

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**31st Day**

**Tuesday, March 18, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. P. Schmeiser** (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to this Assembly it gives me great pleasure to introduce a group of 48 students from the Ursaline Academy from Bruno. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. With this grade 12 group is their history teacher, Sister Benedicta. This academy for girls in Bruno is known throughout Western Canada for its work in the finer arts such as music, painting and drama. The students that are here today represent about 15 different constituencies. One student is from Ontario, two from British Columbia and one from Hong Kong. Mr. Speaker, I am also very pleased indeed because the sister that is with them today was at one time my teacher. They are all dressed in uniform and I would ask them to please stand.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — We hope that they will enjoy their visit with the Legislature today and maybe find it educational and informative. May we all wish them an enjoyable and safe journey back to Bruno.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Matsalla** (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of all the Members of the Assembly to a fine group of 36 boys and girls in the east gallery. They are the grade 11 and 12 students of Buchanan high school, located in the southern part of my constituency of Canora. I am particularly happy to have the opportunity to associate myself with the Buchanan students and their school. Buchanan is my old home town and it is there that I personally obtained part of my high school education. The student visitors came into the city this morning accompanied by their teachers Paul Popoff and Mr. Gill. Mr. Gill is a newcomer to Canada from India. Their bus driver is from the Canora school unit. Prior to coming to the Chamber, they visited the Museum of Natural History and were conducted on a tour of the Legislative Buildings. Following their visit with us they will proceed to the Museum at the RCMP Barracks. We hope that their impressions of the proceedings here and the entire visit will be useful and informative. I am certain that you will all join me in extending to them a warm welcome and a sincere wish for a pleasant and enjoyable visit, and a safe journey home.

March 18, 1969

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome to this Assembly 54 grade seven and grade eight students from the Davidson school in Melville. They are seated in the west gallery. Davidson school in Melville is named after a Melville dentist who lived in Melville for many years and took a very active part as a school trustee. He now lives in Winnipeg and although in his 80s still has a keen and a very observant mind in educational matters. These 54 students have been brought here by their teachers, Ted Starchuk and Bernie Chuko and their two bus drivers. This morning, Sir, they visited The Leader Post and CKCK. They said that they enjoyed the visit through the Legislative Buildings very much. We wish them a very educational and an informative stay and a safe journey back home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to Members of this Legislature 53 young students from Princess Alexandra school in Saskatoon Riversdale. I believe in fact, Mr. Speaker, that they are just now filing in in the east gallery. Members may know that Princess Alexandra school is one of the oldest schools in Saskatoon. It has a long history of educational progress and is certainly one of the leading institutions in Saskatoon. When I attended Westmount school just a few blocks away from Princess Alexandra, I used to say that we could beat Princess Alexandra all the time in hockey, but now representing that area, I see the error of my ways. They are accompanied today by Messrs Alrich and Morris. I sincerely hope that the students and the teachers will find their visit to the Assembly both entertaining and informative.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **STATEMENT ON SWIFT CURRENT TEACHER-TRUSTEE NEGOTIATIONS**

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac** (Minister of Education): — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to indicate to the Legislature a recent development in the teacher-trustee negotiations throughout the province, mainly that the Swift Current negotiation area has requested a Board of Arbitration to settle the dispute in that area. Certainly we will do everything that we can to assist in the establishment of this Board. Generally the picture is a good deal encouraging these last few days.

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — I would like to ask the Minister of Education whether

the request comes from both the teachers and the trustees or just one group?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — It originally came from the trustees and it was agreed to by the teachers.

## QUESTIONS

### Returns

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and House Leader. It has to do with a number of Returns not yet brought down but ordered. I realize that some of them are lengthy and there may be good reason for the delay. A number of the others I think are not necessarily in that category. My reason for pressing it now is that we are in the midst of discussing Estimates, and many of these Returns include information which it is desirable to have during the discussion of Estimates. Certainly having them would save time in discussion of Estimates. May I draw the Attorney General's attention particularly No. 2 - reasons for people not being able to get into technical institutes; No. 46, the travelling allowance for the Premier and Cabinet; No. 39 the services of Mr. Odishaw for the Government in 1969; No. 50 the employment of Mr. Staines; No. 59, the recipients under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan; No. 43, increases in payments to doctors; No. 53, cost of earth moved in 1968. I simply picked these out as ones that it seems to me there shouldn't be any difficulty in supplying the information. Some of them have been ordered weeks ago. I believe I am correct in saying that there is still one not filed from last year. This was to list the directorships held by the Cabinet Ministers. This has been ordered for a whole year now. It must be sitting on somebody's desk or some other reason. Certainly it can't be lack of time that prevents it from being tabled. I say most of them are matters on which information should be in the hands of Members during the discussion of Estimates and I hope that the Attorney General will use his good office in getting a move.

**Hon. D.V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the one from last year it is in the process of being prepared. I had occasion to check on it the other day. I was advised and reassured that I would have that one to table very shortly. So far as the others are concerned, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows I did table quite a number today. I have taken a note of the ones which he has specifically referred to and I will see what I can do about getting them tabled very shortly.

**Hon. D. Boldt** (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of

March 18, 1969

the Opposition mentioned the cost of dirt moved in 1968. When that question was asked I told the questioner, the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), that this answer could not be tabled until later on in the fall. It will be tabled at the next session. We are still moving dirt in the fiscal year 1968-69.

### **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

#### **Return No. 82**

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney:** (Regina Centre) moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 82 showing:

A copy of the most recently audited financial statement of Woodland Enterprises Limited.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak at any length on these. This one and the next one ask for a financial statement of Crown corporations. I am suggesting that the disclosure of the audited financial statement is appropriate. I am suggesting that the mere disclosure of the financial statement would not give information which might be prejudice shown to the operations of these corporations or to the pulp mill or whatever. I am inviting the House to adopt the motion.

Motion negatived.

#### **Return No. 83**

**Mr. Blakeney:** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 83 showing:

A copy of the most recent audited financial statement of Saskatchewan Pulpwood Limited.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the arguments are the same as for the previous motion.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

#### **Yeas - 23 Messieurs**

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

**Nays - 31  
Messieurs**

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

**Return No. 84**

**Mr. Blakeney:** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 84 showing:

(1) A copy of the current union agreement or agreements and any supplementary schedules thereto between Saskatchewan Water Supply Board and any union certified as the bargaining agent for any of its employees.

(2) The number of employees covered by each such union agreement.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it may be that the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board does not have a union agreement or agreements with any union certified as a bargaining agent for any of its employees. If such be the case and if the Minister will indicate this in the debate, I will with the leave of the House, withdraw the motion. If this be not the case and there is in fact a union agreement, I think it quite appropriate for this public utility agency like the Water Board to make available to this House the terms under which it employs the unionized employees. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move in the form provided.

**Hon. A.R. Guy** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I might say in reply to the Hon. Member that there is no union involved in the Water Supply Board and there is no agreement for them to sign.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, then with the leave of the House I will withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

**Return No. 85**

**Mr. Blakeney:** moved that an Order of the

Assembly do issue for Return No. 85 showing:

- (1) A copy of the current union agreement or agreements and any supplementary schedules thereto between The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and any union certified as the bargaining agent for any of its employees.
- (2) The number of employees covered by each such union agreement.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that this motion asks for a copy of the union agreement between the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and any of its unionized employees. The Government Insurance Office, a public agency, and its employees are in the public sector. There is, it seems to me, no reason why the union contract should not be public document. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House adopt this motion.

**Hon. L.P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion I would like to draw the attention to this House of Motions for Returns Nos. 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 100, 111 and 112. As long as I am Minister of Labour I will object most violently to this type of request to the Government or any agencies of the Government, requesting copies of bargaining agreements. I am most surprised that the Members opposite who have been in Government, and should know better to make such a request. The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) knows very well that there are constant attempts within the labour movement to raid another union, of trying to usurp the power that they have within a plant. He also knows that within the Constitution of the CLC, if one union belonging to the CLC wishes to raid, they will ask the permission of the CLC, but not all unions belong to the CLC. As far as I am concerned as Minister of Labour it would be contrary to the trust that has been given by the unions to the Department of Labour. I think these agreements are sacred documents and I think that it is my right as Minister of Labour to protect the unions that don't want to have their agreements made public. Other unions which could be politically dominated and associated with the party opposite would not make this document public.

For this reason I will stand here as long as I have to and ask and urge this House not to permit bargaining agreements between any two parties to be tabled. There was one tabled the other day, The Saskatchewan Government Employees Agreement with the Government. If I had had my say about it and I had been in the House, it would not have happened either. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask and urge this House not to table these documents.

**Mr. W.G. Davies** (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, for many years I have sat in my place on the Government side and now on Opposition and had to listen sometimes in painful silence to the remarks of my friend who is now the Minister of Labour. I can only say now that I have never heard him utter any more ineffable nonsense than I have heard this afternoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — He well knows that the Department of Labour requires the filing of labour agreements. He well knows that any wage rate of any employee of this Government is subject to scrutiny by this Legislature. For him to make this kind of a ridiculous defence at this time to me seems pathetic in the extreme. Mr. Speaker, I hate to say it but the ignorance of the Minister of Labour in this House is positively distinguished.

Mr. Speaker, I want, however, more pertinently to call to his attention the fact that on March 29, 1960 when he and his colleagues were in Opposition - I am not sure if he asked this question or not, but if it was not he then it was one of his colleagues - the question was asked for a copy of all current collective agreements between the Government and its employees, the Liquor Board and its employees and each Crown corporation and its employees.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — My friend, the financial critic, on my side has been compelled to ask each one of these questions in the sequence that he has put in the Order Paper this afternoon. This question was put by a Member of your party, Mr. Minister of Labour, on March 8, 1960 and was answered on March 29, 1960 in every infinity and detail. For the Minister of Labour to rise at this time and make the statement that he has done is the absolute in hypocrisy because this question has been asked and answered on many occasions before and since in this Legislature. I say, if the Minister of Labour is speaking for his colleagues, what is the reason that they sit there and refuse to give to this House information that it asks for and is entitled to. There is not one trade union organization concerned in these questions that would not be prepared to file the documents that are asked to be filed by the Government in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — For the Minister to take refuge in the pitiable excuse that unions somehow would be in danger by the filing of this information in this House is mere absurdity and the Minister knows it. He has the weakest of arguments. I point out to him that the conditions in industry are well known to the employees

March 18, 1969

of industry. The conditions are not so well known by the Members of this Legislature or the public. This is why these questions are being asked at this time, so that Members of this Legislature and the public in general can get the information that the trade unions themselves know about.

I point out again that in 1960, on a simple request by your Members, Mr. Minister of Labour, when you sat there and others of your colleagues that surround you now, had copies of the current collective agreements between the Government and its employees, the Liquor Board and its employees and each Crown corporation and its employees within a period of two weeks. And you people sit there and keep refusing to divulge information that this House has the right to.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. D. Boldt** (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, when the Crown Corporations were sitting, this question was asked there. As Minister in charge of Government Insurance, I said to the members of the Committee that there were certain Crown corporations that felt that they shouldn't make this agreement known to the public, but we are willing, and I was willing, to show it to the Committee members. They asked for the union agreement and at no time while we were sitting did they ask to see it. I still leave this open to them. If any Member of this Legislature wants to see the union agreement between the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and its employees they are welcome to see it.

**Mr. W.E. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has just told us that he is prepared to show us the agreement. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) just a few minutes ago said that he is not prepared to provide the agreement. I don't know whom we are supposed to take information from. To start out with, Mr. Speaker, the request, I believe, is made directly of the Minister in charge of the Government Insurance and not of the Minister of Labour. We are all aware that under the terms of The Trade Union Act there is a provision that copies of the agreement between a union and an employer be filed with the Department of Labour for their purposes.

The request that has been made here is not made to the Department of Labour, but as usual the Minister of Labour doesn't even know when questions are being asked, whether they are asked of one department or another. He comes in here and makes horrendous speeches and a lot of noise. The question is directed to the Minister in charge of the Government Insurance. Mr. Speaker, if the Minister was prepared to provide the information to the Crown Corporation Committee, I don't see why the Minister is not prepared to provide the information to this House, which is the supreme body of the total structures of all Committees. It is the Legislature.



**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) has documented the case very well. This information has never been denied before and I don't know what the Government is trying to hide. The Minister of Labour tries to make lame excuses that somehow the Canadian Labour Congress becomes involved. Mr. Speaker, the questions that are asked here will show that every union is affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress. I am sure that it would be possible for us to ask of the Canadian Labour Congress, because copies are also filed with that body and we can obtain that information. But we would have to write to Ottawa. I know in my own case anytime there was need for information in regard to collective bargaining agreements it is a very, very easy thing really for a trade union to write to the Congress and get the information. However, we as Members of the Legislature are not in the same kind of a position. The Canadian Labour of Congress doesn't hide information. Collective bargaining agreements that are filed are available for anyone to see and unions file them for that very purpose.

We also file agreements with the Federal Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker. I know this, that, if we asked for information from the Federal Department of Labour we could get it, but from this Government we are not able to obtain the information. The Minister of Labour is clearly making excuses talking about something being sacred. When did collective bargaining agreements ever become sacred? No union in the history of the trade union movement has said that a collective bargaining agreement is sacred. They are information that unions are proud to divulge, and I am sure that any union, if requested, would say, "Certainly, let's file that agreement with the Legislature because the people of the Legislature are entitled to have it."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

**Yeas - 23  
Messieurs**

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

**Nays - 31  
Messieurs**

Howes	Coderre	Radloff
-------	---------	---------

March 18, 1969

McFarlane	Larochelle	Weatherald
Boldt	MacDonald	Mitchell
Cameron	Estey	Gardner
Heald	Hooker	Coupland
McIsaac	Gallagher	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois
Barrie	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser
Grant		

### Return No. 86

**Mr. Blakeney:** moved that an order of the Assembly to issue for Return No. 86 showing:

- (1) a copy of the current union agreement or agreements and any supplementary schedules thereto between Saskatchewan Government Telephones and any union certified as the bargaining agent for any of its employees.
- (2) The number of employees covered by each such union agreement.

He said: It will be observed that this motion asks for the filing of a union agreement of Saskatchewan Government Telephones. It will be within the knowledge of the Members opposite that Saskatchewan Government Telephones which is now a Crown corporation was once a Government Department. It would have been the case at one time that all of this information would have been published in public Accounts, in fact was published in Public Accounts. I am not aware that during those days any particular harm resulted to the corporation from having this information available. I now suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House that it will not in any way harm this corporation to have this information available.

This is a utility, it is not a competitive corporation and accordingly it is highly unlikely that this information could possibly hurt anybody. I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the Federal Government readily files the "sacred" contracts which it has with its employees. I would like to call to the attention of the House that on March 10, 1969, there was moved in the House of Commons that an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any collective bargaining agreement between Polymer Corporation and any of its employees. Two days later on March 12th, this was accepted and passed without debate.

Now Polymer Corporation is a competitive corporation. It is in competitive business and yet the Federal Government sees no possible harm in making available to the House of Commons the collective bargaining agreement between the employees of

Polymer and this Federal Government Crown corporation.

I think that there can be no possible reason for this House taking a different view in respect of the collective bargaining agreement between Saskatchewan Government Telephones and its employees. May I again point out to this House that this contract was filed, has been filed in this House before on a number of occasions in the House or Committee. The Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) referred to this in an earlier debate. I make no further reference to it than that, except that anyone who indicates that this is likely to do harm to the corporation, should at least do the House the honour of pointing out what harm was done in the past by filing these contracts.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I think the facts will be that no harm will be done to Polymer. No harm has been done to Saskatchewan Government Telephones and accordingly no possible harm could be done in the future. I suggest that the House ought to adopt this motion and provide the information requested.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.C. Cameron** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment briefly as the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones. The Hon. Member asked me in the Committee if I was prepared to give him this information. I said I would have to consult with the union officials and with officials of SaskTel before I could make a decision as to whether or not we would table the union contract.

The Hon. Member went to great length to sort of portray a picture of Saskatchewan Government Telephones as a mere instrument of government, as a mere department of government. Therefore, there was no harm that could possibly arise to union officials, to the employees, or to the management by the tabling in this House of the union contract. Before I go on to Telephones I want to say there is quite a difference in giving members of a committee copies of a union contract and tabling it formally in this House. This becomes a public document available for all here and anywhere to ask for, to see, and to reproduce and to talk about. Your Committee Members may have the information and there has been no attempt to deny information to the Committee Members in the Crown Corporations. That's why you have a Crown Corporations Committee. They ask for this information in the Crown Corporations Committee and I shall give it to the Members of the Committee.

Now I want to talk about Telephones. Here we have it's true a Crown corporation. We have millions of dollars of payroll in here. We have negotiated a two-year agreement with the

March 18, 1969

union. Incidentally may I say that we negotiated this agreement in a co-operative manner and in a period of time which is the shortest on record.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to say here that Saskatchewan Government Telephones enjoys good relationships with its union, but I do not feel as a responsible Minister that I can assume the responsibility of tabling in this Legislature a document which would reveal to everybody in the telecommunications field precisely what our craftsmen in each category is receiving, precisely what employees in every phase of Telephones gets. we are in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we are in competition with the CNR. We are in competition with other communication areas and some of them would just love to know precisely what we are paying each one of our craftsmen in every classification. They would love to know what we are paying our branch managers. They would love to know what salaries SaskTel is paying in order to do two things: to see whether they are in line with their salaries and secondly the possibility of inducing our top officials to leave SaskTel and join them. Surely a contract that is freely entered into between the Crown corporation and the union is a good contract. It is a contract that should be respected. It is a contract between the employees and their employer and I think in most cases that's the way it should rest. I have no authorization from the Union. Incidentally, I haven't asked them, but I have no authorization from the union to table this contract. I rather feel that if I would ask them they might acquiesce, but it would be with some reservation of making public these contracts which the employees are working under with Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

You people had an opportunity in Crown corporations. You went through the returns and the audited statements of SaskTel from top to bottom. There is nothing hidden. Any question which was asked my officials answered. There was nothing to hide and there is nothing to hide here. You try to make a Federal case out of the fact that we in the competitive field in the telecommunications industry don't wish to make public for all our competitors precisely what we are paying all our officials in SaskTel.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank** (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, on this particular matter I think the arguments, some of which the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones (Mr. Cameron) put forward, are rather specious. The Minister states that the salaries will be disclosed by presenting this agreement and he seeks to create the impression that other telecommunications companies from across Canada will immediately seize this information and draw off our top

staff from Saskatchewan Government Telephones. I suggest to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones if he was to check that agreement he wouldn't find any salaries in it. None of his top officials have their income listed in that agreement so his argument is . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I said they'd know every one of the craftsmen and I said wouldn't they dearly love to know the range of our officials in the top.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Certainly they're not in the union contract. What are you talking about?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker

**Mr. Cameron:** — But they'd dearly love to know what we are paying.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, it's on the record. It's on the record what the Minister said and he can check the record if he wishes. As far as that goes, aside from what the Minister said, the other companies that are in the telecommunications field know within a fraction what his top officials are getting in his department. I am not wanting to know what the top officials in your Department are getting and as a matter of fact I haven't asked. I am asking what the union contract contains and the Minister attempts here to create a situation where it appears we are jeopardizing the whole Saskatchewan Government Telephones operation. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac:** — (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, just a word if I may on this question and if I may relate some of it back to comments made by the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) in the previous debate or North East (Mr. Smishek) or wherever he is from.

Earlier when the . . .

**Mr. W.G. Davies:** — (Moose Jaw South) Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't want to interrupt the Hon. Member, but it is not in the order of the House that you should refer to a previous debate.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — an very quickly relate it o this debate, Mr. Speaker. One will notice, when looking down the Motions for Return that we are debating, the same general theme. There is none dealing

March 18, 1969

with Saskatchewan Transportation Company. If I may revert back to when Crown Corporations Committee was on, Members of the Committee asked me whether or not . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — House cannot discuss the Committee until the Committee reports to the House.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — With respect to this question I can tell them what one union had to say when we asked them to publicize their contract. I have here a letter addressed to the Administration Manager, STC from the Amalgamated Transit Union in Calgary. I had a phone call also from one of the union members in Saskatoon. He phoned his head office in Calgary. The letter reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Richardson:

Please be advised that the Amalgamated Transit Union's preference has been and at the present time is not to make public any contract settlements.

**An Hon. Member:** — Ho, ho.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** Now:

We do publicize contract improvements in our transit magazine for the benefit of our own membership.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . all give the information.

**Mr. McIsaac:**

We feel that this policy has been of benefit both to various employers we deal with and to our membership in general.

So there is one union that doesn't follow the policy referred to by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. May I ask the Hon. Member to table the letter that he has referred to at this time.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — No, I will not table it. I will take full responsibility for it. It's right here. It wasn't addressed to me in the first place.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Again I draw the attention

of all Members to the rules governing letters that they should be tabled. The mover has to take complete responsibility for the letter, its contents and the fact that a bona fide signature is upon the bottom thereof. Does the Member take responsibility or does he . . .

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Very much so, Mr. Speaker, yes.

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to refer to any previous debate as some other Members have at this time, but I would only want to allude to what I think was the counterfeit emotion of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) in a previous debate, followed by the gesticulations of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who has spoken only a few minutes ago. I am equally amazed because of what he has had to say and I am chagrined because of what I think the attitude of these two Ministers this afternoon has done, not only to the business of this House, not only to the information that this House has a right to know but for the public of the Province of Saskatchewan which, of course, indirectly benefits from information when it is revealed by questions that are put within our system of parliamentary government, Of course the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) followed in the debate with fog and smokescreen and evasion, and I think what might charitably be called outright bologna because that really is what he had to say in this debate.

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald** (Minister of Welfare): — What about the letter?

**Mr. Davies:** — The fact of the matter is, of course . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Well, I wish the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) would subside a bit. He might learn just a little on labour relations about which I know he knows nothing. He talked about the fact that information revealed in this answer, if it was given by the Government, would hurt the Government's position in its relations with the Canadian National Railways, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Bell Telephone Company and, Mr. Speaker, the Minister sits in his place and realizes that every wage contract of this type is known within the communications system of this country and by every company within that communications system . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — . . . because they co-operate, because they exchange information and because they are in continual liaison and

March 18, 1969

consultation on these matters. The Minister knows it. So there is no question but that the agreement that he is referring to here this afternoon and which he refuses to have tabled in this House is already well known to the Bell Telephone Company, to the Canadian National Railways and to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say that he is not only evading the question but he is misleading this House and distorting information that he should not distort in a debate of this kind.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) talks about this information being sacred . . .

**Mr. MacDonald:** — He didn't speak in this debate.

**Mr. Davies:** — Now we have no information before this House apart from some extraneous comments by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that there is one union of the hundreds that are involved in collective bargaining relations.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, this is the very Member that got up on his feet only five minutes ago and chastised the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) for referring to a previous debate. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) did not speak in this debate and the Member from Moose Jaw is now quoting him on his past.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — No, he wasn't. The Minister of Labour . . . Check the records.

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I made only a brief allusion to what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) said. When I sat down and when the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) interrupted, we were talking about what the Minister of Education said. Now, I say if he's got any information, put it on the floor of this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — I say that the unions of this country know full well that this information is party to public debate. They know that their wage rates are known to the members of the public who represent them. They know that there isn't the remotest reason why this information shouldn't be tabled in this House. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) took refuge in a shabby way, I thought, by talking about what we are going to do about the salaries of our top officials. There isn't a top official within this union organization. They are not members



of the union; and he knows it and therefore the question is wholly out of the discussion at this time. He knows that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — No, the Minister of Mineral Resources said he'd ask the union first. Why hasn't he asked the unions first. When the Minister discussed this question he said . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I am only pointing out to the Minister his own words. He said that we have to ask the union first. Then he went on to say that he didn't know whether he should. I am afraid they might say Yes, he said. This is what he said to us here this afternoon. This whole debate you know, borders on the hilarious . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Yes, you're right.

**Mr. Davies:** — . . . in terms of the kind of evasion that we are seeing opposite this afternoon. I am really surprised by the Hon. Members because this sort of thing has been going on for a long time. Not so long ago we were discussing some other question of this kind and similar information was denied this House.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't made any reference to any one debate so I'm completely in order, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). I want to refer, however, to another Return which has to do with the divulging of information. This refers to the number of employees and their wage rates. Return No. 71 again asked for on March 15th, 1960 and tabled only a week later. This Return, Mr. Speaker, asked for the total number of employees, both permanent and temporary, employed by the Saskatchewan Government as of December 31st, (that being '59 of course) and in each of the years 1930, 1935, 1940, 1945, 1950, 1959. I don't want to trespass on the Rules of the House by alluding to a previous debate. But I hope everyone of those Members who are opposite and remember the refusal of information asked on a similar question only a few weeks ago will stay in their places, will keep quiet and be absolutely ashamed for having refused to divulge information that was given in a seven-day period for a period of ten years by the previous Government.

Now, the issue really, Mr. Speaker, is, as I've constantly said, one of providing information not to the Members of the Opposition but to the public of the Province of Saskatchewan. Because when discussions on labour relations come into play, when questions of wage rates, salary rates, hours of work, working conditions, come before us, we must know what the relationship is between all the corporations of the Government and the Public Service of this Province. That is why the Members on this side

March 18, 1969

of the House, Mr. Speaker, when we were in Government gave this information freely to the Members of the Opposition who are now the Government On your right. Because we knew that this information was significant. Now when they find it embarrassing they refuse to provide it. These are the people who are constantly rising before us in debate in and outside of this House talking about the need to amend labour legislation so it is more restrictive and more difficult for labour organizations. This is the Government that has done more to restrict the fights of labour than others in 50 years.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're away out . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — I don't know of any other Government that's done it more than the Government on your right, Mr. Speaker. This is the Government that in terms of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) calls the rights of labour sacred. How sacred can you get!

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Members of the Government here this afternoon who have so constantly refused to reveal a whole spate of information of value to the people of this Province as well as to the Opposition to reflect what they are doing in terms of damage to this House, to the cause of this House and to the whole business of democratic institutions.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — I am asking them to change their course because what they are doing here is not good for them, or for us, or for the public of this Province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.E. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), the Minister in charge of Government Telephones rose to take part in this debate, he started off by saying that he was, or implying that he was, in touch with a management of the Government Telephones and the union, and that there was no objection on the part of the union to providing this information. Apparently he corrected himself subsequently, Mr. Speaker, when this debate started and because of the Minister's remarks I stepped outside and took the liberty of telephoning the union involved, the Communication Workers of America. They have informed me that they have no objections whatsoever to having a copy of the collective bargaining agreement filed in this Legislature. Furthermore they are willing to provide every Member of this Legislature a copy of the collective bargaining agreement. They say this information is something that the public is entitled to know. They have no objections whatsoever to it being filed in the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. L.P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker. I said that I would object to every one of these motions most violently and I objected in my capacity of Minister of Labour and I make no apologies to anyone. Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned in previous debates that I as Minister of Labour requested this House not to permit the tabling of these agreements. I repeat again for the records of this House that every trade union agreement in this Province is tabled with the Department of Labour and as such is a privileged document to the Department of Labour. I said as such I don't believe, but maybe my friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, believe that this House has the right to pry into private contracts. I don't believe that any government has a right in a free democratic society to peer into the private contracts of the individual. If these individuals wish to present their contracts as the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) indicated, that is their privilege. But I am speaking as Minister of Labour where these documents have been tabled or registered and filed with the Department of Labour. In my capacity as Minister of Labour, having a copy of every agreement that is filed in this Province, I flatly refuse to table them because I think I would be breaking a trust. These documents, Mr. Speaker, are given to the Department of Labour that in event of difficulties in the negotiating that our conciliation officers would have an idea what is in the contract prior and what are the new demands. They're tabled there in trust to our conciliation officers and to the Department. I challenge anyone in this House, anyone outside of this House, to go to the Department of Labour and ask to see any single document or trade union agreement that's been signed and that's why I, as Minister of Labour, request the House to deny the tabling of these documents.

One of my colleagues has mentioned in this House that he would be prepared to do so. If he does so that's his privilege but as Minister of Labour I say it is not and should not be done so without full consent of the two parties. Now, could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if any of these questions are asked and we would agree to it but that the request would be denied by the other party, it would be sheer folly. I think if the Members opposite were to have it and they can get permission from the unions concerned then I am sure that the corporation in question would table it, but I, as Minister of Labour, have a duty to all unions of this province to see that these documents are not made public. The IWA - and I mention this - has been attempting to raid another union. I think that we have a duty and a responsibility to the smaller unions that they are not raided by the larger ones. It is for this reason, as Minister of Labour, that I urge this House not to continue, not to table any documents that are trade union agreements.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

March 18, 1969

**Mr. Davies:** — Before the Minister takes his seat, would he answer a question.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Minister, is it not a fact that the Public Service Commission prepares précis of wage rates of Crown corporations and Government employees and circulates this throughout the length and breadth of Saskatchewan among public and private employers?

**Mr. Coderre:** — Insofar as I know, Yes, insofar as the wage structure is concerned, but there are many fringe benefits which are something that's within the confines of an agreement between management and labour. The question is this, that you're trying to give the impression that a trade union agreement only deals with the dollars and cents. But there are many fringe benefits, many benefits that should be kept within the organization itself as was mentioned in the debate. Now that you've asked me the question I can answer it and elaborate on it. You were mentioning that the Communication Workers of America would have no objections. Maybe it wouldn't. I'm not going to agree with that, but you yourself in this very debate, in this very question did mention in this one - that's right that all the communications media knows what's going on. But the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Telegraphers is a different group than the Communication Workers of America, so therefore again I would think that the Government Telephones agreement would be out of order . . .

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I've asked the Minister one question and he's now enlarging into debate. May I ask him a supplementary question?

**Mr. Coderre:** — Just one short question that I can answer Yes or No.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — What are these fringe benefits that you say are not revealed within the précis that the Public Service Commission publishes and in a widespread way circulates?

**Mr. Coderre:** — There are 1,200 agreements in the province, my friend, and each one has different conditions in the agreement. Some of them have pension agreements, some of them have not. How can I tell you . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Is this an agreement?

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, I submit to you: what is wrong with a person's mind who asks a question to expect the person to be able to know the contents of 1,200 different agreements in this province?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell us whether the IWA has in fact been found guilty of raiding by the Canadian Labour Congress or by any other body which has jurisdiction to rule on the question of raids within the trade union movement.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I'm not concerned with the internal organization of what happens within the CLC. I am concerned with what happens to the people of this province. If the CLC grants permission to IWA to raid one, that's fine. I am concerned that the members and the people of this province don't get hurt. I don't want to see one trade union member of this province being hurt by a struggle between unions.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.G. Willis** (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, just before the debate is tabled, I didn't catch the name of the writer of the letter or to whom the letter was written. I've waited patiently for the Minister of Education to come back to his seat. It appears as though he is not coming back. I was wondering if the letter is on his desk and if the Attorney General could tell me who the letter is addressed to and who wrote the letter?

**Hon. D.V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the letter is not on the desk and it would be very improper for me to deal with it anyway. As I understand the ruling, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) accepted the responsibility for the letter and its contents and the fact that it was a bona fide letter. That's my understanding and that complies with the Rules of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The rules of the House are that if a Member who has read a letter or part thereof in debate takes full and complete responsibility for the contents of the letter and full and complete responsibility for there being a bona fide signature thereon, he may do so on his own responsibility as a Member of the House and a gentleman and his statement will be accepted. He does not necessarily have to say what the name is but he must take full responsibility for the fact of there being one.

**Mr. Willis:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not raising any question about his integrity or not being a gentleman, but I understood the

March 18, 1969

Minister of Education to give the name and I didn't catch it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If he said the name, it will certainly be on the Hansard record and the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) can get it off the record as soon as it is typed or he can get it from the Minister, if the Minister chooses to divulge it to him.

The Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) rises to close the debate, if anybody wishes to speak further...

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a very brief word in closing. I regret that the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is not here because the letter gave one the impression in reading it that in fact . . . I will turn to another point for just a moment, Mr. Speaker. First I want to deal for a moment with the remarks of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). He has a rather remarkable view that the filing of a public document with the Department of Labour makes it somehow a private document, we have fortunately dispensed with that view with respect to the agreement of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association and the Government. That is a public document, it is filed with the Minister of Labour and it is no less a public document because it is filed with the Minister of Labour, and I compliment the Minister in charge of the Public Service Commission for tabling it. The Minister of Labour has enunciated here a very remarkable doctrine that any contract between the Crown and the private citizen is a private contract. Now this is simply not a doctrine of parliamentary government. The point which he makes - I don't know why he thinks that union contracts fall into a different category than other contracts - he is saying that a contract between a union and the Crown is a private document.

**Mr. Coderre:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not say that a contract between a union and the Crown was a private document. I said that a contract between a union and any employer or management, and you can check your records, is a private document. And I said I don't think that the Government should be peering over it. That's it. And I was outlining the broad principles of where I stood as Minister of Labour in that capacity and not otherwise.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Minister of Labour give his speech on what he thinks the status of private contracts is, and all of it is delightfully irrelevant. We are talking here about contracts between the Crown and its employees. Each one of these bodies, and in this debate we are talking about Saskatchewan Government Telephones, is the Crown and the right of Saskatchewan. There is no possible way that that can be denied. The Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act makes this abundantly clear. What we are talking about is a contract between the

Crown and its employees and that is, on the face of it, a public document. That is, on the face of it, a document to which everybody in Saskatchewan is entitled to access unless there is a good reason to the contrary. If I sell a house to the Crown or the Crown buys a house from me or vice versa, the contract covering this is a public document. It is available to be looked at. This what it is all about. This is what the parliamentary system of government is all about. The Crown's dealings with its citizens are public property.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There may on occasion be reasons why this information should not be made public. The only reason why a contract shall not be made public is for the Minister responsible to stand in his place and say that it is not in the public interest. The Minister responsible in this case is the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). The comments of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) are delightfully irrelevant. He is not the Minister responsible and he ought not to interject in this debate his views as to what that Minister ought to do.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Is that what you would like to do?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We do not object to the Minister of Labour speaking. In fact, it is one of the little elements of humour which we interject into this House from time to time. But I want to say that on the face of it these agreements are public documents. I think the reasons advanced by the Minister for denying this information which is *prima facie* public have not been convincing. They have not convinced me and I doubt whether they would convince any fair-minded observer. The interjection of the Minister of Education left with it the implication that the letter which he quoted from was a letter which indicated that the union would have agreed to the tabling. He quoted only what their preference was, not what their decision was, and I have an uneasy feeling that the full reading of the letter would have said that you may table the agreement. I have that uneasy feeling. I may be wrong and if I am I'd like the Minister to table the letter if he would. But if he wouldn't I will accept his nod to the contrary if in fact he makes it. On the face of it, this is a public document, on the face of it the denial of it to the Legislature can only be done on the responsibility of the Minister in charge, the Minister of Mineral Resources. We have heard his reasons for denying. I would earnestly suggest to you they are unconvincing reasons and that the motion ought to be passed.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

**Yeas - 24  
Messieurs**

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

**Nays - 31  
Messieurs**

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

**Return No. 87**

**Mr. Blakeney:** moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 87 showing:

(1) A copy of the current union agreement or agreements and any supplementary schedules thereto between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and any union certified as the bargaining agent for any of its employees.

(2) The number of employees covered by each such union agreement.

He said: It will be observed that this refers to the Power Corporation. This is the one which I expect the Government to agree to. I do so because the Hon. Mr. Grant is the Minister. He has already in this House expressed a perfect willingness to file information on the contracts between the Government of Saskatchewan and the College of Physicians and Surgeons. He has invited the complete fee schedule to be tabled together with the various changes, and I would think it quite unusual, to put it mildly, for information of that nature to be offered by the Minister at the time that information on the contracts between the Power Corporation and the Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers or the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers was denied. I am sure therefore that the Minister will be



urging his colleagues in this case in the interests of consistency to support this motion, and I would invite all Members to support it.

**Hon. G.B. Grant** (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, to use an old Indian expression, I feel this afternoon that there is heap big smoke and very little fire and I think this is possibly applicable to both sides of the House. I come to the firm conclusion that the Members opposite really don't want these agreements for their own consumption, because they have them all anyway and they can easily get them if they require them. But rather they wish to give the public the impression that this Government is holding back certain information that the public is entitled to.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — I doubt very much whether the public is that concerned with the individual contracts. They have faith in the ability of these unions to negotiate on their own behalf and the ability of the Government or the Crown corporation to negotiate on behalf of the people. Just by way of digression for a minute, I must refer to the Hon. Member's from Regina Centre remarks about my earlier undertaking to file the schedule of fees for the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I am not sure whether I understand him correctly or not. I can't recall agreeing to do that. I did make reference to the schedule of payments, but I made no reference to the schedule of fees. There are two different documents there and if I am wrong I'll stand corrected. I am not aware of anybody trying to raid the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — But I don't think there is any comparison here, and I don't think that any commitment that I have made in connection with the schedule of payments as pertaining to medicare has any relationship here.

Prior to 1964 in the Power Corporation we had a union that was spending more time politicking than they were in working and negotiating contracts. Since that time we find that we have two unions now and the original one has developed a far more responsible attitude. They are spending their time now working for the Power Corporation and for the welfare of their members in the union. They have cut out the politicking and I think everybody in Saskatchewan is pretty pleased with this, because it has given the Power Corporation a different image altogether. I think it has gone a long ways towards helping the Power Corporation show the fine results that it has in doubling the revenue, with fewer people employed and a bigger return, bigger investment on the part of the people, bigger equity, all with

March 18, 1969

very pleasant relationships with the union in question. I might say that the last union contract was finalized in a record period, relatively few meetings in a nice atmosphere, and I think that we will be successful in continuing this relationship with this particular union.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — However, while the relationship is good between the OCAW and the Government and the relationship is also good between the IBEW and the Power Corporation. I should have said the Power Corporation rather than the Government. I doubt very much whether the IBEW and the OCAW wish to get in bed together and exchange contracts or relations. This is my reason for not being prepared to support this motion, because I feel that, while the Power Corporation may be quite aware of what the union contract arrangement is with other similar corporations, this is only natural business, but the same doesn't apply to competing unions. The IBEW and the OCAW are certainly in this category and consequently I'll have to vote against this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.G. Davies** (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't think that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) would join this course of subterfuge that we have experienced from the ranks of the Government this afternoon. The Minister of Health and any one of his colleagues opposite, including the Minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, know that in negotiations between the Government and its employees at any level whether it is the Public Service, the employees represented by the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association or the Unions representing the Power Corporation or the unions representing the employees in Telephones, all down the line, those Ministers know perfectly well that the wage rates in each one of these jurisdictions is a matter of common knowledge, that no secret is made of it, that these rates are released by the Public Service Commission negotiators where they apply, by the Power Commission negotiators where they apply and that this goes on and has gone on from year to year. But for the Minister of Health to now suggest that within the confines of the Power Corporation that the union negotiating members of the two unions don't know what is going on with respect to the . . .

**Mr. Grant:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I made no reference to the wages in my remarks.

**Mr. Davies:** — I don't know what, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could have been talking about with respect to an agreement, if he wasn't talking to wage rates because they form a very fundamental part of any union agreement. But may I continue by saying that he knows perfectly well that the articles of agreement

between the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the articles of agreement between the OCAW and their members are common knowledge between the two union organizations. These agreements are not secret and there is no truth that these union members are trying to keep them secret from this Legislature. This is nothing but the Minister of Health (and I am surprised to see him doing so) joining a chain of subterfuge in an effort to keep from this House information that it has a right to have and which it should not have been denied. It was not denied when the Members who sit now opposite us in Government were asking these questions in Opposition.

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon Riversdale): — I just have to make one comment, Mr. Speaker, and that is the observation made by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was apparently troubled by unions, to use his words, that were more interested in playing politics than on negotiating on behalf of the workers. This, of course, is a continuation of the type of propaganda, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister opposite, the Government opposite, have been putting out not only against the unions that represent the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the collective bargaining agreements for which we seek to have some information about, but about trade unionism in general. Now if there is any politicking going on, I should like to draw to the attention of the Members of the House a photocopy I have of a report in the Toronto Globe and Mail, dated August 27, 1966. It is written by one, E.N. Davis and headlined, "OCAW and IBEW battle SPC." The story was a very interesting story. It talks about a number of negotiations, contracts, wages, fringe benefits and the like, the very thing that this Government now is saying that they are not going to give to the House. But I would like to particularly draw to the Members attention this one little paragraph and it says this:

Although Mr. Steuart (referring to the now Provincial Treasurer) plays it cautiously by leaving the doors open for the OCAW to return to the negotiating table and by suggesting the SPC's offer was not necessarily final, the Government is not afraid of a strike.

And get this:

'Everything is on our side' a Government Minister said.

By the way I wonder who that Government Minister was - it is unnamed. The article says:

We'd reap a lot of political Kudos, particularly in rural areas, if we are placed in a position of having to call a special session of the Legislature to impose compulsory arbitration to end the strike and the OCAW knows that.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, who is

March 18, 1969

playing politics, who's interested about political kudos when it comes to tabling arrangements, collective bargaining agreements. Here we have the Globe and Mail, the reputed newspaper of Canada telling us about an unidentified Minister interested in playing political kudos with the working people of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — I think that is shameful, Mr. Speaker. Not only that, but to have Members of this House believe that wage contracts, particularly as they relate to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation are secret or ought to be secret, is really a sham. I have here a clipping from the Regina Leader Post, dated May 2, 1967. I'm not going to go into length, but it is open for everyone to see.

Five per cent pay hike awarded SPC and OCAW.

And lo and behold, another newspaper clipping dated May 2, 1967 talks about one D.B. Furlong commenting on the pay increases. And here is another particularly interesting comment:

SPC notes benefits for OCAW members.

And, Mr. Minister, for your information, tables everything from salaries and wages and shift differentials, holiday pay, the smallest detail of any collective bargaining agreement. And now, Mr. Speaker, the Government Members opposite would have us believe in this House that any of the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement, as they relate between the SPC and the OCAW or the IBEW, should be secret or in fact are secret. It's a sham. The fact of the matter is that this Government continually revels in dragging across the political arena the question of collective bargaining agreements. The Ministers now say they are very concerned about the individual working man. Need I remind the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Minister in charge, about one individual working person who was dragged up and down the Province of Saskatchewan and made a political football of by this Government opposite, one Mr. Basken.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — The fact of the matter is that the Government opposite is concerned simply and solely in putting down at every opportunity it can any legitimate information respecting the working people's working rights of the Province of Saskatchewan. I only ask this question. Are we entitled to assume that perhaps the SPC is just not giving the type of awards that rightfully the people of Saskatchewan expect SPC employees to be receiving? These are legitimate questions that one asks. The Minister by refusing to table this information is doing a great disservice to the Legislators and the people of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make two very quick points. Firstly, to refresh the memory of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), it was the schedule of fees of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which he undertook to file and not the schedule of payments of the Medical Care Insurance Commission. I was rather surprised at the time. But this was his motion and not mine.

The other point I want to make is a special plea with respect to the Power Corporation. I wonder whether the Government fully appreciates its position when it declines to reveal the contents of a collective bargaining agreement in effect, in an organization which is subject to The Essential Services Act, wherein the employees of the Power Corporation can apparently be forced to go back to work on pain of imprisonment and other penal sanctions. And yet the Government is unwilling to tell the public what the terms of this employment are. I wonder if that's a defensible position for any government. If the Government is taking the position that it can force people to go back to work and take away from them the right to strike, surely the absolute minimum that the Government must do is disclose the conditions under which they work and the conditions under which the Government is forcing the employees to work and not to strike.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

**Yeas - 24  
Messieurs**

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

**Nays - 31  
Messieurs**

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

### Return No. 94

**Mr. W.G. Davies** (Moose Jaw South): moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 94 showing:

- (1) Whether the Saskatchewan Department of Labour survey on hours of work announced in 1966 has been completed and, if so, whether copies of this study are available to MLAs or the public.
- (2) In 1968, the estimated number of Saskatchewan employees who normally worked: (a) in excess of 48 hours per week; (b) a 48-hour week; (c) a 44-hour week; and (d) less than 40 hours per week.

**Hon. L.P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in looking over this question, I am sure the Hon. Member would like to have all the information available. I move, seconded by Mr. Grant (Regina South) the following amendment:

That all the words after the word “week” in the second line of part (2) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

- (b) from 45 to 48 hours a week; (c) from 41 to 44 hours per week; and (d) 40 hours per week and under.

**Mr. Davies**: — Mr. Speaker, I have no objection I think to the amendment, It provides information in somewhat a different form than that which has been requested for some years previous, in which I’ve been answered in precisely the same form, as the question which we have before us, but I am prepared to abide by the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.  
Motion as amended agreed to.

### RESOLUTIONS

#### **Resolution No. 13 - Coordination of Government Programs Respecting Agriculture.**

**Mr. J. Messer** (Kelsey) moved, seconded by Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Federal and provincial Governments, coordination of all Government programs and policies respecting agriculture, ranging from production to the consumer, so that the agricultural sector will be treated as an organized body.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the need for the recognition and the action that the passing of this legislation would bring about is of utmost need to the farming industry and the related industries in Canada today. The agricultural industry as a whole has slowly been slipping into more serious trouble on a yearly basis because there is absolutely no coordination in reaching its ultimate goals or objectives. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the present situation could be termed as chaotic.

It is indeed unfortunate that the view of agriculture held by many people is so narrow. By people I don't just mean the general population, I mean the responsible people who are now heading the agricultural industry. Far too many of these people are only concerned about their particular department or their particular responsibility in which they are involved in the agricultural industry. This applies on a Provincial basis, it applies on a Federal basis, it applies on a world-wide basis in relation to agricultural problems at a world level. Because of this, to put it mildly, this industry is indeed in some trouble. The problems will not be resolved until we recognize that agriculture must be treated as a system which includes food production, food research, food processing, food packaging, food marketing, both Provincial, Federal and on a world-wide basis. For far too many years we have been tinkering with the system by paying a subsidy here and plugging a gap there, only to find that trouble breaks out in some other place. When this has happened in a great many instances, we have urged the creation of another department to look after that particular problem without any recognition as to how we could coordinate that department with the other agriculture departments in operation. We have changed to new methods without thought as to how the whole system will be altered. Agriculture is not a series of little black boxes which are independent of each other. Agriculture is food and all aspects and solutions to problems must be found that best suit the system and not any individual part.

I don't believe it's possible for one to separate food production from nutrition, animal science from zoology, biochemistry from food science. It is not any more plausible to do this than it is to encourage food production on a maximum basis without first of all looking into what the potentials are in the near future for food marketing and for the long-range future of food marketing in the world. The results of demand for food production in marketing by world demands will show the type and kind and amount of production that is needed. Then this should be correlated with the food research departments. The areas in the consumer demand and the world marketing of food will demand the type and amount of production that is needed, and then this should be correlated with the food research departments. The areas in the consumer demand and the world marketing of food will demand the types and quantities of processing and food packaging that would take care of the food production. In this manner we would have somewhat coordinated this system.

March 18, 1969

Canada's problem will exist as long as most of us think of agriculture as farming and thus fail to give the agricultural industry the priority it deserves in terms of national policy.

We need long-term planning and at the Federal level we need to sort out the role of various governmental departments. At the present time, we have food research and policy being formed in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Industry. All provincial governments to some extent form research and policy that greatly affects the agricultural industry. The solutions to our agricultural and food problems will be delayed as long as such fragmentation is allowed to go on. It is time that Canadians adopted the systems approach and realized that the food producer, the researcher and the food retailer are all part of the same industry.

Let's take a look at the situation of wheat. The outlook for Canadian wheat sales is pessimistic. Canada has traditionally sold quality wheat to be used as a mixer by the milling companies in major importing countries. Our share of the world export wheat trade in years past normally ranged between 20 per cent and 25 per cent. It peaked at 39.2 per cent in 1952 - 1953 era and reached a low in 1967-68 of 18 per cent.

The advent of improving milling techniques in the late '50s and early '60s has meant that a smaller portion of Canadian wheat is required in the grist of many countries. The net result seems to be a stable export market for approximately 250 to 300 million bushels of our high quality wheats. Sales to Communist countries dropped during the 1960s due to the changing of milling techniques. Canada in fact has maintained its normal percentage of world wheat exports during most of 1900s, even though total world trade in wheat increased from the one billion bushel level of the 1950s to the two billion bushel level in the 1960s. This is good, but we should have been strenuously working for a larger percentage by trading in other means with other countries. I say this because China, for one country in particular, will not pay a premium for Canadian wheat if cheaper wheat is available. In fact if and when the United States decides to trade with China, this market could dry up for Canada entirely.

An alternative might be semi-dwarf varieties originating from Mexico that are distinguishable from current Marquis-type wheat and could be graded separately. If by selection or breeding, new high yielding varieties of fair quality are produced, these might enter No. 3 Northern if distinguishable from Marquis types. But they must also be distinguishable from two quality varieties such as Petic 62, or relatively, the licence for Petic might be withdrawn. Nor is it conceivable that a new variety, comparable to the best available, but equal again to Marquis quality may be produced. These could then enter top grades provided no other poorer quality or variety which is indistinguishable from it is grown. Mere multiplications of grades is



no solution because of reduced efficiency of elevator and transportation systems.

Politics aside, nobody buys wheat of poor quality if he can buy better quality at the same price. Nobody grows low quality wheat if he can grow high quality wheat at the same cost. The key question is thus whether higher yielding varieties, or lower quality will provide a greater return per acre to the farmer. And a final answer to this question, is it related to Manitou in some hypothetical variety, can only be obtained by growing the latter on a merchandisable scale of at least 30 million bushels per year. The probability of success depends on how close its quality is to that of Manitou and how much greater is its yield, and on whether Canada is prepared to compete in aid and assistance programs involving long-term credits at low interest rates. In the meantime, Canada will do well to concentrate on holding the potential market of 250 to 300 million bushels for high quality wheat, especially against increasing competition from the United States, Australia and the USSR.

The competition is now keen in regard to the trading of world wheat. George Hefflefinger, President of National Grain Company, predicts that in the near future we will be looking at 80 million acres of Prairie crop land, and not knowing what to do with it. J.E. McWilliams, President of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, views the situation in this way, and I quote:

I don't believe Canada ever will be in a position to market all the wheat it is capable of producing. We have a potential of one billion bushels a year and don't believe the market places of the world will absorb this much bread wheat. The importing countries are developing their own technology just as rapidly as we are, if not more rapidly.

This is true and it is showing up in many parts of the world. Pakistan today forecasts self-sufficiency in food by 1970. The Philippines today are self-supporting in food with their new rice technology. India is rapidly seeing the day approach when she will be able to be self-sufficient in regard to food.

Mr. McWilliams further stated that Canada is reasonably certain of being able to find annual markets for some 300 to 400 million bushels of quality wheat with domestic disappearance of another 150 million bushels. This still leaves a gap of around 500 million bushels between what the market is potentially capable of absorbing and the potential one billion bushel output. Mr. Hefflefinger, Mr. McWilliams, and Mr. Charles Croft, head of the Shippers and Exporters Association of Grain Exchange members, all expressed the identical view that instead of concentrating on wheat production we should be beginning to think of agriculture in a total sense.

They say that our wheat policy should not be an end in

March 18, 1969

itself, but it should be viewed as only a part of our total agricultural policy. We have not given adequate recognition to the need of agricultural research into what we can sell readily in the form of food, and inter-producing the farm commodities to meet the demand.

Mr. Croft stated and I quote, 'The Canadian Wheat Board was established in 1935, and much has happened since then. Our system requires updating.'

It is interesting to note that there is general approval among the Exchange members as well as other farm spokesmen of the soundness of establishing the Canadian Grains Council, providing the Council approaches its assignment with a view of Canadian agriculture in a total sense. The statement of our system requiring updating certainly doesn't mean lessening the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. This agency is a most important one in marketing wheat, oats and barley in the best interests of the Prairie farmers. Its system of farm delivery quotas that equalizes the selling opportunities among farmers on the basis of land holdings is basically a good one. However, it could I think be made more realistic in regard to modern-day farming. Through closer coordination of various agencies of the Canadian Wheat Board, I believe the pooling system could be updated, so as to provide better returns to farmers. Also the inclusion of a wider range of crops should be provided. Modernistic changes could take place in better coordinating country elevator companies, terminal elevator operators and other Canadian grain handlers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how does this situation that we have in regard to world marketing of grains affect present policy that we have in regard to agriculture? We find that both the Federal and Provincial Governments are still doing their utmost to encourage maximum production of grains. They are doing this through incentives such as irrigation, clearing and breaking of land, selling of Crown land, and research in regard to producing more from a given unit. Governments along with private companies encourage farmers to increase their knowledge and use of fertilizers, of insecticides, of pesticides and other chemicals. These are only a few of the ways and means by which agencies provide assistance to the farmer to increase his production. I am not saying that this assistance is bad in a singular sense. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that, when we relate the urging by these agencies to increase production with the situation of availability of sales for that production, we find that all we can be doing is encouraging the farmer to produce more than the market can absorb.

This is the single main reason why we should be seriously considering this Resolution, so that we may be able to coordinate our production and research with the marketing and world demand for the food stuffs that we produce.

In the area of feed grain, we find that world trade differs

very considerably from wheat in that it is essentially a cash crop. There are no giveaways, no food aid programs, no international grains agreement. The growth and exports of feed grains have been very rapid since the end of World War II. In fact, between 1955 and 1966, world trade in feed grains increased from 18 to 43 million tons. Since 1945 the United States' overseas sales of corn increased from 100 million bushels to 700 million bushels per year. Canadian export of wheat and barley remain unchanged in the 50 to 60 million bushel range. The FAO predicts a continued growth in world trade in feed grain to 1980 of 50 million bushels per year.

Dr. MacEachern, President, Agricultural Economics Research Council of Canada, speaking in Winnipeg, October, 1968, said:

At existing production levels Canada enjoys a few comparative advantages over the United States, but over all it is at a disadvantage. This situation has greatly deteriorated over the past four years.

The key phrase is, "at existing production levels." In other words, while the United States average corn yields have gone up dramatically, Canadian average barley yields have increased very little. The competitive position of the average Canadian feed grains producer has deteriorated relatively to the United States corn producer. At the same time, some barley growers in Manitoba have been extremely successful in keeping production cost per bushel at a low level by adopting the latest technology in management practices.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, by the predictions of the FAO, that the feed grain industry could possibly create some alleviation to the present problems of the farmer. However, due to lack of coordination of the agricultural industry, nobody is really in a position to say whether the increased productions of feed grains in Western Canada would be of any real assistance to the farmer. I say this because the agricultural industry totally is not ready to handle the increased production of feed grains at this time. Through coordination and proper research in the past, we would now be in a position to take action if the solution was in the increased production of feed grains. As it is, the decision is left up entirely to the farmer as a risk or chance decision on his own behalf.

The livestock industry could possibly be an answer to the agricultural problems. Thirty-five per cent of all the beef and veal produced in the world is produced on the North American continent. The United States is the largest importer of beef in the world. In 1968, the United States imported 900 million pounds of beef. Canada supplied 3 per cent of that market. This could possibly be a market opportunity. In the next 12 years the combined populations of Canada and the United States are expected to grow from 220 million to 266 million. In Canada alone, the predicted increase in population growth and per capita consumption of beef will necessitate doubling in the

March 18, 1969

annual slaughter of beef and veal to meet these demands.

It is interesting to examine the demand and supply projections for Canadian agriculture to 1980 prepared by the Agricultural Task Force by the Economics Division, Canada Department of Agriculture. It brings into sharp focus the challenge facing Canadian producers of feed grains and livestock products. In 1968 domestic utilization of feed grains totalled 15.4 million tons. If we expand livestock production between now and 1980 at the same rate as in the previous decade we'll need 20.8 million tons of feed grain per year by 1980. But if beef production in Canada keeps pace with demand we'll need 26.3 million tons of grain by 1980. If we took these statements at face value only it would appear that there are market opportunities in regard to the livestock industry. There are some who are promoting this at the present time. But here again, because of lack of coordination, with other segments of the agricultural industry, we are confronted with a great many difficulties. If there had been adequate research and promotion done on behalf of all departments within the agricultural industry, we would now be at a point of being able to assure the farmer a stable, adequate return, if he was able to expand into the livestock industry. But to date we have not done this. Consequently we have here again rather a chaotic situation in regard to the farmer's decision-making capacity as to whether he should go into this industry or not.

Another area where coordination and updating are needed is in regard to the selling of grains at the world level. Under The Canada Grain Act, which was passed for the producer's protection, it is illegal to blend the top four statutory grains at terminal elevators. Concurrently, under the terms of the International Grains Arrangement, the Wheat Board may not substitute a higher grade of wheat in completing an order. Mr. Runciman, who is now head of the Canada Grains Council, in commenting on this, and I quote. "saw no reason why blending a specific amount to fill specific orders would in any way jeopardize the producer's position." Wheat Board officials feel that farmers still need this protection under The Canada Grain Act. They admit, however, that limited and supervised terminal blending has possibilities.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the process of coordinating the agricultural industry this policy would be updated to put us in a more viable position in regard to grain sales. I believe a specific area that needs coordinating and updating is in regard to the sale of Canadian grains which are made by agents of the Board. It is through these agents, the shipping and exporting companies, that the Board makes its sales contracts across the world. In the case of long-term agreement, such as Russia and Chinese sales, negotiations regarding price, quantity, quality, and credit arrangements, take place directly between the Canadian Wheat Board and/or the Canadian Government and the government import agency in the purchasing country. But even in the case of government to government sales, final

arrangements regarding shipping, insurance, credit arrangements and delivery dates are made by the shipping and export company acting as agents on behalf of the Canadian Wheat Board.

It is my understanding that four major international trading companies perform most of the shipping and exporting arrangements for the Canadian Wheat Board. They are Drafus and Bunge, both controlled by French capital, and Cargill and Continental, both controlled by American Capital. I find it surprising and want to note here, Mr. Speaker, that we as Canadians have no such thing as a Canadian-controlled international trading company. It is almost unbelievable that there are no Canadian export firms presently selling any significant volume of Canadian wheat.

I want to explain what little I know about truly international trading companies. These international giants have financed to buy and sell both raw materials and manufactured articles anywhere in the world. They have financial interests at any stage of production, processing and distributing on a world-wide basis. Mr. Ernie McWilliams put it, "You must have variety in your peddler's basket." These international companies have just that, and I imagine are in an enviable position to pick up markets wherever they have a financial interest. Recall, if you will the first Canadian wheat sale to Russia in 1961. This sale and the subsequent sale to Communist countries were lifesavers to the whole economy of this country. But it is interesting to know that Drafus and Company were the first to get wind of the grain shortage in Russia. As a result they first sold Russia all the surplus French wheat crop; secondly, they sold Russia what was left of a short Argentinean crop, then a significant portion of the Australian crop; fourthly, they came to Canada for what was left of an Ontario wheat crop; and finally, only after other supplies were exhausted did Russia buy Western Canadian wheat. We came fifth in line. Now was our sale simply fortuitous or was it based upon superior knowledge which led to a greater financial return in the final result? I believe we should know all the answers. At one later date in the 1960s the Cabinet Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board claims he called representatives of the sales agents for the Canadian Wheat Board on the carpet. Canadian wheat had not moved for a period of months when other wheats were and a suggestion by the Minister that it might be wise to expose the facts in the House of Commons brought results in a hurry. It would appear by past performances that most agreements were made on the basis of profits to the grain agency and not on the basis of improving the return to the farm industry and improving the economy of Canada. This is a major concern when the major companies involved are controlled by interests outside of Canada.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if our agricultural industry was better coordinated these problems would come to light at an earlier date. I also suggest that it would have brought serious consideration to the establishing of a Canadian export agency. From the facts I have already related to you in regard to the sales to Russia and China I believe Canada should

March 18, 1969

be giving serious thought to this. True, in the initial stages at least, the fact that it would be dealing only in grains would be of a serious disadvantage. On the plus side, the grain companies of Western Canada have the capital resources to tackle something of this magnitude if given the co-operation and the incentive. The early farmer-owned Grain Grower's Grain Company has an export department and the United Grain Growers still retains it although it is on the inactive list. The early Pools exported grains through the Central Selling Agency until the fall in prices in the late '20s caused bankruptcy. Perhaps the time is past due when the Pools and the United Grain Growers should co-operatively form a Canadian Export Agency. The Line Companies could well, do the same. It is not inconceivable that in the best interests of Western Canada and Canada the best answer would be for one strong consortium embracing both the private and co-operative owned companies. Given the present Government-guaranteed initial prices on wheat, oats and barley, the proper incentive to a Canada-owned export agency or agencies plus the co-operation of the Canadian Bank it would be hard to say that this is impossible. It is my understanding that Wheat Board officials say that they would welcome the organization of a Canadian Export Agency. Here again, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that, through the co-ordination of our agricultural policy, light would have been thrown in this area, and the results would mean more direct benefits to the agricultural industry and in particular the farmer of Western Canada.

I would like to relate to you some questions that were asked of the Canadian Wheat Board officials and the answers they gave. The answers speak for themselves and they show the impossible position that the Wheat Board finds itself in. One was: has the Canadian Wheat Board any plans to make us, meaning Canadians, aggressive competitors in the feed grain trade, both foreign and domestic? In answer to foreign trade it was pointed out that the French sales of barley in the last year had been subsidized at rates sometimes exceeding our offering prices at the export position. They also pointed out that American corn is a very real competitor. In fact they did not really answer the question. They did not answer this question because they do not have the freedom or the coordination with the rest of the industry in order to properly make a decision in regard to what the best for the farmer may be. Another question was: do you foresee any possibility of establishing an international agreement covering trade and pricing of coarse grain? The answer was No, not in the foreseeable future. This is of utmost importance to the Western farmer if he is going to be able to survive. Here again because of lack of coordination and lack of understanding as to what the avenue of solution may be they were not able to react. Another question: what is the Canadian Wheat Board doing in the way of market research and development? What needs to be done in this area? The Board readily admitted a lack of research and market analysis. Amongst other things there needs to be an immediate examination of the prospective markets for feed wheats in a competitive position.

The Board has seldom farmed out any research work. At the present time, two Ph.D. theses are being concluded at the University of Wisconsin with the Canadian Wheat Board assistance. Here again, Mr. Speaker, lack of understanding and qualified research to go on because they do not have coordination with other already established departments in the agricultural field.

These are only a few of a number of questions, Mr. Speaker, but I believe the Board was not in an adequate position to answer, because our agricultural system is not coordinated and they do not know where the agricultural industry stands. It is treated, as I have said before, each one being an individual box from the other, consequently we are not able to lay out a realistic avenue of solving the farmer's problems, nor are we able to improve and maintain a position that would allow economic returns to the farming industry.

Only several months ago the backlog of ships that were waiting for grain at the Western port at Vancouver showed lack of coordination in regard to the transporting and moving of grain in Western Canada. This situation regardless of how many excuses were made by the numerous departments still showed lack of coordination on behalf of these departments. There is no doubt the grain was in Western Canada and that it was in dire need of being moved to the West Coast, so that it could be dried and loaded on the ships that were backlogged there to meet an already committed sale. Thousands of dollars of the farmer's money was lost because of the lack of coordination in this area.

The tough and damp grain itself showed lack of coordination in regard to the farming field. If we had been better coordinated a three-bushel tough and damp quota would not have been opened in Western Canada. Consequently, there would not have been the excessive quantities of tough and damp grain taken off. In all probability, large amounts of this grain would well have remained in the fields and would have been harvested in the spring in a much better condition, but due to lack of coordination between the departments and due to lack of understanding, because of that lack of coordination, a three-bushel quota was opened up and the serious situation the farmer is now in was created.

The grain drying problem within the three Prairie Provinces in itself showed that early coordination would have made a vast improvement in regard to remedying the situation that the farmer is in. With better coordination, I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that we would be able to increase the production of cash crops such as rapeseed in particular, and especially in the Province of Saskatchewan and by doing this put the farmer in a position to cut back on the production of grains that are not realistically easily saleable at the present time, but be able to increase his income through the sales of a cash crop such as rapeseed. Unfortunately, because of our segmented position the farmers are unable to realistically make a decision with regard to what they should produce and the amount that they should

March 18, 1969

produce in regard to cash crops. The lack of coordination between Federal and Provincial Departments of Agriculture shows duplication of costs and serious detriment and cost to the farmer.

To again quote some of the spokesmen on behalf of agriculture, Mr. Hefflefinger, Mr. McWilliams, and Charles Croft and other farm spokesmen, they expressed the identical view that instead of concentrating on wheat production we should be beginning to think of agriculture in a total sense. Mr. Speaker, our wheat policy should not be an end in itself but it should be viewed as only part of our total agricultural policy. We have not given adequate recognition to the need for agricultural research into what we can sell readily in the form of food and in producing the farm commodities to meet the demand. By coordinating our agricultural policies and legislation we would be able to go into the world to discover the realities of the need of food for Canada, what consumers really require in terms of the products Canada can produce, bring back ideas and to the extent that Canada can produce the required foods, then go to the agronomist and research people to request them to produce new types of grain which may be needed. After the needed grains are developed, organize production in requisite quantities and at the same time launch a massive marketing program to dispose of them as feed grains, or as meat.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I still believe that agriculture in Western Canada could have a great future. We have the land base and we have the management know-how, and there are market opportunities if we are determined to find them. But we must have a coordination of our agricultural activities so that we can act in the best interest of the farmer. Canada's problems will exist as long as most of us think of agriculture as farming and thus fail to give the agricultural industry the priority it deserves in terms of national policy. We need long-term planning at the Federal level, we need to sort out the role of the various government departments. At the present time, we have food research and policy being formed by the Department of Industry. The solutions to our agricultural food problems will be delayed as long as such fragmentation is allowed to go on. It is time that Canadians adapted the systems approach and realized that the food producers the researcher and retailer are all a part of the same industry.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I know that I have only highlighted the benefits that coordination could provide to the farming industry. However, it is a tremendous field with a tremendous future. And with the acceptance of this Resolution and the implementation of coordination of the agricultural industry, I am sure that the farming industry will continue to be of a most significant benefit to the economy of Western Canada and Canada as a whole.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!



**Mr. F. Meakes** (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion I first want to congratulate the Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) for not only moving the motion but for the manner in which he introduced it to this House.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, what happened in the House yesterday, and I have no intention of referring to the debate that went on yesterday, but the fact that there was need of that debate shows that the problems facing agriculture are large and numerous. In my opinion, agriculture is sick and governments, both Federal and Provincial, are not doing too much about it. There are many pressures on agriculture, all different, all needing different remedies. The remedy of one ill may react badly on another.

It reminds me of a person getting five doctors to treat him for five different remedies, each doctor being ignorant of what the other may be prescribing, and then comes the bad drug reaction. First, I suggest there should be a complete diagnosis of the illness and then there must be complete coordination of treatment.

The actions of both governments, Federal and Provincial, remind me of the story of the blind men viewing the elephant. Each blind man by feeling with his hands saw the elephant as something different, so each government sees the problems of agriculture in light of its interest and knowledge but not in perspective of the whole industry. In my opinion, what is needed is more real research into agriculture and all its phases, from production to where it reaches the hand of the consumer, whether that consumer be here in Regina or whether it be in China.

Governments in both Regina and Ottawa and I might also say the agricultural industry haven't done nearly enough in this regard. And looking at Canada's gross national product of 1967 it is almost five times what it was in 1867, yet in the hours of work and the gallons of sweat per person per year the average Canadian did not work any more or any harder in 1967 than he worked in 1867.

I ask, how come? I want to suggest there are three reasons. The average Canadian has more schooling than the people of 100 years ago. This means that the average Canadian has new and more abilities than they had 100 years ago. Secondly, I want to suggest that government, business and some people have supported more research which after all is an organized effort to find new knowledge. The new knowledge has found new and better and easier ways of doing things. Thirdly, by investment we have acquired and accumulated the machines, the factories, a communication system and the tools which educated people can use to apply new knowledge in order to produce more of what people want and produce more easily.

The Population Reference Bureau, Washington, 1965 points

March 18, 1969

out that Canada's production per capita is about 24 times higher than India's, yet that same report shows that the average production of an American worker is over 35 per cent greater than the production of a Canadian worker.

In January, 1966, a Conference of International Trade and Canadian Agriculture was held in Banff. It was stated there that in the period of 1955 to 1966:

Although Canadian agriculture presently enjoys a competitive production advantage, this has declined greatly over the past decade, due to rising costs induced by rapid overall economic growth and insufficient technological progress to offset these influences. If the present competitive system is to be maintained these trends must be reversed making agriculture a healthy, efficient and prosperous industry.

The author of that statement went on to point out the cause for the relative deterioration was the result of:

- (1) Inadequate educational levels of Canadian farm workers.
- (2) A relatively low level of expenditure on agricultural research.

And, Mr. Speaker, to quote from that report again:

Eventually the welfare of agriculture producers depends on the relative production efficiency and that of associated agribusiness industries to supply inputs, move and market farm products. The production policy that is suggested then is one based on improving technological progress and efficiency in agriculture. Only a productive agriculture, not a high-price one, can maintain our importance in world markets or even supply domestic needs. Major sources of productivity gains in agriculture appear to have been in fertilizer interactions and reduction of low productivity labour. The high rate of technological change required then will face extreme demands on present agricultural institutions. How well they meet this challenge of human and capital improvement and adapt to change themselves may very well determine the future organization and position of agriculture in this country.

Increased demands will face existing agricultural research in development agencies in generating superior agricultural technological and speeding its rate of adoption on farms. The greatest may rest with educational institutions to raise the present level of managerial ability of both existing and future farmers.

An environment conducive to improvement of efficiency in marketing, transporting and exporting farm products

becomes essential. Whatever the trade policy adopted by Canadian agriculture, it must foster efficiency, be responsive to changes and be guided to anticipate change, if it is to be successful and if we are to remain an important world agricultural producer.

Professor Bentley of the University of Alberta, speaking in Saskatoon on February 25, 1967, on the subject of agricultural research, pointed out that Canadian expenditure is around \$40 million on agricultural research, which represents about one per cent of Canada's farm income. He went on to point out that Canadians spend about \$10 billion on food and, because our \$40 million spent on agricultural research includes research on marketing, processing, preservation, etc., a fairer appraisal of Canada's agricultural research expenditure would be about .4 per cent on agricultural research. He also pointed out that the United States spends nearly twice as much as Canada on agriculture in the lack of adequate research into the different phases of agriculture.

Time Magazine of July 25, 1960, in an article about some of the most spectacularly successful companies, stated that they were spending from 6.9 per cent of gross income on research, compared to an average of 3 per cent for all industry. By 1963, the whole United States, including government, spent about 3 per cent of gross national product. On a comparable basis, Canada's expenditure was about .75 per cent of the gross national product on research and development.

Professor Bentley went on to point out that of the dollar spent on agricultural research in Canada, 70 per cent was spent by the Canadian Department of Agriculture, 18 per cent by agricultural colleges, 10 per cent by Provincial government, and 2 per cent by agricultural businesses. He went on to point out that "in the USA hybrid corn cost \$15 million to develop, but that current dividends, in the USA alone, are an additional \$900 million worth of corn every year." Now I am quoting from the author of that book "Hungry Nations."

The USA now receives each year a 100 per cent dividend on every dollar spent on research, cumulative, since 1930.

It has been estimated that Canadian dividends from Marquis wheat in 1937 exceeded the total cost of the Canadian Department of Agriculture research up to that time. J. A. Anderson in a paper "Viewpoint on Agricultural Research" estimated that Selkirk wheat in ten years increased Prairie farm income by \$1 billion, more than twice the cost of all Canadian research work done at that time. I submit that research is essential to any country or industry in order to maintain a competitive position. It is claimed for instance the Gillette safety razor blades had over 75 per cent of the market in Canada and the United States until Wilkinson Super-Swords came on the market. In the matter of a few months Gillette's share was less than 60 per cent of the market. Why? Because Wilkinson with its research has produced

March 18, 1969

a superior blade.

At one time Canada had undisputed first place in the world for grading as well as for the quality of our grains. But in an article on pages four and five of the May issue of the Canadian Feed and Grain Journal, it states that our competitors have gained on us to a dangerous degree.

Through research, Mexico since 1950, has increased wheat production from 10 bushels an acre to over 40 bushels. The world's record wheat yield of over 200 bushels an acre was established in 1966 in the State of Washington. Canada's 1966 average wheat yield increases, whether in bushels or percentage increase, we have not kept up in the last decade or two with other wheat producers.

Canada has not established systems of augmenting the amount of agricultural research by methods based on the volume of the commodity, as some other countries have. Let us take Britain, where the pig industry development board receives 10 cents to support swine research for every hog that is marketed in the country. Australia has a levy, (I believe a farthing a bushel) on all wheat sold, the funds going for research of that crop.

Compare this to the Canadian record. Some farm organizations have voted in favour of asking for a deduction of .1 per cent of the value of the grain handled by the Canadian Wheat Board, which would be used for promotion as well as research. On \$1 billion wheat crop that would be only \$1 out of every million dollars. I want to suggest that, in order to maintain or improve the competitive position of Canada's agricultural products, we must increase our agricultural research by at least three times.

First there is need for substantial changes in the organization and responsibilities for research. Agricultural research in faculties of agriculture of Canadian universities would need to be greatly increased. This would mean provision of more physical facilities, with funds from outside the regular university capital budget sources, also provision of funds to support agricultural research by Faculty of Agriculture staff members and their graduate students. What I am saying is this, Mr. Speaker, that this research should not have to compete with other types of research. After all, agriculture is the greatest single industry in Canada and if it is to be a healthy and vibrant industry, we must give it the resources and tools so that it can compete in world competition.

I also want to suggest that there are too few able young Canadians entering our Faculties of Agriculture, and so there aren't enough of our own people with high qualifications to do the needed research in agriculture. Therefore, we need a campaign not only to encourage our rural youth, but all our youth, to enter the field of agriculture and its research.

I argue that there should be no hesitation about providing

the extra funds for a policy such as I have put forth, because a program such as this would benefit nearly all the citizens of our country. A good research program would increase efficiency of agriculture, would allow a higher standard of living, and free more of the labour force for producing other things, and help to make a better and a stronger economy.

Canadian Government supports for agriculture are among the lowest in the world: Canada from 1945-64 supported by approximately 1.7 per cent; The United States in 1964 was 17 per cent; France in 1961 was approximately 50 per cent; and Britain in 1963-64 was 69 per cent. Yet, Mr. Speaker, without allowing for these subsidies, the cost of food in Canada is, next to the United States, the lowest in the world. Let us look at the percentage of family income spent for food in different countries of the world. The latest figures that I could find were for 1962. At that time the Australian people spent 23 per cent of their income for food; Canada 22 per cent; Denmark 24; The United States 21; France 31 per cent; Netherlands 31; South Africa 31; United Kingdom 28; Ceylon 50 per cent; Greece 43 per cent; Italy 43 per cent; Yugoslavia 45 per cent.

Dean Kiltman of Ohio State University, speaking to the Animal Institute of Agriculture at Purdue University, made this statement and I quote:

I doubt that there is a major business firm in the United States today which could continue operations, let alone make any progress, with research expenditures as low as those currently being invested in beef cattle research in this nation.

I would like to quote also, Mr. Speaker, from a United States Department of Agriculture pamphlet dated 1962 and named "Agricultural Research."

What has agricultural research done for the United States - for us? One thing is obvious. Research has shown farmers how to produce abundantly so that we have a large variety of wholesome and nutritious foods all year.

Other benefits are less obvious. For example, if farmers today used 1940 methods, it would cost an extra \$13 billion a year to produce food and fibre for the nation. This extra cost would be passed on to consumers, adding more than \$5 a week to each family's bill for farm products.

Most people in the world spend half their available income on food. And in undeveloped areas, people spend most of their time grubbing a living from the earth. Because the United States' agriculture is efficient, however, most of us only spend about a fifth of our income on food and none of our time producing it.

March 18, 1969

The \$13 billion-a-year saving has more meaning when compared to the cost of research. The bill for all agricultural research in the last 100 years, paid by state and federal governments and by industry, is less than \$6 billion. Research truly has been a bargain and in the years ahead it will prove to be an even bigger bargain.

Our population is expected to double in the next 40 to 50 years. Research can help agriculture by developing new ways to better supply products for all these people and quite likely for many others in the world.

But scientific manpower threatens to be scarce in years to come. Most agricultural scientists come from farm families, and the rural population is constantly decreasing. Consequently, one of the best sources of scientists is decreasing, and enrolments in agricultural colleges aren't increasing generally.

And besides that I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we must admit in the Province of Saskatchewan there has been an increase of our students taking the science of agriculture and research. To quote further:

This potential shortage of scientists has been recognized by the Agricultural Research Service which, through formal efforts and informally, is encouraging young people to study agriculture and related sciences in high school and college . . . through graduate school.

These students who are now preparing for a career in research will be the agents of future scientific advances the bargains of the years to come.

There is one other subject I would like to talk on, it's another phase of research, Mr. Speaker, and that is the research into farm safety. I don't know how many Members have read the first study, number one, of the Royal Commission on farm machinery, and the heading on it is "Farm Machinery Safety." It quotes for the period under review there were 466 fatal accidents in Canada and 78 per cent of them were involved with tractors. Over half of those were involved with the turning over of tractors. The next most common machinery accident was combines and balers.

I want to say that we should be proud that here in Saskatchewan that we have led the way in the rest of Canada in the keeping of statistics on farm accidents, but I think there is still a long way to go. It is interesting that from this report, in the Saskatchewan sample, 29 per cent of the total accidents involved were with one make of tractor. And of that 29 per cent 38 per cent of those accidents were from side tipping. Another make of tractor was involved in 18 per cent of all the accidents involved and 23 per cent of that 18 per cent were of the operator being run over for fatalities. In other words the tractor ran over the operator. I want to suggest that here is

a great need for research. Here is an area that, if we only had an AMA, they could really be working on it. Mr. Speaker, there is another effect of it and I suggest the psychological effect. I would like to quote a little bit from the Report starting on the bottom of page 27 which says:

The detrimental health effects in this category derive mainly from the vibration of the machine and the posture that the seat and the control layout require the operator to assume. The vibration experienced by an operator is difficult to measure under field condition, but it can be determined that engines cause vibrations of a small amplitude which are transmitted through the seat, the steering wheel and the footrest. When a tractor is driven over rough terrain both axles vibrate, but the rear axle has the greatest effect on the driver. The vibrations can be of a relatively large amplitude and are transmitted through the seat. If the seat is poorly placed or suspended it may amplify the vibration of the rear axle.

Further on it says:

Recognizing the tractor driver may be exposed to posture and vibration effect for several hours at a time, the S and R Safety Organization examined 371 drivers in Europe to assess whether the vibration and shocks caused damage to health. They observed that the human body tries to counteract vibration by a constant contraction and relaxation of the muscular system. Over a number of hours this causes a change in the response of the automatic nervous system, and this in turn affects the tone of the involuntary muscle system of the gastrointestinal tract resulting in the interference of normal digestion. This same study through X-ray examination also revealed pathological changes in the back far in excess of normal psychological degeneration. A comparison of occupation showed that only among truck drivers was the percentage of spine damage higher. The percentage was lower among miners, bus drivers, factory and construction workers.

Well, I said before, Saskatchewan has done more than any other province in Canada but there is still lots to do. I suggest that we should be pushing our own department and a Federal department to spend more money on this phase of research. It was started out by the Department of Health of this province and they weren't doing too much about it or acting too much, and then they turned it over to the Safety Council of Saskatchewan.

I want to quote from February 20th, 1969, Star Phoenix. The heading of it is "More muscle needed in farm safety." It is written by a man by the name of Christian Smith. Mr. Smith is the past president of the Western Canadian Farm Safety Conference. He launched the farm safety movement in Saskatchewan in 1951 and interested national organizations in Canada-wide programs, and the observance of an annual national farm safety week observed

March 18, 1969

late in July. I am now going to quote part of what the article says:

In Saskatchewan the Provincial Health Department began the Farm Safety Movement and it led the way until the Saskatchewan Safety Council took over all the departments on safety activities a few years ago. However, the medical health officers have shown limited interest in accidents, although these kill more than 600 people per year and send more than 80,000 to hospital. Accidents outrank all other causes of death in the age group 1 to 35 and is the third leading cause of death of all ages. Moreover, the medical and hospitalization bills run into millions of dollars. In spite of this the Health Department originally showed no enthusiasm for accident prevention. The implement manufacturers and wholesale houses show very little interest, but the Saskatchewan Retail Implement Dealers Association whose manager is Leo King of Prince Albert has been in the thick of the preventive efforts since the beginning.

Then further on it says:

Machinery has changed and more and more labour-saving devices are offered. But people have not changed appreciably. There are still foolhardy farmers who take chances with power take-off, from which they have removed guards, or make repairs on machines that are still in gear. There are also people who think that an eight-year-old boy has the physical ability and judgement to operate a tractor that is built for a man. There are also those who use tractors to transport people although actually there is safe space only for the operator.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is need of legislation on the whole problem of noise. Researchers are saying more and more that there are more farmers going deaf because of the noise within cabs. It seems to me most of all there is need for legislation and again just to quote a paragraph or so out of the report on page 65:

The first requirement would be appropriate legislation, then effective and continuing administration without which such legislation would be meaningless, and finally the possibility of eventual prosecution or alternatively litigation by affected parties.

Further on it says:

Concurrently legislation might be introduced to regulate the use of farm machinery. An appropriate goal might be to compel farmers to use and to leave in place safety equipment.

And further on it says:



Legislation concerning the compulsory adoption of certain minimum safety and health protection modifications might be considered immediately desirable. This might include: (1) The compulsory fitting of safety frames or safety cabs on tractors. (2) The outlawing of cabs not built to safety cab specifications. (3) The required fitting of appropriate driving and warning lights. (4) The compulsory fitting of rear view mirrors on tractors. (5) The adoption of the SMV Emblem as compulsory across Canada.

I might say it is already legally required in Alberta, Manitoba and Ontario.

(6) The adoption of a passenger seat and safety handgrips on tractors.

To avoid a conflict it might be necessary to modify regulations which would make it illegal to carry a passenger on a tractor in some provinces.

(7) To require the provision of an additional single pedal driving brake. This is already provided on some German tractors. (8) The setting of maximum limits on noise emission. (9) The fixing of a maximum speed that tractors are built to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, it is 5:30 and I have a few more remarks to make, could I call it 5:30.

The House recessed from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

**Mr. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, I have dealt in some detail with the desirability and urgent necessity of agricultural research. I have pointed out how industry in the United States spends as high as seven per cent of gross income and I have shown how Canada spends .75 per cent of national income. I have pointed out how the whole agricultural industry research needs to be coordinated, if we are to have a healthy, vibrant agriculture that can meet the new technological age.

I suggest Canada is comparable to the United States, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to put forth the argument for program such as spelled out in the motion moved by the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), saying that such a program cannot be done without first having a good, well-financed research program. It should be coordinated to research all the different segments of the agricultural industry.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to second the motion moved by the Member for Kelsey, and ask the support of it by all Members of the House.

**Mr. R. Heggie** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to

March 18, 1969

congratulate the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) for his very well-researched, well-documented, and reasoned presentation of what he considered the agricultural problem in Western Canada as it exists today. He went very deeply into the subject; he ranged far and wide and to some extent acted as a one-man Royal Commission Of agriculture. But he did quite ably bring to the attention of this House many of the problems which confront the farmer of Saskatchewan and Western Canada.

We on this side of the House are getting used to hearing a lot of good, common horse sense from the Member for Kelsey, and the speech that he gave on the problems facing agriculture could have just as well been delivered from this side of the House as from where he sits. The only problem would be this: as I see it such a wide subject as the coordination of all agricultural programs could bring with it certain inherent dangers if there were not proper safeguards. It could lead to putting the farm economy and the farmer into a straitjacket where he became merely an employee of the State. I don't really think that it is what the Member for Kelsey meant.

Because this subject is of such great concern to the agricultural community and because I wish to comment on many of the things which he said and add some comment of my own, I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.