

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session - Sixteenth Legislature**  
**26th Day**

**Thursday, March 21, 1968**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):**— Mr. Speaker, may I introduce to you, and through you to Members of this House a group of 37 grade ten students from Kelliher high school. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Ehman, and their bus driver, Mr. Kaytor. I am sure that all Members wish with me that they will enjoy their stay here, and that they will reach home safely having learned something of the democratic process.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. G. G. LEITH (Elrose):**— Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly seven students in grades ten and eleven from the Elrose constituency. They represent all high schools but one in the constituency. They are accompanied by their drivers, Mr. Alex Milton, Mr. Frank Thom, and Mr. Albert Mewis. They will be in the city today and tomorrow. I hope that they have a profitable and educational visit and a safe journey home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J. A. PEPPER (Weyburn):**— Mr. Speaker, again today I would like to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the Assembly, two groups of students from Weyburn. The first group that I will draw to your attention is the last portion of the Junior high school, some 65 in number in the east gallery, which has made a total of 214 grade eight students from this Junior high school. Again today they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Nedalcov, and also their bus drivers, Mr. Ashbey and Mr. Tate. The other group which I am pleased to welcome is a group of students from St. Michael's junior high school in Weyburn. These students are situated in the west gallery. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, we welcome both these schools to sit in on the happenings of our Legislature today. We hope that their visit will prove educational, and will be remembered as a highlight in their grade eight school program. I know we all wish them a pleasant and safe journey home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

March 21, 1968

### BRYANT ORATORY WINNER

**MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife):**— Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to place on the records of this Assembly a very significant accomplishment of a Saskatchewan student from my home town of Lloydminster. Miss Catherine Elizabeth Faber, age 14, who is attending the Lloydminster Junior high school, has won the Bryant Oratory Cup for Saskatchewan. Miss Faber who is in grade nine chose as her topic - a topic that was very dear to her - "Saskatchewan".

Mr. Speaker, when I first heard this young student speak for 10½ minutes without a single note or cue card, I knew that she was a capable and eloquent speaker. In the Bryant Oratory Finals for the province, held in Assiniboia last Friday, March 15, Miss Faber won out over five other worthy contestants. To my knowledge, she is the only junior competitor in grade nine to win the Bryant Cup since its inception in 1922.

I am proud of Miss Faber and the honor she has brought to her family, her school, our city and to Cutknife constituency.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W. A. FORSYTH (Saskatoon Nutana South):**— Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Legislature a group of students from Prince Philip school. This school is located on Climhill Drive in Saskatoon Nutana South. The students are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Pierce. They also have an extensive program of visits to other points of interest in Regina. I know that you will join me in wishing these young people a pleasant and profitable tour, and a safe journey home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. C.L.B. ESTEY (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):**— Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to this Legislature students from Albert school in Saskatoon who are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. McMillan. We thank Mrs. McMillan for giving her students the opportunity to be with us this afternoon. It is our hope the students will enjoy their visit to the Legislature and we wish them a safe journey home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

Owing to a breakdown in the recording instrument debate on the following Motions for Returns was not recorded.

Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106.

## RESOLUTIONS

For the same reason the opening remarks of the debate on Resolution No. 9 were not recorded.

### RESOLUTION NO. 9 - THE OFFICE OF AN OMBUDSMAN

Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale) moved, seconded by Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the appointment of an Ombudsman in order to provide further means of redress for grievances of citizens against administrative injustices.

He also said: We had asked in the past that the Government appoint an Inter-sessional Committee to study this question and to make recommendations to this Legislature. Well, the Government through the Premier has in the past said No and we anticipated that the answer would be No, again. He is opposed to any Inter-sessional Committees. So, Mr. Speaker, we have changed our request somewhat this year. Three times our requests have been turned down by the Government opposite, by the Premier opposite. In the new motion I am introducing today, Mr. Speaker, we have dropped the request for a study. It is our opinion now that the position of an Ombudsman has been fully researched and has been proven fully by experience in many parts of the world.

This Government didn't act, Mr. Speaker, but others have and now we find that such Provinces as Alberta, New Brunswick and Quebec have passed legislation and have set up Ombudsmen. In 1964 the previous Government, the Government before the one that sits on your right, Mr. Speaker, made favorable mention in the Speech from the Throne re an Ombudsman for Saskatchewan. I quote from the 1964 Speech from the Throne where it says:

Study has been given to measures adopted, notably in the Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand, which provide citizens with direct and easy access to appeal from administrative decisions thought to be arbitrary or unjust. It will be suggested that a Special Committee of the Legislature be asked to inquire into the best means of providing similar access for Saskatchewan citizens.

The fact that while in Opposition, this party to your left, Mr. Speaker, has seen fit to introduce resolutions in four consecutive sessions urging the creation of the position of Ombudsman indicates the importance that we attach to this matter.

**HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier):**— 20 years, George!

**MR. WILLIS:**— For the benefit of those Members who are new this year in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I would say that an Ombudsman is an official directed by Parliament or the Legislature to

**March 21, 1968**

investigate citizens' complaints against administrative officials or bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, maybe the word Ombudsman is the trouble which the Premier had. It could be that he can't pronounce the word. I'll have to admit that I had trouble too sometimes but in spite of this I attempt to say the word, Ombudsman. It is a Swedish word and probably comes in an alien manner to his tongue. But translated the word means citizens' defender. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that since the Premier knew that the translation was citizens' defender this is probably why he would have nothing to do with it.

I want to say that I am not going to speak very long today, Mr. Speaker. If anyone is interested in the question of an Ombudsman there are new books in the library which I would advise them to study. There is one, "When Americans Complain" by Walter Gellhorn - it has a subtitle, "Governmental Grievance Procedures." There is another one by Walter Gellhorn called "Ombudsman; Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries." The Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California at Berkley has put out "Canadian Ombudsman Proposals" by Stanley V. Anderson, published November, 1966. These books do summarize and bring up-to-date what has happened in the world regarding the Ombudsman.

The office of an Ombudsman has been successful in Sweden where it originated in 1809, and in various Scandinavian and other Western countries where it has been adopted since. The Ombudsman for Denmark, where the position was created in 1953, did much to popularize this throughout the western world. Insofar as Canada is concerned the success of the New Zealand Ombudsman first appointed in 1962 helped greatly in bringing this institution to Canadian attention. A Bill was introduced in the House of Commons, Bill C 113, 1966, to establish the office of Parliamentary Commissioner on a Federal level, while Ombudsmen have been authorized also, as I mentioned, in Alberta, New Brunswick and Quebec.

An Ombudsman would receive complaints of the citizens who believe that their rights have been infringed upon by the Provincial Government, its agencies or departments. He would have the right to question civil servants and employees of Government agencies and Crown corporations. He would have access, Mr. Speaker, to Government files pertaining to complaints. The Ombudsman would report to the Legislature, if the Government or one of its agencies refused to do anything to rectify a complaint which the Ombudsman felt justified.

The present Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) moved one of the motions regarding an Ombudsman in two previous sessions. And in 1965, Mr. Speaker, he said and I quote from his address at that time:

Broadly such an official keeps watch over the way in which Government officials apply the laws and regulations to the public and investigate complaints of private citizens against such officials. He doesn't have the power to

overrule officials, but he is in a strong position to suggest that abuses might be corrected. He would report directly to the Legislature probably annually.

Those who argue against an Ombudsman say that such an office is not needed because the Members of the Legislative Assembly perform all the functions of such an office. This is not so, Mr. Speaker. MLAs have neither the time, the staff, nor the means to investigate complaints. They haven't access to files. They merely refer complaints to people who are responsible in the first place for the decision to which objection is taken. MLAs are and should be available to receive and investigate complaints and certainly should continue to act in this capacity. To quote from the Canadian Ombudsman Proposals, the book which I referred to earlier by Mr. Anderson. Mr. Anderson says:

He, the elected Member, cannot hope to be as effective as an independent specialized agency which has the right to demand information, the power to investigate impartially and the duty to report irregularities.

Nor would an Ombudsman interfere directly with policies laid down by the Government. He does not make policies, but he helps those who do by calling attention to unworkable or unfair policies.

And again, in the Canadian Ombudsman Proposal, Mr. Anderson states:

An Ombudsman's office does not alter the basic structure of governments. It does not lessen the executive branch's primary responsibility nor his policy-making prerogative. On the contrary the operations of the Ombudsman are supportive of these functions. The pertinent acts and parliamentary instructions in all the Ombudsman statutes discussed in the preceding chapter are designed to keep the Ombudsman within proper grounds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House as a whole, I think, would be interested in the report which is made to the New Zealand Legislature by the New Zealand Ombudsman for the year ending March 31, 1967. The number of complaints received by the Ombudsman was 713 for the whole year. The number of complaints dealt with by the Ombudsman was 625. Still under action were 88 complaints. Of the 625 cases dealt with, 348 did not call for full investigation mainly because they were not within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman. 351 were fully investigated, and out of these 295 were not considered justified, while 56 cases were justified. But the large number of complaints, Mr. Speaker, received in one year is an argument in favor of an Ombudsman. That so many are justified further argues for an Ombudsman even more. As I said, Mr. Speaker, we have in Canada at the present time, three Provinces which have established the office of an Ombudsman. I have here the references to these Ombudsmen which have been printed in the Financial Post of January 20 of this year, 1968. The Financial Post reports an Ombudsman for Quebec, and it says

**March 21, 1968**

in the Financial Post that Quebec may be the third Province in Canada to have its own Ombudsman or, as he will probably be called, "Protector of the people." The principle has been approved by the Cabinet and now awaits official legislation. The office of Ombudsman has already been created in Alberta and New Brunswick. The creation of an Ombudsman for Quebec is one of a long series of judicial reforms now coming close to fruition in the Province and these reforms which are mentioned in the article include creation of a Commissioner of Human Rights as well as legislation involving civil marriages, prisons, payment prisoners' labor, reduction of prison sentences and liquor control. And here, Mr. Speaker, we have fallen behind the Province of Quebec in providing, what to me is elementary, for the protection of citizens in a democracy with the appointment of an Ombudsman. And then in the Financial Post of an earlier date, we have a similar press release headed "Now Canada has a Second Ombudsman" and this was released October 14, 1967.

New Brunswick became Canada's second province to appoint an Ombudsman, when Dr. Remington's appointment to this post was announced this week. The first Canadian Ombudsman is George B. MacLellan appointed Ombudsman for Alberta in April, 1967. The Ombudsman will investigate grievances or injustices caused by the actions of departments, agencies and offices of the province brought to his attention by private person's organizations.

And, Mr. Speaker, in "Western Business Industry", the May issue, we have the announcement of Alberta appointing the first Ombudsman for any of the Provinces of Canada or any of the jurisdictions on the North American continent. The article in the Western Business and Industry periodical says:

"Alberta appoints first Ombudsman." Eyes of Canada will be focussing more sharply on Alberta next fall, when the first Ombudsman in the history of this country assumes this new Provincial position in Edmonton.

To fill the position from a field of 232 applicants from throughout Canada, the Alberta Government selected George B. MacLellan, Canada's top policeman as commissioner of the RCMP for the past four years. He'll be paid \$20,000 in the entirely new job to which he has been appointed for a five-year term.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the salary corresponds to that of a judge. Having served 35 years in the RCMP, the 57-year-old commissioner is fully qualified for his post. Britain recently appointed an Ombudsman and several other Canadian Provinces have been considering legislation along the same lines as Alberta. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we have considered legislation in this Province, but because of the do-nothing Government on the other side of the House, a Government which has no concern for the rights of people, we have done nothing here in Saskatchewan.

Britain, the article goes on, recently appointed an Ombudsman and several other Canadian Provinces have been considering legislation along the same lines as Alberta. According to legislation adopted by Alberta this spring the duties of its Ombudsman will be to investigate any decision or recommendation made to a Government Minister for any act done or omitted relating to a matter of administration and affecting any person or body of persons in its personal capacity in or by any department or agency or any officer or employee or member thereof in the exercise of any power or function conferred on him by any enactment. The duties of the Ombudsman will also allow him at any time to enter any premises occupied by an agency or department of the Government to carry out its function. Top-ranking business executives, police officials, lawyers, judges and school teachers made up a large percentage of the applicants for the position.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, even after three Provinces have moved in appointing an Ombudsman here in Saskatchewan we do nothing. We have no concern for the rights of those people who may be inconvenienced or harassed by Government decision. In another one of these books which I referred to earlier, Mr. Speaker, in "When Americans Complain", Mr. Gellhorn states, "Governmental activities nowadays touch so many people in so many ways that bruises and scratches are inevitable." Again on the book cover it is recorded that "Modern government which rubs ever more frequently against private citizens probably adds to the sum total of human well being". But it certainly adds also to the sum total of human friction. And then to quote in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, from John Milton, "When complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reformed, then is the utmost bound of civil liberty attained that wise men look for." And believing that an Ombudsman is a logical next step in our efforts to attain maximum civil liberty, thereby relieving the sum total of human friction, I move, seconded by the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale, (Mr. Romanow) the above Resolution.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):**— Mr. Speaker, in rising in support of the Resolution introduced by my colleague from Melfort, I want to remark very briefly, that very often, in the very rapidly changing world that marks the characteristics of Saskatchewan now, we sometimes tend to overlook in economic advancement the very real need to keep up-to-date and keep in step with the social and civil liberties' aspects of government. The discussion of an Ombudsman is one which has been revolving around many of the Legislatures of Canada for quite some time. It has, Mr. Speaker, as you and Hon. Members know, been the subject of some considerable comment in many of the legal and other professional journals in Saskatchewan and in Canada. Essentially, and I'm going to elaborate later in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, about some specific aspects of the office of Ombudsman, but essentially in these particular articles it seems to me that what each individual writer is saying and, it seems to me, what each individual speaker is

**March 21, 1968**

saying when he gets up and voices his support for an Ombudsman or a Human Rights Commission, or some such similar authority to guarantee and protect civil liberties, this point that I emphasized in the beginning, that is, to say, in our fast-paced world we tend to overlook, when we have economic progress, when we have some of the material comforts of the day-to-day living, the very real aspect of civil liberties.

Now, it's only natural I think to acquaint the fact that economic progress will necessarily carry with it a certain amount of civil liberties. Unfortunately I think the comments made by my colleague from Melfort are very appropriate. With the increase in technology and economic growth, government grows also. Government today is big business, and as government gets larger, it's inevitable that more and more of the average people and average citizens of Saskatchewan are going to be affected by the day-to-day decisions of governments. I am not now talking about the day-to-day decisions of a government, as it is here today constituted in this Legislature, although that is also applicable; but I'm talking about the various tribunals and administrative functions, the administrative offices, the day-to-day decisions of inspections, licensing motor vehicles and the like, that from time to time crop up and affect each and every one of us. I think in the light of this increased growth and, if I may add, creeping growth of government into our personal lives, we've got to have the proper legislation instituted that is going to give some measure of redress to the average person of Saskatchewan. This is not a new solution that Members on this side of the House are proposing for the consideration of the Hon. Members opposite. The Ombudsman has been an institution and a very admirable feature of many of the very progressive countries of Europe for quite some number of years. Sweden has had the office of an Ombudsman since 1809, Finland since 1919, Denmark since 1955. Hopefully and fortunately in Canada we are moving towards the position and the institution of the office by the recent implementation of the Ombudsman in the Province of Alberta. I think discussion of the type that the Hon. Member for Melfort generates every year and unfortunately, obviously to deaf ears of the Members opposite, is the type of discussion which is going to gradually move public opinion to the day when we here in Saskatchewan are also going to recognize this need for the proper legislation for the protection of our individual civil liberties.

I think we can quite reasonably pattern and follow the very successful experience of Sweden with respect to its Ombudsman. Members opposite will know that the Swedish Ombudsman becomes seized of a particular case, Mr. Speaker, in various numbers of different ways. First of all, his office is easily accessible to the public who can lodge any complaint that they have with respect to the operations of an administrative tribunal or an administrative officer of government. They may launch these complaints either in writing or by verbal communication. This to me seems to be one glaring area of neglect that we as legislators - and I'm not now talking from a partisan standpoint - have fallen down in the Province of Saskatchewan. It's very



easy, I'm sure, for Members opposite to say, "Well it's simple for an individual Member of the Legislative Assembly to simply write to the Minister in charge or their MLA and action would be done." I think that all of us like to think that we look after our constituents as well as we can. But the fact of the matter is that because of the Government's growth, and it's going to continue growing, the channels of communication are sometimes impaired. The quick ready access to governmental information and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to have quick and decisive action is lacking. In Sweden this opportunity is now available with the office of the Ombudsman. There is a minimum of formality, Mr. Speaker, and requirements with respect to papers or supporting evidence. The Ombudsman's office also, Mr. Speaker, peruses daily papers. It does so with a view to keeping an eye open for reviewing possible cases that merit the attention of the Ombudsman. Statistics show that something close to one-fifth of the cases in Sweden that come before the office of the Ombudsman for his consideration are cases that he has gleaned as a result of his careful perusal of the daily papers in Sweden. I think that the interesting conclusion that we can draw from that statistic is that far too often in the day-to-day occurrences people may be aggrieved or they feel that they have been aggrieved by a particular government decision, but rather than taking on what to them seems a very cumbersome and burdensome task of carrying their complaint to a government official or to a Member of the Legislative Assembly or for example, to hire a lawyer, he lets the matter rest. The advantage of the Ombudsman perusing the papers is of course to help uncover and bring to the attention of government and to the Legislature inequities that individual citizens are sometimes frustrated by. I think this is a very important and desirable feature that right now the Province of Saskatchewan simply does not have, and that the office of an Ombudsman would help to rectify. Also, Mr. Speaker, some 30 per cent of the cases in the Ombudsman arise from the inspection from time to time of the various public offices and court rooms which the Ombudsman is making to make sure that certain inequities there haven't taken place. Once the Ombudsman takes up and gets certain information, he then has ready and quick access to all of the governmental information. If he finds no evidence of maladministration and misconduct, that's the end of the matter. But if the case warrants it, Mr. Speaker, he either issues a reprimand or a recommendation to the proper minister of government or the proper administrative tribunal and perhaps even initiates a prosecution against the minister or the tribunal and then lets the court decide the outcome and the issue it heard. Again, Mr. Speaker, to me this is a highly desirable feature.

I think that the Province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan will be able to benefit by the Ombudsman having access to certain Government papers on a day-to-day basis. It is, after all, Mr. Speaker, only a six to eight weeks' session that Members of the Legislative Assembly concern themselves with. We ask as many questions about the workings and the activities of government as possible; we make as many speeches, perhaps some Members make far too many, on the issues of the

**March 21, 1968**

day and some of the inequities as we see them. But after that eight or ten week period is finished our communication and contact with the bureaucracy of government, and I use that word in a good sense, are really limited to phone calls or a letter, and that's all. Very often the individual MLA and again the individual citizen who has a particular right just simply cannot pursue it any further. I think the argument that we, as MLAs and as servants of the people, ought to be carrying out the functions that I have now very briefly discussed, that the Swedish Ombudsman carries out, really is a specious argument because it just doesn't permit for the proper type of surveillance and looking after the people's civil liberties on a day-to-day basis that such offices as the Swedish Ombudsman affords. It's a sophistication of government, Mr. Speaker, that I submit we can ill afford to go without much longer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some Hon. Members will want to know of course just how far the Swedish Ombudsman goes and how far Members on this House would advocate the office of the Ombudsman be allowed to go. I would admit there is a valid area for differences and perhaps in the give-and-take in negotiations some delineation of the Ombudsman's power can be finally made. I personally hold the view that the Ombudsman and his investigative powers in the Province of Saskatchewan should stop short only of the Cabinet Chamber.

At this point there was a further recording failure.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood) moved the adjournment of the debate.

The question being put on the adjournment motion, it was negatived.

Resolution negatived on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 22**  
**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Wooff	Kramer
Willis	Wood	Dewhurst
Meakes	Berezowsky	Romanow
Smishek	Thibault	Whelan
Snyder	Michayluk	Brockelbank
Baker	Pepper	Bowerman
Matsalla	Kwasnica	Kowalchuk
Messer		

**NAYS - 30**  
**Messieurs**

Thatcher	Grant	Leith
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Bjarnason	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Larochelle
Cameron	Estey	Gardner
Steuart	Hooker	Coupland
Heald	Gallagher	McPherson

McIsaac  
Loken  
MacDougall

MacLennan  
Heggie  
Breker

Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

**MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 27**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale) for Return No. 27.

**HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier):**— Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Deputy Premier that the proposed motion of Mr. Willis that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 27 be amended showing:

- (1) The amount paid to MacLaren Advertising Company Limited during the fiscal year 1966-67 (a) by each Department of Government; (b) by each Crown Corporation; and (c) by any other Commission, Board or Agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.
- (2) The total of (a), (b), and (c) above be amended by inserting the words: "News media for advertising placed through" after the word "to" in the first line; and by adding the following words to the motion:
- (3) The amount of commission paid to MacLaren Advertising Company Limited; (a) by each Department of Government; (b) by each Crown Corporation; and (c) by any other Commission, Board, or Agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.
- (4) The total of (a), (b), and (c) in paragraph (3) above.

**MR. C. G. WILLIS (Melfort-Tisdale):**— Mr. Speaker, I certainly object to the regulation of this motion. First of all, I don't think the government has the information which they are offering to give. They pay MacLaren Advertising Agency a certain amount. And now they say they know what commission they pay MacLaren Advertising Agency. They pay them a sum amount, 100 per cent, MacLaren Agency subtracts their commission from that. The Government has no information regarding the amount of commission which they pay MacLaren Agency –

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WILLIS:**— I don't think you do – . . . a full amount and this is certainly not being factual, Mr. Speaker. I asked for the total amount paid to MacLaren Advertising Agency, not just that which is placed through the news media. Surely the Government hasn't anything to hide. And if the Government wishes to say that MacLaren Agency took 10 per cent or 15 per cent or paid 20 per

**March 21, 1968**

cent, they could have included that in the question without mutilating the question and hiding information, another effort on the part of the Government, Mr. Speaker, to deprive, to keep information from us, to deceive us as to the final amount which is paid to MacLaren Advertising Agency.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 46**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino) for Return No. 46.

**HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways):**— Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Cameron that Motion for Return No. 46 be amended as follows:

That parts (2) and (3) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"(2) The cost of reconstruction including surfacing." and that part (4) be renumbered as part (3).

**MR. E. I. WOOD (Swift Current):**— Mr. Speaker, is it possible to ask the Member before he sits down at this point why he cannot separate the two figures?

**MR. BOLDT:**— Well this gives to the Member the information he is asking for.

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):**— Mr. Speaker, I don't think it gives the information and I don't see why it should be such a hard job to break these things down. This surfacing - you must know the cost, unless it is not in the public interest to know. What have you got to hide here? I'll tell you there are a lot of rumors around our country and we'd like to know. This is why the question is on the Order Paper; that's why I'm here. We want the facts, that's all. I've been asked this question over the years. You took four years to build that highway and now you refuse to answer this. Well, this will just mean that there is something to hide. I would ask the Legislature to vote against this amendment because it makes this job smell still higher than it did.

**MR. F. A. DEWHURST (Wadena):**— Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the Department couldn't furnish the breakdown of these figures as asked for by the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) because from previous questions asked in this House on previous occasions, I know that the Department has the statistics, segregated one from another. We heard on a recent debate that a Member can go into the Department to see a file and get information. How can we get the information when we have these two juggled together, so that we cannot get the information on what each one is to the component part?

The Minister of Highways will leave us no alternative, if he insists on this amendment, but for us to be of the opinion that he is trying to hide something, and he has not given us all of the information. I see no reason why any Minister of the Crown should want to withhold information from Members of this House, when this is public money that was spent for a public highway. We are asking for the breakdown by components . . . for the construction of the grade and for the surfacing of the highway. I'm sure the Minister can supply this information. We are not trying to embarrass him or his staff. We are just asking for a breakdown of the different types of work. I hope the Minister will reconsider it and give us this information on a broken-down basis, because it will give us more information on the cost of highways and the cost the Government and the Department is facing in construction in this day. So I hope they will reconsider and give us this information.

**MR. C. G. WILLIS (Melfort-Tisdale):**— Mr. Speaker, I too am very much surprised that it took them so long to lay such an egg. This Motion has been on the Order Paper for three weeks at the most and finally they come up with a Motion saying they'll give us the information but they must add together the cost of grading and the cost of paving. Now I don't know what the reason for this is, Mr. Speaker; there must be some hidden reason for it. The grading was done by Government crews. Maybe this could be the answer. Maybe they don't want people in Saskatchewan to know how cheaply Government crews work. It could be the answer. We already know what the cost of the paving was. We asked the question last year. We have this. If the Minister thinks he is hiding the cost of Government crew grading, he's mistaken. We can ask another question. We can get the cost of paving by itself. Well why not give us the information in the first place? Surely to goodness you people have withheld information now to an extreme and this doesn't even make sense. I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, very much that the Government would mutilate a question like this in order to put two parts together which mean nothing.

**HON. A. C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources):**— Mr. Speaker, there is no mutilization of the question. It is not being mutilated at all. What is hurting the Opposition is that the Government is supplying the complete information on the total cost of the highway. They don't want the total cost. They want fractions of costs here and there so they can build a story out of it. We are giving you more than you've asked for; we are giving you the complete information of the total construction and finishing of the highway. Now how do you call that mutilating the Resolution when it is giving you yours plus more on top of it?

**HON. W. S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):**— The Government for some reason or other is confusing the House and confusing the country, it seems to me. A perfectly straightforward question has been asked and this type

**March 21, 1968**

of question has been answered on previous occasions. The Minister has not said that he doesn't have the information. The Minister (Mr. Boldt) has not said that they do not keep the information in this form. The Minister does not even lead the argument used by the Government on previous occasions this year that it is going to cost a lot money. Even that raging and ageing Shakespearean actor, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), didn't pretend that this was going to cost \$25,000 or enough money to build X number of new schools. As a matter of fact the Government gave nothing whatsoever for rejecting the requests which were in the original Resolution. It has on the other hand said that it wants to give a lump cost in a certain way for some strange reason. It has given no reason at all as to why it can't answer it in the way the question was asked. The Member indicated it was of particular interest to him to have the question answered in this way. One of the responsibilities of a Member is to find out about the works of the Government in his constituency. One of the needs of this House, in order to judge the actions of the Government on how well it is spending its money, is to get information of this kind. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) in particular should be aware of the fact of the way in which his Department is administered, is under serious attack from one end of the province to the other. He should be aware of the fact that questions are being raised over and over again as to why we are spending the amount of money we are for the kind of roads we are getting. He should be particularly anxious to supply information of this kind, particularly when he has not said that this is not available. Mr. Speaker, one has to be suspicious in cases of this kind. One has to get again the feeling that I expressed the other day in the House that the Government is willing to reduce this Legislature to a body other than it is intended to be, when it keeps on refusing information which the Members of this Legislature and the public have the right to have. And I too want to ask the Government to supply the information in the form that it was asked for by the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault).

**MR. BOLDT:**— On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was implied that we are hiding . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order! Now the Member moved the amendment and in moving the amendment, he spoke to the main motion, because anybody who moves an amendment to any motion speaks to the motion and to the amendment in the same breath and at the one time. And the Member cannot re-enter the debate.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 32**  
**Messieurs**

Thatcher  
Boldt  
Heald

Howes  
Cameron  
McIsaac

McFarlane  
Steuart  
Loken

MacDougall  
Bjarnason  
Hooker  
Heggie  
Radloff  
Larochelle  
McPherson  
McIvor

Grant  
MacDonald  
Gallagher  
Breker  
Weatherald  
Gardner  
Charlebois  
Schmeiser

Coderre  
Estey  
MacLennan  
Leith  
Mitchell  
Coupland  
Forsyth

**NAYS - 22**  
**Messieurs**

Lloyd  
Willis  
Meakes  
Smishek  
Snyder  
Baker  
Matsalla  
Kowalchuk

Wooff  
Wood  
Berezowsky  
Thibault  
Michayluk  
Pepper  
Messer

Kramer  
Dewhurst  
Romanow  
Whelan  
Brockelbank  
Bowerman  
Kwasnica

**MR. SPEAKER:**— The debate continues on the motion as amended.

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):**— Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to carry this debate much longer. I want to say that the attitude of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) does not surprise me, but the attitude of the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) does surprise me.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— I don't know about that.

**MR. THIBAUT:**— Well, you might not agree with me but I've always held him in pretty high esteem. I want to say again that both of these questions involved large sums of money, the resurfacing and the grading. I believe they were done by two different outfits. The questions have been raised time and time again. Can't you imagine why when it takes from 1963 to 1968 to complete a piece of road like that? At times we didn't know who was gaining on the road, whether it was the poplars in the ditch or the highway equipment. The people are asking questions. Just a simple question. The Minister has the answers. He cannot complain it is going to take 50,000 hours to get these answers or \$150,000 to get these answers. He can get these answers in a matter of minutes; he is only refusing to give the information to this House because he's got something to hide.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THIBAUT:**— Nothing else. What are you hiding? Tell us. That's all I'm going to say and I hope he does some re-thinking. I want this information, and I insist on getting it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— . . . The House is not yours!

**March 21, 1968**

**MR. THIBAUT:**— When we form the Government again, we'll expose it.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order!

**MR. WILLIS:**— Mr. Speaker, again the same objection . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:**— The debate is closed. I ask the Member, is he rising on a point of order?

**MR. WILLIS:**— I thought you were on No. 3. I was out for a minute.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order!

The motion as amended carried.

### **MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 47**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thibault (Kinistino) for Return No. 47.

**HON. D. BOLDT (Minister of Highways):**— Moved seconded by Mr. Cameron that Motion for Return No. 47 be amended as follows:

That parts (2) and (3) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"(2) The cost of reconstruction including surfacing." and that part (4) be renumbered as part (3).

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I want to say why this is being done. The Opposition has the tendency of asking questions as to what was the cost, for instance in oiling a road in 1967. Last year we answered this question, and we put a note on it: the oiling by highway crews, gravel taken from the stock pile that was perhaps stock-piled five or six years ago, but they ask for the cost . . . I have the floor . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— Sit down, sit down!

**MR. WILLIS:**— This has nothing to do with the question under review; he's talking about oiling. This is paving.

**MR. BOLDT:**— I'm speaking on the Motion. I'm telling you why we are doing this. So last year we gave the House the answer to the question. What was the cost of oiling for 1967, so we couldn't include the cost of the stock-piling from previous years. So the answer was, the oiling was X number of dollars. Then you ask the question; what is the cost of the private contractor?



As you know we don't have too many contractors going into oiling, but we said in the answer that the cost of oiling by the contractor included the gravel out of the pit, plus the oiling.

**MR. WILLIS:**— On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order! The question before the House is on the Motion of the Member for Kinistino that an Order of the Assembly do issue for the Return showing with regard to Highway No. 3, Kinistino to Birch Hills:

- (1) The standard to which the highway is built.
- (2) The cost of construction or reconstruction of the grade.
- (3) The cost of surfacing the highway.
- (4) The mileage of highway involved.

The Minister of Highways has moved an amendment. He is speaking to the Motion and to the amendment at the same time in moving his amendment, that Motion for Return No. 47 be amended by deleting parts (2) and (3) and substituting the following: "(2) What was the cost of reconstruction including surfacing", and renumbering the other parts, etc. I think that the question of what it costs and how it was done is relevant to the Motion.

**MR. BOLDT:**— Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. WILLIS:**— The point of order has to do with the remarks that the Minister is making. He's talking about dates. There is no date at all here; it has to do with the total cost. He's talking about dates, about something else entirely, something that hasn't got anything to do with this Motion.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— Don't embarrass your Members more than you have to.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Well, if there are no dates in the Motion in connection with the cost of construction or reconstruction, if there is no date in connection with that, I would almost think the Motion might be out of order. Somebody has to decide somewhere along the line as to its admissibility. Go ahead.

**MR. BOLDT:**— I can continue if the Hon. Member for Melfort will sit down, I remember that I let him speak and I want to bring this point across to the Members, just how dishonest the Opposition is in relating to the public. We told them in a note on the answer that the contractor's cost of gravelling in that year and the oiling were included in his cost, and they were not included in the highway cost. So this year we answered a similar question. It happened that the contractor also took the gravel from a stock-pile, and the difference between the contractor's

**March 21, 1968**

price and the Government crew was only \$200. You went around during the election saying, "Here look at this." The Highway crews can oil for \$3,000 and the contractor's price is \$5,000 and some. Those weren't true figures. You had the note underneath the question, but you never exposed that to the public. You left the wrong impression. What I am trying to do with this question is that the two pieces of road are not the same base, so hence there will be a difference in cost. If I made a notice of it you would say, "Well look, here is the Government crew that did a certain job for \$200,000. The contractor that did an entirely different job, a better road and at a cost of \$400,000. But the ordinary taxpayer will not see the difference of the base of the highway. So we're telling you we built a road, we're giving you the whole cost so that you cannot confuse the public.

I want to make this matter very plain. You are accusing the Department of Highways that there is grave mis-administration. What you are doing is throwing a reflection on the Deputy Minister and every one of the officials in the Department. For your information every one of them you hired. I want to tell, and I am sure that you will believe that, if I knew that the Deputy was not honest, he wouldn't sit there. I am confident that, if the Deputy thought that I wasn't honest, he wouldn't sit there. The Department is run as efficiently as any department in government in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:**— The only reason why you are criticizing the efficiency is because we are doing a good job in Highways. We are building highways and you just can't swallow the fact that this Highway Department's budget meets with the approval of the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. W. S. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition):**— I want to make a few comments arising out of the comments which the Minister has just made. Somebody may have followed his reasoning for now answering the questions as they are on the Order Paper. Certainly I got only one conclusion from it. That conclusion was that the Minister does have in his possession the information in the form that it is asked for. There is no problem whatsoever with respect to getting it; there is no added cost whatsoever with respect to giving it to this House. But the Minister refuses to make it available. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Members in this House have a right to ask for information in the form in which they think explains the situation. That's what the Member from Kinistino has done. The Minister however, attempts to be the arbiter of the use of the information. That isn't his job. It's up to the individual Member how he is going to decide to use the information. If he uses it wrongly, then the Minister is perfectly right to criticize him for using

it wrongly, but the Minister is not right to refuse him the information, because he thinks the Member is going to use it in a certain way or other. The Minister's whole argument substantiates what's being said on this side of the House up to this point, namely that the information is available, easily available, readily available and could be supplied to this House in a matter of minutes. He ought to answer in the form which the Member asks. It is not for the Minister to decide what kind of questions Members will ask. It is for a Member to decide on the basis of his own knowledge of the situation and his own needs as a Member of the Legislature.

Let me turn to the second part of the Minister's remarks. Certainly nobody on this side of the House has impugned any dishonesty or inefficiency to individual members of the staff of the Department of Highways. The Minister is quite right when he says that most of them were there when we formed the Government. Most of them were young men who were recruited into the service during that period of time. There is nobody here suggesting there is any dishonesty or inefficiency. The Minister has lost some of his good men, I admit that. The Minister hasn't replaced enough, I think that may well be true. He has not given his officials a proper chance to do the job that they can do for the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that is true. Secondly, I think the Minister has not listened to the advice of his officials in the way that he ought to. Certainly when we see jobs being broken up over a period of time, as they have been in every corner of this province in recent years, then we have to believe that somebody else other than the department officials are making decisions which interfere with efficient operation of the Department. And that, Mr. Speaker, is our complaint, that the officials are not given a chance, that their advice is not being adequately listened to, that there is too much political planning and too little economic and technical planning involved in the work of the Department of Highways.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:**— On this matter of costs, Mr. Speaker, on this matter of reasons why there is room for suspicion that the Minister and his Cabinet colleagues are interfering, let me draw attention to a recent study released by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I know that the Minister and his colleagues don't like using the facts supplied by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. They prefer to develop their own, but people can't ignore a body with the reputation and the skills of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The study which I refer to has to do with highway construction costs. DBS has just published a revised series of highway construction price indexes covering the period 1956 to 1966. They break this into two parts, the period from 1956 to 1963 and the period since 1963. In this latter period take the costs for the years 1964, 1965 and 1966 as compared to 1963. What do we find? We find that the increase in highway construction costs across Canada was 26.8 per cent, but the increase in Saskatchewan was 63.5 per cent.

**March 21, 1968**

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:**— Does anybody wonder that there is a basis for the concern that there is a wastage with respect to highway spending? May I repeat those figures. The increases for Canada, which I should add but don't include, because the figures weren't available, those for Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Alberta but the figures for the rest of Canada were 26.8 per cent in those years. But the increases for Saskatchewan were 63.5 per cent. We have the very dubious and doubtful honor of having the greatest increase in the cost of building highways during that time.

Let's look at some other provinces and what their experience was during the same time. Remember that all provinces experience the same effects with respect to machinery costing more, with respect to wages going up, with respect to materials being more. In the Province of British Columbia the increase was 33.8 per cent; that increase was roughly 30 per cent less than Saskatchewan. In the province of Manitoba the increase was only 27.2 per cent; that I think is 29.3 less than Saskatchewan. In the Province of Ontario the increase was only 24.4 per cent; that I believe is about . . . what, 29 per cent less than in the Province of Saskatchewan. These are not, Mr. Speaker, I say again, our figures. These are not figures which were dredged up by some of our research people. These are the figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. These show that there is reason for concern with regard to the highway mileage that we are getting for the highway dollars spent in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LLOYD:**— I said that the study covered the period from 1956 to 1966. Let me go back and give the Legislature the relative increases in costs of building highways for the period prior to a Liberal Government in this Province. From 1956-1962, the all-Canada index dropped by about one-quarter. In Saskatchewan during that period under the administration of the Minister of Highways, my colleague from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) who just took his seat, it dropped by one-third. The all-Canada change was down a quarter, the change in Saskatchewan was down one-third. Now surely there hasn't been that much difference in conditions with respect to building roads during that period to warrant the great increase compared to Canada's since the Liberals, and a different and better experience before that day. Surely the New Saskatchewan doesn't involve also greater difficulty in building roads to that extent. During 1956-1962 the Canadian index dropped by a quarter, the Saskatchewan index dropped by a third. In 1963, costs rose slightly in both Canada and in Saskatchewan. During 1963-1966 the costs for Canada rose 26.8 per cent, the cost for Saskatchewan rose the highest in Canada, a startling, surprising, worrying increase of 63.5 per cent. Against the background of information of this kind, Mr. Speaker,

I would think the Government would just tumble over themselves to give us every bit of information, every kind of detail we might ask for.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— Stand up, Davey, get up on your chair!

**HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):**— If the junior Member from Saskatoon would just open his ears and close his mouth for awhile he might learn something. Well that's the way you should keep it. Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition quotes from DBS, we get the same kind of a story that we did when they take the information they get and then twist this information and take it out on the hustings, and don't tell the whole truth. They tell half the truth in an attempt to smear our program. Now let's talk about the DBS figures. Sure, the costs went up since we became the Government. Of course they did and we're very proud of this. Why? Because first, we're building 50-foot roads, Mr. Speaker, not 24-foot trails as they did.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:**— We're building paved highways and double-lane highways. That's why the costs have gone up. Let me tell you another reason the cost went up, Mr. Speaker, because when we report to the DBS now, we report all the facts, including the overhead. When I became the Minister, and this is typical, in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation I found that, when they reported how much it cost their crews to do a job, it looked very fine on paper. They said, "Look how wonderful we are." The same Highway crew, but when you dug into it you found you only got part of the story which is typical of the Socialists, because they didn't put down the overhead. It's a good example when they say how much it costs for a Government crew to oil, but they talk about oil, but they don't talk about the gravel that's used.

**MR. LLOYD:**— Talk about DBS.

**MR. STEUART:**— All right I'll talk about DBS. Compare the figures, but you have to compare the standards. You've got to compare two things. First they never got all the facts when you were the Government, given to DBS. Second, we are building a far higher standard of roads than when you were the Government. That's why you got turned out as the Government, because, if you went to Manitoba and Alberta, they were building a higher standard of road. You know if you came into Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, when the CCF were in, you didn't have to see the sign. You just had to close your eyes and you hit a bump and you knew you were in Saskatchewan. And now the reverse is true. We have

**March 21, 1968**

built highways, \$24 million is the most you ever spent in your best year, the biggest spending year you had in highways when you were the Government. Last year we spent \$60 million and we got value for every dollar spent. Mr. Speaker, why? Cloverleafs, out here on Highway No. 1 we finally put a cloverleaf out there. How many people were killed there, 11 people, in recent times. We put in a cloverleaf; we put an interchange. This is part of building highways, modern highways. Of course there is a difference in the costs of highways since we became the Government, but the value is there. You just have to drive out on any highway and you can see the value is there. You can't compare narrow gravel roads to the wide-paved roads that we're building. We are also building roads into northern Saskatchewan. Northern Saskatchewan sat there and I know it. It sat there; there were no roads built, or very few roads built into it. We're pushing roads in to service the mines and the pulp mill, and make no mistake, those roads are costly. They're costly.

**MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords):**— Tell us about Primrose, Davey!

**MR. STEUART:**— I'll tell you about Primrose. We'll have a good industry there, not because of anything you've done in spite of the fact you tried to sabotage it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:**— We'll talk about our record in the north and compare it to yours. The north was sitting there dead, unopened. We put roads in at very high costs and we're proud of this fact. So don't compare your record, of building roads and bridges with our record. DBS figures if you want, but this is typical of what you do. We're going to give you the answers and we are going to give you the whole truth. The Member for Kinistino and the rest of the Members including the Member for Melfort don't want the truth, because they want to go out and smear and tell half-truths . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— Tricky little half-truths!

**MR. STEUART:**— Not too tricky, either because the people recognize it. They tried this in the last campaign and the people recognized it. That's why they're still over there in Opposition and we're still the Government. Mr. Speaker, we're going to give them the truth, the whole truth. What they do with it after they get it, I don't know. But don't let them get up here in the House and cry crocodile tears in an attempt to use one set of figures and compare apples to oranges. The public won't swallow this no matter how often or how loud they cry or how often they repeat these smears.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair):**— Mr. Speaker, he still remains Dubious Dave in my estimation. He talked about narrow gravel trails, Mr. Speaker. He says, "They're not building narrow gravel trails." Well, Mr. Speaker, neither is the Province of Manitoba building narrow gravel trails. This is a unit price comparison today with Saskatchewan versus Manitoba or Saskatchewan versus Canada. Mr. Speaker, for the Minister to rise and drag a red herring across this trail is inexcusable. He's comparing what happened in Saskatchewan any number of years ago with what's happening today. That's an unfair comparison. If you went to the Province of Manitoba you could make the same comparison, what's happening in Manitoba today to what was happening in Manitoba 20 years ago. You could make the same kind of comparison that has no relevance whatsoever to what we have been discussing here this afternoon, that's the Government's refusal to present the information that we asked for in this House. They're afraid that the public will find out that this Government is building political highways in the Province of Saskatchewan and not supplying the people of Saskatchewan with value for their dollar as has been shown by the facts from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order! I believe we are debating the amendment. If I understand the record correctly, I think the Member has already spoken to the amendment.

**MR. WILLIS:**— That was on No. 2, Mr. Speaker. I came in by mistake and thought you were on No. 3.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WILLIS:**— Mr. Speaker, I never fail to marvel at the people on the other side of the House. The Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), whenever he is caught off-base, gets up and yells, and the louder he yells, the further off-base you know he's been. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), when he's caught off-base, gets up and immediately becomes ugly about something. He tells somebody to shut his mouth or keep his mouth, . . . but there's a difference between the two men, Mr. Speaker, even though they do sit so close together. The Provincial Treasurer gets up and tries to confuse the issue. He talks about building wide highways compared to narrow ones we built. These prices which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) read into the records this afternoon were unit prices per square yard, and you have just so many square yards whether you have a mile or whether you have 20 miles. It is all based on that square yard. These prices are regardless of the width of the road, whether it is 50 feet or whether it is 25 feet, and the Provincial Treasurer knows that. He is trying to confuse facts. Another statement was that when you travel along Highway No. 1 all you have to do is close your eyes and you know you are in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker,

**March 21, 1968**

all I can say is that I've driven over No. 1 between Manitoba and Saskatchewan or Manitoba and Alberta. The only thing I can say is that my friend, the Provincial Treasurer must have been driving with his eyes shut because he was driving the wrong way. When you go into Manitoba, you immediately notice a difference between No. 1 on the Saskatchewan side. The Saskatchewan side is much better and it has been for years, that's right.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WILLIS:**— And boasting about what has been done in the province, Mr. Speaker, this Government opposite has followed mainly the plan which was left by the previous Department of Highways, the previous Government. He talks about an intersection at No. 1 and No. 6. This was on the planning board when we left. We were planning it. He talked about the four-lane between here and Moose Jaw. We had already laid out the route for that, the location of that highway. We were planning to build it. We weren't going to have a crash program or have it built in one year or half a year. This Government's crash program did force the prices up. The unit cost prices, not the mileage prices. It can boast all it wants about spending money, but that's all it spent. It has really spent money, wasted money, Mr. Speaker. Then talking about opening the north, my friend, the Provincial Treasurer doesn't know anything that happens, that hasn't happened north of Prince Albert, say. But even north of Prince Albert we had a contract for the extension of No. 102 north of the Churchill River. It isn't finished yet, four years, and it isn't finished yet. And the contract for 104, north of Canoe Lake, you finished with it. That's right, you gave it up. You wasted money here again, boasting about this.

**MR. STEUART:**— Where does the road go?

**MR. WILLIS:**— And the Minister doesn't even know that there is a road from Smeaton to Flin Flon, No. 106. This was built long before his time, but he does know about the road which they built from No. 102 across to No. 106 for a mining company. I was looking at the traffic count regarding this road, Mr. Speaker, and I see that at each end of this road, there were traffic counts of 15 vehicles a day, a great help to a mining industry! This means at the most, 7 trucks, 7 going one way, probably with ore, 7 coming back empty and a car thrown in for good measurement, 15 vehicles a day using this highway which it spent \$2 million building. And he boasts about it. Comparing apples to oranges, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that the Provincial Treasurer didn't know these prices were unit prices we were talking about, unit prices whether it is Saskatchewan, Manitoba or Alberta. And they were comparing unit prices and DBS figures that the unit prices here in Saskatchewan are up 63 per cent and in Manitoba 29 per cent, twice as high here in Saskatchewan under the Liberal Government, and not because of an inefficient department. We have an efficient Department of Highways. I'm very much surprised and shocked when the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt)



gets up and calls in question anything to do with his officials. He talks about his officials being honest. We know they are honest; we appointed them; they are honest. It would take a very good Department of Highways to keep prices down, when the Government insists that they have crash programs and they go ahead and build roads regardless of costs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry):**— Mr. Speaker, I would like to make specific reference to some of the remarks that were presented in this House a few moments ago by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stuart). He is talking about roads, I'd like to see those good roads, he mentioned in the part of Saskatchewan where I come from. We have Highway No. 40 from Prince Albert to North Battleford. I would like the Provincial Treasurer to take a drive over that highway and see all the bumps that there are. This highway was relatively a good highway two or three years ago. Today it is pitted and it is full of holes. Not only is Highway No. 40 in bad shape, but you can select any oiled surfaced highway in Saskatchewan and it is in the same shape. For anyone to get up in this Legislature and say that the Department of Highways is building wide expensive highways is not in accordance with fact. Where are they? Between Regina and Moose Jaw, that's about what your building program has amounted to.

**MR. STEUART:**— How about Saskatoon?

**MR. MICHAYLUK:**— That's right. Moose Jaw and . . . Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a clipping which appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix on November 20, 1964 and this was shortly after the Liberals were elected to form the Government in Saskatchewan. It's entitled "Private enterprise best for road care, Royal Commission told." That was a hearing in Regina and I want to quote just parts of this report: It says, may I quote:

The suggestions came from the Saskatchewan Road Builders Association and the Association of Consulting Engineers of Canada, both of which presented briefs to the Johnson Provincial Royal Commission on Government efficiency at its opening day of public hearings here.

And then to quote further:

The Road Builders Association said it was certain studies would show that private enterprise could handle highway maintenance work much more cheaply than Government forces.

In a Return given to this Legislature in a session of 1967, Sessional Paper No. 148 and a question asked by the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis), the question was put in this manner: For all Provincial highway capital improvement projects with an estimated bid value exceeding \$100,000 finalized in the current fiscal year upon which final total payments made since

**March 21, 1968**

April 1, 1966 exceeded the estimated bid value by 10 per cent. a) names of contractors b) date of awarding each contract; c) estimated bid price and d) total final payment. I used this in the election and I'm going to use it again when the occasion arises. Now may I quote some of the figures, in respect of the costs, what the bid price was, what the final price was and the difference. Now let's take No. 1, the contract No. C6461 awarded on March 31, 1965. Contract price, \$426,825. The final price for this contract, Mr. Speaker, was not \$426,825 but \$665,915.98 - \$239,090.90 more than the contract bid price. This is efficiency, isn't it? Mr. Speaker, when this contract was let there must have been other contractors who bid on the construction of this particular project. We see in this instance that over a quarter of a million dollars was paid more than the contract was let at. This is only one of many. Let us take another contract, No. C6534, awarded on May 26, 1965. Contract price, \$339,014, final price, \$509,358.97, \$170,344.97 more than the contract was let for. This is what goes on in highway building. These are the types of bids and contracts. This is what this Government is doing in building highways. Is there any wonder why the DBS figures show that the cost of building highways in Saskatchewan has exceeded every province in Canada? The Provincial Treasurer stated that we have used this and we misuse these facts and thus we abuse the Government. This is what I used on the platform and we will continue to do so. Our municipal people that have been building grid roads are astounded by the Department of Highways performance because they have built municipal grid roads. They tell me that at no time did they pay anything extra over the bid for which the contract for grid roads was let. But what goes on in respect of highways is evident. When a contract is exceeded by \$250,000, \$170,000, and \$121,000 than the bid was let at, this is definitely misuse of public funds and that is why our cost has gone up by 63 per cent. Higher than in any Province in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. D. T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):**— I think the crux of the discussion this afternoon all started because this Government believes in giving information.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McFARLANE:**— Now for the benefit of the younger Members on the other side of the House, I think it can be pointed out - I'm sure they are not aware of this - but I think it can be pointed out that year after year after year, when we stood on the other side of the House and asked the Government of the Day that was not headed by the present Leader of the Opposition because he didn't have the confidence of the people of the province at that time, but still the former Minister of Highways, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the former Minister of Natural Resources, the former Minister of Co-operatives and one person who should

have been in the Cabinet but was never allowed to get in there, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), time after time when we got up and asked a question on the comparative cost between the cost of building a mile of highway under the Department of Highways or Government crews and under private crews, we were turned down, day after day after day with less debate than we've heard here this afternoon, because invariably they said, from the Minister of Highways at the time, Jack Douglas, right down to the great storm trouper, Mr. Fines that it wasn't in the public interest. So each session year after year when these questions were asked we could never get the information. Since 1964 because this Government through the Minister of Highways was honest enough to give the people of the province the information they sought, then they have tried to compare costs of building a unit of construction under Government crews versus private crews. When they go out on an election campaign they use the tactics that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) here this afternoon said they would use. He said "regardless of whether the Minister of Highways gives us this information or not, regardless of whether it's factual or not, then our Members will go out and use the type of information they want to use." This is what he inferred here this afternoon. The reason why you would never give us the costs of unit construction when you were the Government is because you never included overhead in the construction costs of your unit construction. In the case of your own Government crews, all this was hidden so all you ever indicated to the people of the province at that time and to the Legislature was the actual cost of construction, having no regard to the capitalization of the crews that you had under your service. But this hasn't been the case with this Government. And then the Leader of the Opposition says the highways were in a deplorable condition. We sat in this House year after year, knowing that just prior to election, the Leader of the Government of that day, the Premier of the Province would see to it that a highway was oiled or paved from Regina to Weyburn, his home seat. A year or two after each election, the highway would be abandoned. It wasn't even fit for jack rabbits and parts of it are still down there as evidence of the waste and squandering of public monies at that time. You drive down there and you'll still see parts of those highways. But after every election, this had to be taken care of - he had to win that seat. Well when he joined the Federal NDP, the party went into oblivion. Under the present Government this hasn't been the case and we've saved the people of the province hundreds of thousands of dollars. But I want to say this to the former Minister of Highways delegation after delegation would come in asking for hard topping, asking for oiling, asking for improvements in highways. He turned them down, I suppose possibly because they weren't represented by a person of his political faith in the Government. Year after year, the people from the southern part of the province, part of this province right through to the north asked you to take portions of No. 35, which should have been in the highway system into the system and relieve the municipalities concerned. Year after year for almost 20 years, delegations on behalf of those who used Highway No. 35 came in to see the Minister of Highways. Year after year those people who had used

**March 21, 1968**

Highway No. 47 came in to see you as a Minister and your predecessor. For 20 years they were turned down. Today those parts are both in the highway system and portions are being oiled. Then the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank), got up and said his piece. He didn't tell the people of this House that when his father represented the constituency of Kelsey for some 30 years, all he ever provided for those people in all those years was some 13 miles of dust-free highway. Thirteen miles after 30 years of sitting in this House. His successor, the present Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) has got up on occasions and complained because now after four years of Liberal Government, they've got a tremendous mileage of dust-free roads, and because we didn't go out and put salt on them they were a little icy this year. So this is the type of thanks the Government gets for going in and helping the people of that area of the province. Thirteen miles under 30 years of CCF and today because there isn't a little bit of salt on the roads and they are a little bit icy, in spite of the fact they are all hardtop, then he feels justification for complaint.

And so, Mr. Speaker, all this argument this afternoon simply boils down to the fact that this Government, after 20 years of Socialist Government withholding this information, is willing to provide this information to the people of the province. When the Minister wants to give the full information, then it should go out to the people in the interests of the Department of Highways and in the interests of all the taxpayers. Now they are trying to amend it so that it couldn't be put into this form. The Leader of the Opposition says he is quite willing to have the people on this side of the House go out and carry on these rumor mongering campaigns in which they have no equal in any province in Canada as far as starting rumors or rumor mongering is concerned. But he wants to be able to get the type of information that they can twist and warp to suit their particular conditions and suit it to those people in the province who may be inclined to listen to them. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the point is well taken by the Minister of Highways when he asked to have this return amended, so that the people of the province could get the full information and an honest comparison between the prices of units that are constructed by private crews versus Government crews.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):**— Mr. Speaker, I'm a very good-natured man and I hesitated to enter this debate until the Provincial Treasurer got into it. When he talked of all the good roads in Saskatchewan and how smooth they were, I would invite him to come into Touchwood. There isn't a good road in there anymore. They've all been ruined since this Government took office. If he is talking about waste then I'd like to point out to him that piece of Highway No. 10 between Ituna and Melville which has been rebuilt and oiled, and now it's going to be oiled the second time, according to the Minister of Highway's statement in the House in a

previous debate. I just want to point out this one thing, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to come back to what we are discussing. The Minister of Agriculture just said that they are trying to give us all the information. I want to suggest to this House that it is very much the same as if I contracted to build a house and the contractor in the end refused to separate the cost between the cost of painting a house and the cost of erecting the building. All we are trying to do is to find out the final figure divided in the two pieces of work, the two contracts and just two contracts, the contract of building the roads and the contract of hard-surfacing the road. And I say that he is not giving all the information. He refuses to separate the information into two so that we can get a true picture. So for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I say the Minister of Highways should give this House the information as requested by the Member for Kinistino.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. B. D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton):**— Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a few words about this. The Opposition want to get a set of figures that weren't very accurate to go out in the country and try and prove something, a set of figures that weren't very accurate, Mr. Speaker. I think even a Socialist should know that no person can tell exactly how much or what portion of the maintenance and the overhead and the storage and the shop facilities should be charged to a particular section of a piece of highway. But what they wanted to do was what I got quite used to last fall, listening to my CCF opponent from Yorkton talking about the old Liberal pork barrel. He said this is the old Liberal pork-barrel method of building highways. Well, Mr. Speaker, to shut him up - and we did shut him up by a considerable majority - I had a joint meeting with him that shut him up once and for all, when he made this accusation at a public meeting that this was the old Liberal pork-barrel method of building highways. I went to the trouble, Mr. Speaker, of contacting the Department in Regina here, I had done that last winter sometime and lost the figures and I did it again just before the election to counteract the accusation made by my friend from Melville. The figures I got show that in the last year of the CCF Government, they moved one-third as much dirt as we moved in 1966. They built one-half as many highway miles, less than one-half as many highway miles. They paved just less than half as many highway miles. We moved five times as many cubic yards of gravel. We did this, Mr. Speaker, using a larger percentage of contracting services than we did Government services, but we didn't have to spend three, four or five times as much money in our capital budget to do it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, all they are looking for is a set of figures that they know are not going to be very accurate, that they can go out into the country and peddle this to try and make a few cheap votes.

**MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey):**— Just how stupid does the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) think the voters in Kelsey are? He makes

**March 21, 1968**

reference to Mr. Brockelbank only building 13 miles of dust-free road in that constituency. In spite of redistribution and a great many rumors that went around that constituency against me and slandering me, I'm still the Member in this House with 90 some odd votes. If they want a by-election it will be 900 and some odd votes after that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:**— He made further reference that I have all dust-free roads in Kelsey now. He's forgotten several hundred miles that are still gravel surfaces and dust. He also has neglected to talk with his colleague across the aisle from him in regard to 8½ miles of road built west of Hudson Bay. It started in 1966 and it still isn't finished. Thirty-three days overtime worked now last year in the best construction year this province has ever seen and is there anything being done about it? Nothing. This is where the waste of our money in the highway program is going. He made further reference to an icy and hazardous driving condition in my constituency which he brushed off as being highly overrated, it really didn't amount to very much. The Minister of Highways was aware of it too and it did amount to a great deal. There very well could have been death and injury involved in this. There were dangerous, hazardous, ice conditions, December, January and February, and for several hundred dollars, the Department of Highways would not remove those conditions. Instead it gives all the money that is being appropriated to highways to contractors for exorbitant prices and does not build the mileage of roads that there should be for the dollar value that is invested in them. He further mentioned for the younger Members' benefit - I guess he considers me one - that they were answering questions and this is why they got into trouble. They are not answering questions and the only reason they give for not answering questions is, they say, that the former Administration did not answer questions. And I say they did, but this is irrelevant. I've heard the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Highways, the Minister of Mineral Resources, the Provincial Treasurer, the Minister of Welfare, all say this, because the former Administration wouldn't answer questions so they are not going to. Now what kind of a Government is this? I'm not concerned about the former Administration, I'm concerned about the problems right now and the people I represent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MESSER:**— And I suggest that, if they don't soon smarten up, this old, old government is going to be replaced by a younger, vigorous one that moves ahead and this is the NDP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. E. I. WOOD (Swift Current):**— I believe the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) indicated that there were two pieces of road under consideration

here, and there were different standards of construction used which would have a bearing on the cost per mile and such. I'd like to point out that in these questions and in both questions that have been asked this afternoon, the first thing that was asked was to what standard the highway was built? So I think that this is taken care of in the questions themselves. They are asking to what standard the highway is built. We all recognize the fact that it costs more to build a good highway than what it does to build a poor one.

The Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was speaking in regard to what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) had said about the rise in the cost of building in highways in Saskatchewan in the years since the Liberals have come to power. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out that there had been a drastic increase in the cost of building highways in Saskatchewan in the years since 1963. The Hon. Treasurer rose to his feet and told us in effect that it cost more to build good roads than what it costs to build poor ones. Well, we all know this, Mr. Speaker. We know that it costs more to build an overpass than it does to go straight through. This is not something new that the Hon. Provincial Treasurer was telling us but what he was trying to drag a red herring over, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that what this price index as put out by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is not dealing with miles of road in regard to the raise in cost, is not comparing good roads with poor roads or new roads with old roads. It's comparing the cost of specific parts of building a highway, the cost of moving a yard of dirt, the cost of paving a square yard of highway and such. It's got nothing to do with the cost of building a good mile compared with the cost of building a poor mile.

This paper, Mr. Speaker, is put out by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on December, 1967, "Prices and Price Indexes." It says the revised base weighted highway construction price indexes, 1956, equals 100 for the period 1956 to 1966 - they are presented on pages 5-20 of this issue. Indexes are published for seven provinces and for an aggregation of these provinces. On page 2, I believe, it says: "The revised base-weighted highway construction price indexes, all items and major components combined and Provincial indexes annually from 1956 to 1966 and 1956 equal 100." If I may read this to you, Mr. Speaker:

The revised base-weighted highway construction prices indexes presented herein for the period of 1956 to 1966 include seven provincial indexes and aggregate indexes for these provinces.

Take note of this:

The indexes express the relationship of prices highway departments are paying in any given year to prices paid in the base period for an unchanging or equivalent program of construction.

We are not comparing narrow roads with wide roads, we are

**March 21, 1968**

comparing the basic components of these highways. Prices included in the prices in the index relate to bid items of contracts awarded and to prices the Departments pay for material supplied. I go down a little further:

The price indexes of highway construction in Canada, express prices paid by provincial governments in contracts awarded for highway construction each year as a percentage of prices paid in 1956. Base-weighted indexes are published annually and measure the effect of price change on the cost of specific programs of highway construction in Canada represented by highway construction contracts to \$50,000 or more awarded by specified provincial governments over the period of 1956 to 1966. Weights of items in the index representing the relative importance of units of construction in the specified base-period are held constant. Only prices change from year to year and the index thus measures the movement of prices through time. The all-items index or its components are useful for planning and budgeting for highway construction programs, in escalating or updating previously costed road-work, in estimating replacement costs of previously completed road work and as historical measurement of price trends in highway construction.

It makes it very clear here in this following paragraph if you'll bear with me a minute, Mr. Speaker.

Prices contained in the index are . . . for units of construction work put in place such as an acre of clearing, a cubic yard of earth excavation or a ton of bituminous hot-mix paving.

The Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has endeavored to make the Legislature think this afternoon that what this index was talking about was the comparison of one mile of road work, a poor mile of road work, he is trying to intimate, as compared to a good mile of road work. That is not what these figures are talking about, Mr. Speaker. They are talking about the cost as it says here very clearly: "For the units of construction work put in place, such as an acre of clearing, a cubic yard of earth excavation or a ton of bituminous hot-mix paving." Under this Government, Mr. Speaker, the figures that are shown in this report show very clearly that the costs of these things have escalated tremendously in this province, not the cost of building a good mile as compared with a poor mile, but the cost of putting one yard of earth in place has grown under this Government as compared to what it was under the old Government. What the Provincial Treasurer has had to say in this debate is simply a matter of a red herring trying to confuse the issue and to confuse the taxpayers of Saskatchewan as to what is being done with their money in regard to road building.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**HON. A. C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources):**— Mr. Speaker, I will be very, very brief. I am not going to speak long or ramble on to make the point I want to make. I want to reply to the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). You know I presume he has great confidence in the former Minister of Highways and I presume he is naive enough to take everything the former Minister of Highways tells him as gospel. He stood up - and I think it's through misinformation, I wouldn't like to attribute any other motive to him - and said: "You know under the NDP and in former Government, there was never an overrun on any highway contract." He said, "What the contract price was that's what the cost of the highway was and now we want an accounting of these extra monies." I just happen to have with me, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:**— . . . mention of grid roads in the municipalities, I did not mention highway construction.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CAMERON:**— Oh well, I understand it better now. Ahhhh! He wasn't as naive as I thought he was, Mr. Speaker. Because I have a little information here which probably he does know about and that's why he left out highways. Now I want to give you Highway No. 3 as an example between Manitoba border and a point 12 miles west, done in May, 1962. The contract price was \$97,000, the final price paid was \$122,036.54, \$2,500 per mile more than what that contractor contracted the job for, an overrun of 26 per cent. I'll give you another one, just down in the south, Highway No. 18 between Glen Ewen and Oxbow. A contract was let April, 1963; it was completed in 1964. The contract price was \$588,900, final price \$687,128.24. Let there be no more talk about no overrun on construction of highways. Let there be no further talk that the contract price was the guaranteed price and it was the finished price. If your Minister of Highways had been telling you that, ask him to check again on Highway No. 3 and Highway No. 18. As I said in one of my other debates, you know, Mr. Speaker, you don't have to eat a whole egg to know it's bad. All I quote is two instances because they indicated precisely what I set out to do.

The House recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords):**— Mr. Speaker, we heard quite a lot about highways and the cost of highways from the Members across the way and all apparently because they don't want to, or are afraid to, answer one or two simple questions about the cost of highways. It seems to be that I have never seen a greater performance of throwing up smoke screens that we have over these two sections of highways that the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) would like to know about.

**March 21, 1968**

It would seem to me that it would have been much easier and saved a great deal of time in this House, if the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) had done what he should have done and answered the question.

As someone said earlier, we have heard a great deal from one of the Members over there suggesting that any Member could go into any Department and look at the files and get the answers. But after Mr. Lloyd, the Leader of the Opposition, exposed the facts that highway construction had gone up 63 per cent in Saskatchewan, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, when he exposed what has actually been happening and proved what we have said all along has been happening, there was a great flurry and a great to-do. We saw the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) come out with his red herring. He started talking about the width and the height of the roads, and all the time all we were talking about was a cubic yard, a cubic yard of dirt in place, as the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) has said. All we got from over there was a cubic yard of dust thrown in the eyes of the public.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:**— And there is nobody that can blow the dust better than the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). He stands up in here, Mr. Speaker, straightens out his toupee and puts forth with the greatest of gusto, laboring like the proverbial elephant that he brings in the gnat. The Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) referred to what his municipal people had told him about the cost of highways and that they had not paid for overrun. Certainly there is some reason for some overrun. But, Mr. Speaker, never in the history of this province has there been such a great deal of overrun as there has been since this Government took office. Never has there been such a great increase of costs. Never before has a Government been so lax in protecting the public purse.

It is all very well for the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) to talk about bumpy roads. Well we know about bumpy roads in Saskatchewan. There are more bumps per mile and more Thatcher holes per mile in this province today than there has ever been in our highway system for the last 15 years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:**— Anybody travelling in Saskatchewan or through Saskatchewan knows about it and they know it well. He talks about coming into Saskatchewan. Have you ever come in recently, Mr. Treasurer? Have you come in from Alberta? Did you come in during the past four years? Have you come in on No. 40 from Alberta? It would jar the head off a woodpecker on either one.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— You are the woodpecker that ought to know.

**MR. KRAMER:**— The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) is so used to walking up to his hips in the backyard of his barn that he doesn't know a good hardtop highway from a poor one, and anything looks good to him. We have heard nothing in the last three or four years except about money spent, money spent but we never hear much about miles built, do we? We hear about how wide they are but we never hear about any of them getting finished. People of Saskatchewan have never suffered so many unfinished miles. Well, we don't all travel all over the province. All I know is the area that I have had the unhappy privilege of travelling over. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you this that they are pretty unhappy miles when you travel over many of the miles of north western Saskatchewan. True, some of the roads have been completed. No. 26 has been improved a great deal up to St. Walburg. But while they are improving certain sections of roads, they have allowed other roads that were erstwhile good roads, as the Member for Redberry said, to go to pot. And this all started, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier in 1964 went on his so-called saving binge. A 20 per cent cut in maintenance and the roof fell in on the highway system, because the water started running in. It started to crack up, and the maintenance dropped, and they have never caught up. They have never caught up on the maintenance yet. This Government has failed absolutely in providing Saskatchewan with new highways and it has failed completely in taking care of the highways that it has had.

**MR. L. P. CODERRE (Gravelbourg):**— Open your eyes, man!

**MR. KRAMER:**— Well maybe they have improved in some of the Liberal constituencies. We have about 13 miles in and around North Battleford. That's 13 miles! We need several more. A few miles of super-highway built at too great and wasteful a cost.

**MR. W. R. THATCHER (Premier):**— We go into Estimates tomorrow night if you want to know . . .

**MR. KRAMER:**— All right. Maybe you will go on high with Estimates, but you have asked for a debate on this by refusing to answer the question of costs. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have every right to tell them and answer the debate from that side of the House.

The Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) talks about the clover-leaves that it has built and how it is saving lives. Well I know about a couple of clover-leaves you didn't build at North Battleford where you could have saved some lives. You built one on the other side of the River where there is far less traffic, but right on top of the hill at North Battleford in between the city and the Saskatchewan Hospital, Mr. Speaker, there is a hazard that the Chamber of Commerce has raised with the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). He absolutely refused

**March 21, 1968**

to even put in an ordinary stop sign there let alone build an overpass. The overpass would have been much better there where there is traffic than on the south side of the river and even that wasn't marked well enough and there was a death there. So don't tell us, Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), about the lives that you saved. I can tell you about some lives that have been lost, because the stop signs weren't there.

**MR. THATCHER:**— Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member would like me to rise on a point of order?

**MR. KRAMER:**— Certainly.

**MR. THATCHER:**— I wonder if it wouldn't be in order if we kept this debate on Highway No. 3 from Kinistino to Birch Hills. We do plan to go on Highways estimates, the first item of Estimates, and I would suggest to the Hon. Members that they could raise these points on that occasion. We have had a two-hour debate on this now. Really couldn't we get on with the House business now?

**MR. KRAMER:**— Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to get on with the rest of the business, but the point is this, that certain things were said by the other side of the House. And if they were said in a certain debate, I think that it is proper to answer them. I am simply answering some of the things that were said. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said that these people over here, the people on this side of the House, smeared the Highway program before the election. I want to tell you this, that the waste on the Highway program was the issue in the last election at The Battlefords. I have a statement here and this is the North Battleford News Optimist, September 29, 1967, which reports the Premier's mass rally. Mind you, it is a little over-stated as to 700 people being there. There might have been 500. That was the night that the kids were all out there having a good time, and they were served free cokes and a lot of the bottles had loose tops and so on. This was a wonderful evening when the Premier was there. But the candidate who has gone to his reward right on the front page Sparrow asks, "Give me a chance", says the headlines.

**MR. THATCHER:**— Mr. Speaker, I must ask you to rule. Surely this has nothing to do with the Resolution that we are debating.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— It is my personal opinion that the debate must relate to the cost and the comparative costs of construction, reconstruction cost of surfacing and mileage involved. One group is asking for one type of information in regard to costs and an amendment in regard to the other, or further, or different types of information has been moved. Now we are on the amendment, "What was the cost of reconstruction including surfacing?" That is the basis of the amendment. Members will have to relate

themselves to the cost of construction and reconstruction of the highway system. I doubt very much if a rally in North Battleford and cokes, etc. has much to do with this.

**MR. C. G. WILLIS (Melfort-Tisdale):**— Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Earlier this afternoon you may remember, I rose on a point of order to bring the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) back to the point, back to the motion which we were discussing. It was then at that point that he started roaming away off the motion entirely. If he can do it, I don't see why our Members can't answer him.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— The motion before the House involves the costs of construction or reconstruction of a particular section of highway, and the cost of the surfacing of that particular section of highway, also the mileage involved. That is just the one mile and you can't discuss much on that. However, the motion does bring up the comparative and relative cost of construction and reconstruction in the province, including surfacing and the amendment also brings that up. It is the cost of construction, reconstruction, including surfacing of highways that we are debating and its relation to that particular area and particular section mentioned in the main motion.

**MR. KRAMER:**— Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this ruling hadn't been brought down somewhat sooner. Everyone in the House knows that the debate has ranged pretty freely. The reply here was to statements made on the other side of the House suggesting that we had been making improper statements on election platforms and that we had lost the election because of these improper statements. I was only replying. If the Premier is sensitive about the statements of his candidate and of the statements that he made, fine, I'll be glad to drop this. We'll continue on. I want very briefly to suggest that when it comes to costs, that costs are the things that we are after. I would like somebody who is able to understand the difference between a yard of dirt in place and a mile of highway to reply somewhere along the line on the measurement of cost. I would like someone on the other side of the House to get up and explain this to the Provincial Treasurer because apparently he doesn't know. Apparently the Provincial Treasurer doesn't know. No wonder the Treasury is in such tough condition.

**MR. STEUART:**— I know the difference between a square yard and a cubic yard and that's more than you know.

**MR. KRAMER:**— Well, that may be true. But I know the difference between a square over there and the ones on this side of the House, too. And, boy, they sure are looking pretty square this session.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**March 21, 1968**

**MR. KRAMER:**— Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that this particular amendment and motion are something that should have been answered. The question that we have tried to have answered has been in the public interest. Certainly we are entitled to this information, and I think that the Minister and the Government should have a second look. It's all very well for them to talk about money and miles. We are interested in the money spent and we are interested in the miles built. Mr. Speaker, what we want them to do is to spend a little less money and get a few more miles built and stop wasting the money on capricious little deals over the entire province, on things that the Government should not be concerning itself with. We are sick and tired of seeing Russian thistle patches growing on highways that were built three years ago. We are sick and tired at North Battleford of going out of our way around Bolts Bend at Langham. After spending millions of dollars there you still haven't finished it and you are still inconveniencing the public. Had you built that highway where it should have been built, it would have been finished now and at a great deal less cost.

Cost, waste, Mr. Speaker, no matter where you look. And these people stand up and try to defend this program. Then to make matters worse they refuse to give an accounting to the public when they are asked simple questions in this Legislature.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. C. P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):**— Mr. Speaker, I just can't refrain from making a couple of comments. First of all we have sat here for the last two and one-half hours and listened to the Opposition talk about unit prices, but not once in the debate have they compared the cost of highway construction in the rest of Canada. It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, to compare the increase in unit prices from 0 to 10 as compared to 5 to 10, because if there is one thing that is obvious as everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan knows, it is that in 1954 to 1964 they spent less per mile, less per vehicle and less per car than any other Province in Canada. There is no question that they built the cheapest roads, but they also built the poorest roads in Canada.

And, Mr. Speaker, if they are going to talk about the cost of highway construction, there is only one valid argument and that is, the cost of highway construction in the Province of Saskatchewan is superior to that of the Province of Manitoba and Alberta. From what I understand the unit prices in Alberta are higher. Unit prices in Manitoba are comparable. So if this is true it merely means that the cost of highway construction in Saskatchewan has been created by the improved standards.

We heard the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) say that there was no difference in the standard of highways. We heard the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) say the same thing.

Well let's be realistic. It costs a lot more to haul dirt from a burrowed pit than it does from a ditch. If you are going to build a good, first-class highway, and you are going to haul dirt and clay from a burrowed pit within a half mile from the highway or more, it is going to cost a lot more money than it is to dig it out of the ditch. The standard of highway is definitely related to the cost per unit. There is no question about it. Mr. Speaker, the cost of highway construction in the Province of Saskatchewan is no higher than in the rest of Canada. It is the type and caliber of the roads that they built.

A good illustration, Mr. Speaker, is the amount of highway construction. I took some figures from 1966 and 1963-64. For example, the number of cubic yards moved in 1963 as compared to 1966 - 11,636,000 cubic yards to 32,249,000 in 1966; miles of grading - 345 in 1963 as compared to 677 in 1966; paving - 128.4 miles compared to 242 miles; tons of gravel - 309,000 as compared to 1,565,000. How much money did we spend? Those are all two and three and four times as much, whereas the amount of money is \$47,520,000 in 1966-67, as compared to \$22,865,930 in 1963. If these are, Mr. Speaker, the increased costs that they are referring to, this is the production, this is the kind of roads that the people of Saskatchewan want. They can go anywhere in the province and see the improvement and the people of Saskatchewan recognize it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BROCKELBANK:**— Mr. Speaker, could I question the Minister before he takes his seat? Is that really true that you were a teacher of logic?

**MR. MacDONALD:**— You would never have reached that class.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order! The question was a very poor one and the answer was just about as bad.

**MR. THIBAUT:**— On a point of order. Do I close the debate?

**MR. SPEAKER:**— No. The question before the House is on the amendment. Now the Member for Kinistino hasn't spoken to the amendment and until the amendment is cleared away he can't close the debate either.

**MR. THIBAUT:**— Mr. Speaker, what I was asking was who has the right to close the debate?

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Nobody closes the debate on an amendment. The debate can only be closed on the main motion.

**March 21, 1968**

**MR. THIBAUT:**— Just so I don't lose my final turn. Mr. Speaker, I never thought that I would start something like this in this House on a very simple question. Had the question been answered - and I don't think that it was an unusual one - we would have saved two or three hours time of the House. This is almost as bad as getting some of the other information on liquor. I didn't think that this one was as bad.

I want to say that in the remarks that I have made, I don't cast any doubt on the honesty of the Deputy Ministers. I want that cleared up right now. I think that it is all the fault of the Minister who does not want to give the information that he has. It is not that difficult to get that information, and I've said that before. It is the people in my constituency who have been asking time and time again. They are going to be disappointed when they cannot get the answers that they want to know. I am sure that even the Liberals in my constituency are going to have a pretty red face when they find out what took place here tonight. Oh, there are still a few and I respect them all in my constituency.

When we talk about a cubic yard, whether it is a Liberal cubic yard or a CCF cubic yard, I think that they should weigh the same and measure the same. It is amazing when you look at the increased cost for Saskatchewan, 63 per cent for the cubic yard - oh, this is the cost of highways - higher than last year. I am quite sure that, if the figures for the stretch of highway that we are talking about had been the one that they used for the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures and left the rest of the province out, that 63 per cent would look like fly specks. This is the reason why we are not going to get this information.

As I said a moment ago, it is the decision of the Minister and I don't blame the Deputy at all. I think you have some fine men back there. I am not going to be accused of casting doubt on them. It just boils down to a plain refusal and I don't see any reason for it. But when the costs turn up that way, I think there is a deterrent fee needed on the Minister to hold him down. I didn't know that this question was so potent, but it sure smoked out a few things here this afternoon. With this, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister will reconsider the question as it is straightforward. Unless he has something to hide, he is going to stick to his guns. This is the only reason for this being done. There is something to hide.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The amendment was agreed to.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

### **RESOLUTION NO. 2 - GUARANTEED PRICES FOR FARMERS**



The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):

That this Legislature urge the Provincial Government to immediately request the Federal Government to adopt an agricultural policy that would ensure financial return to provide an adequate standard of living to farmers by guaranteeing prices of farm commodities based on the cost of production and subject to yearly review; such prices to be announced early enough each year to allow farmers to plan their current operations.

**MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey):**— Mr. Speaker, when adjourning debate on this Resolution, I said that this Province relies heavily on agriculture for a stable economic position, and that at present the farmers' conditions and the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan are poor, and all prospects point toward no improvement or in fact toward possibilities of getting worse, unless the Federal Government adopts an agricultural policy that would ensure financial returns to provide an adequate standard of living to farmers, by guaranteeing prices of farm commodities based on cost of production, as outlined in the Resolution moved by the Hon. Member for Touchwood.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that all Members must agree with me in saying that within the last year a complete reversal has overtaken the international wheat market, revealing a pattern of declining prices and falling world trade which developed in the first few months of 1967 and 1968 crop year. The major factor of several contributing to this change was that of abundant crops in most wheat-growing areas during 1966 and 1967. This surplus of wheat and the reduction of international wheat prices show us how unstable the international wheat market can be. It also shows us that it is of utmost necessity to maintain an International Wheat Agreement which sets out reasonable boundaries within which the price of wheat can fluctuate. I might say here that it is indeed unfortunate that the Federal Liberal Government did not foresee the seriousness of this situation during the negotiations of the last International Wheat Agreement, because of their shortsightedness in thinking that the price of wheat would not drop below the old floor price of \$1.95½ per bushel, No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead. When the price did drop below this floor, they were further overly optimistic in thinking that it would only be one or two cents below that old floor price. We now find that it is now four cents below the floor price which means that the Federal Government will have to subsidize somewhere in the neighborhood of \$15 million to make up for this downward trend, in the price of wheat. Mr. Speaker, the only reason that the Federal Government agreed to subsidize this wheat to the floor price of the old International Wheat Agreement was because they were trying to get on the good side of the western farmer and also because the Provincial Liberal Government of this Province was in the midst of an election campaign when the price of wheat dropped. Because of this

**March 21, 1968**

relationship between this Provincial party and the Federal party, the Federal Government was forced to subsidize. Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that subsidies were not in order, under the circumstances, but the reasons for them certainly were not in the best interests of the farmer. Also, Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Liberal Government had been aggressive in the world wheat negotiations it could very well be that agreement may not have terminated. It is also evident that this subsidy is not sufficient to give the farmer the fair return he deserves for his produce. It is evident from lack of grain sales and from poor crops grown in the Province of Saskatchewan last year that there are a great many farmers who are already in financial difficulty, and, if action is not taken by both Provincial and Federal Governments, this financial situation will compound itself to a magnitude whereby the farmer will not be able to continue to operate.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture in Saskatchewan is an industry of small units. The family farm predominates with no single farm unit large enough to affect to any marked degree the overall output of any given farm product. In this respect agriculture stands in marked contrast to centralization of urban industries as we know them today. In most elemental sets agriculture is one of the few remaining examples of perfectly competitive economy, as described in the economic textbooks. For the great majority of farms the management function and most of all the labor are combined in the same person. This is in contrast to the situation in nearly all other large urban industries where management and labor are not combined in the same person. Here a management can reduce its labor force, thus cutting expenses and reducing the output of the firm, thereby helping to prevent disastrous declines in price. Then, too, there are enormous differences in the space requirements of agriculture and those of non-farm industries. This difference in area markedly affects the problems and interests of the two groups of the industries. Personal contact, exchange of ideas and unity of action are far more difficult in agriculture than in most urban industries, for important differences in emphasis in the publicly supported activity of the two groups. Because of the structure and the nature of its labor force agriculture in Saskatchewan is one of the most competitive industries in the national economy. Since no unit is large enough to dominate the market or to affect significantly the national output of a given type of product, the individual farmer does not find it to his advantage to restrict his production as a means of raising the price of his product. Neither is it feasible for him to establish a price for his product, nor in most cases to put a brand name on it. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of farm net income it is difficult to take a single year as being a representative, owing to the unusual large year to year fluctuations in the farm incomes.

However, the average farm net income in Saskatchewan for a five-year period between 1944 and 1948, inclusive, amounted to \$275 million a year. During the most recent five-year period

we have available from 1954 to 1958, farm net income averaged somewhat lower than \$265 million. But unlike other industries no allowance is made for the labor return of the farm operator himself. There were 103,391 farm operators in 1956 and, if an allowance of even \$2,500 per farm operator were made for the labor input of the farm operator and his family, the average return on capital investment in Saskatchewan during the past five years has been negligible. Accordingly it may be seen, with the farm capital increasing by 120 per cent in a period between 1946 and 1956, the Saskatchewan farmer, unlike his industrial counterpart, has not been obtaining a reasonable rate of return on his capital investment. Indeed because of some of these adverse trends cited above, a situation may be developed where the farmer sells his food on occasions below the cost of production. Where the farmer said he is selling food below the cost of production he is telling the truth. That was one thing the Royal Commission of Price Spreads learned during the hearings throughout the country. How does the farmer do this? He does it by sheer persistence and tightening his belt, forgetting about depreciation and living on his capital. Persistence is something that we don't find in other fields.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency of Kelsey which I represent, and which is known to have some of the best land in Saskatchewan, there are farmers who do not have enough grain to fill a five-bushel quota, and there are others who have grain available but have only a three-bushel quota compared to six or seven-bushel quota at the same time last year. These are primary factors along with lower livestock prices, higher machinery and operating costs, higher taxes and ever spiralling interest rates that have recently reached 7 3/4 per cent in many banks. In fact there are a great many farmers not only in northern Saskatchewan, but in the entire Province of Saskatchewan who are not able to borrow money from banks at this exorbitant interest rate. It's not because they don't have the assets for the necessary collateral, but it is because the banking industry's long-range forecast for agriculture is poor, consequently making bankers think that farmer's repayments of loans would be poor - which they would be. There are also farmers in the province who cannot borrow money through the Farm Improvement Loan Plan because the bankers consider this interest rate too low. Now, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can a situation be, the farmer who is caught in a cost-price squeeze that he can do nothing about himself personally, and when he needs operating capital, he can't get money, because the interest rates on one hand are too high and on the other hand he can't get money because the bank won't lend it because the interest rate is too low and it is not a profitable enterprise for them. Now, Mr. Speaker, is the present Liberal Government either federally or provincially doing anything to correct this? At present they are not.

Further indications that we need guaranteed farm prices for commodities is shown in a survey taken by the Economic Council of Canada, which shows that of the three prairie provinces, Saskatchewan has 52 per cent of its rural families classified as poor, which means that their total farm products sold is less

**March 21, 1968**

less than \$3,750. That is 52 per cent of its rural families. Our neighbour to the east, Manitoba, is nearly as bad, although not quite. It has 48 per cent of its rural families in the same circumstances. To the west, we find Alberta has 40 per cent of its rural families in the same circumstances. These statistics, Mr. Speaker, are indeed disappointing, I am sure not only to me, but to all Members of this Assembly, for they show that Saskatchewan has the highest percentage of poor rural families of the three prairie provinces. This is true in spite of the province offering the best opportunity for agricultural development and production of all three of these provinces.

It is further disappointing to see livestock drastically decline in the last several years. Cattle on Saskatchewan farms as at December 1, 1964, were some 2,038,000 head. In December 1, 1967 this had dropped to 1,945,000 head, or reduction percentagewise of 4.6 per cent. In the case of the hog industry, although the present Government has increased its number of hogs, the farmer has increased the number of hogs, due to its program of diversification, which I do not criticize entirely, but the price of hogs has dropped drastically because it has done nothing in regard to stabilizing the price. There should have been a floor established here, so that the farmer can maintain this industry he goes into as a profit-making one. Sheep in Saskatchewan, in spite of all the Premier's urging in his Government to encourage and expand, sheep production in this province has dropped. On December 1 of 1964 there were 105,000 sheep in this province. To December 1 of 1967 this had dropped to some 83,000, or percentagewise a drop of 21 per cent. As for egg production in the Province of Saskatchewan, 1963 there were 29,142,000 dozen eggs produced in the province. In 1967 this had dropped to 21,823,000 dozen, or down 25.1 per cent. Poultry on Saskatchewan farms as of June 1, 1964, were some 6,840,000. On June 1, 1967, this had dropped to 6,480,000, or a drop of 5.3 per cent. Milk production has dropped some 26.8 per cent from 1.1 billion pounds to approximately 815 million pounds.

Mr. Speaker, these decreases in livestock numbers and the slump in the production of agricultural productivity definitely show that this province, as other provinces, is in dire need of guaranteed agricultural prices that will keep in line with the cost of farm production. We have a trend, Mr. Speaker, of farms getting larger, but this doesn't solve the problem, because it isn't all farms that expand in size. It is getting so that only the larger, or the already large scale farms can increase their operations. Consequently there is a slow and steady disappearance of the average or below average farmer, and there is very little being done in regard to the replacement of this farmer. I believe there is something on the Statute Books of this Province in regard to educating farmers who no longer can make a profit-making enterprise out of their farm and putting them into some other field. This is something that there is nothing being done about at the present time.

There are numerous other difficulties that Saskatchewan and Canadian farmers are confronted with. They show the urgent need

for marketing subsidies related to production costs, or income supplements with a domestic price for wheat related to the price index of goods and services used by the Canadian farmer. Along with this, Mr. Speaker, we have to urge both the Wheat Board and Canada to seek expanding sales of Canadian commercial wheat for export. We must also urge the Government of Canada to acquire a new International Wheat Agreement under conditions and prices accepted by the International Wheat Council. We must further urge the Canadian Wheat Board to extend its jurisdiction to the marketing of rye, flax and rapeseed, even if it is necessary to have a producer plebiscite to assure the Government of the farmers' support in this regard. We must urge extension of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Plan to enable all farmers to participate and allow more grain to be included for coverage and also bring up to date the average production yields. At present the production yields are taken over an average of the last 20 or 25 or 30 years, and I am sure the Minister of agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will agree with me that in the last ten years the productivity in the province as was shown by last year has increased tremendously. So it is time that this comparison was updated to the times.

There are other necessary needs for the farmer, such as co-ordinating farm management services to enable farmers to operate more efficiently, expanded research to improve the understanding of complex problems of farming and farmers and to find solutions to these farming problems.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, in its massive struggle for a greater share of the world's wealth, mankind's underprivileged majority is embarked on a collision course with a most violent explosion of population in world history. World population is increasing currently at a rate of between 1 1/4 per cent per annum or nearly 30 million people each year. This rate of growth is unparalleled in the history of mankind. In overall terms the world's 2.7 billion population has almost doubled in the past 70 years and is rapidly approaching the level beyond which scientists believe the earth can no longer sustain all its inhabitants. Closer to home, within the next 10 years, according to the United States Census Bureau projections, the population of the United States will exceed the 250 million mark. It is increasing at a rate of 330 per hour. Within the next 20 years the United States will have a population of some 260 million, and by 40 or 50 years from now, the population will be well over 370 million people. This being the case there are strong grounds for considering Canadian agriculture not as a sick industry as many are prone to do, but as a vital bulwark in mankind's destiny.

In any event such stability in prairie agriculture continues to be the most depressing single question affecting the thought and attitude of the primary producer. No public policy which denies or obscures the basic requirements of this industry can hope to achieve ready response or lasting success. The inevitability of this search for stability has its roots in the physical and economic environment of the prairie region. To ignore this basic need by letting it drift means radicalism, then bitterness

**March 21, 1968**

leading in turn to sectional strife and the eventual depopulation of much of our farming area contrary to anyone's long-term interest. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to avoid this we have to overcome the present cost-price squeeze that the farmer in Canada is in. The first step toward doing it is the adoption of the Resolution put forth by the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), urging the Federal Government to incorporate guaranteed farm prices. I support this Resolution and I ask all Members in this Assembly to do likewise.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J. A. PEPPER (Weyburn):**— Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of this Resolution, because in supporting it I feel that I am taking the necessary steps to try and assist our farmer friends in securing a square deal in the agricultural industry. I know that much of the success of our farmers depends on the agricultural policy that is formulated by our Federal Government at Ottawa, but it is only through pressure, Mr. Speaker, by us as Members from the Provincial Governments, urging the Federal Government to take action and to adopt policies based on the cost of production and subject to yearly review in producing farm commodities, that will in turn guarantee prices to provide an adequate standard of living. This, Mr. Speaker, is a must, if we hope to keep our agricultural industry in the forefront in our province. It is because no measures of protection to our farmers are being provided for them that we find so many of them in the dilemma that they are in today.

The farmers' costs in the last several years to produce grain or in the raising of livestock have soared as we all know to an all-time high. We all know that farm machinery today is getting more costlier each year. A tractor that could be bought for \$3,700 ten years ago has now more than doubled in price. It now costs between \$7,000 and \$8,000 for the same tractor, the same size with the same accessories with it. And every other implement that a farmer requires to operate his farm has climbed the same proportion in price. This is just the initial price of the implement. Let's just take a look at the price of repairs when these implements require them. Again the repairs have gone up in price in the same manner only in higher proportion. I don't think I need to remind any of you Members who are farmers just how the prices have risen, when you take your truck to be repaired or your implement to be overhauled. Compare the cost of having this done now as compared to five or ten years ago. And, of course, the latest increase is the 2 cents per gallon on farm fuel. But the sad part, Mr. Speaker, is that the financial return to the farmer has not increased in that same period of time, thus we say he is caught in the cost-price squeeze. In many cases, he is being squeezed right out of production and is forced to fold up and try his fortunes elsewhere.

Now we give industry incentives to establish within our boundaries. We guarantee prices and subsidize other industries.

What is wrong with subsidizing or giving incentives to our farmers and our agricultural industry? I believe it is only by taking steps such as this that our farmers can plan their current operations.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, various areas of our province have had rail line abandonment, and we must face the facts that there are other rail lines that are certainly in great danger of being abandoned. Recently I received from the Board of Transport in Ottawa a letter stating that a hearing will take place regarding the closing of some stations. This means, Mr. Speaker, that a farmer also in these areas concerned will be faced with the very possible increase in delivering of his grain, because this is very often the first step, in abandonment of a rail line when the agent of a station is removed. So you see again, until we urge our Provincial Government to recommend to our Federal Government that immediate measures be taken to provide our farmers with prices for their commodity, and that they be increased and kept in balance with what they have to pay in order to produce these commodities, we as a Government are not carrying or displaying our full responsibilities to our farmers.

If I may at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to an article in the Weyburn Review, a weekly paper, of March 14th, which I think certainly is worth reading into the records here. It proves the necessity of action being taken to support a Resolution such as we have before us at this time.

The Canadian farmer is the most efficient in the world. In the decade from 1957 to 1966, the Canadian farmer increased his food production by 44 per cent, Russia increased theirs by 30 per cent, United States increased theirs by 13 per cent. According to the 1961 census, 78 per cent of all commercial farms in Canada brought their owners less than \$2,000 per year. Only 12 per cent have farm incomes of more than \$3,000, while only 5.32 per cent make more than \$5,000.

Back in 1946, I think you can well remember, a young veteran starting out could hope to make a living on the farm with a capital investment of say \$30,000. Today to realize a \$5,000 per year income it takes between \$100,000 and \$150,000. According to C.W. Gibbings, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, farm index prices rose only 15 per cent in the years between 1946 and 1966, but the index of items entering into farm costs climbed 169 per cent. These costs now eat up about 80 per cent of a farmer's gross sales. In order to earn the magic \$5,000, he must sell \$25,000 worth of produce. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is caught in a vicious cost-price squeeze and it is only by fantastic gains in farm productivity has he been able to keep unit production cost within some reasonable range of selling prices. But the limit now has been reached. The farmer has gone about as far as he can in subsidizing the rest of the country.

The question arises: should the country now start subsidizing

**March 21, 1968**

the farmer? Many farmers say, No. They can see that although price supports supply some benefits to low-income farmers, these will benefit much less than other farm groups. If we agree that subsidies are not the long-term solution we must bear in mind and remember that our farmers today in Saskatchewan are competing for world markets against farmers who are subsidized. In the United Kingdom 68 per cent of the net farm income is in the form of a Government subsidy. In the United States it is 39.6 per cent. Canadian farmers realize less than 3 per cent of income from Government subsidies. The other measure to relieve the squeeze might appear as higher food prices, but I would say this isn't good. This would invite a greater flood of subsidized foodstuffs from abroad. One solution being advocated is to vacate the land, fewer farmers sharing more of the pie is the argument. This is an economic approach to a sociology problem. Most farmers don't want to leave the land, especially for the uncertainties of urban life. Like it or not, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is being told by society today that his presence in the countryside is not wanted. The sad thing is that the forced migration of the farmers to the cities I think is a mistake for those without marketable skills, and this is 60 per cent of Canadian farmers. They have never attended high school. It is a case of transforming a rural poverty problem into urban unemployment problem. A sociologist, Paul Goodman, puts it:

If the cheapest urban public housing costs \$20,000 a unit to build, and every city has a housing shortage, would it not be better to give farmers \$1,000 a year for 20 years, just for rent to stay at home and drink their own water?

The growth of Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and to bring it closer to home, Saskatoon, Regina, is not inevitable as we are led to believe. Our vaunted technology could as easily produce rural affluence or a co-operative society of farmers and consumers. This, Mr. Speaker, is the tragedy of our present policy. We are denuding the farms to swell the city population. The problems of places like New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and other American stations should be a lesson to us but I am afraid that we completely ignore the facts. We need the countryside and the only people who can preserve the countryside for conservation, recreation and food for the cities are the people who already live there. By 1975, according to the United National Food and Agricultural Organization, the world will be in a grip of famine more terrible than a nuclear war. By then population growth will have exceeded the world's agricultural abilities. There is no known scientific means of either increasing the world's food supply or of decreasing the rate of population explosion soon enough to avoid this catastrophe. India in 1967 is the preview of Latin America, Africa and Asia in 1975.

So I would say that in view of the foreseeable world needs for food, the Canadian Government would do better to encourage farmers to remain on the land and buy what they produce. This no doubt, Mr. Speaker, raises problems to be sure. But our chances of solving them are much better than our present aimless drift with no agriculture policy whatever. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to relate to you the condition many of our western farmers



are in today, and why I think that action, both provincially and federally, must be taken in order for them to keep our agricultural industry in the forefront.

Therefore, I urge all Members to support this Resolution, and in doing so I feel that we will be taking a positive action and a positive step to alleviate the agricultural crisis that is facing our farmers today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. D. T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):**— Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Resolution I am going to confine my remarks this evening to the Resolution as such and leave it up to other speakers to review the whole field of agriculture. I am sure that every Member in this House is quite familiar with the problems not only on the provincial level but also on a national level. I am sure, too, that they are familiar with the facts that the policies set up by any national party, regardless of whether it be a Liberal party, Conservative party, or even a Socialist party, to come down with an overall agricultural policy designed to help agriculture all over Canada, would present a great many problems.

The problems that they are experiencing in the Maritimes today in regard to potatoes and potato farmers, to milk shippers and those engaged in the dairy industry, and certainly to those many thousands of small farmers in the Province of Quebec engaged in the dairy industry and certainly to those many thousands of small farmers in Ontario engaged in those industries are examples. Any national policy designed to alleviate the situation in those areas of the nation could have detrimental effects for our own producers here in Saskatchewan. I think that one of the latest experiences has been the action of the National Dairy Commission in regard to the reduction of the subsidy on butterfat, where it may be designed to alleviate a situation in Eastern Canada, certainly is adding to a problem that we have here in Saskatchewan where we have no over-production of butterfat and certainly an under-production of butter.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak strictly to the substance of the Resolution and other Members, if they so wish, can deal in broader fields. The Resolution proposed by the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) as I said, is indeed very involved. It touches on just about every aspect of the lives of our primary producers here in Saskatchewan. Its scope is so wide that we cannot deal with it in adequate fashion until we define some guide lines. There is no question that one of the major problems that we are facing today is one of farm income. I am sure that's recognized all over Canada, certainly here in our own province.

We are aware that many farm families in the province do suffer from inadequate income, whose living standards are substantially below that which is considered adequate in these times.

**March 21, 1968**

I am sure that it is one of the reasons why we have the rural development programs in this province and some Provincial programs directed to these people in these areas who have the lowest income in our province, on the basis of the 1961 census at least.

However, we do not believe that the solution lies in the method proposed by the Resolution. The Resolution refers to the cost of production. So, Mr. Speaker, the first question then is: what is the cost of production? We all know perfectly well that the cost of production depends on the size of the unit. We all know that there are some farmers in Saskatchewan for whom present wheat prices are yielding an adequate return, and we know that there are many farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan to whom present wheat prices do not give an adequate return. I think that one of the most enlightening studies that has been done recently, was the Vulcan Report conducted by the firm of Hedlin and Menzies, management consultants, a study of the agriculture industry in the Vulcan county of Alberta. I may say, that the county of Vulcan, Alberta represents a good cross-section of the agricultural industry in that province. Some of the larger grain farmers and some of the smaller grain farmers, quite large-scale livestock enterprises, and a good cross-section of soil types provided material for the type of analysis that was done. And our own Farm Business Summary in Saskatchewan conducted by the Department of Agriculture had more or less pointed out many of the findings that were pointed out in the Vulcan Report.

When we talk about standards of living we are recognizing that the cost of living for a farmer and his family is one of the factors in the cost of production. A little simple arithmetic will illustrate the effect of the size of unit on the cost of production. If we assume that the average farm family needs a minimum of \$4,000 labor and management income - and this is not a very high figure today - then on a farm unit of 200 cultivated acres the cost then becomes \$13 per cultivated acre. But on a farm of 800 cultivated acres this is a cost of \$5 per cultivated acre. Remember this is cost per cultivated acre. It means that even in a three-year rotation with two crops and summer-fallow, the cost of labor and management against every acre of crop is \$30 per acre for a 200-acre farm, \$20 per acre for a 300-acre farm and \$7.50 for the 800-acre farm. And the same kind of economics applies to livestock production. To use the data in the 1967 Outlook produced by our Economics and Statistic Branch, it would take 200 beef cows in a cow-calf enterprise, 400 hogs, 24 dairy cows, 600 sheep and so on for a return of about \$4,000 to labor. So that is one problem. What is the cost of production? Whose cost of production would be used? If it is the cost of production of a modern, efficient, reasonably sized unit such a subsidy would mean very little, perhaps nothing to the farmer who does not have this kind of a unit.

On the other hand it could mean a lot of added income to the larger producers. Assume that the cost in the case of wheat was based on 800 cultivated acres or 600, then it means that the man with 1,000 or 1,500 cultivated acres is in even a stronger

position than he is now. He would be in a position to bid still higher for the land to push the price of land still higher and put the man who is just starting or the man who is trying to expand in an even worse position than he is now. I think that I would like to give you some indication of how this applies in the country of Vulcan when I read one or two paragraphs from the study. They are related to the cost of producing a bushel of wheat.

The cost of producing a bushel of wheat varies widely within the county. Largely on the basis of the size of the farm operation, as farm size grew larger, the cost of production declined.

It is very interesting that large farms defined in the study as being more than 1,280 acres had an average cost of \$1.47 a bushel in order to produce a bushel of wheat, a full 10 cents below the average for the county. On the other extreme farms with one section (640 acres) or less in size had a cost of \$1.90 a bushel, 33 cents above the average of the county and 30 cents above the estimated average price realized in the low or medium farms.

In the study, farms of 641 acres or less than 1,280 acres, the price was \$1.63. While the average cost per bushel for the total sample was \$1.57 - I think an even more impressive analysis - there was a good deal of variations between different groups and farms. In one classification of farms it showed that the highest cost per bushel to produce was \$2.64 for farms in the smaller-sized category. The lowest average cost was \$1.19 per bushel for farms with 1,400 to 1,499 acres. The cost per bushel of wheat on individual farms ranged from a high over \$3.50 to a low of \$1.00. So I think this points up the fact that, when you are going to determine the cost of production, what size of unit are you going to select? That is one problem. What is the cost of production and whose cost of production would be used in the Resolution? If it is the cost of production of a modern, efficient reasonably sized unit, such a subsidy would mean very little, perhaps nothing to the farmer who had that kind of unit. On the other hand it could mean a lot of added income to the larger producer. Assuming the cost in a case where wheat was based on 800 cultivated acres or 600, as I said before, then it means that the man with 1,000 to 1,500 cultivated acres is even in a stronger position to acquire land at the expense of the smaller operator.

The same of course holds true to the larger ranchers bidding for ranch lands as against the smaller ranchers in our province. The effect is somewhat different in the case of such products as eggs and pork. Again, however, it is obvious that a subsidy will mean much more to the larger producer than it would to the small producer. And often the larger producers is in a position to expand quickly and to take advantage of higher prices and subsidies that might be in existence. When this happens it means lower prices and then higher subsidy as well as surplus problems depending of course on the product. There

**March 21, 1968**

would be only one way to beat the inevitable effect of subsidies, and that would be through strict production and controls. I am sure that all Members realize that this is what is being done in the United States. Subsidies or guaranteed prices are offered for wheat, for example, but the acreage that can be planted is rigidly controlled. And our producers have not ever in the past indicated nor do they at the moment indicate that they wish to get involved in this type of government regulation.

The Resolution before us goes on to say that these subsidies, these prices should be announced early enough each year to allow farmers to plan their current operations. Well, Mr. Speaker, what does the cattleman whether he is in beef or dairy, do if the price next year looks too low after sitting down and reviewing these prices each year? Would he not breed his cows because the prices look insufficient, or would he sell them all and go into hogs? The grain grower can make quicker shifts. He can make them each year because he can go out of wheat production into barley, coarse grains or oil seeds. However, so far as our economists are concerned, they just haven't been able to come up with an accurate prediction of next year's grain market. Of course, this applies each and every year. We think that while farmers should have the best annual information available, farm planning has to be done on a longer term basis than from year to year. It is true that during the war years the Federal Government called the Provincial Governments into conference at Ottawa and at that time, plans for production could be made, because we knew that we had the contracts with Great Britain to supply bacon products. We knew that because of the lack of shipping facilities that controls had to be placed on production of wheat and so more lands were put into summer-fallow. That was done in years of national emergency, but I don't think that this would be acceptable or practical to the farmers of Canada in peace-time.

Finally I would emphasize that I am speaking of subsidy payments, based on a supposed cost of production. Support payments, we believe, are necessarily based on a concept of stop-loss during the trough in a price cycle. I may point out that at the present time there are support prices under eggs, pork and various other products. These are basically in effect under The Agricultural Stabilization Act. They could be improved as to their application in Western Canada with regard to the size of unit. These are probably outdated because these prices were set some years ago. The problem of farm income has always been a difficult problem and is not less difficult in this period of rapid change and adjustment. In Saskatchewan we have been emphasizing the need of farmers with limited acreage expanding their enterprise to beef cattle, sheep and hog enterprises and have set up programs accordingly. We have attempted to assist through providing community grazing and by various incentive grants. This is probably not the appropriate time to deal at length with the question of farm income, but we are convinced that the concept of guaranteed prices as envisioned by the Resolution or subsidies, will not cure the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the future of our agricultural industry in Western Canada, certainly here in Saskatchewan, is based on exports, exports of the products that we are producing at the present time and certainly will be able to produce in the future. It is true that here in Canada our population is such that we over-produce and that our home markets can't consume all the goods that the agricultural industry can provide. And so in my thinking at least, the main emphasis for the future of our agricultural industry should be placed on having a trade policy whereby representatives of the industry will be travelling through all the developed countries of the world, the countries that have been our traditional markets in the past and the present and certainly to break into the newer developing countries where we have a tremendous market waiting to be tapped.

It is true that at the present time the Federal Government has set up a task force to look into the present policies that are enforced today in the agricultural industry and to look to the future and see what policies can be developed for the expansion for the years ahead.

With these brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, and having outlined the effect of the Resolution and having indicated to this House that I don't think that it serves the purpose as was intended, I would therefore introduce an amendment to the Resolution by deleting all the words after "agriculture" in the second line and substitute the following therefor:

and trade policy establishing a trade commission under the Department of Trade and Commerce to negotiate with the various importing countries of the world and establish markets for Canadian agricultural products that would ensure favorable financial returns to our farmer producers.

I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

**MR. G. R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook):**— Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disappointed in the presentation of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) for a number of reasons, and when I read the amendment to the Resolution I am certainly more disappointed . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOWERMAN:**— . . . in that I was certain at least that the Minister should be aware that we do have an International Wheat Agreement or at least we hope we have one and we also have an International Cereal Agreement which is not very stable at the present, but at least we have these two bodies which indicate to me that what he is proposing in the amendment really doesn't suggest anything more than what we have at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I can do little more this evening than repeat

**March 21, 1968**

what has already been said by the Members on this side of the House, but I must raise my voice in support of the Resolution by the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). There is in fact, and agriculture is in fact reaching, a crisis in the province. No wonder the situation of agriculture is as depressed as it is after listening to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in his rather depressing outlook on the future of agriculture in Saskatchewan. Certainly the great void of no ideas for a solution can only serve to depress the Saskatchewan agriculture that much more.

We really don't look to the Hon. Minister to tell us what the problems are in agriculture, but we look to him for some solutions. We were hoping that in the speech which he presented that he might offer to Saskatchewan farmers a solution or a proposal for a solution at least to some of the problems which we face.

While there is a certain amount of political lip service being offered to farmers, no real long-term programs have yet been suggested by either the Provincial Government or the Federal Government at Ottawa. This Government here in Saskatchewan has received a submission from the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, as recent as January 25, 1968, and I notice that no direct action has been taken by the Government to address itself to this problem by any formal action of this House since we have commenced our deliberations here.

The report that I refer to outlines very well the position of Saskatchewan farmers. The picture is by no means optimistic about the well-being of agriculture in 1968 and the future, indeed, appears even worse. I want to draw a few quotations from this brief and to impress upon the Government again the necessity to do something absolute and something more positive about today's farm problems. There is no one in Saskatchewan today including the Government who will deny that farming is the mainstay of Saskatchewan's economy and is also one of the greater contributors to the gross national product of our Federal Government in Canada. In view of the importance of agriculture in Saskatchewan and Canada, farmers, I think, should expect and I believe that Governments must produce a more reasonable and acceptable economic structure within which farming may continue to make its vital and important contribution for our society. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the economic outlook of farming today is not good. I suggest that if the Governments are not going to assume a more responsible attitude than mere lip service, they will again experience the farmer-labor unrest of the 1930s, which indeed left an undesirable historic mark on this province and on this city in particular.

The Farmers' Union brief suggests that the sharp decline in the 1967-68 export grain sales will of course adversely affect the 1968 farm-cash income to farmers. This may be offset somewhat by the higher initial payments we will be receiving on grain deliveries, and it may be somewhat offset by the expected high final payments in our 1966-67 grain deliveries whenever we get them. However, Mr. Speaker, such conditions in 1968 can only

serve to aggravate and to increase the critical year of 1969.

Let's look at some of the uncertainties facing farmers in 1968 and 1969. Export sales are uncertain. Indeed, they are down something over 100 million bushels. The future of the International Cereal Agreement is in doubt. The 1969 final grain payments will be smaller. The future market in feed grain prices is declining. Hog prices are down almost 50 per cent from February 1966. Beef prices are down \$4 to \$5 per hundred. Farm production costs are at an all-time high. The situation in farming has been more recently aggravated by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) who has placed a two cent per gallon tax on farm fuels. The present soil moisture conditions indicate another 1967 crop year. Indeed some forecasting has already been done by those in that field.

Mr. Speaker, one of the immediate problems is that maximum grain quotas may only rate six to seven bushels in the year 1968. I wonder, and I am sure there are many who wonder why the Provincial Government has not moved in this area to bring about some solution. I know that they may not be able to finalize an agreement but I know also that they ought to have communication with their Federal counterparts at Ottawa and in that regard ought to be able to make some submission to that Government in order to bring about a solution to this rather vital and important problem. According to the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union brief to this Government, cash operating expenses and the operator-family labor costs require a minimum of a 10-bushel quota. This quota would still not provide for depreciation, it wouldn't provide for the investment or machinery costs, and all of these costs of course are part of the farming expenses of today. Mr. Speaker, this year's expected quota will not cover cash operating expenses. This means no living income for the operator from grain sales; and because the farmer must have living expenses, he will be unable to pay his bills and therefore he will have cash operating debts as he enters the 1969 year. Cash operating debts in 1968 and facing the expected critical year of 1969 I'm sure there are many who will agree and there are many who will find this will be the last straw for many small farmers of our province to put them off the land completely.

Mr. Speaker, a Government who claims great interest in the economic development of our agricultural province, and ends up budgeting as much for public works as it does for the development of agriculture, is not worthy of the farm support of this province. I must urge some positive steps by the Government to alleviate the current and future farm problems of our country. Because I can find no such action by the Government in any of its many Bills and orders of this Legislature, I must urge that Members of this House support the Resolution on the guaranteed farm income that has been presented by the Hon. Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). I would urge that they look seriously at the proposed amendment and that, as it provides really no solution to the problems of the farmer, we forego the amendment and support the Resolution as presented.

**March 21, 1968**

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. E. I. WOOD (Swift Current):**— Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

#### **MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 69**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) for Return No. 69 and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Steuart:

**MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):**— Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Hon. Minister had to bring in an amendment because I asked a simple question. I don't know what he is hiding. As a matter of fact I was trying to be helpful to the Minister, because as he pointed out there are rumors and I want to assure him that I don't start these rumors, the rumors in the district that this box factory was subleased to a firm that I am told partly belongs to Mr. Steuart.

**HON. D. G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):**— Just big lies.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— Well maybe it is, you had a chance to answer and correct the rumors. That's why I don't see why you had to bring in an amendment. You could have told the facts of the case as to just what happened . . . who had an option and who had the sublease and this wouldn't have happened. Now I don't know if I can get the information after what you put in there in the amendment. I can't see how it could be amended very well to get the information I want. The Minister did say, Mr. Speaker, that I would get more information and maybe that will clear his name . . .

**MR. STEUART:**— My name doesn't need to be cleared by the likes of you, Bill.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— Mr. Speaker, I resent that. The Hon. Minister is always charging me with rumors and everything else. This is not true.

**MR. STEUART:**— It is, Bill, but that's all right.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— Steuart Electric is supposed to be, according to certain people, subleasing this property and they got it at the same time as the man who got it by lease option. So we should get an



answer in black and white so you can clear the Government and clear all of us.

**MR. STEUART:**— On a point of privilege, the Hon. Member makes a statement that my firm, the firm I'm connected with, is supposed to be doing something. Then he says he is going to clear my name. Who starts the rumor? Well, I can tell you that the firm of Steuart Electric is not renting this and never has rented it and never will rent it and had nothing to do with the buying of it.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 70

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) for Return No. 70 and the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Steuart:

**MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):**— Mr. Speaker, the Minister said he'd give more information that I asked for and I appreciate his kindness and generosity. But I thought since he is so generous that he could give a little more information on top of what he has in this amendment so I'd like to bring in a sub-amendment as follows: Moved by my seatmate, Mr. Meakes and seconded by Mr. Davies, that the amendment be amended as follows:

That the words "and the name of the person who did the appraising" be added after the figures "1967" in part (3); that the words "Whether the property was tendered, the date and" be inserted before the first word "The" in part (4); and that the following words be added to the motion "(7) A copy of all correspondence between the vendor and purchaser concerning the transaction."

**MR. STEUART:**— Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the copy of the amendment that I got reads: That the amendment be amended as follows:

In (3) after "1967" - add the words, "Who did the appraising?"

The next line simply says:

In (4) after the first word "The", was the property tendered, date and . . ."

and it doesn't make any sense. That was the amendment that was proposed. And I've tried to make some sense out of it here by putting the words in and I think the Motion is out of order. It doesn't make any sense. It doesn't say in the proposed Motion

**March 21, 1968**

and in (4), add the words after the first word, it doesn't say that at all, it just says, in (4) after the word "The" was the property tendered. I suggest that the Motion as presented is out of order. It doesn't make any sense.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— The Motion as presented is out of order. The Motion as I've tried to tinker it up I think was.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— On a point of order, after all, the Motion says very simply that you add these words after the word "The." It doesn't say to cut off the whole of the Section 4 and therefore it is only natural and common sense - and if the Hon. Member who spoke had any common sense he would know that - it would fall in between that and the next word which has not been cut out and that would be the first "The."

**MR. WOOD:**— Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it appears to me that the amendment as ready by the Speaker was in order. I do believe it is the Speaker's prerogative to adjust a motion or an amendment to make it presentable to the House. I believe the Speaker has done this in this case and I believe the amendment was presented by the Speaker is in order.

**MR. STEUART:**— I agree. It certainly didn't make any sense the way it was, but the Speaker has added a few words to make it make sense in spite of the efforts of the Member.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— There's no doubt about it that I did and I said that I did change the Motion in order to try and put the meaning into the subamendment.

Subamendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 3 - ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion by Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):

**MR. A. MATSALLA (Canora):**— Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I do so with political impartiality.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:**— Thank you very much. My

colleague, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) on Thursday last, invited Members of this House to give serious consideration to taking steps in adopting legislation to provide for the establishment of an independent commission for the purpose of drawing up electoral boundaries for the Province of Saskatchewan. My contribution shall be in support of the Resolution from a position of nonpartisanship and from the point of view of advisability and fairness to the people of Saskatchewan. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that being a young Member of the Legislature and not having had anything to do with redistribution in the past, I shall speak with sincerity and from the point of an observer of the entire structure.

May I point out however, Mr. Speaker, that if one views the basis upon which electoral boundaries were drawn in the past by this Government and other Governments, his conclusion would be, needless to say, that in most of the cases there was no rhyme nor reason for the boundaries. The pattern followed was not one of population, not one of area, not one of urban, nor one of rural population. Evidently the prime purpose for redistribution in nearly all cases was for political advantage to the Government of that day. To help illustrate my point, Sir, and to add to the discussion, let us take five rural constituencies to the south and five rural constituencies to the north. I made these selections because the area size of each of these constituencies is quite similar; the constituencies to the south; Gravelbourg, number of voters, 6,081; Notukeu-Willowbunch, 5,955; Bengough, 6,410; Milestone, 6,005; Cannington, 9,747; the rural constituencies to the north; Cutknife, 8,640; Redberry, 6,815; Rosthern, 7,436; Kinistino, 7,426; and Melfort-Tisdale, with 10,200. The total of the five constituencies to the south is 34,198. The total of the voters in the constituencies to the north is 40,517. Now this illustration means that there are 6,319 more constituents in the north than there are in the south. The average per constituency to the south is 6,840 constituents, while the average to the north is 8,103 or an average of 1,263 more constituents per MLA to the north. As pointed out by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) similar differences occur from city to city. I agree that an MLA in the city is in a position to represent a greater number of people than one in the rural areas because of the concentrated population.

What the ratio should be, I cannot accurately state. I feel, however, that with limited information on hand, if the Member is to represent his constituents in a fair and efficient manner, the constituent population should perhaps be not more than about 12,000 in a city riding and about 8,000 in a rural riding. It is obvious that population should be the primary criterion in establishing electoral boundaries because a Member represents people and not area. However, the area-size factor would have to be considered in the case of rural constituencies and particularly for areas with sparse population. Mr. Speaker, our sister province of Manitoba has moved ahead in this direction by appointing an Independent Commission in 1956 to review the

**March 21, 1968**

electoral boundaries of the province.

May I inform this House, Mr. Speaker, of the governing factors under the statutes of Manitoba in determining and fixing the boundaries of any electoral division: 1) the community or diversity of interests of the population; 2) the means of communication between various parts; 3) the physical features; and 4) all other similar and relevant factors. I might inform further that the commission performs the task of redistribution every 10 years. A periodic review is necessary mainly due to the population shift from rural areas. The factor of the population shift due to normal course of events has become an apparent problem in Manitoba. In the March 16, 1968 issue of the Leader-Post it is noted and I quote:

Opposition Leader Gil Molgat, Thursday advocated a representation by population policy for electoral divisions which would eliminate the existing ratio that favors rural Manitoba.

The article further states and I quote:

At the same time, Mr. Molgat cautioned the Administration not to tamper with a nonpartisan composition of the electoral boundaries commission.

I submit, Sir, that now, since we have just gone through a provincial election, this would perhaps be the time for Saskatchewan to follow Manitoba and our Federal Government is setting up an Independent Commission to examine our electoral boundaries. Partisan considerations would be cast aside. The objective of the Commission would be to neutrally assess the electoral boundaries situation in the best interests of the voters and the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier):**— Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the arguments of the speakers in this debate so far. I must say with respect, that in moving this Resolution, the NDP is running true to its traditional practice of advocating a policy in Opposition, which it completely ignored when it was the Government. I would remind you, Sir, that from 1944 to 1964, and I looked up the records, the NDP on five different occasions amended The Legislative Assembly Act. Each time they manipulated constituency boundaries to their own political advantage. Yet now rather anxiously, in my opinion, they suggest that an Independent Commission should be set up on redistribution. They intimate that this method would be the fair, impartial way to proceed with any boundary changes. Mr. Speaker, if the NDP sincerely believe that an Independent Commission is the fair impartial way to proceed today, why during their 20 years of office did they not appoint such a commission?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:**— When the Hon. Members recall the Socialists' record on this particular matter, the words of the Hon. Junior Member for Saskatoon looked rather hollow. The Member who just took his seat from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) suggested that there were disparities in population throughout many ridings, and this is so. I think those disparities can be changed without this proposed commission.

Tonight I ask Members in this House, and I ask people of Saskatchewan, to remember some of the electoral anomalies which existed under the Socialists. In Saskatoon for instance where the Hon. Member who introduced this Resolution comes from, until this Government took office, every single citizen was forced to vote for five different candidates. And in the city of Regina, for a long time every voter had to vote for four candidates. Later it was changed to two double seats and two single seats. Over in the city of Moose Jaw, a Socialist stronghold, every voter had to vote for two candidates. In these cities of course the boundaries were so drawn that the Socialist labor votes would carry the weight in the whole of the cities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. THATCHER:**— This Government has taken action to reform those situations. We have removed the multi-seat constituencies in Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw. Today every voter votes for one candidate. Surely that is the fair way to proceed.

I have heard some complaints this session about the constituency of Hanley. Somebody said, "Oh, look at what the Liberals did to poor Bob Walker." May I remind this House that in one of the Socialists' redistributions, a good part of the city of Saskatoon was put into Hanley for just one reason, to save Walker! May I also remind the House and the people of Saskatchewan that when they were in office the Socialists took the vote away from hundreds of members of the Armed Forces in this Province. That vote was restored by the Liberals. It is quite true that probably it will be necessary in the next year or two years or three years, to have another redistribution Bill. This Government will be prepared to bring in such a Bill. Perhaps the cities of Regina, the city of Saskatoon, the city of Prince Albert may have to be given additional representations. Perhaps some rural boundaries will have to be changed, some reduced, some enlarged, some perhaps even eliminated. But the Government will use the same mechanism in the redistribution Bill as has been used in this Province since 1905. I can assure Hon. Members opposite unequivocally that we will be just as fair and impartial in making any boundary changes as they were from 1944 to 1964. That is a commitment. The decision with respect to electoral boundaries is the responsibility of the Legislature. Even if we had such an Independent Commission it would have to come back to the Legislature for a final decision. Thus I suggest in all probability, the same results would be forthcoming as under the present system. For the reasons I have given, Mr.

**March 21, 1968**

Speaker, the Government will vote against this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):**— Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might beg leave to adjourn this debate.

**MR. THATCHER:**— No, we're not prepared to let you adjourn this debate tonight.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Is leave granted?

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— No.

**MR. SPEAKER:**— The question before the House is: shall the debate be adjourned? All those in favor of the Motion say, Aye; opposed to the Motion say, No. I think the No's have it.

Leave to adjourn negatived.

**MR. W. G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw South):**— Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a very brief word in response to the remarks of the Hon. Premier on this Resolution. I think almost everything he said here this evening succeed in avoiding the import of the Resolution itself. Of course what the Resolution called for is something fair, something reasonable, something I think that is overdue.

**MR. THATCHER:**— Just the same as you had!

**MR. DAVIES:**— There is no use, the Premier has had his chance to make his remarks and I think he should subside and listen a little bit and perhaps learn something; perhaps not. It doesn't signify that over a period of 40 or 50 years in the judgment of some people all constituency boundaries have not been as they should have been. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of good reason to believe that boundaries have not always been drawn as fairly as they should because the people that draw boundaries for constituencies are not the best and this is left to ruling Government in power alone, and not with others that have some reason to be more impartial. This is what is proposed in the Resolution before us this evening. When I hear the Premier talk about the manipulation of constituency boundaries and that the Government will go the fair way - as I think he put it - "We use action to reform", another trite little phrase, I think of my constituency in Moose Jaw and the constituency of Moose Jaw North. I can only tell him that what they've done to the constituency boundary there is to make the

boundary look like the CNR trademark. It wanders through the city like a twisted snake and there was no effort whatsoever to try and put an equality of voters in the two constituencies. About 7,500 voters in the one constituency and about 12,300 in the other. There is no doubt whatsoever that the most blatant attempt was used by this Liberal Government to try and carve out a constituency in Moose Jaw North that would for once give them an opportunity to slide someone in to represent Moose Jaw North as a Liberal. Of course they failed and as I told the Premier two years ago, the action of the Government in distorting the constituency boundaries in Moose Jaw at that time would be properly resented by the voters. It was, and the results tell the tale. We again elected two New Democratic Members in Moose Jaw, and I can tell him that no matter how he carves out that constituency, the same results will be seen the next time he does it. Part of this is not only because they don't like the boundaries that are drawn by the Hon. Premier, but they have some reason to remember the Premier for other reasons, in that constituency in bygone days.

I just want to bring the House back to the point which I think the Premier has done his best to get the House to ignore, and that is, this does call for an impartial means of drawing constituency boundaries. It seems to me we've got to a point in this province where we can look upon this proposal and take it as a reasonable one. I don't think that any commission of good citizens is likely to fail very much to do that which is right and proper. As the Premier has pointed out to this House, the Legislature is in any case the final arbiter and decider of what those boundaries shall be. But I think it fair to say that some of the boundaries that have been drawn in the years before the last four years were perhaps not all that they should have been. But I honestly do not believe that in the history of the province there has been such a bare-faced distortion of boundary lines that there has been during the last four years of office of this Government. That makes all the more reasonable the request that we have before us this evening. I regret that the Premier has not seen fit to permit this debate to continue, so that my colleague from Saskatoon Riversdale could participate at some later time. But I think that in any case there is no doubt what this Resolution calls for, and though the Premier, say what he may, he cannot ignore the purpose of it. I suggest that that is what we should be discussing here tonight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park-University):**— Mr. Speaker, might I remind the Hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House that has just spoken that, if we are to get back to remind each other of principles, I think that he and his party should again be reminded of the principles that they have followed.

I don't happen to be from Moose Jaw, I happen to be from Saskatoon and if you want to look at the principles that were

**March 21, 1968**

followed by the NDP over the years, let's take a look at those. If anybody abused the privileges of the voters it was certainly shown in Saskatoon. The Hon. Member (Mr. Matsalla) that spoke a short while ago mentioned that cities should have constituencies in which we would have 12,000 voters represented by a single Member, but the principle of his own party was to have 120,000 represented by members. I think here of all the abuses we have ever seen in constituency boundaries by the NDP, CCF or whatever they want to call themselves. We had enough of that in Saskatoon for 20 years. If you want to look at boundaries that are fairly drawn, come up to Saskatoon and the people there now have three representatives on this side of the House, a thing that they should have had, but they were gerrymandered or whatever you want to call it. They were pushed right out of it by the NDP party for those 20 years. It is really high time we have proper representation. Now that we have it, I think the principles that are followed are shown to be quite fair. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:**— Order, order! Now the Member who moved the adjournment of the debate lost his adjournment motion. I draw your attention to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 165, subsection (8). "A Member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate which has been negated cannot speak to the original motion."

The debate continues on the Motion.

**MR. F. A. DEWHURST (Wadena):**— I agree with the citation that you have just read. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling which you have just read out to us here is the correct ruling, but what happens in a case like this is that the majority of the House are able to use their numbers to prevent the minority from having any leeway. I feel the rules of the House should be to protect the minority.

**MR. STEUART:**— Is he speaking on a point of order or on the debate?

**MR. DEWHURST:**— I am speaking on this debate . . .

**MR. STEUART:**— Well then you had better get back to the point.

**MR. DEWHURST:**— I'm getting there. After 20 years, I can maybe show you something about the rules too.

**MR. STEUART:**— Well I wish you would, I've been waiting and you haven't yet!

**MR. DEWHURST:**— Check the records, you show



me the records. I feel that when a rule like this cuts a person off it creates a hardship on him. The majority can protect themselves. Now on this Motion we have before us, I feel it is a timely Motion, and I felt that it deserves some consideration of this Legislature rather than the type of speech we got from the Premier. In my own constituency what was added to it by the last redistribution gives me a considerably larger area than my neighboring constituencies. Had that not been changed there are certain Members on that side of the House that would not have been back now. We saw in the last redistribution a constituency like Weyburn added to from Bengough and from Souris-Estevan. In each case it was taken from the smaller one and given to the larger ones. In the last redistribution we saw five townships of land taken off Kelsey and put into Melfort-Tisdale, which once again took from the smaller ones by population and gave to the larger ones. Kelsey is a larger constituency than Melfort-Tisdale by area, because it has forest reserves and other areas in it. We also saw about 22 different constituencies changed and in pretty well every case they took from the small one and gave to the large one. This is what the Premier says is a fair distribution. They say that, over the previous number of years when those of us who on this side of the House sat on the right of Mr. Speaker, there were five distributions in whole or in part redistributions and they hadn't agreed with what was done at that time. But now they are telling us in this House that, because they disagreed with us then, it justifies them doing it now and making much more of a fiasco of redistribution than was ever made in this province before. There has never been a time in the history of this province that the gerrymander took place as it did here during the last Legislature. This Government had three regular sessions in their last term of office and three redistributions in the Hanley constituency. Then they say that they were fair and impartial. They made a redistribution, took a look at it and say by gosh that won't get us what we want, so they did it all over again the second year. Then the third year they took a look at it and found out that it wasn't right, so they did it again. When it came to the elections, the boundaries had to be settled by the judge because they still hadn't done it right. If the election had been carried on the basis of the boundaries at Hanley which were set down by this Legislature, then the former Member of Hanley would have been back here, because the judge had to straighten the mess for them. On the one redistribution that they had, they had the boundaries of Humboldt extending on the basis of 12 miles wide with another 60 miles east. People in my constituency, people in the Kelvington constituency would have had a right to vote twice under redistribution of that day. Then they say that this was a good redistribution that had been done in a very prudent manner. Our Premier gets up and says, "You can take my word for it categorically that there will be a fair redistribution." We have seen him categorically give his word before, and as one of the Indian fellows on one of my reserves says to me, "If our Premier doesn't put it in writing, don't believe it." That's what he said, that's what he said, Dave. He hasn't got words to express what happens with the Provincial Treasurer yet.

**March 21, 1968**

Now I think this Resolution is not telling the Government just how it has to be done. It is asking them to give consideration to this proposal. Consequently they are giving no consideration to it whatsoever. They just say that we will use our majority to turn it down, and I feel that, when we look at the shifting of the population of this Province and the gerrymander that is going on, we need a commission set up to do a job of taking the whole into consideration and make a redistribution on behalf of people, not on behalf of the Liberal party. In spite of their gerrymander, if all the votes had been counted which should have been, there would have been two more on this side. So I will ask the House to vote for this Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. G. G. LEITH (Elrose):**— Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate with some reluctance because I wasn't in the House before 1964, but as a private citizen I was witness, as was everybody else in the province to five exercises in cartography that dazzled the imagination in the 20 years that the Socialists were in power. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to the Members of the House, and especially to the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) that he has been mispronouncing the word that he bandies about so carelessly, it is not "jerrymander", it is gerrymander." As a matter of interest the phrase rose from the artful drawing of electoral lines in New York state by a Socialist in 1894 and he is long since dead, but the Socialists persist in pronouncing it "jerrymander" instead of "gerrymander", so I recommend this to the attention of the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who perhaps may take some instruction from this and call it gerrymander in the future.

I want to speak to the Resolution as it is presented to the House. It is based primarily on the wishes of the Opposition to have an Independent Commission given the responsibility of drawing Saskatchewan's electoral boundaries based primarily on the principle of representation by population. Now each of us here and in fact every student of history or politics in this country gives lip service to the principle of representation by population. We learn in school that this is the proper way for representation to be based, but in a country like Canada, far flung, far from centres of government, it is often not practical to base electoral boundaries on the bare principle of representation by population. I want to remind Members opposite that in the last redistribution carried on in the Federal seats in Saskatchewan the number of constituencies was lowered from 17 to 13. The basis of the re-drawing of the lines was in fact representation by population. There was an ideal population figure that each constituency in the country was to attain. Then there was a margin of over-population or under-population that was allowed. In fact, there was an Independent Commission set up to do the work. The constituency of Rosetown-Biggar suffered a very awkward fate on account of this, I happen to live in Township 28, Range 13, West of the 3rd. The area around me for a space

of 40 or 50 miles all lay in the Rosetown-Biggar seat before redistribution. Now I find that I'm in the last township in the last range of the Kindersley-Battleford seat. My neighbors who live a mile and half south of me are in the Swift Current seat. My neighbours that live two miles east of me are in the Moose Jaw seat. This is awkward but this can happen and will happen on every boundary. The unfortunate part of the whole situation is that the Kindersley-Battleford seat is cut off not at the South Saskatchewan River on the west, but on the south side of Township 28. There is a small corner of the west country north of the South Saskatchewan River that is now in the Swift Current seat. It's there because of the principle of representation by population. There is no bridge in that area and these people are cut off from the centre of the new Federal seat. They really belong in the Kindersley-Battleford seat. They ought to be in the Kindersley-Battleford seat. They ought to be in the Kindersley-Battleford seat, but because of the strictness of adherence to the principle of representation by population, and, I submit, because of the independence of the commission there was no change made when representation was made to the commission, asking that this little corner should be put in the Kindersley-Battleford seat.

All across this province as in other parts of the country the problems of geographic location occur. Some parts of the country are cut off by hills and by rivers, as my example illustrates, and I submit to you, Sir, and to Members of the House that an Electoral Boundary Commission which would base its findings strictly on representation by population may in fact suit the ideal but it doesn't fit the facts. So I don't think I could support this Resolution. Further to that I want to remind Members opposite, as they have been reminded tonight, that for 20 years they did as they wished with the electoral boundaries. It wasn't hard to see the principles of "Gerry" reincarnated in the Socialists' ranks. I'm not saying that this principle should continue and I am surprised at the sanctimonious expressions of horror that appear on the faces of Members opposite when they are speaking on this problem. They act in one way when they're in the Government and they talk a different way when they're in Opposition. So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the Resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):**— In listening to the Member opposite, the last one, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City-University (Mr. Charlebois) it struck me that he believes in the theory of partisanship, and also in the theory of retribution. The reason this Resolution was brought in was that this is being done in other provinces and it's been done in the Dominion of Canada, so we brought in a Resolution suggesting to the Government that maybe we could take partisanship out of the business of boundaries of constituencies. I don't know why the Government should oppose it unless it is, as I say, scared and only trying to do it . . .

**March 21, 1968**

**MR. THATCHER:**— 20 years, Bill.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— Well, Mr. Premier, you had four years' time to correct some of the injustices that you say existed previously; you had four years' time. You had suggestions from the press. For example, in 1966 there was an editorial in connection with what the present Minister of Finance did at that time. He brought in a redistribution Bill, Sir, and the editorial in the Star Phoenix at that time had an article called, "The Equity of Partisanship." I'm going to read it to you; maybe you'll learn some sense.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— You can't pronounce some of those words . . .

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— If I can't pronounce them I don't want you to insult me because I happen to be Ukrainian born, I'm doing the best I can.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— When I speak, I'm quite proud of the way I speak English. You don't have to insult me. If you didn't understand then you might have a right to say so but I'm sure you understand what I'm trying to tell you, and insults are not in place in Parliament. Anyway I'm going to quote . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— . . . I've had enough of this nonsense. May I quote from this editorial.

Redistribution of constituencies whether in the Federal or in the Provincial arena is a difficult task. In Saskatchewan's case it is made difficult mainly because the Government is suspected of trying to improve its electoral chances in the next election through the method of redistributing and gerrymandering (if I have that correct). A gerrymander means the dividing of a voting area in such a way as to give an unfair advantage to one political party.

It is interesting to see a further comment in this editorial, because it says here, "Mr. Steuart's belief is that the present Bill (that's the one that you brought in, Sir, two or three years ago) is a fair and equitable as the one he considered the worst in our history."

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— Same old speech . . .

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— And it goes on to say in this editorial and this is something we could learn from -

It is time that the Saskatchewan Government followed the Manitoba Government's lead or if it prefers the Federal Government's course in taking the structure of constituencies out of partisan hands.

I agree.

Saskatchewan's ridings should be mapped by an Independent Commission similar in personnel to the Federal Commission in Saskatchewan, of Mr. Justice R. L. Brownridge and Professor Norman Ward of the University's Political Science Department here. There would be no political considerations here, but there would be the objective assessment of the best interests of the voters in the province.

I hope my enunciation is clear enough that the Hon. Member who insulted me a little while ago can understand what I have read. It goes on to say:

This would be an ideal time,

And I say today is an ideal time too.

for the introduction of non-partisan mapping of Saskatchewan's ridings. In membership the House is fairly evenly divided,

As it is now.

and in terms of the popular vote only a few percentage points separate the Government and the Opposition side. Perhaps after 20 years in the wilderness of opposition the young Liberal Government has not reached that mature magnanimity which would permit it to embrace non-partisan redistribution in the name of fairness and equity.

And as to the concluding paragraph, and please, Mr. Premier, take note of this, it says at a future time, I had hoped that now would be the future time.

At some future, happier time perhaps when the blood of partisanship has cooled and, if and when the Thatcher Government has marshalled a side with a good working majority,

And you have it now.

changes may be made. In the meantime it seems we must be content with the equity of partisanship just as we've had for 60 odd years.

I wasn't going to speak to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I have to speak because if anybody was insulted by the redistribution of boundaries it was the people of my constituency. If there ever was a butcher that butchered up a community like

**March 21, 1968**

Prince Albert, it was the Hon. Members opposite, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:**— Instead of giving the city of Prince Albert two members, as it should have had, they took 22 polls in Prince Albert East and all of the area north of the river, all CCF polls, and they added this to Cumberland constituency. Because they couldn't defeat me in Cumberland constituency they gave me an additional 500 majority, hoping all the time that they would secure themselves in Prince Albert West and in Shellbrook, two against one. The way they wanted to do it, they took all the Liberal votes out of the National Park, out of Cumberland and added the polls to Shellbrook, making it certain that Shellbrook would be a Liberal seat. But were they surprised? Mr. Speaker, we now have the honor of having a Member sitting on our side today for Shellbrook.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.