

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
22nd Day

Tuesday, March 17, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to introduce to all the Members of the Legislative Assembly the following groups of students seated in the galleries: from Caronport high school from the constituency of Morse represented by the Hon. Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, 60 students under the direction of their vice-principal, Mr. J. Heppner; from the Codette public school from the constituency of Nipawin represented by Mr. Radloff, 36 students under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Griffin; 50 adults from the Regina Vocational Centre from the Bosco Annex under the direction of their school teacher, Mrs. Muirhead; and a group of the 20th Westminster Scouts under the direction of Mrs. Fishley.

I am sure that all Members of the Legislature would wish to record an extremely warm welcome to these visitors in the galleries, express the wish that they will find their stay here informative and enjoyable and wish to each and every one of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

**CONGRATULATIONS TO SHAMROCK AND CODERRE COMBINES HOCKEY
CHAMPIONS**

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, this being the 17th of March I am going to put a different twist to it at this time. Instead of the twist of the shillelagh, it's the twist of the hockey stick. I would like to report on the activities of some of my constituents, Mr. Speaker. The Shamrock and Coderre Combines have on the 14th of March won the SAHA Bantam D Division Hockey Champions for Saskatchewan. I would appreciate if this House would join with me in congratulating them on their wonderful work.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

WOLLASTON LAKE ROAD CONDITIONS

Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park University): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House that I have on this past weekend had a trip over the winter road to

March 17, 1970

Wollaston to Wollaston Lake to the Gulf Mine and I would like to commend at this time our Department of Highways for the very excellent job that it has done on this winter road. There are many parts where you can travel over 70 miles an hour. Attorney General Mile 100 out of Brabant Lake we wondered whether the marker meant the speed limit or the mile marker. This is an excellent road and I will say that the people in the North are completely satisfied with it and very much surprised at the good work of the Department.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — I would like to say too that some of the members of the Opposition would perhaps be surprised to know that, when we visited the Anglo-Rouyn Mine, on our return to Lac La Ronge, they have 264 men working there. There is a payroll going into the Lac La Ronge area of \$164,000 a month. It was an excellent trip, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ST. PATRICK'S DAY TRIBUTE

Mr. E. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to join with the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) in congratulating the flying Irishmen from Shamrock for winning the hockey championship of the province. I would like to point out to him that two of the top players on the team are my nephews, Hugh and Gordon Henry.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — It is proper that they should be recognized on St. Patrick's Day. Mr. Speaker, this is the day we pay tribute to the most genial, the most intelligent, most personable, most courageous and most humble citizens on the face of the earth, the Irish. Mr. Speaker, the Irish have the knack of overcoming obstacles in order to make friends with other groups. As a full-fledged subscriber to this trait I find it well within the possibilities and probabilities of the Irish to be friendly with the Scots. No Irishman can find anything wrong, for instance, with the Camerons, the McFarlanes, the McPhersons, the Macdougalls, particularly on St. Patrick's Day. And any Irishman could find room in his generous, tolerant heart to be kind to the Berezowskys, the Radloffs, the Kowalchuks, the Matsallas, the Kwasnigas and Michayluks. Only an Irishman would readily understand that Romanow is only a misplaced Irish name with the 'o' on the wrong end.

When it comes to the Welsh they are vociferous for their numbers and they have to be considered. An Irishman well knows that the only reason they didn't come to Ireland was that they couldn't swim, Mr. Speaker.

Particularly on St. Patrick's Day it is within the Irishman's concept of good-will and brotherly love to accept with genuine pleasure the Howes, the Larochelles, the Thibaults, the Byers, the Meakes, the Woods, the Brockelbanks, the Snyders, the Grants, the Blakeney's, the Bakers, the Healds, the Smisheks, and the Peppers, for on a day like this these people with these melodious Irish names become sons of the old sod to help the Gallaghers and McIsaacs celebrate in a proper fashion.

Irishmen today have no problems with large groups like the Ukrainians, distinct groups like the Scots, persistent groups like the Welsh. Mr. Speaker, I regret to advise this House that the only people the Irish are having trouble with at this time are Irishmen. Their performance during the last year proves that, in addition to lovin' Irishmen are known for fightin'. And with that thought, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend to every wearer of the green, and every son of Ireland, on this St. Patrick's Day. "The top o' the mornin'."

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

WOLLASTON ROAD

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member from City Park University a question with respect to the statement that he made if I am in order.

Mr. Speaker: — I thought he was paying tribute to the Irish. Go ahead.

Mr. Bowerman: — I would like to ask the Member from City Park University (Mr. Charlebois) how many miles did he travel on the Wollaston Lake Road that is in fact on ice and will simply not be a road when the ice melts?

Mr. Charlebois: — Well, this is a winter road of course, Mr. Speaker, and it does go over the ice wherever possible. That is, I would say, 90 per cent over water.

Mr. Bowerman: — Yes, 90 per cent.

Mr. Charlebois: — Yes, and what did you expect it to be?

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, was the Member for City Park University congratulating the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) on ice making?

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 63

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 63 showing:

1. The net profit of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. in 1969.
2. The part, if any, of this profit that was paid to the Government in 1969.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House that since this is a private company and that this kind of information would be of great interest to the competitors of the Prince Albert pulp mill, I don't think this is in the public interest, and I would ask the House to defeat this motion.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, the Order asks for a statement of the net profit of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd. As I understand it the Government of Saskatchewan is a 30 per cent shareholder of that Company. It is difficult to think of a company, in which the Government of Saskatchewan is a 30 per cent shareholder and in respect of which the Government of Saskatchewan has guarantees out which exceed \$50 million, being a private matter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — The facts are that of the total capital provided by this company or provided to build this pulp company, approximately \$50 million is capital in respect of which there is a Provincial Government guarantee, \$5 million is a contribution by the Federal Crown, another approximate \$8 million of working capital is provided pursuant to a Provincial Government guarantee and \$3 million of the equity capital is provided by the Crown. So far as I am aware the sponsors have put in less than \$10 million out of the total of some \$65 or \$70 million. I have no quarrel at this time — it is not my purpose in standing here to quarrel with the particular method of financing. I am just saying that under those circumstances I suggest that the profit and loss picture of the Prince Albert Pulp Company Ltd., is a matter of great public concern particularly, if we may be faced with a \$50 million contingent liability. I understand that the profit and loss statement of the Company would be available to the g. I can't imagine a circumstance under which it would not be available to the Government nor could I imagine a circumstance under which it would not be in the interest of the Company to make known its profit picture. May I advise Hon.

Members that in the only comparable position, that of the steel mill, the financial figures of Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Company Limited were readily available. I don't know whether they were asked for in this House, but any number of people saw them and they were never hidden. I would have thought that the Government would be anxious to make known to the public that the pulp company is doing satisfactorily and that the public's investment is not at risk. If the particular period, the year ended December 31, 1969, is not the right period, if in fact the financial year of the company ends on some other date, I am sure that the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would accept the appropriate amendment so that the financial statement would cover the last financial period for which there are audited statements. But having said that, I would suggest that the information asked for is very appropriate information. It is information of great interest to the public and ought to be available.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in urging the House to reject this motion. In so doing I want to remind the House that for 20 long years the Socialists tried to get a pulp mill without success. Then when the Government changed within about a year, this Government succeeded in getting one of the largest and most successful enterprises that had ever come to the Province of Saskatchewan. And during all those negotiations the Socialists fought it tooth and nail. When we announced the mill, they said it would never be started. Once we started the pulp mill, they said it will never be finished. Once we finished the pulp mill the Socialists said it would never continue operating. Now it is operating. It is making a good profit and hiring hundreds and hundreds of people in our North. Now the Company is willing to take the Province off the hook, it is willing to buy all the guarantees back and the Socialists say, "Oh, keep the financial guarantees." Now the Socialists must make up their minds. The Liberal Government did what they never could do. It got a major \$90 million industry for Saskatchewan. Now we must protect that industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We are not going to give their competitors information that would be useful to them, and perhaps harmful to the Prince Albert pulp mill. and so I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that this motion should be rejected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that I could make the Premier so angry by asking a simple question. After all he has just admitted that . . .

March 17, 1970

Mr. Thatcher: — Flip flop!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Oh, please don't interrupt: You had your speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Premier the other day, mentioned and he has mentioned it again today that this pulp mill has been making profits. As a matter of fact it is not secret at all that the Company has made something like \$27 million or \$29 million gross profit and it has been in the press. Now what I have been asking is for the net profit . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Nonsense!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now the Premier has to go into the old story of trying to condemn the former CCF Government who had worked for a pulp mill and who had been negotiating with the very company that he sold the resources out to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — But the deal that we would have made would have been beneficial to the people of Saskatchewan, not the kind of deal that you made.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, this Government has taken public money to the tune of some \$80 million according to the confession of the Provincial Treasurer last year in Crown corporations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — \$80 million of public money. Now it says they are making profits and surely we should know whether we are getting at least some of it back. Oh, be quiet over there!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — All that I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is a simple question. We know what the gross profit is, the Premier is saying that there is a profit, we know that we have some investment. We want to know whether he is going to sell this Canadian or Saskatchewan resource. This is up to him but he'll be condemned if he does so, but this is another question which he has brought into the picture . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — No wonder you are in the back seat, Bill!

Mr. Berezowsky: — But right now all I am asking is what is the net profit, if any, and what did the Government get? Is this company turning over that profit to the Government because of our 30 per cent share or is it not? If the Premier and his Government want to hide that from the people of Saskatchewan then this will be just another one in a hundred denials of telling the facts to the people of Saskatchewan. Go ahead and hide it!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 23

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

NAYS — 30

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

RETURN NO. 67

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 67 showing:

1. The number of acres that were cleared in each

provincial pasture during each year 1965 to 1969.

2. The number of acres that were broken in each provincial pasture during each year 1965 to 1969.
3. The number of acres that were seeded to grass or forage in provincial pastures each year 1965 to 1969.
4. The acreage cost of: (a) clearing per acres; (b) breaking per acre: (c) seeding per acre.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in this question under section 4 it is impossible to give the information the way the Member has requested, because when we call for tenders we don't break down the cost of breaking and seeding when we call for private tenders. Then for breaking and seeding, here again we don't separate the cost of the seeding part of the operation from the breaking part.

That clause 4 Return No. 67 be amended by deleting phrases (b) and (c) and the following substituted therefore:

(b) breaking and seeding per acre.

Amendment agreed to
Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 82

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 82 showing:

1. The total amount that was paid in 1969 for architects' fees in respect of the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital.
2. To whom these fees were paid.
3. The amount that was paid to each payee.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), as follows:

That clauses 1, 2 and 3 be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

1. Whether the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre will be preparing an annual report for the year, 1969.

2. If so, whether the report will include details of the amount of money spent by the Centre for architectural fees and of the name or names of the architectural firms to whom these payments were made.
3. If not, the amount spent by the Centre for architectural fees during the year 1969 and the name or names of the architectural firms to whom these payments were made.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. W.G. Davies.

RETURN NO. 83

Mr. Whelan (Regina North West): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 83 showing:

1. The total number of judges of magistrates' courts in Saskatchewan as of February 28, 1970.
2. The number that hold university degrees in law.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I had a word with the Hon. Member about this. There was one point that wasn't clear. He asked for the total number of judges of magistrates' courts in Saskatchewan as of a certain date. We do from time to time have occasion to appoint part-time judges on holidays, and sickness and so on. I ascertained from the Hon. Member that he wanted the total number of full-time judges, so I am proposing an amendment which will give him that information. Then bearing in mind the fact that when a motion is made and a motion is ordered or an Order is ordered, it becomes the property of all Members of the Legislature. I am going to give some additional information which some of us over here thought might be interesting. I am making this motion to amend, seconded by the minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) that Motion for Return No. 83 be amended as follows:

That clauses 1 and 2 be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

1. What was the total number of full-time Judges of the Magistrates' Courts in Saskatchewan as of (a) February 28, 1964; and (b) February 28, 1970.
2. Of that number, how many held university degrees in law.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

STATEMENTS BY MR. SPEAKER

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Mr. Speaker: — Before we proceed into

March 17, 1970

motions, I have some items that I wish to deal with in regard to these Motions that are on the Order Paper. I would like the House to allow me to deal with them now because I would consider it most unfair if I left it for some later time and my Deputy had to deal with them. I think I should do my own work.

In connection with the Motion of the Member for Touchwood, moved on March 3rd, which proposes to amend Resolution No. 1, I would draw attention of all Hon. Members to the fact that a Motion which passes becomes an order of the House and all Resolutions must be considered in that light.

The amendment urges the Federal Government and the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan to take certain steps which, in the case of subsection (d) would require an expenditure of provincial funds.

I draw attention of all Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 249, which says in part:

No principle is better understood than the constitutional obligation that rests upon the executive government, of alone initiating measures imposing charges upon the public exchequer.

Citation 260, subsection 1, further states:

The tendency has been in the Canadian House of Commons, for the past twenty-five years, to rule out all motions purporting to give the Government a direct order to do a thing which cannot be done without the expenditure of money. Our Journals are full of precedents to this effect.

The Journals of this Assembly contain many instances of rulings in connection with Bills and Resolutions which infringed the prerogative of the Government of the day to be the sole arbitrator of increased expenditures.

I refer Members to the journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, March 30th, 1965, pages 161, 162, 163, 164; March 24th, 1966, pages 192, 193 and 194; November 30th, 1920, page 70; February 15th, 1939, pages 91 and 93; March 6th, 1947, page 91 and March 11, 1947, page 99.

Students of procedure might also be interested in Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, pages 779 to 783.

I wish now to draw the attention of all Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 251, subsection 4, which states as follows:

Private members may introduce resolutions that do not directly involve the expenditure of public money and have no operative effect but simply express an abstract opinion on a matter which may necessitate a future grant.

An abstract resolution does not finally bind the House to make a grant, and it imposes upon the Government the responsibility, and also grants the privilege of either accepting or rejecting the recommendation.

Whether or not this particular amendment is in order hinges upon the definition of the word “urge”. The Oxford dictionary gives the following definition: “Drive forcibly, impel, hasten, cause to proceed with effort”. I consider the word “urge” as used in the context of the amendment to be mandatory, and that it neither implies recommendation or consideration of the proposed course of action.

I further draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the fact that any irregularity of any portion of a Motion renders the whole Motion irregular. (See Beauchesne’s Citation 199.)

However, in the light of the foregoing, although in my opinion the Member’s Motion is out of order, it would appear that only a slight change is needed in the wording to bring it into order.

I would draw attention to a Ruling made by Mr. Speaker Johnson as recorded in the journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, March 5th, 1952, page 125, where, when faced with a similar and analogous situation, he did by leave of the Assembly, alter the wording of a Motion in order to make it conform to the accepted form of Private Members’ Motions involving the expenditure of money.

Perhaps the Assembly would now wish to extend the same courtesy to the Member from Touchwood which was extended to an Opposition Member at the suggestion of Mr. Speaker Johnson in 1952, and if the Assembly gives such leave the Chair will change the wording of subsection (d) by striking out the word “extend” in the first sentence and substituting therefore the words “consider the extension of”.

Amendment agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 6

Mr. Speaker: — I would now draw your attention to Resolution No. 6 standing on the Orders of the Day in the name of the Member for Kelsey, and everything which the Chair had to say in connection with the amendment to Resolution No. 1 applies, in my opinion, to this Motion, and accordingly the Chair is again, by leave, prepared to apply the same remedy by inserting the words “to consider” after the word “Saskatchewan” and before the word “and” in the first line.

I wish to advise the Assembly that by taking the foregoing action in these two specific cases, it is not be considered that the Chair is establishing a custom, continuing practice, or assuming an obligation.

Amendment agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 7

Mr. Speaker: — In connection with Resolution No. 7 standing on the Orders of the Day in the name of the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland, I would draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the Rule of Anticipation concerning Motions, which is to be found on page 399 of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, the pertinent passage of which is as follows:

Stated generally, the rule against anticipation (which applies to other proceedings as well as motions) is that a matter must not be anticipated if it is contained in a more effective form of proceeding than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated but it may be anticipated if it is contained in an equally or less effective form. A bill or other order of the day is more effective than a motion.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 131, states:

The Anticipation rule, which forbids discussion of a matter standing on the Paper being forestalled, is dependent on the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same session. In applying the Anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussions which lead to the most effective result, and this has established a descending scale of values for discussions — Bills, Motions, Amendments, etc. Thus a Bill must not be anticipated by (or more shortly 'block') discussion of a motion, amendment or subject raised on another motion."

From the foregoing it follows that the most effective form of procedure supersedes the less effective.

The subject matter of the Petition in Resolution No. 7 is, in the opinion of the Chair, now contained in Bill No. 39, and the Bill being a more effective form of procedure than the Resolution, the Resolution of the Member for Prince Albert East Cumberland is, therefore, out of order.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — On a point of order, I did bring in this Resolution before the Bill was brought in. I didn't anticipate that the Government would do that. I had hoped it would do it because it is very vicious legislation in the first place and penalized quite a few farmers, but I did bring it in before the Bill was brought in. I am not very clear on this, I am not a legal man, not a lawyer, I'm just an ordinary farmer, and I would like to know just — I have to abide by your ruling — but I just wonder if it could be clarified.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I'll clarify the ruling by repeating what I said in the ruling which is that the House should discuss the most effective form of proceeding, and a Bill is a more effective form of proceeding, obviously, than a Resolution, even though I agree that the Resolution was on the Order Paper first. I don't deny that but the Bill is still the most effective form of proceeding.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — 1968-69 DURUM POOL ACCOUNT

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Moved, seconded by Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):

That the Legislature of Saskatchewan urge the Canadian Wheat Board and the Government of Canada to take all necessary steps, including all necessary legislative amendments, to keep the 1969-69 Durum pool account separate from all other grain accounts and to ensure that all surplus earnings from the sale of Durum be paid to the producers of Durum.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the matter that is before us on the Order Paper is here because of the concern and public attention that was raised by Mr. A.B. Douglas, M.P. for Assiniboia, in the House of Commons on January 17th. He was concerned Attorney General that time because the Canadian Wheat Board does not differentiate between different kinds of wheat and that there is no provision for a separate sales pool of Durum wheat apart from hard red strain. The Hon. Mr. Lang has indicated several times that selling prices for grain have been lower than the levels required to meet the initial payments to farmers. However, Durum sales were made Attorney General good prices and this ought to have meant some extra money for final payment to producers.

I don't have the report of the Canadian Wheat Board for the 1968-69 crop year, but in the previous year we exported Durum to the Federal Republic of Germany, the USSR, Switzerland, Poland, Italy, Albania and several other unspecified countries. The low initial price this year plus the reasonably good export demand for the Durums seems to indicate that there ought to have been a surplus in that pool. The question was, Mr. Speaker: did the Federal Government intend to use this surplus to offset deficits incurred by other kinds of wheat? Now, I must say that the Government would have been perfectly in its legal right to do so and in fact its failure to do so is going to be a direct charge against the Federal Treasury. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I must agree with the action that has been taken, that is, that the final payment is going to be made. I don't agree with the legalistic view that Durum is lumped with the hard spring wheats. The producers of Durum have not been contributing to the general wheat surplus and thus putting downward pressures on prices. The producers of Durum have been diversifying their operations

March 17, 1970

at an increasing rate. Durum acreage in Saskatchewan jumped from 680,000 acres in 1965 to 2,600,000 acres in 1969. The producers of Durum do labour under some disadvantages. The crop is very attractive to wild ducks and geese, threshing is more difficult than is the combining of ordinary spring wheat. It requires a slightly longer growing season. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the life of a Durum producer is not an easy one and I don't think we ought to put any more disincentives in his way.

Now, Mr. Lang has announced that a Durum wheat final payment will be made, and I want to express the appreciation of Saskatchewan Durum producers for this. Mr. A.B. Douglas, M.P. for Assiniboia, deserves great credit for this move, because I know that he has been working tirelessly to get this payment for Western farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we should also recognize and remember that The Canadian Wheat Board Act does not differentiate between Durum and other wheats, and I think that all of us should be seeking changes in The Canadian Wheat Board Act to isolate Durum from other hard strain wheats.

Finally, I believe that this Resolution on the Order Paper has had some beneficial affects. Certainly the problem has been brought to the attention of the Government of Canada. This Legislature is concerned and was going to debate it. Mr. Speaker, there is no point in continuing and I ask leave to withdraw this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Now to begin with the Member hasn't moved the motion. It is presumed that he would do so when he spoke so I presume that he has. a motion once moved can only be by leave of the House withdrawn.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on it first if I may if this is in order.

Mr. Speaker: — It can only be by leave withdrawn and if you rise to speak you are not giving leave and it has to be unanimous, so that's it.

Mr. Wood: — I won't be very long. I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do agree with the Hon. Member across the way (Mr. Leith) in regard to what he has said about this using of the funds from the Durum pool to be spent in taking up the loss on the other grains. Also I would like to agree with him on commending the Federal Government on what it has done here. I would like to qualify my commendation a little in this, in that I think that there wasn't very much else that it could or should have

done. Now it could be that the legal position of this is that the Government would have been entirely right in using these funds for the hard wheat pool, but I think it is open to a good deal of argument. I do maintain that Durum is entirely a different plant than wheat. There are so many different kinds of wheat — Chinook, Marquis, Rescue and Manitou — and you can't tell one from the other. I mean they cross-pollinate and you can mix them and you can even mix Thatcher in with it, and it still is wheat. Wheat is wheat, but you can't mix Durum with wheat. It doesn't cross-pollinate, it's a different plant. You just mix it in the elevator and you're in trouble right up to your neck. When you say that wheat is wheat then that's fine, but Durum just is not wheat. They are as different as daylight is from dark and any ruling that puts them in the same boxcar is out. I think the Hon. Member is entirely right when he says that the Wheat Board regulations in this regard should be looked Attorney General. Durum and wheat are two different plants, you just can't mix them that way. I do agree very much with what the Hon. Member has said in that the regulations of the Wheat Board should be investigated on that.

I may say in this regard that there was a good deal of public sentiment in the country on that. I have letters here from municipal councils, Farmers' Union districts, cooperative associations and Wheat Pool committees in my area, requesting me to take what action I could to help to see what they considered to be wrong was righted. I am very glad that the Federal Government has seen fit to do so.

Mr. Speaker: — I few moments ago the Member (Mr. Leith) asked to withdraw his motion, does the Member still wish to withdraw.

Motion withdrawn.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 — REDUCTION OF HIGH LEVELS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

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

That this Assembly urgently recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan, action by which the present high, and anticipated higher, levels of unemployment in the Province may be substantially reduced through such means as (1) Publicly financed, or financially assisted, projects for low-cost housing, and to provide schools, hospitals, pollution control, parks and recreation expansion; (2) The improving of labour standards legislation, and the effecting of policies that would augment the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes, as well as to increase employment of many others in the community; (3) The maximum use of available special programs with respect to industrial development and the provision of technical and vocational training.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when I drafted

this Resolution and after I had given notice of this Resolution on the Order Paper, we had not heard the Provincial Treasurer's Budget Address. It would be, I conceive, Mr. Speaker, infringing on the rules of the House to comment in any particularity on what took place during the last debate. I shall try to steer clear of any direct references to it. But may I, however, say this that I am first of all, naturally enough, glad to note that, since my Resolution was placed on the Order Paper, some Government commitment — even if a last-minute effort — has been made in an endeavour to escape the consequences of having done little or nothing beforehand to solve the grave problems of unemployment in this province.

I am, therefore, prepared to offer a lukewarm welcome to the announced program. I said something to this effect and made some criticisms in this vein during the Budget Debate. I want now only to say this, that the terms of this Resolution are just as cogent and just as important and just as necessary as they were when notice of the Resolution was given in the House.

Mr. Speaker, while I suggest that the Government has not acted responsibly in following the advice that is tendered in the Resolution, its declarations of recent weeks indicate that it has at last decided to pay lip service to my proposals. Now lip service does not constitute a program. And in this case it is a tardy recognition in words only. But it is, I suppose, progress of some doubtful kind.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, calls for "publicly financed, or financially assisted projects for low-cost housing, and to provide schools, hospitals, pollution control, parks and recreation expansion" in the first set of recommendations. Now may I say something on this. It is conceded by economists that home-building activity is a foremost means of promoting and stimulating beneficial improvement throughout the economy. It is not simply that the construction industry and its employees gain, although this of course is an important aspect. Hundreds of industries that supply construction and housing, with articles both large and small, are very substantially assisted. As well, the building of schools, hospitals and like structures provides similar galvanic effects. An adequate construction drive in Saskatchewan would undoubtedly do much to get business moving from its present state of semi-exhaustion.

But point one in the Resolution touches on more than that. We want the economic stimulus new construction offers. It would also supply buildings which are badly needed Attorney General this time. We need low-cost homes, we need schools, we need health facilities. This kind of construction is the proper accompaniment because it affords the province other valuable benefits.

Housing programs of the low-cost type can also be secured by the Province with the minimum possible investment and with the minimum contribution of municipalities and local governments because, of course, the Federal Government finances 75 per cent of such plans. So that \$1 million spent by the Province — that

is invested by the Province — results in an aggregate spending of \$4 million. It is an attractive way for a Province, especially in the position that Saskatchewan now finds itself, to provide work, needed facilities and savings in human terms, because, as everyone knows, bad housing breeds delinquency, misery, maladjustment, crime and ill-health, which bring with them a perpetual harvest of social ills and financial burdens.

Point one in the Resolution refers, Mr. Speaker, as well, to programs for pollution control and parks and recreation expansion. Saskatchewan has a splendid opportunity of forging ahead by elimination of as yet relatively easily handled pollution, and preventing the emergence of blights that have risen in so many regions of North America which saw earlier economic development.

The significant cutback in capital spending in parks and recreation last year by the present Saskatchewan Liberal Government was strongly regretted by Members on this side of the House. It was dearly bought program cutting, having regard to tourist potential and the welfare of Saskatchewan people. Now is the time for us to remedy last year's mistaken policy. Again, in providing work for people, we also build tourism and the happiness of our own population.

Mr. Speaker, my own constituency of Moose Jaw South would be happy to see Government activity to help the city of Moose Jaw cope with a formidable problem of pollution, especially on the River and in the River valley. The third largest city in s is sited in a district which has tremendous possibilities for natural development along the River valley and into the Buffalo Pound Lake area. It has been well established that any enterprise planning to locate in a community looks on the attractiveness of the centre concerned. Moose Jaw is a pleasant, friendly place. Its labour force has a great reputation. But the presence of a pollution problem poses a kind of deterrent. A program to overcome it, assisted by the Saskatchewan Government, is a rational proposal since it dovetails with the objective of bolstering the Moose Jaw economy with the aid of the new Federal special Area legislation.

Moose jaw is in an excellent position to benefit from tourist-attracting facilities. I would once again like to suggest that the transformation of the Regional Wild Animal Park to a Provincial Zoological Park should be undertaken with Federal-Provincial cooperation.

These, then, Mr. Speaker, are local examples I am naturally pleased to suggest. But there are dozens of others that come to mind in any discussion of parks and recreation requirements of Saskatchewan people.

I want to remind the House of what I have said on other occasions that any program to erase unemployment and to spark the economy must pay due regard to the fact that the largest

March 17, 1970

number of employees in Canada is the service industry. Indeed automation has made many industries so productive that comparatively few staff are retained to man goods-producing plants. Saskatchewan cannot disregard the potential of employment in service industries. One of the main branches that holds promises of course is our tourist industries. This is why the proposal in my Resolution for parks and recreation expansion should not be ignored.

Mr. Speaker, point two of the resolution calls for the improving of labour-standards legislation and the effecting of policies that would augment the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes as well as to increase employment of many others in the community.

The last part of the Resolution envisages the examination of many existing programs and the contemplating of new ones to boost buying power, incomes and employment. It embraces a significant part of the purview of poverty or near poverty in our society. The New Democratic party has had much to say on desirable policies in this spectrum and millions of words have been uttered and written by many others on the general topic. The Fifth Annual Review of the Economic Council of Canada, called the "Challenge of Growth and Change", as an example, made specific recommendations on how a government should proceed. This Resolution is in tune with such policies and with the view of the Economic Council of Canada.

I want to say more about the first part of the Resolution, namely, the proposal to improve labour-standards legislation. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear case for a rapid and substantial adjustment in Provincial minimum wages.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Our minimum wage has been eroded by inflation. Its value in relation to average wages has declined. It is the lowest on the Prairies. The minimum wage offers the greatest protection to unorganised workers in the traditionally unorganised plants and businesses whose owners are still successful in illegally obstructing and preventing the free entry of their employees into labour organizations.

These wage earners are mostly part of the large poverty fringe. They are truly poor and disadvantaged. They lack decent housing amenities, good education and a happy life generally because they are poor. It may be said that upping the minimum wage won't transform their lives. Perhaps not. But it would make an excellent beginning in this desirable direction. Mr. Speaker, minimum wages in Saskatchewan are now well below 50 per cent of the average weekly wage paid to the province's workers. In actual and relative terms, Saskatchewan minimum wages are depressed. An increase of \$15 per week in the general standard would mean an added purchasing power of, I would estimate, better than \$20 million annually for this depressed

group. This, again, would aid in creating more work for business and industry. at the moment, minimum wage rates are so low that the resulting aggregate income for this body of workers, disposable or entire, offers no such opportunity.

Minimum rates in the United States of America have been increased a number of times since 1962 precisely because, apart from the human misery imposed by low rates, there were compelling arguments to use higher minimum rates as one measure for dispelling poverty. A powerful lobby in the US has contended that jobs would be lost if minimum wage rates were raised.

Strong evidence to refute this thesis was provided just two or three years ago, in 1967, in my recollection, by the United States Secretary of Labour, W. Willard Wirtz.

Mr. Wirtz first of all stated that nine million workers not previously covered by minimum wage protection have been brought under the umbrella of new minimum wage rates. His report then went on to say that the economy had continued to prosper, along with an increase in employment of nearly two and one-half million workers. There had also, he said, been increases in employment in practically every one of the industries most directly affected by the wage changes in the United States. Mr. Wirtz said that additionally prices in the year when the rates became effective rose less than they had in the previous year when the lower minimum standards applied. Finally, retail prices of goods in relatively high-wage industries, virtually unaffected by the minimum wages, rose more than the prices of goods produced in the non-durable goods industries where the minimum wage rise had the greatest impact. Mr. Wirtz said. Significantly, Mr. Wirtz said, at this time \$4.1 billion in new buying power had been created by the higher minimum rates, a definite boost to the whole United States economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the adoption of this Resolution might spur the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and the Government of Saskatchewan to implement increased fair minimum rates which are not desperately necessary in Saskatchewan.

In the interests of saving time this afternoon, I will not minutely examine other labour standards which should be improved in this province, except with respect to one and that is hours of work. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for the adoption by this Province of a 40-hour week.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — There has been no basic change in our Hours of Work Act since 1947. Almost a quarter century has elapsed. Surely, even this Liberal Government will see the justification for some forward move at this point in time, when unemployment is as prevalent as it is and when it is necessary to take steps to forestall an even higher degree of joblessness in this province.

March 17, 1970

There has been some debate about how effective hours legislation is in combating unemployment. Without dwelling on this, it is certainly obvious that a reduction in hours has some marked effect in fighting it. The editor of the Scientific American, Gerard Pill, in a book he wrote in the mid-sixties, called "Science in the Cause of Man" estimated that if the 60-hour week prevalent in 1900 had been general in 1960, there would have been 27 million unemployed persons in the United States. Hours of work have come down because of unions and because of a measurable rise in living standards and productivity. A moderate descent to a 40-hour week in Saskatchewan would cause little if any disruption and it would accomplish a deal of good in coping with unemployment.

From the point of view of employee policy, such a change would actually assist in keeping workers in the province. For unorganised labour, especially those in the smaller centres, long hours tend to stay static. But working people don't wait. They can't be clamed for migrating to other provinces where lower weekly hours of work and higher earnings obtain. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is really no good argument against, and a multitude of facts to support, the move to a 40-hour week in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the third part of my Resolution proposing "a maximum use of available special programs with respect to industrial development and the provision of technical and vocational training." The first part of the item is, I believe, self-explanatory and so perhaps is the last. I shall make some brief observations about the last part. One of my colleagues on this side of the house will be having more to say about it.

Mr. Speaker, in a province where about half of the population has an academic standing of Grade 8 or less, it is to be regretted that many vocational and technical courses cannot be undertaken because of the educational deficiency that is involved. Upgrading is of the essence in the rapid and successful use of these programs as they affect the lives of the worst educated sections of our population, among whom Indian and Métis people are so numerous.

Mr. Speaker, Federal financing has made it possible for us to expand technical-vocational training in Saskatchewan. While progress has been made, it isn't good enough. We have to do better, and very much better. And since unemployment is often the hardest to dislodge among the poorest educated people, it has to follow that a prime solution is to significantly increase training measures. Dealing with unemployed tradesmen, may I also say that it is while they are unfortunate enough not to have jobs that we should offer technical-vocational upgrading courses. For example, the whole face of training needs in the building trades is shifting. Journeymen recognize that they must receive supplementary training. I say, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time to give it when construction is slack and when journeymen are unemployed.

The intent of this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is something like the program for the war on poverty. The Economic Council of Canada has said that the program against poverty falls into four major categories: (1) manpower development, training and mobility programs; (2) individual improvement and/or educational programs; (3) community action and community change programs, and (4) income maintenance programs. I would solicit the support of the house in adopting this Resolution without amendment. It is timely and it is essential. It recommends practical, reasonable steps. It is a declaration of policy which the whole province as well as its employed population would greet with enthusiasm and support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second the Resolution introduced by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and to rise and speak in support of the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan during moments of exuberance comes up with some very interesting statements. On February 26 while speaking to the Canadian Petroleum Association, Saskatchewan Division, he said this, “The state owes every man a job, unless he is too lazy to work.” He is also a man who is something less than modest when it comes to making election promises. Members will recall the 1964 Liberal election platform. The first plan was, and let me quote:

Create 80,000 new job opportunities for Saskatchewan young people in four years through a dynamic industrial development program.

In 1965, when the Premier brought down his first Budget, he made some firm commitments to the people of the province. He talked about ‘the kind of principles his Government intended to pursue.’ The first of these principles was “The election promises made by the Liberal Party.”

In 1967, the number one plank for that election was again more jobs. While the 80,000 figures was omitted, they said and let me quote:

Continue to create more jobs by expanding the dynamic industrial and resources development programs.

After the last election we got a new Provincial Treasurer and he restated the position expressed by the Premier three years earlier. He said, “We would keep our promises to the people.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is 1970 and something has happened to the Liberal dynamism. They have forgotten the election promises made in those two elections.

March 17, 1970

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Now again in 1965 the Premier reported to this Legislature, and let me quote: “During 1964 Saskatchewan population reached an estimated total of 949,000.” Well a few days ago the DBS reported the Saskatchewan population to be down to 948,000 at January 1, 1970 — a reduction of 1,000 in five years under a Liberal g. The labour force has therefore dropped proportionately. In other words, today there are fewer jobs, fewer workers, Mr. Speaker, than there were in this province five years ago. But the number of job opportunities for the workers has dropped sharply. How bad is the employment and the unemployment situation in the Province of Saskatchewan? The picture is bleak indeed; the Government is afraid and ashamed to tell the truth; questions have been asked but the Government has refused to answer. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), who has just taken his seat, has already told the House during previous debates that statistical data on provincial employment and unemployment published in the Department of Labour Annual Reports are deliberately omitted from the Report for 1969 — a further example of the Government’s suppression of the truth and the facts.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell this Legislature exactly why the Government is refusing to answer these questions. It is because on January 30, 1970, there were 29,753 persons registered with the ten Canada Manpower Centres in the Province, exclusive of Lloydminster, and another 708 were registered Attorney General Lloydminster which includes part of Alberta. No doubt half or more of these are Saskatchewan residents; in other words, over 30,000 people were registered. How many more thousands are unemployed but are not registered? For example, the Indian and Métis who live on reservations. The number of registered vacancies as Attorney General January 30, 1970 for the 10 regions was 789, and 24 vacancies were registered Attorney General Lloydminster. Mr. Speaker, in the Regina region alone there were 8, 150 persons registered. The largest single occupational group was construction workers — 1,781. This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I suggest why the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is refusing to answer questions on unemployment in this House. This is why he is trying to supports the facts. It is because these figures give us the telling story of how miserably this Liberal Government has failed to keep the election promises of 1964 and 1967.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, during the Budget Debate I described in some detail the fallacy of the Government’s so-called ‘crash public works program.’ The truth is that in most instances there is less money appropriated for capital expenditures this year than was provided last year. What this will mean is that there will be fewer jobs created because the Saskatchewan Government’s expenditures on construction are in fact reduced.

This Government is either oblivious to the problems facing the people of the province or just unwilling and incompetent to act.

Mr. Speaker, last year after the session prorogued, hardly a day passed by that I did not receive a telephone call, a letter or a direct personal inquiry from people, asking whether I had any information where they may be able to find a job. Many of them were tradesmen and experienced workers, carpenters, plumbers, electricians, ironworkers, truck drivers, typists, store clerks, salesmen and labourers without specific trades. I conducted a survey among the building trades in the city of Regina and found that some 10 to 30 per cent were unemployed, depending on the particular trade. Some had not had a job for six months and longer. So, on May 20 of 1969, I wrote to the Premier. In part, my letter said:

A number of unemployed tell me they are in desperate financial circumstances; their unemployment insurance benefits have been, or are on the verge of being, discontinued; some have received credit from their corner grocer and are unable to meet payments.

I drew attention to the increase in the crime rate and suggested that at least a part of it can be attributed to rising unemployment. Many university and high school students were just unable to find jobs last year, Mr. Speaker. In my letter I added the following statements and recommendations. Let me quote:

I feel strongly that the Provincial Government has a responsibility to take all steps necessary to alleviate the unemployment problem. May I therefore suggest that the Government convene a conference on the problem of unemployment in Saskatchewan. Such a conference should include representation from the Provincial, Municipal and Federal Governments, agencies like Unemployment Insurance Commission, Canada Manpower, MLAs and Saskatchewan MPs, organized labour, employers, teachers, farmers, representatives from the technical schools, university, news media, welfare agencies, Indian and Métis organizations, church groups and perhaps others.

The purpose of such a meeting would be to discuss and consider for government action job-creating projects and such measures that could prevent the escalation of the problem.

May I suggest for your consideration the following projects, which if initiated would create many needed jobs:

1. A massive public and private housing construction and urban renewal program.
2. Immediate start on construction of the Regina Base Hospital.

March 17, 1970

3. Extension of regional park development, including a provincial tree-planting program.
4. Expedite construction of needed university facilities, particularly at the Regina campus.
5. Expedite and extend construction of needed Provincial technical schools.
6. Immediate consideration of building a high school within the boundaries of Regina North East constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised this matter several times in the Legislature. In our constituency there is no high school even though we have a population of some 35,000.

1. A program of modernization and redevelopment of many Saskatchewan towns and villages.
2. Construction of needed public buildings, schools, community centres, sports facilities, etc.

In my letter I proposed the following:

As you are aware, Federal cost-sharing or substantial assistance is available in respect of many of the above-suggested programs.

And I suggested that the Government of Saskatchewan make strong representations to the Federal Government to re-institute the Winter Works Program and have the length of the works season extended to meet the needs of climatic conditions in Western Canada. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I suggested at the time that this question of unemployment be put on the agenda for discussion and consideration during the June Provincial-Municipal Conference. I received a reply from the Premier a few days later. His letter states and let me quote:

May I acknowledge with thanks your letter of May 20th. May I assure you that the views which you have expressed will be given careful consideration.

Well, Mr. Speaker, nine or ten months have elapsed and we don't see any kind of a meaningful program initiated to alleviate unemployment so far. I sent a copy of this letter to the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and he replied in part saying:

I am sure that the Government and myself are very cognizant of the many problems facing our society today due to the economic slump.

The Minister of Labour said that he and the Government were cognizant of the problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a cure did they prescribe. They trimmed Provincial Government expenditures and on two successive periods stopped Government employees' entitled increment increases, they told the employees,

to subsidize Government operations.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier announced his so-called crash public works program in this House, he said he was hoping that Ottawa would be persuaded to increase its capital spending. Mr. Speaker, after reading The Leader Post editorial of February 18, one can't help but ask where this Liberal Government of Saskatchewan was when the Federal Government was preparing its public works program for this year. Read the first sentence. Let me quote:

Judging by the federal Transport Department's main estimates for 1970-71 Saskatchewan is a forgotten province.

Manitoba will get \$1.6 million. The Federal area public works project expenditures total \$94 million — Saskatchewan will get less than half a million dollars of this total — Manitoba will get \$3 million. The Federal Public Works Department has produced estimates totalling \$323 million. The grand total for Saskatchewan is \$3.8 million. A little better than one per cent of the total national amount, Mr. Speaker. Compare this with Manitoba, look at The Leader Post editorial of February 18th. In two Federal works projects, Manitoba got close to \$5 million, Saskatchewan got only half a million dollars. You know, Mr. Speaker, when Premier Schreyer, whose name has been mentioned quite often in this house, goes to Ottawa he doesn't scream and he doesn't put on a fit, he doesn't pound tables, he goes to Ottawa to negotiate the best possible deal for the people of Manitoba rather than resort to histrionics.

This Government treats the unemployed workers like they were cold statistics. Mr. Speaker, these are people. They need to eat, they need a roof over their head. They need jobs and incomes to support their families. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the unemployment problem is best summed up by an 18-year-old youth who sat in my office as tears rolled down his cheeks while he recited to me his predicament in mid-August last. This 18-year-old boy 'phoned me and asked whether I had any idea where he might be able to find a job. He had already been to Canada Manpower Centre, several times and had visited dozens of employers since the end of June school term. I gave him a list of about one dozen suggested companies he might see. He did this and two days later he came to my office telling me had no luck. He told me he comes from a family of six brothers and sisters. He is the second oldest. He had completed his grade 12 with an average mark of 60 per cent. He said he was interested in getting into the field of electronics. He had made application for employment with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Saskatchewan Government Telephones, as well as many other employees. I decided to telephone the personnel department of the Saskatchewan Telephones and was told that they had some 200 job applicants. I described the plight of this youngster to them and was told that because of his average school marks not being spectacular and since he did not have a physics course, his chances were almost nil in getting considered. I telephoned the

March 17, 1970

Department of Education to see what chance there might be of getting him enrolled into the Moose Jaw Technical school to take an electronic course and what financial assistance, if any, was available. I was told that, had he been in the labour force for one year, he could get his tuition fee paid. If he was in the labour force for three years, he could get his fees paid and receive a living allowance — that's providing there was space. But because he had not been in the labour force, there is no educational assistance for him, there is nothing for him and there was no work for him, Mr. Speaker. This young man told me of his problem at home. His father was ill and had to take an early retirement. Except for his older sister having part-time employment the father's meagre pension was all they had to feed the family of eight, six children and two adults. They were behind in their house payments and in taxes. His father lectured him daily about getting a job. He broke out into tears, saying "I have tried, honest I have tried every day since school ended, I am scared to go home."

Mr. Speaker, this is one example of the kind of 'an 80,000 job program' this Government has offered our youth. This is the kind of a future it has planned for the young people of this province.

The people of Canada, I am sure, were shocked and dismayed when the Prime Minister of Canada delivered his pre-Christmas present, saying that he is prepared to push Canada's unemployment to 6 per cent and higher as a means to fight inflation. This is the man who a year and a half ago talked about a "Just Society", an economy of full employment. He said, let me quote:

If inflation continues it will destroy the dollar, destroy our export market, destroy the Canadian middle class.

Canada's greatest single export commodity has been grain. It is not inflation that has destroyed it. It is lack of government policy that has brought our grain export market to a standstill and our farmers down to their knees. Mr. Trudeau is concerned about the middle class. Mr. Speaker, what about the working class, the ordinary little people, the average wage earner? He is prepared to accept 6 per cent and more of them to be unemployed. On Thursday last, Mr. Benson in his Budget said he is prepared to go one per cent higher. It is not the middle class who are the victims of unemployment, it is the carpenter, the bricklayer, the store clerk, the ordinary labourer. These are the people that I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker. The middle class will survive, they always have. Mr. Trudeau and the Liberal Government have created inflation through their monetary and fiscal policy by lifting the lid off interest rates. It is irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, and, I suggest, economically stupid to fight inflation by a deliberate policy of creating unemployment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Now the Federal Government

is going to be imposing credit controls. What this will do to Saskatchewan is more business bankruptcies, I suggest. Yes, inflation could be fought and controlled by immediate selective price controls; establishment of a prices review board with power to act, reduction and control of interest rates, profits controls and an income policy and measures for greater control of our own economy. Voluntary price restraints are just not going to work. This is why labour has refused to be a party to an unpractical and useless plan.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that too much of our inflation is imported. We are not masters of our own house. A great many prices are set in boardrooms outside of Canada over which we have no control. Canada must take action and take action now in the resolution of this problem.

Secondly, the Government's monetary and fiscal policy is outmoded. It has caused interest rates to climb to an unprecedented level. This has caused unprecedented profits to be made by financial interests. Bank of Montreal 1969 profits were 89 per cent greater than a year before. Chartered bank profits as a whole were up 26 per cent over 1969. Finance insurance and real estate profits were up 47 per cent over 1968. This is the root of the problem. But did the Premier and his Government make any representation on this problem of inflation to the Federal-Provincial Conference? No, Mr. Speaker. What about the question of corporate profits? Last year corporate profits went up 20 per cent over 1968. Again this Government was silent on this question. It is always talking about wage control and income control, but we never hear them discuss talk and advocate profit controls and interest controls.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, if average wages in Saskatchewan were raised to a national average — they are presently \$12 a week behind — this would inject into Saskatchewan's economy some \$150,000,000 additional purchasing power right here in the Province of Saskatchewan. This would be good for business, good for the wage earners, good for the Province of Saskatchewan. This would create new jobs. We don't see the Government coming out with a program and a policy to ensure that our wages in the Province of Saskatchewan will be equal to those of a national average.

We need an income policy for the farmers. We have suggested on this side of the House a \$200 million cash injection into the hands of our farm people. This would create new jobs. Mr. Speaker, if there are other or better means that could be found we certainly would not object. We need a policy to remove poverty, put the unemployed to work. We need a meaningful public works plan as outlined in the Resolution moved by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and the recommendations that I made to the Government on May 20 last, not a sham as was presented

by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer earlier during this Session. We need a reformed labour policy to help eradicate poverty and to create new jobs, yes, removal of the restrictive labour legislation, repeal of Bill 2 to strengthen and improve collective bargaining, and thus improve labour-management relations, and in this way help to raise the Saskatchewan substandard wages to a national average.

Secondly, we need legislation for a legal workweek of a maximum of 40 hours a week, with some restrictions on the overtime work in this period of high unemployment. Hundreds of new jobs would be added through the reduction of the present 44 and 48-hour workweek. We need a \$2 per hour minimum wage. This would add new purchasing power to the people. We need to improve Workmen's Compensation benefits and raise Workmen's Compensation pensions. This would add new purchasing power. We need an overall improvement and an overhaul in the labour standards in this province. We need to introduce legislation for a sick-pay plan. This too would help inject new purchasing power in the Saskatchewan economy. Yes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps what is really needed is a new Government to do these things I have suggested of creating new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss briefly the vocational and technical education facilities, specifically, the lack of technical and vocational facilities. The record will show conclusively that there is a desperate shortage of technical and vocational school facilities. For a number of years I have asked this question in the House: the number of persons who applied for technical and vocational institute courses in Saskatchewan and were rejected because of (a) academic standing; (b) space and (c) any other reason. Here is the record. 1966 for academic reasons 123 were rejected; space 880; other reasons 5. 1967 academic 139; space 590; other reasons 20. 1968 academic 34; space 709; other reasons 52. 1969 academic 293; space 793; other reasons 137. 689 Saskatchewan people were rejected or refused admission because of academic reasons, but this Government has no upgrading program of meaningful substance. For lack of space, almost 3,000 were turned away. For other reasons, perhaps financial, 214. Thousands of young people, wage earners and farmers are knocking on the doors of our technical schools, but there is no room. The statistics I have just quoted do not tell the whole story, Mr. Speaker. These are figures for which there is record only. How many thousands would have applied, but knowing full well that there is no room did not bother applying. How many of the 30,000 workers registered with Canada Manpower Centre at the end of January — we know that the figure has risen since then — would have applied and would have taken the opportunity for upgrading technical, vocational and apprenticeship courses, but knowing that there was no room did not bother? Despite the shortage of space this year the Government has not provided a single penny for new technical and vocational school construction. Let us look at the record of this Liberal Government on technical and vocational school construction programs. In the 1964-65 Budget the Legislature appropriated just about \$2 million, only \$132,000 was

spent; 1965-66 \$456,000 was appropriated, only \$28,000 was spent; 1966-67 \$2.7 million appropriated, only \$1 million spent; 1968-69 \$3.5 million appropriated only \$3.1 million spent. During those years, 1964-69, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature appropriated \$12.5 million for construction of technical and vocational schools, but only \$7.5 million was spent. The Government deliberately under spent the technical and vocational school program by \$5 million. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that these days there is not enough space and facilities in the technical schools.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the Government to provide me with information in regard to last year's expenditures. We appropriated \$1.9 million for 1969-70, but to this date I have not received an answer.

Mr. Speaker, since and before I was elected Member of the Legislature in 1964, I talked about the need for technical and vocational institutes in the city of Regina. In 1966, the former Minister of Education told this Legislature that there was a need for such an educational facility in the city of Regina. He even talked about it outside the Legislature. He said that the Government was considering starting the construction in three or four years. In other words, construction to start no later than 1970. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the Estimates. No appropriations are made, yes, there is a figure of \$175,000 under the heading of Institute of Technology, Regina. But neither the Minister of Education nor the Minister of Public Works has tried to explain while they took part in previous debates. This probably represents some renovation work to be done on the old Saskatchewan House. It is not an institute of technology for the city of Regina. If there was a plan of construction, then there would also have been an estimate for reimbursement from Ottawa, but there is none, Mr. Speaker. When the Premier or the Provincial Treasurer talk about job-creating construction programs, it would seem to me the first to have considered would be construction of technical and vocational school facilities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Not only because they are needed, but because there are large sums of money available from Ottawa, 75 per cent of money is available for technical and vocational school facilities program from Ottawa, but this Government has not proposed any construction program Attorney General all this year, no money Attorney General all for technical and vocational school construction. Mr. Speaker, I urge this Legislature to give overwhelming support to the Resolution presented by the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw South.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Heald (Attorney General).

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — INDEPENDENT ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Moved, seconded by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the introduction of legislation to establish an independent electoral boundaries commission similar in principle to the ones established in Manitoba and Alberta charged with the responsibility of drawing Saskatchewan's electoral boundaries based primarily on the principle of representation by population.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on Resolution No. 8 which is now before us dealing with the matter of an independent electoral boundaries commission for the Province of Saskatchewan, I think I could begin by saying that the record of this Government opposite is untouched by an attempt to bring in one major piece of legislation dealing in any way with electoral reform. This is very unfortunate for the people of Saskatchewan.

Since I was elected to this House in 1964, I have kept close track of what has gone on in the area of electoral reform, or more accurately, Mr. Speaker, what has not gone on, in the area of electoral reform.

The records show that in 1965 the Members of the Opposition proposed, as shown in the Journals of Saskatchewan, page 196, dealing with Bill No. 89, The Legislative Assembly Act amendments that the New Democratic party members attempted to delete on second reading and substitute the following words, I quote:

In the opinion of this Assembly, the Government should give consideration to the appointment of a Royal Commission similar to the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Saskatchewan.

That, Mr. Speaker, was moved by J.H. Brockelbank, the Member for Kelsey constituency and Mr. Nollet, the Member for Cut Knife constituency and was defeated in this Chamber by the Government majority.

In 1966, the following year, a resolution was brought forward, Resolution No. 6, and the purpose of that resolution, Mr. Speaker, was to formulate legislation or at least get an opinion from this Chamber as to the formulation of legislation to disclose the source of political contributions. That is shown on the Journals of Saskatchewan on page 101 and page 145. It was moved by myself, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. W.J. Berezowsky, the Member for Cumberland. It was defeated by the Government majority in this Chamber.

In 1967 the record shows on page 82 and 97 of the journals of Saskatchewan that a resolution was brought forward by myself,

seconded by the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) asking for a committee to investigate The Report of the Committee on Election Expenses (1966) and bring in equivalent recommendations for the Province of Saskatchewan. Again, Mr. Speaker, that was defeated by the Government majority in this House.

In 1968 another worthy resolution was brought forward and the record shows in the Journals, pages 99, 141, that a resolution was moved by the Member for Riversdale and the Member for Regina Centre asking for an Intercessional Committee to study and review The Election Act. At that time, Mr. Speaker, that resolution was defeated by the Government majority in this House.

Later, in 1968, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to introduce another resolution which I thought was of some importance to the people of Saskatchewan and to the Members of this Chamber that in Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission be set up in the Province of Saskatchewan. The matter was debated, and the record shows in the Journals, pages 79, 109, 127 and 145 that this resolution, introduced by myself and seconded by the Member from Canora, went down to defeat at the hands of the Liberal majority Government in Saskatchewan.

In 1969 the Government moved by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer to name a special Intercessional Committee to study The Election Act, Chapter 4, Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan 1965, and make recommendations. The Members of the Opposition at that time moved to strengthen that resolution that the Government was putting forward, with the cooperation of the Government Members, that a study of the best practical ways of setting enforceable limits to the expenditures in election campaigns be included in the resolution, and that was carried.

This year, Mr. Speaker, I again am putting forward a Resolution on a Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission in the Province of Saskatchewan. With each passing year, Mr. Speaker, I feel more certain that an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission will be established in Saskatchewan. We on this side of the Legislature have had to bear a considerable number of defeats in our quest for real electoral reform, as the record clearly shows.

An Hon. Member: — 20 years!

Mr. Brockelbank: — I have just been here 5 ½ years, Hon. Member. Most provinces have taken electoral reform in their stride, Mr. Speaker, and I believe this does put some indirect pressure on the more tardy provinces such as the Province of Saskatchewan. I refer of course to the Manitoba Electoral Reform changes in 1956. They were introduced, Mr. Speaker, by a Liberal Premier, since then supported by a Conservative Government.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Where is he now?

March 17, 1970

Mr. Brockelbank: — Where are the Liberals in Manitoba now, would be a better question, Mr. Speaker.

The Province of Quebec implemented reform which could be truly referred to as far-reaching in 1963. That, Mr. Speaker, was again done by a Liberal Premier. In the mid-1960s a Federal Liberal Government redistributed the Federal constituencies on the basis of the recommendations of the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission of the Federal G. Most recently in 1969, the Province of Alberta passed an Electoral Boundaries Commission Act. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are surrounded. The Government, Mr. Speaker, should be commended for establishing an Intercessional Committee to study The Elections Act and The Controverted Election Act within one year after it had declined our suggestion for the same study. However, I am unable to agree that the formulation of legislation on the basis of this Special Legislative Committee's recommendations can be classified as far-reaching changes in electoral reform, as was done by the Premier in the first major address in the Legislature. That was a gross exaggeration.

In the event that this Government is not convinced of the need for more significant changes than it has presented at this Session, let me remind them of some editorial comments by newspapers which present a Liberal view of the day-to-day events in Saskatoon City. In The Star Phoenix lead editorial of April 9, 1966, entitled, "Equity of partnership," the editor, Mr. Denis W. Adkins states in part:

It is time that the Saskatchewan Government follow the Manitoba Government's course in taking the structure of constituencies out of partisan hands. Saskatchewan's ridings should be mapped by an independent commission similar in personnel to the Federal Commission in Saskatchewan of Mr. Justice R.L. Brownridge and Professor Norman Ward of the University of Political Science Department here.

There would be no political considerations here, but there would be objective assessment of the best interests of the voters of the province.

Later in March 26, 1968, The Star Phoenix printed another lead editorial by a different editor, Mr. Max MacDonald, entitled "Controlling Democracy" and it states in its concluding paragraph, Mr. Speaker:

Since it is in the voters' interest to have an independent commission many of them would react favourably to adoption of a program such as the Opposition now advocates. Conversely they should show their displeasure with any government which stubbornly continues the inequitable practices of the past.

I might, Mr. Speaker, Attorney General this time take a brief moment

aside from my notes and compliment the Saskatoon Star Phoenix. I don't very often get a chance to compliment the editorial page of the Star Phoenix, but I think that at this time the Star Phoenix should be recognized for a public service that it is trying to conduct on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, by putting forward its voice in favour of an independent electoral boundaries commission for Saskatchewan.

I am glad to see some recent support, Mr. Speaker, that has come from The Leader Post editorial page. On March 5, 1970, The Leader Post in an editorial, entitled "Streamlining election procedures", has this to say in its second last paragraph:

A useful suggestion from the minority report is the recommendation that redistribution of seats be removed from politics. Governments should recognize the right of electors to be fairly represented in the Legislature, a right which an independent and permanent electoral boundaries commission is more likely to respect than a partisan legislative body.

Finally, a compelling practical reason should have indicated to you — and I am sure other Members before now — that the continued exodus from rural areas to urban areas has created an undesirable imbalance in our legislative representation.

In 1968 when I presented a resolution similar to this Resolution, I pointed out that there were wide population differences between one rural constituency and another rural constituency; between one urban constituency and another urban constituency; and between one city constituency and another city constituency. The figures that I used to support my argument, Mr. Speaker, are the figures that were drawn from the office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

I have heard the Premier and the Treasurer say publicly on more than one occasion that there would be a redistribution before the next election. I call upon them now to lead the move for real, far-reaching changes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Commissions' personnel in Manitoba and Alberta are each independent but their composition varies somewhat. The composition is of small concern to me. The acceptance of the basic underlying feature of independence is what is important. The governing factors for each commission vary in some aspects and coincide in other terms. This is of minor concern as well as the difference in personnel.

Each year there is a more substantial body of public opinion in favour of an independent electoral boundaries commission. since it has been two years since I have tested the temper of this law-making body, I suggest now and propose this Resolution.

March 17, 1970

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second this motion which was placed on the Order Paper by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank).

I am sure that any party in Opposition in this province feels that they are at a disadvantage or have been at a disadvantage, regardless of whether it happens to be Conservatives, New Democrats or Liberals, because of our failure as a Legislature to establish electoral boundaries by an independent commission. there will likely be re-establishment . . .

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — You had 20 years!

Mr. Whelan: — The worst set of boundaries that were ever drawn were the ones that you drew for Moose Jaw Lake Centre, Mr. Premier.

There will likely be re-establishment of electoral boundaries this year. Some of the work that has been done on boundaries in the past must make it evident to the voters that there has been an attempt by the party in power to maintain its position by adjustment of boundaries. Evidence will show that in certain instances there has been no attempt to: (1) convenience the voters; (2) establish the principle of each vote for each person being of equal value; (3) justify or explain the size or shape of constituencies or the reason for boundary adjustments.

Because of these facts, the only conclusion the public can draw is that each time a change of boundaries takes place, it precedes an election, and is an attempt by the party in power to maintain or continue its term of office.

Let me quote one or two of the more glaring and unbelievable situations, one of which I am sure had something to do with bringing about changes in the Federal Act. 1. For years the city of Regina was encircled by a riding that was called Moose Jaw Lake Centre federally. 2. The six Provincial ridings in Regina at the present time, and particularly Regina North West, Regina North East, Regina South East and Regina Centre have the most illogical, disconnected, unexplainable set of boundaries one could possibly imagine. 3. A most frivolous change of boundaries took place when, in three instances, people who have been nominated early had their Provincial constituency boundaries deliberately redrawn so that none of the three resided in the constituency in which he was running, as a result of the boundary changes. The absurd drawing of boundaries to carefully eliminate their residence was mischievous and without regard for the convenience of voters.

Mr. Speaker, every party has in the past in this province, while in government, (I make no exception) practised some of this boundary fixing, but not without the public understanding completely the intention of their actions. This is most unsatisfactory. Someone mentioned earlier the change in the

boundaries federally. Regina City finally received a set of Federal boundaries for the two constituencies that make some sense, after many long years of living with an awkward, unexplainable situation. This came about as a result of an independent commission. The Independent Commission's action is appreciated by Regina residents because of the convenience of association with their representative and the simple, easily understood, boundary with Albert Street as a dividing line.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, this came about only as a result of a Federal independent commission.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — One has only to look at the rapid and continuing drop in the population of rural constituencies, while the cities are increasing in size, to realize that a city Member, in many instances, represents twice as many voters as in a rural riding in Saskatchewan. There is no longer an argument that it is difficult to meet rural voters because transportation facilities are relatively poor. In the past, when trains and horse-drawn vehicles were the mode of transportation, there may have been some justification for this argument, but today in the age of motor vehicles, the helicopter and the airplane this argument is not valid as it once was.

Let me sum up in advocating for a constant review by a permanent boundaries commission. In the present age of rapidly changing location for many residents, with 10 to 15 per cent of the population moving each year, particularly in Saskatchewan, from rural to urban, in many instances boundaries of electoral districts have neglected to register such population movement, with the result that representation is not closely related to population.

A Legislature that presumably represents the population and speaks in its name cannot, in good faith, allow a situation to develop where it may be accused of electoral discrimination. A Legislature can be accused of paying only lip service to democracy if it fails to redistribute electoral boundaries in accordance with population changes. It is also understandable that a Legislative Assembly may not be acutely motivated to change electoral district boundaries, and where the Legislative Assembly itself presides over such changes, charges that changes are unfair or self-interested may be harmful to the concept of representative democracy, even if the charges are not true, Mr. Speaker.

This is probably the soundest and main reason for an independent, permanent electoral commission, appointed by the whole Assembly, its recommendations to be reported back to the Assembly. I would also suggest that such a commission should be redirected after each census, every 10 years, in accordance with a set of guidelines which would be established by the Legislature and used as a reference by the commission.

March 17, 1970

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that through the establishment of such a commission the public would be assured that votes in an election would be of approximately equal value. The present situation where votes in one constituency are electorally worth only $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{3}$ as much as votes in another constituency makes a mockery of the theory of representative democracy meaning that everyone has an equal vote.

Those who prefer to continue the present inequality are not upholders of representative democracy but, perhaps, its enemy, for they give the enemies of representative democracy their most convincing argument, Mr. Speaker.

I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to stand up and support the motion and in doing so I hope that the Resolution will be broadly debated today or, if it is postponed to some other time, I hope that the situation will not be ignored, because the problem is more serious than some of us may want to think.

If this Resolution is fully debated and the Members give sincere expressions of their views and of what they know and what they have seen, then I am sure, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to arrive at some kind of consensus and there will be no difficulty in supporting this motion, I am sure.

There are a few principles involved in this motion, as has been pointed out by the mover and the seconder, and I want to reiterate them. I think that first of all the constituencies in the Province of Saskatchewan should be so constituted as to make it most efficient for the Member to represent the people in that particular area. This is not the case now. I could speak of my own constituency, Mr. Speaker. I know the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) are quite aware of what I am talking about. As a matter of fact all Members in this House should be aware because I have brought this to the attention of the House on previous occasions.

Take, for example, the polls on the island which is called Cumberland House Island. In order for me, as the Member for that particular constituency, Prince Albert East-Cumberland, to serve those people I have to drive through the constituency of Nipawin some 150 miles. Yet the people in that particular area could very well be served by the Member for Nipawin or the Member for Kelsey, but certainly the Member for Nipawin. There is a road through the constituency to Cumberland House and yet, I have to go from Prince Albert on to Nipawin and on for 150 miles to reach that one poll to discuss matters with those people. I think that if we believe in democracy certainly something

should be done about it. If you had a commission to decide on the boundary something would have been done about it. But because it is in the hands of a political party, and I am not exempting either party, the fact is that the constituency is the way it is today.

I could take another constituency like Athabasca. If the Member who services Athabasca (Mr. Guy) wants to reach the people of Pelican Narrows he has to drive through my constituency for some 150 to 200 miles to get to Pelican Narrows or Sandy Bay or to other points. I don't think that it is fair to the Member to ask him to do that. I don't think it is fair that he must take an airplane and fly all across my constituency to get to a certain corner in the Province of Saskatchewan to serve the people of that area. As a matter of fact the Member for Athabasca knows that on many occasions in the past, I have gone down to Pelican Narrows and discussed the people's problems there and brought their problems into this Legislature. I am sure that he appreciates what I have done. It has not been political but has been a sincere effort to try and serve those people. I hope that he will support the Resolution to see that some justice is done to improve constituency boundaries.

Mr. Guy: — Did you build a road in there, Bill?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, we did build a road in there. I am glad you finished it. I conceded, as a matter of fact, the road that was being built to Cumberland, I conceded to wait a little while in order to get a road into Pelican started. You finished it and all thanks to you. You are the Government so you should have finished it. You should have built a road to Deschambault as well. The Hon. Member who sits beside you was going to do it, I was sure. As a matter of fact I said he is quite a nice gentlemen but I am very disappointed in him and he didn't build that road and he didn't build dozens of other essential roads. I am sure that you wouldn't build it because you haven't been up there! You haven't talked to the people and you don't know the matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member (Mr. Guy) would be better to keep his mouth shut because he hasn't mentioned a single matter concerning the people of the constituency during the debate so far. And I hope that he will keep his mouth shut from now on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The other point is that we talk about representation by population. I don't agree that you can do so entirely. in this Province of Saskatchewan, we have a situation where you cannot plan for so many people for each Member. There are situations such as in the North where you have a scattered population and in such cases one would have to consider area as well as population. I could mention my constituency set up by a decision of

March 17, 1970

this Government. Really I have two constituencies and so I have a population of such an area. I think that it is very unfair. I could point a finger at the Government for doing this kind of planning, because I represent an urban constituency of Prince Albert East, which could have one Member and I represent a northern area which is Cumberland, which should have a Member. But the Government did not forget when it called by constituency Prince Albert East, and gave it a hyphen and then Cumberland, thus indicating that I do represent two constituencies. However, I could look after the constituency of Athabasca as well and I may decide to run there next time and still have an easy job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Leaving all arguments aside and in all sincerity, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why should political parties decide on boundaries? Why should they gerrymander all over the country, even if something has not been done for 20 years as the Premier charged? Certainly we would have done it five or six years ago had we been the Government and we are going in that direction and will see justice done.

I plead with all Members in this House. Let's be sincere and honest with the people of Saskatchewan. Let's put this whole matter into the hands of a commission and let the commission use its good judgment to plan constituencies in the Province of Saskatchewan in such a way that we may have the best kind of set-up that is possible for human beings to devise.

I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to three speakers in the Opposition speak for this Resolution which they introduced and they make it sound very simple when in fact it is a very complex subject. As a matter of fact in the session of 1968 I gave an address to this House on the matter of an independent boundary commission, using as the basis the Federal Commission which had been set up to divide Saskatchewan into the required number of Federal seats which at that time had to be reduced from, I think, 17 to 13.

I will have more to say on this subject again and I intend to bring before this House some of the material which I gave in that former address and make some comments on the remarks given by the Members opposite today.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate on this subject.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — DEBT LEGISLATION

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Moved seconded by **Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale):

That this Assembly, concerned with the economic conditions which prevent sincere debtors from meeting their obligations, recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the following immediate action:

- (a) organize an information program to advise farmers of their legal rights and the avenue available to them when threatened with seizure or foreclosure;
- b) update legislation administered by the Provincial Mediation Board, and expand the staff to provide maximum assistance to hard-pressed debtors requiring extensions on mortgage payments, and other debts.
- (d) introduce provincial moratorium legislation based on the provincial jurisdiction to enact laws with respect to property and civil rights.
- (e) guarantee continuation of electrical power services to farmers unable to pay power bills because of their inability to sell stored grain;
- (f) postpone payments on crown lease rental payments and on payments for land purchased from the crown;
- (g) prevent seizure of farmers' production machinery;
- (h) make immediate and strong representations to the Federal Government to:
 - (1) forestall business bankruptcies in rural communities;
 - (2) update and rewrite the Farmers Creditors Arrangements Act;
 - (3) provide protection for Saskatchewan people who have loans under the National Housing Act, Veterans Land Act, Farm Improvement Loan Act, and Farm Credit Corporation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is timely, necessary and must be considered as urgent. Our discussion of and support for the contents will be watched, I am positive, by many worried citizens of our province.

Mr. Speaker, do not misjudge or misunderstand the introduction of this subject — debt legislation. It is not an attempt to help evade commitments. Probably no one in this Legislature has a better working knowledge of the sincerity, integrity and the honesty of Saskatchewan debtors than this Member.

March 17, 1970

Since 1941, in many ways, but particularly in actual debt and tax negotiations, which took us into every part of this province, into farm kitchens, into every RM office, into thousands of homes, rural and urban, this experience has led me to conclude that obligations are signed for seriously, met if humanly possible, and honourably lived up to.

To modernize farming methods, to meet the need for more land, to purchase homes or necessities of life, contracts were made. The leaders of our country assured our farmers that we were moving. Jobs would be available. "Grow wheat and we will sell it," they said. Debts in the farm area increased automatically. From 1959 to 1968, according to a survey in the Canadian Farm Economics, Volume 4, No. 5, December 1969, covering the area of Elbow, Loreburn, Strongfield and Hawarden, total farm investment on medium-sized farms from \$52,000 to \$114,000.

Mr. Speaker, the study shows that returns were not as inflationary as the investment. This has resulted in heavy indebtedness. While 50 per cent of farmers were in debt in 1959, the figure has now risen to 68.2 per cent for the large farm group. Both medium-term and long-term debts have increased during the period. Long-term debts for large farms increased from an average of \$3,814 per farm in 1959 to \$19,343 in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, these tables are complete and many Members will have studied them in detail I am sure. Because of lack of income, it is a story of more debt. What has happened in the farm sector is also reflected in the retail field. Sales have dropped and accounts receivable have gone up. Without funds to buy new inventory, with the wholesaler pressing for payment, the retail outlet, whether farm machinery or groceries or whatever it may be, is facing a discontinuance of operations. This is a difficult choice: extend credit to an honest customer with 20,000 bushels of grain, or do not extend credit to him.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is in a very bad debt position. First, a dilemma created, not because he cannot produce, but because he cannot market. Second, although large farms have been the trend, they are in even worse debt position, although it is generally accepted that they are more efficient. Third, grain deliveries for the current crop year are lower, and this will mean that the farmers' debt situation will become more acute before we meet again.

Mr. Speaker, Federal and Provincial agencies or Government guaranteed loans account for a huge portion of this debt, but again a review in the Canadian Farm Economics, Volume 3, No. 4, October 1968, an article by R.S. Rust shows that more recently the trend has been to trust companies, finance companies and credit unions. The situation has, therefore, been aggravated because these groups have been charging a higher interest rate. Latest figures seem difficult to obtain but the overall farm debt in Canada rose from \$1,558 million in 1960 to \$3,859 million in 1967. Interest on this debt in 1968 amounted to approximately

\$250 million. Repayment of this debt in the Prairie area, but more particularly in Saskatchewan, is a very grave problem. Up to date, repayment has been relatively good, but what of the foreseeable future?

1. Grain quotas are low.
2. The price for grain is lower.
3. There is no final payment except for Durum wheat this year.
4. High interest rates forbid borrowing.

In addition farmers are hesitant about the long-term advantages of diversification. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, first the farmer, second, the urban employee, and third, the city businessman are at the mercy of an economic hurricane.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Governments, Federal and Provincial, should be prepared to legislate to protect their equities. Because of the general economic situation which confronts us, this Resolution has been drafted and placed on the Order Paper. If you follow it, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to explain the urgency for each section as it appears on the Order Paper. (a) Organize an information program to advise farmers of their legal rights and the avenues available to them when threatened with seizure or foreclosure. This section calls for organization of an information program to advise farmers of their rights. This program might be handled through the Provincial Mediation Board or a branch of the Attorney General's Department. It could provide, in general terms, the type of legal procedures that could protect farmers under, for instance, The Limitation of Civil Rights Act; The Land Contract Actions Act; The Farm Improvement Loan Act and there is other legislation as well in the area of tax enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, if a handbook was published setting out the right of hearing, the type of notices required, and general information, it could introduce the farmer to an agency where he might seek more complete advice. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this would be greatly appreciated at this particular time. My own experience in the last several months has been that farmers, who 15 years ago ran into financial trouble, are now writing notes or asking for information, emphasizing the need for placing this general information in a handbook, as was the case in the early 1940s — incidentally that handbook is still available and it was an excellent reference guide. There are still some around that people could use as a guide to draft a similar sort of hand guide or reference manual for the farm population. It would be helpful to every Member of this House, of great assistance to the farm population and, in my estimation, in the long run would bring about understanding between debtors and creditors. (b) Provide for legal service for urban and rural people confronted with financial problems. Mr. Speaker, under (b) the need for legal service and advice is recognized. This was first recognized under the old Debt Adjustment Board which was Provincial

and secondly, under The Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act which was Federal legislation.

During six of the ten years I spent with The Provincial Mediation Board a lawyer was on hand to provide, in capsule form, general and in some cases, specific advice to the citizens of Saskatchewan who were in debt trouble. As affluence became more evident, the need for his legal services became less necessary and this type of advice and assistance was discontinued. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are now at a state where the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) in consultation should consider the hiring of someone with legal knowledge of debt consolidation, farm economics and with legal training to work preferably with the Provincial Mediation Board office. © Update legislation administered by the Provincial Mediation Board and expand the staff to provide maximum assistance to hard-pressed debtors requiring extensions on mortgage payments and other debts. The Board administers a number of Acts: the Act which establishes the Board itself, the notices it receives; The Land Contract Actions Act; tax enforcement and consolidation; and The Farm Security Act and others.

When second reading came up on The Farm Security Act, I recall drawing to the Attorney General's attention the fact that the portion being amended applied only to agreements written prior to April 30, 1937. Now we have a whole new set of circumstances. We haven't a crop failure; we have in effect a market failure.

Mr. Speaker, most of the legislation that the Provincial Mediation Board administers that was written or is presently administered is completely out of step with the present situation, because that legislation was written for crop failure. Even the definition of crop failure, it was in the year 1944, or prior to that time, is completely inadequate at the present time. There is an urgent need for new legislation, Mr. Speaker. Certainly this is not politically controversial. We should be able to update the debt legislation in every way through a committee in discussion with farm groups, consumer groups, rural municipalities.

(d) Introduce Provincial moratorium legislation based on the Provincial jurisdiction to enact laws with respect to property and civil rights. Under this section there is some argument about whether or not Provincial moratorium legislation can be written that would be effective. At the time the last moratorium legislation was tossed out, as I interpret it, the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court was that the Province had no power to compel a creditor to accept a reduction on his debts, nor to achieve this objective by denying the creditor access to the courts to enforce payment of his debts. There was also the matter of legal infringement on the banking area because of interest rates and debt reduction. The Court of Appeal, Saskatchewan, in 1954 by a majority decision upheld the constitutional

validity of The Moratorium Act (Saskatchewan, 1943), but this decision was reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada in 1956. Both courts, however, agreed that under certain circumstances the Province might enact moratorium legislation. The last Mr. Justice Rand in his judgment indicated that it would — and I am quoting in part from the judgment — I think this may be unfair, but at least it gives an indication of what he was thinking:

Depend on the facts, circumstances and means adopted determining the true character of the moratorium.

The Privy Council also felt that according to the Abitibi Power Case (1943), the Province might limit moratorium legislation to a special class or suitor, or one particular class of action or suitor. It seems obvious to me that, without reducing debt or interfering with the interest rate, but because of the civil rights and property jurisdiction of the Province, one might write legislation that would stay certain proceedings or freeze as it were in action for a period of time, if say, the Provincial Mediation Board felt such notice to refrain or stay was justified. Faced with a very real situation, like the one just to figure out legal ways and means to prevent a foolish or hasty creditor from putting a farmer out of business when the farmer has no way of marketing his goods.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — If the legislation were written and ready it would not only ease the worries of farm and urban people, but it would act as a deterrent to the impatient and unreasonable creditor who, without objectivity, attempts to collapse the farm operations by hasty or unjust action.

Part (e) of the Resolution calls for a guarantee of continuation of electrical power services to farmers unable to pay power bills because of their inability to sell stored grain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, many farmers with as high as 20,000 bushels of grain stored have found in the past and will in the future find it difficult to pay electrical bills for services for electric power. Since the Saskatchewan Power Corporation holds as security for the bill a claim as good as a claim for taxes, and since the reason the bill is not paid is because the grain cannot be sold; and, in view of the fact that Saskatchewan Power Corporation enjoyed this year a \$10 million profit, we believe it should announce a policy guaranteeing the continuation of electrical power services to farmers, who, in many instances, may be without power. Some of the diversification advocated so often will not be possible without electrical services; diversification to raise broilers, mix feed for hogs and

cattle, light buildings occupied by laying hens and so forth. Mr. Speaker, to remove electrical services from the farm in these circumstances could be tantamount to putting the farmer out of business.

(f) Postpone payments on Crown lease rental payments and on payments for land purchased from the Crown. This section is self-explanatory. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) could give the House particulars regarding payments in arrears for lease rentals and for land purchased from the Crown. An announced policy to all lessees and all purchasers of Crown lands would be most desirable, most reasonable and most practical.

(g) Prevent seizures of farmers' production machinery. Mr. Speaker, if a farmer's productive machinery is taken from him — in many instances the legislation is Federal, legislation over which we have little or no control — then the farmer's means of earning an income no longer exists. One of the great problems at the moment, of The Farm Improvement Loans Act, although it has been a great help because of the lower rate of interest and the long-term payments, is that the farmer is unable to sell his grain to meet the legal payments. He was forced to resort to purchase farm machinery through this loan plan. Loans in this category run to \$250 million. A farmer enlarged his operations each time he was asked to grow all the grain that he could grow because it could be sold. He put more money into big machinery each time through The Farm Improvements Loan Act. The situation now, Mr. Speaker, is that the banks are obliged to enforce the security which they took with respect to each loan. Even after the machinery is sold or put on the market, if in some instances it cannot be sold, it is only after every effort has been exhausted by the banks that they call on the Government for the guarantee. This puts the onus to enforce payment on the banks because failure to do so may deprive them of the right to obtain the Government guarantee later on. There is no legislation in existence that I can think of an, Mr. Speaker, - I stand to be corrected — that would prevent any bank, under The Farm improvement Loan Act, that has a mortgage with a farmer on his cattle or machinery, from moving against the security. Mr. Speaker, machinery is the key to the farmer's production. Without it, he is helpless.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — We must seek ways and means of guaranteeing the continued use of his production machinery, particularly where Federal legislation is involved. I was pleased to hear that some changes would be made at this Session in The Limitation of Civil Rights Act, regarding notices, and I commend the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) for it, but there is such a large area in which Farm Improvement Loans Act is the key administrative vehicle that I urge that this area get immediate and careful attention.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time under The Orderly Payment of Debts Act we can prevent action up to \$1,000 under the Bankruptcy Act. The Attorney General spoke of increasing it to \$2,500.00. I think this is commendable. Not only should it be increased but the whole unbelievable morass of red tape should be cut to a minimum. In addition, the businesses in the small communities of our province who are carrying huge accounts receivable, who are unable to obtain credit from wholesalers, who are in a state of hysteria and close to collapse should be protected through this legislation or similar legislation, or our rural communities will disappear. I urge the Government opposite to enter into negotiations with the Federal Government, looking at the prospect and possibility of developing procedures that will allow payment on a long-term basis when a small business in a rural community is faced with a bankruptcy action.

The Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act is still on the Statute Books. I recall, Mr. Speaker, referring two or three farmers to the Official Receiver in the early 1950s, but even at that time it was limited in its application. As originally written it applied only to a farmer who was unable to meet debts incurred prior to — I believe the date was May 1, 1935. The Act when it was written was good legislation, it was a Godsend that removed fear and developed understanding; it meant encouragement and hope for farmers of that day. I recall talking to many of those who had been referred to the Official Receiver. They were honest people who made the commitment and met the payments. It kept thousands of people farming their land when they would have been on relief or assistance. But above all it raised them up and put them back in society. The Act is still good today; it should be examined; it should be brought up-to-date. I would certainly urge that it should apply to debts contracted not before 1935, but a similar piece of legislation should refer to debts contracted before, say, 1968. Through their good offices, the leaders of the Government opposite should make every attempt to update The Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act or similar legislation, and re-write it so that it applies to the situation that exists in Saskatchewan today.

Mr. Speaker, I have made reference to two parts of section (h) of the Resolution which called for forestalling business bankruptcies and updating The Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act. I would like to turn now to part three which reads as follows:

Provide protection for Saskatchewan people who have loans under The National Housing Act, Veterans Land Act, Farm Improvement Loan Act and Farm Credit Corporation.

Under part three of this section of the Resolution we are asking that the Provincial Government, in consultation with the Federal Government, provide protection for Saskatchewan people, or attempt to persuade the Federal Government to provide protection for Saskatchewan people, who have loans under The National Housing Act, Veterans' Land Act, Farm Improvement Loan act and Farm Credit Corporation.

March 17, 1970

Mr. Speaker, even now in my constituency there are people who are unable to make NHA payments. They are trying to sell their homes for their equity and they are planning to move. Their equity has shrunk. It is a case of whether there will be a foreclosure or a fire sale. I question the advisability of the NHA people taking action to realize on their security because the security as the situation worsens becomes less valuable. These circumstances also exist regarding The Veterans' Land Act. I have already outlined the set of circumstances farmers find themselves in who have Farm Improvement Loans. I think it is an unsatisfactory situation. The whole area has to be re-examined in the light of present conditions. Since there is an ultimate guarantee for a Farm Improvement Loan from the Federal Government, the banks could be given special instructions. The Government of Saskatchewan should lend its good offices to see that the instructions are such that they will leave production equipment in the hands of farmers.

Let me turn for a moment to the Farm Credit Corporation. A great portion of mortgage money in Saskatchewan is loaned through this Federal agency. Farmers, urged by the leaders of the country to cultivate as much land as possible and grow as much wheat as possible because it would be saleable at a good price, mortgaged heavily with the Farm Credit Corporation. Statements may have been made by the Federal Government because it believed them, because information suggested that the statements at that time were correct. But the net result is that the price of land was driven up; loans were made at 75 per cent of the real value which was an inflated value of the land. Farmers competed with one another — in many instances to obtain an extra quarter section. The Farm Credit Corporation took security not only on the land purchased but on all the land the farmer owned. The problem the farmer has today is not only making the principal payment, the problem he has is paying the interest on the mortgage he has contracted for land he purchased at an inflated price. Many of these loans were taken at a low rate of interest, but instances have come to my attention where the Farm Credit Corporation has approached the mortgagee, who is in arrears in regard to principal, interest and taxes, and the Corporation has urged him to sign a new contract at a higher rate of interest, for instance, at 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent when the original mortgage was made at 5 per cent. I think we can ask the pertinent question: how is it going to help the farmers to get out an economic deluge and financial chaos by raising the interest on a loan that is already in arrears?

Mr. Speaker, there will be people at both Federal and Provincial levels who will suggest the action outlined in this Resolution, which urges immediate steps by the Provincial Government in conjunction with the Federal Government, is pushing the panic button. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you from my own experience that debtors are proud people and Saskatchewan debtors are unbelievably proud; they will not admit their debt problem before a judge until they are face to face with eviction, foreclosure, cancellation or seizure. Many times in my

Those indebt and tax trouble would not appeal until they were in desperate circumstances. Their reasons: first, they were too proud to do so; and second, they didn't know how to go about it; and third, no one had advised them anywhere along the line. True, there are court procedures, Mr. Speaker, but the average debtor, whether for consolidation or foreclosure, is afraid of an appearance in court and the cost of a lawyer is just one more expense at that particular time which he cannot afford. You may say that my experience has coloured my reasoning. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it has sharpened my judgement in this area. You may say that this approach will deprive us of further funds. I say to you that the wise creditors negotiated sincerely and eventually all the debts owing to them were paid in full. The rapacious, rambunctious, impatient creditors on the other hand lost their shirts.

Let me emphasize in closing that this type of legislation is not written, never was written, and its updating is not recommended for those who would evade their responsibilities or try to escape from a contract. New legislation will be written and worked out to postpone payment, payment by hones and sincere debtors who are in trouble because of market failure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare).

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