

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature**  
**23rd Day**

**Tuesday, March 7 1967**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the Assembly through you, Sir, that in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon there are 28 students from grade six to ten inclusive from the Grand Coulee School in my constituency, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Ken Johns. For those of you who don't know where Grand Coulee is — I'm thinking of the people way up in the frozen North who may not have had the advantage of visiting some of these smaller communities around the city of Regina — I should tell Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, that Grand Coulee is a very progressive, modern community situated a very few miles from the city of Regina and they have very many progressive organizations in that district. Only a week ago I had the privilege of having as my guests in the Speaker's gallery, a group from the Homemaker's Club in the Grand Coulee district. This is a continuation of the little visit to the Legislature each year for the last number of years. This visit today by the students from Grand Coulee I'm sure is very useful to them. They will see democracy in action, they will see Members on all sides of the House and from all corners of the House standing up and without fear or favor expressing their opinion on the various issues which come before the House. I'm sure that this will be a valuable lesson to all of the students who are of course engaged in these grades in Social Studies. So on behalf of all Hon. Members, I would like to extend a welcome of everybody I'm sure, to these students today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. SALLY MERCHANT (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether all of the students who are expected from the city of Saskatoon have yet arrived, but there were to have been today in the galleries, groups from three schools, from Collegiate Park and from Richmond Heights, as well as from Queen Elizabeth School in the city of Saskatoon. I think perhaps no town or city avails itself of the opportunity to be with us in this Legislature as much as our city. That's because we're smarter up there and more interested in our own welfare. We are delighted to have these young people with us and I know Members will want to join with me in welcoming them here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I think I see now the Richmond Heights School on the other side in the east gallery and I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Lady Member for Saskatoon can't claim all the smart children in Saskatoon. Richmond Heights School is still a part of Hanley constituency and there are just as smart children in Hanley constituency as in any other place in Saskatchewan. I want on your behalf, Mr.

March 7, 1967

Speaker, to welcome them here. They are a part of the recent addition to the city of Saskatoon. I want to welcome them here and I want to say on your behalf that I hope they will profit from their visit here and enjoy their visit, and that they will have a safe and happy trip home tonight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, not to be outdone by the Members from the city seats, I want to inform the Members from Saskatoon that the smartest people in Saskatoon are the ones that come from the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and attend university and other functions in that point. This afternoon we have two such groups, one from my home town, grade seven and eight from Glenavon High School under the direction of Mr. Jerry Zrymiak and Mr. Brandow. They are quite a gang of young hockey players who have their cheering section with them. I would like to point out that the principal, their teacher, Mr. Zrymiak was twice a member of the intermediate "C" team that won out in the Provincial Championships in Saskatchewan and I want to inform the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) that they are going to do likewise in a few days in the intermediate "B". And then I turn to the Speaker's gallery to welcome this afternoon an outstanding group of grade twelve students from the town of Indian Head, the most beautiful town in Saskatchewan. I know these groups are going to enjoy their visit to the Legislature here this afternoon and we hope that they have the opportunity to be back on many more occasions

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a group of grade eight students that are with us here today from the town of Kipling. I believe that this is the first time that a group has come from Kipling and I hope that they find their stay here very educational. It may even be educational to the extent that some of them will become candidates. I hope that some will, but I hope they don't all decide on the constituency of Cannington.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT RE: BOARD OF GOVERNOR'S PERSONNEL — SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN HOSPITAL CENTRE**

**HON. G.B. GRANT (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, some time ago I indicated that I would announce the personnel to make up the Board of Governors at the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre to be located in Regina and I am pleased to do so today. The Chairman, Mr. John Rowand was announced some time ago and the other six members of this Board are as follows: Dr. William A. Riddel, principal of Regina Campus at the University of Saskatchewan, who will act as representative of the University on the Hospital Board; Dr. Robert W. Begg, Dean of the College of Medicine and principal-elect of the Saskatoon Campus. He will act as a representative of the College of Medicine on the Hospital Board; Mr. B.R. Leddingham, a Regina businessman and general manager of an automobile firm; Mr. W. Hilsden, also a

March 7, 1967

Regina businessman who is general manager of a contracting firm; Mr. G.L. Gerrand, a solicitor in practice in Regina; and Mr. Lorne Wilkinson, a Regina resident who is secretary- manager of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. I trust this announcement adds to the pleasure of the Member from Regina West.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT RE: GOVERNOR GENERAL VANIER'S FUNERAL**

**HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to tell the House that this Legislature and Government will be represented tomorrow at Governor General Vanier's funeral by the Hon. Wilf Gardiner. I'd also like to say that the Opposition has agreed in case there's a close vote, to give us a pair for Mr. Gardiner, for which we thank them very much. As all Hon. Members know, tomorrow in the Cathedral, a place will be held for all MLAs if they will be there around 10:45 a.m. for the funeral ceremonies that are taking place here in Regina.

#### **QUESTION RE: SUBMISSION FOR APPLICATION BEFORE AIR TRANSPORT BOARD.**

**HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to answer a question put orally yesterday by the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker). This question dealt with the response of the submission for applications before the Air Transport Board, having to do with certain scheduled passenger services in Western Canada. Notice of the impending hearings regarding an application by Transair was published in the Regina Leader Post on March 4, 1966. Work was immediately begun on preparation of a submission to the Air Transport Board by the Saskatchewan Government. The submission was forwarded with a letter of transmittal with the signature of the Hon. Gordon B. Grant, on April 12, 1966. Acknowledgement was made by the secretary of the Air Transport Board on April 13, 1966. Subsequently the hearing was postponed and has now been re-scheduled for May 1 next, in Regina. As for the application to the Board by Transair, the Government has received no notification of this from the company. Information regarding the application was forwarded to my office during this past weekend by the Air Transport Board. The matter is now being investigated.

#### **RESOLUTIONS**

##### **RESOLUTION NO. 6 RE: INCREASE FOR MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM PRICES OF WHEAT.**

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife) moved, seconded by Mr. H.A. Broten (Watrous):

That this Assembly, recognizing the seriousness of increasing high farm costs and low farm prices, strongly urges the Federal Government to negotiate for an increase of 50 cents per bushel for both the maximum and minimum prices for wheat under the International Wheat Agreement when renewal of this agreement is under consideration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is intended to bring to the

March 7, 1967

attention of the Federal Government the urgent need for an increase in the price of wheat. Now since wheat is the principal source of income for Saskatchewan farmers, specific references to an increase of 50 cents per bushel for both the maximum and minimum prices under the International Wheat Agreement is similarly intended to bring into sharp focus the great need for a substantial increase of this order. I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that any price arrived at will be subject to all the ramifications associated with negotiating an agreement of this kind. However, in view of greatly increased farm costs over the years, the fact that the price of wheat to the farmer since ratification of the first agreement in July, 1949, has been lower in 12 of the following 17 years than it was in 1949, fully justifies this request. I merely mention this to indicate that a very substantial increase in the price of wheat to the farmer is now long overdue because of the comparative tremendous increase in farm costs over this period of time. We all recall the controversial United Kingdom Wheat Agreement signed August 7, 1946. We can also recall that despite the original terms of this four-year agreement, the British Government announced on September 20, 1947, that a \$2.00 price had been agreed upon for the crop years 1948-49. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, it was felt even at that time that a \$2.00 price would be more realistic. The first International Wheat Agreement of July, 1949 to 1953, provided for a maximum price of \$1.80 per bushel and a minimum price of \$1.50 per bushel dropping by 10 cents per bushel each succeeding year in U.S. funds. These prices were below the then prevailing prices because it was expected at that time that prices would fall. Instead, price of Class II wheat, that is wheat outside the agreement, stayed higher throughout the entire life of this agreement. It might also be noted here that the United States paid a 60 cents per bushel subsidy on all wheat sold under this agreement. This subsidy totalled some \$600,000,000 for the four-year period. We are all aware that the Canadian Government has never engaged in providing export subsidies and has relied chiefly on the Wheat Board as an agency to obtain for our farmers a reasonable price for their wheat.

Mr. Speaker, in 1953, for the second agreement, it is significant that the United States proposed a maximum price of \$2.50 a bushel and a minimum of \$1.90 per bushel, while Canada proposed a price range of \$2.25 per bushel and a \$1.75 per bushel exclusive of the six cents per bushel carrying charge. This, Mr. Speaker, also indicates that these two countries even at that early date felt that a substantial increase in the price of wheat was warranted. The fifth and last International Wheat Agreement covered the four-year period of 1962, '63, '64 and '65. As everyone knows, this agreement was extended to cover the years 1956-66 and now 1966-67. The maximum and minimum prices under this agreement were \$2.02 per bushel maximum and \$1.62 minimum in U.S. funds. I might observe here, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that the maximum price is above the \$2.00 mark is because, of course, of Canada's currency depreciation. These prices I quoted are in United States funds. When this is transmitted into Canadian currency, it is \$2.00 per bushel for the maximum. For a good part of this agreement, prices were almost at the maximum.

These prices are now most unrealistic and I think everyone agrees with this statement. The Wheat Pool organizations have notified the Government of Canada that they will no longer support a further extension of the current agreement unless the price range is adjusted upwards. The Central Pool's

organization reports that world carry-over of food grains has been going down at a rapid rate. The U.S. secretary of Agriculture states that world wheat imports have more than doubled during the last decade and that world imports in the next decade for wheat will far exceed the supply capability of the exporting countries. When one considers the undernourished circumstances existing throughout the world and the projected further great growth in the population of a hungry world during the next decade, it will take vastly more quantities of food to meet the food need at a proper level. The Pool's directors' report, outlines their program in the following words and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Improve conditions of trade amongst all nations. This means not only freer movement of food and food products from producer to consumer countries, it also means better opportunities for the underdeveloped countries from whom they must buy food. In terms of trade in wheat, it means that an improved international wheat agreement including all wheat exporters and importers and realistic minimum and maximum prices.

Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the tremendous forthcoming world food demands, appropriate price incentives will be necessary if our farmers are expected to produce sufficient to meet even minimum world food needs. There is no other answer to the problem of a domestically depressed agricultural industry and a food-hungry world even though export subsidies may be required. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that our Federal Government looked at these possibilities, as I say, to provide export subsidies if these are required. Certainly farmers should no longer, as in the past, be expected to subsidize food for both domestic and export purposes. It is high time that we accepted the principle that agriculture must also constantly increase production by way of price incentives if the nation as a whole is to progress and prosper.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we place tremendous emphasis on expansion in the non-agricultural sector of the economy. We are willing to go to great lengths in terms of tax incentives and various other concessions to induce industry to develop our resources in Canada. I'm saying here, Mr. Speaker, that it is equally important that we apply the same economic rule to the agricultural industry, that we very deliberately provide price incentives that will constantly increase our productive capacity in view of a tremendous world food demand. Mr. Speaker, there is no other answer to the cost price freeze and rural depopulation problems. Existing undesirable economical trends must be reversed towards a more constructive and beneficial direction and purpose.

I'd like to say a few things about farm costs and prices, Mr. Speaker. May I again return to this matter. First of all, let's look at farm costs only during the last International Wheat Agreement itself. During this four-year period of time, the western farm cost index went up by 29.3 points or an average of 7.3 points each year. Therefore, one can easily add another 14.6 points for the 1966 and 1967 years which would mean an increase in costs of goods and services required by western farmers. From this alone, Mr. Speaker, it appears that an increase of 50 cents per bushel in the price of wheat is now fully justified. When one considers factors over a longer period of time, this will in all likelihood be not nearly enough to offset the accumulative cost increases since the original

March 7, 1967

International Wheat Agreement was signed in 1949. I have already mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that in almost all the years since the ratification of the original International Wheat Agreement in 1949, the price of wheat to Saskatchewan farmers was lower and in many years very much lower than it was when ratification took place. Well, what about farm costs in the longer period of time? For example, let us take farm machinery cost. In 1946 the retail value of new machinery and repair parts purchased by Saskatchewan farmers was \$34,390,000. In 1964 the retail purchase value rose to \$135,472,000, an increase of nearly four-fold. On the other hand the farm price of wheat in 1946 was \$1.62 per bushel and in 1964 the price was lower at \$1.60 per bushel. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, one can see the logic of farm organizations and this Legislature now asking that a serious attempt be made to have the maximum and minimum prices to be negotiated under the new International Wheat Agreement raised by at least 50 cents a bushel.

Let us look at farm costs in another way. On a per acres basis, the per acre cost of new farm machinery and repair parts purchased in 1946 was less than \$1.00 per acre of improved farm land. In 1964 this per acre cost rose to \$3.15 per acre and mark you, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the acreage of the improved land increased by approximately 7,500,000 acres over this same period of time.

There are other people too who are seriously concerned about this whole question. I have here a clipping that I took out of the press very recently, dated March 6th, in which Professor J.C. Gilson of the University of Manitoba is quoted as saying:

Canada has no national farm policy, merely a conglomeration of policies created during emergency.

With this statement, Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord. I believe everyone will agree that we have been endeavoring to deal with the farm income problem on a haphazard piece-meal basis, trying to meet an immediate problem without ever properly looking at the whole problem of farm income. Dr. Gilson states further, and I quote:

Our research and extension programs have been planned from the beginning to promote and encourage efficient production, while many of the price support marketing policies have apparently been designed to freeze resources.

And may I again make this observation. This is exactly what's happening. We find prices of various farm commodities such as hogs and dairy products depressed, and we find our farmers going out of or decreasing that particular line of production. So in effect we are saying to farmers, "By utilizing the technique of pricing downward you must not produce anymore or you'll be punished." To quote further from what Dr. Gilson said:

Despite gains in physical productivity in the last 15 years, the farmers' net incomes have not risen proportionately.

This, too, Mr. Speaker, has been my constant contention that, despite the growing size of farms, better opportunities by means of physical aids to increase production, the existing trend to larger and larger farms is not providing a solution to the

farmer's chronic low-income problem. This is another field, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not refer to it at this time.

I wish, however, to make further reference and I am sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will be familiar with this. The Farm Management Department of the Department of Agriculture as everyone knows, has been doing some very careful checking through farm management clubs. I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a table which indicates the per seeded acre costs for farmers in the three major soil zones, the brown soil zone, the dark brown soil zone, and the black soil zone. This survey is from the members of the farm management clubs. They would represent a higher than average skills which I think, in terms of farm management ability and their farm sizes would be above average. The findings are that in the brown soil zone, in 1965, the total per acre cost for the seeded acreage on each farm was \$30.95 an acre for the dark brown soil zone, \$31.26 and acre and for the black soil zone, \$32.08 per acre, Mr. Speaker. The significant point, though, I think, that arises out of this survey is this: 1965 was a good crop year, in fact the brown soil zone in the farm management club survey had an average yield of 27.1 bushels per acre, the dark brown soil zone, 22.3 bushels per acre and the black soil zone, 21.4 bushels per acre, all well above the average. The per acre cost per bushel in the brown soil zone was \$1.14 per bushel on the basis of that yield, Mr. Speaker, and for the dark brown soil zone \$1.37 a bushel, and for the black soil zone \$1.50 a bushel, which very briefly simply means this, that it would take an average crop of some 19 or 20 bushels per acre to enable the farmers to break even on their operation. This, I think, is pretty conclusive evidence if any evidence or support is needed for a request of at least a 50 cent per bushel increase in the maximum and minimum prices of wheat. And I'm not suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, or to this House that an increase of 50 cents a bushel would be adequate, but I do believe that it's realistic at this time. I do say further again that if such an agreement should be entered into and if it would be necessary to subsidize wheat sales particularly to some of the underdeveloped countries, it would be fully justified and warranted in the interests not only of a more healthy and prosperous agriculture, but in the interests of our own and Canada's economic progress as a whole.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, other farm costs such as chemicals, fertilizers, electrical supplies, power units, welders, and a variety of expensive tools and other appliance costs are now required items in modern farm operations. All of these add to the total of increasing farm costs. In addition, demands for better rural services, such as more costly roads, improved health and educational services, now loom large in the farmer's fixed costs. I don't think it's enough for us to just talk about the possibility of reducing taxes because actually and in fact when you take all of the political aspects out of this it has never been accomplished. Let's face it, it won't be accomplished. I think we should set about endeavoring to not only improve the farmer's income, but to stabilize the farmer's income to a level that will enable him to meet all his costs, his farm operational costs, and the cost of public services provided for him at any level of government, Mr. Speaker. So no one can seriously question the need for fixed farm prices and incomes to meet these accumulated fixed costs.

A further convincing argument, if one is needed, is the tremendous increase in farm capital investments for Saskatchewan.

March 7, 1967

In 1946 total farm capital investments stood at \$1,230,000 according to DBS estimates. The value of capital investments in 1965 reached \$4,500,000,000 according to DBS estimates. This is a tremendous increase. We should therefore, at the very least ask the Federal Government to have negotiations proceed on the basis of an increase of 50 cents per bushel.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H. A. BROTEN (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, I second this Resolution with a great deal of pleasure. First, I would like to mention that farmers cannot keep on raising wheat for the same price when costs have gone up at such a fast rate.

Mr. Speaker, Ill give you some factual figures to substantiate this. First, Mr. Speaker, let us look at our DBS figures on western Canada's farm costs exclusive of living costs. They have gone up from 100 in 1939 (basis 1935-39 as a hundred) to 199.2 in 1949. From 1949 to 1966 they have gone up from 199.2 to 392.2 or 60 per cent since 1949. If we wanted the same relationship to farm costs as 1949 wheat as, wheat would have to be \$2.77 a bushel at Fort William in order to have the cost price relationship as in 1929. Mind you we said \$2.77 a bushel, and at present we are receiving somewhere around \$1.95, so we are about 80 cents short here, Mr. Speaker. We are asking for \$2.50 in this Resolution. I must say that we are quite modest in our request. Mr. Speaker, besides this gap in farm income and higher prices, we have just related, I would like to mention factual farm costs taken from page 12 of the 1965 Saskatchewan Farm Business Summary, which the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) mentioned. In using the dark brown soil as the nearest average, Mr. Speaker, and on an average of the 41 farms that reported, the operating expense shows — and these are actual — that those average expenses are \$7,085. Depreciation for machinery and buildings was \$2,585 and interest on all investment at 6½ per cent — that is machinery and \$100 per acre on the cultivated land. The interest load on capital would be \$7,283 and an estimated operating labor bill, \$5,000. This would be a total of \$21,953. If you took 20 bushels to the acre as the average crop which these people showed it would be 10,280 bushels. If you take the expenses of \$21,953 and divide that by 10,000 bushels, we get a price needed to meet his costs of \$2.14 a bushel. To that if we add the Wheat Board expenses and freight rates, he would need \$2.34 a bushel just to meet his costs. Mr. Speaker, this is on a thousand acre farm. We all realize that all farmers haven't got as good soil as would be in the dark brown soil. On top of that, as the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) mentioned, these farmers' figures are actual cost figures that are used in these bookkeeping clubs. Also these farmers are a better than average farmer, so you can see that we are very modest in our request. One can see our request of a \$2.50 ceiling and a \$2.00 minimum is quite modest. His cost can be much higher, that is the smaller farms costs can be much higher, so we are conservative in our request for \$2.50 maximum and \$2.00 minimum. If one doesn't advocate this price, at least to the average farmer, he is saying that the farmer does not need or deserve justice.

I've used actual cash expense figures and actual depreciation figures and I've allowed \$5,000 for wages on this 1,000 acre farm. I've allowed 6½ per cent interest on capital instead of the five per cent which was recommended because in these days this higher interest rate of 6½ per cent is more realistic. May



March 7, 1967

I repeat that the other expenses are actually based on the average of these farms in the dark brown soil listed in the bookkeeping clubs. If one does not agree these figures are a minimum, then he says the average man doesn't have the right to equal treatment with other groups for wages and return on capital and for management fees. I hesitated to use these figures on actual costs because the farmer is larger than the average farm in the bookkeeping club. The farmer in the bookkeeping club can be considered above average in ability perhaps, but even he has large deficits in today's price structure. Having shown how our costs have gone up and having shown what actual expenses are, I think a good question would be: How is the price set on the product we sell? This would take us to the setting up of the International Wheat Agreement and I'll give a little bit of the history.

International efforts to stabilize wheat marketing originated during the great depression when the prices of wheat fell to less than 50 cents a bushel. The first discussions were among the exporting nations and were held in London in 1930. A system of export quotas was considered but no agreement was reached. In 1933, a two-year agreement was negotiated among the wheat exporters and importers, aiming at ways to combat depressed prices by reducing production and surpluses. Export countries were to accept export quotas and controlled production so as to meet their quotas plus domestic requirements and a reserve. Importing countries were to limit their production and increase their consumption and reduce their import duties when prices rose to a specified level. The agreement soon collapsed due to a bumper crop and serious disagreement over export quotas and acreage reductions. Although, the 1933 agreement ended, the International Wheat Advisory Committee continued. In subsequent years poor crops relieved the pressure on the wheat market until another large crop was harvested in 1938. Negotiations for a new Wheat Agreement on export quota lines was under way when World War II began. During the war and early post-war period governments regulated wheat marketing directly by a wheat protocol of 1942, between the four large wheat exporters, Canada, Argentina, Australia, and the United States, and the largest importer, the United Kingdom. An International Wheat Agreement of export quota type was drafted and was presented to a post-war international conference. This plan collapsed in 1947 when Argentina, who was a major exporter, abstained.

One can see, Mr. Speaker, the difficulties there are in arriving at agreements. By 1948 declining wheat prices led to conferences and a multi-lateral contract type agreement in 1949, the forerunner of today's agreement. For a while after the 1949 Agreement, which was the forerunner of the meaningful agreements since that period, the free market price exceeded the maximum price under the 1949 Agreement. The remainder of the decade of the 1950's, however, witnessed the build-up of large stocks in Canada and the United States and a downward trend to low prices. One can see how the farmers in Western Canada fared. The surplus was built up in the world to a certain degree by attractive enough prices produced by a government subsidy for every country in the world except Canada. Our Liberal Government at Ottawa refused to accept the responsibility of a price level which is high enough for the farmer and low enough to enable the high degree of trade with the various needy countries of the world. And I'll have a little more to say about that a little later.

One of the highlights in the world wheat trade picture is

that the total volume of world trade in wheat in the post-war picture was twice that of pre-war two levels. Meanwhile the problem of unsatisfied demand in the four countries persisted. The post-war International Wheat Agreements had been three-year periods. The 1949 Wheat Agreement was renewed in 1953 and 1956 and revised substantially in 1959 and renewed in 1962 and recently there have been two-year extensions. The price to the farmer at the Lakehead by the present Agreement is a floor of \$1.62 to a ceiling of \$2.25 in U.S. funds for No. 1 wheat. There are 10 exporting countries and 37 importing countries which cover about 80 per cent of all grain trade, a very important agreement as far as world wheat trade is concerned. Under the 1953 Agreement the market price floated with the agreement arranged, but a sharp break was prevented only by the U.S. and Canada voluntarily piling up huge stocks. The U.S. farmer got a break by a subsidy for export and for some storage. As I mentioned before only the wheat grower in Canada received no subsidy and no storage payment. It was only the Canadian wheat grower along with the U.S. Government which helped to keep the price in the 1950's as good as it was. In the United States the Government stored the wheat at government expense, here the Canada farmer stored a lot of surplus at his own expense. Mr. Speaker, the farmer in western Canada is tired of competing price-wise at such low prices and in the final analysis he's competing not against other wheat growers in other countries, he is competing against the farmer backed by the Treasury of every other wheat-growing country. The least we can expect of our Provincial Government is the wholehearted support to encourage the Federal Government to have the International Wheat Agreement raise its floor and ceilings by 50 cents as the Resolution says. May I add here, Mr. Speaker, that the agriculture support for Canada is the lowest in the world. I have a report by Mr. Bentley of the University of Alberta in which he gives a percentage of net income the farmers received from the various government-support prices and other programs. And I'll relate some of these countries. From the support-price and other government programs, from 1946 to 1964 the farmer in Canada received 1.7 per cent of his net income. In the United States in the year 1964, it was 17 per cent of net income from the Government. In France in 1961, it was 50 per cent of net income which came from government sources. And in Britain in the years 1963 and 1964, it was 69 per cent of net income. The British farmer received 69 per cent of his net income from government supports and subsidies and government programs, whereas in Canada, 1.7 per cent was received and may I add that this is from a Liberal Government.

Harry Hayes repeatedly said that Canada agriculture received less government assistance than any country he visited while Minister of Agriculture. How true he spoke. If Liberal Governments won't give us a square deal by support-prices, surely it is not asking too much for the Liberal Provincial Government to get after the Liberal Federal Government to help negotiate a square deal or pick up the tab itself like all wheat-exporting countries have done.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H.D. LINK (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, as a Member representing a large urban riding I have always felt somewhat reluctant to participate in a debate involving agriculture. I felt that perhaps I was not well enough informed about the problems facing the farmers of

this province.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Minister of Agriculture in this Legislature, I do not feel that way anymore. In fact I must confess that his counterpart on the Federal scene, a lawyer, seems to have a much better grasp of the problems that face the farmers of this country than has any Member on the Government side in this Legislature.

I rise to support this Resolution, asking this Assembly to urge the Federal Government to negotiate for an increase of 50 cents per bushel on our wheat when the International Wheat Agreement comes up for renewal. I do so because I am utterly convinced that the farmers of this country require this increase, if they are to keep somewhat in line with the increased cost of everything that they have to buy, and secondly, because I know that as an urban dweller if agriculture suffers we in the cities are only a step behind. This may be a selfish way of looking at it, but it is a fact. Thirdly, I support this Resolution because I believe that unless our farmers are encouraged to produce more food, we may well all be in trouble, not only in Saskatchewan and Canada but throughout the world. Mr. Speaker, unless the primary producer is paid enough for what he produces, it will not be long before there will be a complete collapse of the agricultural community in Canada. Mr. Speaker, the 50 cent per bushel increase in our wheat, I suggest, will mean very little when we consider the staggering problem of producing enough food for the people of the world in the years that lie ahead. Mr. Speaker, what does our second century mean to us? What is one of its greatest challenges? What contribution can we make as a nation to our future and to world progress? During the first 100 years we in Canada have enjoyed with some exceptions, an abundance of fine food. What are our prospects for increasing this food supply as we prepare for this new century? Can we meet the challenge of the fact that the world's population is expected to double in the next 35 years of the new century we are entering? Food, clothing, and shelter have always been and will continue to be the mainstay of human existence on this earth. It has always been taken for granted that Canada's food supply is an inexhaustible one. This isn't necessarily so, as we may soon discover, unless changes are made very quickly. I am not at this point suggesting that an increase of 50 cents per bushel will solve this problem and give us an abundance of food in the future. In fact, I'm sure it won't. I do suggest it will help. It will perhaps give us a little more time to do some planning and, Mr. Speaker, plan for the future we must, or very soon Canada will not have a surplus supply of food. We have, and I sincerely hope that we will continue to have, in varying degrees a few surplus items.

The red lights are however beginning to flash. Danger signals are clear. Several items of food which until recently were in substantial surplus are today in short supply. Dairy products and certain types of meats are outstanding examples. For Canada's next century, if it is to be one of continued progress, we must immediately devise a new, up-to-date, positive, forward-looking food production and distribution plan. We could, Mr. Speaker, be asked to double our present food production before very long. You ask; is this possible? Mr. Speaker, it is not only possible, but most desirable.

One of the first things we have to decide, Mr. Speaker, is whether Canada will continue to be one of the world's suppliers of food products. If this is the case, we will have to give the farmers some incentive to produce this food. It is true the

March 7, 1967

50 cents per bushel is not going to solve the food problem forever, but it will help. Mr. Speaker, I'm disturbed not only by the amount of wheat and other food that will have to be produced by Canadian farmers. What I am even more concerned about is who is going to grow this wheat, and who is going to own the land, the distribution system, and the processing plants. I suggest that unless we take some action now Canada's food supplies will continue to come more and more under the domination of giant food-chain corporations and other industrial giants. More and more the chain stores are not only marketing to the consumer, but also undertaking the production of certain food items themselves. The question is then, Mr. Speaker; are our present farmers to become simply piece-workers for these industrial giants? If so, can we not look forward to a time when these corporations have a terrific stranglehold on our entire society? We would not dream, at least I hope not, of giving these companies control of the water supplies of our nation. Why let them get themselves in the position of controlling our food supplies? This may happen if we do not act very quickly. Mr. Speaker, a 50 cent per bushel increase in wheat will perhaps not stop this type of takeover. It will however, I repeat, give our farmers some incentive to produce more wheat and will enable them to compete better with those giants that are trying to take over the agricultural industry.

I was encouraged recently to learn that our new Federal Minister of Agriculture has raised this very important point. He evidently has his misgivings also on this control of food supplies by large food chains. Apparently he isn't as green as some people first imagined. If we are to stop this situation from going by default, we simply must as Canadian citizens and as the primary producers of food, take bold and resolute actions to gain or maintain control of our products. I believe a plan must be worked out that will enable the farmer to keep control of his products from the time he produces it until it reaches the consumer. Unless this is done, it won't be too long before a mere increase of 50 cents per bushel will not save him.

It may not be possible for the farmer to control the products past the wholesale level, and I rather suspect this will be the case. From there on it may become mainly a consumer problem. I believe there will be some discussion of consumer problems in this House and I will not go into that aspect of the matter at this time. Canadian producers have many problems, but I believe one of the greatest is the almost total lack of producer-control on the marketplace. Unless our farmers gain and keep control of the wheat they produce they will soon be nothing but sharecroppers or piece-workers for corporations. In the United States, farmers and congressmen have apparently become alarmed about this same condition of the control of food supplies getting away from the actual producers, in their country. Almost two years ago, a National Commission was appointed which just recently tabled its report. The public, as well as the food producers there, are really alarmed at the degree of control these food chains already have on the United States' food supplies. They have been shocked and dismayed by facts revealed in the important document entitled, "Food from Farmers to Consumer." Our Federal Parliament might well give immediate approval to the appointment of a similar study in Canada because many of these food chains are international in scope and operation. In one section of the report reference is made to this effect, "The concentration of economic power in the processing distribution of food is a development," said the Commission, which poses more clearly than ever before the question of how farmers can

obtain sufficient bargaining strength to defend their prices. To help the farmers cope with this concentration of power, the Commission suggested:

That farmers in either a locality or a region be allowed to band together to regulate their production and marketing practices so as to set floors under their prices and that a new government device called Agriculture Marketing Boards be established.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time we did some real serious thinking about establishing this kind of a study. As I said earlier, while supporting this Resolution, I must confess that I believe unless something further than this is done, our farmers will gradually disappear and the agriculture industry will be taken over completely by corporations. The 50 cents per bushel that this Resolution is discussing, in my opinion will just stall for a while what I consider to be the inevitable outcome of the struggle between the primary producer and the corporations.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to you that an adequate supply of good food is the most important item that the Canadian people can produce both for themselves and for millions of other people in the world. We have been blessed with four or five exceptionally good crops. What would happen if we had a few failures? Already the farmer in my opinion is paying more for everything he buys in comparison to what he gets for his wheat. With a poor or even medium crop I don't see how he could keep going. Although far from the right answer, I am going to support the Resolution proposed by the Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) which asks this Assembly to urge the Federal Government to negotiate for an increase of 50 cents per bushel for both the maximum and minimum prices of wheat under the International Wheat Agreement when renewal of this Agreement is under consideration.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BREKER:** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 10 RE: MINIMUM WAGE LEVEL**

**MR. W.G. DAVIES** (Moose Jaw City) moved, seconded by **Mr. G.T. Snyder** (Moose Jaw City):

That this Assembly, recognizing that the sharp increase in living costs of the past several years has borne especially heavily on low-income earning employees and their families, recommends to the Government of Saskatchewan and its Minimum Wage Board, speedy action to (a) establish the \$1.25 per hour minimum wage level stated in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code; and (b) retain the Canadian Welfare Council to undertake a full investigation to determine the minimum wages required in Saskatchewan to furnish the necessary cost-of-living to employees.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that I speak to this

afternoon may at first glance seem to be somewhat removed from the one that we've just been debating. But on deeper analysis it may be realized that it is in reality a complimentary Resolution. Both in the former Resolution and in this one, we attempt to discover methods of helping large groups of our citizens. So it seems to me that the two Resolutions that we consider this afternoon are in a genuine sense anti-poverty, pro-economic security Resolutions. In speaking in support of the Resolution that I shall be moving, Mr. Speaker, I remind the Assembly that in 1966 the Members considered a Resolution of somewhat similar character which had been placed before the Legislature. The Resolution in question was moved by the Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) and seconded by myself. It went as follows:

This Assembly endorses the Canada Labour (Standards) Code enacted by the Parliament of Canada and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take appropriate measures to establish conditions in Saskatchewan not less favorable than those provided in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code and to give first priority to raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour.

When this Resolution was debated, the Minister of Labour moved that all words after "Assembly" in line 1 be deleted, one of course this had the effect of deleting most of the Resolution. The following words were added:

commends the Government for endorsing the Canada Labour (Standards) Code enacted by the Parliament of Canada, and for the measures it is considering to establish conditions in Saskatchewan comparable to those provided in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

Subsequently, as a result of a sub-amendment which was moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Melfort-Tisdale, (Mr. Willis) a Resolution was finally adopted which had, in addition to the words which had been placed by the Minister of Labour (Hon. L.P. Coderre), the words:

and recommends that the Government proceed expeditiously in these changes with the least possible delay.

At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, the Government has not acted to establish conditions that are comparable to those provided in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code nor has it, to my mind, proceeded in the language of last year's Resolution "Expediently in these changes with the least possible delay." Now, this is one of the reasons why I feel that a further Resolution on the subject of minimum wages and pertinent matters should again be moved in this Assembly.

The new Resolution which I ask the Members to endorse, recognizes that the sharp increase in living costs of recent years has had especially adverse results on the lower-income wage-earner and his family and calls for quick action to put into effect the \$1.25 per hour minimum wage that's stated in the Federal regulations. However, it also requests the Government to retain the services of the Canada Welfare Council to undertake a full investigation to determine the minimum wages required in Saskatchewan to furnish the necessary cost of living to employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should say at this point that the words

March 7, 1967

“necessary cost of living to employees”, is an extract from The Minimum Wage Act itself. The Minimum Wage Act requires a Board, as one of its prime duties, to establish conditions that will furnish this necessary cost of living to employees. I think it is significant we should understand that the Minimum Wage Board and the Government have under this legislation an express obligation to effect not only arbitrarily decided minimum wages, but indeed, those that will effect the “necessary cost of living.”

It is not my purpose today to repeat the very many arguments that have been advanced in this Assembly in other years, to explain the philosophy that is behind this Resolution now before the Members. I intend to be as concise as possible in justifying the case for the Resolution.

Perhaps it might be a good idea in the first place to deal with the type of argument advanced by my friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) in attacking Resolutions of this nature. His reasoning has gone something like this: “You CCF’ers had 20 years to do something and didn’t do it and now you’re asking us to do what you would not do.”

But this, Mr. Speaker, is again a case of someone with a very bad defensive position going on the offensive in order to escape it. In fact, there is nothing whatsoever to validate the position that the CCF while in power in this Province did little or nothing about minimum wage conditions.

As a matter of history the action of a CCF Government for better labor conditions is so well established across this country that it’s almost unnecessary to state it. Suffice it to say that when the CCF was elected as a Government in 1944, it proceeded to do a number of things in the area of minimum wage that were unique in the Province, and, I suggest, across the country. It’s worthy of note that in 1944 when the CCF Government came to power that wages as low as \$5 a week existed under the previous Liberal Government’s Minimum Wage Board regulations. Now, what did the CCF do in 1944 and thereafter?

First of all, it established the highest single minimum wage rate in Canada. Over the years, although there were other individual wage rates that were somewhat higher in other provinces, the general level of minimum wage standards was not exceeded anywhere else in the nation. In addition, in terms of paid public holidays, overtime, and other fringe benefits, it’s just simply undeniable that the Saskatchewan Minimum Wage regulations established by the CCF were foremost. To say otherwise is to fly in the face of the record and any serious student of labor relations in Canada would hardly dare to suggest otherwise.

The last increase in the minimum wage under the CCF was effected on March 1, 1964. Subsequently, there have been two increases of the minimum wage under the present Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. Now, I must remark that up to 1964, the increase in the cost of living was 146 points — 10.4 points higher than it was when the CCF Government was in power and at least 8 per cent higher overall.

It’s also worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that from 1949 to April of 1965, the cost of living index in Canada went up only an average of two points in each of the years concerned. But by January of 1967 using the 146 points basis that I have just cited, you will see that the rate of increase in cost of living was three times as high as in the previous period mentioned.

March 7, 1967

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the present Government did take some action with respect to minimum wage increases it has done little more than to keep pace with the rapidly advancing cost of living. And I believe overall that it has not kept pace at all. In any event, it is nothing for the present Government to crow about, nor can it suggest from a factual point of view that the previous CCF Government did not make a good deal of progress in the field of minimum wage levels.

Mr. Speaker, the average weekly wage in Saskatchewan even as far back as May, 1966, was \$88. I would think it's around the \$90 level at present. And this means that the present top minimum wage of \$40 a week is over \$48 below the average. In percentage terms it means that the minimum wage is about 45 per cent of the average weekly wage in the province. It seems to be reasonable that the minimum wage, apart from all other arguments, should bear a much higher relationship to the average weekly rate of pay.

For years the CCF Administration in Saskatchewan attempted to keep well ahead of the minimum wage changes at a time when the movement in other jurisdictions was, I think it could be said, truly stagnant. The stock argument of many people at the time opposed to progressive revisions here and elsewhere, was that no Federal legislation to set a norm or pattern in minimum wage had been established and therefore the Province shouldn't get too far ahead. Since the Federal Government has moved to set up the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, the situation is entirely different. A national pattern has been set. It's incumbent on any Provincial Administration to follow it. There is no longer any validity to the argument that there is no accepted nation-wide scale set by a Federal authority. The present Liberal Government in this Province therefore does not face the principal obstacle that used to confront the CCF Government, in setting a minimum wage. The fact that three years after the introduction of the Federal Minimum Wage legislation, action has not been taken to bring the Saskatchewan Minimum Wage up to the Federal standard, is not only cause for regret, it is evidence of a weak and unwilling position on the part of this Government to do its part in bringing its minimum wage up to the very modest Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, personal income in 1966 — and these are the Premier's own figures — was 14 per cent over that of 1965. The Premier's figures also were that retail trade in 1966 was up six per cent, a total of \$1,312,000,000. In the words again of the Premier, 1966 was a "most prosperous year." It is clear enough that in the midst of this general buoyancy there should be every reason why the present minimum wage can be raised to an adequate level.

May I point out too that the minimum wage of \$40 a week in the cities of this province represents a little more than \$2,000 a year. Now, this sum is about \$1,000 — almost one-third less — than the amount which is considered by some authorities to constitute a bare level of income, below which we would have to characterize an income as at the poverty level.

Everyone knows this is our Centennial Year. We talk a great deal about projects for a better Canada. We do a great deal of talking, it seems to me as well, about the need to eliminate pockets of poverty. Surely, Mr. Speaker, our most obvious place to begin in eliminating poverty is in substantially



raising our minimum wage levels in this province to a decent standard.

**MR. THATCHER:** — No, no, raise the real wages.

**MR. DAVIES:** — I'm not going to quarrel with the Premier about raising what he calls the real wages, but I'm saying that the minimum wage or the real wage, whatever you call it here, both have their positive relationship to one another. I'm saying to him that as the Leader of the Government in this Province he should have the courage to do what the Leader of a Liberal Government at Ottawa has had the courage to do.

**MR. THATCHER:** — But, we have, in the real wages.

**MR. DAVIES:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, the then Minister of Labour, when he introduced the Canada Labour (Standards) Code in October 13, 1964, in the House of Commons, pointed out that a conference of Provincial Labour Ministers had agreed on the need for progressive labour standards in Canada as a whole. It seems to me that now is the time for this Province to act so as to justify that statement which was made almost three years earlier.

I want to comment too that if the Canada Labour (Standards) Code was being considered today it would need to be substantially higher than \$1.25 an hour if the cost of living rise is recognized. This brings into focus the fact that every delay in implementing the \$1.25 an hour minimum wage in this Province not only denies employees the advantages of the higher rate, but has resulted due to living costs in the erosion of the rate itself.

When the Saskatchewan Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) in July of 1966, announced that some increase in the minimum wage to the extent of \$2 a week would be effective on September 1st of 1966, he also said in a news report that Minimum Wage Board hearings would be held in the autumn of 1966 and that those hearings would also consider new revisions in rates. But very strangely a concurrent statement appeared in the press, quoting the Premier as saying that the \$2 per week increase probably will be the last increase for some time. One of the reasons for this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is to discover whether the Government is in favor of moving forthrightly to a substantially higher minimum. A contradictory policy as evidenced by the two quotations now definitely appears to exist.

Certainly the move at this time is in keeping with the thinking at the conference of Provincial Labour Ministers that was headed by the Hon. Allan MacEachen, three years ago. There's just absolutely no justification for a hold-the-line policy on minimum wages which have lagged far behind in the general prosperity of the Province.

Now, as I've suggested, there is increasing support for conditions that set some kind of a primary wage floor much higher than the relatively wretched wage conditions that have existed in past years across Canada. The Toronto Telegram in October of 1964, not precisely the foremost exponent of progressive views, nonetheless said, and I'm quoting from their editorial:

Until acceptable minimum standards are established and

March 7, 1967

enforced for all workers, Canada cannot honestly refer to herself as an affluent society.

And I noticed — and it was heartening — that a prominent farm newspaper, The Western Producer, last October 22, in discussing the Federal minimum wage standard, also gave approval of the conditions and the principles that were set forth.

The Western Producer recognized, and I'm quoting here,

that the existence of the code should encourage the Provinces to follow suit by passing complementary legislation applicable to other workers.

A strong hint, I suggest, to this Government. The Western Producers went on to say, and I quote again:

The Code should serve as a sort of yeast to produce rising minimum working conditions across the country.

Later on in the editorial the Western Producer said this:

The Minimum wage set by the National Code is \$1.25 per hour. In the five-day, 40-hour work week also set by the Code, this would mean a gross income of \$50. This is not an unreasonable figure. In fact, it is minimal for any urban worker who has any dependents to support.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the second part of the Resolution which calls for investigation by the Canada Welfare Council. I first of all want to refer to Section 5 of The Minimum Wage Act. It says and I'll quote it exactly:

In exercising its power under clause (a) or (b) . . . of Section 6 to fix a minimum wage, the board shall determine such minimum wage on the basis of either;

(a) what the board deems adequate to furnish the necessary cost of living to the employees in the class of employment affected; or

(b) what the board deems to be generally prevailing in the class of employment affected;

and the board may, as it deems fit, use either basis in fixing a minimum wage for employees or classes of employment . . .

There is no doubt in my mind that the question constantly arises in fixing minimum wages. What is the minimum wage adequate to furnish the necessary cost of living to employees? The significance of the responsibility of the Board as stated in this section is that it does not make a finding on minimum wages isolated from the facts. Its responsibility as stated in the Act is quite clear, and that is to furnish the necessary cost of living to employees.

Over the years there has never been a solid, scientific investigation to establish a basis for the setting of minimum wages, and in my opinion this is why the minimum wages have everywhere in North America, apart from Saskatchewan, lagged very far behind other rates and failed to provide an adequate bare level.

March 7, 1967

My Resolution, Mr. Speaker, simply asks that an authoritative, non-partisan, knowledgeable body be commissioned by this Government to undertake an investigation on which further decisions can be made to justify the setting of minimum wage levels that are in every respect fair and reasonable and based on all available authentic information. These studies have been undertaken in numerous places in North America. One of the studies I can refer to is the study undertaken by the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. This by the way was in 1964. The study at that time established that a minimum budget for a family of four was \$409.88 a month. Today's terms everyone will see because of cost of living advances would make this seem very much higher.

The illustration anyway is that budget guides have been constructed by bodies that are competent to make those investigations. It's submitted that we should proceed in the same way in Saskatchewan. It just seems to me incomprehensible that we should any longer delay the kind of examination which, as I have claimed today, is to quote precisely, indicated by the direction given by the Act itself. The Canada Welfare Council would seem to be an irreproachable organization to conduct the kind of study that I recommend here this afternoon.

Another reason why an advance in minimum wages is indicated concerns the fact that a large proportion of employees are in the so-called service industry. As a matter of fact such has been the change over the last decade and a half that almost two-thirds of the employees in Canada are located in the service industry. Some of these are paid reasonable rates of pay. A very large number of people in this group are paid anything but princely rates.

Periodicals, magazines, and newspapers, and other media have been full during the last several years with material on the extent of poverty in Canada. It's well known that approximately 25-30 per cent of the people of this country are in a state of economic deprivation. Many others are just on the border-line. The Federal Government has been properly preoccupied in considering some measures whereby large sections of people at this poverty level can have their incomes raised. The Canada Labour (Standards) Code recognizes this principle.

I want, this afternoon, to give great credit to Mr. Stanley Knowles, MP. For over 15 years, Mr. Speaker, he regularly moved bills for Federal labour standards legislation. They were just as regularly rejected. As recently as 1964, he submitted bills before the House of Commons. The Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) himself, in moving the Labour Code Bill in the House while perhaps left-handedly, still gave a measure of tribute to Mr. Knowles for the work which he had done in laying the basis for the final approval of the legislation itself in 1965.

The \$1.25 wage rate, which the Resolution suggests should be favorably considered for recommendation to the Government of this Province, is not the kind of wage rate which is normally discussed in collective bargaining. Essentially it's the kind of wage which is paid where labor organizations don't exist and where there is no collective bargaining whatsoever. When seeking approval of a \$1.25 minimum this afternoon, I'm not talking about the kind of bargaining that takes place between trade unions and employers. In a province like Saskatchewan where there are a

March 7, 1967

great many enterprises with under 20 employees, the difficulties for employees who want to organize and do the job themselves in bargaining collectively with their employers, is plain enough for everyone to see. This emphasizes to my mind the need for minimum wage protection in a Province where this situation is characteristic.

There's been a great deal of talk about population losses in Saskatchewan. I've always maintained that higher wage levels and better working conditions in this Province would do more than any other single factor to keep our working people from going to greener pastures. I very definitely feel that one reason why Saskatchewan should have better legislation than other parts of Canada, in the field of labor, minimum wages, etc., is to provide a more attractive field at home.

We must always remember that we have a very severe and extreme climate. This is one of numerous reasons why many of our people look to greener pastures. I think this is a practical reason why our legislation should be foremost at all times in the field of labor. Mr. Speaker, we're living in a period where working people have heavy costs. People can't buy homes, pay taxes, and the general costs of food, clothing, education for their families, without reasonable wage rates. This whole proposition involves a setting of suitable legal wage floors to prevent the exploitations of the worker in a time of relatively high prices and escalating costs.

The consensus of my Resolution is simply this, that the Assembly requests consideration of the Government in establishing a minimum wage floor that is substantially better than \$2,000 a year, and secondly, that in keeping with the whole idea of setting minimum wage rates that are fair and just in every respect, a more scientific investigation be undertaken by agencies of the Canada Welfare Council.

I haven't covered by any means all of the aspects or arguments that could be made on this subject this afternoon. I have no doubt that other Members on this side of the House will be rising to speak on the Resolution, probably one or two from the other side as well. I would want, however, in closing this afternoon to suggest that every Member of this Assembly, including every Government Member of this Assembly, can safely endorse this Resolution without feeling that it will do damage to his party.

I ask your support, I ask you to think of the thousands of little people, many of whom I'm sure you know, who can benefit from a move of the kind recommended, and who in any case deserve positive action to assist them in difficult circumstances.

I am confident that if you think of these aspects, you will have no trouble in discovering in your mind a number of good examples that point to the need for the passage of this Resolution. I say again that we are in Centennial Year. The measure of a country's greatness is in what it does for the least of its people. There's no doubt that a substantial section of our population is at, or near, the minimum wage level. It is in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, incumbent upon us in a Centennial Year to do by minimum wage action that which will advance the well-being and improve the lot of thousands of our citizens who deserve a better deal.

**MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 15 RE: SETTING UP OF THE OFFICE OF AN OMBUDSMAN**

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale) moved, seconded by Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):

That this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to the setting up of the office of an Ombudsman whose duties would be to inquire into imputed cases of alleged administrative injustice within Saskatchewan; to make recommendations to the Government concerning his findings; and to report annually to this Legislature as to his activities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the introduction of a motion urging for the third time in three years, consideration of the setting up of the office of an Ombudsman, three times in three years, Mr. Speaker, urging the appointment of an Ombudsman, points out the importance attached by the CCF to the question of the rights of the individual when confronted by the growing power of government administration. That this concern for the individual is not shared by the Thatcher Government opposite is regrettable to say the least.

In submitting this motion again in the session, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to review in detail the arguments for an Ombudsman advanced in this House in previous years. These are in the records of this Legislature and are readily available to any interested person, even to my friend the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if he would take time to consider the arguments which have been advanced in the past. The Legislature should be reminded, however, that over the years with the developments of our democratic parliamentary system, governmental activities have increased. A century or two ago, governments confined themselves largely to matters of foreign affairs, the administration of justice and a few other general matters. Today, the modern state provides a great variety of social services and undertakes the regulation of much of the daily business of our citizens. There has been a corresponding increase in the number of administrative bodies clothed with authority to carry out the policy of government. Professor Way, in his Administrative Law, defers to this new concept of governmental activities when he states and I quote:

In order to carry out so many schemes of social services and control, powerful engines of authority have to be set in motion. To prevent their running amuck, there must be constant control both political and legal. Ultimately the political control rests with parliament though in reality, much power is in the hands of officials. The legal control is possessed by the courts of law.

Legal control of administrative decisions, Mr. Speaker, at least in common law countries, is inadequate and at times ineffective. The established courts are ill-equipped by constitution to deal with many of the problems of government in an expeditious, informal, and inexpensive manner. Courts will say whether an administrative decision is lawful or unlawful. They will not say whether it's right or wrong. Courts will determine the legality but not the merit of an administrative action. On the other hand, political control in modern states is often ineffective and inadequate to assure administrative justice to individual citizens. Often there is no investigation of such complaints in depth and Ministers and Members of Parliament alike are inclined to accept without much question the explanation of departmental officials. The inadequacy of legal control and the ineffectiveness of political avenues available to the citizens in search for administrative justice have been recognized in many countries. The Scandinavian countries reacted first by setting up the office

March 7, 1967

of the Ombudsman — a sort of public defender — to investigate and recommend remedial action regarding complaints of administrative injustice. Today the institution is widely copied. The experience of New Zealand, a fellow member of the British Commonwealth, has had the greatest effect on Canada mainly because of the wide publicity resulting from visits to our country of the present Ombudsman of that country.

The Parliamentary Commissioners (Ombudsman) Act was passed by the New Zealand Parliament in 1962. New Zealand's Ombudsman — with information from the Member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), Mr. Speaker, — New Zealand's Ombudsman has power to investigate complaints of persons arising because of administrative injustice. Complaints must be in writing and must be accompanied by small fees. The investigation must be private. The Ombudsman has a discretion of refusing to investigate a complaint if in his opinion it is not justified. The Act gives the Ombudsman very complete powers to summon and examine on oaths if necessary, and a complete right of access to departmental records and to department premises. Contacts with the government department and agencies concerned are deliberately kept on an informal basis with the objective of arriving at the truth of the matter, while at the same time securing and retaining the confidence and co-operation of senior department officials in the righting of wrong and the remedying of administrative errors. Before investigating any matter, the Ombudsman is required to inform the head of the department or agency affected and if during his investigations it appears there may be grounds for an adverse report, he is required to give to the agency or department concerned an opportunity to be heard. Similarly, it is expressly provided that the Ombudsman may not in any report make comment adverse to any person unless that person has had an opportunity to be heard. The Ombudsman has no power to make an executive order or decision; he can make a recommendation to the department and if that recommendation is not acted upon, he can go to the Prime Minister and then to Parliament.

The grounds upon which the New Zealand Ombudsman may make a recommendation on a report or a report itself, are wide and sweeping. He may report if a decision which was the subject matter of the investigation appears to have been contrary to law, or if it appears to have been based wholly or partly on the mistakes of law or facts, or if the decision appears to him to have been unreasonable, unjust, oppressive, or improperly discriminatory. He is empowered to make a recommendation if in his opinion the decision which was the subject matter of the investigation was wrong. The complainant must be informed of the results of the investigation. This New Zealand Act provides the Ombudsman shall make an annual report to Parliament on the exercise of his functions. In the case summaries and in the case-notes printed in the annual report, the complainant's name is not disclosed or any facts given which could lead to his identification. Every effort is made to preserve the confidential nature of the complaint.

The statistical records for the first three years of operation of the office of an Ombudsman in New Zealand showed that complaints received, totalled 2,265. Of this number, 858 were not proceeded with mainly because of lack of jurisdiction, 286 were partially investigated and then withdrawn by the complainant or discontinued by the Ombudsman for various reasons. Fully investigated were 1,010 complaints. Of these, 196 were justified resulting in some remedial action, and 814 were judged not justified. Investigations were pending on 111 complaints at the end of the period. In New Zealand the office of the Ombudsman has been welcomed by the citizens generally, accepted by the public

and by the press. The States Services Commission from the outset has given support and co-operation to the Ombudsman and recently a member of the Commission stated that the Ombudsman has done much to induce a harmony between public servants and Services and this has often improved the social efficiency of a department's operation. The Association of State Employees, The Public Service Association, was initially hostile but recently the Association's official journal published a favorable review stating in part:

It is becoming increasingly clear that the office of an Ombudsman is not necessarily the trap for public servants which many of us feared when it was first established.

Indeed, the present incumbent is making it probably that public servants will make more and more use of the office for settlements of otherwise unappealable grievances. It is apparent that the office of the Ombudsman in New Zealand is meeting with the same success that it has in other countries where it has been instituted. Here in Saskatchewan we have conditions similar to those that led to the appointment of the Ombudsman in other countries. Our system of government is becoming more vast and more complex year by year. The Government is the largest single employer in the province. More and more citizens are affected by government action and government administration. Officials of departments of governments deal directly with private citizens in all walks of life, in all parts of the province. In addition, many agencies, Crown corporations, boards, commissions, and other tribunals, make decisions affecting the lives and liberties of our citizens. In this massive confrontation of citizens with government administration it is only to be expected that there should be complaints regarding administrative injustices. As in New Zealand and the Scandinavian countries, it'll be found that not all complaints claiming administrative injustices warrant action of a remedial nature. It is essential that every person who has a grievance should have access to a forum where he can be heard and his complaints, if considered justified, be fully investigated.

An impartial, non-political Ombudsman is necessary here in Saskatchewan. This is one right that should be available for the protection of our citizens. Here in Saskatchewan during the CCF's 20 years of office, rights of the individual citizen — for the full 20 years which we were in office — were respected and were given prime consideration. In this regard I want to quote from the Budget Speech delivered Friday, February 23, 1964, by the then Provincial Treasurer, the present Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. J.H. Brockelbank). The Provincial Treasurer of that day, said:

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying something about the rights of the individual. We have always tried to assure that in the search for the general good, we do no individual wrong. Indeed, it is a matter of pride that Saskatchewan has led Canada in the protection of the rights of the individual. Let me point out some of the things which have been or are being done. Early in our administration we introduced The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act, to guarantee the basic rights of every citizen. The Fair Employment Practices Act was designed to outlaw discrimination against any individual. Saskatchewan was the first province in which the right to sue the Crown was established. In 1963, the Legislature passed a Regulations Act to ensure that administrative regulations would be subject to the Legislature's scrutiny. The Government provides assistance for legal counsel for indigents and this is being extended in 1964-65. A new Expropriations Act is being introduced this session to make more certain

March 7, 1967

that property owners are fairly treated when it becomes necessary to use their property for public purposes. And we are including in the Budget for next year, provisions for a special legislative committee to consider the possibility that a Commissioner for Citizens' Rights should be established in Saskatchewan. Such an office similar to the Ombudsman of the Scandinavian countries would provide citizens with an avenue of appeal from administrative decisions which they consider to be unjust.

That, Mr. Speaker, from the Provincial Treasurer's remarks or speech, in 1964. For a period after 1964, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the new Government was about to bring in legislation establishing the office of an Ombudsman. The present Attorney General (Mr. Heald) addressed a meeting in Prince Albert, October 19, 1964, telling his audience that:

The Saskatchewan Legislature will be asked to consider establishment of a public defender.

Again in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, it was a different story. Twice the Members on this side of the House introduced a motion asking that the question of an Ombudsman be considered by a committee of the Legislature. Twice the motion was defeated by the Government majority opposite, twice the Attorney General voted against even considering the question of a public defender. Liberal actions, Mr. Speaker, do not measure up to Liberal promises. Other people in Saskatchewan already, Mr. Speaker, recognize the importance of an Ombudsman, the so-called public defender. The Western Producer, in an editorial of March 24, 1966, headed, New Zealand's Ombudsman, stated:

We would guess that most people there (New Zealand) welcome the presence of a public protector near the seats of power. We are sure that most Canadians would be of the same mind especially nowadays when big business towers over individual citizens.

The Star Phoenix, on March 24, 1966, had an editorial headed, Ombudsman May Be The Answer, and the Star Phoenix in its editorial stated:

The Saskatchewan Legislature for the second time in two years has voted against the establishment of a committee to consider the appointment of an Ombudsman for the Province. An Ombudsman is a person to whom the individual citizen may complain, if the citizen feels that he has been mistreated by government authorities. The Ombudsman has wide authority to obtain information from government sources and to determine the right or wrong of the case.

The use of Ombudsmen is fairly common in Europe. New Zealand has one, Manitoba is going to have one, and Alberta is considering it.

The Resolution for committee study in Saskatchewan was moved by Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina West) and defeated in a close vote along party lines.

Saskatchewan may or may not be ready for an Ombudsman. However, we would have to disagree with the reason given for opposing the study, that an Ombudsman would interfere with the prerogatives of MLAs. The suggestion seems to



be that the local MLA has inclusive right to hear complaints from citizens. This is a very dangerous concept.

The Member of the Legislature is a partisan politician. If he is a Member of the Opposition, he has very little access to information, and even less chance of getting anyone on the Government side to listen to him. If he is a Member of the party in power he is part of the Government against which the citizen is complaining. The prospects for the citizen in either case are less than promising.

The advantage of the Ombudsman is that he is non-partisan. He is a member of no party, but is instead an arbitrator between government and individuals. If he is partial it is toward the citizen he represents.

We have altogether too much government in this country and instead of getting less, we are getting more and more. In the face of all this policing of our lines, the individual citizen is even more in need of protection from the arbitrary and heavy hand of the state. An Ombudsman may be the answer.

Then there is another editorial in the same period, Mr. Speaker, this time the Leader Post, March 22, 1966, an editorial headed, "Protecting Personal Liberties", and it starts out:

There is no accounting for some of the ways of government.

This observation is prompted by the Manitoba Conservative Government's adoption of an Opposition Liberal-NDP proposal to appoint a Provincial Ombudsman, almost simultaneously with the Liberal majority rejection of an Opposition resolution calling for a committee study of the appointment of such an official in Saskatchewan.

Manitoba becomes the first province in Canada to take this step, and the second of the Commonwealth Governments. New Zealand pioneered in naming an Ombudsman. Saskatchewan recently had the pleasure of playing host to Sir Guy Powles, a man who has held this post for three years since it was established.

Saskatchewan now will be able to observe how this plan of protecting the individual from government officialdom works out in the sister province.

One of the objections to an Ombudsman is that we already have too much government. So why add to it? The very fact that governments play increasingly strong roles, affecting individuals to a greater and greater extent, undoubtedly is the most powerful argument for naming an impartial person to act as a referee between the government and the people.

In recent years governments had tended to set up boards clothed with absolute powers under which appeal avenues are closed. This has magnified the danger of autocratic treatment of individuals and the need of vigilance against the abuse of these powers.

Even if the appeal avenues of the courts are left open,

March 7, 1967

this is a costly procedure for the individual. Normally instead of fighting injustices perpetrated by big government, he would be inclined to do nothing other than lick his wounds.

The Federal Government has an auditor general appointed by Parliament and answerable only to that body. A similar plan has been proposed for Saskatchewan and its adoption will come in due course.

The auditor general's task is to ferret out wasteful uses of the taxpayer's money. Over the years this office has justified its existence fully in publicizing misuse of public funds. The support of public opinion, generated by the auditor general's annual reports has been of incalculable work in keeping the Federal departments functioning more efficiently.

An Ombudsman would occupy a post somewhat similar to that of the auditor general. However, he would not check on financial matters, but on how the government uses its powers.

Where an individual feels that he has been wronged, the Ombudsman would examine the complaint and intervene in behalf of the complainant, if he believed this to be warranted. Also in annual reports, the Ombudsman would draw attention to government lapses in the use of its powers and marshal public opinion behind him.

It has been said that it is not enough to have won freedom from government tyranny, but that eternal vigilance is necessary for the preservation of personal liberties against encroachments of government. Complexities of modern government render it difficult for the people to maintain effective vigilance. An impartial and independent Ombudsman would provide this needed protection against erosion of personal liberties.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I have another editorial here from North Battleford News Optimist. The editor of the News Optimist says in an editorial of March 22, 1966:

The increasing complexities of government demand that the rights of the individual be given every possible consideration. In Scandinavian countries, in New Zealand, and at least in one Canadian province, Manitoba, action has been taken to appoint an Ombudsman. His chief duty will be to help the average citizen get justice from his government in cases where justice has been doubtful.

It was odd that, when the Legislature in Manitoba was passing enabling legislation to appoint their first Ombudsman, the Legislature of Saskatchewan was rejecting a similar proposal.

There is increasing evidence today that government must be concerned more and more that the real power of democracy is not assumed by our growing powerful civil service. It is possible for the civil service to completely misinterpret the laws passed by the Legislature. More evil is more often wrought by the things left out of laws than the things put in them. The Ombudsman clearly has a duty to not only gain justice for the citizen from this

interpretation and carelessness, but he also has a duty to show the legislators their grave responsibility to the electors. The need for an Ombudsman has come about because our governments have become increasingly powerful and because the price of justice is such that only the wealthy can really afford to see that they always get it.

An Ombudsman is a citizen watchdog who should have no particular political affiliation but who nevertheless should be politically astute. He is as necessary for good government as is the government itself and the opposition. Both the Saskatchewan Legislature and the House of Commons in Ottawa could make good use of such an appointment.

In face of this endorsement, Mr. Speaker, the endorsement of this institution of an Ombudsman by Saskatchewan's leading farm weekly, two of the largest dailies of the province and a very influential semi-weekly paper, one wonders at the lack of interest being displayed in this question by the Government opposite.

Talk only by Government Ministers is not enough, Mr. Speaker. The time has come for action. Action is being taken by other countries, by Britain and by five other Canadian provinces. Britain is setting up an Ombudsman according to an article appearing in the Financial Times, January 1967. The article states under the heading, "British Ombudsman Might Aid Alberta." The article states — and I'll only read a part of it:

Sir Edmund, previously Parliament's Controller and Auditor General, has been appointed to proceed with the arrangements for his new job, to be created shortly by the Parliamentary Commissioner Bill. The proposed legislation is expected to become law before long. Alberta and other Canadian provinces are preparing to go ahead with similar legislation soon. Both Ombudsmen — Alberta's will be called Commissioner for the Legislature and Britain's, a Commissioner of Parliament — will be expected to investigate complaints lodged by private citizens against real or imaginative injustices by the Administration. Both offices are to be established by legislation somewhat similar to New Zealand's Parliamentary Commissioner Act, of 1962. In Britain any person who believes he is affected by maladministration of a Government Department would be able to ask his MP to forward the case to the Ombudsman for investigation. And in the words of a senior Cabinet Minister here, the Ombudsman will be able to make his own inquiry from top to bottom of a department. He will be able to investigate the lowest clerk and the highest Minister to discover exactly what happened.

The five other provinces, Mr. Speaker, Ontario, Alberta, Newfoundland, Quebec and Manitoba, are contemplating appointment of an Ombudsman, according to newspaper reports.

Manitoba's proposal is outlined in a White Paper entitled, "Citizen's Remedies Code" presented to the Manitoba Legislature, December 1966. It has a section on the Ombudsman that should be of interest to Members, and I will read into the record part of the White Paper headed, "Legislative Commissioner for

Administration.” And Manitoba considers this important, Mr. Speaker, as is shown by the fact that paragraphs 46-64 outline their proposals.

Consideration is being given to the introduction of Legislation for the appointment of a Legislative Commissioner for Administration. This part of the White Paper explains the reasons for this proposal.

The interests of the citizen who is affected by a decision of Government are already safeguarded in a number of ways. He may have the opportunity of putting his case at an inquiry, held before administrative action is taken. He may have the right to appeal against the decision. He may have a remedy before the courts.

These arrangements, however, cannot cover every instance where a private person feels that he is suffering injustice as a result of faulty administration on the part of a Government Department.

Under the British system, which has been adopted in Manitoba, the Legislature is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen, by history, by tradition and past and present practices. It is one of the functions of the elected Member of the Legislature to ensure that his constituents do not suffer injustice at the hands of the Government. The procedures of questions, and debates on supply have developed for this purpose under a pattern of Parliamentary Government; and the Members are continually taking up constituents' complaints in correspondence with Ministers and bringing citizens' grievances, great or small, to the Legislature where Ministers individually are accountable. It is not proposed to create any new institution which would erode the functions of Members of the Legislature in this respect, nor to replace existing remedies. Our proposal is to develop those remedies still further . . . It is proposed to give Members of Legislature an additional instrument which they may use to protect the citizen, namely, the services of a Legislative Commissioner for Administration.

Under these proposals, the Commissioner will be an independent officer whose status and power will be conferred by statute. He will be appointed by the Crown; his salary will be a charge on the Consolidated Fund; and he will be secure from dismissal, except by motion of the Legislature. He will report to the Legislature each year and otherwise as occasion requires.

Consideration will be given to designating the Registrar of Consumer Protection as a Legislative Commissioner for Administration.

It is proposed that the Commissioner will act only when requested by a Member of the Legislature and on a complaint of personal injustice suffered by the complainant.

And I might point out, Mr. Speaker, this is a departure from the New Zealand procedure where the complainant may complain directly to the Ombudsman. But in Manitoba it is proposed that the Commissioner will only act at the request of a Member of the

Legislature, and on a complaint of personal injustice suffered by the complainant.

It will be for the Member to decide whether the complainant appears to be one appropriate for reference to the Commissioner. In the first instance the complainant must bring his complaint to the attention of the Member who represents the constituency in which the complainant resides. If the Member declines to refer the complaint to the Commissioner, or fails in a reasonable time to do so, the complainant may then approach any other Member of the Legislature.

Most complaints will come from private individuals, but companies or other corporate bodies — other than those under publicly elected or appointed authority — will not be excluded. The Commissioner will be authorized to consider any complaint sent to him by a Member of the Legislature from anyone lawfully resident in Manitoba. Visitors from outside of Manitoba will be included if the complaint relates to something that happened while they were lawfully present here. So will persons living outside of Manitoba, if their complaint is about the administration of the individuals' rights or obligations arising here.

Except for some exclusions which are set out hereunder, the field for the Commissioner will be the whole range of relationships between the private person and the Provincial Government, and all public authorities under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. Consideration will be given as to whether the role of the Commissioner should be extended to include municipal governments and school authorities.

The exclusion we propose to make from the Commissioner's field of investigation are those where there are dominant considerations of public interest, namely, the exercise of powers in relation to investigating crime or determining whether a matter shall go to the courts. The Commissioner will not normally pursue matters which are within the competence of the courts; he will have discretion to act if he thinks that the remedy open in the court is not one which the complainant could be reasonably expected to use, but this will not affect anyone's right of access to the courts. He will not pursue issues already covered by tribunals or other quasi-judicial bodies, nor would he look into appointments by the Crown or by Ministers. He will be excluded from investigating any actions of Government Departments in personnel matters. The actions and decisions of Crown Agencies, Corporations, Boards and Commissions will be excluded from the Commissioner's field of investigation.

We intend the Commissioner's procedure to be as informal as possible, subject to the requirement that if he takes up a case he must give the person against who the complaint lies, the opportunity to comment on it. He will be empowered to decide whether the parties can be legally represented, but legal representation will be the exception, not the rule. Legal aid will not be available. The Commissioner will be able to call for oral or written evidence; he will have power to compel production of documents, including minutes of Government Departments,

but excluding Cabinet or Cabinet Committee documents. The Government will always retain the right to refuse the production of documents. The Government may, in its discretion, provide a document to the Commissioner on a confidential basis. He will have power to get evidence on oath, although we would expect this power to be used infrequently. In this connection the sanction to be evoked in the event of defiance of the Commissioner, will be to refer the matter to the Court of Queen's Bench.

The Commissioner will have the discretion to refuse to pursue a case where he thinks there are insufficient grounds for the complaint and where he does not regard it as within his scope. He will not normally pursue a case where the matter complained of had been known to the complainant more than 12 months previously, but he will have the discretion to do so.

The Commissioner will be concerned with faults in administration. It will not be for him to criticize policy or to examine a decision . . . unless it appears to him that the decision has been affected by a fault in the administration. If he finds nothing wrong, he will inform the Member of the Legislature who had approached him. If he finds that there is justifiable cause for complaint and the Department responds to his invitation to put it right, he will inform the Member. So far as the Commissioner is concerned, this will be the end of the matter, save for a possible reference to the case in his annual report to the Legislature. If the Department does not act to the Commissioner's satisfaction, it will be open to him to report his conclusions to the Legislature in his annual report.

It may be found convenient for the Legislature to establish a Committee to consider these reports in the first instance. This Committee would have the usual powers of a Committee to summon witnesses, (including Ministers) to take evidence and report to the Legislature.

It will be for the Legislature, with the help of the Committee, (if one is appointed) to consider what action should be taken on the annual report of the Commissioner. The Commissioner in his annual report may comment on defects in the system which have come to his notice as a result of investigating individual complaints.

We do not intend that a reference to the Commissioner should automatically hold up action on the case by the Government; sometimes this might be contrary to the public interest. Ministers will have discretion to proceed with a case even where it is being examined by the Commissioner. They will also have discretion to prevent disclosure of information by the Commissioner, where the public interest makes it necessary to do so.

The fact that we are proposing this scheme does not mean that we think that the administration of Government Departments is open to serious criticism or that injustices are frequently suffered by individual citizens. Far from it. We are in no doubt that the tradition of integrity and impartiality in our public administration is being fully maintained. But our proposals should increase confidence in that administration — by enabling complaints

March 7, 1967

about administrative actions to be fully and impartially investigated so that, if a grievance is justified, it may be remedied, or if it is unjustified, this may be demonstrated. It should also result, as has proved to be the case in other countries, in the further improvement of administrative standards and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, that from the White Paper issued by the Provincial Secretary of Manitoba, December, 1966.

There are notable difference, Mr. Speaker, between New Zealand's Commissioner and that of Manitoba. But steps are being contemplated in that province, in Manitoba, to adjust alleged administrative injustice.

Saskatchewan too has published a White Paper entitled "Citizen's Protection Code," dated February, 1967, three months after the publication of the Manitoba White Paper. This is similar to Manitoba's in appearance, Mr. Speaker, however, as you can see it is much smaller. A smaller younger brother edition, and, Mr. Speaker, lacking any reference to an Ombudsman.

From a reading of the Protection Code it appears there is a willingness on the part of the Government opposite, to protect the citizens against himself or against actions of small businesses or little salesmen. But there seemingly is no willingness to protect the citizens against possible maladministration of the biggest business in our province, the Government itself. If you enter into agreement with the Government here in Saskatchewan, there is no cooling-off period during which you can reconsider. If a Government administration takes action against you in any form, brother, you may have had it. There is virtually no remedy if a person feels aggrieved except as the Leader Post puts it, "nothing other than lick your wounds."

In advocating the setting up of an Ombudsman, I wish to emphasize like Manitoba and Britain and other provinces, and other countries, we do not think that the administration of Government Departments is open to serious criticism or that injustices are frequently suffered by individual citizens. And like the reference in Manitoba's White Paper, we say, far from it.

Experience has proven that an Ombudsman on the one hand builds up confidence in the public that justice is the main concern of government administration and on the other hand improves standards and efficiency of government administration.

It is our belief that an Ombudsman can only work successfully in a country that is reasonably well administered. It is quite likely, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan's Attorney General, who in 1964 was contemplating introducing legislation setting up the office of an Ombudsman, will once again, with all other Members on the Government's side of the House vote against any suggestion of an Ombudsman in Saskatchewan. By so doing they will once more exhibit their callous disregard for the plight of the individual citizen of this province, who may feel that he has not received justice in his dealing with the Government. Even though the Government will likely turn down again for the third time, Mr. Speaker, any suggestion of an Ombudsman, this motion which I am moving today will serve to reassure the citizens of Saskatchewan of the CCF's continued interest in securing the best possible administration for Saskatchewan and the best possible administrative justice for the citizens of

March 7, 1967

Saskatchewan.

This motion will serve to reaffirm that when the CCF again is elected to power, one of the first acts, Mr. Speaker, will be the appointment of an Ombudsman whose duties will be to investigate individual grievances to the end that administrative injustices will disappear.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about the question of an Ombudsman as a private backbench Member in the Legislature.

The Members opposite, this afternoon, have been doing a very adequate job, I suppose you might call it, of trying to convince the people of this province that they are the fighters for citizens' rights, for everything of pie in the sky that we might be able to think of, and of course with little consideration of how much it might cost to the average taxpayer and so on.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that on this Resolution, the appointment of an Ombudsman, as far as I am personally concerned, would be nothing more than an indication that our democratic system, as we know it and as constituted by the Members of this Assembly, is absolutely nothing more than a failure. I think that we have many ways in which the average citizen is now protected. For example the Hon. Member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) quotes to us from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, an editorial which I do not agree with. For example he suggests that if an individual confronts any Member of this Legislature, be he on the Government side or the Opposition side, with a problem, that this problem would not be looked into. Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this problem is not looked into and if it is a case that merits some attention and if the Member of the Legislature is any good, be he in the Opposition or the Government, that person will receive the attention that he requires, and if he is being unjustly dealt with that this can be corrected. Each of us here are Ombudsmen in a way; there are 59 Members here and I have never yet seen an example, in the time I've been here, in which an individual with a case that was reasonable and sensible when presented could not have it looked into and given assistance too. We have a number of other ways in which this Government or this Legislature functions in protecting an individual's rights. The Attorney General this year will bring in a program that involves legal aid; there are courts, there are Members of the Legislature, and I personally believe that the appointment of an Ombudsman would only serve to frustrate the individual Members of this Assembly in a great number of respects. Of course the cost of operating an Ombudsman would be substantial, and I for one am firmly convinced that this Province in setting priorities for expenditures of many, needs a great many things besides Ombudsmen at this time. The arguments that I have been presented in favor of an Ombudsman, I feel, in actual practice in this Province would not be workable to any great extent. The cost, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I feel is not what the people of Saskatchewan want to spend large amounts of money on when there are so many other things we need. I feel that we have many ways of protecting citizens now if these are exploited. As for the accusation that the Members of the Legislature, as presented by



March 7, 1967

the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) in the editorial he quoted, cannot deal with these individual problems, well if a Member of the Legislature can't deal with these individual problems, then they have a pretty poor Member and I think that the people of that constituency should start looking for a new one. Therefore, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as a Member of this Assembly, I believe that as of now we have substantial methods by which individuals can have their rights protected. Therefore, I think that this Resolution is most inappropriate for at least some time to come.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. R.A. WALKER:** — I feel impelled to say something on this matter. I was well content with the address of the mover and I thought that he covered the ground admirably and made a case which was unanswerable. I think the same still, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) this afternoon. The Member for Cannington is opposed to this proposal. I find this a little difficult to understand as it seems to me that any proposal which promises or offers to enrich or enlarge the rights of the citizens of the province ought to be welcomed by any Member of the Legislature, particularly a backbencher who has no particular vested interest in the powers of government but ought to really be concerned primarily about the rights of his constituents. I should have thought that a backbencher speaking on the other side would have said that even if this will only add a lot or little to the rights of the citizens, even if this will only enlarge their rights by a small part that it would be worth a reasonable expenditure to do so. But the Member, who is a new Member, demonstrates I think, the adage that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. It demonstrates just how true that truism is.

Here is a Government that has been in office only a little over three years, a Member sitting as a backbench supporter of that Government who is a young man and a University graduate, and has been in this Legislature only for three years who is already imbued with the notion, with the idea that governments can do no wrong. He's already explaining away the right of governments, the freedom of governments, justifying the power of governments and ignoring the rights of the governed. This strikes me as being a rather sad commentary on the Liberal party.

Surely there must be some malign interest in that party which is giving these young Members this idea so quickly because ordinarily young minds aren't as quickly corrupted as this. I would have thought that some thought should be given by the Hon. Member who just sat down to just what it is in the Liberal party that is causing this sickness that is manifest here in this debate.

It seems to me that the Liberal party ought to have a real good look at itself if it is already convinced that governments don't need to be checked upon, that the public doesn't need to have their rights secured or enlarged. If this is already the prevailing pattern of thought in the Liberal party, it's about time the Liberal party for its own good, had a real good look at itself. I suggest that they are in a better position to know where to start than we are on this side of the House, because after all we only see the exterior facade of that party. Members who are in it must know where the strains and stresses of dictatorship and totalitarianism and smugness spring from better

March 7, 1967

than we can.

I was a little surprised when he said that any problems which a voter has can be resolved by simply going to see his MLA. Well, I suggest that perhaps the Member for Cannington has had better luck dealing with complaints from his constituents than some Members of this House that I know.

I'm thinking of a complaint that came to me early in January and which I passed on to the Department of Highways. Although I got one letter acknowledging the complaint and a promise that it would be looked into, this is now March 7th. Almost two months have gone by and I can't get this matter taken care of by the Department of Highways. They're too busy forking out bales of money to contractors, in that Department, apparently, to be able to worry about complaints by citizens.

Now the Member for Cannington may think that it is more important to shovel out bales of money to foreign contractors than it is to adjust complaints by the people of Saskatchewan who write to the Department and get no answer and who get their Member to write and likewise get no answer. I suggest that Members of this Legislature ought to be the first to admit that they need some help in dealing with the Government on matters of complaints.

I could document a fairly impressive list of complaints that I have made to the various Departments with little or no results. Of course, we have to remember that as Members of the Legislature on this side of the House at least we are unable to ask the Minister to produce his correspondence or to ask the staff of the Department to produce their correspondence, because we can't even get them to produce correspondence here in this Legislature where the rights of the common people ought to be regarded very highly. But in private correspondence, we of course can't ask for full disclosure of the facts that might be in the possession or knowledge of the Department. So far as I am concerned in my dealings with government departments, I would welcome somebody that I can turn these complaints over to and have the facts got at, a report obtained on the basis of the facts and a recommendation which would be made to the Premier by some impartial tribunal.

It strikes me as rather strange that the Government would take the position that this isn't worth the spending of the money. I don't know how much money would be involved, there is some experience in other provinces. Perhaps this might involve an expenditure of \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year and this wouldn't alarm me or worry me at all. It seems to me the people are entitled to this in ordinary justice. I suggest that the people would get a lot more good, Mr. Speaker, out of having some impartial body getting information and facts from the government departments in order to adjust complaints than any good the public will get out of the extra \$100,000 that has been added to the expenditures for next year's publicity.

I'm sure that an Ombudsman would be of more good than a few extra gray-flannel boys emanating from Toronto and putting out, churning out, Liberal propaganda that we are going to get. And that, Mr. Speaker, is going to cost a \$100,000 next year just for the extra, not for the regular diet we've been getting but for the extra. It's going to cost \$100,000. A small fraction of that would provide some useful public service.

March 7, 1967

One Member remarked that the money that is presently being spent on Parliamentary Secretaries might well be better spent on something of this kind. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Government opposite finds all kinds of projects which are less worthy of spending \$30,000 or \$40,000, or \$50,000 than this.

Now, of course the stock answer of the Government is that the CCF were in power for 20 years and I can just see the thought forming in the mind of the Deputy Premier.

**HON. D.G. STEUART:** — I know why you didn't have one.

**MR. WALKER:** — Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this really isn't the answer. The people of Saskatchewan elected the Liberal party on the mistaken assumption that it was going to give better government than the 20 years that we had under the CCF.

If the Liberal party takes the position that it's not obliged to do anything better than was done by the CCF during its 20 years of office, then of course their whole excuse for existing disappears. The people of Saskatchewan will be very quick to recognize that, if the Liberal party always excuses its failure to do something on the grounds that, if we did something, it might show up the CCF and it might make the old CCF Government look less spectacular than it really was, then of course the people of Saskatchewan will quickly see through this and at the first opportunity will correct this slight slip of the hand that occurred in April of 1964.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that Members on this side of the House are better able to judge the need for an Ombudsman than any of the Members elsewhere, because Members on this side of the House have had the full course, they have seen the picture both from inside and outside of the Government. They're able to appreciate the fact that government officials assume that they are omnipotent, that they are incapable of making a mistake. Then they are able to see from the other side that this view is probably the most dangerous thing to be guarded against in our public institutions. So it is better to have made a late conversion than to have made no conversion at all.

My hon. friends opposite, I hope, aren't going to have to go through the experience of being ejected from that side of the House and put over on this side in order to come to this modicum of wisdom.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the thing that really shocks me is that young members of a party that is young in office should take the smug and complacent view that he can do no wrong, that there is no need for anyone to check into our activities to see whether we have injured someone, perhaps inadvertently by administrative malfunction, that the expenditure of money spent on any kind of check-up as to our actions would be a waste of public funds. This kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, is almost equal to that of the Bourbons who were put off the throne in the year 1792. They had ruled one way or another in parts of Europe for several hundred years. This party after only three years in office is subject to this same malaise. I would hope that the Attorney General who has been following this debate with interest — and which we appreciate — would perhaps give this matter a little more consideration before allowing or permitting any more

March 7, 1967

adventurers on that side to make the kind of statement that the Member for Cannington made. I would sincerely hope now that an election is approaching — so the Premier says — that the Liberal party, if for no other reason than to burnish up its image a little bit for this coming election, would lend at least support now to this proposal.

The Liberal party has done a number of strange things in order to create the illusion that it is interested in the consumer and interested in the citizen generally. I would ask that the Attorney General now round this out by acknowledging that perhaps it isn't just some peddler on some back road that the Government should be protecting people against, but that it's the people who tax, who seize and appropriate some \$300,000,000 a year of the taxpayers' money, it's the people who make the rules of the road and make the rules under which we all have to live. This should all be subject to some protective measures. This four-day cooling-off period is a good thing and I'm just sorry that we didn't think of it sooner. I think that it would have been very, very helpful if we had adopted this legislation prior to the last election and put it in The Election Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WALKER:** — Sad to say, we attained wisdom too late on these matters. I would caution the Government to consider this matter now and make some statement which will give us some encouragement and the people of the province some encouragement to believe that the Government is really concerned about protecting the public from inadvertent administrative errors that may be made by their staff. So I would urge the House on both sides to support the motion that was so ably spoken for by the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis).

**HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Hanley always makes some slimy remarks and he's about as slimy . . . You know, I enjoy fishing and I'm reminded by him of a jackfish. He is so slimy you can hardly get him into the boat.

**MR. WALKER:** — Mr. Speaker, if I said anything that was slimy, I'll withdraw it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. BOLDT:** — You know when the Government was elected, the Liberal Government, we had watched the Socialists in action for about 20 years. They liked to have a whole bunch of fellows around them. We called them fuzzy-haired Socialist planners who walked around the country. And the Cabinet Minister — if I came into Regina to see the Attorney General, he was somewhere on his farm, building a farm out at Lumsden. You could never get a hold of him.

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):** — At the expense of the taxpayers.

**HON. D. BOLDT (Rosthern):** — I think I would support the, I can hardly pronounce this word, Ombudsman. The Hon. Member from Hanley is the man for whom we need this type of a person. I remember how he went around this country in 1964 during the by-election in Hanley and talked about how these children were being thrown out in the street from Embury House and there was no protection. He had the monopoly of the radio, of the press and he spread all this false gossip. I want to remind the Socialists of what these fellows do. Here is a man who is always trying to protect these people that are down and out. But you know, I had a letter from the Hon. Member not so long ago, just before I left the Welfare Department. I looked into this case and this is the way he operates. When the Socialists were in power they agreed that a welfare recipient should have some legal aid and they provided for \$25 per case.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — You won't like the story once I'm finished with it. The Socialists in their wisdom provided \$25 legal assistance for the lawyers. So here was this one little girl who got into trouble and of course she went to the lawyer from Hanley. And do you know what he charged? He charged this girl who was on welfare the full tariff.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Yes, Sir! \$200 and yet these people across the way decided that if there was any legal assistance to be given to a welfare recipient they, especially on a deserted case where the husband had left the wife, would provide \$25. In this particular case the girl got into trouble and she sought legal assistance. She could have gotten it within the Department, but the Department people were fair. They said you can get your advice from wherever you want, so she opened up the telephone directory and by gosh, she came upon Mr. Walker. And she surely was sucked in. This gentleman claims that these people should have some protection. There is correspondence in the Welfare Department that will prove that he charged her the full tariff, this little girl.

**HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — I can take it, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a point here with respect to some limit of decency which I doubt is being observed. Is this in any relationship to this Resolution, the details of private business, Sir?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I would say that this would be a proper thing to land in the lap of the Ombudsman, if you had one.

**MR. LLOYD:** — The point I'm making . . . if this lady . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

**MR. LLOYD:** — Has the fact that this could

March 7, 1967

go to an Ombudsman any relationship to whether or not this gentleman is discussing the Resolution before us?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — He is discussing pros and cons, the needs of an Ombudsman in the province of Saskatchewan, whether there should be one or whether there shouldn't. This is my understanding. If I read the Resolution correctly, the Resolution says:

That this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to the setting up of an office of an Ombudsman, whose duties would be to enquire into imputed . . .

**MR. LLOYD:** — Oh, I didn't catch that word the other time.

**MR. SPEAKER:**

. . . cases of alleged administrative injustice within Saskatchewan, to make recommendations to the Government concerning his findings and to report annually to this Legislature.

I think the whole motion hinges on setting up the office of an Ombudsman whose duties would be to enquire into imputed cases of alleged administrative injustice within Saskatchewan. Now does it or does it not fall into the category of alleged administrative injustice? Well, I suggest it was related to the Social Welfare Department and I suggest that this is Government.

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may pursue the question. Is the charge made by a lawyer in the course of his private business related in any respect whatsoever to the administration of justice by the Government?

**MR. BOLDT:** — This is the point that I'm trying to make. I'm quite sure we needed one when you people were the Government but now that we have a government . . .

**MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** — On a point of privilege.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Are you going to make a speech or have I got the floor?

**MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** — On a point of privilege. The Minister has stated, and I take it he has stated it as a fact, that my colleague here charged a girl apparently on public assistance or in some kind of trouble, he mentioned the full tariff, he mentioned \$200. Now, when this kind of a matter is raised, I think in fairness to Members and to respect the privileges of the House and the privileges of all the Members, we should have something more than just the casual word of a Member about a situation like this. Unless the Member is prepared to produce the proof that this happened, I think it had better not be mentioned.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Yes, well, this is the Hon. Member from Hanley. He mentioned that we were busy collecting bundles of money from contractors and insinuated that we did it for political purposes. Now when the shoe is on the other foot you can't take it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1967

**MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Hon. Member apparently doesn't get the idea at all. If I said that the seatmate of the Hon. Member, Mr. Cameron, the Member for Maple Creek, was doing something that was, or appeared to be, improper even, or certainly was improper or inferred that it was improper, I figure I'd have to withdraw that unless I produced the proof that it had happened.

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — On a point of privilege by the Member for Kelsey, I wonder what is his point of privilege. The allegation is against the Member for Hanley as I understand it. I don't know. I raise the question of propriety of whether the Member for Kelsey can rise on a point of personal privilege on behalf of the Member for Hanley and I took it that was the point.

**MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** — I'm not rising on behalf of the Member for Hanley, I'm rising on my own behalf because when the privileges of one Member, of any Member of this Legislature are infringed, that is an infringement on my privileges and a danger to mine and that's why I rise.

**MR. McFARLANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think the point by the Member for Kelsey is well taken because the Member from Hanley who spoke and ran out of his seat had mentioned the fact that people on this side of the House were piling out bundles of cash to their friends, the contractors, and then he is out of the House. Now when the shoe is on the other foot — they're tender-skinned — he beat it out of the House and now they're trying to cover up for him. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the point by the Member for Rosthern is well taken.

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, further to the point of privilege, earlier this afternoon the Government denied access on behalf of the people of this Legislature to a letter which did have to deal with public business. Now, however, another Minister undertakes to quote a letter from the files which has nothing whatsoever to do with the private business at all.

**MR. BOLDT:** — I quoted no letter. I have no letter here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — To begin with it's not for the Speaker to judge or to adjudicate on the veracity of anything that is said by Members in the House in each individual instance. Members stand in their places and say what they have to say on their own responsibility. When the Member speaks of a letter or other correspondence he may or may not have had, he has to do this on his own responsibility and take the responsibility therefore. And if he had the letter he quoted therefor, he would even have had to table it and take the responsibility therefore. Now, what we are getting back to here is the Resolution that is before the House. The Resolution that is before the House everybody can read, and I would think the House would be ready to spend their time debating the Resolution. I would say to the House, also, that quite a lot of our difficulty here stems, I think, from the unfortunate use of personalities and that goes for just about everybody. I would suggest that if we get away

March 7, 1967

from these personalities, we won't get into these kind of problems.

**MR. NOLLET:** — Mr. Speaker, further on the point of privilege as I understand, it . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Now, if the Member has a point of order, let him state it now.

**MR. NOLLET:** — . . . relates to a Member not being in his seat when another Member makes a charge directly against him. In this case he charged that my seatmate (Mr. Walker) had charged someone else \$200. Now he wasn't in his seat to deny or correct it or anything else. Will this House accept this, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — This first duty of a Member to this House is . . . If he isn't in his seat that's his own responsibility.

**MR. NOLLET:** — Mr. Speaker, we all know the Hon. Member left the House to catch a train and when the Hon. Member left his seat, it seems to me that the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) took full advantage of it to make this charge when he could . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — It was the responsibility of a Member to this House to board a train. It now being 5:30, I do leave the chair until 7:30 this day.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Have I got the floor, Mr. Speaker? I'd like the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) to say in because I'll put a charge against him too.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned until 7:30 this day.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Mr. Speaker, when I sat down this afternoon we heard the Member for Hanley criticize the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). I want to assure the Hon. Members that the Member for Cannington is one of the finer, younger Members of this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I want to assure the Members opposite that he will be around when a lot of the people on the other side of the House won't be.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I'm quite sure that he was capable of assessing the situation properly and carefully when he outlined his thinking this afternoon. Some of the things that the Member for Hanley



March 7, 1967

(Mr. Walker) criticized were about the Highway Department where he had written a letter to the Department. He had received an answer but the problem wasn't solved. You know most of the problems that I have in Highways is that the CCF's left that Department in such an awful mess that most of the problems are dated back to 1959, '60, '61, '62, '63, and '64. It would have been very proper under the Socialists to have an Ombudsman. The Socialists describe themselves as the peacemakers, the lover-makers, the do-gooders, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, they are dressed in sheep's clothing and under the clothing they are like wolves.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I mentioned the case this afternoon when the Welfare Department in 1959, in their wisdom, had decided that legal aid would be provided for the destitute to the amount of \$25. In the case I mention, and I don't want to repeat what I said this afternoon, I'm sure that the young girl would have liked to go to an Ombudsman, if one had been available, but the CCFs at that time didn't see fit to have one. Had she gone to someone other than a Socialist lawyer, should would have received fair treatment, I'm sure. I'm only thankful that we haven't got more Socialist lawyers in the province. Not only do I believe that this young girl was entitled to see an Ombudsman, but a social worker as well. Now here is the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) describing what a fine saint he is and what saints the Socialists are. The Hon. Member for Hanley after demanding almost a full tariff from this particular, unfortunate girl and the girl having sought advice from the social worker, he wrote the Department demanding she be dismissed on political grounds. Sure, this is right in the correspondence. This social worker received her degree with distinction from the University of Saskatchewan and received one of the best recommendations from the regional supervisor, yet the man who represents the law, the Hon. Member from Hanley, wanted her dismissed. If we ever needed an Ombudsman, they needed one. I believe an Ombudsman would have been in order in 1944. All the talk about human rights and human dignity, why the Socialists don't know the word nor the meaning. Let me relate to you what happened in 1944 to the ferry-men in my constituency. When the CCFs took over in 1944, when they were elected, everyone that hadn't voted red was fired by the Socialists. Every one of them. You might laugh at this and you talk about human rights and human dignity. Some of these people were of Indian and Metis background. No Bill of Rights or Ombudsman was considered at the time when the Socialists were in office. Why, they replaced the ferry-men with Socialists, and then brought them into the union. When we formed the Government the former dismissed natives wrote me one letter after another. They wanted to be reinstated into their positions. I bent over backwards to try to have these reinstated but this was impossible. The Socialists' Bill of Rights and Ombudsman is nothing but a union. Now when we dismiss a civil servant or cancel an SGIO agent, they point to the Bill of Rights and an Ombudsman. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, if the Socialists ever get re-elected which they won't, there will be no Bill of Rights or Ombudsman until they have paged through their black booklets and dismissed every one of the civil servants who disagrees with their philosophy. I also think that an Ombudsman would have been proper and orderly under the Socialist regime, so that the farmers could have had someone to go to. I'm sorry that the former Minister of Agriculture isn't in his seat to find

March 7, 1967

out why the former Minister of Agriculture received 2,500 acres of Crown land and the Liberal farmers were there just to watch to see these people prosper.

**MR. LLOYD:** — Rubbish.

**MR. BOLDT:** — Rubbish, he admitted it here the other day. It was over 2,500.

**MR. LLOYD:** — But, Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal Government we are free, the individuals are protected, we don't need an Ombudsman.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — We don't have to buy votes with welfare. Nobody is afraid that he'll be cut off because he doesn't believe in our philosophy, that he'll be cut off welfare. We lease Crown lands to the needy regardless of political faith. Why we even sell Crown lands to those people who received Crown lands, (and many of them were Socialists), under the former Government. Now when they speak about the Christian attitude, I would like to quote from a chap that was a CCF at one time and I'm prepared to show this to the Members. I will read from a letter that was written to one of our Mennonite papers. And here is a chap, I will mention afterwards who he is, he is very well acquainted with the Socialist philosophy and he writes like this:

I speak with regret of my political experience and wish to warn others against the same mistake. My association with the so-called democratic, socialist movement led me farther and farther from God until at one time I could defend communism and consider God a myth. Socialists frequently portray themselves as liberators doing only good and when convenient quote scripture. But underneath it, all forms of Socialism are far removed from God. It is true that there are pastors and former pastors in the Socialist party, but their Christianity rates with those that feel that the Bible is not the real word of God and those who claim to be Christian atheists, whatever they mean.

Now listen to this:

When the CCF-NDP bungled up so many things, I decided to leave the party. Soon after I discontinued my active association in the party, I noticed how my attitude towards God had been changing. As I look back, it is evident that Socialism because of its nature destroys that which it would have us believe are its aims. Socialists want the world to believe that they are the most fervent workers for peace but there isn't a Socialist who knows the meaning of peace. They define peace as freedom from war, strife, disorder and undisturbed state of mind and absence from conflict. The Bible goes further to describe peace as living in harmony with God and fellow men. True peace can only come from God. Peace begins in the heart and is reflected in our attitude to others. The attacks on Premier Ross Thatcher are typical of the attitude of Socialists against a former party Member.

**MR. R.H. WOUFF (Turtleford):** — Now I see where we're going.

March 7, 1967

**MR. BOLDT:** — You won't laugh when you hear whose signature it is. Signed by S. Makaroff, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. One of their followers, do you want to see it here, signed by S. Makaroff.

**MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** — On a point of order, it is customary for a person or Member reading from a paper to give not only the name of the person who signed the letter, but the date of the paper and the name of the paper so it can be identified.

**MR. BOLDT:** — The Mennonite Brethren Herald. I received about five issues of this publication dated February 10, 1967, Volume 6, No. 6. I'll table it and if you want to copy it, you can and you can read it to them. Now this is the attitude, this is the experience of one of the Socialists within the party and the name is very familiar to the people opposite. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that you are convinced that I'll not support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a few observations I'd like to make on this motion and I would beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RESOLUTION NO. 2 RE: RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. C.G. Leith (Elrose):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to maintain through appropriate means a liaison with the new Canadian Transport Commission to ensure that the effects of rail abandonment on Saskatchewan communities are minimized, and that the transportation network that evolves will meet the long-term requirements of Saskatchewan's changing and expanding economy; and to make available the services of such provincial government agencies as the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Highways to attempt to provide adequate alternative transportation and communication facilities to local communities that lose rail service.

**MR. R.H. WOOFF (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, there is probably no more urgent problem for the Legislatures of this nation and this Province and particularly at this session than this matter of rail line abandonment. It can affect our economy very greatly. The measures that we intend to take to reduce the proposed mileage to be abandoned by the railway companies or to assist in replacing railway services by alternative or substitute means of transportation is one of the very, very important problems of the day. I would like to indulge your patience, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments as I endeavor to set the stage for my discussion on the Resolution. The profit and loss, the balance sheets of the railway companies, important though they may be, are not necessarily for that reason and for that reason alone the only criterion by which we

March 7, 1967

judge the importance of railway service. The good or ill, the progress or otherwise, the success or failure of the economy of the nation or the Province depends or can depend upon this service. While I was in Britain a year ago, I saw that country battling with the same problem, the same difficulty that we are facing here. Truly the problem over there was not of the same magnitude as our own and just as truly it may not have been of the same importance in a country served by so many highways and good roads and only about the same size as our own Province. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I was struck by some of the statements issued in the White Paper dealing with the rail line abandonment problem in Britain and I would just like to quote some of those statements to you.

The first principle is that transport resources, railway lines in particular should be maintained or improved to meet the broad social needs. Commercial viability is important but secondary. And secondly and as a corollary, socially desirable but unprofitable services will receive an open and continuing subsidy.

This is the approach that is being taken towards this same difficult, yet important problem in Britain.

These statements, Mr. Speaker, emphasize the fact that to have abandoned any line purely on the balance sheet basis may not be sound economics either for the nation or the Province as a whole. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, faces a line loss in the unprotected areas equal to both our sister prairie provinces put together. Saskatchewan is a province that ships in and uses more agricultural machinery than probably any like area in the world. And Saskatchewan by its very location is faced with long hauls, whether it be exporting or importing. Rail line distances from our ports and our industrial centres in the prairie provinces are great regardless of what direction you come from. We are indeed a land-locked area. Saskatchewan cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to have its basic industry, agriculture, and livestock producers, to say nothing of its retail and consuming public, become captive shippers. And by that we mean those who are faced with high rates and no alternative or competitive transportation facilities for these long hauls. Yet, Mr. Speaker, neither the Premier or the Minister of Agriculture or any Member or group of Members of the Cabinet made any representation to the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications on this vital and urgent issue. I repeat again that this Government made no representation on behalf of one of the provinces that stands to lose the most, and that is Saskatchewan. I would just like to read a short paragraph or two out of the brief that was presented, the only one that was presented to this Committee on behalf of Saskatchewan agriculture by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lloyd. And the opening paragraph which I would like to quote to you at this time is:

No province in Canada is more actually aware of the need for an efficient and rational transportation system than Saskatchewan. No Province is more vulnerable to its lack. Saskatchewan is a landlocked Province distant from both markets and major suppliers. A transportation system is indeed Saskatchewan's economic light.

I would like to quote one other paragraph:

Finally there is the fact of monopoly, at least on the

prairies. In an industry in which the public interest is paramount, Canadians have recognized the need for public control of rates in similar situations, for example, the Bell Telephone Company. We submit that where monopoly exists the need for overriding public control of rates is no less in the field of transportation than it is in communication.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Government sent legal counsel to represent it before the Committee. However, I also have on my desk the proceedings of the Committee on Transportation and Communication for November 24, 1966. In this Report of proceedings it is pointed out on more than one occasion and emphatically that Saskatchewan's Premier, though informed of the Committee sitting, though personally invited, had at that time failed to make any appearance though the Committee had been sitting for three months. There are several references as I said, Mr. Speaker, to the lack of representation or apparent interest on the part of this Government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, while discussing the absence of such supposedly important people as the Premier, the Hon. Minister, Mr. Pickersgill when questioned by some Members of the Committee had this to say:

If I were a businessman and I thought my interests were at stake, I would hire the best lawyer I could find and be down here to see that protection should not be taken away unless something equally good should be put in its place.

That, Mr. Speaker, I submit this Government has not done.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — We had the best one we could hire.

**MR. WOUFF:** — In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Government's lack of action is little more than abandonment of agriculture by this reactionary Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. WOUFF:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to the Resolution itself. From the very first time that I read the Resolution I considered it a masterpiece of evasion, something that had not been written without a great deal of deliberation and consideration.

I would just like to consider it a sentence at a time and I read:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to maintain through appropriate means.

Now just imagine if you can, what appropriate means really conveys when you give it serious consideration. Just what is meant by appropriate means? I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is anybody's guess. Certainly one function is to let the Government out of any binding commitment. I go on to the next part of the Resolution:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to maintain through appropriate means a liaison with the new Transport Commission to ensure that the effects of rail abandonment in Saskatchewan communities are minimized.

March 7, 1967

What does it mean when it says, minimize? What kind of a standard or what kind of a commitment has this Government made? By and large it is one of those meaningless phrases that can be picked out of thin air which roll easily and smoothly off the tongue without one feature that commits the Government to real assistance in this great problem. Again it certainly keeps the Government out of involvement. The Resolution goes on to suggest something about the Government making available the services of such Provincial Government agencies as the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Highways. Once again, Mr. Speaker, just what does the Government mean by reference to the services? Do they mean merely in an advisory capacity? There's certainly no commitment to any material help or assistance either in fighting the case, or assistance by these Departments in bringing about an alternative transportation system. And then finally at the end comes the one that really puts the cap on this sorry list of make believe, where it says,

Services of such Provincial Government agencies as the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Highways to attempt to provide alternative and transportation facilities to local communities that lose the rail service.

Attempt! What a weak meaningless phrase. The most ineffectual effort is an attempt. What promise of any worthwhile assistance have we in such committal jargon? Such a statement was made for one purpose only, to keep the Government out of any financial commitments on behalf of those about to lose their railway service.

I also have here a statement that was made by the Premier last Thursday. I think it's a little ironic as well as amusing to read the statement following the Resolution. The statement read to the House by the Premier, when you analyse it, is about as meaningless, about as evasive as the Resolution itself. I don't think I am going to deal with it at length. It was an attempt to use a great many words and say as little as possible but above all to keep the Thatcher Government clear of any definite commitment. First there is no committee set up, and secondly, if there was, just what is wrapped up in the meaningless phrases about liaison and criterion I wouldn't know. I'm referring to what the Premier said in one of the closing paragraphs of this statement. There is nothing in either the Premier's statement or the Resolution which guarantees the people in any community any assistance in presenting their case before the Committee. There is nothing in the Resolution which says that rail line abandonment should be on an area basis rather than line by line abandonment. There is nothing which asks that the Federal Government take some responsibility in helping to replace transportation systems or alternative transportation systems where rail lines have been abandoned. I am going to propose an amendment to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I feel is much more meaningful to the Province in areas where they are facing line abandonment. I move, that the motion be amended by inserting the following words after the word 'ensure' in the third line:

that public hearings are held on all rail abandonment applications and that such applications are decided on the basis of all relevant economic and social factors and;

That the motion be further amended by inserting the following

words after the word 'economy' in the sixth line:

by measures such as the retention of the Crow's Nest Pass rates on grain.

And that the motion be further amended by deleting all words after the word 'of' where it first appears in the seventh line and substituting the following therefor:

the Provincial Government in assisting communities with presentations to the Commission; in providing adequate alternative transportation and communication facilities and in obtaining Federal assistance for communities that lose rail service.

Mr. Speaker, I move this amendment, seconded by Mr. H.A. Broten, Hon. Member for Watrous.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The debate continues on the amendment.

**MR. H.A. BROTEN (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take part in speaking on this motion and the amendment. This rail line abandonment process is a frightening move for the farmers and town people in Saskatchewan. I emphatically declare that we must emphasize the procedure which would call for public hearings on any line which railways think should be abandoned. May I say here, Mr. Speaker, that when any of these lines are torn up, many farm families will be uprooted also. The least that can be expected is that they and their representatives be heard through public hearings. Most of the farm families so affected have spent their lives in a certain isolation, and because of the severe cost price squeeze, it takes just a little shove to shove them off the farms. Or if they live in a small town their businesses may disappear entirely. The Government should be heavily scored for not entering this in the Resolution in the first place. By leaving out this important section and the other part to the amendment, it would appear that the Liberals in this province are not willing to be counted on in getting rid of the rail question. The Liberals take it for granted that there should be a wholesale taking-up of rails. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House fight this laissez-faire type of thinking. Let me quote from what Mr. Lloyd had to say before the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communication. I think it is important that we put into the records of the House what the Member for Biggar had to say before the Committee, why I think hearings are vital in this whole battle of rail line abandonment, and why this House should accept this amendment. I quote the Leader of the Opposition's presentation to the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications on Tuesday, November 22, 1966.

In Canada, transportation accounts for a greater share of the gross national product than in any other country. It has in its own right an important part of our economy. But more than that it is a particularly vital instrument of development, a key tool in promoting Canadian growth and the welfare of the Canadian people.

I may say that we are not unmindful of the contribution of other modes of travel but we have restricted ourselves

March 7, 1967

on these comments almost entirely to railways. When Saskatchewan, because of our need to move volume production by rail to distant markets and ports of export and because of our need to bring in much production equipment, we are acutely conscious of the need for an efficient and rational transportation system. We are particularly concerned then with any change that may add further disadvantages to those imposed by geography. One principal concern is that the proposed approach to the setting of freight rates may be detrimental to the people of Saskatchewan. A second is that the proposed procedures respecting rail line abandonment may not ensure an adequate weighing of many social and economic factors which are not directly related to the balance sheet of the railways.

And he goes on to say:

I would be more confident about Bill C231 if it more clearly established the concept that a transportation system should be built, maintained and improved to meet broad social and economic needs. Commercial viability - the profit and loss accounts of the owners — is of importance but it is secondary. The effect on the balance sheet of the whole nation may be different from the effect of that of a railway corporation.

Thus transportation services cannot properly be considered within the limits of a single corporation or group of corporations. They cannot be judged on economic factors alone. Transportation services must be shaped to meet the legitimate needs and aspirations of people in the broad regions of a vast country. It is here that action and control by the Government of Canada is essential.

Mr. Speaker, this abandonment question is having important and far reaching consequences. What is the criterion or reason for guaranteeing the lines until 1975? I quote further from the Standing Committee's brief presented by the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd). I believe we have, in the Hon. Member for Biggar, one who has an outstanding grasp of the whole situation on which he has spent considerable time, one who understands the need for Canada, Saskatchewan and the farmers in particular, of a good sound transportation policy. He pointed out that a factor of considerable importance in current consideration is the Federal Government's statement of policy issued on September 12, 1966. This established the rail network in the prairie provinces which the railways will not be permitted to abandon prior to January 1, 1975. In many respects this announcement has been welcomed.

It did provide assurance of continued operation for a limited period at least, of some lines where abandonment applications had been filed.

However, there are some aspects of this policy statement which require further examination.

In particular we recommend first that considering the obligation placed on the proposed Commission to conduct regional studies of rail transportation needs, the scope of the Commission's authority to alter the Government's guaranteed prairie rail network needs to be clarified; second, that the basis for applying the measurement of 50,000 bushels of grain per mile and to



determining which lines were guaranteed be made public. He is mindful of the fact here that some lines on which the figure was less than 50,000 bushels of grain per mile were indeed protected, but at the same time there were other lines on which at some time the figure of 50,000 bushels is exceeded which have been left unprotected. Thirdly, we recommend that if the above measurement is to be applied, consideration be given to the evidence that the long-term trend in grain shipments is moving upwards. One obvious effect of rail line abandonment is to increase the distance of many farmers from markets and this added distance, in some cases 25 or 30 miles, is a possible secondary effect. For instance the abandonment of the Canadian National railway, Aberdeen to Melfort line, which is not protected will be detrimental to shipments via the Hudson Bay route to the Port of Churchill. Grain rates through Churchill along this line are two and three cents per hundred less than to the Lakehead. He noted that in the Manitoba brief they have expressed other concern about the overall control of Churchill rates. He urged railway planning which will encourage and not handicap the use of the Hudson Bay route. Bill C231 provides for procedures prior to the rail line abandonment. It established the principle that the criteria for abandonment shall be indeed more than a financial consideration of the railways.

One can readily see that hearings have to be held in order to be scrupulously fair to the people involved. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should have problems with the idea of emphasizing the need and reminder in the amendment related to the Crow's Nest rates. I won't say anything on that except that the Crow's Nest rates are essential to the well-being of western Canada. On the last part of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, where we are asking the Provincial Government to assist communities in representations either to resist rail line abandonment in their communities or to provide compensation for the loss, I would say, Sir, it is a reasonable request that the Provincial Government give assistance in presentations. Mr. Speaker, I would say here and now that I am against all rail line abandonment because we are indeed a young country and we have seen such an increase in productivity and enterprise in general in the last 10 years, hence I don't think at this time we can readily say that this line should go and that one stay. Further, in my area of the province, the potash railway business will be as much as, or more than, the grain hauling business, therefore sufficient income will be found to cover any losses incurred in grain hauling or other transportation needs. Mr. Speaker, I fear the Liberal Government has not taken the proper lead in the area of rail line abandonment. They should be willing, able and ready to help communities to protect themselves and I say, Sir, they have not seen fit to do this. Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health):** — My name would indicate that I come from Scottish ancestry, but I do have an ounce of Irish in me on my mother's side. I'm afraid some of the statements made by Hon. Members for the Opposition tonight have aroused that Irish. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition made quite a show of his presence in Ottawa at the Transportation Committee hearing, as though we had not been present. He ignored the fact that I attended all other meetings called in Ottawa, had personal meetings with the Hon. Mr. Pickersgill. Then he turned up for one meeting and criticized

March 7, 1967

this Government for not being present on that particular occasion. We were represented, Mr. Speaker, by one of the leading legal authorities on transportation, namely, Mr. Gordon Blair of Ottawa.

The Hon. Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) said that no committee had been named to look after the welfare of any community that might be faced with rail line abandonment. I don't know where he was when the Premier announced the formation of a committee the other day consisting of the Hon. J.C. McIsaac and representatives from SARM and SUMA. Also on the committee will be transportation and road officials as well.

I think the final statement from the Hon. Member from Watrous (Mr. Broten) was the one to cap it all, when without any qualifications or explanation, he merely wound up his remarks by saying that he is against all rail line abandonment. Well, he would be a fine one to have on the committee because he has already made up his mind before he even hears representation. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment but will support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. W.S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):** — I am interested in the comments of the Minister who has just taken his seat, the Member from Regina South (Mr. Grant) and who has been the Minister, I understand, that is responsible for speaking on behalf of the Government and directing Government studies in respect to this problem.

After having listened to him, I must say that I agree with him that the Government was wise in selecting a lawyer to present the case rather than allowing him to do it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Well now I certainly have no quarrel, nor does anyone of this side of the House, with the skill, or the knowledge, or the ability of Mr. Gordon Blair who was the lawyer used by the Government on this occasion and, as has been said, was the lawyer used by our Government also on occasion. Certainly the subject is a very technical one. The services of a learned person in the form of a lawyer would be most useful and most essential in drawing up and presenting a brief of this kind.

I submit, Sir, that the arguments that were presented and the discussion which took place would have been considerably strengthened by the presence there of a Cabinet Minister of the Government that sits opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — This surely could have been expected to have some influence with the Committee of the House of Commons that was examining this matter. These gentlemen who examined the matter were not technical experts. They were members of a deliberative body such as we are ourselves.

Now again I want to say that I for one regret the fact that the Government did not have one of the members of the Cabinet

March 7, 1967

present to add, even if nothing more than the moral weight of presence there, to the effect of the representations made.

I am not going to argue whether it was good, bad or indifferent, that the other provinces weren't so represented, but I would draw to the attention of the gentlemen who sit opposite the fact that this is a much more important problem for Saskatchewan than it is for the other western provinces.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — I would draw attention to the fact that the Province of Manitoba, which my friend from Regina South (Mr. Grant), who just sat down, didn't mention, while being represented by a lawyer was also represented at those hearings by a senior member of the Cabinet of the Government of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was further interested in the statements of the Minister that he would not support the amendment but would support the main Resolution. I would hope that he would reconsider that statement. I would hope that, simply because the amendment came from this side of the House, he wouldn't feel it was therefore essential for him to oppose it.

The Resolution as it was presented by the Hon. Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) was in itself a good Resolution. The amendment which has been offered takes nothing away from that Resolution but the amendment I submit, adds something very vital to that Resolution. Consequently as I say, I hope the Member who has taken his seat, wasn't speaking for all the Members of the group that sit opposite, and I hope that he himself may take some time to consider or reconsider the position which he has just announced.

Let me draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, the effective clauses of this amendment and let me in doing so urge upon the House how important it is that the Government do something in line with the urging of these particular clauses.

The amendment first of all asks that this agency, which it has proposed be set up, make certain that public hearings are held on all rail abandonment applications and that such applications are decided on the basis of all relevant economic and social factors. It goes on to urge that we re-endorse the historic and important economic position in Saskatchewan with respect to the Crow's Nest Pass rates on grain. And finally it urges that the Provincial Government assist communities who are threatened with abandonment and are appearing at these public hearings. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it urges the provincial Government to make a commitment to these communities from which rail lines will be removed in order that there may be adequate alternatives provided. It expresses the hope that the Provincial Government will urge the Federal Government to assist these communities in providing these alternative services.

This is what the Minister of Health (and the Minister of Industry) proposed he won't support, the specific statement that there will be hearings before abandonment. He is not going to support that applications should be decided on the basis of all relevant economic and social factors. He is not going to support a strong position which is urged here with respect to retention of the Crow's Nest Pass rates on grain. He is not going to support the Provincial Government committing itself to

March 7, 1967

assisting communities in preparing to make a statement when they come face to face with the Canadian Pacific or Canadian National Railway. He is not going to support a commitment on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan that if rail lines are abandoned then this Government or whatever Government sits here will help them provide the necessary alternatives. He is not going to support the idea the Provincial Government ought to say to the Government of Canada, if these rail lines are abandoned, then the Government of Canada should consider providing some compensation in providing those alternatives.

Frankly I am surprised the ready, quick, easy way in which the Minister rejected the whole amendment. I shouldn't be surprised and neither should anyone else, because this is typical of the way in which the Government has handled this complete issue.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — In just a matter of two minutes he decided that he is not going to support any of these matters. Mr. Speaker, I say again nobody should be surprised because it is with this same casual air, this same lack of concern about important matters that the Government has treated this entire issue of the changes in rail legislation and the very considerable consequences which this can have on the economy, communities, on the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Let me take just a few minutes to outline to some extent how serious this is, with respect to the one aspect only, namely rail line abandonment.

It is true that as a result of some assurances from the Federal Government it seems that some of the lines originally proposed for abandonment will have some protection until 1975. But I ask the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, to consider the form of that assurance. This assurance is not part of any statute although there is a statute which gives the Government an opportunity to move in this way. But there is no statute saying that these will be protected until 1975. There is no regulation saying that these lines are going to be protected until 1975. There is no Federal Order-in-Council saying that these lines are going to be protected until 1975. All we have is a policy statement, issued in public and put into the newspaper by the Government, that certain lines are going to be protected until 1975. This in the first instance, Mr. Speaker, is not good enough. 1975 is coming at us pretty quickly. It is only a matter of seven or eight years more and this is not too long to prepare for what may well be the uprooting of almost entire communities, the redirection of a great many services over a considerable part of Saskatchewan. We can't afford to sit and wait without more assurance than we have.

What this means of course is that there are a number of rail lines which are without protection whatsoever. Now, tomorrow, next week, next month, we simply don't know when the railways may decide to make use of the power which they have, to apply for abandonment of these lines.

Let's take a minute to look at the picture of what the

March 7, 1967

abandonment as applied for by the railway companies can mean in parts of Saskatchewan. I would like my friend from Elrose (Mr. Leith) and my friend from Kindersley (Mr. Howes) to take a look at the — Don't object to me calling you a friend — situation in that part of the province, because if the total applications . . .

**MR. W.S. HOWES (Kerrobot-Kindersley):** — May I ask the Hon. Member a question?

**MR. LLOYD:** — Yes, indeed.

**MR. HOWES:** — What rail lines are up for abandonment between now and 1975 in my seat, please?

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member was as active above his jaws as he is with his jaws, he might not have asked that question whatsoever.

**MR. HOWES:** — You cheap . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . and look the other way.

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, if that was a reflection on personalities may I say there are a hundred times a day in this Legislature more strident ones than that made.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. LLOYD:** — Mr. Speaker, may I go on? The Member from Kindersley (Mr. Howes) whom I think I know reasonably well and am on reasonably good terms with, was looking me straight in the eye with what I thought to be his accustomed grin when he made the remark. I made my reply in that same spirit and it certainly wasn't meant to be a personal reflection. I don't think he took it as a personal slight or reflection on him whatsoever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I go on? The Member has asked what rail lines in his area are to be abandoned before 1975. What I was talking about was the total picture. I have said that if one looks at those which are not protected and then one looks at those for which applications have been made but remain protected only until 1975, then this is what the situation would be. If one takes these two groups of lines together then there wouldn't be any line between the Goose Lake line and the Empress line in that entire area left operating. If one goes north you could go from the Goose Lake line to the main line of the CNR which runs through Biggar to Edmonton and the only line left there would be the major line running through Kerrobot.

This is what we must contemplate as possible. Some of these are protected until 1975, but we have no assurance of protection after 1975. I submit to my friend from Kindersley (Mr. Howes) that we can't wait until it starts to rain before we start to fix

March 7, 1967

the roof. If we do, then this Province is going to be soaked and some it drowned because of this denuding of railways, if we don't get action on it now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:** — It is because there is so little time in terms of this big problem that I urge the Government to stiffen its position with respect to this very serious problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I go on as to the effect in some areas which aren't in the fortunate position of the areas that I referred to just now. Let me, for example, refer to some areas in my own constituency. I draw attention to a line which presently operates from approximately Asquith to Baljennie. I draw attention to the line which operates from the town of Biggar to North Battleford. I draw attention to the line which operates roughly from Perdue running in a southwesterly direction down toward Rosetown. These are without any protection whatsoever.

Let me say to this House, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs who is about to take over as Chairman of the Committee, the people in many of these areas are worried. They are greatly concerned. Some of them talk about selling businesses, others don't know whether to expand their farm operations. There is a concern which is difficult to appreciate unless one really goes out there and talks and meets with the people. And if you take a look at the map you can see the reason for this concern. In many cases, as I have said before in this House, twice this year, Mr. Speaker, people are going to be hauling grain 30 and 35 miles further when these lines are abandoned.

Let's take a look at which this going to mean for the farmer to being with. It's going to mean many new trucks will have to be purchased. It's going to mean larger trucks will have to be purchased. It's going to mean more miles and more hours covering more miles of road. All of these add to the cost of production.

As my friend from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) so very well pointed out, this is going to mean forcing more small farmers off their land. This is going to speed up the migration out of agriculture. This is going to make still more farms uneconomic. These are some of the costs that should be taken into consideration when the whole matter of abandonment is being decided.

And these, Mr. Speaker, are not costs which communities can figure by themselves. You know back in 1963 we did some research as to what these costs might amount to. We studied some 24 sub-divisions in which applications for abandonment had been made. Some 3,000 farmers supplied the information. It was discovered that the increase in the cost of hauling grain was something over 300 per cent according to the farmer's calculations. It was discovered that there was estimated loss in market value of land of \$1,600 per farmer. It was discovered that there was an estimated loss in the assessed value of land and that was \$530 per farmer.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of research has been discontinued by the Government opposite. The Government has

also discontinued the assistance which communities need if they are going to study their own problems.

Let's get a look at the picture. There is going to be a hearing. Here we are going to have the Canadian Pacific Railway and here we are going to have people settled around a small community and the small urban community that is the centre. These are pretty unequal advocates, Mr. Speaker. These people deserve some help in getting their case ready. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this Resolution calls for.

May I again urge the Members who sit opposite, I urge the Minister of Industry, the Member from Regina South (Mr. Grant) to reconsider the position which he took too quickly and too easily and without any consideration of what the amendment says. And in particular I hope that the Members of the Government will support this Resolution which is important because it asks for three things.

It asks the Government to help communities in preparing their case when they have to argue whether or not the railway line is going to be abandoned in that community. Secondly, it asks the Government to make a commitment to those communities from which rail lines are removed in order that they may be better equipped to provide the alternative roads and bridges which are needed. And thirdly, it asks the Government to urge the Federal Government to take some share as the legislation provides it can in helping to pay the cost of these alternatives.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members who sit opposite will join us in making this kind of a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan and making this kind of a request to the Government of Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be very brief tonight. But it appears to me from the outset that this whole process is just one of trying to evade the original motion as placed on the Order Paper some days ago. Because something has been done by the Government, the Opposition is trying to leave the impression with the people of the province that nothing has been done and is trying to bring in an amendment to the original amendment to try and get some political credit for this type of manoeuvre.

After the outburst of the Leader of the Opposition, I think there are one or two things that I would like to draw to his attention. I suggest to him that I represent an area of the province where we have had experience with rail line abandonment. A rail line abandonment, not under a Liberal Government, not under a Provincial Conservative Government, but under a Government headed by him or his predecessor and a Diefenbaker Government at Ottawa.

I just want to remind him of the lack of facilities that he provided to the people in that area at the time this line was up for abandonment. I attended some of these rail line abandonment meetings and I never saw one Provincial CCF Cabinet Minister at any of those meetings. I have still to this day, Mr. Speaker, to see any evidence of any degree of intense interest taken by them as a government at that time.

March 7, 1967

And what happened? With no precautionary measures, practically no help to the people in that area, the Wolseley-Reston line was abandoned from Wolseley right through to Manitoba. But what has happened since then? He is asking us in his amendment as the Government of the day, to provide services for the farmers, provide them with roads and provide amenities for the people who live in those towns. Well from the day that line was abandoned till the day he left the Government, it had never made a single move to give this type of amenities to the people in that area of the province. Since that day, Mr. Speaker, those people have got oiled roads and an oiled highway right from the Trans-Canada Highway from Regina practically to the Manitoba border. Those towns now have sewer and water installed in many of them within the last two or three years. Those towns have hard-surface streets and those towns have had the hospitals preserved, all these done by the Government who sits on this side of the House, not done by the people on the other side of the House who pretend to protect these small towns.

Mr. Speaker, as a Minister of the Government on this side of the House, I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan, if and when any of these lines should be abandoned, will get far more protection, far more services under this type of a government than they would under the former Government.

Now I want to give you some indication of some of the things that led up to the Act we have in Ottawa at the present time. When we formed the Government we set up a Cabinet Committee and on that Cabinet Committee was the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Municipal Affairs along with a few others. At that time you will remember that Bill No. C120 was before the Federal House and there were a lot of inequities in that Bill. Because of some of the information that farmer groups had done on behalf of the people of the province, we could use this as evidence and we sat down with some of the farmer organizations in this province. I can remember sitting down with them myself, and suggesting to the farm organization that we would go along with them in representations to the Federal Government, asking that some of the inequities be taken out of the former Bill. This was done. The three western provinces provided a united front and because of that action that Bill was abandoned. We now have a new Bill before the Federal House giving more consideration to the interests of western Canada.

Now the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) said he didn't think anything was being done. He said that no committee had been set up. Of course he said this, because this was one means where he was going to pave the way to this type of amendment he wanted to bring in here this evening.

But I would suggest to the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) and to the Member from Watrous (Mr. Broten) that, if they would read their newspapers more and if they would listen to some of the announcements that are made in this House, there would be no reason for bringing in the type of suggestions they did here tonight.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is designed for no other reason than to try to distract the attention of the people of this province from the original Resolution which in effect provides all the services that they are requesting and which was brought in by the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith). For the Leader of the Opposition to get up and say that if the Member



for Regina South (Mr. Grant) doesn't vote for this amendment, he's voting against all these services that are being provided in the original motion.

And I want to indicate to you that he says all the words after "of" in the seventh line be struck out. Now what are we providing after the word "of" in the seventh line? Such Provincial Government Agencies as the Department of Municipal Affairs and on this committee we have a representative from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities acting in the interest of all the municipalities in the province. That man can surely speak for the interests of rural Saskatchewan, plus all the services of the Department of Municipal Affairs. He wants this struck out. Then he says he wants the services that will be rendered by the Department of Highways all struck out, so they wouldn't have the opportunity to determine where the service roads or the servicing highways should be provided to help the people who may have a part of their rail lines abandoned. All this would be struck out. Likewise adequate alternative transportation and communication facilities to local communities that lose rail services should this event take place. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that all that is intended in this Resolution — and it was quite obvious by the remarks of the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), the Member for Watrous (Mr. Broten), and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) — is just a designed white-wash job to try to indicate to the people of the province that they should have some credit for the services the Government on this side of the House has provided in the last week and over the past three years.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion, as the amendment is just a white-wash job. I want the people of the province to realize that. I intend to vote against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, I'm very interested in the question that is before us in this Resolution. My prime interest is that a good Resolution be passed by this House without division because this is a very serious problem affecting the Province of Saskatchewan. In this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for us to discuss any problem without introducing some political shades. As a matter of fact, I haven't really seen a Member on either side of the House that has been able to do that. Not only can we introduce political angles on practically all questions that we introduce, but we find it very easy to get hot and sometimes angry. I get hot about things myself once in a while, and I get angry at Members once in a while even, Mr. Speaker, I confess I get angry at you once in a while and I know I shouldn't.

Now, I think when we boil this down even to pure political consideration, it's in the political interest of every Member in this House to vote for the amendment. Read it over carefully, see the things there. Hesitate before you vote against them. Now, I think what we need after the warm discussion we've had on it today, is a little time for everybody to look it over carefully. It will be printed in the Votes and Proceedings tomorrow. The people will be able to see for sure what it means and to study it in the interest of getting the good things in the amendment adopted and the good in the Resolution adopted without division in this House. I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 4 RE: NEW TRANS-CANADA PIPELINE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Link (Saskatoon City):

That this Assembly, believing that it is not in the interests of the people of Canada to have any part of the proposed new Trans-Canada pipeline constructed outside of the territory of Canada, request the Federal Government to act so that the whole of the pipeline is located within Canada.

**MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on this particular Resolution. Personally I find it almost unbelievable that the Government of Canada could make such an inexcusable and disgraceful about-face on a matter so crucial to the well-being of all Canadians. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this kind of approach to one of our country's great natural resources and the transmission of that natural resource to market may well deal a blow to the continuance of Canada itself as a national entity. How any government could logically turn down the request for utilization of an alternative U.S. route on the grounds it would not be in the interest of national policy, on August the 25th, and reverse its stand on October the 6th, some five weeks later is almost beyond belief.

One may well ask, Mr. Speaker, what factors caused the reversal of the decision. The Government says it reversed the stand because of an undertaking by Trans-Canada Pipelines to transport more than 50 per cent of the volume of gas required in eastern Canada through its mainline transversing northern Ontario and that by the year 1976, 60 per cent would be transported through northern Ontario and that the long range objective should be to transport at least 65 per cent of the volume of eastern gas through northern Ontario facilities. Further it states that Trans-Canada would enter into an agreement to ensure that the company would never dispose of its interest in the Great Lakes Transmission Company which is the company proposed to construct the line south of the Great Lakes through the Michigan area. They would never dispose of its interest in the Great Lakes Transmission Company unless it secured the approval of the Canadian Government.

However, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that one of the main reasons the Federal Government gave when it initially turned down the Trans-Canada Pipeline application was because the 36-inch line proposed for construction south of the Great Lakes in American territory would in fact replace the 30-inch line as the main line. The Federal Government now says in reversing its decision, that the 30-inch line in Canada, it has been assured, will remain the main line. Mr. Speaker, this is merely an exercise in credulity. It is complete fiction to say that the 30-inch line is the major line when the 36-inch line proposed will have a 44 per cent greater carrying capacity than the 30-inch line. The law itself currently requires the main line or lines shall be located entirely within Canada. Mr. Speaker, is the company name now going to be changed from Trans-Canada Pipelines to Trans-Canada via U.S.A. Pipelines?

Mr. Speaker, critics of an all-Canadian line contend that it would be cheaper and faster to build the line south of the Great Lakes in American territory. They contend it will result

March 7, 1967

in a \$75,000,000 saving in distribution costs over a 10-year period. However, the National Energy Board of Canada contends that the all-Canadian route would within the same 10-year period create an income to Canada of \$700,000,000. To recap it, Mr. Speaker, the advantages of the proposed U.S. route as outlined by those who support this route may be easily summed up.

1. They contend the construction costs would be lower. 2. They contend that the line would be constructed more quickly. 3. They contend that the export of gas to the United States would be facilitated. 4. They contend that the financing of the project could be more easily arranged. 5. They contend that there would be safety and protection of continuous service which would be of more advantage in the location south of the Great Lakes than if it occurred north of the Great Lakes in Ontario.

One, I would think, Mr. Speaker, should recap the disadvantages. They may be summarized as follows: 1. The initial economic loss to Canada of the expenditure on wages and materials would be a very large one. I don't think anyone would argue against that particular point. 2. Our country, Canada, would lose the economic values inherent in operation and maintenance of that line for all time to come. 3. Canada would lose the personal and corporate taxes on construction, operation and maintenance. 4. Canada would not collect the 50 per cent corporation taxes on that profitable proportion of the operation lying in American territory. 5. Canada would have only partial control over one of its own tremendously important natural resources, natural gas. 6. There would not be assurance of completely adequate supplies of natural gas fuels for the potential development of mining ventures in the pre-Cambrian shield area, north of the Great Lakes. This is not only vitally important to Ontario and northern Ontario particularly but is of vital importance to all of Canada. 7. It is vitally important to the whole concept of Canadianism and the actual continuance of Canada as a sovereign entity that we control the means whereby our industrial development is shaped. The Canadian motto, Mr. Speaker, from Sea to Sea, does not contain a postscript which reads "except when it isn't convenient".

Canada, by the construction of an extension of Trans-Canada Pipelines outside of its own territorial boundaries would lose the economic impetus which would naturally flow from the huge capital expenditures in wages and materials during the period of construction. We would lose the benefits inherent in the maintenance and operation of the line, not just for a year, not just for 10 years, but for all time to come, and in any event, Mr. Speaker, as long as the natural gas supply lasts.

The economic facts must be logically faced, Mr. Speaker. However, we should not lose sight of the intangibles either. They are important too.

Supporters of the proposed American route contend there is an immediate financial advantage in cheaper construction costs. There has already been a year's delay and there is little doubt there will be considerable additional delay as hearings have now been called by the Federal Power Commission in the United States. Construction costs are rapidly rising because of strong inflationary tendencies. The additional costs related to the project and the delay, could well equal the amount the applicant claimed initially it could save by using the U.S. route.

March 7, 1967

Mr. Speaker, this is our Centennial Year. When are we going to stand up for Canada and the implicit obligations which go along with being an independent sovereign nation?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Let us not err once again in selling out our resources and yes, Mr. Speaker, even our self-respect. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of this Assembly seriously consider the implications of this Resolution and strongly support the Resolution in order that we may succeed in convincing the Government of Canada that it should again reverse its stand and insist on an all-Canadian route for this vitally important national project.

**HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I think we should take a honest and a hard look at this Resolution and this proposed pipeline, as Canadians, before we vote on it. The pipeline would go from Alberta through Saskatchewan and through Manitoba and down to the United States, then looped on up into the Windsor area into the markets of Ontario and the markets of Quebec. Trans-Canada Pipeline would bring natural gas from Alberta to the border of Manitoba then down through the United States and then join up, if they are successful, with the American Natural Gas Company, a large transporter and distributor of gas in the mid-western United States for the construction of some 989 miles of 36-inch diameter of pipeline. This will go from Emerson on the border south of Winnipeg to Sault Ste. Marie and on to Sarnia. The proposed new U.S. company that will construct and operate this pipeline will be called the Great Lakes Transmission Company. Trans-Canada Pipeline Corporation will participate actively with the Great Lakes Company to have equal ownership of stock, a 50 per cent representation of the Board of Directors and an agreement to nominate the Chief Executive Officer. This was all presented at the time of the hearing. It was also stated that approximately 90 per cent of the gas through the Great Lake line taken from western Canadian fields, will be delivered to the markets in eastern Canada. The balance of 10 per cent will be sold in the U.S. middle west. And the surplus from these export sales will go to reduce the cost of gas in Canada's eastern provinces. Additional future sales to the U.S. market will be made only in the best interests of the Canadian gas producers and the Canadian gas consumers. No additional sales can be made with the U.S.A. unless it is in Canada's best interests because Canada controls the gas supply and the authorization to export natural gas. This procedure, Mr. Speaker, is entirely under the control of the National Energy Board. The Great Lakes Project, as it is known, will save Canadian gas consumers, as it was pointed out by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Robbins) some \$75,000,000 in the first 10 years of its operation compared with the cost the consumer will have to pay for gas that is transported through a loop line in northern Ontario. These savings will continue throughout the life of the facility. In view of current pressures of inflation and when industry faces keen world competition, any action that has a levelling affect on prices is surely in our national interest. The lower prices were made possible by this Great Lakes project will increase the volume of sales very substantially. More sales mean more distance of distribution lines, more employees, more prosperity, more jobs. Mr. Speaker, if the Great Lakes project is abandoned and the company is forced to

duplicate the existing pipelines through northern Ontario, the gas delivered to the Windsor-Montreal area will have great difficulty competing with gas from U.S. sources. Many U.S. pipelines are extremely anxious to capture the Ontario and Quebec markets. The large markets in Ontario and Quebec are lost. The large diameter pipeline through northern Ontario would not be justified. This in turn would eliminate the economic advantages of big-inch pipelining and costs would be forced up. As a result, prices to consumers would rise and everyone in eastern Canada, and I suggest in all of Canada, would lose the advantage of low-cost energy. Mr. Speaker, this project is of vital interest to the people of Saskatchewan. I would like to put on record some of the advantages the successful completion of this project holds for the people of this province. The Great Lakes pipeline will deliver western Canadian gas to eastern Canada at lower costs if it is allowed to go through the United States than would otherwise be possible. The distribution companies in eastern Canada have consistently supported the Great Lakes Project. A direct result of the Great Lakes Project is that more western Canadian gas will be sold in eastern Canada with resulting incentives to the producer in western Canada. The Producers Association of Canada has consistently supported the Great Lakes Project. Second, associated with the Great Lakes Project are immediate exports of western Canadian gas. This gas has been found by the National Energy Board of Canada to be surplus to Canada's foreseeable requirements. Third, the large volume associated with the Great Lakes Project makes a large diameter pipeline possible with the resulting of lower rates for gas delivered in the Province of Saskatchewan. This will assist industrial development in our own province. Fourth, the Great Lakes Project will require an additional 36-inch line to be added to the existing Trans-Canada system within the Province of Saskatchewan. Two present lines in the Province of Saskatchewan do not reach 34 inches. Fifth, construction in the Province of Saskatchewan directly related to the use of the Great Lakes Project will result in additional employment in this province and substantial additional municipal taxes. Mr. Speaker, the pipeline will make the extension of natural gas to the following towns in Saskatchewan possible: Govan, Semans, Raymore, Quinton, Punnichy, Lestock, Leross, Kelliher, Ituna, and Goodeve.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, because the proposed gas line goes through and picks up customers in the United States, there is no doubt it will make the project a sounder economic proposition. This will mean cheaper Canadian gas in eastern Canada, cheaper gas to run Canadian industries, cheaper gas to heat Canadian homes in eastern Canada, many of these homes, the homes of working people being in our two eastern provinces. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists' Resolution would deny the sales for Canadian gas, large volume sales of western Canadian gas through eastern Canadian sources. The Socialists would deny work on this pipeline for Saskatchewan people. They would deny taxes to Saskatchewan, added taxes to Saskatchewan municipalities and they would deny cheap fuel for eastern working people. Why, Mr. Speaker, would they present this Resolution? Mr. Speaker, no matter how they talk, it's because they had their anti-American ballots. Now we've always known that the Socialists would do almost anything to keep American capital out of Canada, but now we see them attempting to block Canadians from doing business in the United States. Mr. Speaker, the Socialists are in fact the worst kind of isolationists. They would build a Berlin wall

March 7, 1967

around this country. They talk about peace, they talk about helping their fellow man. They talk about feeding the hungry people of the world. They talk about sharing the tremendous gifts that the Good Lord gave to this country. But when any move to do this is made, they block it and bring up every argument they can marshal, especially if it affects any of our neighbors to the south.

Mr. Speaker, we are Canadian citizens. But surely we are also citizens of the world. We will never realize the great potential that is possible for this nation, if we take the mean and narrow view that is consistently put forward by the Socialists in opposition. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a great deal more to be said on this subject. Sir, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKERS RULING ON MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 43 RE: WORKMEN'S  
COMPENSATION BOARD. (RESEARCH)**

He said: Perhaps somebody may wish to debate this motion and because if you recall there was a point of order raised on it the other day, therefore:-

In regard to the point of order raised on the Motion for Return No. 43, standing in the name of the Member for Moose Jaw, I have refreshed my memory on a previous ruling I made upon an analogous subject and find that the ruling referred to, which can be found in the Journals of February 17, 1966, related to two Questions which were ruled out of order because as stated in the 17th Edition of Erskine May: "Questions addressed to Ministers must relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected . . . or to any matter of administration for which the Minister is responsible."

However, that citation and the ruling based thereon referred strictly to parliamentary Questions.

The present point of order refers to a Motion for a Return — that is a Motion made by a Member seeking the production of certain information, and while the Government may not be responsible for or may be unable to produce the information aforesaid, a Member has the undoubted right and privilege as a Member to make the Motion.

It then becomes the responsibility of the House to deal with such Motion in the usual way.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**RESOLUTION NO. 11 RE: ABANDONMENT OF VIOLENCE AND WAR**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Kelsey):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the use of violence and war as a means of settling international disputes should be abandoned, and further, recommends the urgent need for greater development and use of the United Nations as a democratic form of world government.

Motion agreed to.

**RESOLUTION NO. 5 RE: REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENSES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the appointment of a Committee composed of Members of the Legislative Assembly to conduct an examination, following prorogation of the Assembly and during the intersessional period, into the Report of the Committee on Election Expenses for 1966, for the purpose of drafting equivalent provincial recommendations to serve as a basis for provincial legislation to make the democratic system equitably available to all, the said Committee to report its recommendations at the session next, following December 31, 1967.

The motion was negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 22**

Lloyd	Hunt (Mrs.)	Wood
Nollet	Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Blakeney
Davies	Thibault	Willis
Whelan	Nicholson	Kramer
Dewhurst	Berezowsky	Link
Wooff	Snyder	Broten
Larson	Robbins	Pepper
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)		

**NAYS — 29**

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 7 RE: INCREASE IN OLD AGE SECURITY PENSION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that any increase in the old age security pension by the Government of Canada should be payable at age 65 without a means or income test.

**MR. A. MITCHELL (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to comment on this Resolution. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is well recognized by the people of Saskatchewan as well as all the people of Canada, that any progressive legislation relating to pensions for our aged has been introduced by Liberal Governments. In the past two

March 7, 1967

years for instance, several very significant measures have been introduced. First, the Canada Pension Plan which is without a doubt the finest pension system devised by any country in the world. In addition to the Canada Pension Plan we now have the guaranteed Income Supplement. Mr. Speaker, in view of the concern shown and the excellent record of the Federal Government in this respect, I would like to compliment and congratulate the present Federal Government. I would, therefore, like to amend the Resolution, seconded by Mr. E.F. Gardner, the Hon. Member from Moosomin, that all words after Assembly be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

congratulates the Federal Government for implementing the Guaranteed Income Supplement so that all people in need over the age of 65 will receive up to \$105 per month.

**MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to deal with this Resolution too extensively because I would have thought that it is quite obvious to Hon. Members on both sides of the House that the provisions now being made, or proposed to be made, on behalf of senior citizens of our country are in fact entirely inadequate. I was amazed when I heard the Hon. Member from Bengough make the statement that he did and move the amendment that he did. I can only excuse him because he perhaps has not been involved in the political world for very long and therefore doesn't know too much of the history of old age pensions. For someone from that side of the House representing the Liberal party, to talk about what the Liberal party had done for pensioners, is pretty ridiculous to anyone else in this country. That's been demonstrated time and again and he ought to know it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEDERSON:** — Perhaps because of the present Senator who used to be the Member down there, because of that influence, he may not remember that the Liberal party were known as the Six Buck Boys at one time just a few years ago. I want to say something about this question of pensions because I believe that the people of Canada have in fact been cheated by the proposals that we now have which, as the Government has suggested, and the Federal Government suggests, are supposed to provide some degree of security for our senior citizens. Let me first of all discuss this question of a means test. I've read these speeches that were given in the House of Commons in some detail and I've seen the Liberal party in power there try to justify this question of a supplement to the old age pension providing your income wasn't over, in the case of a single person, \$1,200, or I believe \$1,280 per year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a means test then I'd like to know what it was.

And secondly, I would like to know why the Liberal party has changed its attitude on this question of means test. One of the great Liberals, I would suggest, of this century, McKenzie King, one time Prime Minister of Canada, enunciated time and time again that there should be no means test, no discrimination and that was why the original legislation was brought in on an across-the-board increase as we had done prior to these elections when we were re-elected in 1962. Well now Hon. Members opposite probably know what happened just as well as I do, but I am certain that the people of Canada didn't elect them on the promise that they would provide this type of a means test to the



ageing people of our country. And I am certain, Mr. Speaker, the statements of the now Prime Minister in those election campaigns were used as a cover-up to hide his real intent of bringing in this type of legislation which would include a means test. I recall a speech that he made in Charlottetown, an election ago, in which he said, "Oh, it would be so easy for me to go around and say that we will give \$100 or \$105 a month," but he said it would cost the taxpayers of Canada \$850,000,000 at least. Well the actual fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that it would cost somewhere between \$260,000,000 to \$280,000,000. The Prime Minister and his Minister had to admit this in the House of Commons when the debate came before the House just a short while ago. So I suggest that the fact or the suggestion that it would cost the taxpayers of Canada too much money, just doesn't hold water. I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that there are funds available to provide this increase and I believe that it is not too late for the Federal Government to be urged to make a change in their policy and provide an across-the-board increase and a supplement if they wish, until such time as the new Canada Pension Plan takes effect. There are literally hundreds and thousands of senior citizens in this country who for one reason or another are unable to qualify for anything over the \$75 per month. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have not arrived at a situation in our evolution as a society where we are prepared to penalize the thrifty, where we are prepared to say to our citizens that, because you worked hard and developed your own small nest egg, you are not to share in the general economy of the nation. That those who perhaps have not, and in many cases through no fault of their own, managed to draw together through thriftiness and other reasons, sufficient money to look after themselves, should be rewarded. I for one do not hold with that principle, Mr. Speaker. I believe that any legislation that tends to penalize the thrifty, the industrious, as the legislation does at the present time, is wrong legislation. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I speak with some feeling on this Resolution. I believe it's a good one and it is unfortunate that the effect of it coming from this House perhaps will not have much bearing on the Federal Government and their attitude. We've seen a good deal of evidence of that when suggestions have come from this Province, from the Government, so I presume anything coming from the Opposition would have even less effect. Nevertheless I believe that it is valid, it's a valid Resolution and deserves the support of any sound-thinking citizen of this province and certainly of all Members in this Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising in this debate, I do so without any hesitation however, because I believe a means test or income test forced upon our senior citizens to see if they should qualify for an increase of pension is an insult to many of our pioneers and to many of our senior citizens who have built Saskatchewan into the province it is today and Canada, a place which we can all be justly proud of. Many of our citizens in question have contributed in numerous ways, first, through their toil and their sweat, a stage that any province must go through. The pioneering days and its early history is a period of time that we of this generation too soon forget. These people who worked and toiled under altogether different circumstances than we have today so that you and I in this generation will have the privilege of enjoying their results, I feel that they must be recognized. It is only because of their courageous endeavors, Mr. Speaker, that you and I have this opportunity of enjoying a

March 7, 1967

much improved ways and means of providing a living with so many more conveniences that we may use at our disposal. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the least we can do is to use these citizens all in the same manner because in their eyes one is no less deserving than another. I think, Mr. Speaker, we should be even going a step further and be suggesting to support a motion to increase the pensions substantially up to say \$125 per month or so without a means test. This would be much more realistic under the present high cost of living conditions that are facing them today. But at least adopting a Resolution such as we have here would be a step toward giving them equal thanks for their contribution to a society which they all shared in pioneering and building. It is very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that one and one-half million Canadians are on the lonely side of 65 years of age. Both their numbers and problems are growing unnoticed by the rest of us and in many cases they are forgotten and shoved out of sight. The public is blissfully ignorant of even the most elementary truths about the increasing proportion of the population over 65 years of age. Both the numbers and proportions in Canada are growing very fast. Today, Mr. Speaker, there are 1,500,000 over the age of 65 or 7.6 per cent. By the year 1980, there will be 2,379,000 or 9 per cent. Strange the eldest group is growing the fastest. The number of people over 75 years of age is expected to more than double in the next 15 years. The group over 85 years of age, fastest growing of all, is increasing three times as fast as the general population. It is also quite interesting when we are informed that the majority have less money than the rest of us. Three-quarters of the women and half of the men in 1961, had less than \$1,000 a year to live on. Single women were the worst off with an average income of \$800 a year. And I think, Mr. Speaker, even worse than the financial embarrassment is this that many are lonely as they have no one to visit them but perhaps a public nurse. The busy community goes on around them and they have difficulty fitting into the picture purposely, they feel like strangers in their home town.

There are perhaps three basic changes in society over the last generation. First I would say that modern medicine is keeping people alive longer and also vigorous longer. Where people used to apply to institutions at the age of 70 or 75 years of age, they now apply at ages of 80 to 85. The second basic change is pension plans and retirement policies. They have forced more and more people into idleness without assuring them, Mr. Speaker, that they have enough money for comfort and without changing our attitude that a man is worth only what he can earn. And perhaps the third basic change is this; the breakdown of the extended family means that children no longer expect to house their ageing relatives or have they room to do so. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the most serious thing of all isn't this. I fear this is taking place in a society which accepts the downgrading of the elderly as a law of nature. This is in sharp contrast to an article I came upon in the Regina Leader Post, February 15, 1967, entitled Judges May Get Raises, and I quote:

Judges appointed by the Federal Cabinet would get salary increases ranging from \$3,000 to \$7,000 under a Government Bill now before the Commons. Chief Justice Robert Tachereau of Canada would go up to \$40,000 a year from \$35,000. The other members of the Supreme Court of Canada would be paid \$35,000 instead of \$30,000. The \$7,000 boost would go to the seven members of the Exchequer Court of Canada which hears tax appeals and other cases involving administrative law. The Court

President, Wilbur R. Jacket would receive \$32,000 and his colleagues, \$28,000. These salaries compare with \$40,000 for the Prime Minister and \$35,000 for Cabinet Ministers including their parliamentary indemnities and tax-free allowance. The Chief Justice of Trial in Appeal Courts in the provinces would go up to \$30,000 from \$25,000. Other members of Provincial, Supreme and Appeal Courts would get \$26,000 instead of \$21,000. County Court judges would receive \$19,000, up \$3,000. The two Territorial judges for the Yukon and the Northwest Territories would go up \$5,000, to \$26,000 and also collect a Northern allowance of \$2,000 annually for the first time. Judges performing extra judicial services for the Federal Government or a Province such as enquiries and mediation of labor disputes also would get an extra \$2,000 a year plus expenses.

These raises, Mr. Speaker, were suggested all without a means test or an income test. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not arguing that judges are not qualified for substantial reimbursements for their very important work and the great responsibility that goes with it. But I do argue the fact that, when it comes to an increase in pensions for our senior citizens, all of them, regardless of their income, are entitled to the same consideration without a means test. And you must remember that many of them had contributed in the eyes of the public also in a very honorable and a very memorable way, that is by pioneering and building and in no small manner building this Canada which we are all so proud to call our own. So I ask all Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, to consider this Resolution and to support it in its entirety and to vote against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. B.D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to say too much on this Resolution but there are a few things I think could be said. The Resolution of course is typical of the kind that we would expect from the Socialists when they are in Opposition and don't have any responsibility. They are a very benevolent bunch of fellows but when they are in the Government they are quite different. The Member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) when he was speaking on this Resolution the other night, pointed out quite adequately the attitude that this Opposition had when they were in the Government in respect to pensions and means test. I'm not going to repeat what he said tonight but in respect to a universal old age pension increase right across the board, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind Members of the House that, if the Federal Government is increasing the old age pension by \$30 a month had done this, many of the people, who do not require the increase in the pension and who are not asking for an increase in pension, would be getting something they are not in need of. I think of the people who have provided themselves with an income of \$500 or \$600 a month on retirement who are going to get the \$75 a month anyway and who would get another \$30, which should be going to some of the poorer people in the country. I want to remind my friend from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) about the suggestion that his party made in the House of Commons when the \$30 a month increase was passed. I believe his party recommended a \$25 across-the-board increase. This would have cost considerably more to the taxpayers of the country and it would have deprived a good many people who are going to get the \$30 a month increase of \$60 per year. Now \$60 doesn't seem like very much but I think it behooves my friend from Arm River to talk about pensions

March 7, 1967

and the Liberal record on pensions and in particular when the Prime Minister of his party lowered the old age pension back between 1930 and 1935. It wasn't very high at that time, Mr. Speaker.

Something else, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to point out. I mentioned a moment ago that the old age pensioners who would not require the \$30 increase and would get it, if these people's suggestion was carried out, would cost the Government many more millions of dollars. Every time that a government extracts more dollars from the taxpayers, the dollar is worth less in buying power. So it all adds up, Mr. Speaker, that the person who needed the \$30 and who is going to get the \$30, would get less goods with the \$30 increase that he got. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment moved by the Member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) is a good amendment and I'm going to be real happy to support it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina West):** — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to join in this debate until I saw the motion moved by the Member for Bengough, (Mr. Mitchell), the purpose of which is clearly to divert the discussion from the proper subjects of discussion as set out in the Resolution. The short question that is posed before this House by the Resolution is whether or not it is appropriate to have old age pensions at this level with a means or income test. I can well imagine why Members opposite would not wish to vote on that question because it is remarkably difficult to think of arguments which at one and the same time say that we should pay \$75 without a means test but that we should not pay \$105 with a means test particularly in a time of real inflationary pressures. These people, we all know, oppose the idea of a \$75 payment without a means test, but they've never really had the courage to say that. In fact they usually find a way of saying that it's a fine idea to pay \$75 but not \$80. Whatever the pension may be at this present moment in time — largely due to the progressive policies of the party represented by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) — is the particular level which the Liberals say is somehow the ideal level. They have had their opportunities in times of burgeoning prosperity to assess what they thought the old people in Canada ought to have and they set their price of \$6, as we all know. Their record is very clear on this. They had a time during what I believe was almost unparalleled prosperity in Canada in the mid 1950s, and yet they assessed the need of senior citizens at \$46. As I say it was largely due to the efforts of the other party represented by the Member for Arm River that brought the level to \$75. Well it is now \$75, and, as I say by some remarkable feat of political osmosis, whatever the level is now is just exactly the level that ought to be paid without a means test. And whenever any suggestion is made that the pension ought to be increased, the suggestion immediately brings forth the idea that there ought to be a means test. Now I take it that we are all agreed, I'm sure we on this side from conviction and Members opposite from convenience, that \$75 is a level which ought not to carry a means test. And the only question now is whether or not the level ought to be higher than \$75. We all know that since the time the \$75 figure was arrived at, there have been substantial rises in the cost of living. One would have thought that Members opposite would at least say, "If we agreed with \$75 then, we ought to agree with \$80 or \$85 now." Not so, not so. Again by some trick of osmosis they say \$75 is still the appropriate

March 7, 1967

level without a means test. And they have come along with their income supplement plan. All of us know, I think, that this is just another effort of theirs to bring to the social policies of Canada, the rigors of Mr. Sharp's view of social organization. He likes the sort of poor law or pauper approach to this. He has now felt that it is appropriate that these people who are going to feed off the public purse, as he would doubtless phrase it, ought to be properly demeaned. And they ought to be appreciative of the assistance they are getting from a munificent Government.

I think that all of us know that this type of approach is one inappropriate when we are dealing with the contribution made to this country by our senior citizens. While undoubtedly there is a level at which a flat rate pension ought not to be paid, I am one who cannot believe that \$100 is too much for a flat rate pension, or indeed \$105. And I therefore, Mr. Speaker, find myself in a position of having to oppose the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) and I propose that the matter might perhaps be clarified for the purposes of this Assembly, if I move an amendment to it which reads as follows:

That the following words be added to the amendment:

but regrets that the level of assistance is not adequate and the manner in which it is to be provided is inconsistent with the dignity and respect which should be accorded to our senior citizens.

I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Moose Jaw, my seat mate, Mr. Davies.

**HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:59 o'clock p.m.