

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session - Sixteenth Legislature
29th Day

Tuesday, March 26, 1968.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, seated in the east gallery are three classes of grade eight students, a total of about 90 of them from the Imperial school which is located in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers Mr. s. Lamb, Mr. Bartel, and Mr. Wittner. On behalf of this House I extend to them a warm welcome and hope that their stay this afternoon will be most pleasant and educational. I hope the experiences that they will gain here this afternoon will assist them in their social studies, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, in the Speaker's gallery is a fine group of students from Massey school here in Regina under the direction of Mr. Jantzen. I believe you had the privilege of meeting them before the House went into session and I know you conveyed a good message to them because they asked a lot of very intelligent questions. We extend a welcome to them and along with other Members of this House I am sure you join with me in hoping that they will find this visit most informative and educational.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity through you to introduce a group of students from Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. I believe they have just arrived in the west gallery immediately behind me. It is Westmount school and I have a son going there. They are accompanied this afternoon by their teachers, Mr. s. Fenton, Mr. s. Sutherland and Mr. Adair. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly will take this opportunity to wish them a pleasant stay in the Chamber and an informative stay and a pleasant trip back to Saskatoon Mayfair.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

BATTEN COMMISSION

March 26, 1968

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher). A news report this morning quotes Consumer Affairs Minister Turner as saying that he had written the Prairie Premiers asking for permission to meet the research staff of the Batten Commission. I would like to ask the Premier, since two weeks have gone by, when this permission will be given from Saskatchewan so that the work of consumer protection may proceed.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Well I might tell the Hon. Member that I do not recall having received such a request from the Minister. However, we are looking into it, but I will say again that we plan no action as a Government until we have had consultation with Manitoba and Alberta. This was a three-Province Commission.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Could the Premier give some indication to the Hon. Members of the House when this consultation with the Prairie Provinces might take place?

Mr. Thatcher: — Well I think it will be obviously not possible to hold that consultation until after the three sessions have adjourned. So there are no plans until after that time.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — A supplementary question to the Premier. Does this mean there has been no consultation either by telephone or correspondence with respect to something that the Commission urged as being rather necessary for immediate attention.

Mr. Thatcher: — We have discussed this matter by telephone, but we feel that no decisions can be met or made until the Prairie Economic Council does meet again. As a matter of fact we feel that the recommendations were so nebulous that really nothing is being lost.

ANNOUNCEMENT

LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. Thatcher: — While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that the Government will not proceed with legislation at the current session to permit liquor advertising on radio, television or newspaper.

QUESTIONS

RETURN NO. 4

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like again refer to Order No. 4. The Provincial Secretary (Mr. Steuart) has brought down Orders No. 102, 81, 80 and 59. No. 4 was one of the first Orders passed by this House, ordered away back on February 28. The longer we are denied this information, Mr. Speaker, the more people have cause to question the expenses which were asked for regarding the Member for Nipawin.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — The information hasn't come down yet from the Department. I'm sure they are doing their best to make it available as soon as they can. As soon as it comes into my hands, I will file it.

Mr. Lloyd: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier was pointing out yesterday, improperly, that time was getting on. May I say to the Government that a number of these unanswered Returns are rather necessary for discussion of the Estimates. I do want to ask the Government if it can't push along the answering of a number of these relatively simple ones so that the work of Estimates may be expedited.

MOTION FOR RETURNS

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 110 showing:

For each of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board stores closed since May, 1964, (a) the total sales figure and (b) the operating expense, in the fiscal years 1963-64; 1964-65; 1966-67, and 1967-68.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, for reasons which I explained about a week ago we cannot give the information in part (b) and I move an amendment as follows:

That the words "and (b) the operating expense" be deleted.

Mr. Speaker: — An amendment has been offered, moved by the Hon. Premier, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that Motion for Return No. 110 be amended by striking out all the words after "and" in clause (a).

The Clerk has just drawn my attention to a problem in connection with the amendment and I think he is correct, because the amendment, if it was carried, would delete everything in part (b) which would include the number of years for which the

March 26, 1968

question was asked in part (a) and I would presume that the intention of the amendment was to strike out the words "the operating expense". The first part of the Motion asks for the total sales figure and if we strike this out in clause (b) we'll strike out the number of years, so what years would that relate to.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I got the advice of the Clerk in drawing this up and I thought I had it right.

Mr. Speaker: — Now look, let me just read the Motion to the House as it would be if it was amended, as I think it should be amended.

For each of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board stores closed since May, 1964, the total sales figure in the fiscal years 1963-64; 1964-65; 1965-66; 1967-68.

That the words "and (b) the operating expense" be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 113

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 113 showing:

With respect to property required by the Department of Highways for construction of Highway No. 3 from Crooked River to Chelan, (a) the description of each property along with the acreage of each; (b) the names of the owners of each property from whom the Department is acquiring or has acquired the property; (c) the purchase price of each property where an agreement has been arrived at, with each purchase price shown in its various components; (d) the date on which each agreement for purchase was signed; and (e) the amount paid to each owner for the removal of buildings from the said properties.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. Member has made a mistake, it should read Highway No. 23, not 3. Am I correct?

Mr. Messer: — Yes, that is correct, I am sorry.

Mr. Boldt: — I would think that he would have to withdraw the question, re-submit and we would answer it.

Mr. Messer: — Just call that a typographical error and have it

corrected here.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . somebody else can amend it.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I would move that Return No. 113 be amended by changing Highway No. 3 to Highway No. 23.

Mr. Speaker: — “That the numeral 3 in the second line be struck out and 23 substituted therefor” is the correct wording. We’ll have it ready in a minute. It’s moved by the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) seconded by the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) “That the number “3” in the third line be struck out and the number “23” substituted therefor.”

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Point of order, Mr. Chairman, second line.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, second line. Didn’t I say second line? “That the numeral “3” in the second line of the Motion be struck out and the number “23” substituted thereof.”

Amendment agreed to

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 116

Mr. Messer: — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 116 showing:

Copies of all Agreements entered into since January 1, 1965, by the Government of Saskatchewan with Anglo-Rouyn Mines Limited or with any other company subsidiary to Rio Tinto Mining Company Limited.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I just want to point out to the Member that we have no knowledge of any Rio Tinto Mining Company. It is not registered here, so it is impossible to answer the question. Does he wish to drop it or re-draft it.

Mr. Messer: — It probably could be redrafted but the question reads, with any Anglo-Rouyn Mines Limited or with any Company subsidiary to Rio Tinto Mining Company. If you do not have anything for the latter portion of the question, it doesn’t delete the answering of the first portion.

Mr. Speaker: — I draw the attention to the Member to the fact that he

March 26, 1968

spoke when he was moving the Motion and he can't speak twice, but never mind he's done it anyway. Now to get this thing in order. The Motion is now the property of the House and it can't be withdrawn save by unanimous consent. You either have consent of the House to withdraw it or amend it.

Mr. Kramer; — Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to have a Motion to delete the subsidiary to everything after Anglo Mines Limited or . . .

Mr. Speaker: — It's not for the Speaker to answer a hypothetical question. But why don't you try it and see. I think it would probably work out alright.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfield): — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the Motion I have had questions answered where, and have seen questions that have been answered in the House, some section of the question was not, could not be answered and consequently the answer was noted on the reply. Could that be the same procedure here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Well it is certainly within the competence of the House if the Members see fit to process a Motion for Return that can't be answered. That's their privilege.

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — CREATION OF A CONSUMERS' AGENCY

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) moved, seconded by Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):

That this Assembly, recognizing an urgent public need, recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan, the creation of a consumers' agency that would vigorously undertake the development of a broad and effective program of consumer protection, education and information; an agency which would also make every effort to work closely with the appropriate branch or department of the Government of Canada.

Mr. Davies — In beginning this discussion on what I think is a most important Resolution on the Order Paper, I can't do much better than to refer to a recent speech of Mr. Eric Luxton of Ottawa, who is Director of the Consumers Association of Canada and who spoke recently in Regina. At that time he said, "Canadians should not be serfs in today's market place." Now plainly, Mr. Luxton was calling for changes that would release consumers from the bondage of which they are held in our commercial society. Mr.

Luxton spoke again on February 27th in Moose Jaw. At that time he said among other things, "The consumer lives in a jungle, a vast, complex, mixed mess."

He observed then that advertising, purchases, displays, packaging and the like were costing the public very dearly. He cited a list of groceries in a shopping centre. The cost of these groceries came to \$19.29. He said, "The total food costs of that package come to \$8.15 and the rest, not an ounce of which goes to nutrition, comes to \$11.14."

Mr. Luxton spoke only a few days before on the Report on the Royal Commission on Consumer Problems and Inflation. This Report was tabled in the House. Members may recall what I think was somewhat ironic, that the Report, which told prairie people of the enormous extent to which consumers have become victims of big corporate practices, was laid on the Members' desks just as the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was informing us of the large new tax burdens which would be their unhappy lot to carry during the coming year. Nothing could be more illustrative, Mr. Speaker, of the utter failure of this province than the fact that simultaneously with the filing of the Batten Report in this House the Government announced tax increases that will cost every family of this Province \$175 a year.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said that the Batten Report won't be put on the shelf. This is a good statement but it needs actions, and not words to justify it. I must refer to the question that was asked earlier this afternoon and the answer given by the Hon. Premier. I must first of all refer to the news item on the basis of which I asked the question. This was a news item in this morning's Leader Post — by the way, the one I am reading — saying that Consumer Affairs Minister John Turner had asked the Prairie Premiers for permission for his officials to meet with the research staff of the Batten Commission, but had received no reply. In this same item, Mr. Turner states that this letter had been sent some two weeks before. Now the reply we get from the Premier this afternoon is that there has not been a meeting of the Prairie Premiers, (the Economic Council of the Prairies), and he must consult with them first before any action whatsoever is taken.

I find this an amazing statement. After all, Consumer Affairs Minister Turner is not asking at this point for any definitive action. He has only asked to meet with the research staff of the Batten Commission. I say that, if the Premier is anxious to take this Report off the shelf or to put some of the proposals into effect as I think they should be, this is not the quickest way of proceeding with action in that direction. I was also somewhat consternated to hear the Premier in passing, refer to the proposals of the Batten Commission as "nebulous" provisions. This is odd, because if the Prairie Premiers have not discussed it, it would seem to be curious and peculiar that the Premier would pass judgment on it before he had discussed

March 26, 1968

this matter with his fellow Premiers. But I must also say that many people of this province have read the recommendations of the Batten Commission, at least in brief form, and have come to the conclusion that they are not nebulous at all, that some of the proposals particularly are very sharp ones and very much to the point. If the Premier's reference is any indication of the thinking of this Government, then I would suggest that something be done by them very quickly to change his mind in this connection.

Mr. Speaker, when the Members of the CCF in this House presented their brief to the Batten Commission, the cost of living stood 4½ per cent lower than it did on January of 1968. If you add the enormous obstacles in increased living costs posed by the citizens of this Province, this Government has a very, very long way to go before any significant progress is made for consumers. While I am on the question of the brief that was presented by the Members on this side of the House to the Batten Commission, I am gratified to say that the Commission agreed in nine important proposals with the recommendations that our Members made at that time.

I should also say here that the Resolution in front of you is one that I had prepared and ready on the first day of the sitting of this House. I withheld the Resolution thinking that the Batten Commission Report might contain material that would suggest an alteration. I'm happy to say that I did not have to change one word in the Resolution and that it conforms almost exactly to a principal recommendation made by the Batten Commission.

The Members on this side of the House have, for several years, been requesting that the Government of this Province, working with the Federal Government, should take steps to restrain the excesses of large corporate concerns of this country, as they affect consumers and to otherwise act in the interests of the consumer. Almost any suggestion that corporations might be guilty of dangerous activities seems to be hotly resented by the Liberal party of this province to undertake real action in the interests of consumers.

The Batten Report has told us that prairie people are paying the highest food costs in Canada. What a travesty this is, Mr. Speaker! Here in the heart of the greatest food belt in Canada, the public is paying more than the most heavily urbanized areas of Canada. Excess profits, and excess capacity on the prairies on the part of the food chains, cost the average family \$61.28 extra in 1966, according to this Report. The Report added that the concentration of control of the grocery market by the large grocery firms in the second largest city of this province, Saskatoon, is heavier than in any city in the United States. The Report went on to say in this regard that in Saskatoon, Regina and Calgary, the four largest food firms control more than 67 per cent of the entire market. Mr. Speaker, with the straightforward comment of the Batten Commission that

excess profits are due in this region to monopoly power and that large prairie grocery concerns are earning profits 200 and 300 per cent above the American standard, that competition is actively curtailed by the operations of these great chains, we at last, have caused the Members on the Government side of the House to realize that they have been exceedingly behindhand in taking brisk and effective steps to counteract the situation and to create some degree of equality for the consumer in society.

The Batten Commission, Mr. Speaker, has properly brought to our attention one factor that is sometimes ignored. This is that consumer legislation is not really a new consideration for governments but that governments have not responded either swiftly or adequately in bringing consumer legislation up-to-date to meet the problems of our more complicated modern society. Action to help consumers in some way or other is as old as society itself. What we are confronted with today is the necessity to create new, broad measures to aid the buying public, recognizing the powerful forces that oppose him in today's changed and more sophisticated market place.

You know it was as early as 1950 BC, that Hammurabi, the King of Babylon, established strict laws to protect his subjects against short measures of grain and wine. The penalty for short weight in those days was the drowning of the offending merchant. Our own Magna Carta of the 13th century, as well as proclaiming certain well-known rights and liberties, also stated firm requirements for measures of food and drink. Legislation of Henry III of England defines standard yards, bushels, weights and containers that were all identified by the application of the King's seal. Numerous similar examples can be given especially in the 19th and 20th centuries dealing with weights, measures, goods' quality, food and drug safety, to name a few. But it is a far cry from feudal times and even 50 years ago in terms of the different environment and relationships existing between buyer and seller. In the Middle Ages for example transactions of sale between strangers were very few and rare. In these circumstances, the responsibility and the ability of the buyer to protect himself was a pretty reasonable proposition. But in 1968, this situation has altered immensely because no longer is the consumer in the virtually even position of earlier times. Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that by 1970, an estimated \$25 billion will be spent yearly in all forms of advertising in the United States of America. A lesser amount of course is spent in Canada, but it is deemed to be roughly proportionate to the United States' expenditure having regard to our population. Conceding that advertising can and does on occasions play some useful role for industry for the consumer and the economy, it is in my view impossible to mount any rational defence of huge expenditures of this order.

Some of the Members may know the book "Waste Makers" by Vance Packard. He deals in one of the chapters with a report from an official of General Foods stating that a typical American family is exposed to 1,518 selling messages just in the

March 26, 1968

course of one day. And this figure did not include the material stuffed into the nation's mailboxes, which was estimated at another 16 billion pieces a year. This incidentally at that time was just four times the volume of mail of a decade earlier. In passing, it should be known that the American public subsidized this mailing to the tune of \$190 million seven years ago. The figure is probably much larger today.

It has also been estimated that dealing only with television the average family hears an hour of television commercials every day. It has been calculated, and I think this is a very important fact, that more than half of all the advertising dollars go to promote cigarettes, alcoholic beverages, patent medicines, soaps and cosmetics. I don't perhaps need to urge that this can hardly be accepted as socially desirable. Lung cancer, a great deal of which is caused by the use of tobacco, is said to kill close to as many Canadians yearly as are slain on the nation's highways. One has only to listen for an hour or two of television, almost any evening, to understand the insidious degree to which tobacco advertisers have used this powerful mass medium to promote the sale of a product that is almost as lethal as the automobile.

The Batten Commission has made some trenchant observations about advertising. The Commission recommended that the Governments of the three prairie provinces urge the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to examine the feasibility of creating an agency similar to the United States Federal Trade Commission with power to force advertisers to restrain or modify their announcements, when these announcements are unacceptable in terms of honesty, adequacy, taste, or such other characteristics.

I believe also that, in addition to this recommendation of the Commission, governments will need to take the type of action eventually that will restrain advertising through the medium of some other kind of action, such as a tax, especially where advertising is plainly becoming an onerous cost on the consumer and where it places the consumer in a more difficult position to make a sober judgement.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention here today to examine fully the recommendations of the Batten Commission. I say that in my opinion it is a very worthy report and one that, if it is followed by the various Governments, can be of considerable assistance to the consumer. I am today dealing with what is, I think, the central recommendation made by the Commission and one that is most likely to benefit the consumer if this Government acts upon it. To put it another way, we must have effective consumer protection. If there is any main item that emerges from even a scant look at reports like the Batten Commission it is this, the consumer is a victim without adequate defences. One hears a great deal of criticism about the stupidity of the buyer, whether it is in the supermarket, or any other store, for that matter. I say it is little wonder that the buyer is

confused, makes mistakes, often spends his or her money unwisely. Most of his mistakes are encouraged, aided and abetted by millions of ingenious appeals, put together in many instances by the best brains that can be hired and perverted for a price. A fraction of the huge funds spent on advertising would, if used to build consumer awareness, and to create some consumer protection, undoubtedly shield and arm the consumer better for the encounter.

It has been said that the National Bureau of Standards of the United States created many years ago to test goods and materials that were used by the United States Government, initially cost the United States Government in 1927, \$2 million for this first year of operation. But in that year the Bureau saved the United States Government \$100 million; and of course this figure has risen since that time. This, incidentally, is the same agency that 40 years later has been largely responsible for forcing the automobile industry to undertake partial reform for safety.

Mr. Speaker, another outstanding reason for helping consumers today through governments is the enormous change which has taken place in the market place itself. It has been reliably stated that after World War II, there were 1,500 items on the shelves of the average supermarket. But today it is said that the figure has risen to 8,000. The housewife is confronted with bewildering choices in the multiplicity of items that are offered for sale. These are often displayed in an array of cunning and deceptive packaging and sizing. The evidence about this is just overwhelming. She is also, of course, deliberately misled, confused and deceived in the whole process. The public in this country knows something about the great debate which has gone on in the United States over legislation and other means urged to meet the lack of consumer information and protection. Such organizations as the American Trial Lawyers' Association, representing 25,000 practising lawyers, vigorously supported the amount of control into the field of fair packaging and labelling. The recent Ottawa consumer hearings have also generally borne out the compelling need for action in Canada. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that the party of which I am a Member has also been a steady and a consistent advocate of these and many other consumer measures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — A steady and a mounting demand is being built up in North America for some action on drug prices and the excesses of drug firms. Just a few days ago there appeared an inconspicuous item in the Regina Leader-Post, announcing that three of the largest drug firms in this country and the United States had been fined almost \$100,000 for monopoly practices in the manufacture and sale of drugs. This kind of information is depressingly familiar. The Kefauver hearings in the United

March 26, 1968

States several years ago substantially confirmed what Canadian Government investigations have determined in a more recent time. These findings have caused shock and indignation among all that have become acquainted with them.

Drug advertising compared to drug development is one of the many examples often quoted. It's well known that four or five times the amount of money that is spent on drug research is spent on drug promotion and advertising. The evidence before the Kefauver hearings produced facts to show that drug companies in the USA spent more than \$5,500 a year on sales and promotion, for every doctor in the United States, \$5,500 for every physician in that country. The huge discrepancies that exist between the prices of certain essential drugs, often those that were researched and discovered in other countries and the exorbitant returns on invested dollars in the bulk of the drug industry, all come together in a picture of rampant and unseemly monopoly commercialism in a field that is vital to the relief of illness.

In my opinion, there would appear to be only three solutions to this social evil. The first is early action by governments to regulate the industry in the public interest. The second, would be the creation of public drug industry to supply a genuine ingredient of control, competition and progressive change. The third, and the more drastic of course, is the nationalization of the private drug industry itself.

Now, the Batten Commission Report does not, in my opinion, deal adequately with this sector. However, whatever one's views are on the general subject, there are few who won't agree that the public is badly informed about drugs, that it needs protection in this field and would benefit by a program designed to acquaint citizens with the facts to better enable them to confront the powerful drug bloc that exists in this country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I turn for a moment to another of the Batten Commission recommendations, namely that with respect to housing. I was gratified to see the direction of the Batten Commission's thinking on this matter. For many years (and I can recall myself making a speech on this matter some ten years ago), Members like myself have been urging action with respect to housing, housing directed to public planning, research, and overall responsibility for those large sections of society that cannot afford to buy or rent accommodation in today's market. I think the Batten Commission has made a real contribution in recommending that the Federal Government develop an effective framework to gather data, collect statistics and undertake research in housing. An even more significant recommendation perhaps is that housing authorities should be created in all of the three prairie provinces to concern themselves with the "broad range of problems raised by all aspects of housing and the demand for it."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — The authorities again are

asked to take strong initiative in “conceiving, proposing and planning housing developments and research into housing problems.” Mr. Speaker, I think we have finally come to the time when everyone in this Province must realize that the question of housing is one in which the public as a whole has to take a pre-eminent responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — We should not lose sight of the fact that in public activity designed to construct new homes and apartments, and other buildings there is great value in other ways. For example, there is probably no other kind of industry today that creates as many direct and indirect benefits to employment as does the housing and construction industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with approval of the need for far more aggressive activity in research and housing design. The Batten Commission, in common with a number of other authorities, has remarked that we have been very tardy and very remiss in North America, in making investigations in this field. I am personally convinced that research on the part of construction experts, as well as independent experts — and I emphasize that the latter are needful — can produce some very vital reforms that will reduce the cost of home building and in general, stimulate building in all its manifestations, everywhere else.

Mr. Speaker, what has been done in Canada towards the objectives suggested in the Resolution that will be placed before the House today? May I first of all refer to the Consumer Bureau Act that was passed in New Brunswick effective on May 19, 1967. Under this Consumer Bureau Act, the Provincial Secretary becomes the responsible Minister of a bureau that is headed by a director. Necessary staff may be hired by the Minister as he deems fit. The duties of the Bureau include the maintenance of the liaison with consumer groups, and the collection and distribution of information to educate and advise consumers on consumer protection. The Bureau also has the task of promoting and assisting counselling services in respect of consumer problems. The Bureau is to receive and investigate complaints involving the protection of the consumer. The Bureau, in addition, shall perform any duty imposed by the Act, or which is prescribed by the Act or the Minister. This is a pretty broad field of reference. The Director of the Bureau is appointed a Commissioner under the Inquiries Act whenever he needs to exercise those prerogatives.

In the light of the Batten Commission Report, the Federal legislation is perhaps the most important item for our consideration here today. The Federal Act is known as The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs Act and this was passed by the Canadian House of Commons on November 27, 1967. The new Act creates a Minister and a Deputy responsible for the Department. The kernel of the law is in Section 6. This gives the Minister instructions to initiate, recommend or undertake

March 26, 1968

programs designed to promote the interests of the Canadian consumer, co-ordinate programs of the Government of Canada that are designed to promote the interests of the Canadian consumer, promote and encourage the institution of practices or conduct tending to the better protection of the Canadian consumer, and note this, Mr. Speaker, co-operate with Provincial Governments or agencies thereof or any bodies or organization or persons in any programs having similar objects; and to undertake, recommend or assist in programs the Canadian consumer to become more fully informed about goods and services that are offered to the consumer.

Section 6, subsection 2, of this Act is interesting. I'm going to quote very briefly from it. It says:

For the purpose of carrying out his duties and functions under the Act, the Minister may undertake research into matters to which the powers, duties and functions of the Minister extend, co-operate with any or all provinces, or with any department or agency of the Government of Canada or any organization or person undertaking such research and publish or cause to be published or assist in the publication of, so much of the results of any such research as the Minister deems appropriate and in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, a look at the Resolution that I shall move before this House, will reveal that it is admirably designed to fit in with the Federal legislation. You will note that the Federal legislation, as well as charging the Minister with powers to begin activity over a broad territory of interest and of assistance to consumers, properly envisages this taking place in co-operation with provincial governments. Indeed I think it's hard to see how any good and effective consumers' program could operate without that essential unity of approach. Mr. Speaker, the Batten Commission on page 365 makes this recommendation. I'm here quoting verbatim:

This Commission recommends that each of the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta establish a consumer section to safeguard, inquire into, and advance the consumer interest in all spheres. This section should, in each case, take the form of a civil service body but have the status of a crown corporation reporting to the legislature through the Attorney General. The section should be given a formal title which unambiguously indicates its duty to protect and advance the consumer interest. The section should be so organized that when and if desirable or necessary it could be transformed into a complete department, with a minister of its own, thereupon taking over for its own administration the relevant consumer oriented sections of other departments.

If I may pause here, Mr. Speaker, this has some interest for us here today after the remarks of the Premier, because it is not necessary, as one will see by the recommendations of

the Batten Commission, for us to await any meeting of the three Premiers of the Prairies, because the Batten Commission recommends the establishment of consumer sections in each province and ultimately, that each Province should have its own consumer department with a Minister. So I suggest it's hedging to a considerable degree, to say that it is necessary to put off the consideration of outright action for consumers until the three Premiers have met.

The Batten Commission goes on to recommend that the newly organized section on consumer affairs will be given the following responsibilities:

First the section should be made responsible for the supervision of trade and professional associations. Second, the responsibility for the licensing and regulation of corporate and business affairs should be exercised by the section. Third, the supervision of consumer credit legislation should be the function of this section. Fourth, the section should be required to initiate proceedings designed to provide the consumer with known and enforceable standards of quality and performance over a much more extended range of products than at present. Additionally the Commission recommends that a senior officer of the section should be provided by a sufficient and well-trained staff to enable him to conduct functions such as the following: The section should be given power "to collect and collate all legislation pertaining to the consumer, and all complaints arising from the consumer, and to initiate through the minister recommended legislative extensions, modifications, or contractions" where this is considered necessary.

In the second instance the consumer section, it is recommended should have powers to obtain on a temporary basis staff from other departments where the section considers this desirable and needful to the carrying out of an inquiry or the initiation of legislative proposals. Thirdly, the consumer section, the Commission says, should have powers to conduct its own independent inquiries, where it should be able to employ expert staff from wherever such can be obtained. The section should also be properly authorized in the opinion of the Commission to function as a liaison with the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Commission feels that the senior officer of the section would obviously have to be of sufficiently professional institutional stature to be able, as required, to discuss various matters directly with the Federal Minister.

As well as these duties, the Commission feels that the section should be specifically instructed to concern itself with the many matters that affect provincial consumers and whether solutions lie at the Federal or the Provincial level. This general instruction should specifically require the section, the Commission thinks, to keep industrial and commercial practices under scrutiny and to report to the Director of Combines Investigations suspected violations of The Combines Investigations Act. The Commission clearly feels that the

March 26, 1968

consumer interests in each of the prairie provinces need to be, in the language of the Commission, “clearly and vigorously represented to the relevant authority in such a way that the institutional or other lethargy should be minimized.” Up to this point it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the lethargy has been expressed by the Leader of the Government party.

The Commission in its proposal No. 6, states that the consumer section should have powers to join forces with other Provincial consumer sections of the Federal Department, whenever such would be the most effective and efficient method for carrying out inquiries. The Batten Commission has also suggested that the consumer affairs section be created, should be advised by an Advisory Council of six persons, one of which, but not the Chairman, who would be *ex officio*, the senior officer of the section. The Council would be made up of persons professionally qualified to act in the consumer interest although not expressly appointed as representatives of other interests.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that not only will this House give unanimous endorsement to this Resolution, but that the Government will very quickly move thereafter to do the things that are suggested by this Resolution. I don't think there is any room whatsoever for tardiness and delay at this time. The creation of a Consumer Section should be regarded by the Government as a matter of top priority.

Mr. Speaker, additional steps to energetically protect and assist the consumer have been needed in this province and Canada for many decades at the very least. If they have been needed over these years, they have been more desperately needed during the period of the past four or five years in which inflationary pressures have been most noticeable.

In expressing the hope that this House will accept this Resolution, and that the Government will proceed to implement the recommendations it sets forth, I would also like to appeal to the Government to create a consumer agency, and an advisory council of people who are widely accepted and acknowledged as experienced, capable and impartial persons. I would hope that the Government if it agrees to set up these bodies would ignore all partisan consideration in this connection.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, that the consumer is sovereign has been for far too long a fiction in this country. It is time that we achieve a situation where the consumer is, in fact, king. All of what many people are trying to achieve in consumer laws is directed to helping often the most helpless, unfortunate and inarticulate members of our society. The consumer protection laws today mean far more than that. They involve a whole system of value judgements, of moral attitudes, of our general sense of charity and consideration for humanity. In the analysis, consumer laws are a buttress to democracy. Democracy depends on informed people. The purpose of my Resolution, in the end, is not only to protect the consumer but to arm and to equip him for the struggle that he has in today's world.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Resolution presented by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies). It is a timely Resolution, it is a Resolution that is in keeping with the Batten Commission's recommendations and it deserves the unanimous and complete support of this Legislature.

All Members know that there have been sharp price increases in consumer goods over the past several months. During the last two years, retail food prices alone rose in the Province of Saskatchewan between 10 and 15 per cent. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are concerned and are fearful of the effect the sharp price increases are going to have and are having on the wages of working people, on living and production costs of farmers, and those who are forced to live on fixed incomes, particularly people who have to live on \$75 a month pensions, or is it \$76.50 now, and the welfare and the unemployment insurance recipients. The need for a consumer's agency at the provincial level to develop an effective and broad program of consumer protection, education and information is urgent.

Mr. Speaker, let me first talk about the need to protect the consumer from the many unjust price increases that we have been experiencing. Members know that the rising prices for food and other household necessities have occupied a great deal of public attention. Let us briefly examine who is responsible and what are the causes for the high and rising prices. The Senate House Committee on Consumer Prices found in its investigations that Kelloggs, a cereal manufacturer, had a profit figure of 11.3 per cent after taxes. Both General Foods and Kelloggs report advertising and promotion spending of more than 14 per cent of sales. Both profits and advertising costs are considerably higher than the wages and costs of material. Now, the Members opposite are always inclined to be critical that the cause of rising prices is due to labor costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, facts show that a 39 cent box of cereal contains only 3 cents of wage costs compared to 4.5 cents for packaging and the other materials, 6 cents for advertising and sales promotions and 4 cents for profits. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that sales and promotion costs and advertising are twice as high as the cost of wages, and profits are at least one-third higher than are wages.

In the meat-packing industry, we find that in the period 1956-65, the number of production workers fell by 22.3 per cent and productivity rose during that same period by 54.3 per cent. The labor cost per pound of meat fell from 4.6 cents a pound to 3.12 cents per pound. But has the consumer had any reduction in the retail price of meat? Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. The reverse has been true. Meat Prices have been going up, and up, while labor costs dropped and the prices to farmers have remained relatively unchanged. The same situation as in the cereal industry remains in a great many industries manufacturing and distributing household foods and items. Advertising and

March 26, 1968

promotion costs are greater than are wages for soaps, detergents, tooth cleaners, tea, coffee, baby foods, frozen foods. The list is endless.

Sidney Margoluis, a noted consumer expert, writes that much of the anger has been directed toward supermarkets, and especially towards such highly visible factors that raise prices as trading stamps, bonus bingo and other lottery games, night openings, carry-out and other services. In reality, the food manufacturers are even more responsible than the stores, he says. But the supermarkets are trying hard to dodge their share of responsibility, if extra services, such as cheque-cashing, carry-out boys and night openings were discontinued, retail prices would drop from 6 to 9 per cent. This was the conclusion arrived at by the President of the National Association of Food Chains. Furthermore, he pointed out that supermarket profits are only about 1.3 cents of the dollar. This is in the United States. But Margoluis points out that they are really dodging the issue. It is not the percentage that hurts as much as the money they waste — your money — to achieve the dollar profits. The fact is that supermarkets have joined in the food manufacturers' modern game of pushing at you a host of highly advertised processed products whose prices have little relation to their actual value.

To a noticeable extent, television advertising, with its ability to command a huge audience has made retailers as consumers its captives. Any product that can be advertised on television in a dominating way now is able to force its way onto the supermarkets' shelves simply by its ability to develop demand. One result is that modern large supermarkets now carry between 8,000 and 9,000 items compared to 3,000 or 4,000 that used to be considered a big stock several years ago. The proliferation of items, brand and sizes, many only slightly different or merely under different names, has helped to thwart the early promise of supermarkets that they would reduce the cost of bringing foods from the farm to the consumer. Both business and government officials often argue that this wide variety of brands and items is a benefit to the consumer. In actuality it has become a major source of shopping confusion and one of the reasons why food prices have gone up in our time more than any other commodity, and why much of the benefits of automation on the farms and in the supermarkets themselves has been lost to the consumers and the farmers.

Now when the first supermarket started in the big depression of the 1930s, in an abandoned garage in Jamaica, New York, it had only pine-board tables and cases cut open so shoppers could serve themselves. The original supermarket operated at a retail margin of 10 per cent, that is, it took only 10 cents out of each sales dollar for all its operating expenses and profits. By the 1940s, the supermarkets had crept up their percentage to 18 per cent and now their mark-up is often between 21 and 22 per cent. Also beware of supermarkets and service stations offering bingo and sweepstake games such as "Bonus Bingo" and "Match and Win". The number of winners is

controlled. Some newspapers in the mid-western states of the United States have been full of classified ads from people seeking other people who might have the matching half of the number needed to win a prize. So you can see that your chances of winning even a small prize, let alone \$1,000, is very slight. Meanwhile you can be misled into buying at more expensive stores and buying costlier products.

Many excuses are being made by owners of retail food supermarkets for the high cost of foodstuffs and other household necessities they sell. They argue that net profits on sales are small. Facts show that net profits on sales in the United States are 1.3 per cent and 2.3 per cent on the average in Canada. But then they try to convince us that this isn't much. I submit that measuring profit in the retail food store on a sales dollar is completely a wrong base on which to measure profits. The more appropriate and proper base to measure profit is on investment, not on the sales. When we examine profits on investment the picture looks entirely different, Mr. Speaker. The Royal Commission on Price Spreads of Food Products found that the five major food chain companies operating in Canada between 1949 and 1957 had a 17.1 per cent average rate of return on investment. That was 10 years ago. The wholesale trade had 11.1 per cent and food processing averaged 8.4 per cent.

Some may suggest that the return on investment in recent years has not been as great. I don't know, but obviously the return must be considerable, otherwise we would not see so many luxurious supermarkets and giant department stores opening practically every day at every street corner of our cities. Facts show that 20 per cent out of every dollar spent in the retail food store goes towards the payment of these new supermarkets. This is almost three times as much, Mr. Speaker, as the cost of wages to employees who work in these stores. It is also argued that the mark-up between the wholesale food prices and retail prices is not large. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is meant by not large? Is 20 to 22 per cent mark-up on meat not a large mark-up? Is an average of 12 per cent mark-up not a sizeable one on canned goods and other dry lines sold in the grocery stores? These are the average mark-ups the food chains in this province are taking at the present time.

Other unnecessary but expensive items consumers pay for are gimmicks; bingos, trading stamps, giveaways and what have you, that the retail food chains promote. Mr. Robert Mueller, the editor of "Progressive Grocer" claims that a survey conducted by his magazine in the United States found that 14 cents of the food retailer's expense dollar is spent on these types of gimmicks. Advertising and other promotional costs take another large share of the food dollar. I do not object to informative and useful advertising. This Resolution before us calls for informative advertising to be presented to the consumers. But as a Member of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about much of the present advertising, its usefulness and its informative value. I do not blame the press and other

March 26, 1968

advertising media. They carry what the sponsors give them. I have, Mr. Speaker, with me, a newspaper ad that was sponsored by one of Regina's food chain companies about 15 months ago. I would like to draw this newspaper ad to the attention of the Hon. Members on both sides of the House. You will notice this is a two-page newspaper advertisement. The biggest portion of this newspaper ad is not advertising the food product or the items that this chain company sells. Almost two-thirds of this newspaper ad is advertising the games that this company is promoting. "Win up to \$1,000, play instant bingo." You will notice that I marked it, only this portion of it here is advertising the games and the so-called give-aways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that a full page newspaper advertisement in the Leader-Post costs approximately \$400. This is a two-page advertisement; this is approximately \$800. This particular company employs, or has two stores in the city and employs 25-30 people, or maybe a few more now. Mr. Speaker, my estimate is that this newspaper advertisement cost more than the company paid for a full day's wages for all its employees. One newspaper ad appearing in one day cost more than wages for all employees and they normally run two or three a week.

Mr. Speaker, I had brought to my attention this afternoon a newspaper item which I think is significant and relevant to this discussion. It is an item that appeared in the Grenfell newspaper — and I'm sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not here, because he should take special note of this report that appeared in the newspaper in his constituency. It states this:

Let's start off on a light note with the news from Indian Head that Mr. s. Verna Thompson of Wolseley hasn't like the price she has been getting for eggs. Recently she shipped off 15 dozen eggs and later received payment, one 4-cent stamp. The eggs were valued at \$1.87 and the freight was \$1.83, hence the 4-cent payment. I can imagine that would put her in a state where she would like to give up democracy. But you haven't heard the best part of it yet. Her husband shipped 15 dozen eggs since then and to another candling station in hopes of a better price. The eggs were valued at \$2.67, the freight was \$3.50 so he now owes the candling station 83 cents on top of giving them the eggs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I thought that this information would be useful to present to this Legislature. I think if we examine the facts we will find the farmer is at the end of the totem pole, we will find that certainly the wages are not the cause of the high consumer prices we have been paying in recent months, we will find that advertising gimmicks and profits are the main cost of the high consumer costs we are paying. The need, Mr.

Speaker, to adopt this Resolution and for the Government to take action upon it is urgent. It is timely as I said earlier, it is in keeping with the Batten Commission Report.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a few more remarks to make on this Resolution and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — AGRICULTURE MACHINERY TESTING PROGRAM

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey) moved, seconded by Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that the Agriculture Machinery Testing Program be reinstated and that the scope of the Agricultural Machinery Administration be extended so as to provide reports on all components of the agricultural production industry.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, in view of the assistance and benefits that the Agricultural Machinery Administration supplied to the Saskatchewan farmer in the way of testing farm machinery and further because the needed information is no longer available. I am moving this Resolution in its regard. Mr. Speaker, a prudent selection of farm machinery can yield as significant financial benefits as might result from a reduction in the initial price. Yet although some of these points on the performance of a machine are obvious to the purchaser, many are not. To make an intelligent choice, the user must have available unbiased information on the performance of the machine that is on the market. Moreover, this information must be based on general conditions under which the machine will be used. Since even the most thorough test by the farm machinery companies themselves lacks the necessary objectivity and is in any event, rarely found to be adequate, government testing programs have been established. Today such tests and services are available to farm people and manufacturers in 21 countries outside of the Soviet bloc.

The National Institute of Agricultural Engineering has provided the public testing service on farm machinery in the United Kingdom for almost 18 years, while the Swedish Government Agricultural Machinery Testing Institute was first established in 1897 and has grown progressively since that date. In the later case almost every farm machine sold on a large scale in Sweden is submitted voluntarily by the manufacturer to the Swedish Government testing agency for field testing and the publishing of the test report. Other countries throughout the world that supply independent farm machinery testing are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United States and Yugoslavia.

March 26, 1968

Although the United States and Canada have shown the greatest degree of farm mechanization, public testing programs have not been established here to the same extent. In fact, the Farm Machinery Testing program begun in Saskatchewan in 1958 was the first comprehensive testing program in the North American continent, although the Nebraska tests which were confined to tractors have been conducted for many years. It is unfortunate that this independent agency of farm machinery testing was discontinued by the present Liberal Government. I say this because most other agricultural countries in the world, as I have indicated, have independent testing, and because of the interest expressed in the Saskatchewan program by the Member of the House of Commons Committee, who several years ago thought that this program was not only warranted but a necessity to the modern day farmer. The desirability of a testing program was recognized by the Select Special Committee on Farm Implement Prices and Distribution of the Saskatchewan Legislature as far back as 1939. Among other recommendations, this enquiry pointed out that the Federal and Provincial Government organizations should encourage to test the utility of new implements, to suggest improvements and where possible, to encourage standardization of implements and repair parts. This was in 1939.

Again, in 1952, the Special Select Committee of the Saskatchewan Legislature on Farm Machinery recommended that the Provincial Government consider the creation of a Farm Implement Board to test, inspect and certify under actual working conditions farm implements and machines sold in Saskatchewan. As a result of these inquiries and continued requests from farm people, the Province of Saskatchewan in 1958 set up the Agricultural Machinery Administration under the CCF Government to perform the following duties in the machinery-testing field:

- (a) Test and appraise under actual working conditions implements sold or offered for sale in the Province of Saskatchewan.
- (b) Undertake development work to improve and develop implements for use in Saskatchewan.
- (c) Publish such reports, pamphlets and bulletins as are consistent with the intent of this Act.

The concrete results of these tests fully justified the establishment of this program. In almost every instance, the field testing of the units has led to changes by the manufacturer that improved the functional and structural performance of the machines that were tested. Mr. Speaker, to show the Members opposite some of the benefits of such a field-testing program, an example of a test conducted by the Agricultural Machinery Administration under Field Test No. 859 carried out on the "Du-Al" windrower, manufactured in the United States and sold in Saskatchewan, points out the importance of field evaluation of farm machinery by an independent organization. The test on this machine revealed its inability to perform in an acceptable

manner in Saskatchewan grain fields and the public report which was released in June, 1960, stated:

The swather is not capable of satisfactory operation in cereal crops as bunching of the swaths, and driving on the swaths at the corners is not acceptable.

As a result of the field testing of this machine, the manufacturer stated as follows in the published report and I quote:

We have evaluated the tests conducted and are in complete accord with all the modifications recommended by the Agricultural Machinery Administration. This machine is not presently for sale in the Province of Saskatchewan and is now undergoing modifications. It will not be released for sale until the necessary modifications have been made and tests have proven that this unit is satisfactory for use in the province.

The machines that had been sold in Saskatchewan by the manufacturer of this machine were accepted in return by the manufacturer and the farmers involved were refunded their purchase price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an indication that this company was in agreement with the test that was carried out and the problems that arose from their machine not being constructed properly for conditions here. But until an independent organization had carried them out they were continuing to sell these machines in the province. Now this is one test. There were many of them that showed that there were machines, as there are now being sold in the Province of Saskatchewan, that are not satisfactory in their operation. The Agricultural Machinery Administration was a source of information to the farmer before he purchased such a machine, and the tests point out in many instances where machines were not acceptable to the agricultural conditions in the Province of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of this, the present Government for some reason that I do not know discontinued this very valuable program.

The experience of the Farm Machinery Testing program that was operating in Saskatchewan led to certain conclusions. It concluded for instance that very few models of farm machines can come on the market free from mechanical and functional defects. Some of these defects are taken care of by the manufacturer upon receipt of experienced data from the farm users; but a great many others, especially since the discontinuation of the Agricultural Machinery Administration, remain to mar the performance of the machine to be corrected by mechanical changes at the user's expense. In many cases, the changes dictated by field experience are available to the user only at an additional cost. In other words, I would believe it fair to state that farm machinery manufacturers are presently using farmers to work the bugs out of their new machine designs.

In addition, one of the basic problems is that the

March 26, 1968

manufacturers design machines primarily for the biggest market areas. It is recognized that sales in Canada are only about 1/7 of the United States market. For this reason, farm people in Saskatchewan are often faced with the necessity of using a machine designed primarily for other areas entirely, and because of this, find them quite unsuitable for Saskatchewan and Western Canadian conditions.

A prime example of this problem occurred in the fall of 1959 when many farmers were buying grain dryers because of the wet conditions at that time. For the most part, these grain dryers were designed to dry shelled corn, and certainly in no case had the design been modified to avoid damage to the milling and baking qualities of hard spring wheat. There was considerable loss in many instances to farmers before the functional and structural performance of the dryers were improved upon. With the significantly high portion of farm income being poured back into the farm machinery, operators can ill afford to purchase high priced machines that will not perform in the manner they anticipated. The Agricultural Machinery Administration would and could through its testing program offset such costly losses to the farmers of Saskatchewan and indeed the prairie provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring forth some of the statements that emerged from the public hearings of the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery, which was conducted by Dr. Clarence Barber, head of the Economics Department of the University of Manitoba. Statements to this Commission shocked some members of the machine industry. But others were a predictable expression of the increased frustration felt by farmers across the country who are caught in the present cost-price squeeze. In the public hearings of this Commission, it was pointed out that, if some farmers had their way, the Canadian farm machinery industry and its distribution system would be placed under strict public regulation. Others would require machinery companies to establish central parts depots, stocked by all manufacturers to provide farmers with spare parts within 24 hours or less. One farm organization wants manufacturers to be required by law to make new machines, and I quote, "function properly" and provide necessary repair parts, "or be liable for time and crop loss of farmers." Virtually every farmer in the country wants more interchangeability of machine parts. In short a large segment of the Canadian farm community is dissatisfied with the goods and services offered by the machinery companies of today.

Some indication of what the Commission may recommend has already been predicted by the equipment industry itself. Mr. J.R. Graydon, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Farm Industrial Equipment Institute, who has attended most of the hearings across the country, says he thinks the Commission, whose report is expected in September, will propose some kind of testing program. He also suggests that the Commission might (a) recommend that the manufacturers provide considerably more product information and develop a new form of warranty, possibly similar to the present automobile manufacturer's warranty.

(b) recommend legislation to ensure an adequate supply of parts, and that manufacturers develop more centralized parts depots or joint retail outlets that would stay open at all times during peak periods of farming operations.

Of all the Royal Commission's inquiries into industry in recent years, none has perhaps fallen heir to more tangible evidence of consumers' displeasure than this one. Assorted hardware and parts collected from farmers across the country are now stored in Ottawa headquarters of the Commission, lying in mute indictment of the manufacturer's art. The collection of parts that failed to do the job they were designed for is probably the most dramatic evidence presented to the Commission. What importance the Commission in its deliberations will attach to it remains to be seen. But from the weight of the testimony presented, orally and in briefs, outlining complaints about availability and quality of repair parts, it seems likely that this aspect of machinery industry will receive more than passing consideration. This Commission further pointed out the drastic seriousness of the problem and lack of interchangeability of parts. The farmer contended that commonly used parts like hydraulic couplings, knife sections and guards, belts, bearings, chains, wheels, universal joints, and so forth be standardized. In the parts that companies buy, such as bearings, farmers could not see why the maker's number could not be used rather than a company part number. Nor could they understand why hydraulic coupler hose connecting threads could not be the same for all equipment. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is in dire need of the interchangeability of parts and consequently is demanding standardization of the farm implement industry.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of International Harvester Company having total agricultural sales of some \$910 million, Massey Ferguson \$932.1 million, John Deere \$877 million, the highest profits that they have had in a number of years, the trend is every year to a higher profit for the machine industries. They are not adequately area-testing the machinery that they manufacture for durability and performance. I say, Mr. Speaker, that they are more concerned with planned obsolescence, as the car industry is. They are more concerned with frills, with sales gimmicks, and advertising that will sell a larger volume of machinery rather than with manufacturing and testing a machine that will be relatively trouble-free to the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, it is just not a farmer here or a farmer there that is asking for a machinery testing program in Saskatchewan and, indeed, in the prairie provinces. It is, according to a survey conducted by the United Grain Growers Limited of Canada, that, at least 88 per cent of the Western Canadian farmers contacted in their survey, have indicated they want to see some sort of testing program initiated for farm machinery which they buy. Further the survey indicated that information received from the dealer regarding a machine is somewhat false,

March 26, 1968

misleading and insufficient in detail. This is further true in regard to operating and instruction manuals, where the farmer has been more experienced in regard to servicing and repair of farm machinery. They are the farmers who complain the most in regard to lack of information in regard to operation and service of these machines.

The National Farmers Union pointed out that the only way a farmer could determine how a machine would perform was from what his neighbors told him. Many times after a new model had been introduced and sold to farmers, the companies call the machine in for modifications or send out a kit to correct a weak spot. To a farmer this means inadequate testing of the prototype and/or the initial factory run. Because of such conditions, they strongly urge for an agricultural machinery-testing program.

The Canadian Federation of Agriculture has urged the establishment of a continuing joint Federal-Provincial machinery council, which would address itself to legislation, warranty policy, and repair and parts service organization, transportation and communication problems and the like. It would be a vehicle through which farmers and farm organizations would submit their problems to be dealt with. The Federation also noted that farmers in Canada were not satisfied that there was adequate farm machinery research, either in new design or in the performance and durability of present machines on the market. It recommended that rather than establish an independent public agency an expanded engineering research service be set up in the Research Branch of the Canadian Department of Agriculture. This service would work closely with other agricultural disciplines and co-ordinate public agricultural engineering research and work with private consumer research companies.

Support for a testing agency has also been indicated from a somewhat unexpected quarter. The Canadian Federation of Farm Equipment Dealers, which also expressed regret at the elimination of the Agricultural Machinery Administration, have recommended that steps be taken to set up a national equipment-testing organization which might be financed jointly by government, machinery manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers and farm commodity organizations. Such an institute would perform certain prescribed tests for each type of new machine with set minimum standards to be met. Not only could it make recommendations to manufacturers, but it could also act as a clearing-house for failures in the field, reported by both dealers and farmers.

Mr. Speaker, all of these recommendations point toward the desirability of a program based on the Agricultural Machinery Administration which was operated by the previous Government in the Province of Saskatchewan. In every aspect of the agricultural industry today we can find a lack of quality machinery; and because agriculture has become a highly mechanized field any breakdown or loss of time due to breakdowns is a major catastrophe to the farmer today. Consequently, I urge every Member of this Assembly to consider and support this Motion.

This Agricultural Machinery Administration should by no means be restricted to the testing of only farm machinery. It is of utmost importance and dire necessity that testing and experimentation be done in other fields, such as agricultural chemicals and fertilizers. Because of the high cost of farming and the cost-price squeeze which the farmer now finds himself in, he has to use every available means to increase his production so that he will stay in a profit-making position. Many of the reports of tests that the farmer now has available to him in regard to chemical and fertilizer applications are for areas other than his own, and consequently because of area, soil and/or climatic changes these recommendations are not of any value to him. Indeed in many instances these recommendations may be in a direct hindrance to what he should actually be doing. Therefore the Agricultural Machinery Administration should not only test machinery but should be testing fertilizers and chemicals or any commodity that is used in the basic agricultural industry of today.

Mr. Speaker, I again ask all Members of this Assembly to give this Resolution due consideration. I am sure that all Members opposite are aware of the seriousness of the present agricultural situation. Many progressive steps will have to be taken if we are going to maintain this industry and keep pace with the world food demands. One of the major steps forward will be the implementation of an Agricultural Machinery Administration that will through its testing program and recommendations of all farm commodities save the farmer a great deal of money in breakdown time and experimentation on his own behalf. Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of this House to support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! It's customary when a motion is lost that the seconder of the motion shall by courtesy have the opportunity to speak immediately after the mover. If he doesn't choose to avail himself of that advantage at that time, he can enter the debate later on.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I should like to congratulate the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) for having made such an excellent presentation to this House. I agree with him that no one in this House should refuse to support this Motion and I am sure no one will refuse. I think it is a timely and a good proposition and certainly, if the suggestion is implemented in legislation, then we will find that the farmers of Saskatchewan will appreciate this kind of move by the Government. I'm not going to bring recriminations into this House, but I must mention that we did have an AMA testing service in Saskatchewan which the farmers liked. When it was removed by the present Government most farmers were quite unhappy about it

March 26, 1968

and since that time we have been able to learn of its value. At the time the service was removed I recall that it was argued that the University of Saskatchewan would provide machinery testing which farmers desired and should have had. So far I do not know of any farmer in this Province, at least I haven't met one, that has been able to get the kind of information that he would like to have. And so there have been all kinds of requests and all kinds of discussions. I would like to refer you, Mr. Speaker, at this time to a study that was made very recently by the United Grain Growers, I think it is proper and good information which should be recorded in this House. This is from the Leader-Post, November 22nd, 1967. It says:

“Study shows farmers want machine test.”

That's the heading, and I think it suggests reasons why we should all support it, because this indicates if nothing else just what the farmers of Saskatchewan are thinking. I quote:

Western Canadian farmers would like to see some kind of comparative machinery-testing agency established on the prairies. A recent study was carried out by the United Grain Growers, of which 761 farmer members of that organization were questioned about their interest in farm machinery testing. This study which covered 130 farmers in Manitoba, 295 in Saskatchewan, 323 in Alberta and 13 miscellaneous persons, indicated 88.8 per cent of the farmers were in favor of comparative testing of farm machinery sold in the three prairie provinces, and that such testing be carried out in the provinces.

Now I am not going to read it all, but I do refer the Hon. Members to the Leader-Post of that date and they can get more of the comments. But I will say this, about the middle of the article, in the second column, it says:

Only 5.4 per cent of the respondents were satisfied with performance and durability of machinery they bought.

And this is very, very important. About 30.4 per cent felt that they were misled by false information and 63.6 per cent felt that they did not receive enough information. Now, Mr. Speaker, that alone should make it certain that something should be done by the Government to see that farmers do get the kind of information that they should have, particularly when we look at the farm economy and see that we get nothing for eggs or less than nothing for eggs, when we see that the price we get for grain at this time is something like the price we used to get 25 years ago. Yet everything else has gone up! Surely the least that any government can do is to try to help those farmers who are trying to stay on the land. Now, if the Government refuses to give consideration then I can only gather, and all farmers of Saskatchewan will gather, that its only reason is a selfish or some other kind of reason. I might suggest that this might be the reason. For example, again in the Leader-Post of November 16, 1967, there is an item which says “Testing by Government

of no value". Let us see, Mr. Speaker, who is speaking. It is not the farmer speaking, it is not the Government speaking. I quote:

Ottawa. Universities and Governments are useful in farm machinery research but standardized equipment tests have little value, the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery was told today. George Vincent, President of Cockshutt Farm Equipment of Canada Limited, Brantford, Ontario, said the company has worked with the Ontario Research Council and the University of Saskatchewan to develop and test products and has co-operated with the University of Manitoba in the study of four wheel-drive tractors. In a company which budgets 3 per cent of gross sales for research and development and has also made use of Federal Government incentive schemes, Mr. Vincent said, "The tax write-offs allowed for research permitted the Company to invest more in research than the 3 per cent figure allowed normally."

And he mentions that the research is needed, but says that testing by the Government is no value. Now that isn't what the farmers of Saskatchewan or Manitoba feel, that isn't what the Members of the Legislature of Manitoba feel, and I am sure the Members in Alberta have talked about it too, because there are definite advantages to have an independent body to test machines. I could tell you about some of the experiences I have had. I have bought machines for my farm, different kinds of machines, diskers, combines and others that just wouldn't work. I could tell you the reasons why they wouldn't work, Mr. Speaker, because many of these machines are made in Ontario or even overseas, and they have not been properly tested in the area in which I live and they have not been able to perform efficiently. I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that various areas have different needs. When we had machinery testing here in Saskatchewan we did get the kind of information which was valuable. I challenge the Minister to produce evidence of how many farmers have been getting information on machines in the last four years since they have removed AMA. I haven't heard of any and yet the farmers need that information very badly, they can't find further economies in farming. So I would say that, when we invest dollars in implements and spend tens of millions of dollars in the price of implements, surely the Government can spend a fraction of a per cent to give us the kind of information that is going to mean many hundreds of thousands of dollars for the farmers. If the Government refuses to do so, then I can only consider that it is only friends when there is an election. Members get up and say, "We're friends of the farmer," but when it comes to perform and produce legislation then they are found wanting. Mr. Speaker, I have considerable more to say on the subject and I would like to adjourn the debate.

Leave for adjournment negatived.

Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — The subject matter of the Resolution that we are considering has been debated at some length in previous sessions.

March 26, 1968

I can say quite frankly that I am not going to support the Resolution. I have some comments to make on it and I would like to make them at a later date, so I would ask for leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

An Hon. Member: — That's democracy!

**RESOLUTION NO. 11 —
ESTABLISHMENT OF A MUNICIPAL FINANCING CORPORATION**

Mr. H.H.P. Baker, (Regina south East) moved, seconded by Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):

That this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to the establishment of a Municipal Financing Corporation to assist local governments with capital projects by providing the means whereby local governments may market debentures without having to depend exclusively on the open market.

Mr. Baker: — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you've given me the opportunity to speak on this Resolution after what just happened a minute ago. Of course it's typical of the Member from Yorkton.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! You can't refer to what has taken place in the previous debate under the debate you are launching now.

Mr. Baker: — All right, I'll leave it. I'll have some more to say on that later.

Mr. Speaker: — And that remark was uncalled for too, and it was a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. Baker: — I have always looked upon this as a very democratic institution, Mr. Speaker, and you have been most fair to both sides. There is no criticism of you at all. I think as one Member to another, no matter what side of the House we're on we should show a little courtesy. But I want to deal with the Resolution.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

Mr. Baker: — I don't profess to dwell an hour on it but I do want to . . .

An Hon. Member: — Point of order!

Mr. Baker: — . . . reiterate and bring some of the points back to the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Point of order!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — I think the Hon. Member has to refrain from speaking on subjects which have already been dealt with and has to continue to speak about the Resolution which he is bringing into the Legislature. I suggest he get to the Resolution and . . .

Mr. Baker: — Well I am. I just said I am speaking to Resolution No. 11 and I will. I think the Member across the way is out of order, Sir, I am on the right Resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — Now every Member has a right to rise on a point of order, and I would suggest we debate the Resolution that is about to be moved, I presume. It's not before the House yet.

Mr. Baker: — Well I will try to continue, Sir. I think most Members of the Legislature know the feelings of the larger urban centres and the position of SUMA with regard to the setting up of a Municipal Financing Corporation, more commonly known as the Municipal Loan Fund. They also know the feelings of the mayors of Canada who had supported this over the years and most mayors in every province continue to support the establishment of a fund of this type. In other words, to say as we say, the Government of Saskatchewan should establish a Municipal Loan Fund or Municipal Financing Corporation offering loans to local governments at a low rate of interest. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this Legislature is fully aware that the Budget contains nothing in addition which will be of assistance to municipalities and very little to assist local school authorities. The Government appears to have adopted an attitude that the only big spenders in the Province in 1968-69 will be the Government itself. It has placed local government authorities in a most difficult position. Having imposed drastic tax increases on the people of this province and having done nothing to assist the municipalities, they are faced with increasing municipal taxes or with cutting back on services which the people of our cities, towns and villages not only deserve, but desperately need. The so-called tight money situation has obviously done nothing to cut the spending habits of this Government. Because of tight money, high cost money and inflation, there is all the more reason why a fund of this type is so necessary today. Repeated cries of austerity heard remind me of the narrow-minded parent who tells his child, "Don't do what I do. Do what I tell you to do." The cities, towns, villages and hamlets and RMs have endeavored to assist this Government by delaying capital projects to the point where it is now imperative that some projects must now be undertaken despite the high cost of money. While I appreciate

March 26, 1968

the difficult position of the Local Government Board in advising local governments of marketing conditions we cannot continue denying local municipalities from proceeding with projects. These monies are needed for capital work projects now, if we are to progress with our growth. Nevertheless I feel that the local governments have been put in a very untenable position. The Local Government Board must exercise its extensive authority over the local governments while conscious of the immense spending of its parent body.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that this Government was made aware of the fact that the local government authorities were created by the Government of Saskatchewan to perform specific functions. It is the duty of this Government to assist the local authorities to carry out their functions. It must provide part of the capital funds at reasonable interest rates to keep municipal economies buoyant. The Government is well aware that the capital needs of local government are far more urgent than perhaps some priorities listed in the Province's expenditures. Quite a point has been made that the Government in 1967 purchased something over \$2 million worth of local government debentures offered for sale. While I do not have information at hand, I feel I am safe in assuming that those debentures offered a high interest rate and even at such a high interest rate they would have been difficult to dispose of on the open market. Our city has not been neglectful in assisting towns, villages or other cities in helping them out. I might point out that the city of Regina has on record debentures purchased in Saskatchewan from cities, towns, villages and RMs to the tune of a total of \$18,186,000. This bears out the need for action by this Government for the establishment of a Municipal Loan Fund or Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of debentures issued for local government purposes has been increasing over the years from a about \$17 million in 1957 to \$30 million in 1966. There is also a definite indication that the market is reluctant to pick up the debentures of the smaller local government authorities even at high interest rates. This Government has the means to ease the situation and should take the steps necessary to see that help is forthcoming to local governments, by establishing this Municipal Financing Corporation. It then would leave risk capital for investment in industry, the building of apartments, housing and other commercial enterprises. This is at a premium today as we all well know.

The Canada Pension Plan makes considerable funds available to the Government of this Province at low-interest rates. The Government has been diverting all of these funds I believe to the use of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Government Telephones. Yes, this is one way the Government can say more of its equity is in Saskatchewan or in Canadian hands, yes, by using Canada Pension Funds contributed by Canadians. No one denies that these utilities require capital funds for expansion, but I would say that the self-liquidating feature of the debt of these Corporations makes them much more attractive on the open

market than are the debenture issues of local government bodies. In other words the SPC and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, or SaskTel, can compete for available funds. Local governments do not have the same preferred position. The first year of the Canada Pension Plan saw \$22 million placed at the disposal of the Province; by last year the figure was about \$29 million; for the coming year I suppose we can estimate that \$35 million will be available. Mr. Speaker, this is a ready-made source of funds with which to establish a Municipal Loan Fund. Loans could be made available to local authorities at a low rate of interest, perhaps one quarter or one per cent higher than the rate paid by the Government to the Canada Pension Plan. It should be possible to devise a means of distributing the funds available on an equitable basis. I would suggest for the Government's consideration that \$30 to \$35 per capita would not be unreasonable in the initial stages. The establishment of a Municipal Loan Fund would be of immense help to the Local Government Board too in helping them plan the needs of municipalities for capital expenditures. It would also take off a considerable load from the Government eventually in its grants to municipalities, because this in essence would cut costs in the long run. The Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia recognized the needs of local government authorities and have taken action to assist them. I was pleased to note that the Premier hopes to inaugurate a foundation plan similar to those existing in our neighboring provinces. This could be a step in the right direction to relieve municipalities of the high education cost-load. What point is there in being classified as a have province when progress is stifled by the lack of funds for capital development? Where is development more readily apparent if it is not in the upgrading of our cities, towns, and those other areas governed by local authorities? It is estimated that local urban authorities are apt to spend more than a half billion dollars over the next 15 or 20 years. Mr. Speaker, prosperity brings people, and people must be housed in our cities and towns, and provided with all reasonable services and facilities. Even in these so-called austere times it is the duty of the Government to ensure that adequate capital funds are available to permit the natural growth of municipalities. Smaller municipalities are witnessing difficult times with high interest rates to unload their debentures. Cheaper borrowings can be made by larger cities, it is true. All the more reason why the Province can get money much more cheaply than we can. The provision of gas and electricity is not enough to bring new investors into our province. We must have sewer and water, new schools, paved streets with adequate lighting as well as parks and recreational areas. These facilities have been left to the local authorities to provide.

Taxes by government are collected in the following manner. You look at the Federal field. Most of theirs comes through income, excise taxes and so forth. Provinces get the biggest percentage of their money through sales, resources and so forth. But the cities chiefly get their funds from property taxes. I have always advocated that there should be services to property which belongs to local authorities and when you speak of services

March 26, 1968

to people this belongs to the two levels of government, the Provincial and the Federal covering education, welfare and health costs. The Government must now take steps to ensure that the funds are available with which to provide them.

Mr. Speaker, at the last session of the Legislature a Motion was passed that the Government study the feasibility of setting up a Municipal Loan Fund. I would hope the results prove it is needed now. It is evident that the need exists. It is also evident that the Government can take steps to establish such funds. I therefore look for the support of every Member of this Legislature in passing this Resolution. The Federal Municipal Loan Fund set up some six or seven years ago was a real primer for the economy of Canada. This made social capital available at low interests and it also had a 25 per cent forgiveness feature. On a project dealing with our sewage system in Regina costing something like \$1,250,000 we realized close to \$300,000 as an outright gift. The rest was borrowed at a low rate of interest. I am not asking for any forgiveness feature in this legislation, but that monies be provided at lower than the present market interest rates so that our municipalities can continue to forge ahead. It also means more revenue too for our Provincial Treasury, because a good portion comes back as a tax source. Therefore, it is good business for all, no matter which way one calculates it, and it will create the much needed jobs which we will require over this year and the next. If this is not done, we could be triggering a very serious unemployment picture. Mr. Speaker, I think some of the points that I have outlined indicate the tremendous need of a fund or of a Municipal Financing Corporation of this type.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that a good case can be made for the setting up of a Municipal Financing Corporation. I do believe that the Hon. Member from Regina South East has made a very good case on it this afternoon. I do believe that each municipality endeavoring to sell its own debentures or bonds and going into the eastern market and other markets of North America to dispose of these bonds puts itself in a very weak position. These municipalities are quite possibly unknown beyond the borders of our province and for them to go into a crowded market and endeavor to sell their debentures is very difficult indeed. The fact that they are not known would put them in a position of possibly not being able to dispose of the debentures in the first place, and secondly when they were disposed of they would have to be at a much higher rate of interest than what they could have done, if they were well known and had well-secured bonds. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government has always held a very good position in this regard. They have been able to sell their bonds throughout Canada, and I believe they are still in a quite comparatively good position when it comes to selling bonds, both here and in the United States. Their ability to obtain money is incomparably better than that of the municipalities of the province, especially the smaller ones and some of the smaller ones may need this money quite badly for the providing of very

necessary capital expenditures.

We have at the present time throughout our Province, Mr. Speaker, a good many communities that need capital development. I think that the Hon. Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) has made a very good case in this regard. If we are going to attract industry to our province, if we are going to attract people to come here and live, we have to have sites that are prepared for the industry and we have to have facilities within our cities and other urban as well as rural centres which will attract people and the people are going to like to live here. This is not only in regard to streets and sewerage and other facilities in the cities, but in regard to roads and such in our rural municipalities. If we are to make this province what it should be and what it could be, Mr. Speaker, we are going to need more capital than has been provided in the past to do so.

In reference to the past, Mr. Speaker, we have had money made available. The former Government made available monies from the School Lands Funds and other funds that were available to the municipalities and lent this money out to them for various projects that were brought forward. I do believe the present Government is doing the same thing, but I do believe that this procedure could be improved upon. I think that more monies could be available and I think we could have a different procedure set up to handle this than what has been done in the past. I think that each situation must stand on its own merit. What was possibly sufficient a few years ago may not be sufficient today. I do maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when the Government should be prepared to do something about setting up a Municipal Financing Corporation as has been outlined in this Resolution by the Hon. Member for Regina South East.

I say, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be absolutely no difficulty and no dissension in the House on this Motion because as has been pointed out here today, a year ago we did have a Resolution asking the Government to give consideration to this and I believe it was passed unanimously in the House. Besides this I do believe that slightly over a year ago that Resolutions were passed at the annual conventions of both the political parties that are represented in this House, asking for something along this line. If the Members opposite are committed to this sort of thing, as the Members are on this side, I think there should be no difficulty whatsoever in having this Motion accepted by the House at this time. Mr. Speaker, there are a few other words that I would like to prepare on this, I don't consider that I have exhausted the subject from my own viewpoint and I would like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is typical of those that

March 26, 1968

are presented by the Members opposite. They had 20 years of the best times this Province ever saw up until we became the Government and after we became the Government the times really got good. We are the ones that assisted municipalities and tried to help them with the problems they had in financing local improvements or the problems that faced the urban municipalities in the Province of Saskatchewan, and the problems they faced in those years were very severe. I know, because I represented a city that had difficulties in raising money. We came down to the Government time after time to get assistance and we were turned down. Now in the Opposition they suggest that we set up a fund to make it possible for the municipalities to borrow money at reasonable rates of interest. We recognized this problem; in fact we put it in our platform and we intend to fulfil our platform, this plank in our platform along with all the other planks that we went to the people on when we were elected.

It comes strange from the Member from Regina who also wears the hat of the Mayor of Regina to get up and lecture us about our responsibilities. I would suggest he remembers this when he goes back to his own council. I see they've taken on the responsibility of lecturing us and passing motions requesting us to change certain legislation, to reconsider certain tax increases. I suggest that the Mayor of Regina and his council would do much better to look after their own record. I can assure the House that, if the city of Regina under its present administration, under the leadership of the present Mayor do not put their own house in order, when we do bring in this legislation — and we will bring it in, in our four-year term of office — the city will have a great deal of difficulty qualifying for any help in this regard. We've got the highest tax rate of any city in this province here in Regina, also one of the worst debt ratios of any city probably in Western Canada. I would advise the citizens of Regina that they should look to the administration of their city if they want to receive any help in regard to borrowing money at reasonable rates of interest that will be backed up by this Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do recognize the problems that face municipalities. We have done something about it in the past and we intend to do something in the future. One of the problems without a doubt is their ability to borrow money at reasonable rates of interest. In fact in this year of tight money, and I think last year as well some of them had the same problem. This year the problem is even worse; some municipalities will have difficulty borrowing money at any rate of interest.

I want to go into this in much more detail, Mr. Speaker, but I want to go on record as saying that we do intend to do this. The fact is that we will carry out this program and we will put into effect a program to allow municipalities, to support municipalities in their efforts, to borrow money. It won't come about as a result of any urging from the Member for Regina East (Mr. Baker). It will come about because we do recognize the problems that face urban municipalities. It will

come about because we recognize that the growth, that has taken place these last four years under the Liberal Government, has made those problems even more severe. It will come about because we have put it in our program and we intend to do it.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Bjarnason	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Larochelle
Cameron	Estey	Gardner
Steuart	Hooker	Coupland
Heald	Gallagher	McPherson
McIsaac	MacLennan	Charlebois
Guy	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser

NAYS — 24

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

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — AMENDMENT TO THE VEHICLES ACT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):

That this Legislature urge the Government to make such amendments to The Vehicles Act as are necessary in order that the Highway Traffic Board of Saskatchewan be empowered to, firstly, suspend an operator's licence for a period of one year where an operator of a motor vehicle has displayed a breathalyzer reading of .08 per cent blood alcohol content and, secondly, suspend an operator's licence for a period of one year where an operator of a motor vehicle has refused to submit a breathalyzer test having been so requested by a peace

March 26, 1968

officer in the lawful execution of his duty.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in favor of this Resolution, I wish to say that it is a very important one. I hope that the Government side will treat this Resolution very respectfully and that it does not wind up being all mutilated like most of the resolutions have been dealt with.

Ever since I have entered this House I have been very interested in traffic safety. I know several times across the way you will hear them say, “Well you had 20 years.” I don’t look at it in this light. I have never treated the question of traffic safety and I have never felt that it had any place in the realm of politics. We should approach this problem with a united front as we might say. To prove my point I want to go back to Hansard 1961 and I want to read to you the Resolution that was brought in by the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) who has been here since then. It was supported right across the floor. I want to point out that I was on the Government side at that time.

Mr. Steuart: — It will never happen again.

Mr. Thibault: — The Member for Prince Albert West might just as well sing his swan song now. With the close shave you had in Prince Albert, you have no more hopes.

Well now we get back to business. And I want to read the Resolution that I brought in in 1961:

That in view of the rising death toll and injuries on our highways and the consequently appalling loss of human life, this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to further encouragement and assistance to a comprehensive program of driver education.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had a school teacher in the Opposition by the name of Mr. Foley, the Member for Turtleford, a great friend of the Premier. He warned the House that we should not encroach upon the school curriculum because there was just a limit to what you could do in schools, although he supported the Resolution.

A few years ago, we set up a Legislative Committee to study highway safety and the effects of alcohol on driving. I want to quote from the report, page 10, and this is one of the recommendations that the Committee has made:

That a Standing Committee of the Legislature be initiated to continue and study traffic problems.

It is the opinion of the Committee that a continuous review of traffic safety is necessary to ensure progress in

this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this Committee was dropped. We had quite an increase in the death rate as I have said before, and I want to bring it to the attention of the House at this time. In 1960 there were killed on our highways 164; by 1967 we have risen to 287 deaths. We can use the argument that we have more miles driven and so on, but I can assure you that we have not kept pace with the need. Had we kept pace or pushed right ahead with the recommendations of the Committee, I think that we could have saved a lot of these lives.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now one thing that sort of worries me a bit is the recommendation by the Federal Government of legislation that is to be brought down using point one — alcohol level — to decide whether a person is intoxicated or not. I am very concerned about this suggestion. In my opinion, if point one is accepted, what we are doing is legalizing drunken driving on our highways. That's exactly what we would do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I have a press clipping from the Free Press, February 14, 1968:

“Breath Test Bill called unrealistic”.

This is according to Dr. Penner. He is the doctor who helped develop the breathalyzer and he clearly states regarding point one, or he uses the figure 100 milligrams.

Legislation before the House of Commons which would make it mandatory for suspected impaired drivers to take a breath test is unrealistic and should never be passed in its present form, according to an acknowledged Canadian expert, Dr. W.W. Penner.

The legislation part of an omnibus Bill, which would radically change Canada's Criminal Code if passed sets a maximum legal blood alcohol content for drinking drivers at 100 milligrams.

Dr. Penner, chief pathologist at the Winnipeg General Hospital told an audience at Greater Winnipeg Safety Council's annual meeting Tuesday, at the International Inn that a 100 milligram limit was far too high.

He said that a 200-pound man could consume nine ounces of whisky or six bottles of beer in an hour and still register a blood alcohol content below the purposed legal maximum.

March 26, 1968

Now if you think that you can drink six bottles of beer, I would say — even if you take the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) and I wouldn't trust him with one bottle — six bottles of beer within an hour is just a little too much. This is not a laughing matter. Every time we have talked about traffic safety there are some Members across the way that stretch their mouths away up to their ears and laugh about it. It is not a laughing matter.

An Hon. Member: — Shame, shame!

Mr. Thibault: — It is a dirty shame, when we've got 267 killed on our highways in one year, that some Members across the way will find it convenient to laugh about it. I am going to quote further from this news article.

Dr. Penner suggested that 50 milligrams might be a more reasonable limit, but stressed that a 200-pound man would still be able to drink six ounces of whisky and four bottles of beer in an hour and not exceed that mark.

And even the smallest amount of alcohol consumed increases the probability of a driver being involved in an accident.

The pathologist urged that the phrase "impaired driver" be more clearly defined in the new legislation before it is passed.

One of the biggest problems with current laws on drinking and driving, he claimed, was the fact that the police had no firm guidelines to use in determining when a driver is impaired.

The proposed Bill would do nothing to solve the problem, he said.

(Under the proposed amendment to the Criminal Code, police could force breathalyzer tests on only those that they had reasonable grounds to suspect were impaired.)

Dr. Penner suggested that words be defined to term the scientifically verifiable blood alcohol content.

Twenty-five years ago, Dr. Penner helped develop the first chemical blood alcohol test used in Manitoba. Since that time he has participated in a number of studies on the hazards of driving while under the influence of alcohol.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of you would be rather uncertain about the alcohol level of .08 that is talked about a great deal. I don't care what they do with this Resolution, if they leave the .08 alone, go along with .08, and if they want to

mutilate the rest of the Resolution, I am not going to quarrel too much with it. But the .08, I believe should be stuck to, because many other jurisdictions are taking the level of .08. The suggested level by the Federal Government is definitely too high. To prove my point I want to refer to a breathalyzer test that we had during the work on the Committee. Now, to set all the Members who sat on this Committee at ease I will not reveal names and I will not reveal weights. I want to say that during this breathalyzer demonstration we had five volunteers who volunteered to drink to prove the accuracy of the breathalyzer. We had Members of the Legislature who were observers at this exercise. It was done in a scientific way with police officers in attendance, doctors and nurses. Anyone who sat and observed this performance I can assure you, was convinced that .08 was still too high.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give you an idea of the performance of the subjects who volunteered to be the guinea pigs. I think the Government paid for the liquor in this case and I don't expect the Government to make any research to find out how much it cost.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — But it was good V.O. anyway. We had five subjects. One subject consumed 10 ounces of liquor in about an hour. To determine how accurate their driving would be, they were put through a test of several things: how they reacted to the red light; how quick they performed taking their foot off the foot-feed and putting it on the brakes. And this is what they came up with. On 20 tries when they were sober, they made two mistakes. After this subject drank 10 ounces of liquor, he made eleven mistakes. His alcohol level according to the breathalyzer was 1.11. Now the blood test showed very much the same level. The breathalyzer gave the benefit of the doubt to the person that was charged. The blood test showed a higher level of alcohol than did the breathalyzer.

Now what about the reaction of taking your foot off the foot-feed and getting it on the brakes? Everyone of the subjects failed to perform properly on the first try of getting their foot off the foot-feed and getting it on the brakes. Without fail the five subjects failed to get their foot properly on the brakes, which means that on the first try, at the first red light, they would have got into an accident. But after playing around with it for awhile, they got themselves oriented to it. It took one-third of the time more to get a foot on the brake after they had been drinking than before they drank. So the speed was lessened. They took more time to get off the foot-feed and get onto the brake. There was one subject who drank 14 ounces — now that should give you an idea of what problems the police will run into. I am talking about the exterior appearance of these four subjects. This character with 14 ounces was able to walk quite normally, speak quite

March 26, 1968

normally and you wouldn't think that he had a single thing to drink. But when we put him on the machinery to perform he just wasn't there. So now how does a policeman judge a person without using the breathalyzer.

We had consumptions of alcohol of, 10, 8 and 14 ounces. Now one subject after consuming 8 ounces, was completely out of commission. And there again, still the subject had a blood count of .09. Completely off their feet at .09! The Federal Government is going to pass legislation at .10. I am going to tell you that if I was a police officer I would be tempted to completely forget taking breath tests, if they are going to set the level at .10. We would be setting the pace. This is why I am going to spend a little time here to speak about .08.

There is another news item here that I would like to bring to the attention of the House, the headline in the Leader-Post, March 21, 1968:

Alberta's breath tests ruled valid.

Alberta's compulsory breathanalysis test law was ruled valid Thursday by Alberta Supreme Court.

The court's appellate division rejected a magistrate's ruling that drivers refusing to take the test are within their rights.

An Edmonton lawyer, Leon Prodor said he is considering a further appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Prodor acted for Frank Tenta 31, after Tenta refused to submit to the breathanalysis test a year ago in Edmonton.

Mr. Justice H.G. Johnson and Mr. Justice N.D. McDermid ruled that they were bound by a previous Supreme Court decision in a similar case and that magistrate Carl Rolf was wrong in holding Alberta legislation beyond the province's jurisdiction.

Mr. Judge M.M. Porter held that the compulsory legislation is "legislation in the criminal field" and therefore, outside the province's jurisdiction.

If we are going to pass legislation here, Mr. Speaker, we should go for .08. Let's not get away from it. Let's not be tempted for any reason at all. .08 is the top that we should go. As a matter of fact if I had my choice it would come down to .06.

We also had quite a bit of study in this Committee. I always appreciate committee work, because we can talk to these Liberals without any politics. That's when they perform the best. There was a Grand Rapids Report that we studied. There

is a graph if someone wants to see it; it is in the final report of the Committee on the last page. It shows a graph of the chances of being involved in an accident and what happens. According to the Grand Rapids Report, if you have one drink you are better off than with none. But I am inclined to disagree with that. But .04 is when you start getting into trouble. When you have reached .06 it starts rising at a considerable rate. When you get to .08 this is when the line starts shooting almost straight up. When you get to .1 your chances of being involved in an accident are very great. When you get to .3 you are not around in an automobile; you are in the ditch some place and you are out of danger then. I would go along with the Government holding breathalyzer demonstrations throughout the country to tell anyone in the audience if they tell you that they could drive better when they had a drink, let them come up and perform before the whole audience. I think that there would be nothing more convincing because it convinced the committee.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Minister Of Mineral Resources): — Are you going to pay for the liquor?

Mr. Thibault: — Well no. I think that the Government should pay for it. I think that the general public wouldn't be ashamed to declare the amount that was consumed, before this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — You would be glad and I think the entire House would say, "Good for you. If you can have it, we would vote any amount of money you want for this type of liquor," because I know that some of our Members on the Committee were quite uncertain about this .08. After our demonstration, there was no question. I have a little more to say on this, Mr. Speaker, but will you call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BOY SCOUTS

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House, I wonder if I may be allowed to introduce to the Assembly a group of 14 boys who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They belong to the 44th Douglas Park Cub Pack. In that particular Pack there are 33 boys but today we have 14 of them with us. They have been selected by the leaders for the special excellence in the good work that they have been doing. They are accompanied by Ken Morini the Cub Leader and also two fathers, Doug Drysdale and Rudy Prockner. I extend to them a warm welcome on your behalf, Mr. Speaker, and on the behalf of the Assembly and hope that their stay here this evening will be

March 26, 1968

pleasant and that they will be able to learn the first lessons in parliamentary democracy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Thibault on Resolution No. 4 — Amendment to The Vehicles Act.

Mr. Thibault: — Mr. Speaker, when we call it 5:30, I was going to comment a little more on the breathalyzer. I know that we could go back into the records and remind you of what some people have said in this House about the breathalyzer. But I think that it would be a waste of time. I feel strongly that the demonstration that we had was more than convincing, also that the breath test gave the benefit of the doubt to the accused because the breathalyzer showed a little lower count than the actual blood count.

One thing that I would like to bring to your attention is the judgment of distance. With the person who had 10 ounces of alcohol, in judging distance he made two mistakes before he drank and after he drank he made eleven mistakes. This shows quite a step up from two to eleven. I think if we would support this Resolution that it certainly would be a step in the right direction.

Another point that I want to bring out is the question that the judges may not go along with it in the courts. I feel that, if the judges would witness a breathalyzer demonstration before they are even asked to judge a drunken case, to judge the result of a breathalyzer test, it would be more than convincing to the judge also, because I know that before we had this demonstration, I mean the Committee had the demonstration, that several of the Members were supporting the .1, but after the demonstration they changed their position and they were unanimous on .08. I think the very same feelings could be held by a judge in the courts. But if all the judges would witness a demonstration of the kind we had, I don't think there would be any worry about the enforcement of this .08. I want to make it quite clear that I think that .10 is nothing but sheer lunacy and we'd be just legalizing drunken driving.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, I wouldn't quarrel with amendments in the others parts of the Resolution. That wouldn't bother me too much, but if the .08 is not gone along with, well, I would begin to wonder if Members are really sincere.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some observations with regard to this Resolution and I beg leave at this time to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 27

Thatcher	Coderre	Mitchell
Howes	Bjarnason	Larochelle
Boldt	Estey	Gardner
Cameron	Hooker	Coupland
Heald	Heggie	McPherson
McIsaac	Breker	Charlebois
Guy	Leith	Forsyth
Loken	Radloff	McIvor
MacDougall	Weatherald	Schmeiser

NAYS — 20

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 84

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davies (Moose Jaw South) for Return No. 84.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that Motion for Return No. 84 be amended by deleting part (2).

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I fail to see just why the Government refuses to give us this information. All we are asking here is the name, address, principal line of business of each unsuccessful applicant for appointment as special liquor vendor in the above-specified time period. We are not asking how much business is done by these people; this is not private information. I can't understand why the Government is reluctant to pass this information on to us. Surely they can't have anything to hide here. Surely we should be able to get this information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, I draw to the attention of the House that this is the self-same question as I understand it which was answered some two years ago by the Government. It would appear that the Government is getting less and less anxious to answer questions that pertain to the business of the people of this province. As the last speaker has indicated, information that

March 26, 1968

is being asked for here is quite relevant, pertinent in every way, and I think that everyone in this House is entitled to that information, as much as indeed the people of the province are entitled to receive that information. I am at a loss to know why at this moment and time the Government has decided that it will not give the House the information that it gave two years ago. The only conclusion I can come to is that more and more the House and the people are being denied information that was previously supplied to the people of this province and which for some reason it now doesn't want to supply.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Davies — Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House that there is an error in the No. 1 Section — 15 (a) was 15 (a) before the revision of the statute. It is now Section 16 and unless anyone wants to get technical about it, I suggest we might take it as a typographical error and treat 15 (a) as 16.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I would presume that we should have an amendment with it. I'll tell you. The question before the House is on the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) for an Order of the Assembly to issue the Return No. 84 showing:

(1) The name, address, principal line of business and date of appointment of each person who has been named a "special liquor vendor" under Section (and I've amended it) 16 (a) of The Liquor Act, from February 14, 1966, to March 1, 1968.

Is the House agreed on that change?

Motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 91

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Michayluk (Redberry) for Return No. 91.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, this particular Motion for Return asks for (b) the number of meals served at the Department of Natural Resources Cookhouse (maintenance headquarters) during each of the above years; and (c) the amount charged per meal in each of the above years. My information is from the Department of Natural Resources that no record of such meals or charges are kept because you are engaged or hired either with sustenance or without sustenance. And therefore I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) that Motion No. 91 be amended:

That the letter "(a)" after the word "Park", and parts (b) and (c) be deleted.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — CLOSURE OF COMMUNITY HOSPITALS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville):

That this Assembly recommends to the Government that no community hospitals be closed, —

- (a) until it has been conclusively established that alternate services will be available on a year-round basis;
- (b) without prior consultation with hospital boards and communities affected;
- (c) without a minimum of 12 months notice;
- (d) until alternate use has been found for hospitals which are structurally sound and in a good state of repair;
- (e) until a thorough study has been conducted into the needs of affected communities, including the concentration of senior citizens in the area, travel conditions and distance from alternate hospital services, and other pertinent factors.

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife): — First of all, I'd like to congratulate my colleague from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) for his capable presentation regarding the Resolution in the talk he gave some days ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — I'm rising to speak in favor of this Resolution for two main reasons because, first of all, according to the Saskatchewan Hospital Survey and Master Plan, which is the only major serious study we have of Saskatchewan's hospital needs, two hospitals in my constituency, namely, Lashburn and District Union Hospital and Cutknife Union Hospital are scheduled to be converted to alternate use between 1961 and 1970, so these two hospitals concern my constituency.

The second reason I rise to speak for this Resolution is because of this Government's lack of insight into appointed committees and its recommendations as shown glaringly by the startling announcement without serious consultation and deliberation of the closure of eight hospitals on December 10 last year by the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant).

March 26, 1968

Before turning to specific ideas and sections of the Resolution before us, I would like to review briefly some of the key ideas of the Saskatchewan Hospital Survey and Master Plan, 1961. It says in the Plan that one of the major aims of the survey was to state recommendations for the construction, extension, replacement and closure or conversion of specific hospitals to meet existing and future needs. Now this Survey stated plainly its recommendations, but above all it stated and I quote:

The present assessment of future needs should not be considered a static evaluation to be applied without any degree of flexibility.

And I repeat, "should not be considered a static evaluation to be applied without any degree of flexibility." Now in spite of this simply stated recommendation on page 155 and 156 of this report, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) chose to ignore it and thus left himself out on a limb. He also frightened and angered many Saskatchewan residents by his previous announcement regarding hospital closures. The Hospital Survey Report stressed that the closure of hospitals and the availability of beds within a geographic area must take into account such local factors as population changes, (that is the composition of the population in the area) and the number of older people in an area. It said it must take into account such things as existing hospitals, patterns of hospital use, trading centres and transportation. The Report recommended that patients should not have to travel any more than 30 miles over all-weather roads to get to hospitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to review the approach to the problem made by Mr. Allan Blakeney, then Minister of Public Health, in April, 1963 when the Hospital Survey Report was made public. He stated at that time that steps directed towards closure had to be well planned and proceeded with in an orderly manner after consultation with the hospital boards and medical staffs involved as well as with hospitals in adjacent areas. He stated also that at the time it would be necessary to consider special problems peculiar to a particular community which may be affected by closure. This is the only sensible approach to a very complicated problem, Mr. Speaker. Now as far as the 21 limited function hospitals that would be scheduled for conversion to some alternate use, Mr. Blakeney pointed out at that time that this was a difficult aspect of planning in the hospital field. It was, namely, the adoption of treatment facilities in the light of technological, scientific and social change and the problem of obsolescence. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the hundreds of Saskatchewan citizens who will be effected by decisions made in regard to hospital closure, I urge this Government to make its policies clear at this time and sensible; to discuss the problems with the 31 hospital boards whose hospitals have been recommended for conversion by 1970 by the Hospital Survey Committee. I'm asking for immediate discussion and planning, Mr. Speaker, because the people in the Lashburn area already have organized an action committee to get a new

hospital built there. And according to the plans of that Committee, a new building will cost approximately \$150,000. They plan to raise some \$61,000 by debentures and another \$60,000 by donations. Now, Mr. Speaker, this hard-working active group as of March 16, has already collected some \$41,700 in the form of pledges and donations. Can you imagine what a let-down there will be if the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) makes another quick decision in this matter and decides to close the hospital completely? What a sorry, sad day that will be for the citizens of Lashburn, their doctor, their druggist, and the 400 some families that this hospital now serves. All this will happen if this Resolution is not passed by this Legislature.

Now the Resolution states clearly that no community hospitals be closed first of all until it has been conclusively established that alternate services will be available on a year-round basis. Now this part of the Resolution simply asks that there be enough beds in nearby hospitals on a year-round basis before any hospital is closed. In the case of the Lashburn Union Hospital, closure would be a disaster because the hospital in Lloydminster has a steady waiting list of some 28-40 patients.

The second part of the Resolution is simply urging the Government to use a gentleman's approach of consultation with boards and communities long before any decision to close the hospital is made. Section (c) of the resolution asks for a minimum of 12 months' notice. This is really a minimum, Mr. Speaker. The doctor needs time to relocate, the staff, many of whom are local people, will need time to readjust to the loss of a job. The druggist in the area too must choose to sell out and buy some other form of business or move to some other more stable area. Section (d), the fourth section of the Resolution simply suggests that if the hospital is structurally sound and in good repair, it should not be closed until an alternate and wise use has been found for it. And I might suggest there are numerous alternate uses that one could put for these hospitals. For example, they could be offices for physicians; they could be small nursing homes; homes for the aged or dental clinics or health centres for diagnostic purposes or training centres for the retarded.

Now the last section urges a thorough study of the needs of the affected communities, including the concentration of senior citizens in the area, travel conditions and distance from alternate hospital services, and other pertinent factors. Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution embodying the principles of consultation before action, a thorough study before action and the principle of courtesy and respect for existing institutions and for the people of this province. I urge all Members therefore to vote in favor of this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in this

March 26, 1968

debate because I am one of the Members in this Assembly that has one of the small hospitals which the Opposition are making a great noise about. I say it is mostly noise, Mr. Speaker, because the Members opposite have given us a lot of platitudes, a lot of talk, but not one single one of them has stood up and actually said that they would keep a hospital in Saskatchewan open that is possibly going to close. Now we haven't said that we are going to close these hospitals for sure. We are negotiating with them, this is quite true. But not one, not one single Member, Mr. Speaker, that has entered this debate has said that they wouldn't consult. They will talk and that's all we ever hear from them is talk. All the hospital boards will ever hear from them is talk, because not one single one of them has stood up in this Legislature and said that they would keep that hospital open if they were the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I want to review, I want to review because I live in one of these towns that received notice from the former Minister of Health, the now Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) during the 1964 election when there was a great talk about hospitals. They received a letter and that letter was published in five papers by the NDP candidate. The letter said at the top by the candidate, "No hospitals can be closed in Saskatchewan." But if you read the letter and we suggested to the people of Cannington that they read it pretty closely. The letter was well written by a very well educated lawyer who had gone to a great deal of work to actually tell the people of Saskatchewan absolutely nothing. And, Mr. Speaker, what it was was a dodge that he hoped the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't see through, but they did see through it because he didn't promise them in one single paragraph or one single place that those hospitals would stay open. He promised them the same thing that the Members opposite are telling us here tonight, that they'd talk about it, they'd investigate it, but he didn't tell us that one single hospital would stay open. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Members opposite to stand up and say that the hospitals that we are talking about closing and possibly will be closed in Saskatchewan in the future, won't close. Because you . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . because, Mr. Speaker, you can talk all day but what these communities eventually want to know is whether they are going to be open or whether they are going to be closed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the people of Maryfield, despite a piece that was printed in the paper, have been very, very good to me . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — . . . not only in votes, but they have been very good to me since. And I want to say, also, Mr. Speaker, that in fairness to them the piece that came in the paper that they got a lot of bad publicity about (and myself I might say) was unfair in that it was largely a publicity stunt pulled on various other Members of this side of the House. Now I'm not meaning to say that this should not be taken seriously because it is quite serious, and I wish to make a few other comments in regard to this hospital situation. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if we get down to separate the wheat from the chaff and all of the propaganda being put forth by the Opposition, we get down to the basic fact that we have difficulties that we must face as far as many of these small hospitals are concerned. There is drastic need that we have a very definite policy, and I know from talking to the Minister that this policy will be forthcoming in regard to what the Government does intend as far as these hospitals in the future are concerned.

Now I want to take just a few moments to outline some of the problems that these hospitals are facing and their problems, which it won't matter who the Member of the Legislature is, it won't matter whether he is NDP, Liberal, Conservative or any other political party. They are problems that the public in those communities will have to face eventually within the next few years. The first one of course and one which the hospital at Maryfield faces is the problem of low utilization. The fact of the matter is that they are down to approximately five patients per day. If you follow and look into the Department of Public Health records, you can find that a great number of the people that live in this community aren't actually using the hospital themselves. They are using other facilities simply because other facilities at neighboring towns are better. Now this is simply not a problem that will ever be overcome by any government, the problem of low utilization. This is a problem which is facing many of the small hospitals in Saskatchewan today. The required number of staff is large because of the 40-hour week, the professional people required to operate the hospital is substantial and yet the number of patients that are being serviced here is declining. Basically the local people of these communities will have to face the fact that in many cases they aren't using these hospitals. Although we may be able to temporarily take measures to assist them to operate their building unless these communities have a higher utilization rate, a necessary utilization rate, I don't mean an inflated one, Mr. Speaker, then eventually some of these hospitals certainly will likely have to disappear. I hate to say this myself, I know that problems are associated with the disappearance of the building. The Members opposite that have spoken in this debate have mentioned these problems and none of them likes to see a declining town. But I would point out that the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who spoke suggested hardships that would be created by loss of jobs. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, the local people employed are important, but I would take issue with

March 26, 1968

the loss of jobs that he has suggested simply, because I do not think hospitals were ever built with the intention of creating employment. Factories have been built to create employment, but I think that we are in a sad way as far as governments are concerned if we start to run hospitals simply to give jobs to people in that particular area.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — The hospital should be maintained as long as it is servicing a number of people in that area and giving them the type of health that is required. But I don't suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in any manner should we continue to operate hospitals simply to give somebody in that particular town a job. I think this would be gross inefficiency in our health system. Of course many of us are familiar with the staff problems that are associated with these hospitals, and some of them have certainly run into doctor problems and nurse problems. The particular hospital in my constituency has had neither one of these and certainly this is in their favor in continuing to be a medical centre.

Mr. Speaker, there is much merit in the Resolution that has been proposed by the Opposition. Later in the debate, the Minister will be speaking on it and outlining more of what the Government's intentions are. I would like to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition may cry long and loud but not one of them has spoken and said that they would actually keep the small hospitals open, or offered a definite alternative plan except more talk with local boards. This is not what the local boards are interested in. The local boards are interested in a very concrete plan of action. As this debate unfolds, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that those Opposition Members who speak stand up and tell us if they would actually keep these small hospitals open or not, or whether they are just going to give us more talk.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 97

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Willis for Return No. 97.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources) that Motion for Return No. 97 be amended by deleting the words after the word "appointed" in part (1) and the following substituted therefor:

to permanent or probationary position on the staff of

the Department of Highways from October 12, 1967, to date not including promotions or transfers.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is getting tired of asking questions which are turned down continuously by the Government. It won't be long, Mr. Speaker, before we across the House cross the floor during the session with a paper in our hand and put it under the Premier's nose and say, "Is this question okay, or shouldn't we ask it this way? Are we entitled to this information or not?"

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the Hon. Gentleman speaking on a point of order or is he speaking on the subject matter of the debate?

Mr. Speaker: — I gather he has risen to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Willis: — And if the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) had listened a little more carefully he would have found out that I was opposing the amendment which the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has put before this House.

Time after time the Opposition Members have asked this Government questions. Time after time the Government has told us that these questions are not to be answered in the form we request them. All I ask here is for complete information. The Minister of Highways says that we could have part information. This is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly highhanded, dictatorial, callous, and it is drastic action which the Government has taken to try to shut off information which we have requested. I want to inform the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) that sometime tomorrow I will have a question which I wish to ask. I will bring it to his office if he is not in the House. I will consult with him before I ask the question to find out whether or not I can ask the question. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, and I want to congratulate one or two of the Members on the opposite side who have risen and spoke to another debate, particularly the last debate. I think the young Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) should be congratulated in putting information before this House. I saw the Premier turn around two or three times and try to get him to sit down in his seat. When he did sit down in his seat . . . Mr. Speaker, I run out of words trying to condemn this Government for its lack of response to questions which we have asked on this side of the House.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House should let that tirade by the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) go unanswered. You know it's a curious thing, this is about the sixth motion that asks for exactly the same

March 26, 1968

information in respect to the different departments of Government. In my department and in various other departments, this is about the fifth or sixth one, and we have in each case suggested an amendment to clarify and put it in the position of being permanent or probationary. On each occasion the Opposition have agreed to the amendment, there has been no opposition. Now here, this is about the sixth or seventh one. Does the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale want us to answer one way with respect to some departments and in another way with respect to this department. This is about the sixth or seventh department, and all we are doing in this motion is making the wording in this motion exactly the same as it was for Education, exactly the same as it was for Industry, exactly the same as it was for the Attorney General's Department. Now if this is hiding information we plead guilty, but I submit in all earnest and in all sincerity we are giving him the same information that we suggested in the other departments and you all agreed to the other motions.

Mr. Willis: — The information you want to give us.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, that is the subject that is being debated and I think that it also deserves an answer. I notice on the Journals of the Saskatchewan Legislature, 1962, a number of motions amended by the then Government, Motions 1, 2, 52, 53, 61, 65 and 68. More than half of the Motions for Return were debated and amended by the then Government and now the Opposition.

Amendment agreed to
Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — GUARANTEED PRICES FOR FARMERS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. 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.

and the proposed amendment by the Hon. Mr. McFarlane:

That all the words after the word "agricultural" in the second line be deleted and the following substituted 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 return to our farmer producers.

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, this I consider is one of the important Resolutions of the session, because it affects not just agriculture itself but the whole economy both national and provincial. It's strange but it's true that over the 60 years of my experience in the province, Saskatchewan farmers have been fighting year by year for even-handed justice before government and marketing organizations such as the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. One may go back to the original brush with the CPR Company when the farmers had to take the railway company to court in order to procure the simple right of loading grain over the loading platform by the Armstrong method. And it was a miracle, Mr. Speaker, that they won their case. You can go back to the days of Partridge and Motherwell, the organization of the old territorial grain growers, the Saskatchewan Co-op Elevators, and later the Wheat Pool and the Farmers' Union and finally, last but not least the Canadian Wheat Board. We have received much benefit, Mr. Speaker, from all these efforts. I have only drawn your attention to them to highlight the fact that the heart of the problem that faces agriculture has never really been dealt with. Agriculture is still in the position of producing at near loss. We have appealed to Federal Governments and Provincial Governments at various times and by as many proposals. In the early days we asked for free trade. The farmers were prepared to take their chance on a world sellers' market if they were allowed to buy on the world-wide open market. If we must be compelled to buy in a protected market then we ask that we receive like treatment with industry. We've asked for parity prices, but all kinds of obstacles could be raised as barriers to such an approach. At the same time gold mining could be subsidized and all kinds of devious ways and methods of subsidizing and protective tariffs could be worked out for industry. The farmers asked for deficiency payments. Remember they sent a group to Ottawa to put this proposal before the Federal Government in 1958 but again all kinds of bogies were conjured up as to why this could not be done. Yet over and over again the people of Canada have had to provide railway companies with subsidies — this glorious independent sector — they've had subsidies and payments in many, many ways. We've asked for a two-price system, but oh, no! Such an approach would be ruinous to the country or just wouldn't work. Even those aspiring to the Premiership, the Prime Minister's position, in the hectic race that's going on at the present time, each one refusing the two-price system. Governments paid lip-service to the farmers as the pioneers as the backbone of Canada, and as the most important industry in the country, but they leave the farmers to the tender mercies of chance and fate in a world of open competition against subsidized agriculture in almost every wheat-exporting country of the world.

Last year the Wheat Pool asked Hedlin, Menzies and Associates to make a survey on the whole agricultural situation.

March 26, 1968

Mr. Charles Gibbings as President of the Wheat Pool wrote the foreward to the report. In it he quotes one paragraph that I would like to read:

In the final analysis, the basic economic welfare of the entire prairie farming community must relate to the ability of the farmer to make a net return from the production of wheat. The design of policy which must concern itself with wheat and in the context of today must concern itself with the relentless advance of farm production costs and the inability of the farmer lacking imports from beyond the industry itself to compensate for the increases.

However, just what is the story of Liberal Governments, both Provincial and Federal? Campaigning in the 1961 election, March 8th, in Saskatoon Prime Minister Pearson said, "Return a Liberal Government and we will guarantee \$2 wheat." Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the most wonderful opportunity presented itself to the Prime Minister and his Government to fulfil that promise in the face of a six-months' gap in the International Wheat Agreement, when the farmers of Western Canada were left naked and unprotected, what happened? The Federal Government waited until prices had declined some 20 to 22 cents per bushel, and then put a floor of \$1.95½ cents, not \$2, under wheat until next July 1st. When T.C. Douglas reminded the Prime Minister of his \$2 promise, it was brushed off with, "Why reap up the past," or words to that effect.

In Mr. Gibbings' address to the annual convention of the Wheat Pool last fall he made some comments that I would like to read into the records. At the time he was speaking of the change that had taken place in world wheat markets, both so far as deliveries and sales were concerned, and so far as the price was concerned. He went on to say what the impact would be on farm income and I quote:

These changes are bound to have a major impact on farm income in Western Canada. The impact of the price decline will take a while to show up because it affects future income rather than the current position. But the decline in exports will have an immediate effect because it has already begun to slow the pace of farm deliveries. This is shown in current figures.

Grain deliveries in Western Canada during the first three months of the present crop year have declined by 65 million bushels. Deliveries to Saskatchewan country elevators are 43,500,000 bushels less than at the same time a year ago. So far as current income is concerned the decline in deliveries is partially offset by the higher initial price which is in effect this crop year.

I want you to keep that in mind.

Producers certainly appreciate what the higher initial

payment is doing to maintain income this year. But it should not be allowed to obscure the harsh reality of the current world price. Of the floor of \$1.95½ for Number One Northern at the Lakehead, the price is now almost 4 cents below the average for the same grain throughout the crop year 1965-1966 and it is 17½ cents below the Board's asking price in April of 1967. This reduction in price level combined with the smaller crop harvest this year must be reflected ultimately in farm cash income.

Boiled down, Mr. Speaker, this means 1969 will be much worse than 1968.

Inadequate prices — The income reduction arising from smaller sales at lower prices has to be squeezed out of an income that was already inadequate for many grain producers. The inadequacy of wheat prices during the last four years as you know has been disguised by the unprecedented volume of sales. In four years from August 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, western wheat producers sold an equivalent of 5-year average deliveries based not on the long-term but on the most recent ten years. In the four years deliveries amounted to 100 million bushels a year above the 10-year average. It was these extra deliveries that enabled some producers to keep pace with the rising costs of things which must be bought to produce a crop. Costs are continuing to go up. In the current year the high level of deliveries will not be there. Industry is going to run a long way behind meeting its costs under present marketing conditions. Rising costs on farms, costs of goods and services going into farm production, have been rising at the rate of almost 4 per cent a year ever since 1949. The total increase to 1966 is about 66 per cent. The price of wheat on the other hand has gone up only 9 per cent from 1949 to 1966 and more than two-thirds of the wheat increase or 6.6 per cent occurred in the last three years.

Wheat prices are now down. There is no sign of any slackening in the rate at which costs have been climbing. I suggest that this puts agriculture in an impossible position. This is why the floor of \$1.95½, when applied on the basis of reduced deliveries, will prove inadequate to meet the needs of Canada's grain producers, however effective it may be in freeing the hands of the Canadian Wheat Board to meet the competition currently being offered by other wheat exporters. The income gap arises from disparity between costs incurred and production and returns which are the product of volume of price. The attack must be on all three elements if the gap is to be removed and a reasonable return substituted for it. And each of the three is complex in itself and inter-related with the other factors.

Producers are the victims of inflation. This is one of the

March 26, 1968

most important approaches that Mr. Gibbings made. The impetus to rise in costs comes from factors outside agriculture. Farmers by themselves can do little about inflation. Grain producers are not contributors to it but victims of it. Being one of the groups most severely hit by inflation, they may very well ask the Government to do something to slow down the pace at which the costs are rising and thereby keep the farm income gap from getting any worse.

May I once again point out that the Liberal Government carries the responsibility back to 1949 and 1945 when it lifted the price controls. This is the date to which Mr. Gibbings is referring in this address. Producers are and have been doing things to reduce their own individual costs — and if they hadn't most of them would have been out of agriculture a long time ago — by the process of mechanization and the use of fertilizers and herbicides.

I would like to suggest one thing more, Mr. Speaker, and that is that over the last six months the Federal Government has been playing politics with the farmers' wheat and the farmers' money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — The only reason that it gave us increased initial payments was to cover the present situation. The only reason that it has hung onto the final payment to the last of March is in order to make it look as good as they could for an election year. Any request that the farmers have made for rye, flax and rapeseed to come under the Wheat Board has fallen on deaf ears so far. As you well know if you were raising rape, rapeseed has dropped not 22 cents but 1/5 of the price that it was one year ago.

What about our Provincial Government? Some three years ago when a Resolution was passed in this House, following a drop of wheat prices, a Resolution requesting the Federal Government to do all in its power to seek new markets and to save further decline in wheat prices, just what happened? A solid month after the Resolution was passed in this Legislature, it was still lying on the desk of the Premier in this very building.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — One of the first slaps in the face that the farmer received from this Government and the former Minister of Agriculture was to have that gentleman — and I think that I am being very kind — go to the farm machine companies and ask them what they thought about the value of AMA. This, Mr. Speaker, coincides with going to the grain exchange and asking them what they thought was the value of a Wheat Board, which I am very suspicious was done on various occasions, before we finally succeeded in wringing the Wheat Board out of the Federal Government. Is it

any wonder that the farmers have lost confidence in the Liberal party?

I would like to turn for a moment to the Minister of Agriculture's remarks. What he said, Mr. Speaker, was very wide of the Resolution and I am not going to comment on it. However he persists in his approach to Provincial agriculture by riding the barley production idea, as being one of the great answers to the predicament that the farmers find themselves in. I am sure that he is not ignorant of the situation that prevails in Saskatchewan regarding barley production. I would like to quote from an article in the Family Herald Weekly Star:

The eastern farmer is rapidly approaching the point where they will no longer have to depend on imports of prairie grains. Ontario farmers produced 72 million of corn last year, nearly three times the amount grown in 1960. Corn as a crop is spreading eastward. Last year Quebec farmers, the second time that this crop has officially been recorded, grew 20,000 acres. And some maritime farmers, particularly in Nova Scotia have started to use the crop for silage. There is no reason why the importance of corn as a feed crop should not increase in the future.

The second point that must be considered and one which has immediate application is the abundant supply of United States corn available to eastern livestock producers. At the present the price of United States corn in Montreal is only 7 cents higher per 100 weight. Western feed barley is \$2.47 per cwt for No. 1 Western barley as compared to \$2.54 per cwt for United States corn in late December. The two grains are not entirely interchangeable and eastern millers have more experience with barley than with corn. But with such a narrow spread, the higher-energy corn becomes an attractive alternative to barley. Only recently Mr. Walter Miller, president of Ontario Farmers Union was speaking at Kenaston and had this to say. He spoke of the sudden ending of the sugar beets production in the Chatham area, remarking that 20,000 acres devoted last year to sugar beets would have to be put to corn this year. But there is an over-supply of corn right now and United States corn is being imported at cheaper prices than Canadian grain.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the situation of barley at the present time. I was down at the Wheat Pool only the other day and I asked them about the barley market. They told me that not only is malting barley in difficulty on the market but also feed barley. I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the freight subsidy — for this is what it really is — is of value to western farmers on coarse grain. But if you note what I quoted from Mr. Miller's address, this is practically wiped out now and corn is coming in even below our western feed grains.

I am sure that the Minister knows full well what the situation is at the present time in the province. There are not

March 26, 1968

just hundreds of thousands of bushels of barley but there are thousands of granaries full of barley. I know people who have three or four granaries full of barley, before they took off the big crop in our area last fall. In spite of freight assistance, the price of barley is scarcely above the cost of production and cannot be treated as an answer to the agricultural problem of Saskatchewan.

Just in closing, a word directly to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. The amendment is a typical one, coming from the Liberal Government. It pulls all the teeth out of the original Resolution. It buries the whole matter in a vague, long drawn-out, world-wide search that could only result in the death of agriculture in the meantime, very much like closing the door after the horse is stolen. Let's face it! Agriculture is the life-blood of the nation and agriculture is a sick patient at the moment. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, matters as much as food in the day-to-day business of living. Let us stop mucking about and do something concrete while the patient is still alive. Heart transplants are altogether too risky and too costly. I hope this Government will show some signs of initiative and some real concern for our basic industry and support the Resolution.

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to read the final words of this report that the Wheat Pool had compiled:

The long-run prospects of wheat industry in Western Canada are favorable. It is probable that there will be a short-term period in which the economic circumstances would become difficult, as a consequence of a variety of causes. The industry is so fundamental to the welfare of 200,000 Canadian enterprises, to the welfare of the prairie region and the economy of the nation that it is important that the commitment of the Government of Canada should extend well beyond the performance of the useful function of marketing the farmer's grain at prices that chance to be dictated by the vagaries of world circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

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

Mr. Wooff: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to punish you once more for just a few minutes.

Mr. Steuart: — You are carrying the load tonight.

Mr. Wooff: — I assure you that I'll try to be brief this time. Mr. Speaker, the subject of constituency boundaries has been one of heated discussion for many, many years. This seems so incompatible with our want of democracy and multiple-party system to have constituency boundaries drawn by a party in power, whether that party be my own or otherwise. It lends itself to inconsistencies and much criticism. I know I have listened to the Premier and the present Government claiming to take great exception to multiple-city seats and any variation of this method. Had they done a decent and honest job of drawing boundaries on single-member basis, I for one would have found no criticism. When I recall the antics of the Government Members a year ago whenever the subject came up and especially of the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) one realized that nothing honorable was being attempted, a three-year stint on the constituency of Hanley that had not even the remotest connection with natural boundaries or population count, except party affiliation.

Many now realize their utter gullibility. No self-righteous or parsimonious harangue by either the Premier or anyone else can hide the gerrymandering that was so openly evident. I hope that the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) will note that I said gerrymandering. I also hope that before he takes anyone to task again on this pronunciation he will go to a good dictionary. Would he pronounce germ — germ or would he pronounce German — German? Well I'll admit that anything can happen in this language of ours with its multi-linguist background, but it so happens that in this particular case it is right either way. However, back to boundaries. We will never have a good, a just settlement of constituency boundaries until we set up a Committee or a Commission representative of all political parties or a strictly independent one.

Mr. R.A. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in this particular debate. I have taken some time to study the electoral boundaries of the various redistributions from its inception in 1905. Starting with 1916 in which there were 59 Members in the Saskatchewan Legislature, which is more in keeping with the present number, it didn't seem to matter a great deal which party was in power. The constituency boundaries were altered and I presume altered in favor of the party in power on each occasion there was redistribution.

My general consensus of the matter is this, that there would be very little to be gained by having an independent commission to redistribute the seats, because it is apparent from the Federal redistribution which was done by a Commission that the net result ends up less realistic than any redistribution made by the political parties. In the 1916 redistribution, taking it as a norm — there was a redistribution in 1920 — and taking

March 26, 1968

the Bengough seat as an example, it was left practically the same in both these redistributions. Then in 1932 as all the Members here know, there was a change in Government. Another political party was in power and the Bengough seat really got emasculated in that redistribution. It took on a shape like a tornado with a narrow base and wide at the top. Then in 1938 there was still another Government in power and the Bengough seat then took on a different shape. It sort of broadened out and was lengthened in a vertical direction and leaned towards the northwest, just as good though as the 1932 redistribution. In 1951 there was a different political party altogether in power and it had a chance to alter the Bengough seat. It had it, but it only added to the confusion by altering it slightly and still leaving its rather ridiculous shape. Now I only use the Bengough seat as an example because it was one which went through these sort of changes. Looking at the latest map, the most recent distribution, we have Bengough still with much the same outlines that it had in 1938. If you look at all these maps, the situation is not nearly as serious as the Members opposite would make out. I feel fully convinced that the people who know the province best, the people who are the representatives, the Legislators, have just as good an opportunity, have the knowledge and the experts to guide them to divide the province up into seats which give reasonable representation by population.

Before I go into that, I want to speak a little about the English system. Now there is no doubt that in Great Britain they have had a great deal more experience than we have had in Western Canada, even a good deal more experience than they have had in the United States, where they don't call it a redistribution, they call it redistricting, but it means the same thing. Everyone knows from his history books that it was in the early 19th century that the Parliament of Great Britain began to realize that the districts were all out of shape. There were some cities which had grown in population as result of the Industrial Revolution, where a Member of Parliament was representing literally several hundred thousand people, while in some rural constituency perhaps in the north of England or in the north of Scotland, (where there had been a shift in population due to the Industrial Revolution, not any different than what is happening today) a Member of Parliament was representing a very few voters. Those were the days when they referred to these districts as "rotten boroughs" and "pocket boroughs". Those are all names that we learned in our history books of the redistribution that began to take place in the 19th century. The British experience was to try and redistribute the seats on the basis of four or five main propositions. They didn't use the expression 'representation by population'. That is more or less an American expression adopted by Canadians. They used what they called a 'quota' to try and get a reasonably equal quota of people or voters in each seat. But it is the same thing as 'representation by population'. They felt that the second consideration was the matter of trying to divide up the counties of England so that the electoral divisions didn't go over the county boundaries. Now this is a sensible proposition.

They didn't want a Member of Parliament representing part of the county of Middlesex, let's say, and the county of Essex that came close to it. They wanted to have the Member of Parliament representing a constituency which was all within one county, because after all in England these counties grew up around trading centres. They grew up around rivers and they grew up around bays or some geographical fact which centred the population in that area. In the era when there was poor transportation, a county grew up as a sort of a district within itself. And so the British experience was to divide the counties so that at least the constituencies were within the county boundaries and corresponded in some sensible way with the interests or trading areas which were within those county boundaries.

Then the next consideration was one which is well known in Western Canada or in Canada generally, and that is the disparity between the city and country or between the urban and the rural. Even the English commissioners who at various times made a redistribution of England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales said that a country Member of Parliament representing a rural seat could better represent that seat if it wasn't too large, whereas a Member of Parliament representing a borough or a city seat could represent a great deal more people effectively than his rural counterpart. That is still a matter of interest here in Western Canada or in Saskatchewan that a city Member can represent a great deal more people effectively in a city seat than he can, if he is spread over a great area as we have here in Saskatchewan.

Now that brings me down to the point where I wish to refer to the recent redistribution made of the Federal seats whereby Saskatchewan's representation in the Federal arena has been reduced from 17 to 13. Now the Government of Canada set up as I recall it a separate Commission in each of the 10 provinces and in Saskatchewan the personnel of that Commission was a Queen's Bench Judge and a Professor of Political Science from the University of Saskatchewan. If there was a third member on it I can't remember who he was, but it doesn't matter, it was a multi-person commission. They deliberated as I understand it, for a number of months, I think actually they took over a year to make this redistribution of the Federal seats and they heard representations from various bodies, including political parties. But what they ended up with is in my opinion the worst emasculation of the Province into electoral seats that I have ever seen. Here you have an independent Commission which was devoted, and I'm not criticizing, but devoted to the representation by population theory. In other words it made the boundaries like that "drunk caterpillar" referred to by the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), made them wiggle around in all directions in order to obtain the precise number of voters in each constituency. In doing so, in my opinion it has destroyed the whole geographic face of the map of Saskatchewan where it is divided into natural trading areas with the natural boundaries creating a basis for the seats. For instance if these boundaries between Regina East and Regina Lake Centre,

March 26, 1968

are examined, their lines are far worse than any redistribution on the Saskatchewan map made by any political party. Furthermore, they have taken cities and divided them in two to balance out the population and joined them in with rural areas in order to get the population balanced. In trying to reach for perfection they've got the Prince Albert seat with more jogs than that drunk caterpillar could make, and they have ended up with the Swift Current-Maple Creek seat so large in size that it would be like representing the State of Western Australia. It just becomes almost an impossibility for a Member of Parliament to do any kind of a decent job for the people in this area. In the Battlefords, the traditional pattern was that the people living and trading around the Battleford area down to the Wilkie and Unity area were drawn north toward Battleford. And so always was the Meadow Lake area included in this traditional trading pattern. But now it put them in with the Battleford-Kindersley seat so that it upsets their whole relationship in trading areas. Of course people don't like this. They object to having their normal habits broken up by arbitrary decisions of a Commission.

Take the seat of Saskatoon-Humboldt and Moose Jaw. Here are a couple of townships which are eight or ten miles out of Saskatoon in which to vote for a Member of Parliament for Moose Jaw. This was probably done in order to obtain this perfect balance of representation by population, but it destroys many other things which redistribution should stand for. It would almost make sense to me that any area within eight miles of Saskatoon should be voting for a Member of Parliament in or about Saskatoon where his trading and cultural interests lie. I can only summarize by saying that a commission, in devotion to the perfect, ends up in a far worse position than if it had left it to realistic bodies who understand. And this includes all political parties. They all get a turn at it; leave it to the realistic people who in the end can make a fair distribution.

Now the difficulties. The accusations that are levelled by one political party against another is that in order to get electoral advantage they try and group all the Liberals together in one seat and the CCF in the other, hoping in the scramble that the party in power will come out with a few more seats. Now this isn't anything new. Sir John A. MacDonald, the greatest gerrymanderer that Canada ever had, had a phrase for it. He said his theory was to "hive the grits". In his day it was, "hive the grits", group the grits all into one hive and let them have a member and the Tories would take the rest. Now that was his idea then and it hasn't changed a great deal. But it is different; there is just a different stripe in the hive now. So when you consider the English system and the fact that they set up independent commissions to try and bring a fair distribution, I refer you to this article in Public Administration of 1955, an article called, Redistribution of Seats, by David Butler. David Butler also wrote a larger textbook on the same thing. But his conclusions were that, no matter whether it was done by a commission, or by political parties, anomalies in redistribution always seems to arise, and it was

never fair no matter who did it. I would say that if these reasonable milestones are used: (1) have a quota or representation by population; (2) keep the seats to represent trading areas; (3) allow a disparity between town and country; (4) add to the total number of seats when necessary, and you will get a division which is reasonably fair.

Another consideration of course in this House — and they had the same thing in Great Britain — is not to increase the number of Members of Parliament too greatly. They have somewhat over 600 in the British Parliament. Here a legislative body for the size of this province would get out of hand if the seats were increased much beyond 60 unless we had a very, very rapid increase in population.

I say, Mr. Speaker, in summary that the political parties, given the expert advice that is available with a knowledge of the geography of Saskatchewan, the trading habits, the voting patterns and all the other considerations which we must face, can equally do as good a job at dividing up the seats as any electoral commission has done. Consider what has been done in the Federal field for the proof of that. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Adjournment was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31

Thatcher	MacDougall	Radloff
Howes	Grant	Weatherald
McFarlane	Coderre	Mitchell
Boldt	Bjarnason	Larochelle
Cameron	McDonald	Gardner
Steuart	Estey	Coupland
Heald	Hooker	McPherson
McIsaac	McLennan	Charlebois
Guy	Heggie	McIvor
Barrie	Breker	Schmeiser
Loken		

NAYS — 21

Lloyd	Berezowsky	Brockelbank
Wooff	Romanow	Pepper
Willis	Smishek	Bowerman
Blakeney	Thibault	Matsalla
Davies	Whelan	Messer
Dewhurst	Snyder	Kwasnica
Meakes	Michayluk	Kowalchuk

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

March 26, 1968

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan) moved second reading of Bill No. 59 – **An Act to amend The Medical Profession Act.**

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this Bill I want to say that it has been requested by both the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan and the College of Medicine of the University of Saskatchewan. The College of Medicine has revised its curriculum with the intent that in his final year the medical student would provide certain medical services in hospital as a kind of undergraduate hospital medical intern. These amendments are considered advisable, Mr. Speaker, in order that the status of the student as a person providing medical services will be clarified. Details in the change of curriculum and the proposed functions of the undergraduate intern can be explained to best advantage by officials of the College of Medicine and College of Physicians and Surgeons. This explanation can be given when the Bill is considered in the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers. The new curriculum will not be fully in effect until 1970-71, but it is intended that the undergraduate internship program be applied to students in their final year commencing September, 1968. With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Mr. MacDougall moved second reading of Bill No. 60, **An Act respecting The Saskatchewan Association of Architects.**

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 60, An Act respecting the Association of Architects was last revised in 1942 and has not been reviewed by the Legislative Assembly since that time. This Act is being updated, having regard to sections that are no longer applicable and judicial interpretations of various sections or similar sections in other statutes across Canada relating to professional people. In addition to the general updating of the statute, the Bill will allow more flexibility in the future in allowing the Professional Architects of Saskatchewan to function under the continued supervision of the Legislative Assembly. The Bill allows for continued changes to be made by bylaw, thus eliminating the requirements for amendments to the statute itself whenever a change is desirable. With those brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbanks: — Will the Member permit a question before he takes his seat. Was this requested by their Association and was there any opposition to the changes.

Mr. MacDougall: — No, it was requested by the Saskatchewan Architects

Association because they felt that the Bill that they presently operate under was outdated and they wanted to bring it up to date.

Mr. Brockelbank: — With regard to the question, Mr. Speaker, I asked if anybody had opposed the . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — No, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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