presume that the answer is "yes", but I would like a comment with respect to that.

The other comment I think I had to direct is this: with respect to the power contained in section 8 to obtain information, would the minister care to make a comment on what sanctions would be imposed in the event that any repository of information declined to provide the minister the information being sought under section 8?

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think the hon. member is permitted at this stage to ask detailed questions as he is doing. My understanding is that he can only discuss the principle of the bill at this time. Then when we get into committee he can ask these detailed questions.

Mr. Blakeney: — With deference, Mr. Speaker, I think each of the questions I have asked contains a question of principle. If the minister or the Premier would like me to phrase my comments so as not to refer to particular sections, that is all right with me.

Mr. Speaker: — I think I will have to rule the point of order is well taken. You will have to so phrase your comments.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, as I view this bill then, Mr. Speaker, it contains two or three principles on which I would like to comment. As I see it then, Mr. Speaker, I find here a principle authorizing the minister to give assistance of a general and unlimited nature, simply on the say-so of the minister. I would wonder whether that is a prudent principle, if in fact, it is

contained in the bill. I would solicit a comment from the minister thereon.

Other principles, it seems to me, are involved. A suggestion is that we are going to establish consulates or embassies at various points in the world. We already have one in the United Kingdom — that is the office of the Agent General for Saskatchewan. I wonder, therefore, whether this act is intended to enshrine the principle of continuing to operate such agencies and whether or not the present activities of the Agent General are meant to be covered by this bill.

The bill also contains a power in the minister to obtain information from citizens. The question then arises as to what happens if the citizens don't provide the information. The question which I raise for the house is whether or not sanctions are meant to be provided in this or any other legislation for the failure to disclose information. Those are my comments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate, might I say that with reference to the hon. member's inquiries about the principle involved in the question of assistance, I would say that there will be no deviation from that which is currently followed and there is no reference in section 5 to financial assistance, as such.

His inquiry about the Agent General, in keeping with the principle which I explained, we are divesting the department of those services that are felt to be properly housed in other departments or provided by other departments. The Agent General renders services to numerous departments of the government, not only Industry and Commerce, and the provision of this section he referred to, would be for the establishment of such offices as are enumerated here. In connection with the inquiry of information supplied by persons, I would not care to comment at this time on that point.

Mr. Speaker, I am optimistic regarding the role that the Department of Industry and Commerce can play in the life of the province and I am confident that this bill provides the necessary authority for the department to carry out adequately the aims and objects of the department.

I move second reading of the bill.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member takes his seat, I wonder if I understood him to say that the passing of this bill and presumably the repeal of the Bills referred to therein will remove the statutory basis for the office of the Agent General, and if I understood that question to be correct, is some other spot going to be found for that activity or not?

Mr. Grant: — I think I said it would be transferred.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill no. 4, An Act respecting The Village of La Ronge.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a corrective one in order to rectify a situation which has existed for almost ten years, and I am confident that you agree it is necessary now and I will explain why.

On July 28th, 1955, the village of La Ronge was enacted as a village, under The Village Act and by an order of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. At the time, however, La Ronge was located in a Northern Administration District, set out in the provisions of The Northern Administration Act and pursuant to the provisions of section 107 of that act, the Minister of Natural Resources would have the power to incorporate the village and not the Minister of Municipal Affairs. There was evidently an error or misunderstanding at the time, however, and the village of La Ronge was accordingly reported to be directed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Thus the present bill is proposed for the purpose of legalizing the status of La Ronge which, by law, is in fact no village at all. An order-in-council will also be necessary to withdraw the village area involved in the Northern Administration District, and thus the present bill will legalize the village status of La Ronge. I think you will agree that this is an important and a necessary bill at this time. I will therefore, move second reading of

the bill. Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. D. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill no. 5, An Act respecting The Town of Creighton.**

He said: A somewhat similar situation here, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the Town of Creighton. I do not feel that this will be controversial and that it is a necessary act to correct the situation which has existed since 1952.

A little history. On March 5th, 1952, the village of Creighton was reported to be erected as a village by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when, in fact, by virtue of the Northern Administration Act, the minister of Natural Resources would have the only power to erect Creighton as a village because Creighton was in the Northern Administration District. On April 29th, 1952, the area of the village of Creighton was withdrawn from the Northern Administration District, thus putting it within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. However, the withdrawal of the area after it had been purported to be erected as a village does not have the effect of curing the error made. In 1957, the village of Creighton was declared a town and in 1959, additional territory was added to the town of Creighton. The present bill, Mr. Speaker, is designed to ratify everything that has been done in Creighton by the Department of Municipal Affairs since the initial error arose and I am therefore going to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. G.J. Trapp (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill no. 7, An Act to amend The Teachers' Federation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill takes into account the transfer of teacher training from the Teachers Colleges into the faculties of the university of Saskatoon and Regina. The first part of the bill takes care of this. We have Teacher Colleges now, and the faculty of education at the university so we need to take care of this.

The next part, defines the term "Indian Day Schools" which is really not very clear in the act at the present time. We really meant, for years, under the act, federal Indian schools, so it clears up this point, the federal Indian schools instead of Indian Day Schools.

The other part of this bill is to give the executive and the council of the federation the right to designate who may become voluntary members of the federation and receive the bulletin and the magazine. It was originally set down in the act in rather definite terms, but some changes have occurred since. This will give a little more latitude for voluntary membership in the federation. Many people who are interested in education want to become voluntary members and get the magazine.

One other item does away with the 50 cent fee that was charged, and leaves it to the executive or the council of the federation to set the fee because 50 cents doesn't even cover the cost of one magazine today. It was set many years ago and I think this should be rectified at this time. This is the purpose of this bill, to do these three things. I would move that Bill no. 7 be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill no. 9, An Act to amend The Credit Union Act, 1962.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the amendments to this act, these changes have all been requested by the Credit Union League and as has been customary after a proper review, these amendments are brought in as requested. One purpose is to make it clear that by resolution to borrow up to 50 per cent of the combined capital, surplus, and deposits approved by meeting of the members will remain in force from year to year until amended or rescinded by the members at another meeting. The annual approval of the Registrar to borrow this money, will, of course, still be required. This amendment is more or less for clarification.

The directors will be able to borrow on their own, with the

Registrar's approval, up to 25 per cent of the capital surplus and deposits.

Another part of the bill is the clarifying of the position of directors who are members of the credit committee. This will be clarified where approval by both directors and members of the credit committee is needed loans for the purchase of land, buildings, or for financing of businesses.

Another change will be to enable the board in charge of the mutual aid fund to make loans to credit unions that want to install up to date vaults, safes or other similar equipment to protect the cash deposits and safety deposits in the box. It is to be noticed that recently there has been a rash of break-ins and that the reason given is that they did not have the necessary funds to purchase these vaults, etc. This is to provide them with the funds.

The details, I think, can be dealt with more clearly in the committee. Therefore, I move, Mr. Speaker, that bill no. 9 be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour and Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development) moved second reading of **Bill no. 10, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation (Accident Fund) Act, 1955.**

He said; Mr. Speaker, in presenting this bill for second reading, I should mention that, according to provisions of the act, every four years a Committee of Review should be appointed to review the work of the Workmen's Compensation Board and the amendments to the act be recommended. Some of the recommendations made by this committee are herewith presented at this time.

This act allows the Workmen's Compensation Board to make inter-provincial agreements only with the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba at this moment. The amendments will allow the board to make agreements with other provinces, with any board of other provinces in Canada.

Other sections deal with matters of industrial diseases, while another section again deals with the performance of work in different provinces. For example, under the present agreement with Alberta and Manitoba, the Board of the province in which the accident occurs accepts the claim for the injured person regardless of the province in which he resides, and payments are made in accordance with the rates established by the Workmen's Compensation Board of the province accepting the claim.

Another section intent here is to liberalize the restriction of common-law relationship by reducing the period of co-habitation to five from seven years. Several years ago, if you remember, this restriction, in respect to common-law wives having children by common-law husbands, was reduced from five to three years.

Another section intent is to bring the minimum compensation more into line with the minimum wage today. The schedules, of course, are adding certain diseases to the present schedules and the result of these recommendations by the Committee Review, by hospital employees. The diseases noted are in the amendments as being added.

Another section indicates that the amendments will come into effect July 1st. The reason for selecting July 1st is the fact that it is more convenient for general administration bookkeeping than it would be any other time but the mid-year term. When this comes into effect, all beneficiaries will be entitled to the minimum of \$32.50 a week or a proportion thereof if the disabilities are less than 100 per cent. This can be discussed more fully in detail in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill no. 10 be now read the second time.

Mr. Walter E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour, made reference to the Committee of Review which was set up last year. I am wondering whether the minister intends to file a copy of the report and recommendations of the committee with the legislature. I would first like to urge him that the report of the committee be made available to the members of the legislature. I have not seen the report, but I do know that there were a number of things that were reviewed by the Committee of Review and I would hope that there were many more recommendations made by the committee, than those contained

in this bill. I welcome the suggestion that is included that the Workmen's Compensation Board be permitted to enter into agreements with other provinces, not just Alberta and Manitoba in respect of industrial diseases. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the minister that the schedule of the industrial diseases that are to be added does not go far enough. As we extend industrial development in the province including new chemical plants, fertilizer plants, potash development and mining expansion, there are new diseases that are showing up, largely because of the kinds of condition under which many people have to work. I would hope that the minister might consider the addition of rheumatism and rheumatic fever, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and other infectious diseases. In the case of hospital work, tuberculosis should be covered by Workmen's Compensation. I would also urge that a provision be made in the industrial diseases schedule that sickness, as a result of inhaling of harmful dust, mist, vapors, and fumes, be included.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, that is extremely important is coverage for lung cancer. The schedules and the amendment are not at the present time broad enough to include this. There are reports that lung cancer shows up in later years among many men who have been operating diesel engines. The use of radio isotopes in industry has also brought with it new conditions and new diseases. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the schedule amendment as it is at present, is not broad enough, and would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would meet with members of the board and that he reconsider the present narrow amendment that has been brought into the act. As I said, with the increase in industrial development, new conditions and new diseases are showing up in industry.

This is an area that workers have brought to our attention. I know, as one who appeared before the Committee of Review last year, that we had a lengthy discussion on this particular topic. I also know that the Committee of Review was keenly interested in this particular area. I would hope that the Committee of Review had made some recommendations to the minister to broaden the legislation respecting industrial diseases.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, is the amendment that the minimum rate be increased from \$30 to \$32.50. Just the other day we heard a good deal of forceful argument presented that the present minimum wage in Saskatchewan of 36.50 is inadequate and that it is the intent of the government, as pointed out in the Throne Speech, to improve the minimum wage. The present minimum wage is \$36.50, and I agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is not an adequate minimum wage, but it seems ironic that the government on the one hand argues that a minimum wage of \$36.50 is inadequate, yet in case of Workmen's Compensation they say that \$32.50 would be adequate. Here lies the government's complete inconsistency, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Regina (Mr. Smishek) is straying a little bit from the intent of the bill. The lion, minister said that the benefits are going to be increased for certain diseases and industrial diseases are included, of course, but certainly I think that this is a committee matter. If he intends to discuss the areas into which he thinks we should go, then let us talk about it in committee.

The same with the increase in benefits. I think he should be held to the intent of the bill which is to increase benefits.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I am in your hands. What I would like to do in conclusion on this particular point, is to urge the government and the minister to reconsider their position in respect to the \$32.50 minimum and bring in a proposal that will be at last equal to that of the minimum wage that may be established. I will have more to say -when the bill comes up for third reading.

Mr. Speaker, with these few observations I would hope that the minister would now consult the board, broaden the industrial diseases schedule and increase the minimum rate, before the bill comes back here for further consideration.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Hon. Douglas T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Tax Enforcement Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is only

one amendment to this act and it is quite a minor one. Under this act, the treasurer of cities, towns, villages, and rural municipalities, is defined and has the powers to do certain things with respect to collection of taxes in arrears by means of tax lien procedures. In most instances, the work is actually done by the secretary-treasurer of the municipality. In that respect, the present definition of treasurer is quite adequate. However, this is only so, generally, with smaller municipalities such as towns and villages and rural municipalities. In the cities, the work of the treasurer, under this act is sometimes done or at least desired to be done, by a person who cannot properly be called a collector of taxes, but merely a person who carries out the regular routine of preparing tax lists, attending to publication and filing of tax liens. In fact, the person who does this work is not a collector of taxes but is merely carrying out the tax lien procedure. The amendment, proposed here, would allow the definition of treasurer to be any person to whom the procedural powers have been delegated. The person, in fact, would not have to be the collector of taxes, as the present definition requires him to be.

There is not a substantial change here but merely an enabling change in the powers to delegate and assign the heavy work-load of the secretary-treasurer in cities and larger municipal centres.

I will, therefore, move second reading of Bill no. 11.

I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the same type of amendment was required to broaden the definition of the assessor in the Local Improvement Act in 1964 session.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Douglas T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of **Bill no. 12, An Act to amend The Community Planning Act, 1957.**

He said: Once again, this is a minor amendment to the act, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to point out that the council of a city, town, village and rural municipality or other municipal corporation can, by bylaw, set up a Community Planning Commission to advise and to assist the council with respect to all matters pertaining to community planning and the orderly development of the municipality. The commission is made up of at least three members and can have no more than nine members. The commission is generally represented by all aspects of local government, namely the council, the employees of the municipality, residents of the municipality, and so forth.

At present, two-thirds of the members of the commission constitute a quorum and it is felt that a majority should be a satisfactory quorum. This reasoning can be supported by the fact that municipal councils themselves can act with a majority by constituting a quorum. I might point out that the Community Planning Commission is only an advisory body to the municipal council and, therefore, I do not feel that this amendment will substantially alter the present status offered by merely changing the definition of a quorum by the present amendment. With that, I am, therefore, going to move second reading of Bill no. 12.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of **Bill no. 13, An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is only one amendment in this bill and this deals with the summary convictions for failure to pay the hospitalization tax. The purpose of this amendment is to remove the possibility that a person may be imprisoned for failure to pay a fine imposed by the courts because of his failure to pay the hospitalization tax.

The act at present provides that failure to pay the tax is an offence liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$25. Since no other provision is made in the act respecting failure of the person to pay the fine, the Criminal Code applies and the individual could be imprisoned for a period up to six months.

Mr. Speaker, the part of the Criminal Code applying reads as follows, 694, sub-section two:

Where the imposition of a fine or the making of an order for the payment of money is authorised by law, the law does not provide that imprisonment may be imposed in default of payment of the fine or compliance with the order. The court may order that in default of payment of the fine or compliance with the order, as the case may be, the defendant shall be imprisoned for a period of not more than six months.

We do not believe that imprisonment should be possible for persons brought before the court in the first place only because of failure to pay a debt to the crown. It is interesting to note the total number of convictions for failure to pay the fine and the total number of persons imprisoned. For 1963, 285 convictions and five imprisonments. For 1964, 90 convictions and two imprisonments.

The effect of the proposed amendment will be that imprisonment for failure to pay fines will no longer be possible and that payment of fines will be enforced by a District Court Judge now in the same manner as a payment of tax.

Mr. Speaker, I think that most governments have stopped throwing debtors into prison a long, long time ago. I always found it hard to believe that the so-called humanity first socialists who sat in government for twenty years, would actually throw people in jail for failure to pay this hospital premium. But they did it. And who were these people? Well, most of them, Mr. Speaker, who had trouble paying this were poor people. This is why I found it very difficult to appreciate their charges of our so-called war on the poor when I might say that we have not thrown any of the poor in jail yet, and I do not think they can stand in their places and say that, because we, have the record.

This is only part of the story. These premiums pay about one-third of the total cost of the hospital plan, and so, this individual who ended up in prison, probably paid his fair share of the other two-thirds of the taxes. If he failed to pay this one-third he could end up in jail, besides that he would have the benefits stopped, so he was loser two or three ways. He would be in jail like a common criminal, lose the benefits under the hospital plan and have the embarrassment of being hauled into court and then left in jail. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is another example that the CCF talk one way, humanity first, friends of the little people, and have acted another way.

Mr. Thatcher: — True.

Mr. Steuart: — I do not know, I was taunted a little while ago about compulsion. Well, this is one piece of compulsion we are going to end. We are going to see that the government ceases to force people into jail if they can't pay their hospitalization tax.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite, have a change of heart and in the time that they have sat in the opposition they have had time to think about their sins in the past and that they will, of course, vote for this.

I take great pleasure in moving that Bill no. 13 be now read a second time.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Before the hon. member takes his seat, will he permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Perhaps after I propose the motion.

Mr. Walker: — Well, after you propose the motion and the hon. member takes his seat. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Steuart) whether he would also propose to relieve people who fail to account for the other taxes that support medical care from imprisonment. For instance, for

people who fail to account for education and hospital tax, the act also provides a jail sentence for failure to pay. People who fail to drive a properly licensed automobile may be fined and, in default of payment of a fine, they go to jail. Do you propose also to exempt those people . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, when they quit braying over there I will be glad to answer the question. As the former Attorney General should know, but obviously doesn't, those people who collect the education tax and who fail to remit it, don't buy the goods, they sell them. The storekeeper won't collect taxes for goods he doesn't sell.

Mr. Walker: — You can bring the entire department before the magistrate by refusing to licence a car. Now if this person is a poor person, are you going to exclude him from the jail sentence if he fails to pay his fine.

Mr. Steuart: — What are you talking about? Mr. Speaker, paying the hospital premium and throwing him in jail as you did — five in 1963, two in 1964 and I don't know how many more over the years — Humanity First! This is what we intend to do, and I don't know how many poor people are out buying cars in other provinces bringing them in. If they are wealthy enough to go out of the province and bring in a car, I am sure they are wealthy enough to pay the very small premium that we charge for their hospitalization.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I think I want to say a word on this because some members of the house may not have got a clear picture of the present state of the law from the address by the hon. member for Prince Albert, the Minister of Public Health (Hr. Steuart). I think he left the impression that, if someone did not pay his hospital tax, for the sole reason of not paying the tax, he could go to prison. Now, this is not quite true. I say that the law as it now stands says that if your offence is that you didn't pay the tax, then you can't go to jail. It is only if your offence is that you didn't pay the tax, got fined and didn't pay the fine that you can be imprisoned. This is how it happened. I think anybody who reads the 1963 amendment here, which was supplied to you on the ditto paper, can very easily see what happened. It says that where a person is fined, in addition to the fine the magistrate may order that the tax be paid, this is added to the fine. Then it goes on to say, in the case of the default of any payment ordered by this first section, you can't go to jail. All you can do is have the money collected as a judgment.

Now, the law officers, at one time, believed that this meant that the fine and the tax were rolled together and you couldn't go to jail for the non-payment of that sum of money. That is not what the court said. I agree that is not what the court said, but that is how it got there. It was believed that the sum required, by order made under sub-section 1, was the fine and in addition the tax, everything rolled together. This was the belief when this was passed by the house and I think a check of the debate in the house at that time will indicate that this was the belief. I guess it was 1963, however, it didn't turn out this way, and I am sure that members on this side of the house see no particular objection to the bill which is now proposed. The intent of the 1963 amendments was to roll together the fine and the tax and to have the whole thing collected as a judgment. The 1965 bill will do this, and accordingly, those who voted for the 1963 bill will presumably have no objection to the 1965 bill.

I may say that some of the points raised by the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) are interesting and that it is true now that for failure to pay a parking ticket, you can go to jail. There are quite a few things you can go to jail for and . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . vicious mess. Let us face it.

Mr. Blakeney: — I think that we have no objection to this bill but I think that no one should leave here feeling that he has struck a great blow because there are probably 5,000 similar offences which all of us have committed at one time or other, exceeding the speed limit and all the rest of them that you can go to jail for, and while it would be interesting, perhaps, to start ticking them off one by one, and one is a little bit, it isn't a great blow.

However, as I indicated before, I certainly will have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, just, a word, Sir. I must reply to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) because I think the purpose of bringing in this legislation was as a result of certain actions in the Prince Albert district. Actually the man concerned is from my constituency, by the name of McTaggart. The minister knows very well that he tried to make an issue of this case, a political issue, Sir, and that is why I am standing up because he has accused us here of having legislation which is onerous or unpleasant. I agree with everything the other members have said but I want to make it clear that this came about as a political issue. This is legislation that the minister has promised. I am not against it but I did not like the way the Liberal party, up in my part of the country, used one of my constituents for this purpose. The case was there was a young man who was not able to make a living for himself. He was the son of a well-to-do farmer. The father refused to pay his hospital bill . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . this case . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . as the minister knows, was a sad one. They brought this young man into court. Nobody else was responsible for what happened to him but the Liberals opposite. I quite agree we should have this kind of legislation but I want to go on record as to why it was brought in. It is to keep a promise that the Liberals made after they had made a test case just for political expediency.

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Would the member state that, name again?

Mr. Berezowsky: — McTaggart from Paddockwood.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. who?

An Hon. Member: — McTaggart.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You know the name.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member from Regina East, I am not a lawyer and I am . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — West.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . west, east, west, well it won't matter next time because it will be the hon. member lawyer from nowhere.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I don't know whom I confused. I may have confused the lawyers. I hope I did, they have been confusing us common people long enough, but all I know is that the CCF put a law on the books and the courts of this land took it one way and they threw seven people I know in jail. We are going to change that act, if they go along with it, members on this side go along with it. One member over there shouted "Window Dressing". Well, to the people that end up in jail, because of this Humanity First government's actions, thrown into jail like common criminals because they couldn't pay the head tax, I don't think they think it is "Window Dressing", and as far as the poor individual from Cumberland, the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) said that he was very disturbed about what happened to one of his constituents. Well, I think the constituent was pretty disturbed, or should have been, about the CCF act that ended up putting him in jail, and, as far as trying to twist it around as I recall it, it was the good Liberals in Prince Albert that finally bailed him out of jail and set him on the road to freedom again which is our lot in life as usual

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill no. 13.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill no. 17, An Act to amend The Family Farm Credit Act, 1959.**

Mr. Speaker, in moving this bill, the purpose of the bill is to make it possible to continue the loaning operations until March 31st, 1966 of The Family Farm Credit Act. While the demand for long term loans under this act is declining there are some new applications pending as well as new applications on hand that should be processed. Also a number of existing borrowers want to borrow more to improve the farm units and some who have no other provisions.

Even though the interest rate under this act is six and one-half per cent including the loan insurance, it is higher than the Farm Credit Corporation loans. Some demands for family farm credit still continue, partly because applications in some cases can be processed more quickly by the Co-op Trust Company under these circumstances. That is not the case under the Federal Loan Program. In addition the amount loaned, namely up to 80 per cent of the appraised value of the land, tends to be somewhat higher than the Federal Farm Credit Act. Now the provincial government has under review the availability of long term agricultural credit for farmers from various sources. Now the need for a new type of long term agricultural credit to fill the gap that now exists is being studied. Pending the completion of these studies, it is felt that the act should now not be allowed to lapse, since it still seems to be filling a need, even though the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) had said that the act had not accomplished what had been anticipated in the first place.

Mr. Nollet: — No reference to this act, none whatever . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I said, the former minister sometime during the last session had mentioned in the house that he thought it had not met completely the needs and there still was a gap in the program. However, more of the details of this bill can be discussed fully in the committee as a whole. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill no. 17 be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of **Bill no. 14, An Act to amend The Game Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for two amendments to The Game Act. The first amendment is to section 89 of The Game Act and is quite a simple amendment to permit every holder of a big game licence to wear, while hunting, and every person accompanying or guiding such holder, to wear a blaze orange cap or toque. The color "blaze orange" is a recognized safety color. It is brilliant orange, permitting quick recognition and we believe that a person hunting big game or guiding or accompanying such hunters should, be permitted to wear such a color cap or toque. It would be a further step in making every effort to reduce firearm hunting accidents. Mr. Speaker, you will notice that it requires four amendments by simply adding after certain words, as indicated in the bill, the words, "or, blaze orange". I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that I need to say anything further with respect to the amendment to that particular section.

Now the second amendment is an amendment to section 95 The Game Act, This particular section was inserted in the act in 1963, and at that time the section permitted the use of the crop insurance fund for the purpose of paying for the hunter safety program providing that at no time was the fund to be reduced to less than \$300,000. This fund has now been built up to somewhere in the neighborhood of \$450,000 or more and there is, Mr. Speaker, an increasing amount of pressure to acquire, develop and operate lands owned or purchased by the crown for the purpose of developing suitable wildlife habitat, and to control crop damage that may be caused by big game animals or by game birds. This amendment is merely to provide that the impost of \$1 for wildlife crop damage insurance, which is charged on all hunting licenses and permits, both from people in Saskatchewan and from people from other provinces and the States can be used and made available, in excess of \$300,000 to purchase habitat and feeding areas for water fowl which will reduce the likelihood of wildlife depredation, habitat for big game to relieve hunting pressures on private land and contain big game land game birds species in order to relieve hunting pressure on private land

and to permit game birds to nest undisturbed.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in order to properly give effect to what is desired to be done, the entire section 95 is being repealed — as enacted by section 95 of chapter 39 of the statutes 1963 — and that an entirely new section is substituted. Actually much of the wording is exactly the same as the 1963 amendment except that in addition to permitting the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to, from time to time, authorize paying the expenses, or part of the expenses, incurred in conducting and carrying out a safety training program for hunters, it goes on, to provide that the funds may be used for acquiring by purchase, lease or otherwise, any area of land considered by the minister to be suitable for the protection, propagation and perpetuation of birds and animals and of developing, using and managing any such areas in such manner as the minister may consider advisable for the protection, propagation, perpetuation of birds and animals. It goes on to provide as the previous amendment had, that no such monies shall be used, at any time, so as to result in the funds being reduced below \$300,000. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will be of considerable assistance in the development of our wildlife and I do not think I need to add anything further. I think that the purposes of the amendments are quite evident and I take pleasure in moving that Bill no. 14 be now read the second time.

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — I would like to ask the hon. minister a question. I was wondering if scarlet or yellow were safe colors. In my opinion, scarlet is a very bad color in the woods because at dawn and towards evening, it looks dark, and I was wondering if you have any comments to make before you take your seat.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — No, I think that the hon. member from Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) has reference to the existing amendment which calls for the bright yellow. This calls for blaze orange, but you would want to know whether it is considered that the act as it presently exists, is a safe color. My information is that it is a safe color, that both the scarlet, yellow and the blaze orange are recognized safety colors.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I rather welcome this purchase of game habitat. This is something that is necessary but I wonder whether this is going to be complimentary to the ARDA programs or separate from them, whether this is going to be a provincial project that is going to be run separately and apart from ARDA, as a little program of our own, or whether it can be dovetailed into ARDA if and when agreements are made with the federal people and when they do make some decisions as to just where wild habitat does fit in with ARDA.

Mr. Thatcher: — I think these questions should be answered in committee as a whole and not on the principle of the bill and with respect, Sir, I would suggest the hon. member would live up to the rules . . .

Mr. Kramer: — I don't care when they answer as long as assurance is given that further discussion is possible.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of **Bill no. 15, An Act to amend The Northern Administration Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Northern Administration Act in two minor but yet quite important respects. Section 82, as it now stands, provides that the minister may grant aid or relief to any needy person who is a resident in the district and may provide for the medical care and treatment of any resident of the district who is financially incapable of procuring such care and treatment. Now, the amendment merely adds the words "and dental". I think that this brings it in conformity with municipal acts where a municipality is entitled to provide dental care to needy people. In the case of The Northern District Administration Act, there is no specific provision and it is felt that this should be added to section 82.

The other amendment is an amendment to section 90. This is also a rather minor amendment but still of some importance to the department.

This section was passed some years ago and placed a limitation on the burial expenses of indigents. It provided that the amount shall not exceed \$50 where a casket only is purchased, or \$70 where additional services are also provided. It has been found that the amount is totally inadequate under present circumstances and the purpose of this amendment is . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . bury the poor . . .

Mr. Cuelenaere: — . . . to place another maximum on the amount of funeral expenses of indigents from the present total amount of \$120 to \$175. Incidentally I am told that this is in conformity with the legislation that will be proposed in connection with the municipal acts. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving the second reading of Bill no. 15.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour) moved second reading of **Bill no. 18, An Act to amend The Employees' Wage Act, 1961.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this bill, I would like to draw to the attention of the house that section 26 of the act will be repealed because it has somewhat objectionable remedial action which in the opinion of the government is one that leaves a bad taste in the mouth of everyone. We find that in similar cases, say under The Debts Act, when a person fails to pay a debt, he is not usually sent to jail for it. This is what this section provides, in that if an employer was convicted because he failed to comply and was convicted because of his violation, he either made restitution or was sent to jail.

The amendments of the act will not make provisions that where the person is in default of payment, and he is convicted by provincial magistrate or Justice of the Peace, that a judgment will be made in a district court and can be enforced as such. If the employer, in this case, has not got money, an injunction is filed against him. Should he re-enter into the field of business or eventually get some money, the employee may receive his money later on. At least he is going to get it. It is better to have your wages come in at some future time than not at all. I hope this explanation clarifies the situation but if not, it can be dealt more thoroughly in committee. Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill no. 18 be now read the second time.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the proposed amendment. As I read the proposed section 26 it excludes the following provision:

That in addition to the fine imposed, order the employer to pay to him forthwith the amount of such wages and the provincial magistrate or Justice of the Peace shall pay to the employee such amount forthwith upon receipt of it.

My understanding is that at present the magistrate is automatically made a collector of the wages that may be due to the employee. At present the magistrate or the Justice of the Peace will upon receipt return monies owing to the employee. The amendment that is proposed really weakens this provision as I see it. It merely requires the magistrate to issue an order and the employer might be fined, but then the employee would have to go to court to collect the money owing to him. There might be an instance say that an employer might be owing an employee \$50 and the Justice of the Peace might issue an order to pay it, but then the employee would have to spend twice as much money to collect it, whereas under the present provision of the act, the Justice of the Peace or magistrate is an automatic collector. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the present provision work much more in favor of the employee and costs the employer much less to collect wages due than what is proposed in the amendment.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take issue with what my hon. friend, the member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) had just said about the proposed amendment. As I understand it, his interpretation of the proposed amendment is that the employee would have to go to court to collect his money in the sense that he would have to sue the employer. This is not true. If you will look at the proposed amendment, you will see that where a default is made in payment of any sum ordered to be paid, all he has to do is to file this order in the court and it becomes a judgment in the district

court. He does not have to start a law suit. He has the judgment, based on his order and he has the same rights as anybody else who has a judgment against a person. He can garnishee his wages, or he can seize the assets that the man may have, subject, of course, to the normal legal exemptions. But this is not putting him in a worse position at all. It is putting him in a stronger position. He is going to have a judgment of the district court which he can enforce against the employer, if the employer has any attachable assets. Now, the other principle, Mr. Speaker, the important principle here is again as was the case in the Hospitalization Act. We are doing away with the principle of legislation which provides for imprisonment for failure to pay a debt. That is the position here.

Under the existing section, sub-section 2 of the present section, provides that an employer who fails to pay any money ordered to be paid under sub-section 1, is guilty of a violation of this act. Under this section, although the employer has an alternative of paying the fine and thus avoiding imprisonment, this section, as it is presently constituted, could in effect result in his imprisonment for failure to pay a debt, where he is financially unable to pay the fine imposed. This is the principle of this amendment. We propose to do away with that proposition. We are not taking any rights away from the employee. He has a judgment of the court and he is in a stronger position than he was before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, and I oppose it on two grounds. Firstly, I think that we should agree that the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) has made a partially valid point. Let us consider what this act is supposed to do. These employees who use the Workmen's Wage Act or the Employees' Wage Act, are not wealthy employees. They are usually people who are ill-paid and ill-informed. Now heretofore, they used to go to the Department of Labour and the department would assist them in laying a charge and the magistrate heard it and if the magistrate found that the wages were owed, the magistrate collected the money from the employer.

Obviously, if the employer didn't have it, the magistrate didn't collect it, but if the employer had it, he collected it and gave it to the man and the man walked out of court with the money. Now you people are proposing to make a change which would say that rather than walk out of the court with the money, he will walk out with an order which he is supposed to take up to the court house — mind you, these are plasterers, hod-carriers and laborers who don't know where the court house is, let alone where to file such a paper. They are supposed to take this paper, file it at the court house; they are supposed to be able to issue a garnishee or perhaps instruct the Sheriff to seize. What you are saying is that they have to consult a lawyer in order to collect their money. Well, I would just like to ask some man over there, let us say the member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) if I handed him a court order, how would he go about getting his money?

Mr. Heald: — Go and ask the Sheriff.

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh, Oh, he knows where the Sheriff is — these people who are ordinarily collecting this money don't know who the Sheriff is, let alone where to find him. The facts are that whereas previously, he walked out with the money, he will not be able to this any longer. I say this, Mr. Speaker, these people simply should not be palmed off with a court order which they don't know what to do with. They should have the money in hand if possible. Now I have no objections if you want to provide that in a case where the magistrate believes the employer hasn't got the money, then he shouldn't issue this order. I no objections to this. But where the employer manifestly has the money, why not have the magistrate collect it, give it to the man, and this an end to it. Why go through this process of a court order, filing it, filing the judgment, and all the rest of it? Now let me make one more point, yes, the lawyers get it all and the lawyers simply don't want that kind of client. Now, I make one more point. We heard in this house, and to this extent, I am out of order, but we have heard on other occasions, members opposite say that there is something wrong with sending a man to jail for not paying a debt.

I have heard on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, say that this was a principle that they wouldn't stand for, and that something has got to be done about it, and what did they do? They introduce a bill by which this man will go to prison if he doesn't pay this money. How will he do it? They have provided that the wages due will be the subject of the order, and also the fine, but the other sections make perfectly clear that if he doesn't

pay the fine he goes to prison.

There is no doubt about it that, under this bill, you have used the same language that you were so much complaining about in the Hospitalization Act of 1963. Now, I have heard the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) on another occasion wax very eloquent on just how bad a principle it is, and we have it right here before us. You can check the wording, and it is the same wording. It is the same wording, it says:

Where default is made in payment of any sum ordered pursuant to sub-section 1 . . .

and that is the very section which the court has given a different interpretation, on,

. . . to be paid, the convicting magistrate shall make it into a court order.

But, certainly in the other case, i.e. Hospital Act, the same wording resulted in imprisonment, and you will do so in this case. So if you want to remove that principle, you haven't done it.

Furthermore I suggest that the proper way to deal with this thing is to leave the magistrate as the collector, but provide that in any case where the magistrate reaches the conclusion that the employer cannot pay, then allow the magistrate to issue the order to cover both the fine, if he likes, and the wages, whatever he likes — although obviously you have to split them because the fine goes to the crown, the wages go to the employee. The bill should provide that in any case where the magistrate thinks the employer can't pay, when you give the employee a court order — it is a judgment, it may be worth something in the future.

But where the employer can pay, don't send the employee out with a piece of paper when you could send him out with his money. I ask you to consider those two suggestions, which I think are worthwhile and concrete suggestions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. John Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and with deference to the hon. member from Regina, I cannot agree with the interpretation he places on the proposed amendment.

The proposed amendment is, of course, very clear. In sub-section 1, it provides that the convicting provincial magistrate or Justice of the Peace, shall in addition to the fine imposed, order the employer to pay to the employee the amount of such wages.

Now, here is an order of the magistrate. This does not prevent and in most cases will not prevent the magistrate from imposing the fine and in addition to that, to order the employer to pay to the employee the amount owing, and he still collects it, just as it is at the present time. All this proposed amendment does is to give to the employee an additional right.

Now, those of us who have been engaged in the practice for many years, know very well that quite frequently, and I must tell my hon. friends across the way that despite the fact that he says the lawyers get all the money, employees still engage lawyers very frequently to bring their case before the magistrate. In many cases that I have acted on, even after the magistrate had made the order for the fine, and even after he had ordered the payment of the wages, there was just no way of collecting them. Admittedly, sending the man to jail doesn't give the employee his wages. But sometimes, and very frequently, the employer has assets from which the employee could realize the amount of the judgment that was made by the magistrate, and this is precisely what this sub-section 2 gives to the employee. It permits him to go to the magistrate, and it says "upon request" upon his request — and that request will usually come after the default on the part of the employer to pay the wages — and all he has to do is to make a request and then obtain the certificate, which is provided for in the act, and then it is a very simple procedure to file the certificate. Very often these types of orders fall within what is known as "Small Debt Procedure" where the costs are small, both payable to the lawyer as well as the fees payable to the Sheriff and to the clerk of the court, and immediately he has automatically a judgment of the District Court of the Judicial Centre in which

he resides. Armed with that order, he can immediately issue a garnishee summons, to garnishee a bank account if he has one, garnishee monies owing to the employer by someone else and if the employer happens to be also—and in some cases they are — a wage earner, it permits him to garnishee the employer's wages.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this section does give to the employee some added remedy rather than to subtract. With respect to the matter as to whether the person can go to jail for non-payment of a debt, I think that the section now before us is pretty well all inclusive where a fine may be imposed and the employer ordered to pay the wages and in default the employee is entitled to this remedy.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we may adjourn the debate on this bill so that further examination could be made. I would, therefore, move that the debate adjourn.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 9:36 o'clock p.m.