

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature
42nd Day

Thursday, April 5, 1966

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ESTEVAN BRUINS VICTORY

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris—Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to call to the attention of this house that the Estevan Bruins last night went on to win the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League championship by defeating the team from the little town of Weyburn, Weyburn Red Wings. They humbled the Red Wings to the tune of 4—0 and now they go on to meet the Fort Frances Canadians in Western Canada semi-finals, I believe it is. I think that this house would like to wish Estevan well in their quest for the Memorial Cup.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RESOLUTIONS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION: RE VIETNAM

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife):

That this assembly, aware of the impossibility of resolving the conflict in Vietnam by military action or by negotiations on a bilateral basis, and fearful of the serious and tragic consequences of an escalated war, strongly urges the government of Canada to work diligently to achieve a cease—fire and to move negotiations for a peaceful settlement to the United Nations or a reconvened Geneva Conference.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, there are two main reasons why in my opinion this resolution needs some further comment. One is because the subject matter which the resolution asks us to consider is certainly among the most serious of all subjects which face people, no matter where they live in the world today. It needs discussion in the light of the best of our reason. It needs discussion without the kind of passion and intemperance which the Premier gave it when he spoke to the resolution when it was last before us. The second reason is that to which I have just referred and that is the way in which the Premier, presumably speaking for the government opposite, saw fit to treat the resolution and the words of the mover of the resolution.

The theme of the Premier's remarks was that such suggestions as included in the resolution, and such remarks as made by my

colleague the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) should not be made. A second theme was that in particular they should not be made in the legislature. He went so far as to suggest that anyone who did make such remarks was guilty of both indiscretion and was indeed seeking to provoke and destroy some of the values in our society. He disputed the needs and the propriety of such statements as were in the resolution and in the supporting statements of the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, believed some fifty years ago that peace by negotiation is possible and is probable, if a person believes that and believes it fully, then he has an obligation to say so. He has an obligation to other human beings, particularly those who are paying the cost in terms of their lives to say so. I submit, that if a person believes that sincerely, as the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) who spoke on that does believe, he can't justify remaining quiet, he can't justify committing the sin of great silence.

There are others, of course, who have also indicated the need for speaking out on this particular issue and in that respect I read a statement made by Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon. It is a statement that was made in the Senate of the United States as recently as October of 1965. No one, I would hope, would suggest that Senator Morse was anti—American. Here in part is his statement:

What is needed in America is the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet in the communities of America, of free people protesting against the course of action in Vietnam. Mr. President, there are those who would silence those of us who are here to protest. There are those even in this body who believe some sort of censorship ought to be placed on free men who practise their freedom by protesting foreign policy. I think my god that there are in this country thousands of people who will be heard from, tomorrow, and in the weeks and the months ahead, and who will not be cowed into submission.

That statement is particularly appropriate to recommend to the attention of the Premier in this particular regard.

He raised secondly the question of whether this was an appropriate subject for discussion in this legislature. Well, there are, of course, many precedents in the past from which one can deduce that the legislature in the past has certainly considered such subjects to be appropriate. This legislature is more than just a place where laws are enacted; it is a very real and proper sense, I suggest, a forum. In it members of the legislature have a right to point out and to point up matters which are of genuine concern to those whom they represent. These are not always matters on which we can take specific action. They are in many cases matters on which we think some leadership ought to be given to the people. They are matters on occasion which we think we have a responsibility to make suggestions to all federal governments.

The resolution before us was an attempt to formulate some views of this legislature which could be passed on to our federal government, the government of Canada. The subject matter, I remind the members of the legislature again, is among the most serious ever considered by Canadian people; it is, I suggest, an

April 5, 1966

entirely appropriate one for discussion in this legislature.

The members will recall the emotionally charged charge of the Premier that the statements and the resolution itself must be construed as being anti—American and pro—Communist. This part of his remarks I suggest were among the most ridiculous of the many ridiculous statements which were made. He attempted in using that kind of approach to make use of the smear tactics. He used it most liberally. One would have hoped that we had grown out of that particularly pernicious habit in this particular assembly.

The member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) made, not a long, but a very clear statement on the resolution. I have taken the trouble to read his remarks, I have read them carefully, and I have read them with appreciation. Certainly there is nothing in the statement that he made that any fair and decent—minded citizen would consider as being either anti—American or pro—Communist. The tactics used by the Premier in attempting to so label them are the tactics of a late but unlamented Senator McCarthy of the United States. Such words as were used were designed to make people hate and fear and disgusted. The type of argument laid down by the Premier is such as is designed to discourage reason; in fact, one must say the effect of them is an attempt to deny freedom of speech.

The resolution itself and the remarks of the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) deny every word of the Premier's remarks in that sentence. Moreover, let us note this, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution and the words to support them, in fact, ally us with some of the most powerful and respected voices in the United States. They ally us with the thinking and they support the words of many of the best known and most highly respected Senators of the United States — names such as Fulbright, Morse and Kennedy will come to mind; they ally us and they support the words of some of the world's great journalists in the United States such as Lippman. They put us in a similar relationship with some of the outstanding scholars in the United States, the name of one, Dr. Hutchings, formerly President of the University of Chicago and President of the Ford Foundation.

The resolution and the words of its sponsor called for negotiations; they called for United Nations' action in respect of a problem that is a problem of the world; they reminded us of the Geneva Agreement; they underlined the dangers of the wide destruction which may take place if the present course in that unfortunate, unhappy country of Vietnam is continued. The resolution calls for actions for all people, not against any people. It stated ideas. The Premier's answer was simply to shout names; he called out names against those who happened to disagree with him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate some of the statements and some of the persons who share, or who have shared the kind of concern expressed by the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) and the resolution, who have urged comparable action to that urged in the resolution. I call some witnesses which the government ought to listen to. Prime Minister Pearson, speaking just a little over a year ago to the Canadian Society of New York, is on record with these words:

Today the aim of the international community must be to secure conditions in South East Asia in which under international control and under international supervision,

and effective international policing, the states in that area can work out their own affairs and conduct their own policies without the interference from any neighbour or any outside power.

So stated Prime Minister Pearson a year ago; so speaks the resolution; and so argued the MLA from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet).

Certainly no one is going to suggest on that side of the house, I trust, that Prime Minister Pearson is either anti—American or pro—Communist. Secondly, I note a news item which appeared in the Leader Post about a year ago telling of the opinion of Professor Galbraith of Harvard University. Professor Galbraith is a distinguished Canadian scholar who has made a reputation for himself in the United States. He was one of President Kennedy's chief advisors; he was at one time United States Ambassador in India, nobody would suggest that he was anti—American. Yet, he, in that news item, is credited with having called for a halt to U.S. bombing in Vietnam.

The New York Times, again about a year ago, carried a plea to President Johnson and some 2,500 ministers, priests and rabbis in the United States. One would not consider these as being anti—American or pro—Communist. The plea is introduced in these words and I quote:

Mr. President, in the name of God, stop them.

Here is another reference, this one is a more pointed criticism of the United States. The words are not mine; they come from a source usually considered as a very reasoned and non—biased source. The London Observer in its April 25th Air Mail edition had this to say:

The United States is fighting a mistaken fight. However much we may wish to avoid embarrassing an ally, however much we may sympathize with President Johnson's difficulties, the point has come when polite murmurs of dissent are no longer appropriate. When you see a friend sleep—walking on the edge of a precipice carrying your only child in his arms, it is your duty to try to wake him even if this involves raising your voice and making rude noises.

This statement, of course, went much further than the resolution before us or the remarks of its sponsor. Certainly no one would suggest that it comes from a source that is anti—American. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this resolution far from being anti—American is in favour of everything that is usually considered to be in the best traditions of the American nation. One of those traditions is that to be silent when one's conscience says disagree is not part of the traditions of that nation.

More recently, of course, there have been some extremely spirited and pointed discussions in the United States led by some of those men whom I mentioned recently, Senators Fulbright, Morse, Kennedy and others. Nobody suggests, nobody should suggest that they are anti—American or pro—Communist because they decide to speak out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a more direct reference to the resolution and what it seeks to do. Let's be aware of the fact that there are many issues underlying the situation in Vietnam and it is dangerous to over—simplify or to merely select the convenient as

April 5, 1966

did the premier. I suggest that to accept the idea that the issue in Vietnam is simply one of Communist aggression, or the containment of Communist expansion by military action, is a dangerous and misleading over—simplification. To accept it as some do is to blind ourselves to some very vital facts. To accept that as the issue or the reason is to encourage, I submit, the right of Communist nations to take equal and similar actions in opposition. To argue that all we have to do is to be anti—Communist is to ignore what we have to be in favour of. To do that is to court the overwhelming menace of an annihilating 20th century war, a war in which humanity's clock would not just be turned back. It would be stopped and the mechanism destroyed.

I have to suggest that there are some other issues which need to be examined and which, if the spirit of the resolution were accepted, would be examined. One of those issues is the right of people in small national to work out their own destiny. This was a right which the Geneva Agreement of 1954 envisaged for Vietnam. It is a right which has, however, been abrogated in Vietnam. It is a right which the resolution suggests must be restored. This, may I remind the legislature, is a right which is important just not for the moment, not just for Vietnam. It is of importance to other nations in Asia, in Africa and South America. As a matter of fact it is a right important for all nations even though this right may not be in jeopardy within their own boundaries.

I think one of the unfortunate facts of the situation is that in Asia and in Africa there are many people who see the Vietnam conflict as one of white versus colour, as one of continuation or attempt at domination by white people. There are many in those countries who recall, if not the words, certainly the feeling of the wake of history. Included in this wake is the fact that the first atomic bomb was dropped by white people on non—whites, such self imposed past handicaps of exploitation, of colonialism, of the bomb on Hiroshima make difficult development of confidence and respect that are necessary to the peace and development and the growth of human rights that are to be the achievements of the future. The resolution would make a contribution toward developing their confidence.

A second issue which deserves examination in the Vietnam situation is the major issue of the future, or the fat of international organizations including the United Nations. the unilateral decision, and such it must be termed, of the United States in Vietnam has built a wall around the United Nations. It is a wall which must take its place in history as real and as symbolic as the much discussed and condemned wall which divides Berlin. We need to be reminded walls not only shut out; they also shut in. In the very appropriate words of the great American Poet, Robert Frost, who once wrote:

Before I built a wall I'd ask to know what I was walling in or walling out.

There is a wall in Vietnam which has walled out the United Nations, which has walled out the potential of the United Nations for preventing war, for promoting the welfare of people. It has also, I'm afraid, for the United States itself, walled out and alienated the sympathy of many people inside and outside of that country. This itself is something of a stark tragedy. The resolution seeks to tear down that wall and to let the influence of the United Nations and other nations in, or to replace that of the two antagonists. Let there be no doubt about it, and nobody would disagree, that the world needs the application of the UN ideal, it

needs the realization of the hopes which were born with the United Nations some twenty years ago. The world needs the great strength that is available in the economic development of the United Nations and indeed in the general hearts of American people. The kind of action taken in Vietnam walls out this strength. Perhaps it is appropriate that we remind ourselves of the words of the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, who said not so long ago:

I am sure that the great American people, if they only knew the true facts and the background to the developments in South Vietnam, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary.

The world cannot afford to have the potential of the UN shut out, or the potential of the U.S. shut in. Such is one of the consequences of action as it is proceeding in that unfortunate country today.

The third or related issue is the hope for the extension of the application of international law. There is little scope for international law in a world in which a course of action is determined by one nation and applied because that one nation has the military power to apply it. The whole hopeful concept of a system of international law is ignored and endangered by the situation in Vietnam today. This in itself constitutes a threat to mankind.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a chance for existence, if that existence is to be free from fear and dignified by some fullness of life, it will be within the framework of international order. It must be a framework which is not built on the basis of two pulls, one Communism and the other Capitalism. It must be a framework within which the United States, Western Europe, the USSR, China and India are major partners. It must be a framework within which smaller nations are a part; it cannot be that any one nation opts out at will of the discipline which is necessary if we are to have a world of law and order.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more that could be said as to what needs to be done and needs to be recognized if there is to be a proper resolving of the conflict. I am very much aware of the fact that this conflict cannot be resolved without considering the major place which China holds in the world today. China is, Communism in China is; we prefer it otherwise but the fact remains, Communism in China is. We can do much, I submit, in our Canadian nation to find a way in which to develop better relations with that country. One that comes to mind which is appropriate at the moment is what is going to happen, or what is not going to happen in respect to Expo 67. The situation at the moment is Mainland China has not been invited. I understand it has been refused the right to have exhibits there. It would be worthwhile for Canadians, recognizing this country as being one of our best customers, recognizing it as one of the great powers of the world today and tomorrow, and accepting the fact that it is Communist, to have this kind of contact, I submit, with some aspects of the Chinese people, some aspects of the Chinese economy and some of the Chinese people. It could have been one of the ways in which we can get to talk to them as human beings rather than just persons who happen to be antagonistic to us.

Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to indicate that in my opinion there are some major issues in Vietnam, major issues which the acceptance of the resolution before us would help to resolve in a favourable way. I just restate briefly those issues. There

April 5, 1966

is the menacing and escalating threat posed by action which may be met by counter—action and could result in World War III. The resolution urges that there be negotiation not just between two parties but between more. There is at issue the rights of people in small nations to determine the disciplines under which they will live. The resolution suggests a way in which this could be brought closer to reality.

There is an issue which concerns the future of international organizations. It concerns the future of the United Nations itself and its six agencies. It includes the future of international law and the hope that these kinds of international organizations and these kinds of international recognitions could give for a same and sensible and possible future. Mr. Speaker, no amount of name calling, no amount of attempted throttling of free speech, no amount of destruction of motives can contribute to the solution of these very real problems for those in our province and in our country and in the world. But the idea in the resolution could, I suggest, make a contribution. It is a resolution that, in the words of the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) in introducing it “expresses thoughtful ideas based on reason”; it could make a contribution and I hope that the members in the house will see fit to give it unanimous endorsement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of this resolution, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to speak on a resolution which is one of the most important ones that have come before the house. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is one of great concern to all Canadians. Sometimes people will try and tell me that they are not interested in foreign affairs. Well, all I can say is that they should be. Surely if they are not interested in their fellow—men in other parts of the world then, for their own selfish personal reasons you would think they would take some interest. In this day and age when people can orbit the earth in about the same time as it takes to drive to the City of Regina, I say it is impossible to sit back and try to ignore what is going on in other parts of the world. If we do, we do so at our own peril. Mr. Speaker, in order to speak on this resolution one should really spend a good deal of time as to the events that have brought us to the present state of affairs in Vietnam. This, Mr. Speaker, would take more time than I feel it would be right or desirable for me to take at this time. I, therefore, propose to deal with the Vietnam question on the assumption that all the members of this legislature are familiar with what has transpired in Vietnam prior to the conflict that is now raging in that unhappy country. Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen in Vietnam? Is the war going to continue for a long period of time, or is there a possibility of bringing a negotiated peace? Right now the war has had two major developments — one which is hopeful and the other which would bring offensive uneasiness to those who wish to see the war there ended.

The first encouraging sign is the fact that the United States is moderating its demands and has changed its objectives considerably. On the other side there are indications that the National Liberation Fund and its allies in Hanoi are willing to moderate their demands in order to achieve peace. Some of these changes ought to be noted. In his famous April 7th, 1965 speech at Baltimore, President Johnson agreed to unconditional discussions. It was explained by administration representatives that this did not mean negotiations and there were several qualifications.

President Johnson was willing to discuss with any government, and this meant that he would not negotiate with the National Liberation Front. Later he agreed to include the National Liberation Front members in the Hanoi delegation. Now there is no insistence on this, and it is generally believed that this obstacle could be solved as it was in Geneva in 1954. Furthermore, the Americans have retreated considerably from their earlier demands that South Vietnam be permitted to exist as an independent state. Up until recently the United States has refused to accept the Geneva Declaration promises for a referendum or reunification. This principle, I believe, has not been accepted by the United States government.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the Americans have also refused to back the principle of free elections in the southern zone on the grounds that they could not be carried out under the existing situation. This was partly because they knew the Vietnamese would not elect a program—U.S. government. Now the Johnson administration has stated that it would be willing to accept the decision of the South Vietnamese people, even if it produced an unfriendly government. More realistically, Mr. Speaker, Dean Rusk has suggested that the United States might accept some sort of a coalition government in the south on a settlement similar to that allowed in 1962.

In general, the Johnson administration has accepted the Geneva agreement of 1954 as the basis for peace and is trying to work out the differences with a four—point peace proposal issued by Hanoi last April. Right now, Mr. Speaker, the differences seem to be as follows: There is no agreement as to whether the United States troops should withdraw before negotiations begin, or after. The United States has accepted the principle of phasing out the U.S. military force, but insists that stability must be guaranteed. Secondly, the National Liberation Front in Hanoi insists that the Vietnamese should be allowed to solve their own problems without interference and in the south this means that the National Liberation Front should be recognized as the real government.

If a coalition is formed, the National Liberation Front can account for 42 seats for which all but 11 are to be controlled by them. The United States would not accept this and it is extremely unlikely that the South Vietnamese government would accept voluntarily any type of coalition government. Mr. Speaker, there are, however, some real discouraging signs at the present time. The most obvious, of course, is the rapid build—up of the American military forces in Vietnam and a further escalation of the war. With the build—up of American forces it is estimated they will number 600,000 or more by the end of the year. The war is becoming more and more an American war. Here, Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that everything that has been done regarding the build—up of the American forces has been done at the request of the President. One wonders sometimes about this amount of power in the hands of one man. Long range B—52 bombing is certainly less discriminating, the reason successful operations against concentrated Viet Con forces were carried out mostly by American forces. This, of course, plays into the hands of the National Liberation Front and Viet Con who argue that the Americans are merely replacing the French as the colonizers and that the succession of puppet government in Saigon is merely the equivalent of Frances Bao Dai. In Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, the Americans are the foreigners, and the Saigon government consists of traitors who have sold out their country for political power and a change to fill their pockets. This, of course, is the attitude of the Hanoi people.

April 5, 1966

Mr. Speaker, what's wrong with the Americans? Can't they see where their policy is leading? It is obvious they have learnt nothing from the great Chinese Civil War and evidently do not understand the political, social and economic revolution that has occurred since the last war. The Americans stress that this effort in Vietnam is a great test to prove to the world that war as a national liberation will not be permitted by the western nations, that only an American victory here will stave off the spread of such a vogue all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is nonsense to believe that even a success in Vietnam will prevent such outbreaks elsewhere. The war in Korea did not stop radical revolts simply because they are not primarily due to outside interference in the international affairs of other countries. In commenting on the many revolts similar to that in Vietnam, Walter Lippman, a well known American, Mr. Speaker, correctly stated:

What is common to them all is violent discontent with the established order and a willingness of a minority of the discontented to die in the attempt to overthrow it.

What is particularly sad to me, Mr. Speaker, is what the Vietnamese war is doing to the United States and to its image around the world. People are starting to laugh whenever President Johnson and his supporters speak of the American commitments in Vietnam as the sole means of guaranteeing the South Vietnamese "freedom, democracy, and self—determination" much in the same way as we laugh at the Russians when they speak of the "people's democracies". That is, because, Mr. Speaker, there has never been any system of freedom, democracy or self—determination in the various governments that the U.S. has supported in South Vietnam. It is hard to picture General Ky flying his purple plane, dropping napalm bombs on innocent people and praising Adolf Hitler as his "only hero" bearing the torch of the "free world" in south East Asia.

The American practice simply falls far short of the official pronouncements. Perhaps that is one reason why the Americans have failed in Vietnam while the British were able at least temporarily to achieve their objectives in Malaya. Mr. Speaker, what does "free world" really mean? In Asia, Mr. Speaker, it obviously doesn't mean what is generally associated with the term: liberty, constitutionalism, democracy and self—determination. The Saigon regimes and other U.S. allies there have been as dictatorial as any Communist government. The only real difference between Saigon and Hanoi is the type of economic system, and thus American intervention in the area seems to fit the Marxist description. There is no doubt that America is fighting a great struggle with the ideology of Communism. The struggle today, as everyone knows, is not in Europe but in the so—called undeveloped world, and the Americans enter the struggle with at least two strokes against them. They are a white, western, status quo power, allied with the former colonialist powers in Western Europe. They support, Mr. Speaker, an economic system that has been generally rejected on the grounds that it is immoral and wasteful and not suitable for a country demanding quicker development and careful use of capital assets. The only positive program the Americans can offer is the old concept of individual freedom, democracy and self—determination. But while it is preaching these principles, it is not putting them in practice. The new American "consensus" appears to support the idea of dictatorship, as long as it is not leftwing.

Mr. Speaker, what is Canada's role in Vietnam? At the Geneva conference in 1954, Canada was asked by the powers to become one of the three members of the Control Commission set up in Indo China. After consulting with the United States, Canada accepted. The Americans have never seen any conflict between Canada's vote as their closest ally and the position of Canada on the International Control Commission in Vietnam. This attitude, Mr. Speaker, was reflected in the recent letter to Prime Minister Pearson asking for token military support for America's cause in Vietnam. Although the Prime Minister denies that there was a request for troops, the contents of the letter, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, have never been revealed and American news sources say that identical letters were sent to all NATO members and did ask for troops. Canada's policy in Vietnam since 1954 was outlined in an article appearing in the March, 1957 issue of External Affairs and Mr. Speaker, to this effect:

Within the framework of the Geneva Agreements, Canadian policy in Indo—China has had three major objectives.

First there has been an over—riding desire to prevent the resumption of hostilities in the region. In the second place, Canada has attempted to confine her responsibilities in Indo China to a reasonable restrictive reading of the Geneva Agreements. Our representatives have had no desire to play a general good—office role in the area nor to urge on any of the four Indo—China states any particular measures not explicitly provided for in the various agreements. In particular, the Canadian position has been that the Vietnam commission has not within its present terms of reference any responsibilities in connection with the elections to unite the two zones of Vietnam as stipulated in the final declaration made by seven of the nine powers, participating in the Geneva Conference. Similarly Canada has used its influence to prevent the commission becoming involved in the border disputes between Cambodia and South Vietnam which have arisen in recent months. Thirdly, Canada has attempted to carry out her obligations in Indo—china in such a way as to complicate as little as possible her relations with major friendly powers with interests in the region, notably the United States, France and India.

Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious that right from the beginning Canada has decided to play a passive role in Vietnam, and not to seek initiatives for peace. At the same time, with the implementation of the "troika" principle the United States felt that Canada's primary role was to defend the western position. How long Canada was to remain was outlined in section 14(a) of the 1954 Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam.

Pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam, the conduct of civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there in virtue of the present agreement.

When there were no elections held in 1956, Canada was requested to stay on as an indefinite member of the I.C.C.

However, Mr. Speaker, Canada has not been as partisan in its role on the International Control Commission as has the Polish delegate. From the beginning Canada has recognized a dual loyalty, to the treaty as well as to her western allies. From 1954 to 1962,

April 5, 1966

Canada did not hesitate to criticize the United States and the South Vietnamese regime when it violated the agreement on the cessation of hostilities. The now well-known majority report of India and Canada on June 2, 1962, criticized both Hanoi and the Americans for violations. The position was supported by the Minister of External Affairs, Howard Greene. But there seems to be a decided change in attitude under Paul Martin. This is reflected in the speeches of Mr. Martin, who has come down firmly on the side of the Americans without any pretence of objectivity, and also in the Canadian Minority report of the I.C.C. released on February 13th, 1965. The majority report by India and Poland criticized the U.S. for its bombing raids on North Vietnam, open violations of the Geneva Agreement. In this minority report, Mr. Speaker, Canada refused to condemn or even mention the American bombings and concerned herself solely with trying to prove that Hanoi was subverting the South Vietnamese government, significantly using this argument on information provided by the Saigon regime.

Mr. J. Blair Seaborn, Canada's representative on the I.C.C. in Vietnam has a rather unique view of his role. According to an article by Geoffrey Stevens in the July 31st, issue of the Toronto Globe and Mail he writes:

His reports — he files one almost every day — receive immediate high-level attention in Ottawa and Washington. According to reports from the U.S. Capitol, Washington's approach and its changes in policy and tactics have to some extent been based on the Canadian's assessment of the political and military climate in North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that his is a perversion of Canada's vote as a member of the I.C.C. It is not, I submit, the function of the Canadian representative to provide intelligence reports for the American government. What reports are made should be directed to the co-chairman of the Geneva Conference, Britain and the Soviet Union and should be made in conjunction with the other members of the I.C.C., Poland and India.

This new attitude can best be seen by reading the statements of the Hon. Paul Martin in the house of Commons on March 8th and May 28th, 1965, as well as his statements before the Standing Committee on External Affairs on June 10, 1965. He has adopted the same double standard used by the U.S. United States military aid to South Vietnam is now considered to be legal, regardless of what the Canadian representatives have said in past reports of the I.C.C. and a legitimate right of self defence; on the other hand it is illegal for the National Liberation Front to seek aid from the Vietnamese people who happen to live above the 17th parallel. Like the Americans, the Minister for External Affairs only refers to those sections of the 1962 report of the I.C.C. which criticize Hanoi. Both he and Prime Minister Pearson have accepted the American argument that the revolt is "aggression" of a new variety, supported by "outside" sources. In reality, aggression under the new American definition means any use of force by people to throw out governments which defend the status quo of conservative or old regimes. Mr. Speaker, by this definition, the American colonists were guilty of "aggression" against Great Britain and the north was guilty of "aggression" against the south in the American Civil War for trying to reunite the country. The "domino" theory and the threat of Communist expansion now justifies any means. Those who dissent, Mr. Speaker, according to Mr. Martin, from U.S. policy are guilty of "appeasement" similar to that tried at Munich in 1938. When similarly charged with appeasement by Joseph Alsop,

Professor Hans J. Morgenthau just replied:

Anyone who believes that these desperate situations and issues are identical is beyond the reach of rational argument.

Mr. Speaker, what is the result of this change of policy? Canada has been branded a “lackey” of the Americans by the non—western world, and her position and influence in Vietnam as a supporter of the Geneva Agreement has been undermined. Perhaps this has made it impossible for Canada to play any positive role in promoting a peaceful settlement in Vietnam — the same stance by the Wilson government doomed the Commonwealth Peace mission. I tend to agree with Senator Wayne Morse who holds that Canada’s and Britain’s support of the U.S. has made it more difficult for the Americans to extricate themselves from Vietnam and at the same time save face. Because of animosities that have built up over the years, the U.S. has felt that it could not accept France and De Gaulle as a mediator. Proposals by an objective Britain and Canada would have had greater possibilities for success, I suggest.

Having said all this, Mr. Speaker, I feel Canada can still play a role. The Pearson government can surely be at least as conciliatory as President Johnson. So far all we hear from Ottawa is that the U.S. cannot unilaterally withdraw, but that military means alone won’t win the war and, therefore, negotiation is a necessity. But there have not been any specific proposals for compromise; Canada has not yet (at least publicly) even accepted the principles of the Geneva Agreement as a basis for negotiated settlement. Instead of platitudes, Mr. Speaker, let’s hear some concrete proposals from our government, at least as radical as those put forth by Senator Mansfield. If a supervised truce is necessary, and the United Nations won’t and can’t pay for it, then why not propose having the middle powers like Canada pay for it outside the United Nations? Why not make some specific proposals on a ceasefire? On withdrawal of foreign troops? On the composition of a caretaker government in the south? Certainly, Mr. Speaker, Canada has the information on which to base specific suggestions. But these suggestions must be made publicly, not secretly as suggested by the Heeney—Merchant report. It is even more important to show the American Public that its friends are worried about the Vietnamese war and wish a negotiated settlement either through the United Nations or through a reconvened Geneva conference. The consequences of an escalated war in Vietnam are terrifying, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is up to our government to do everything within its power to see that this is not allowed to happen. If Canada really does want a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, then let the world know that we differ at least to a degree from the United States on her policy in Vietnam and have some positive alternatives to offer. Mr. Speaker, because of Canada’s close association with the United States and her long involvement in Vietnam, this is the logical country to make a definite peace proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all members of this house will find themselves in agreement with this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the house is on the proposed motion of the member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet):

That this assembly, aware of the impossibility of resolving the conflict in Vietnam by military action or by negotiations on a bilateral basis, and fearful of the serious and tragic consequences of an escalated war . . .

April 5, 1966

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, look at them coming in when you are on your feet putting the question.

Mr. Speaker: — I see them coming in.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Can they vote? Isn't that a house rule?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, if hon. members will take a look at something that I said recently, they will see that I said that I don't think the chair has the right, and I certainly would never exercise the right if I did have it, to deny any elected member, elected by the people of this province, the right to take his seat unless those doors are locked. When the question is being put formally and officially and a recorded vote is being held . . .

Mr. Kramer: — . . . kick the doors . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Now that is entirely uncalled for and it will merit a well—deserved rebuke if it is repeated. The question before the house is on the proposed resolution of the hon. member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet):

That this assembly, aware of the impossibility of resolving the conflict . . .

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: — Did somebody raise a point of order?

Mr. Nollet: — I did, the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was sneering and I just asked him if he thought this subject was funny?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 23

Lloyd	Thibault	Link
Cooper (Mrs.)	Willis	Baker
Wood	Nicholson	Brotten
Nollet	Kramer	Larson
Walker	Dewhurst	Robbins
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Pepper
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Davies	Smishek	

NAYS — 31

Thatcher	Grant	Romuld
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Bjarnason	MacLennan

Cameron	Trapp	Larochelle
Steuart	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Heald	McIsaac	Coupland
Gardiner (Melville)	MacDonald	Gardner (Moosomin)
Guy	Gallagher	Mitchell
Merchant (Mrs.)	Breker	Pederson
Loken	Leith	MacDougall
Radloff		

SECOND READINGS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) for second reading of Bill No. 30, **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act.**

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes to comment on the remarks of the minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) when he spoke after I introduced the bill not long ago in this house. I listened very intently to what the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) had to say, Mr. Speaker. I listened with interest to his remarks. I listened hard expecting him to say something about the bill, but I listened with complete disappointment because at no point in his remarks did he say one single solitary word about the proposals in the amendments which are before us. He chose to occupy his time rather by pointing the finger of scorn at me, and then indicating his position as a candidate for the Liberal Party Academy Award as the most frustrated actor of the century . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . he went to work on me, the press reported it in these words — “Lloyd Roasted”.

Well, if I was roasted, it could only have been because of the hot air that issued from the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I assure him I am rather a tough kind of bird and it takes a lot more than that to have much of a roasting effect. He professed a considerable amount of surprise, Mr. Speaker, that in legislation with respect to human rights I should talk about human beings. It even came as a shock to him that in order to demonstrate the need for some human rights legislation I should describe how human rights had been erased for some and eroded for others. The contention of my remarks, which I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, is that that is the situation, unfortunately, in the province, that in part this is the situation. Because of actions taken by the government since assuming office, human rights have been erased for some and have been eroded for others. the main weight of argument rested on a claim, which he made, that 20 years ago I had been a nasty fellow and I continued to be a nasty fellow right up to the present time. Well, let me just look very briefly at the allegations which he made.

April 5, 1966

Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that his allegations concerning what happened nearly a quarter of a century ago had been partially correct. Suppose, for example, Mr. Speaker, that the figures he used regarding those leaving the service of the government at that time had not been swollen and distended and distorted by including all of the part—time and temporary summer help who obviously would leave during that period anyway, because the period of their employment was over. They were there for the summertime. Suppose that those dismissed had not included a number of people like some highway inspectors for whom we could never find out what their job was and some of whom never left their place of residence. Suppose Mr. Speaker, that the situation had been that people had been dismissed improperly and unfairly. I am not going to deny that that may very well have happened. Governments are subjected to considerable pressures on the occasion of changes of governments. There may very well have been some too hasty decisions made. I don't know. I say there may have been. My point is that if that was the case, then legislation of this kind would have been extremely helpful and useful for the government and for the people concerned and for the province generally.

The member, for example, raised the question as to how many times I had tolled the bell. Since he raised it, I can tell him. I have taken the opportunity of looking back over the record of the Department of Education. I tolled it once with respect to one particular person. Mr. Speaker, that decision I would be prepared to support in the face of any tribunal of any kind that may have been established or any kind that might be established in the future. The action which was taken was taken because it was good for education in the province of Saskatchewan that the action be taken.

I want to remind him also, Mr. Speaker, that immediately we took office in 1944, we began a series of actions which gave to public employees a kind of protection and advantage which they had not had in this province, which they did not enjoy in any other province in Canada at that time and which they enjoy all too few as yet. We gave to our employees the right to organize, the right to form trade unions, to achieve collective bargaining, and to fall heir to all of the protections and advantages which the best traditions of trade unionism can give them. That has been a mark of leadership. It was at that time leadership in this province and throughout the country. It leaves us in the position of leadership still today. It is rather interesting to note that now almost a quarter of a century afterwards the federal Liberal government at Ottawa is talking about doing the same thing. That is about the usual distance in years between our doing and their considering whether or not to do something or other. Almost 25 years ago we gave employees this kind of protection. Liberals at Ottawa are now talking about doing it.

Mr. Speaker, suppose as I said there had been some mistakes made, then this kind of legislation would have been good, good for the government as well as good for the employees as well as good for the people. Consider then when we return to power this year, next year or the year after, now that the government has guaranteed, has added some guarantees by changing constituency boundaries for the Premier and the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) — I suppose we may expect an election before too long — Mr. Speaker, suppose when we return to power we show some of those same tendencies, then I submit, these kinds of amendments which are being proposed would be good for the government, good for the employees and good for the people of the province. That is the basis on which we ought to decide whether to support or not to support

these amendments that are before us. I submit that the members of the legislature have a responsibility to do, as I suggested in moving this on second reading, to consider it part of our job to do everything that is fair and legally possible to see that employees have some basis of equality, the best possible position to protect themselves against acts which would hinder them whether these are acts of government or acts of private employees.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the bill warrants support. May I just add this. I have not pretended that these amendments would correct all of the problems to which I referred. To do this there will be other things for us to do when we return to power. I think of the procedure with respect to Ombudsman. Just let the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) continue on his course and it wouldn't take any time whatsoever. We need some additional procedures. We need some additional machinery in order to give people full opportunity to establish themselves as full—fledged citizens. The position that we have taken with regard to the Ombudsman study, the statements that have been made with respect to the need for a Human Rights Commission in this province, or the statements that will need enactment, this party will enact such measure when returned to power. in the meantime, all we can do is to put forth the kind of amendments that we have here, Mr. Speaker. It will be most important to the people of the province to note how the members of the government vote, whether they vote to extend human rights or whether they vote to continue to deny human rights for the people of Saskatchewan and in particular the employees of the government.

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 25

Lloyd	Willis	Baker
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Broten
Wood	Nicholson	Larson
Nollet	Kramer	Robbins
Walker	Dewhurst	Pepper
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Blakeney	Michayluk	Pederson
Davies	Smishek	
Thibault	Link	

NAYS — 30

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

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of **Mr. W. S. Lloyd**, (Leader of the Opposition) for second reading

April 5, 1966

of Bill No. 39, **An Act to amend The Fair Employment Practices Act.**

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to think of what I could say in reply to the debate from the side opposite when nobody has said anything. This presents a bit of a challenge.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I just say this, it is perhaps significant in itself that nothing has been said. Were I to say something it would have been much the same as what I have just said. I hope the government in the space of a few minutes has had a conversion and would be persuaded to support this very essential measure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 25

Lloyd	Willis	Baker
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Broten
Wood	Nicholson	Larson
Nollet	Kramer	Robbins
Walker	Dewhurst	Pepper
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Blakeney	Michayluk	Pederson
Davies	Smishek	
Thibault	Link	

NAYS — 30

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

**RESOLUTIONS
ADJOURNED DEBATES
MOTION: RE CONSUMER PROTECTION**

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City):

That this assembly:

- (1) Urges the government of Saskatchewan to give consideration to establishing an active program of consumer protection along the lines advocated by the Canadian Association of Consumers; and
- (2) Urges the government of Canada to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs which would (a) protect the interests of Canadians with respect to the value, utility and safety of all commodity items offered for sale, (b) enforce limitations on and disclosure of interest and other consumer credit charges, and (c) produce and disseminate authentic information based on effective commodity research and testing.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, consumer protection I feel is a field in which all of us should take a keen interest. I would like to commend the member for Saskatoon in bringing a resolution of this kind into the legislature. I have had some experience over the past 20 years in the private practice of law and in the last two years as Attorney General and Provincial Secretary and as such have to concern myself daily with problems in this area. I think I have come to have some appreciation of the complexity of today's business world and to recognize that in the matters of consumer protection our mercantile law leaves something more than a little to be desired.

I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the interest which we have and the concern which we have in this province and in this legislature for improved consumer protection is shared by nearly every jurisdiction in our country. We have seen the matter discussed in our federal parliament, and, as the member for Saskatoon remarked, this has resulted in the establishment of a joint committee of the Senate and the house of Commons to investigate prime purchases. Further to that a committee in the province of Ontario recently completed a broad survey on consumer credit. I am sure that all members of the house are aware of the work that went on and is going on in the province of Manitoba in this field. I refer particularly to the report of the Tallon Commission, the Tallon Report being Tallon of the Manitoba Law School on second mortgage transactions. Recently, of course, in Manitoba they have appointed the Premier's committee on consumer credit. Nova Scotia has undertaken a similar investigation and in the United States, Senator Douglas and his committee have been considering interest disclosure legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all these studies have been made by eminently qualified people, selected not only from the ranks of consumers but as well from professions, leading institutions and so on. These reports have been valuable material for study in all other jurisdictions and have sparked legislative activity in many provinces. Alberta, for example, has in this session introduced a bill to control the direct seller or, as he is called, the door—to—door salesman. In this matter they have followed the initiative which we took in this legislature last year in providing a statutory cooling—off period.

The Premier's committee in Manitoba recommended control legislation also on direct sellers. It was interesting to note, I think, that in Ontario the Ontario report on consumer credit

April 5, 1966

recommends the implementation of direct selling legislation immediately. Mr. Speaker, I mention these studies and this legislation to underline and emphasize the fact that across our nation today there is legislative interest and legislative action. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this government, since it has been in office, has demonstrated its interest in the field of consumer protection. We hadn't been in office long until we had a full appreciation, I think, of the fact that the operation of the Provincial Secretary's office was antiquated in the matter of consumer protection. We felt that there was failure on the part of the previous government to provide the Provincial Secretary's Department with the staff and funds to properly carry out its functions. You will recall in the debates last year that these functions — we were discussing them — ranged from supervision of the act dealing with investment contracts through various other areas involving cemeteries, real estates, Agents Licensing Act, insurance companies, and generally all programs that involved protection of the general public. When we took office we found that the staff of the Department of the Provincial Secretary had not been increased in the past 12 years although the work had virtually doubled in that period. This meant that there was nobody available to make adequate investigations in the field of complaints from members of the public. Now, in the last year we have increased the staff of the Provincial Secretary's office and increased their budget so the department does now have an investigative staff and an analysis staff who do have some time at least to get out of their office and into the field to not only investigate existing problems but to see and anticipate problems as they may occur in the future. I think this is a realistic approach. I am not throwing my chest out and saying that we have done everything we should do. I think we have got to do more in the future but I suggest that it's a start.

I feel that it doesn't matter how good your legislation is, unless you have a staff that can enforce this legislation there is really no real effective protection to the consumer. The public looks to this department for assistance in the event of unfair treatment. I think we are not beginning to provide this service to the public of Saskatchewan. It became apparent last year that the legislative provisions in the Commercial Agents Act were not getting the job done in a satisfactory manner. We, therefore, introduced the Direct Sellers Act last year which provided for the four—day cooling—off period. I feel that this act has proven to be of more benefit to the consumer than the old act and has controlled this area in a more satisfactory manner.

I am of the opinion that in the matter of the sale of commodities there is more chance for abuses and there are more serious abuses in door—to—door selling than in most other retail fields. Now, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as I said last year, it became apparent that the Cemeteries Act was inadequate. You will recall that last year we introduced amendments to the Cemeteries Act. These commercial cemetery companies had previously been allowed to enter into contracts with purchasers without having set aside sufficient money in trust to ensure that when the service was needed money would be available. This has indeed been an area that was causing the public a great deal of concern. I think the amendments to the act last year and the administrative policies now being followed by the department have resulted in a marked increase in the matter of protection to the public.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned in the Throne Speech this year that the government would be introducing legislation to regulate the sale of motor vehicles in the province and

members have that bill on their desks now. This was a matter of great concern in Ontario to the committee studying consumer credit. Consequently an act was introduced last year in the Ontario house to require the licensing and bonding of used compulsory arbitration dealers. Fortunate for us in Saskatchewan, I think, we haven't faced quite the same problems that they did in Ontario in this field, but the government believes that the purchasing of vehicles is of such importance to the public that we need control legislation that would result in consumer benefits. So, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the present government has introduced legislation that does make significant progress in consumer protection. We are aware that this is only a start and there is still a great deal to be done. However, I feel that to date we have moved carefully in order that we do not unduly disturb or upset areas of our economy that are today functioning quite satisfactorily.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of consumer protection we are using, of course, a rather imprecise phrase. It is not logical to restrict consumer protection to the sale of commodities or perhaps more properly described as chattels. I would prefer to think of consumer protection as extending to all kinds of business transactions whether for cash or credit, in retail or wholesale purchasing involving chattels, land, and so on. Perhaps we are more concerned at this time with retail purchasing because it affects more of the public but I don't think we can ignore other aspects of this problem. Mr. Speaker, to give the term consumer protection such a wide interpretation makes it embrace almost the whole field of mercantile law, which law, of course, has taken many centuries to develop, not only here but in England as well. In the development of our mercantile law the court has been able to work out through many, many hundreds of court cases, principles that have produced justice to both the purchaser and the vendor. That the courts have been successful in doing this is reflected in the high regard held throughout the world for our system of law. I feel, therefore, that we must necessarily interfere with concepts that have developed over the years every time we pass legislation, which alters the law which is drawn up around the business community, but we must do it carefully and sparingly. Now, this law that has evolved or developed, which is known as the common law, is applicable to many contractual situations and prescribes many of the remedies that are available to the purchaser or the vendor. We have many statutes in this province and in this country which provide for the rescission of contracts for reasons that did not exist in the past in common law; that is, we have interfered with the common law. We see furthermore statutes such as the Limitation of Civil Rights Act which was passed in this legislature many years ago, under which the seller is prevented, whether it's a land transaction or a chattel transaction, from enforcing the covenant from paying the money. He is restricted in his remedies to repossession of the land or the chattel. All these remedies have a fairly dramatic effect on the operation of our law and in some cases have serious consequences on the economy of our province. I think it is fair to say of course that when the provisions of the Limitation of Civil Rights Act were first enacted during the depression years, there was probably some disruption to those organizations in the business of loaning money for the purchase of land. Another illustration of how a statutory requirement interferes or abrogates the common law would be the Mechanics' Lien Act, which, of course, was completely unknown to the common law. This act changed the credit picture so that in many instances credit was granted on the security of the property improved. This security was sufficient to allow many organizations like lumber companies, material, men and so on to advance credit to people who would otherwise be denied

April 5, 1966

credit. I think it is interesting to note that, from time to time in most jurisdictions in this country, submissions have been made by some people to repeal the Mechanics' Lien Act. They have been rejected and I think it's generally accepted that this act does facilitate the extension of credit in the construction industry. Mr. Speaker, what I am leading up to here is that major changes in the law must require of necessity a considerable amount of study to see that we do not include transactions that would unduly prejudice the operation of our economy and create undue injustices. This means then that an immense amount of study must be done, and it is a study that cannot be accomplished in a few months. For example, contrary to what the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) said, or seemed to feel, it is not everyone that can borrow from either the bank or credit unions. We know that many people are forced to borrow from small finance companies and therefore, must pay a larger amount of interest. What we can't lose sight of, however, is the fact that perhaps there is a greater risk involved in this type of loan and this may be some justification for an increase in rates. If we unduly restrict the operation of small loan companies, this may result in a denial of credit to some people. Similarly in certain second mortgage transactions the security may not be all that good and due, perhaps, as well to the credit reliability of the mortgagee, there may be a greater degree of risk involved. If there is a greater degree of risk there may be some justification for a higher rate of interest.

Mr. Speaker, this doesn't mean to say at all that I agree with everything that is going on in the second mortgage field. There are a lot of abuses. I've seen instances where the terms of the mortgage have been absolutely disgraceful. It is these abuses that must be prevented. What is difficult, Mr. Speaker, is to arrive at a solution that still permits a free flow of commerce and at the same time corrects these abuses. Therefore, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that any legislation to be introduced in this area must be carefully weighed and considered to see that the government does not prevent desirable transactions from going on and that when it is introduced the legislation is fair and just to all the parties concerned.

Mr. Speaker, there is another overriding problem in this area. That is the question of who has the legislative jurisdiction. I don't want to explore this area extensively today but I would like to point out to hon. members that the matter of interest, for example, is assigned by the BNA Act exclusively to the federal government. Of course, the control of banks is also vested in the federal government. At the amendment time the provinces have more or less exclusive jurisdiction in the fields of contracts. Now these grey areas between federal and provincial jurisdictions are now being explored by the governments involved, but this has complicated the matter of introducing legislation at this time. I am confident that these questions will be resolved in the near future. The government recognizes that at this time there are things that can be done to remedy certain abuses without unduly prejudicing anyone. I do not feel free at this time to mention precisely what the government has in mind for future legislative action. However, I think I can indicate to you and I did mention it the other day in reply to a question, that my department, the Department of the Attorney General, has been quite busy for the past few months on a number of matters which I feel certain will be well received by hon. members when legislation does come down. In some of these fields we have nearly concluded our considerations. However, there are certain basic concepts that have not been resolved

to my satisfaction. These prevent introduction of legislation at this time. The Deputy Attorney General last month attended a meeting of the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, Alberta and Manitoba on interest disclosure legislation. We would like, of course, to see uniform acts in as many provinces as possible, because this simplifies not only the enforcement of these acts but as well facilitates the law for those people who do business in more than one province. I don't think it's desirable at this time to give details of this legislation, but I trust that in the very near future measures will be introduced in the house based on our present studies. And in a related field, Mr. Speaker, today there is a committee in Regina representative of the federal government who are here setting up an agenda — they are going across Canada — for a securities conference which is a related field. There will be a securities conference in Ottawa in June consisting of officials from the federal government and all the provinces in Canada.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think that I am not able to vote for the resolution in its present form, as I believe this government has established an active program of consumer protection and that it will be continuing to expand this program as quickly as legislation can be prepared. Further with respect to the second part of the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) resolution urging the government of Canada to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs in my judgement and in my respectful submission, many of the matters suggested fall exclusively within the sphere of provincial governments. In any event they are matters which probably can be better carried out by the government of the province. For these reasons I would beg leave of the assembly to move an amendment, seconded by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant):

That all the words after “assembly” be deleted and the following words added:

Approves of the action taken to date by the government of Saskatchewan in the matter of consumer protection and recommends that the government of Saskatchewan continue to expand and explore its program of consumer protection.

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, as a co—framer of the original motion with the co—operative member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) I would like to add to what the member had to say on the occasion that he spoke to the motion. I think that he gave an excellent speech on that occasion.

I would like to begin by saying that I regret the fact of the amendment that has just come before us. I want to suggest to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that the motion that we have for consideration establishes a much broader basis for consideration and that the amendment, of course, narrows this to the point where it does not do the things that the motion had intended to be done. I would like also to say that, if this government were anxious to really show its sincerity in a program of consumer protection, it might begin by making a grant to the Saskatchewan section of the Canadian Association of Consumers. We were told the other day that there is no grant for this body to be made by this government this year. To me any sincerity that the government may have in the way of extending consumer protection should first and foremost be extended by making a grant to the very organization of consumers that is set up to protect the rights of all people in this special area. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is possibly no

April 5, 1966

other subject in Canada right now that is giving more concern to more people than the need for a program of consumer protection and covering the other items that are mentioned in the resolution. The Co—operative Review said recently:

It is startling that although consumers are the largest economic group in the country and two—thirds of the spending in the economy is by consumers, they are the only important group whose views are disregarded when important decisions are made.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is really no question about governments undertaking substantial sums for financing the cost of consumer programs. The present amounts that are spent by the federal government, for example, for consumer protection, \$2,000,000 for food and drug control by the federal administration is extremely small in relation to the enormous sums that are spent in sales promotion and packaging. I think we have to begin on this problem by realizing that every cent that is spent on often elaborate packaging, often quite unnecessary packaging and containers in my opinion, comes from the pocket of the consumer. So why then should not the public through its own elected authorities have some spending made on its own behalf that will guide its own purchases more intelligently and extend more protection to consumers. Miss Edith McCook of the Consumers Association of Canada has told us that consumers are now spending more than \$20,000,000,000 each year on consumer's goods and services. As my associate on this side of the house has so well informed us, immense amounts of this kind simply beg for consumer protection. Take the packaging industry. The people of the U.S.A. spend, according to some authorities, \$20,000,000,000 each year just in packaging. It is indicated this sum corresponds almost exactly to the whole sum that is spent by the entire Canadian people on consumer goods. The amount of the American expenditure I think indicates the extent of wasteful expenditures that must be made for wrappings and containers of all kinds. In fact the chairman of the Senate Inquiry Commission was recently told that there was an estimate that each American family was tossing into the garbage can the equivalent of \$190 each year in the form of used containers. It has also been pointed out that the \$20,000,000,000 expenditure on items of this kind, containers and packages, is one—third more than the total amount spent on the American school system, and nearly as much money as is spent annually in new cars in the U.S.A. Packaging costs in the U.S.A. are also equal to almost one—half of the total revenues of all state and all local governments. When you think of examples of this kind you see the formidable problems that are before the public.

The Hon. L. H. Roantree was chairman of a select committee of the Ontario legislature a few years ago, in the year 1960 to be precise, and this committee had to do with control of drug costs. He has announced that because of the activities of this committee the Ontario government now saves \$500,000 each year in the cost of drugs just to government institutions. I think this is a good example of what can be done by investigations of the kind that have been suggested. It indicates, of course, the need for a much greater field of investigation in depth that would undoubtedly, in my opinion, save the public enormous amounts of cash both at the public level and in individual purchasing. Of course, we know that one of the largest promoters of expensive packaging are the super markets. It's interesting to know that the 30,000 odd super markets in the U.S.A. now control 70 per cent of food sales. By the way, this figure in Canada is larger; 78 per cent of food sales in Canada are considered to be controlled by super markets. These

sales in the United States, by the way, last year totalled \$55,000,000,000 and as a further figure on wasteful packaging it has been estimated that more than \$10,000,000,000 of that \$55,000,000,000 went for cartons, cans, bottles and other containers, one—fifth in other words, Mr. Speaker, of the total sum spent on food.

Now legislators in the U.S.A., I think, are must farther ahead of us in Canada in relation to this whole business of devising and pressing for some sort of effective consumer legislation. One of the bills now before the United States governing bodies is a so—called Truth in Packaging Bill. Its purposes as far as I can find are not very revolutionary. They hope to get a statement of the net rate content on the front panel of packages and standards regarding the size and location of the type. They hope to prohibit adjectives like giant, big, jumbo and all the others that we are familiar with in the net weight description of the package. They hope to ban the so—called “cents off” legends as an integral part of a package label. They hope to have package sizes, shapes, dimensions or pictures that deceive consumers, regulated and the bill wants to establish reasonable standards of weight or size for packages and for decorations of quantity other than a net weight. Finally, they would require adequate information on the ingredients, the composition of the contents that would be placed in a prominent place on packages. Now one would think that a very innocuous—sounding bill of this kind would have passed very quickly. It has been fought by special interests in the U.S.A. for three years, so far successfully. Indications are now that this bill will get passage and that some further good results will probably be obtained.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that one of the results of what is occurring in the whole great area of food sales is that the farmers’ share of the retail dollar is shrinking. We were told this some years ago by the royal commission on Price spreads. The fact is now, according to the federal Department of Agriculture, that whereas in 1950 the farm share of the retail food dollar was 58 cents, by 1960 it had declined to 44 cents. The apparent reason, according to the Royal Commission on Price Spreads, was that the consumer is paying more for food because of the increased cost of processing and marketing and extra services such as the giant new buildings, trading stamps, the parking lots and all the other appurtenances that we know so well. Miss Jennifer Cross writing in an issue of the magazine nation on February 21st of this year said:

Aside from problems of how to choose from among the 8,000 items in today’s super markets, which is more than five times the number of items stocked before the war, confusing or dishonest containers make it impossible to buy rationally or to compare prices.

Miss Cross has given us some very good examples of how even well informed and well educated people have a very difficult time of shopping intelligently in stores today because of the confusing and the misleading information that is contained on labels or is intimated, or is in other ways conveyed in a mistaken way. Mrs. Helen Hayes of the California consumer Council organized a test in a typical super market. She selected five college—educated wives. She gave each one of them \$10. She asked them to buy 14 common household items, everything from rice to toilet soap. She asked them to choose on the basis of the most quantity for the most money, and her team took twice as long as the average shopper in selection.

April 5, 1966

In other words they exercised the greatest care they could so as to identify the cheapest items. Nonetheless they erred as badly as most shoppers would do and did not make the kind of purchases that would be indicated by the type of experience and the better information that supposedly these people have. Now if this is the case for college—educated shoppers one can well imagine that others less well informed would have greater difficulty in distinguishing truth in packaging and advertising claims.

There was another survey taken by the Arkansas Bureau of Standards. It found that 80 per cent of pre—packaged foods were found to be short measure. It is coming to a point where the large management organizations are admitting that something has to be done. I notice in *Canadian Business* for December of 1965, an item pointing out first of all that the farm share of the food dollar slipped to 30 cents in the United States, and they go on to talk about compulsory arbitration and tire safety, a subject that a committee of this legislature has occupied itself with during the last year. But talking about tire safety standards, this article says:

The tire industry has no safety standards and expert testimony revealed that the average compulsory arbitration has tires safe enough to carry only three passengers without baggage.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is a shocking thing to know that apart from the fact that the consumer is being swindled today in very many instances, his very safety and the safety of his family have been endangered by items such as the design and the tires of the modern automobile. Now I am not going to say anything about the need for consumer credit. This area has been very well covered by the co—operative member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) but I think it must be seen that where consumer credit has reached a new peak during this last year with a total outstanding amount of some \$3,664,000,000, legislation for more effective control is all too necessary. There is a crying need for action and that as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think we need very much in this province and in Canada the dissemination of the most timely and valuable information that we can get on consumer products. There is no question but that the consumer is at the mercy of the situation as it has been estimated the average Canadian is exposed to some 1,500 selling messages every day of the year. I pointed out that we are spending now a comparatively trivial sum in food and drug protection. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an effective Consumers' Bill of Rights should contain the following: (1) Effective legislation and enforcement to end price fixing by monopolies and combines. (2) Limiting rates of interest on credit purchases and items that would require full disclosure to the purchaser if rates and total interests were discharged. (3) Legislation to end deceptive and misleading packaging and advertising. (4) Effective safeguards against distribution of tainted, impure and dangerous food, drugs and other consumer goods. (5) Legislative and financial assistance for consumer co—operative and credit unions. (6) A research organization to assist industry and consumer groups in product research, establishment of quality and size standards. (7) A minister of the federal cabinet responsible for representing the interests of Canadian consumers in all matters of public policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Saskatchewan government could do much to forward a program of this kind by itself. First of all, of course, is our own rate of opinion that can be expressed to the federal authorities, which, of course, the original

resolution wanted to do. Secondly, as I have suggested, the government could very well carry out a program that would encourage the many organizations in this province that have an interest in these questions to do something for themselves, by giving them some financial assistance as could be given to the Saskatchewan section of the Canadian Association of Consumers. Now the amendment that we do have before us is unfortunate in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, because it has very, very much narrowed the element of consideration that was in the resolution and I think has evaded the kind of responsibilities that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) suggested the government wanted to take. If the government is pursuing, as he has suggested, an active program of consumers' protection there should be nothing whatsoever in the original resolution that would be objectionable in the opinion of the government because this is really all that it has suggested. If the number two section of the resolution has incorporated matters that could better be dealt with by the Saskatchewan government then, of course, there is no reason why action could not be initiated as early as possible on those lines. I believe that the most important thing, however, is for this government to by itself and in concert with the federal government to busy itself on all lines that will get the most immediate action. I do not think, with deference to what the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has had to say, that a sufficiently active program is being pursued. I will, therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask that the house support the original motion.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words in connection with the amendment. This amendment comes very strangely from the government which states that we should approve the government's action in the matter of consumer protection and urge them to continue to explore and expand all avenues of protection in the future. It comes a bit hypocritical too, if I may use the word, Mr. Speaker, for a government that has just destroyed a most important service to the farmers who are great consumers of farm machinery. Yes, you can put your hands over your eyes and feel ashamed of yourself. In one breath you talk about consumer protection; in another area of great importance you remove it entirely.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — You've given us that five times.

Mr. Nollet: — This is Liberal hypocrisy at its best, Mr. Speaker. May I inform the house that 21 per cent of the farmer's income is expended on machinery. May I remind the members opposite that a select special committee of this legislature investigated this particular field of consumer needs and recommended to this house that a farm machinery testing agency be established. This passed the legislature too without dissent. Such an agency was established and was doing excellent work. It had a competent staff, it had the facilities to undertake this kind of work that would protect our farm people in purchasing, Mr. Speaker, an amount of some \$114,000,000 worth of implements and repair parts. Now this same government that has destroyed this service comes back and wants us to congratulate them on their performance in regard to consumer protection.

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Vote against it.

Mr. Nollet: — I certainly will vote against it and certainly will have something to say in the country about the hypocrisy of a government that asks us on this side of the house to pat them on the

April 5, 1966

back for what they have done when they have actually destroyed consumer protection. They are the great destroyers. May I say that I don't think that there is another member on that side of the house that would suggest, at least I never heard anyone else suggest, that we should abolish agriculture machinery testing. This I believe was the sole idea of the Premier of this province in his pathway of destruction, destroying services right and left, particularly these kinds of services that mean so much in terms of protecting the farmer and his interests.

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will say a word or two concerning the amendment. My remarks will be brief.

The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) mentioned I believe that there was a necessity of going very slowly in terms of protecting consumers. I believe, using his exact words, he said: "We should proceed sparingly and carefully to avoid disrupting the flow of commerce". This is a typical Liberal approach. I think the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) also mentioned the fact that the government had done something in terms of protection to people in relation to cemeteries. I might say that most of the consumers of today will be in those cemeteries before this government will provide very much protection to them.

Mr. Speaker, the senior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) made some remarks with regard to the various phases of the original resolution and I do not want to spend any particular time going over this particular ground. I would like to spend a little bit of time in terms of consumer credit. I would like to just quote briefly from an article I wrote some 11 years ago with respect to this product in relation to what is happening to the cost or proportion of the consumer's dollar which goes to producers and also goes to processors of food. Since 1948, shortly after the cessation of hostilities in World War II, the proportion of the consumer's dollar spent on foodstuffs, which goes to the actual producer of food has been declining at an alarming rate. In that year 51 cents out of each dollar which you and I as consumers spent on food went to the producer. Today only 43 cents out of each dollar spent on food goes to the producer. Now that is back in 1955 and the decline has continued. Where did the eight cents out of each dollar go? It went into processing, distribution and sales expense. According to these processors, merchandisers say that demanding customers want their bread sliced, their cakes mixed, their pie crust ready-made, their orange juice squeezed, their cream whipped, their vegetables chopped, their whole meal frozen into a package. According to these food processors consumers would not buy any food at all unless they made it available in bright packages, displayed at eye level on super market shelves. The market must be super duper too with a merry-go-round to entertain the kids while Mama and Papa waltz rubber tired push carts to the rhythm of canned music. Sales people assert consumers are not just buying food; they are reacting to impulses. According to them it is impulse buying not food planning which sells food in our modern times. Result, more and more stores are decked out with moving, jerking, glowing gadgets and in some really up-to-date stores incense pots waft enticing odour over noses so that noses as well as ears and eyes may trigger impulses. Wise consumers should take all of these forms of high-pressure advertising with a grain of salt.

Mr. Speaker, I did say that I wish to make one or two comments with respect to the credit angle. I understand, if my information is correct, this government had some intentions in this regard,

but apparently someone with a great deal of authority squelched the idea of any legislation being brought up in this respect. Mr. Speaker, that thrift does not merely mean savings. It includes wise utilization of credit which is a very important part of thrift, particularly in our modern day. I think the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) mentioned that debt, up to a total consumer debt of some \$3,600,000,000. It's now exceeded, quite frankly, \$4,000,000,000, and the process is continuing all the time.

I have in my hand an article I cut out of the Star Weekly, published in Toronto in 1962, entitled "Debts Can Drive You Crazy". There is a lot more truth in that particular statement than many of our people realize. Here are two or three brief quotations from this article, one by a branch manager of a loan company. This is what he says:

I have been in the loan and finance business for years and I have seen the mental anguish and financial difficulties many people have got themselves into, encouraged no less by interest—hungry credit organizations and abetted by irresponsible credit managers.

There is a good deal of truth in this. I have been confronted with many people on the verge of nervous breakdown in terms of their situation related to utilization of credit in terms of modern day buying. Another comment from this particular article talking about the victims of an easy credit philosophy which is very current in Canada today:

No one has begun to comprehend the vicious impact on family life of this type of philosophy.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of truth in this. I have made a habit of cutting out of magazines this type of thing. I don't know if the members can see it. This is a picture of a real estate man talking to a man and woman, evidently interested in buying a house. The house is hanging over a cliff as it were. It has a ladder descending below the house and up above it says on the house "consumer credit" and the caption above is "Oh yes, and it has an enormous cellar".

There are real dangers in this extension of credit. This perhaps will add a bit of humour to the situation but frankly the situations with which I am confronted are quite tragic. But I would like to read a quotation called "Easy Credit Diary":

January 4th. Bought a car today. Very easy terms. Very fine car with cigar lighter on the dash. Should finish payment in 18 months.

February 4th. Paid instalment due on car. Bought a radio set on easy terms. Fine set. Payments will be small and monthly.

March 11th. Little late with the car payment this month.

Will have to let radio payment go over until April as I bought a set of books and paid \$11 down. Very fine books, everybody should have this set.

April 15th. Borrowed \$50 from the boss to meet the compulsory arbitration payment. The radio man came to take the radio and we put out the lights and weren't home. The chump hung around all evening so I couldn't read the books.

June 1st. Borrowed \$100 from Uncle George to pay the \$50 to the boss and to meet the car payment. Got behind a little on the book payment because I bought a piece of land in new real estate development. This land ought to jump

April 5, 1966

in value. Paid \$50 down.

This is the finale of the diary.

July 15th. Somehow I don't miss the radio very much. And you can get plenty of books from the public library. The thing that hurts is that Uncle George should be so mean. Of course, I told him that I would pay back the \$100 on July 1st. But you can't do the impossible, can you? Trying to arrange a character loan from the bank. If I can borrow \$250 I can get square again and everything will be fine.

August 15th. Bank says I have no character.

September 15th. Garage man is holding the car for labour bill. What right has he to hold the car? It doesn't belong to me.

October 1st. It isn't any use. I had to get the car go. Anyway I would rather have that piece of land. They have given me a month's grace on it.

November 15th. Well, they can have their old land. Good riddance. If I knew where to get \$30 to meet the payment on the piano I would be all right. Bought a new automobile today on the pay—out—of—income basis.

December 6th. Income stopped.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. It now being 12:30 I leave the chair until 2:30 this day.

The assembly recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to three groups of students from the city of Saskatoon. I gather they are not all here yet but some of them are here now. I understand that there are groups supposed to be situated in the east gallery from Prince Phillip School in Saskatoon. Two groups are to be situation in the Speaker's gallery, one from Prince Phillip and one from St. Goretti. We are indeed pleased I am sure to have these students with us today and we hope that they will appreciate what is going on here and be able to understand it. We also hope that they will have a pleasant journey back to Saskatoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MOTION OF CONDOLENCES — MR. COOPER, MP.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to draw the attention of the house to the very recent tragic passing of the Member of Parliament for Rosetown—Biggar, Mr. Cooper. I understand that some members wish to move condolences. Would the house wish to take that into consideration now or after the motion is put on the q? Now, by leave of the house agreed. We will have condolences now.

Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon with a good deal of regret to inform this house of the passing of my very dear friend, the former member of Parliament for Rosetown—Biggar, Mr. Speaker, C.O. (Tim) Cooper. Mr. Cooper was one of my closest neighbours

and a long time associate in the field of politics as well as in the field of municipal affairs. He has made over the years a most outstanding contribution, not only in his own community but in the broader field of politics as well. He was a man who had a terrific handicap in that he lost, as a young man, one arm but nevertheless managed to get out of life something that very few people succeed in getting out of life, namely a satisfaction of having achieved both high office and some note of distinction in his community and in this nation.

I am not going to say too much, Mr. Speaker, about Mr. Cooper. I think his record of service will suffice to speak for him. I, therefore, beg leave of the house to move, seconded by the hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher):

That this assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing today of the former Member of Parliament for Rosetown—Biggar, Mr. C.O. Tim Cooper. Mr. Cooper was first elected to the house of Commons in 1958 and was re—elected in 1962 and 1963. He was a former Vice—President of the Saskatchewan River Dev Association, a Municipal Councillor from 1941 to 1947 and Reeve from 1947 to 1958. He was a farmer in the Hawarden District. He was born October 17, 1899, at Meaford, Ontario and educated there. In 1924 he married Lelia Potter of Hawarden, Saskatchewan. They had four children.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this assembly expresses its most sincere sympathies with members of the bereaved family.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself and my colleagues with the remarks of the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson). I think Tim Cooper was liked by almost everyone who knew him. He was an experienced farmer. He was a good family man and he was known as a community worker. I think that Tim Cooper will be missed not only by his family and immediate friends, but I think he will be missed by people throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, as has been noted, Mr. Cooper was the federal member for Rosetown—Biggar and as a result, of course, he and I represented a number of the same people, he in Ottawa and I here in Regina. Certainly many of those and myself would associate ourselves with the remarks which have been made respecting Mr. Cooper's services to the community and country and with respect to our regrets at his passing. I would guess that many of us first became aware of Mr. Cooper, Mr. Speaker, because of his work in regard to a project which is currently under discussion in the house, namely the better conservation and use of water partly in the Saskatchewan River system. We knew him later as the Member of Parliament. We were aware that he had a lengthy hospitalised period in Ottawa a year or so ago. He had come home. He continued with this last winter for a long while. All of us regret very much the sad news which the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Pederson) in the house has just conveyed to us and join in every way with the expression of appreciation for what he had done and with regrets at his death.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I hope I may be permitted to join and say a

April 5, 1966

word or two in addition to what has been said by the party leaders in reference to Mr. Cooper because Tim Cooper was a constituent of mine, having been the Reeve of Rosedale municipality and having lived near Hanley during all his productive farming life. I think his address was Hawarden but he was Reeve of the Municipality of Rosedale for many years.

I think that Mr. Cooper was probably one of the first people of Hanley constituency that I met the day after I was elected in 1948. I got a telephone call about eight o'clock the next morning, asking that I come out to meet his council which I did. I recall the very practical way in which he went about presenting his submission to be resubmitted to the government, as I recall, for a market road bridge. I recall that the whole council went out to the Beaver Creek, just south of Hanley. We looked at it and we walked around the spot for some little time. He was even hospitable enough so that he brought out a little lunch which we all partook sitting on the grassy slope of the Beaver Creek that day. Tim was always direct and always practical in his approach to government problems.

I was one who enjoyed a long and productive association with Mr. Cooper over the years since 1948. I think Tim Cooper can be described as probably one of the most solid and least pretentious of men. He was Reeve of the municipality. There was always a beaten path to his door by his constituents from everywhere in the municipality. He provided over that office with great satisfaction on the part of all his municipal constituents. I recall 1958, I think it was when he decided to stand for parliament and was nominated by his party. Mr. Cooper — and I say this by way of illustration as to how unpretentious a man he really was — said to me a few days before the election that he thought it would be a tragedy to Canada for a man of such great distinction as M. J. Coldwell, not to be in the next parliament of Canada. He thought that it would be a tragedy for Canada. He said he didn't expect to win against such a man but he was trying as hard as he could. He fought hard even though he thought the odds were overwhelmingly against him. He readily conceded the qualifications of his opponent. He was never arrogant or boastful or proud in any narrow way of having won the constituency of Rosetown—Biggar for his party. I always looked forward, when in that area, to calling on Tim. I shall miss him as I am sure will all the people of Rosedale municipality and all the people of the Hanley constituency who knew him. I join with the party leaders in expressing our sorrow at his untimely passing, a man in his early sixties and regret that Canada will be the poorer for his passing and that his community will be the poorer for the loss of his services.

Mr. G. G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express my sympathy on behalf of the people of the Elrose constituency. He represented our area for some four or five years. Everyone that knew him liked him very much and he became a friend of many people through his association in politics. I would like to join with the other members of the house who have expressed regret at his passing.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION: RE CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, when you called 12:30, I was in the process of reading in to the record excerpts from An Easy Credit Diary which I had said would have been humorous had it not been so tragic. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a peculiarly unstable type of world. I contend that the old Epicurean attitude of eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow you may die will get us nowhere. All debt has the economic disadvantage of borrowing from future spending. Any family and incidentally any economy which builds its prosperity on an accelerating debt builds for itself somewhere in the future a greater instability. The logic of the original resolution is self-evident, I would contend, Mr. Speaker. The probability that government members will base their conclusions on logical thinking rather than Liberal thinking, one must conclude from experience, is extremely remote. If this assembly approves of actions taken by this government as proposed in the amendment, then it is content with the Liberal philosophy of too little and too late. I cannot, therefore, Mr. Speaker, support the amendment and I would urge all thinking members to defeat it and support the motion as originally presented.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City) moved second reading of Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The City Act.

Mr. Speaker: — Hon. members will recall that on Monday, April 4, 1966, Bill No. 102, standing in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw, was introduced by leave and read the first time, its further procedure being subject to a Speaker's caveat as to its being in order. The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I need take only a few minutes this afternoon in moving second reading to explain the meaning and purpose of this bill.

I think a simple study will show members that it is simply to give municipal organizations the right to consider and to set up pension plans for their municipal members in the same way as they are now authorized to set up pension plans for their municipal employees. The house may be aware that for quite a number of years now there has been a discussion in the Saskatchewan Association of Urban Municipalities as well, I believe, as in the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities as to the desirability of pension plans for the elected members of municipalities. I now understand that at the meeting of SUMA at Moose Jaw, the proposition was approved by resolution. I would guess that the government will be having this fact made known to it as soon as the new executive has an opportunity, so that the proposition in the bill will have the blessing of the SUMA organization. Now, of course, the fact that SUMA has given its approval is natural enough, because I believe it could be said that, especially in the large urban councils a great deal of time is necessary to be spent by mayor and aldermen in doing the business of the areas that come under their purview.

April 5, 1966

I think that others here could speak better about this than myself, however. During the time that I was a member of the Moose Jaw City Council, our council often met two or three times each week, with the time in committees — and most of us were members of at least several — the time spent in civil duties during the week was considerable. In fact many of us, I think, in some weeks spent as many as forty hours, which is considered a standard work week these days. There is the fact that people in all walks of life who accept the duties of civic office also have to accept certain sacrifices that go with this. Sacrifices which perhaps need not be accepted. I am now speaking about opportunities that are missed financially speaking and others that would go to promote the prospects of individual council members, so that in a period of ten or more years — and many councillors in this province have spent at least that much time — a great deal of sacrifice, I suggest, has been made by the people who participate in local government.

I don't think I would need to convince anyone in this house that local government is perhaps the foundation stone of all government, in that it provides the experienced people who may accede to office at the legislature level or the level of the house of Commons. In my opinion the experience that one gets in the local government body is invaluable when one becomes a member of the legislature. I think it is also obvious that many people are reluctant these days to accept nomination for civic office because of many of the inherent difficulties and sacrifices to which I have made some brief reference.

It seems to me that there is merit in the suggestion that council bodies, if they feel that there is good reason for setting up a pension scheme of the kind which is permissible only by the bill before us, which wish to do this may do so by the section that is in Bill 102. I think that councillors are not likely to be excessive in this regard. Local government is very close to every member of the city council. I cannot see any city council or any municipal council, whether urban or rural in this province, setting up a pension plan which provides advantages which are out of keeping with the services that are given by the participant members. I have no means of knowing what kind of scheme might be agreed to. However, I think everybody would concede again that across this province there are many members of local government across this province there are many members of local government bodies who spend hundreds of hours and more each year in the pursuit of civic duties. I point out that this section is permissive. It simply gives the council authority to do for elected members what it now has the authority to do for the employees of local government. With that brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Bill 102 should receive the approval of this house and I would now beg leave of the assembly to move second reading.

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I might, to just add a few words to those of the senior member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) in regard to this bill. I think that we are all agreed that the municipal people are some of the most devoted and dedicated public servants that we have and that these people do spend a great deal of their time and a good deal of their energy in regard to public affairs for which they do not receive a great deal of remuneration. I think that the matter of superannuation is something that we could well afford as citizens of the province to have added to assist them in their work. As the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) has pointed out that this matter of superannuation might assist in some small manner to allay some fears

that people might have about the inroads that this would make upon their time and they would thus be able to satisfactorily look after their declining years.

I would like to see this principle carried further in regard to not only the City Act but also to other municipal acts, but I believe that having this applied in regard to the City Act is a good start. I think that the cities are our larger municipalities. I think that probably there will be more funds available in this way in some of the larger centres. I think it should be given consideration in this regard for the cities by way of a start. If it is taken up by other organizations I think this authority should also be given to them. I would like to go on record as being in favour of this bill.

Hon. J. C. McIsaac (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two on the bill before us today and to give members on both sides a little bit more of the history behind this move that has been mentioned here today.

The bill is actually, shall we say, the pet project of the mayor member from Regina East (Mr. Baker) more so than of anybody else, who as usual is not in his seat at this time. He has had ample opportunity to bring this question before the house in a proper manner. He could have brought a resolution of council, his own civic council, and brought it to my department last fall in time for full consideration of the government and the house. He could have moved a house amendment to the City Act when it was under discussion earlier in the session. However, he chose not to. He then discussed this thing with me informally. At this time we agreed to let the resolution or let the suggestion carry to SUMA and deal with it there. This was done. At the convention just concluded last week in Moose Jaw, a resolution along the lines of this amendment was agreed to on Friday. On Saturday members opposite introduced the bill and yesterday the executive secretary of SUMA did call me and indicated that he would like to bring forth some type of plan. I have had a number of the staff check into whether other provinces have this type of legislation and to date we can find nowhere that other provinces have. We haven't yet dealt with any of the other resolutions that SUMA brought forth at their last week's convention and I fail to see the great urgency of the move requested here. Now, for this reason I propose to vote against this bill at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I am only going to say that the member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) whose name was mentioned is interested in speaking on the bill; he probably is entitled to some right to speak, some reference has been made to him. Unfortunately the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) says the member deliberately walked out, which is completely incorrect, of course. It is completely incorrect, no matter how many times the member for Prince Albert may choose to restate it. He did have another appointment which he considered he had to attend to at this time. I, would,

April 5, 1966

therefore, beg leave of the assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of the **Hon. Mr. Steuart**, (Minister of Health) for second reading of Bill No. 96, **An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act**.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I move second reading of the bill, I would just like to say a very few words.

A study of Saskatchewan history shows that we have had about ten redistribution bills of any importance since becoming a province. The latest was last year when some changes were made in the city constituencies of Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, and Regina. The redistribution bill which we will be considering here could really be considered a part of the same updating of constituency boundaries we began last year. Last year we did the three largest cities. This year we are proposing to bring other urban centres and some rural seats into line with conditions as they exist today. Going back over former debates on redistribution held in this house, it is interesting to note that most of them have a great deal in common. The government of the day usually claims that changes are necessary to bring about greater equity in the population of the constituencies and the opposition invariably argues that politics play too great a role in the changing of constituency boundaries. Mr. Speaker, one principle emerges from a study of every redistribution that has ever taken place in Saskatchewan. The government of the day has always taken full responsibility for planning redistribution. The only committee to consider any change in constituency boundaries has been the Committee of the Whole of this legislature. Now our government agrees with this policy and has followed it in developing the proposed changes outlined in this act. We believe it is part of the responsibility of the government to propose question, such as redistribution for the consideration of the legislature. We are not convinced a so-called independent committee or commission would necessarily give the province either an equitable or a sound redistribution. Incidentally the government committee consisted of the Hon. J. McIsaac, Mr. Coderre, Mr. McFarlane and myself.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been a redistribution affecting more than a few seats in this province since 1951. In the ensuing 15 years a great many changes have taken place. The population has shifted, changing trade patterns have taken place, and of late especially industrial development has brought tremendous changes in Saskatchewan. Now in the proposed redistribution that is presented in this Bill we do not claim to have corrected all the inequities that are present and were present 15 years ago or that have developed either naturally or be design in the intervening years. We have in this bill recognized outstanding inequalities in population; we have recognized changing trade patterns as well as growth potential in many constituencies. I don't propose to go into any detail at this time. The proposed new maps have been distributed and we can I think much better discuss the various changes in the Committee of the Whole. With these very few comments I move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I submit that only a member like the member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) could make the kind of speech to which we have just listened about the kind of legislation which he is recommending to us. Regardless of that, Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate presuming that the legislation passes, to have a first opportunity to welcome a number of new constituents. I know that all of the members would like to do this but not all will wish to do it in discussion in the house. On behalf of all the rest of them and in particular, myself, I am happy to welcome a number of new constituents, according to the map the constituents who live in Martinsville, the constituents who live in Loreburn, the constituents who live in the areas surrounding those communities between there and Saskatoon.

There are many reasons I suppose for being a member of the legislative assembly; the greatest one must be the satisfaction that comes from the work. It can't be the money; and it can't be the hours, judging by the last few months, it is, seriously, in this matter of satisfaction. A good deal of this satisfaction comes from the opportunity that it gives those of us in this position to constantly and continually meet with the people of the province, to get more and more conversant with their problems and their hopes and to try our best to do something about meeting those problems and moving everybody closer to those hopes. I am sure that the members in the new part of my constituency, that is if the bill passes, will have some problems. I gather from discussions in Power Corporation Committee that I will be able to go to the minister in charge of the Power Corporation and argue for gas in Martinsville and places like that, so I shall expect to see him in matters of that kind.

In addition to getting new people, I, of course, get some industries, a couple of chemical plants, a plastic plant, and I believe an airport, even a new part of a river. So while, like many others, I have new people I also have a greater variety of development, a greater part of the productive effort of Saskatchewan. Certainly my present constituents and myself will welcome and be eager to get acquainted with these new neighbours of ours. At the same time like many other members there is some regret at losing some former constituents. During a period of years one does form some close friendships and associations and it is always with regret to have to break ties of that kind. Many of mine I am happy to say I am able to pass over to the good hands of my colleague the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker), and commend them to him and him to them.

I do want, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about the whole matter of redistribution, particularly about some of the criteria which we will be well advised to consider in determining the shape and the size of constituencies. In a democracy which is governed according to the principles of responsible and representative government, we, of course, draw our authority from the constituencies. As a result every attempt to design constituency boundaries should be directed towards forming groups which can be effective and efficient as the proper basis for authority in our parliamentary situation.

One of the factors is, of course, that of population to which the minister who introduced the bill made some reference. It seems to me that with regard to this the government would have been well

April 5, 1966

advised to have waited for a few months. We all know that there is going to be a census taken this summer, our information is that provincial counts, down to at least the level of the urban and rural municipalities, will be available by late this year. There may be an error of one to two per cent at that time but this would have been a very useful guide in regard to the population distribution within the constituency. The minister who has just taken his seat (Mr. Steuart) said that this bill was a continuation of last year's. That being the case, it clearly indicates that they didn't take population into consideration at all because certainly last year they considered population as a minor factor, if it was considered at all. I realize that one can't perhaps deal with the problems by having just the same number of persons in urban centres represented by one person as in rural. If you took it on the basis of a strict representation by population then the bill would have provided for eight members to Regina, seven members to Saskatoon, two members to Moose Jaw. Obviously considering the rate at which our major cities, at least, continue to grow it would have seemed wise for the government to have given greater consideration to this population factor. It will be a matter of regret too that when they are redistributing there was not consideration given to removing the imbalance with regard to population which they created in setting up the city seats last year. May I just draw attention to the fact the constituency of Regina South is made up of some 7,500, whereas the constituency of Regina South—East has over 15,000; in other words twice as many people in it. In Saskatoon the imbalance is not quite as great but still great. The constituency of Riversdale, population 9,500; constituency of City Park University, population 14,500. In Moose Jaw a similar kind of imbalance appears. The situation there being that Moose Jaw South has a population of over 12,000 and Moose Jaw North some 7,780. It seems, Mr. Speaker, then, looking at what was done in the cities a year ago, considering the words of the minister who introduced the bill that this was a continuation of last year, that population was not a very particular factor in the decision of the government with respect to the constituency boundaries. Secondly, we should be concerned not just with the population as it is at the moment, but a redistribution bill should make an attempt to anticipate population changes. We know that some areas in the province are growing, and the shape and the size of the constituency should be such as to accommodate this growth. It is fairly well established I think that we cannot expect comparable growth and population in other parts of the province. This too should be recognized in drawing the map. As I shall hope to demonstrate in a few minutes this particular criterion received little consideration from the government either.

A third criterion is that of community interests. Constituencies, while they are electoral areas, certainly should be considered as more than just electoral areas. We should be thinking about an area which lends itself to an association between the people in the area providing for formulation of ideas about government, the kind of area which makes it possible, which encourages the idea of people meeting together to assess their problems and to assess what position government ought to take with respect to those problems. Just as in the nation as a whole we need a number of ties that bind so that principle is still useful with respect to a constituency. I don't believe that this factor has had any real consideration on the part of the government.

A fourth criterion is, of course, that of communication: highways, newspaper circulation, television and radio services.

All of these can contribute to that kind of cohesiveness in a constituency that provides the best opportunity for people to participate in political activity and government, if you will, at the constituency level. I see little evidence of this in the bill that is before us.

Frankly the criterion of geographical barriers is important. It is obvious that some of these have been observed by the government. It is impossible, of course, to miss all the time. It is pretty difficult to avoid having constituency boundaries conform with some proper geographical barriers.

Let me just look at some of the situations created by the proposals in the bill. I agree with the minister that we can discuss all of them better in Committee of the Whole; but to illustrate what the government didn't do, let me just refer to a few of them at this time. There are some transfers which are proposed from constituencies which are already smaller than the average in the province. Very frequently these transfers from constituencies already larger than the average situation in the province. Frequently those constituencies from which population is taken are constituencies with it is unlikely will grow and develop in regard to population. Frequently those constituencies to which population is transferred are those which can be expected to grow and develop so that in a few years we will have an even greater disparity than existed before this particular proposal was put forth. Let me take for example the constituency of Bengough. In 1966, in Bengough, the number of voters was 6,859; that's down 100 from 1964. This is below the average for the province, but voters were moved from the Bengough constituency to the constituency of Weyburn. Weyburn had in 1964, 11,640 voters and undoubtedly has more now. Nevertheless the proposal of the government is to take from a constituency of 6,859 in 1966 and add to a constituency which has over 11,000. The result will be that Weyburn looks very likely to have twice as many voters as the constituency of Bengough.

Let's look at the situation in the constituency of Hanley. Previous to this proposal being put forth, partly resulting from changes in the legislation of last year, the only constituency in the province with a smaller population than Hanley was the constituency of Athabasca, a constituency which has a great area. In the by-election there were some 5,400 voters in Hanley, pardon me, after the transfer last year some 5,400, and the legislation this year proposes that it be reduced to 5,300. Now what kind of criterion was established here nobody will ever know except that little inner circle of persons across the way whose names we are given a while ago. The constituency with the second smallest population in the province is reduced so that it is still smaller. Yet the minister who introduced the bill says that this was to correct certain deficiencies in population distribution.

Let's look thirdly at another transfer which moves some part of the area previously in Kelsey into the constituency of Melfort—Tisdale. Kelsey according to the 1964 list had 7,700 voters; Melfort—Tisdale had almost 10,000. As the result of the proposals to move area from Kelsey to Melfort—Tisdale, the result on the basis of 1964 figures, of course, would be 7,000 for Kelsey and 10,500 for Melfort—Tisdale. Again the disparity is being increased.

Let's look at the changes proposed which affect mutually Last Mountain and Wadena constituencies. In 1964 Last Mountain had some 8,000 voters, Wadena had some 8,600. This was a fairly good average

April 5, 1966

sized constituency, but as a result of these proposals Last Mountain is being reduced in size and twisted into rather a queer shape, if I may say so, to some 7,000 voters, whereas Wadena as I read the figures would probably be increased to about 10,000. I admit that in Last Mountain because of potash developments we can expect some population increase in the town of Lanigan and surrounding areas, but hardly, unlike enough to add 1,000 voters, shall we say, in the next several years. The proposed changes will still leave a very considerable disparity there. Nobody can be certain, of course, that there won't be potash in the constituency of Wadena which will draw interest in that area as well.

I want also to look at the constituency of Cumberland. This is one of the very large areas represented by one member in the province of Saskatchewan. The government has paid the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) a great compliment in its proposals, Mr. Speaker. It is suggesting that the member from Cumberland is able to take care of an area about twice the size of almost anybody else in the house. This I submit is a great compliment. It already had a very large area. The area is increased in addition to this being one of the largest constituencies in the province, it will also have one of the largest populations in the province outside of the cities and will have a population of some 10,000 voters as I understand it.

They applied a somewhat different criterion when they came to The Battlefords which had a small area with a population of some 10,500 voters. The area has been decreased and will have some 9,500 under the present arrangement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are other examples that could be made, that could be used to demonstrate the point. The point is, of course, that the government has not in effect corrected imbalances which did exist and has not given consideration to trends with respect to population. It has frequently not only neglected the facts but it has detracted by virtue of moving voters from constituencies where the voting population is smaller than average to others in which the voting population is already larger than average. It seems obvious, Mr. Speaker, that it wasn't a geographer who advised them with respect to the drawing of the map. It seems obvious it was not a demographer, if that's the way to say that word, with respect to the drawing of a map, not somebody who concerned himself with population. The question is then, who did advise them? What was involved in deciding these boundaries? I had a lot of difficulty figuring this one out until I began to look, constituency by constituency, at the advantages gained by certain members, and then the whole thing became perfectly clear. Because when one looks at it constituency by constituency we find this: that the greatest amount of benefit based on the 1964 vote goes to the Liberal member from the city of Prince Albert. On the basis of the 1964 vote, his majority was 78, on the basis of the change that is proposed here, his majority would be 434. The chairman of the committee ends up with a majority of 354 more than he had in 1964. Then I find that the constituency which received the second greatest amount of benefit so far as the Liberal party is concerned was the constituency of Morse. Morse's majority in 1964 was 236. It will be increased by these figures to 399, and there is an increase of 163 in the Liberal majority there, borrowed I may say from the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Nollet).

Now, let's look at the situation, Mr. Speaker. the greatest political benefit in this map of maps is to improve the potential situation first for the Minister of Health, the member from Prince

Albert (Mr. Steuart), secondly for the Premier, the member from Morse. Here are the two managers for the Liberal party who have managed exceedingly well in this respect. So far as the changes for the other constituencies are concerned I am convinced that for the most part they have just been invented in order to give some added plausibility to making the two changes which I have mentioned as part of the bill. The attempts to bolster the position, the position of the Liberals in Morse and in Prince Albert clearly indicates, I submit, the main reason for these proposals that we have here. Quite clearly the Minister of Health and the Premier were not willing to face the electorate on the basis of the present day boundaries and so these changes have been made. So far as those of us on this side of the house are concerned, Mr. Speaker, if the bill passes, we will certainly welcome our new constituents and serve them well. But we are prepared so far as to the general situation and election is concerned to face this government on the basis of the old constituencies, on the basis of the changes they are producing here or on the basis of any further changes that they may produce as they study the figures further in the future. We will welcome the chance and the challenge to put it to test.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to keep my remarks very brief. I am one of those fortunate people who didn't have my constituency touched at all and, frankly, not caring too much in general terms insofar as my party is concerned what they did with the boundaries because I have no members to squawk about them. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a point that has been missed and should be raised at this particular moment insofar as this bill is concerned. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that having gone to the trouble of introducing a bill dealing with redistribution, and having done so last year as well, that the government might have been well advised to have taken a look at the entire picture of representation in this province, not only in comparison with the past but in comparison with other provinces in Canada. My party has advocated for some time that a redistribution was necessary and in that redistribution there should be a modest reduction in the number of constituencies in the province. Last year we increased them. Very naturally we had to increase them to cover the city seats but in bringing in a general redistribution I believe that the boundaries could have been devised in such a fashion to have cut down on perhaps half a dozen members who are represented in this legislature. I have done some checking on the figures and the representation of various members across Canada — I haven't completed all of Canada — but for the six provinces from Quebec West, I find that Saskatchewan members represent per capita less people than in any other province in Canada, with the exception, of course, of the Maritimes. As I say I haven't checked those figures. In round figures our 59 members in this house represent approximately 16,000 of population apiece. This is compared with Manitoba where the representation per member is 17,000; in the province of Quebec, 59,000, in Ontario, 61,500; in Alberta, 22,000 and in British Columbia, 34,000.

Now I have taken these six provinces because they are somewhat in the settled areas at any rate similar in geographic size. I think that it is time that, when a redistribution proposal such as this comes before the house, things other than political considerations be used in devising a map. I believe that there are other factors involved and amongst them are some of the economies

April 5, 1966

that we heard of from the government last year. They talked about trying to save some money. I think this is one of the methods that could have been used. I don't think it is necessary for us to have 59 members. I would have thought that this would have been one of the criteria in designing this map.

The boundary changes that have been made in almost all circumstances seem to indicate, at any rate on the surface, that they have been made in order to benefit some of the sitting members on the other side of the house. But I want to warn hon. members that those sorts of things have been tried before and they have always redounded against the people instituting those types of changes. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that a general review of the entire constituency boundary situation in Saskatchewan would be possible in the future, but however, if this is all we are going to get in this session we will have to be satisfied with it. I wanted to register that protest on the changes without taking into account the fact that we are overstaffed insofar as members are concerned.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say but a sentence and that is this. When I look at what has happened to Cumberland constituency on one hand I am very happy to welcome all these workers from North Prince Albert and East Prince Albert whom apparently the minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) has decided to desert and to refuse to represent which I think he should have done. I also point out that had he given consideration in principle to the Cumberland constituency as he himself has said on different occasions, the pulp mill would bring in a large population. If that population had been added to the population that I represent at the present time, that in itself would make quite a large constituency. But no matter how big, I am quite happy to look after the interests of the people of East Prince Albert, North Prince Albert, Cumberland constituency and up at Creighton. If they would only be kind enough to add Athabasca to me I think I will be more than satisfied.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I again draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to welcome the hon. member from Cumberland into Prince Albert. I hope it won't be for too long. I gave him the pulp mill but I had to draw the line at the peanut mines up in the Athabasca country. You know, it's amazing, Mr. Speaker, how these Socialists talk when they are in opposition about human rights and about equality and equity and fairness and redistribution and democracy, how they love to mouth those words, how they acted when they were in opposition.

Now, I want to go back to 1951, the last time they made a redistribution of any size. I want to go back to 1951. Some of the members are still here. In fact they fixed themselves up so well that I imagine they will be here for — well, it lasted for about 20 years. You know the man that piloted the bills through at that time was Mr. Clarence Fines, the late unlamented Mr. Fines. He got up and said that this 1951 redistribution was based on “justice, equality and equity”, and that “no thought of gaining political advantage was given when the government proceeded with this bill.” Then he proceeded to introduce the most political gerrymander in the province’s history.

I will just deal with some of these games they played back in 1951. First they got up and admitted that Moose Jaw wasn’t entitled to two seats, admitted that. Finally they admitted that Moose Jaw was only entitled to one seat but we didn’t want to take a seat away from those people. I don’t suppose the fact that both those people were CCF had anything to do with the decision. Well of course, when the Liberals gave it, it was a thriving city. Then it started to go down hill in 1944 and when it got around to 1951 it didn’t have two seats coming to it. I’ll quote further from Mr. Fines. He said, “I should like to say right away that the present bill is not perfect. We have no intention of trying to go over the whole province and make every rural seat of exactly the same number of members. There are certain jogs in it that can’t be avoided”. Well, we straightened out those jogs, but when you . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . squeeze a little there was the odd other one developed I must admit. But you know I thought the highlight was reached when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) got up and in his usual sanctimonious way said that in a democracy we draw our authority from the constituency and the constituency should be based on equal population and so on. Well, let’s take a look at his attitude in 1951, what they did with his seat. Go back to 1951 and I’m quoting from the then Leader of the Opposition in the debate. He said “We have for example, two polls taken off the Biggar constituency, represented in this house by the Minister of Education, Langham town and Langham rural.” Now, those two polls were taken off Biggar and added on to Rosthern. Then he asked the question, could it be because Biggar was too large in population and Rosthern too small? Then the minister said, (that’s Mr. fines) “We are just trying to be fair about this thing and get the population balanced”. Well, what is the truth about it? With these two polls, Mr. Speaker, Biggar would have had 9,516. In other words if these polls, Mr. Speaker, Biggar would have had 9,516. In other words if these two polls had not been taken off Biggar and put in Rosthern, Rosthern would still have been a 1,000 larger on the votes’ list than Biggar. Yet in spite of the fact that Rosthern was 1,000 larger than Biggar, they take these polls off the Biggar seat and throw them into Rosthern and still further increased the disparity between these two seats.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Steuart: — I go on to quote . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Would you permit a question? What is the population of Moose Jaw South and Moose Jaw North now since you . . .

April 5, 1966

Mr. Steuart: — I'll get to that in a minute.

Mr. Kramer: — . . . 12,000 in the South and 6,000 in the North.

Mr. Steuart: — Will you sit down and close your big mouth for a while and open your big ears. You will hear something, and you might even learn something but I doubt it. We could pump it in but I think it shoots right through. There's nothing there to stop it.

Well, I'll continue to quote, Mr. Speaker, about Biggar, about Mr. Lloyd. Never anywhere in this debate could I find in 1951 that the then Minister of Education, Mr. Lloyd, who so sanctimoniously bleeds about human rights and democracy now, stood up and said "I protest". Oh, no. I quote the Leader of the Opposition in 1951 in that debate, he said "Or could it be, Mr. Speaker, they were a little bit worried about the Minister of Education?" I think they have good reason to worry about him. His majority was only 708 which means that had there been a turnover of less than 360 in the next election the minister would have been beaten. but they didn't take any changes. They made his seat safe. What other seats did they make safe? Watrous they added to. North Battleford was then held by the Liberals, but they gerrymandered North Battleford. That was the greatest tragedy that ever happened to North Battleford because they ended up with the present member (Mr. Kramer). They did a little juggling in Swift Current, made it safe, not for democracy but for Socialism for the next 20 years. We had a Liberal member of the seat for Melfort—Tisdale . . .

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the hon. member had used this material in the material of his speech the rest of us could have replied to it. I think Your honour is well aware of the fact that, I think Your Honour recognizes that the rules of the house prevent a speaker on closing a debate, to introduce material which is new and which cannot therefore be replied to. Most of these statements could easily be rebutted but the hon. member didn't make them in his first statement. This is cowardly abuse of the rules, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Steuart: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in my speech I very definitely avoided, it was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) who brought up the question of juggling and balancing. He brought it up and I'm answering it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! A point of order has been raised by the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker). In answering the point of order I think it is well supported in the necessary authorities that when a member is closing a debate he may answer the arguments of others. I couldn't say that the member wasn't answering the arguments of others.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to keep this debate on a very high plane as we have done with this redistribution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . and, of course, I always have difficulty getting down

to their level, even though I start off a little lower than most of them, physically that is. But, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that when you look over that redistribution in 1951 and then when you look at the record when the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was the Premier very briefly, until the people of the province corrected that terrible mistake in the last election, you find that they changed Regina, they changed the boundaries in Regina. If they hadn't changed the boundaries in Regina we would have won every seat, and we wouldn't have had to look at some of those fellows over there. We would have had good lively members on this side. We would have won every seat. But they knew what they were doing. They changed Regina, split it up into some two member seats and one—member seats, and gave great big majorities to Regina South because they knew they couldn't win. Then they went up to Saskatoon another city, another 1,000 people, and I quote Mr. Lloyd, he said "We found some difficulty in trying to divide Saskatoon into constituencies which would still remain, all of them, more or less good community entities". then I thought he added the most smashing statement of all. He said, "Five, of course, Mr. Speaker, I realized all my education had been lax. I realized the advantage of having been Minister of Education all those years because I was astounded when he said that five was only one more than four. You know, Mr. Speaker, when they had their hand on the throttle, when they had control, how did they act?"

Mr. Kramer: — Tell us about Moose Jaw.

Mr. Steuart: — they gerrymandered. They twisted boundaries. They split Regina up until it suited their purpose. But when we bring in a reasonable and fair distribution to update things, they get up in their places and cry like timber wolves. I am sure that some members on the other side, when the votes are counted, when they stand up to vote for instance, the new member from Prince Albert East—Cumberland among them, will be bothered by their conscience and they will say "We should vote for this. It's very fair and it's very equitable". But then they may not because they are not too free thinkers, not like the members on our side.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — But I would urge all members to vote for this. It's very fair. It's very equitable. In fact I made a statement this morning that I will stand behind. This redistribution is as just and fair and equitable as any redistribution that has ever taken place in the history of Saskatchewan, I would, therefore, beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Election Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Election Act, the only reason this has to be amended

April 5, 1966

is that we have changed the name of one of the constituency from Cumberland to Prince Albert East—Cumberland so it is necessary if we amend the Legislative Assembly Act we also amend the Election Act. It is just a housekeeping amendment and I would beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just before it passes, may I compliment the minister who introduced the bill. He made a much more intelligent speech on this one than he did on the last one.

Mr. Steuart: — May I return the compliment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — It seems that the constituency of Cumberland is going to be one of the biggest in area and the largest in population. You might as well give it the largest name.

Mr. Speaker: — May I also commend all the members who have taken part in this debate for the most outstanding example of debating brevity that has ever taken place in the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Attachment of Debts Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are short amendments to the Attachment of Debts Act. The amendments to section six of the Attachment of Debts Act will enable the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission to be garnisheed directly with respect to wages or salary owing to any of its employees. This would place the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission in the same position in this respect as the Crown corporations, the Department of Telephones, the Liquor Board, Liquor Licensing Commission and Workmen's Compensation Board. Now the amendments to section seven will enable the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance commission to be garnisheed with respect to monies owing to any person other than monies due with respect of salaries. This amendment would also place the Medical Care Insurance Commission in the same position with respect to these other monies as Crown corporations, Liquor Board and the Liquor Licensing Commission.

The other amendment is an amendment to section 22. It will enable a judgment creditor to apply ex parte for payment out of monies paid into court under a garnishee summons after two months have expired. In addition this amendment will permit the court or judge in the event of any such application being made to require service of the notice of the application on the judgment debtor if it so sees fit and confers discretion on the part of the court or judge in granting any such application. The way it is now, the judge, as I understand it, doesn't have to give notice to the debtor. I can certainly think that the debtor is entitled to this notice. This gives the judge power to direct this notice.

This amendment has been asked for by the Law Society and with

that short explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would, therefore, beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to the Coroners Act. These amendments provide a new section in the act which requires, makes mandatory an inquest to be held with respect to any death occurring in a jail, penitentiary, lock—up or in a correctional institution. This is a provision which has been adopted in the Alberta Coroners Act. There was a case within the last 12 months in which an inquest was not ordered into a death in the Prince Albert Penitentiary because they were satisfied that the man had committed suicide. However, I considered it advisable and the department considered it advisable that all deaths in such institutions should be the subject of an inquest. This amendment will make an inquest in these circumstances mandatory.

There is also a new section being added to the act by this amendment which will provide that a person charged with a criminal offence arising out of a death should not be required to give evidence at the inquest with respect to such death. This merely puts into the act, makes statutory, the law as held by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of *Battery versus Nunn* which was decided last year. This puts it into the statute.

Now, the other amendments to the act strike out of our act references to an inquisition. It is felt that the use of the word “inquisition” could be misleading. It has been in the statute and it has been in the forum for many, many years but we think it is capable of misinterpretation. The word “inquisition” is not a word which is used in this day and age and it could be misunderstood by the average person. What is referred to, of course, in the act as an inquisition is really a coroner’s certificate which is also signed by the jurors. But we are taking the word ‘inquisition’ out of the act.

There is another amendment in the proposed amendments which is designed to place some restrictions on coroners ordering post—mortem examinations. It has been found in the past few years that coroners commenced ordering post—mortem examinations where the only purpose of the post—mortem examination is to enable the hospital to perform a post—mortem for the purpose of pinpointing the cause of death where there is no question of foul play or malpractice. The purpose of the post—mortem in many cases has been in the interests of medical research. Now, while this may be a laudable objective it is not considered that this is a sufficient reason in the Coroners Act to have inquests ordered in the circumstances.

The new subsection one of section 22 provides for cases in which a coroner’s investigation is necessary. Subsection four is designed to stop inquests in order cases except as provided in the new subsection five which provides that the coroner may authorize a post—mortem if requested by the next of kin or by the hospital provided the costs are paid for by the next of kin or the hospital. These sections also come out of the Coroners Act of Alberta.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would, therefore, beg

April 5, 1966

leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 100, An Act Respecting Dealers in Motor Vehicles.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Motor Dealers Act is to license, regulate and control the operation of compulsory arbitration dealers. The act provides for the licensing of all dealers and salesmen and requires that dealers will have to be bonded. The licensing provisions of this act follow closely those of other licensing acts such as the Real Estate Agents Licensing Act, Direct Sellers Act, and Saskatchewan Insurance Act. The act contemplates that it will be administered by the Registrar of Companies who is provided with the usual discretionary investigative powers.

Under the act a deal will be required to maintain a satisfactory place of business. He will be required to keep certain records, to use a form of contract that is prescribed by the regulations or approved by the registrar and to supply to the purchaser a copy of any contract signed by him. The public will be protected under the act by the licensing and bonding provisions. Dealers often handle substantial sums of money belonging to their clients and we feel that the bonding requirements will ensure a measure of financial responsibility. The bond will also provide protection in the event of bankruptcy or failure on the part of a dealer to perform under the contract. Regulations governing the form of contract can also provide a measure of protection particularly in the case of transactions involving used cars. We feel, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the great majority of compulsory arbitration dealers in the province are reputable dealers. We feel further than the act is needed to curb the operations of a very small minority flux of dealers from other jurisdictions where they may not be able to obtain a license. So with that short explanation, I would beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. J. C. McIsaac, (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I move the second reading of this bill, I am advised by the Law Clerk that we should have the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I beg to inform the assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the bill, recommends it to the consideration of the assembly.

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, amends the MLAs' Superannuation Act, no relation whatever to the Legislative Assembly Act or to the Election Act which we just dealt with.

The amendments contained in the bill provide for integration with the Canada Pension Plan, but only insofar as members of the Executive Council and the Leader of the Opposition are concerned. Private members are not included. They are excluded from the Canada Pension Plan insofar as the sessional indemnity is concerned. Informal discussions have been held with members on both sides in

this connection and I think most members are familiar with the situation.

This bill provides for diversion of the required 1.8 per cent to the Canada Pension Plan from the contributions to the MLA fund to a maximum of \$5,000 per year. It also provides for a reduction in that part of the pension which is calculated on salary up to \$5,000 per year. It applies only after January 1st of this year. This reduction in this initial \$5,000 amount is 35 per cent, the same as for all of the employees of the Public Service and the Crown corporations. I would remind members again that the amendments here have no bearing on MLA pensions or pensions earned by previous members or members of the cabinet, previous cabinet opposite. There is a provision to make regulations if future changes in the Canada Pension Plan require changes in the contribution or benefits. It also provides that the agreements be ratified. With these few remarks I would, therefore, beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words on this. I have no quarrel with the bill that provides for the Canada Pension Plan to apply to the members of the Executive Council, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) can speak for himself if he wishes. But I do want to take objection to the fact that the government is prohibiting MLA private members from taking part in the Canada Pension Plan insofar as their sessional indemnity is concerned. Now there are some private members who will have very little other income which will class itself as earned income, on which they can pay under the Canada Pension Plan, other than their indemnity, and the federal pension people class us as employed people, not as self—employed. We are employees and the government is the employer so that, take for example, a farm member, who may have his farm rented, he may get \$2,000 or \$3,000 in rent from his farm but he cannot pay into the Canada Pension Plan on the basis of his rent. They do not regard this as earned income but this is income on investments. It's the way they regard it. Consequently the member that is in this position is left where he can't take any benefit at all out of the Canada Pension Plan. Now there may not be very many members in that position, but I say that, if there is one member, he shouldn't be prohibited from taking part in that program, making the contribution and getting the benefits.

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — I might say at this point, so far as I am aware of the information discussions we have held with the members opposite that the minister spoke of in moving second reading of this bill, that irrespective of whether or not we did have income outside of the house, if we had been, incorporated under the plan, it would not have been of much value to us. I think that, in most cases and as far as I know all cases of the members in the house, it is going to be to their advantage not to be included in the plan as the hon. member (Mr. McIsaac) has pointed out.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know very much about this, but it strikes me that the members of the government are putting themselves in the position where their pension under the Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Plan will forever be reduced by the amount of their Canada pension. It seems to me, for instance, the member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), by integrating his members' plan with the Canada Pension Plan will forever have his legislative pension reduced by \$104 a month. if I am wrong, I hope you will correct me.

April 5, 1966

Because the two plans are being integrated, the member may make contributions after he ceases to be a cabinet minister. He goes back into private practice and will make the usual 3.6 per cent contributions on his income up to the maximum, but he will always have the Legislative Assembly pension reduced by \$104 a month, unless I am mistaken. Can he draw both the legislative pension at the maximum allowance of \$325 and as well draw the \$104 Canada Pension Plan? Because if he can't then you are doing yourselves out of pension benefits which you are entitled to and which you are going to pay for. The money you make in private practice after you cease to be a minister will be subject to a 3.6 per cent reduction. You are going to be paying for the Canada Pension Plan. If your Canada Pension is going to be subtracted from your MLA pension you are getting something less than you are paying for. I think you are making a mistake, if I understand it correctly.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, just in reply to some of the points raised, I appreciate the comments of the member for Kelsey and I would just say that before this time we have left out the MLAs. But there is no reason why we couldn't change this in the future if we found there were a number of people going to suffer from it. At the same time, in reply to the remarks of the member from Hanley, we could deal with them here, but I would prefer to discuss them more fully when the bill gets in committee. The impression is not entirely correct, partly so, but not entirely.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. J. W. Gardiner, (Minister of Public Works) for second reading of Bill No. 94, An Act to amend The Water Resources Commission Act.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — This is a topic, as I indicated in the few remarks I made the other day, that is of very great importance and is becoming of increasing importance all the time. I had the opportunity to look back at some of the remarks which I made when introducing the original bill some several years ago just to put on the record briefly the kind of problems that had been reviewed at that time. I read for example, from the statement made by the Committee in Council of Resource Ministers which warned us that Canada, despite the fact that it is blessed with one—quarter of the world's fresh water supply, finds their stocks which are readily available to her people being rapidly depleted through neglect and mismanagement and lack of knowledge. It was for that reason that after some years of study of our own situation, that the bill which is being amended now was placed on the statutes originally. As I indicated the other day, it seems to me that for the most part the bill which is now before us, the amendments which are now before us properly preserve the principles and directions which the legislature adopted unanimously at that time and consequently we endorse the whole idea. The increase in industrialization in the province continues; the increase in our urban population continues; the urge and they need to diversify our agricultural industry continues; the need of our urban centre for domestic water continues. For all these reasons we need to do much about water. I am glad that the government has set up necessary machinery to deal with some of these

problems and we concur in those decisions. Mr. Speaker, however, in order to raise just a few matters that do give me some concern in the act as I understand it, we can deal with them either when the minister replies or perhaps in Committee of the Whole. I am somewhat concerned about some of the new powers which, as a result of these amendments, will reside in the Commission. As I understand it, the commission receives or will receive powers to cancel or alter existing water rights, in some cases admittedly after agreement, but in some cases without an agreement. When this is done there is an appeal — it must be entered within a period of 30 days — but the appeal is only to the cabinet. I notice also that the commission has been given fairly complete power to fix fees and levies without necessarily having first of all received the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. It appears to me that the commission is being given virtually a free hand in this respect. Again it is true that an appeal is provided for, but it is also true again that the appeal is only to the cabinet.

I notice, too, that in the event of lack of payment on the part of a customer, after 30 days in default the commission can cancel a right or a privilege and can do so without notice. It seems somewhat extreme.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the minister will be able to satisfy us that these are not undue powers which are being suggested to be placed in the hands of the commission as a result of these amendments. I should think, too, that in the projections with respect to costs of the various projects, it would be well if a more complete picture could be given. When I say more complete picture I realize that we have had a fair amount of detail with respect to reservoirs and some other developments, but there are other community effects which will have to be rectified as a result of larger reservoirs. I think for example of the proposal to make a reservoir out of the Blackstrap canyon. I agree this is, apparently, an admirable kind of reservoir, and in an area in which it is needed. It would, however, result inevitably it seems to me in a need for a relocation of a highway and, perhaps, some rather extensive structures in that sense. I would hope that the legislature and the public could before too long be given a complete cost, a more complete estimate of the total cost involved.

One other point which gives me some concern, Mr. Speaker, is the question of to what extent is all this to be self—liquidating. I read the minister's statement which he was good enough to give me after he had given it in the house the other day. There is evidence there that parts of the program are expected to be self—liquidating. I felt that there was an undue amount of evidence, an undue possibility that the two larger portions of these would be expected to be based on the self—liquidating figures. Now reference is used, the self—liquidating point comes up in reference to inter—basin diversions in the province. We are going to have a very considerable amount of inter—basin diversions, this being the idea of many people, for example, that eventually water which now runs down the Churchill is going to have to be transferred into a Saskatchewan system, and some of this will have to be transferred into the Qu'Appelle system and finally even down into the Souris system.

Reference is made also to diversion of supplies which are now outside of the province. Many of us have recognized that this is certain to be a need in the future. It was because of this that we convened the meeting in the province with respect to study of the Nelson River potential, work which I am pleased to see is being continued. There seems to be a reasonable amount of evidence, at

April 5, 1966

least, that eventually in order to meet the needs of Saskatchewan and to meet the needs of Manitoba we are going to have to divert water which now runs northward into the oceans there and which runs westward into the Pacific. This is going to be very expensive. It doesn't seem to me practical to talk about plans of this kind on a self—liquidating basis and I am not suggesting that the bill states that, or the minister's remarks state that, but there did seem to be something of an undue emphasis on the extent to which these projects would expect to be considered as self—liquidating.

I know that the direct users are going to be beneficiaries. Sometimes they are going to be beneficiaries of a very considerable size. Certainly the whole province and the whole economy of Canada is going to benefit likewise. My urging is, Mr. Speaker, that projects which are necessary, in which the benefits may be a long time delayed, may not be stifled by any lack of willingness to invest public money, not to be stifled by any attempt to make the balance sheet too major a measuring stick as to the desirability of those projects.

Mr. Speaker, I think anything else I can say can be pursued in Committee of the Whole. I indicated the group on this part of the house will support the amendment as proposed.

Mr. H. A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, personally, I would like to commend the government for the action that it has taken on this water development through the Water Resources Commission.

As most of the members might know a lot of the immediate effort will finish up in the constituency of Watrous or mighty close to it. Regarding water supply to potash mines and villages, I would agree with the idea of the project in the first place and with the ideas that would be followed through from the pattern that was set up by some subsidization from government. This has been the case in Eston and Kindersley, but I really can't see the same thing here where water users would have to pay the shot themselves. I would say that the initial money would have to come from the government coffers and we appreciate this.

The think that has concerned me to a degree is that some of the villages that are fairly close to the line would probably find any charge that is above their present cost prohibitive. I would like to ask the minister if he intends this to be somewhere near the price of water that the communities now pay — something like \$7 a month for both sewer and water and if he feels the villages might have to pay less than \$7 for water because this charge must include sewerage.

I would like to say further that when I was told about the co—operation that was necessary in order to make this feasible, it was interesting to hear the story of how if one potash plant got it alone how expensive it would be, but by reason of co—operation between the two or three areas it was possible for each one of them to get this water perhaps a bit cheaper than they could build it alone and still benefit the communities besides. So, it is a good thing we didn't listen to some of the advice that we got from the former member for Hanley (Mr. Pinder) when he was a member for a month or whatever it was. He seemed to put up quite a resistance against any government participation in this type of thing. I am happy the government did step in and go into this in a manner that would be worthwhile and one that would have some lasting value for Saskatchewan.

I think, we can all realize that the Water Commission is just in its infancy, and that water is important as far as Saskatchewan and North America are concerned. I can't remember much emphasis being put on water except in the last five years, probably the last two years we found that water in North America to be one of the most valuable assets we have. Canada is definitely blessed with a greater portion of this water, so I am sure that the Water Commission will be able to look after our interest in the way it should, and I would say the interests of Canada. I have always thought that this was necessary, that our own interest in Canada be looked after first and foremost, and that consideration be given to other countries after we make sure that our own future developments will be looked after.

I think this whole idea is a tremendous undertaking. It can be the lifeblood of future industrial developments in Saskatchewan and, in fact, it might be the most important natural resource that we have.

I definitely support this bill and think it is a good principle for the government to take.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate, if anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief in closing the debate. I do want to say to the members of the opposition that I appreciate very much their remarks with regard to the legislation that is now before us. I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) that I think in committee would be the best place to deal with the question of powers that he brought up. I think probably he will realize the reasons for the measures that are in the bill.

I would also like to recognize his feeling with regard to the effect that it might have on community life in certain areas of the province. I think all of us realize that these changes come about whether it is the inauguration of new school systems, or of new public utilities. They are all going to have some effect on community life. It may be necessary because of costs for perhaps some community life to be changed slightly, for some to perhaps have to change the particular community they go to because of the exorbitant cost of trying to provide conveniences so that they can continue exactly as they have in the past.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) that the commission is looking at these effects as closely as they possibly can. They are desirous of making adverse effects on community life in any part of the province as minor as possible. I can assure him that the commission will at all times keep in mind the effect that their actions will have on communities within the province.

The only other comment I would like to make is that, of course, the communities and industries that are going to be enjoying the benefits that are provided to them by the government through the actions of the Water Commission and the Water Supply Board will be, I think, expected to pay at least a fair and reasonable share of the cost of these schemes. I think I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the commission as it states in the bill will at all

April 5, 1966

times try to relate the costs to the individuals themselves, to a reasonable and fair price and something that could relate fairly closely to the cost that they would have in providing the same services to themselves by other means. It would be our hope that this could be done as closely as possible for the communities that are affected in the province.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and all members of the house, that the government being the agency that the appeal is to be made to will perhaps give greater protection. Because I can assure him, as I know any government is going to be very cognizant of the rates and levies that will be charged, of the effect that it is going to have on the individuals, and of course, the effect that it will have on the government itself if the commission attempted to charge fees that were out of line, or perhaps unfair to individuals concerned.

I would just like to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that I appreciate the remarks he made with regard to the possible need in the future for the diversion of water supplies, probably between provinces, perhaps even from the far northern parts of Canada. I can assure him that the commission is now involved in discussions with the other provinces and with the federal government towards making the water resources of Western Canada available to all the provinces of Canada in a fair and equitable manner. It is our hope that in the not too distant future we will be involved in an active program in order to bring about the results that he stated in his remarks to make certain that waters in this part of Canada can be made use of by all the people of Western Canada, and done in such a way with the agreement of the provinces and also the federal government.

It would be my hope, as it is his, that a portion of this cost, of course, will come out of the provincial treasury and I would hope also a good share of the cost would come as well from the federal authorities, which, of course, will, I think, gain as a great advantage for Canada as a whole in order to develop our water resources in western Canada in a proper fashion. So, I am quite certain that in the diversion of water supplies that the residents in Saskatchewan can feel quite safe that they are not going to be called on to bear the total cost of diversion of water in the province. So, with those remarks, I would beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. Broten: — Would the minister permit a question? Regarding the cost to these small communities, does he feel if these are well within the ability of these smaller communities to pay the shot as far as their planning as it is at this stage?

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I would say insofar as I indicated it would be our hope to keep the cost at the relative cost they would probably pay for that particular service, by providing it to themselves, but then the cost, of course, would I think be within their capacity to pay.

Mr. Broten: — Do you anticipate what you will get from the federal go, depending . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, of course, I think the question would be better in committee, but I think at this moment for the individual schemes that there would be actually a minimum of cost—sharing with the

federal government. I am speaking of the larger diversions and I am speaking now of the possible federal sharing.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

THIRD READINGS

ADJOURNED DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Coderre that Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Trade Union Act be now read the third time.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, just before the third reading vote is proceeded with, many of us on this side of the house indicated some very real objections and concerns with respect to this particular bill. It will be recalled that in speaking on second reading I reminded the government of their promise which had been to maintain and improve trade union rates and securities, and I suggested that the short question was: does the bill do this? It seemed to me that at that time it didn't I have to say that even after listening to the minister and to others in various explanations, I am still convinced that the bill does not achieve that objective.

At that time I indicated that we had at least five concerns. That many people throughout the province shared those concerns. It was our belief that this bill made it more difficult to organize new trade unions, it made it easier to disestablish existing unions, it would facilitate jurisdictional conflicts, it appeared to allow an employer who wishes to do so to use direct influence against the organization of a trade union and to do with impunity.

We introduced amendments which would have cured some of these faults, which would have improved others, which would have lessened the serious effect of some. Unfortunately, the government did not choose to accept those amendments. As a result it is our opinion that these matters remain as those which are of concern to the people of the province. It remains our conviction that this bill does nothing to facilitate the development of good or better industrial relations. We are convinced that the government could have acted with respect to improving industrial relations, but it chose not to do so. For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I want to restate our very emphatic opposition to the bill as it has been presented and as it has been amended.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate, if anybody wishes to speak, he must do so now.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very, very short. I would like to state first that the committee was appointed to look and recommend, if any, any recommendations to be made in the Trade Union Act. The committee did report recommendations. If at that time there were any violent exceptions by anyone, I think it would have been quite in order at that particular time to present a

April 5, 1966

minority report. Therefore, it is quite evident that the report as such was a general consensus, a compromise between all parties who were presenting something. At this point I believe it is only in order, Mr. Speaker, that I should publicly thank the committee for the wonderful work that has been done on this report. A promise to maintain trade union security is being kept and maintained, but I don't believe that the security of anyone should be kept at the expense of any single individual human being. This, as amended, certainly protects the rights of the individual.

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

YEAS — 29

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

NAYS — 19

Lloyd	Whelan	Brotten
Cooper (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Larson
Wood	Dewhurst	Robbins
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Berezowsky	Pepper
Blakeney	Michayluk	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
Thibault	Link	Davies
Smishek		

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.