

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature  
37th Day

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students situated in the galleries of the Legislature; from the constituency of Regina South West, represented by Mr. McPherson, 31 students from the Argyle School, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Rose; from the constituency of Saskatoon Riversdale, represented by Mr. Romanow, 73 students from the princess Alexandra School, under the direction of their Principal, Mr. Lewis, and their teachers Mr. Ulrich and Miss Sharon Hoey; from the constituency of Bengough, represented by Mr. Mitchell, 51 students from the Assiniboia Public School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Smith; from the constituency of Lumsden, represented by Mr. Heald, 42 students from the Lumsden High School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Tony Karol; from the constituency of Morse represented by The Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher), 60 students from the Caronport School; from the constituency of Rosthern, represented by Mr. Boldt, 31 students from the Osler School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Peachy.

I am sure all Hon. Members will wish to extend to these students, to their teachers, and to their bus drivers, the warmest of all possible welcomes to this Legislature. To express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here enjoyable, educational and wish to everyone a safe trip home.

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

**MESSAGE FROM LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**

**HON. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Lieutenant-Governor.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Lieutenant Governor has been informed of Further Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service to the Province for the 12 months ending March 31, 1971, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly. I table them herewith.

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Thatcher that:

**April 6, 1971**

His Honour's message and the Further Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Finance.

Motion agreed to.

## **QUESTIONS**

### **HOMECOMING '71 PROJECTS**

**MR. A. MATSALLA (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister-in-Charge of Homecoming, or since he is not in his seat, then to the Premier.

In view that the deadline date for submitting applications from municipalities for Homecoming projects was February 28th, that was about five weeks ago, and as many of the municipalities are presently setting their budgets for the year, would the Premier inform this House when the municipalities could expect advice from the Homecoming office, whether or not their project applications have been approved?

**HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier):** — I should be pleased to refer that to the Minister who could possibly answer tomorrow.

## **STATEMENT**

### **SAMPLE OF WATER FROM PULP MILL**

**MR. M. KWASNICA (Cut Knife):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to inform Members of the House that I was to the pulp mill over the weekend. I should like to send a sample of water that I brought from the pulp mill effluent and I should like to send it over to the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer. I ask them to examine it carefully and smell it and to tell the people of Saskatchewan whether he supports the statement by Carl Landegger. "That it is not a joke when I say that the water we put back into the river, is much cleaner than the water we take out."

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary. I shall gladly go and get the Hon. Member a sample of water taken just below the sewer pipe in Prince Albert and I shall refer it to him and I suggest that he take a bath in it.

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the Deputy Premier that two wrongs don't make a right.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! Before we proceed any further I draw to the attention of all Hon. Members that we have now entered into the oral question period and it is expected that Members

who rise will ask oral questions.

## QUESTIONS

### APPLICATION FROM TRANSAIR

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Premier a question whether he is aware that TransAir has made an application to operate service from Winnipeg via Lynn Lake, through Wollaston to Uranium City? Now this has happened before. I think it is very important to the business people of the Province of Saskatchewan that air services, if they are to be provided to the North, should go through our cities if at all possible, such as Regina, Saskatoon and particularly Prince Albert, the city that the Hon. Provincial Treasurer and I represent.

The question is: is the Government aware of this and if they are then what representations have they made to the Secretary of the Transport Board or Committee?

**MR. THATCHER:** — No, we are looking at the situation and probably will present a brief opposing the application.

## MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

### RETURN NO. 138

**MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook):** — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 138 showing:

With regard to the forest fires under the purview of the Department of Natural Resources in Saskatchewan during the fire season 1969 and 1970: (a) The number of fires that cost the Department more than \$5,000. (b) The number of these fires that were flown on for suppression purposes. (c) The owners of the aircraft employed for these purposes. (d) The number of hours that each aircraft flew daily with respect to each fire. (e) The types and hourly rates for each aircraft concerned. (f) The total amount paid to each aircraft owner or company concerned.

**HON. J.R. BARRIE (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in order to be more specific in connection with the period of time for which information is required I move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy):

That all the words after the word 'Saskatchewan' in the

**April 6, 1971**

second line be stuck out, down to and including '1970' in the third line and the following words inserted therein: for the 1970 fire season ending December 31, 1970.

**MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, are you cutting out the sections (a), (b), etc.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Now just a minute until we find out what is being cut out.

**MR. KRAMER:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister what is different today than what was the situation two years ago. It is exactly the same wording and we did receive satisfactory and extensive information along those lines. This is the exact wording of a question placed and answered two years ago, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — . . . if we are not careful because the Minister has already spoken to the motion and to the amendment.

**MR. KRAMER:** — I am asking him a question, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Well, we shall consider that one as a question. Perhaps the Minister might answer it.

**MR. BARRIE:** — Well there was some confusion whether the season was the 1969-70 or 1969 and 1970. In order to simplify it I have moved this amendment.

**HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, pardon me. For clarification on behalf of the Member, season is singular but 1969 and 1970 are a dual year. It could be the season 1969 and as well the season 1970. If he is asking for the singular season, it is 1970.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the point that we were attempting to get at in the motion with respect to the amendment that the Minister has made was really two seasons. I perhaps should have said 1968-69 and 1969-70. This is the information that we are requesting, the point that was referred to by my colleague from The Battlefords, is that we have the information for 1966-67 and 1967-68, and we should like the continuing information for the year 1968-69 and 1969-70. I appreciate that there may have been some confusion with regard to this but if the Minister could supply it, we should be grateful to have this information.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RESOLUTIONS

#### RESOLUTION NO. 4 - SHIFTING OF TAX BURDEN FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):

That this Assembly, mindful of the ever-increasing burden placed on property owners by the steadily-rising cost of education, recommends to the Government of Saskatchewan that it find ways of shifting a significant amount of the tax burden for school purposes from property to taxes more closely related to the ability to pay, in acknowledgement that property taxes should be for property services.

**MR. A. MATSALLA (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, in discussing this all important Resolution, I want first of all, Mr. Speaker, to point out that in our present government financial system we have three bases for taxation, that is per capita, property or wealth, and monetary transactions in income and sales. It is on these bases, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to discuss the substance of the Resolution, with, of course, greater attention drawn to taxation on property and how it would apply to financing of present day school costs.

Since the early years of our province, Mr. Speaker, up until about the '50s when schools were operated on more of a local service basis, individual school districts managed as well as could be expected under the conditions of that day. They operated almost entirely from monies collected from property tax levies. The districts, might I add, experienced extreme financial difficulty. Supplies were kept to the bare minimum and there were times when teachers had to go without salaries for many months.

Since the '50s, Mr. Speaker, through the awareness of our society, our education system improved and became more sophisticated. With the changes came increased costs and with increased costs there came greater demands on property for more tax monies. Today, we find that school taxes in many municipalities have far surpassed the level of municipal taxes.

In the early years, Mr. Speaker, local governments had been given virtually a clear field in the use of the property tax base. In time the potential base gradually shrunk through exemptions for government, religious, charitable and educational institutions. In addition there were encroachments of new taxes such as union hospitals, drainage, snow removal and others. Property was becoming overloaded with tax levies. Today it is

**April 6, 1971**

very definitely recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the burden of school taxes on property is too great. Steps have to be taken to shift the taxes from property into a new and broader financial base. I should like to make reference to three articles in the Leader-Post. The first article of March 25th, 1971 headlined "Change in financial education is suggested." The Secretary Manager of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities speaking to the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association has this to say and I quote:

Our proposal is not a proposal to increase taxes, it is a method of placing the burden where it rightfully belongs.

Another article of the Leader-Post, September 13, 1970. The headline reads "SUMA brief calls for taxation base change for education." Now in submitting a ten-page brief to the Cabinet, the Association had indicated and I quote from the article:

The Association reiterated its position of previous years that the school property tax levy should not exceed 20 mills on the equalized property assessment.

Another article in the Leader-Post of March 27th, 1971 with the headline "Broader tax base needed." I quote from the article:

The necessity for increased education services and the extension of existing services in the years ahead requires a broadening of the tax base for education, George Slater, President of the Saskatchewan School Trustees said Friday.

Now to further my argument, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that property can only produce money through its earnings or sale of productivity, and earnings or sale of productivity could and does fluctuate. If the earnings, say of an apartment block or business decrease, the ability to pay on the assessed property tax levy decreases simultaneously. Or if production of farm property falls, or if the market for farm products is low, there would be a direct effect on farm revenues and hence reduce the farmer's ability to pay the required school taxes. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it is unfair to demand a fixed amount of taxes from property that periodically doesn't produce. It is therefore unfair to burden property with taxes without regard to ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, besides property tax being regressive it falls more extensively on lower income groups, or income groups who own a modest home and receive an annual income of under \$6,000 from wages or business. The people in this income group make up the greatest number of our society. It would be their property which would be assessed a greater percentage of the tax and it would be they who pay the greater portion of the school property taxes. This, Mr. Speaker, is not equitable taxation and cannot be fair.

Equity in property school tax is being questioned more and

more by people who are retired and people with no children. The contention is, why should we pay school taxes when we do not use school facilities. There is criticism that the school tax load is unevenly distributed between the rich and the poor areas. Properties in industrial and in good farm land areas normally produce good revenues as compared to residential and less productive farm areas. Obviously the criticism is a valid one, and particularly so today, when education is no longer considered to be a service of direct local benefit. The criticism is a valid one because today society believes that education is no longer a right but a privilege and as such its opportunity should be equal.

To be fair, Mr. Speaker, it must not be overlooked that the property tax base in spite of its inequities has administrative and local advantages. Tax revenues from property are more stable than other revenues, the tax is easily identified and less changeable in value. However, during severe depression such as we had in the Thirties, and the Liberal depression of today, revenues would drop sharply and remain at a low level for several years until the economy picks up. Barring any drop in the economy, budgeting for property tax revenues could be quite accurate. Once the requirements for fund is budgeted school boards are assured of the tax money they expect to receive. Another perhaps significant point, Mr. Speaker, is that the rate for tax revenue is set by local school boards. This in itself, if respected, normally places financial control and responsibility in the hands of local people. On this point I want to say that it is questionable whether today school boards in actual fact do have the financial control of and responsibility for local education services.

Mr. Speaker, ever since this Liberal Government took office in 1964, local control and responsibility has gradually been removed and eroded by this Government. There has been interference and harassment by the Government in administrative and financial procedures. Due to inadequate grants school boards found themselves in financial difficulty. Now with this as a lever this Provincial Government entered into the local arena in a dictatorial fashion and arbitrarily attached various conditions to payment of grant assistance. These include such things as budget review, teacher-pupil ratios, area bargaining and others. Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel and I am sure I can speak for my colleagues that even though a Provincial Government could provide for the payment of the greater portion of education costs, local school boards could continue to hold responsibility. Their responsibility would continue to be to provide adequate education facilities and exercise diligent control over finances. I feel that there is no need for Provincial Governments to exercise financial control over school boards unless in cases of misuse and mismanagement. We in the New Democratic Party believe that if local school government is to play a useful role in our education system and have strength it must share in responsibilities to a greater extent than it does today. But this Government through its interference in the affairs of local school government has weakened the position of

**April 6, 1971**

school boards making them puppets of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whatever defence may be made for property tax as a means of financing school costs, it is far outweighed by the disadvantages I pointed out earlier. The fact is that property tax has been playing a lesser role in the financing of schools. Over the years as education costs rose senior governments have been increasing their support toward education, however, very slowly. Today, Mr. Speaker, the property taxpayer finds himself burdened with the highest school taxes ever. It is true that Government assistance towards education increased but the increase in grants was not sufficient enough to hold school mill rates down to a reasonable level. With the high school tax level plus tax increases to cover municipal and other local services the property base is no longer able to reasonably produce the demand of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, let us for a moment, look at property school taxes from the point of view of equity. To discuss equity we should have in mind the two basic theories related to the field of taxation: that is the ability to pay doctrine which I have made reference to and discussed earlier, and the benefit theory. From the danger of repeating myself, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to say that from the point of view of benefit I feel confident that the Members of this House will agree with me, that under our present system of education finance there is very little direct benefit that could be associated with local property school taxes.

The benefits derived from education today are more of an indirect nature and somewhat difficult to measure in value on a local basis. Mr. Speaker, we educate our children locally, yet very few of them remain with us nor have they reason to remain with us. They continue their higher and more specialized education and then proceed to establish themselves wherever opportunity presents itself. It could be elsewhere in the province, it could be somewhere in another province, and it could even be in another nation. We must accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that today there is a great movement of people from area to area. This is particularly true of students and people with specialized and technical training. Conclusively, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the theory of benefit, local and direct, does not hold true and cannot be applied to financing education costs through local property taxation. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting is that education costs should be shifted from local property onto another and broader tax base. The limited tax base of property should eventually be exclusively used for the purpose of financing services of a direct and local benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the need and urgency for the tax shift today is greater than ever before. The significant continual and rapid rise in school taxes on local property since 1964, that is since this Liberal Government took office, leaves much to be desired when we speak of tax equity and tax load. Earlier, in this Session, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the glaringly high



tax increases which occurred since 1964, as compared to a fairly stable mill rate prior to 1964 when the CCF were in office. Saskatchewan people today are paying the highest taxes ever - the highest in the history of the province.

Mr. Speaker, as stated in the Resolution before us, we in the New Democratic Party are conscious of and concerned about the ever increasing burden of school taxes on property. We believe that the tax load must be lightened and that every effort should be made to reform the present property tax structure. We maintain the Liberal tax shift on to property which has taken place since 1964 should be reversed. The shift should be made towards a broader provincial tax base. We know, Sir, and I know the people of Saskatchewan know that we cannot depend on this Liberal Government to make the much needed tax shift. We know too, Sir, that this Government cannot be trusted to fulfil its 1964 promise of finding ways of reducing land and property taxes. The Liberals have failed shamefully. Property taxes since 1964 have skyrocketed. We in the New Democratic Party have advocated for some time now that education tax should be removed from property. Mr. Speaker, our new program for progress has a new and a fair property tax deal for Saskatchewan property owners. In its first term of office, Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic government will sharply reduce school tax mill rates on local property. It is our objective in the first term of office to assume 75 per cent of the cost of education. This will be at least 25 per cent greater than is presently assumed by this Liberal Government.

Revenues to replace the property tax will first of all come from elimination of present Government waste and extravagance of public funds used for providing incredible incentives to big industrial corporations, unnecessary Government propaganda publicity, and mismanagement of programs. Mr. Speaker, it is our belief that Saskatchewan resources should be developed for Saskatchewan. On this belief, resource development will be expanded yielding millions of dollars in royalty revenues that presently are going out of the province as profits to foreign corporations. And finally on the basis of the ability to pay principle, our Government expects increased revenues from taxes on higher income and corporation taxes. I ask all Members on both sides of the House to give full support to this all-important Resolution.

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

**HON. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, I find it amusing to hear the Hon. Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) say that if the NDP are elected in the next election they will assume 75 per cent of the burden of school costs. Well, I am going to tell him something, he is just a piker. This generation of NDP Socialists are second raters. You'll never get elected that way, boys. I want to point out what you promised back in 1943 when Tommy Douglas came out of Ottawa to take over the leadership. Tommy

**April 6, 1971**

Douglas promised, 30 years ago, to pay 100 per cent of the cost of education and he got elected. Mind you, he never kept the promise. I shall say one thing about little Tommy Douglas - you fellows have got a big lesson to learn - when he decided to kid the public he didn't fool around, he promised to pay and it is clearly on the record, 100 per cent of the cost. Do you know how he was going to get the money? From the Crown corporations, he was going to go into the shoe business, and into the timber industry, and into the box factory business and start a woollen mill, and he did too. Only instead of making any money, he lost it by the millions and they went broke and pretty soon the party itself went bankrupt and the people put them out of office.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about local property taxes; all property taxes, not just the property taxes for education but the whole picture of local taxes, but I should like to take a look at the record. Just let's take a look at the record. During the 20 years that you Socialists were in office, you can't hide from the record . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You have 1,477 new taxes.

**MR. STEUART:** — I know the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale never likes to talk about the NDP record. I don't blame him, if I had such a lousy record I wouldn't want to talk about it either. He's ashamed of what they did, but I have to do my duty and remind the public every now and then of this terrible record. That's why they are in Opposition and that's why they will stay in Opposition. During the period of time they were in office the taxes on the homes of the poor people, and the old people and the senior citizens, went up not 100 per cent, not 200 per cent, not 300 per cent, but over 400 per cent. So when we became the Government, the people of Saskatchewan were the highest taxed people anywhere in the whole nation.

Let's look at our record, look at some of the things that we have done, not just talk. Socialists love to talk, talk is cheap, but they are no good at acting and not very good at talk either.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Oh, you're good!

**MR. STEUART:** — Yes, I am good, I'm good at talk and I'm good at action. But look at what we've done - I'm an all-around man, I have to admit that.

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

**MR. STEUART:** — The first thing that we put in was the Homeowner Grant. If you want to help the homeowners, the farmers, the people in the villages, the people in those little homes you talk about, the best and most direct way is to give them a homeowner grant

and we did it. I see that Premier Schreyer promised the same thing before the by-election in Manitoba.

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

**MR. STEUART:** — You know what it shows, that if a political party is prepared to stand on a good Liberal platform of honest development, American investment, the Homeowner Grant, all the things that Schreyer promised, he stole our platform, holus-bolus, didn't think of one of his own. He hid the Wafflers out of the way, put those fellows under the table. He said, "Fellows please stay out of sight, back into the woodwork, stay there until the election is over." He promised a good Liberal platform and the people of Manitoba agreed with it and they elected them. I must admit it was a good Liberal platform and he got elected on it. We brought in the Homeowner Grant and we shall give homeowners \$12.8 million this year.

We took the equalization grants for the municipalities from a contemptible, unbelievable \$600,000 and raised them to \$2.75 million. We brought in snow removal grants, we brought in grants for police protection. We increased library grants, we increased health grants. Then we got around to helping the schools. Let me tell you what we did for education. In the best year you Socialists ever had in office, your record year, you know what you gave to schools? \$37 million, that's all. It is hard to believe, I know you will find it is unbelievable. He is so ashamed he is leaving, it gets worse Allan, I don't blame you. In the last two years, just increases - stay Roy you'll learn.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I got to talk to some kids.

**MR. STEUART:** — You may come on this side of the House if you learn the truth.

An increase of \$20 million within the last two years. This year we shall give to school boards of this province, \$81.8 million.

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

**MR. STEUART:** — So, what has happened? Last year all over this great province we found school units, almost all of them, held the line. Many of them reduced taxation and this year almost without exception, the school boards and the school units are finding it possible for the first time, I should say in 20, 30 or 40 years, to reduce the mill rate for education. So don't try to kid the public that we haven't taken real direct, honest and practical steps to help local taxpayers. Later on in this debate, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), who is doing a little research, will bring into the House the actual record of the number of school units and school boards that have been

**April 6, 1971**

able this year, because of our tremendously increased grants, to reduce the mill rate for education. But that is only part of the story.

The NDP like to talk about taking the burden off the property tax for education. They don't like to talk about the total cost of education. When we did something practical about the alarming increasing cost of education, such as reviewing the school board budgets, which the school boards admit is a good thing, they are not unhappy about it. It is working out very well, and they are co-operating with us and we have been able to save the taxpayers of this province millions of dollars. When we talked about increasing the ratio of pupils to teachers, somewhere back close to what it was when we came to power, did the NDP support this? No, they don't. They cry about it, they snipe at it. Why? Because they haven't got the courage to attack the problem in a practical and a sensible manner. Mr. Speaker, not only have we done something about the cost of education, but we have done something practical about the problem of shifting the burden of the cost of education off the back of the property owner on to the general revenue of the province. I can tell the people of this province if we are re-elected this year we shall continue this great program. Since I may have something more to say on this question, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 1 - EARLY AND EFFECTIVE ACTION TO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT**

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

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan early and effective action to fight unemployment, provide jobs and stem an alarming migration of workers and their families from Saskatchewan to other provinces, as well as accompanying heavy losses to the Province's economy, on lines that would include: 1. Publicly financed or assisted public housing, and public assistance for the construction of schools, hospitals, public parks, recreational programs and similar projects. 2. Improvement of labor standards protection, including the minimum wage, to assist the buying power of thousands of people on low incomes. 3. The institution of special methods to aid industrial development and expand technical and vocational training and upgrading.

**MR. D.G. MacLENNAN (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I want to say, first of all, that I am pleased that the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) has seen fit to introduce

this Resolution. The solutions to the unemployment problem proposed in the Resolution are valid and worthwhile. There is just one difficulty, the Hon. Member has pulled a Rip Van Winkle on us and has apparently been asleep while the Government has been taking the very action that he recommends. The Government of Saskatchewan has, of course, been cognizant of the negative impact of unemployment for some time. We readily admit, Mr. Speaker, that economic conditions have been such that unemployment has been a problem right across Canada. However, it must be recognized that in our particular kind of economy characterized by a free market system, a certain amount of job displacement is inevitable. As a matter of fact, the economic council and most economists have expressed the view that an unemployment rate of three per cent or less, in fact, represents a condition of full employment. The effect of an idle supply of labor is nevertheless a cause for concern. One thinks, for example, of losses in output resulting from unemployment. The extra production created by the unemployed if they had been working would have resulted in higher personal incomes and purchasing power and accordingly higher business sale volumes and government revenues. In addition, the financial resources of the country must be tapped to provide the funds necessary to meet the living needs of the unemployed.

For these reasons, the Government determined a long time ago to develop effective methods to alleviate unemployment, to reduce as much as possible the human and social consequences of unemployment, and to lessen its economic costs. In taking action in this connection, the Government has had to consider another important point. Although agriculture is still our largest single industry, the trend to farm mechanization and larger farms is resulting in a continuing decline in our agricultural labor force. At the same time, the election of the present administration has coincided with the entry into the labor force of large numbers of young people. It is apparent, that the Government of Saskatchewan has been successful in finding jobs for people displaced from agriculture, for thousands of young people, and for persons without jobs as a result of the general economic recession.

Let us briefly consider just what the Government has done to implement policies designed to create employment, with particular reference to the points made in the Resolution before us. What about the Public Works construction program? Well, Mr. Speaker, what we have done is to embark upon a special \$18 million crash Public Works program which is creating job opportunities for many Saskatchewan residents who would otherwise have been out of work. The projects, Mr. Speaker, being carried on under this program extend to all sectors of our economy and include the schools, hospitals, public parks, and recreational facilities referred to in the Resolution.

In addition, regular capital spending programs have gone forward and it has been made possible for the Crown corporations and the University to speed up their capital projects.

**April 6, 1971**

With regard to the improvement of labor standards protection including the minimum wage, it is hardly necessary for me to point out that the minimum wage has been increased four times since 1964 and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, it was indicated in the Throne Speech that the minimum wage will be adjusted upward again.

In the case of our labor standards policy generally the Government has consistently demonstrated its concern for the rights of the individual worker and measures to provide additional protection for employees, to whom wages are owing, have been, and will be taken.

In his resolution, the Hon. Member also makes mention of industrial development. I find it somewhat difficult to reconcile this reference with the position taken by the Members opposite in the pulp mill debate of a few days ago. The development of industry and the creation of job opportunities were assigned very high priority when this Government took office in 1964. Since that time we have taken steps to encourage new industries to come to Saskatchewan in increasing numbers. As a result, our previously agriculturally-oriented economy is becoming more and more diversified.

The Resolution also covers the expansion of technical and vocational training. This is a point well taken. In order to keep pace with the current technological revolution and ensure the continued economic development of this province, more and better educational resources are needed to upgrade the qualifications of present and future members of the labor force. Fortunately we in the Government have done more than talk about this problem in nebulous terms. We have acted. Education and training programs and facilities are being expanded and improved continuously. It is easy for a government, any government, to say glibly that it is taking steps to reduce unemployment, but the crunch comes when an attempt is made to assess the effectiveness of government policy in quantitative terms.

Well, the unemployment figures speak for themselves. The Members opposite can trot out all the red herrings in the Atlantic Ocean but they cannot change the fact that Saskatchewan has the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. In mid-February there were in Saskatchewan 6,000 fewer unemployed persons than in January. In February of this year there were 9,000 fewer workers without jobs than in February of last year and that the current unemployment figure is lower than that for the month of February in any one of the last 11 years during which the Opposition was in power. This is not to suggest that the Provincial Government is self-satisfied with the situation. An unemployed person is not impressed by statistics. To him, it is no consolation that he is living in the province with the lowest unemployment rate. For this reason, there is probably no government in Canada that is doing more to further reduce unemployment than the Government of Saskatchewan. This is why in the next fiscal year we are going to spend directly on public works \$15.8 million, representing the largest Public Works

program in the history of Saskatchewan. This is why we are building a new institute of Applied Arts and Sciences in Regina. This is why we are making construction grants available to the university, schools, hospitals and nursing homes. This is why Saskatchewan Crown corporations have planned capital spending programs of over \$57 million. And this is why we are going forward with plans for the Meadow Lake pulp mill and Wollaston Lake uranium mine projects.

All of these measures represent both short and long-term plans on the part of this Government to expand and diversify the Saskatchewan economy for the benefit of all citizens in the province. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that in introducing the Resolution before us, the Hon. Member for Regina North East actually intended to pay tribute to the Government for the efficient manner in which it is going about the business of reducing unemployment.

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

**MR. MacLENNAN:** — However, his phrasing is a little fuzzy and needs to be fixed up. Accordingly, I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) that all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Commends the Government of Saskatchewan for taking early and effective action to fight unemployment and provide jobs by means of the following measures: (1) publicly assisted housing, and public assistance for the construction of schools, hospitals, public parks, recreational programs and similar projects; (2) improvement of labor standards protection, including the minimum wage; (3) the institution of methods to aid industrial development and expand technical and vocational training and upgrading.

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

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, in looking at the amendment commending the Government, there are some questionable points there that require some research and study and I should at this time beg leave to adjourn the debate so I can prepare myself, Sir.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 7 - INDEPENDENT ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION**

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

That this Assembly, recognizing that the most recent

**April 6, 1971**

redistribution of legislative representation is in many cases grossly unfair, recommends to the government immediate establishment of an independent electoral boundaries commission, such commission to present its completed report to the Legislature for implementation before the next provincial general election.

**MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park—University):** — Mr. Speaker, when the NDP . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — How many people in your riding, Jeff?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The Member wishes to speak.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — If you wish to ask a question of me, would you be kind enough to address the Speaker, and ask his permission.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would answer the question? Would the Hon. Member kindly tell this House how many constituencies . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, he asked permission to ask a question . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — In a debate if a Member rises to ask a question it is considered that he may do so but he should wait until the conclusion of the Member's speech who has the floor. I am concluding that the Member from Saskatoon City Park—University is rising to speak to the question. If the Member has a question to ask perhaps he could wait until the Member had made his speech and then he may entertain a question or he may not, as he sees fit.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I don't know if there is any way that you can get this fellow to shut his mouth, but I'm trying.

Mr. Speaker, when the NDP criticize redistribution they are certainly not fooling anyone with their holier-than-thou speeches and declarations. Certainly they don't fool anyone from Saskatoon or Regina. Now let me remind this House of the situation that existed under the NDP when they were the Government. And let me remind the Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) who isn't in his seat, but I shall remind him anyway, when he refers to vicious legislation. Well, first of all the city of Regina under the NDP was divided into four constituencies. This was fine but with complete lack of logic and for political reasons only, the city of Saskatoon which at that time had a population of 110,000 was one constituency with five Members representing this one constituency.



Now let me say to the Members of this House, and including the Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers), that no matter which way you look at the situation which existed at that time, it certainly must be recognized as the most unfair and unjust piece of politics that had ever existed in the history of our province.

If the method of representation which was foisted on Saskatoon had been used in Regina, the NDP would not have been able to elect one Member and this was very clearly proven when Tommy Douglas was defeated hands down when he ran federally in Regina.

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

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — And while the situation in Saskatoon was most ridiculous it was at the same time a very clear demonstration of the ruthless attitude of the NDP government of that time.

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

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — And while the situation in Saskatoon was most ridiculous it was the same time a very clear demonstration of the ruthless attitude of the NDP government of that time.

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

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Imagine one seat with five members and each member expected to represent 110,000 people. Is this what you call regard for people? Well, I think it is a disgrace in our political history. And what was the attitude of this smug hypocritical group in this Legislature when this situation existed and was questioned.

**MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino):** — You were wiped out . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — You were there, Arthur, and you backed this up at that time. Tommy Douglas, with a sarcastic laugh, declared in this House that there are no natural boundaries in Saskatoon.

**MR. THIBAUT:** — On a point of order!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! On a point of order!

**MR. THIBAUT:** — The Member quoted that I was here when we had the redistribution bill and I was not here. I got here in 1959.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I made a mistake.

**April 6, 1971**

However, to get back to Tommy Douglas' attitude, he simply laughed at the Opposition at that time and declared that there are no natural boundaries in Saskatoon. So, I should like to know how ridiculous and how smug can you get? When you people start to talk about us, you'd better think back to those days. And what about the constituency of Hanley about that time?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What did Wilf say?

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Do you want to stand up and make your speech now?

What about the constituency of Hanley the way it existed then? You talk about boundaries - this constituency had a completely ridiculous boundary arrangement. It started with Greystone Heights, it moved over to Sutherland and then it crossed the river to Richmond Heights and then around to Montgomery Place, and then across the river again to Hanley. Well, imagine a complete circle around the city of Saskatoon.

And what was their answer to this when the logic of this arrangement was questioned? Well, there's a fellow that you NDPs don't like to think about or mention in this House and he was Clarence Fines, and it's no wonder you don't want to mention him anymore.

Clarence Fines declared that 'we are the government and we can make any boundary we want.' What a great statement to make to the people of this province.

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

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — And you fellows stand there and try to chastise us, you certainly have a lot of nerve. Now how come the great hypocritical display of sanctimony now, when these were the facts when the NDP was the government?

The Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) continually refers to democracy. Well, let me remind him that in 1964 an NDP member needed only 37 per cent of the popular vote to get elected in Saskatoon. The highest that they received was 38.5 per cent and the result was that the NDP were elected four to one. And what an utter disgrace, when the total vote was NDP 81,168 and the Liberals 77,802. Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland, that this is your idea of democracy because you were here and you stood up for that. What an unheard of political scheme where the NDP could get 81,000 when there were only 43,500 voters. You fellows talk about hypocrisy but believe me you take the cake, now you can eat it.

The NDP claims that the answer is a commission . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Independent!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Well, I think if we look at the Federal-Provincial constituencies, these were designed by a commission. Can you tell me of a commission that isn't independent?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Of what?

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — A commission that isn't independent? Not when you're speaking of this kind of thing. Don't start to talk about a commission in that sort of way. That's nonsense! When you look at the commission job that was done on the Federal-provincial constituencies . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Ward Commission.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — This is fine. Do you mean to tell me that he was biased?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Pardon me?

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — He wasn't biased! Neither was his commission. You wouldn't defame the integrity of that commission in this House, you wouldn't dare, you wouldn't dare! You wouldn't dare question the integrity of that commission.

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

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — No, Sir, you wouldn't. Let's hear you. Let's hear you question them. No way!

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I don't think this debate is being carried on in the normal custom.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Well, these Federal-Provincial constituencies were designed by a commission. I say they were fair and unbiased but certainly they didn't come up with boundaries that were all that great. You just ask the people, ask the members of the constituency north of the river in the Swift Current-Maple Creek constituency. Ask them what they think of the job that the commission did and then ask the people west of the river in the Moose Jaw constituency. So, to say that a commission will come up with all the right answers is nothing short of wishful thinking.

Because of my own direct involvement, I should like to ask that we look at the present redistribution in Saskatoon. And you compare it anyway you want with the NDP arrangement, and any way you want, it certainly has to look good. When our Liberal Government came into office, Saskatoon was divided into five constituencies and now because of the population increase in the

**April 6, 1971**

city one further seat is added. And this has been achieved by splitting the City Park-University constituency, a part of Saskatoon which has had a vigorous growth and an increase in population. We have used, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a natural boundary - something they couldn't find - the South Saskatchewan River. And certainly if Mr. Douglas could not find natural boundaries, we have had no trouble, and let me assure you that the people of Saskatoon are being serviced in a much more equitable manner as a result.

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

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can say sincerely as I do in almost everything that I say when I take part in debate, that I had not intended to enter into it but having been challenged and provoked by that thought-stimulating speech from the Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), I now find myself compelled to enter the debate.

Now, primarily, the burden of the remarks of the Member for City Park University, as I understood them, was something like this: that somewhere back in the political history of Saskatchewan - 1960, 1956, 1964 - I don't know what particular year, he said you fellows were bad fellows and I want to tell you examples of why you're bad fellows. He said you did everything wrong. You gerrymandered the boundaries and now you have no right to say that you as a political party, have no right to say that you oppose the gerrymander put in by the Liberal Party in the 1969 session.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, the implication clearly by the Member from City Park University, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that because a government may or may not have done something with respect to redistribution, it now has no right or it ought not now complain with respect to the activities of this Government. I challenge that statement as being a misrepresentation of our role taken by the Members opposite.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — You are not telling the truth!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I can tell the Hon. Member from City Park University, that I have taken some time in examining gerrymanders and the redistributions carried out by our former governments and your government, and there has never been as blatant a gerrymander ever in the history of Saskatchewan as the one that was passed last year.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — There has never been a gerrymander that has been so attacked on a wholesale basis, Mr. Member from City Park-University, as the gerrymander that was introduced by the Liberal Party last year. It's attacked not only by the Members of the New Democratic Party, it's attacked by the responsible press. It's attacked by the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post. It's attacked by farmers' groups. It's attacked by almost every responsible association in the Province of Saskatchewan.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I can tell the Hon. Member from City Park-University that it may have been better to have had five individual constituencies in 1964 but that sin is little as compared to the sin of having now six individual constituencies in Saskatoon on the basis of the redistribution, the way you've set it up. Let me just remind the Member from City Park-University how this gerrymander by the Liberals is going to affect the people of Saskatoon.

In my riding - thanks to the gerrymander - I'll be representing now something over 17,000 voters. My colleague from Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) will be representing 17,000 voters. But do you think the Liberals will be representing 17,000 voters?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** No, no!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Do you think the future MLA from Saskatoon City Park will be representing 10,000 voters? Do you think the future MLA for City Park will be representing even 7,000 voters?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** No!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The future Member of City Park will be representing no more than 5,500 voters, thanks to the gerrymander of the Liberal Government opposite.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to tell the Hon. Member from City Park-University that on the basis of that gerrymander, there will have to be three times as many people voting in Riversdale to elect an MLA in Riversdale as the number of people that put in an MLA from City Park. Is that fair? Is that an equitable situation with respect to redistribution?

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — That's because of the natural boundaries!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, the natural boundaries!

**April 6, 1971**

Well, now, the Hon. Member from City Park-University says the natural boundaries. Well, I can tell this Hon. Member about natural boundaries. My constituency borders 22nd Street down south to what one would think would be a natural boundary. In fact, everybody in Saskatoon, by and large, concedes that a natural boundary is the river. There is no reason for Saskatoon Riversdale to skip the river and go into the Nutana side as it does. That's what the Liberals did before the 1967 election. Then they did it again in 1969. They took away from the Member for Nutana South, all of the bad NDP polls that he had in his riding, and they put them into mine. They took away from the Member of Saskatoon Centre, all the bad NDP voters and put them into mine. They put all that onto the east side, skipping the natural boundaries of the riding so that they could guarantee the re-election of the Member for Nutana Centre and Nutana South.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That's the only way that they could do. The only way that they think they can get those two Members back in there is to lump them all in so that I represent three and one-half times as many voters as any one of the Liberal Members on the opposite side and I ask you whether that's fair?

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, the Member from University is defending the gerrymander bill. Well, the Member from City Park . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I'm tired of being called the Junior Member!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — No, I'm not calling you the Junior Member but if you keep making speeches like that, I might have to revert back to calling you the Junior Member. Now, I'm going to treat this as an oversight, Mr. Member for City Park-University, and not call you the Junior Member.

But, I want to tell this House and the people of Saskatoon, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I can well appreciate why the Member from University likes this gerrymander bill. Can well appreciate why Mr. Charlebois, the Member from City Park-University gets up in this House and defends the Bill. Because his Liberal counterparts fixed it up in such a way so that it wouldn't be too tough on him either. Do you think the Member from City Park-University has to represent 18,000 voters?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** No!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Does the Hon. Member from City Park-University have to represent 12,000 voters?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** No!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Hon. Member from City Park—University will be lucky if he represents slightly over 10,000 voters compared to 18,000 in Mayfair and in Riversdale.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — . . . 13,000 voters!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The fact of the matter is . . .

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — 13,000!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, the Hon. Member says 13,000. I don't buy that figure. I say it's slightly over 10,000 but even taking his figures of 13,000, where's the fairness in terms of city seats when there is absolutely no difference in terms of the number of votes that a Riversdale voter should have, the strength of his vote. What is the difference for the 18,000 people that I represent compared to the 13,000 you represent? Absolutely no difference whatsoever. And I know that the Member from University, or the constituency where he has been nominated in, would have the people of Saskatchewan believe that this is a good gerrymander bill because, like the Member from Nutana South and the Member from Nutana Centre, these Members need this gerrymander bill to get back in. These Members can't get back in otherwise, they think.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Do you remember . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, I have a bit of a surprise for you come the next election - you're going to be defeated in that election, as well as everyone of you on the opposite side.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I support all New Democratic Party candidates and Mr. Richards is a New Democratic Party candidate and I'll be supporting him.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that my colleague from Saskatoon City Park-University said something about the federal boundaries commission. He asked whether we should quarrel with the federal boundaries commission. He said, why the redistributions made out by the Ward Commission on the boundaries are being challenged all over the place. They may be. I haven't heard of challenges since the redistribution was carried out federally but I want to tell the Member and the people in this House that if there is a dispute on the federal boundaries commission, it has to do with the boundaries because they may

**April 6, 1971**

quarrel with some aspects in terms of the lines being drawn. That's far different from the type of dispute that the people of Saskatchewan are having with the boundaries commission drawn by the Government of Saskatchewan and the Liberals opposite, because our dispute is based on the fact that, apart from maybe drawing out certain general areas that are not proper, you people opposite have based your boundaries entirely on political motivation and that can't be said about the Ward Commission.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to add one other word to this matter. I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that I think this redistribution was the most blatantly unfair redistribution for Saskatoon and Saskatchewan that the people of this province have ever witnessed. I'm not going to recite the figures that the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) has recited. I want to tell the Members here that a man who has had some experience on gerrymandering says that it is also the worst gerrymander that he has ever witnessed.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who was that?

**MR. ROMANOW:** — A member of the Liberal Party, a member who sat as a Cabinet Minister opposite, Mr. Wilf Gardiner.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Wilf Gardiner is an expert on gerrymanders and redistribution because he is a member of the Liberal Party but even this last gerrymander turned his stomach and he said that it was unfair.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Even Mr. Gardiner said that this was an unusually unfair gerrymander that the Liberals perpetrated. Mr. Gardiner was asked a question on the radio broadcast a few days ago. The question was a fair, straightforward one on redistribution of constituency boundaries. The question was: "What do you think, Mr. Gardiner, of the redistribution of constituency boundaries last year?" And it goes on to say this, the answer: "I think I would be unfair to say that I don't think that they ever did as good a hatchet job of boundaries as the present Liberal Government in this distribution."

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Now, Mr. Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) when I say this gerrymander is a 'hatchet job'



I use the words of an eminent authority in the Liberal Party. When I say that it is a hatchet job, I'm using the words of a man who knows all about hatchet jobs in the Liberal Party - Mr. Gardiner. And he goes on to say this:

I know there are people within Mr. Thatcher's Cabinet and also Members in the Legislature who oppose the type of redistribution that was carried out.

I wonder if the Hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), a man who is a fair-minded Attorney General, opposed this redistribution and gerrymander Bill. I'm sure he did but was silenced by the Premier. I wonder if the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) who is not in his seat, a man who from time to time bolts his party ranks, I wonder if he opposed the redistribution and gerrymander Bill by the Liberals. I'm sure he did but again the Party whip was on. But I do know that the Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) didn't get up to oppose the gerrymander Bill. I also know that the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) didn't get up to oppose the gerrymander Bill. Because these Members want to live politically and they put politics ahead of democracy and principles of decency.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — So Mr. Gardiner says, "I could not agree with the redistribution of boundaries that was carried out last year." Then he went on to say this:

However, I think I would be prepared to admit that the redistribution of last year was unusually unfair.

That is saying it mildly, I must say - Mr. Gardiner saying it was unusually unfair.

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, the reason why the Bill's redistribution is so unfair is because the Government knows that in a fair election fight, it will be defeated. The Government knows that the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan object to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) has not taken one step to protect them against the evils of the Federal Task Force on Agriculture, and the basis of Liberal farm policy and they would defeat them on a redistribution Bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! On a point of order.

**MR. MacDOUGALL:** — What's this particular point got to do with this debate? He is ranging all over the lot once again as usual. I ask you to have him stay in line.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I ask Members to read the

**April 6, 1971**

the Resolution and stay on the subject.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Liberal Members opposite know, Mr. Speaker, that if they had a fair redistribution boundaries commission that would set up constituencies fairly where there was representation by population, they know that on a fair redistribution Bill they would be defeated for a whole variety of issues - the Task Force, the pulp mill, the labor courts Bill that they are trying to argue about. They would in fact be wiped out.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — They know, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democratic Party star is on the rise throughout all the Prairie Provinces.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — The Member for Athabasca, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy) knows all too well what I mean. Because the two by-elections yesterday and the victory of Ed. Schreyer in the New Democratic Party proved just that point.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to tell the Members of the House that in Manitoba they do have an Independent Boundaries Commission. In Manitoba they have an Independent Boundaries Commission of the type that is called for by the Resolution of my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) and when the Independent Boundaries Commission is applied like it is in Manitoba the result will be a wipe-out of the Liberal Party opposite.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to tell you just what I mean about a wipe-out, Mr. Speaker. Do you know that in the Province of Manitoba the Manitoba Elections Act defines a political party, in order to get the status of being a political party, as a party that has at least four MLAs in the Manitoba Legislature. By that definition the Manitoba Liberals are no longer a party in that province because they only have three.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if there was a fair independent boundaries commission setting the boundaries for this province, just like their counterparts in Manitoba and throughout the Dominion of Canada, the Liberals opposite would be wiped out.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Wiped out as they were in

the two by-election victories of yesterday.

**MR. CAMERON:** — That's a great way to console yourself.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), Mr. Speaker, says it is a great way to console myself. I don't console myself. I'm confident that even with an unfair gerrymander we are going to beat you and if you don't think that I am right I should ask the senior Member of the Government, one of the true Liberals according to Mr. Wilf Gardiner, to persuade the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan to call an election right away so that the people of Saskatchewan can determine this issue.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — But the Minister of Mineral Resources is a very astute politician. He is shredded. He is wise. He is experienced and he knows that to counsel the Premier to call an election right now, especially after Manitoba, would mean the most humiliating defeat since 1944 of the Liberal Party opposite.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — So the Hon. Member (Mr. Cameron) says we ought to console ourselves.

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

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well the Hon. Members opposite say that the issues of the day in this province are such that they will not get re-elected on this matter or on labor courts. I say that the Government opposite will be defeated, for labor courts as one reason, but among all of the other sins of the Government, such as the Task Force, and the pulp mill fiasco and all the other things I've talked of . . .

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — Mr. Speaker, we've already made one request and we are giving him a reasonable opportunity but I really don't think that labor courts in Manitoba and so forth have very much to do with the subject we are talking about.

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

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — Mr. Speaker, could I speak on a point of order?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) on a point of order.

**April 6, 1971**

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — I think it is well recognized, Mr. Speaker, that the only avenue of acceptance or rejection of the Government is through voting and in order to keep that avenue of representation of the people of Saskatchewan we must have constituency boundaries that take into account the population of the areas. Those areas must be as evenly balanced as possible. I think the Member is quite within his rights to show that the people have lost their right to protest just by the way the boundaries have been juggled. I think the Member is quite in order to say that the people can't protest the agricultural policy, at least the chance of protesting it is limited severely because of this gerrymander.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think it is about time I read the Resolution:

That this Assembly, recognizing that the most recent redistribution of legislative representation is in many cases grossly unfair, recommends to the government immediate establishment of an independent electoral boundaries commission, such commission to present its completed report to the Legislature for implementation before the next provincial general election.

I think that the House had better consider the time lag implied in regard to this debate. In that regard what the mover is asking for or rather, what the motion is asking for, is an independent electoral boundaries commission to sit to consider and to report before the next Provincial election. I ask Members to relate their words to the motion. I think the debate has strayed rather wide afield and perhaps we can get on the motion, which is the establishment of an independent electoral boundaries commission which will report before the next Provincial election.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you for your ruling. I conclude my remarks by saying that there is a need for such a commission as set out in the Resolution. There is a need because the average Liberal MLA on the basis of the gerrymander will represent about 7,700 people, and the average New Democrat on the basis of the gerrymander will represent about 12,200 people. That is a gross inequity and unfair. It offends our sense of fair play and it offends democracy and the principles of democracy in the Province of Saskatchewan. Any Member opposite who votes against this Resolution is not only betraying the interests of his own constituency but is betraying, in my view, the higher ideals that this Legislature stands for.

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

**MR. W. A. FORSYTH (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to enter this debate because really I get infuriated when I think of these people being so holier-than-thou across the way now. I remember very well going into the Hanley by-election trying to do a little work in the Hanley by-election . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) on a point of order.

**MR. BYERS:** — How is the Hanley by-election related to the request here for an independent commission?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The Member has asked whether the Hanley by-election has anything to do with the motion before the House. The actual by-election, the actual by-election itself, that is a physical fact that by-elections don't have any bearing on the debate, but the fact that there must have been boundaries in the constituency of Hanley in which the by-election was conducted, would, I think, be relevant and pertinent.

**MR. FORSYTH:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it was those very boundaries that infuriated me so much that I really wasn't going to take part in this debate. When I started in Sutherland and felt I almost had to have water wings, I went over to Richmond Park, which is across the river, and found a great natural boundary there, Mr. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). It was a back lane that we could hardly even find on a map of the city. It was a back lane that divided Hanley from this monstrous constituency represented by five Members in Saskatoon. So we trudged down the back lane; we lost our way a couple of times in mud puddles and wandered around there and ended up in Montgomery Place, which is about as far away as you can get from Sutherland in the city of Saskatoon. This is still part of the constituency of Hanley. Then we cross the river and get back into Hanley again. That's a great example of how to set out boundaries. This is the example that was set by the people across the way who were the government at that time. I just wanted to correct a couple of figures that the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has used.

Mr. Member for Riversdale, at the time of the last election I heard no complaints from you at all but you did have the smallest number of voters of any constituency in the city of Saskatoon. At the present time you are using conjecture rather than any enumeration but when you get up to 17,000 I should be very, very surprised if you are within the bounds of truth when you come to look at the figures that will come out of the enumeration. When you speak of my constituency being made smaller you obviously haven't looked around the town lately and seen the

**April 6, 1971**

tremendous number of apartment buildings that have been built on Louise Avenue, the large apartment buildings on McKeon Avenue, and the whole area of the Nutana South constituency that was not developed at the time of the last election. I expect the number of voters that I have this time will be greater than the number I had last time. So let's not have any of this nonsense about you having the mammoth constituency that you claim. The figures will not be very close to anything that you have mentioned.

I have other things that I think possibly should be brought to the attention of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and I should ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 9 - ABOLISHMENT OF DETERRENT FEES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): —

That this Assembly calls upon the Government to immediately abolish hospital and medical care deterrent fees, because deterrent fees place an unfair burden on many citizens requiring health care, especially those least able to pay.

**MR. R. HEGGIE (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Resolution 9 relevant to the one originally moved by Mr. Smishek.

Now there is nothing like actual experience in dealing with hospital bills and deterrent fees to know whereof you speak and what actually the costs are and what it does cost people when they have been confined to hospital.

Firstly, this Government had the courage in the 1968 session to implement utilization and deterrent fees at the expense of some political unpopularity. It had to be done; it was done; and it should have been done by the then CCF Government when the plan was first instituted. I said before in this House that if the CCF at that time had had the moral fortitude to implement some type of utilization fee or co-insurance in the first days of the hospital and medical plans, the cost of health services in the province would be a good deal less today. How easy it would have been to have sold the public of that day on the idea of being saved from catastrophic medical bills, wherein the Government paid the larger share and the patient made a contribution towards the cost.

There has been much said, and it has been said in this present Session, that deterrent fees are a tax on the sick. I just underwent extensive orthopaedic surgery and I think I can talk from personal experience. Twelve days in the St. Paul's Hospital cost the Government, on my account, \$50 per day for a total of \$600. The University Hospital would have cost the

Government \$70 per day or \$840. The Specialist's bill was \$352 and I was surprised that it was so modest considering the massive surgery that he performed. So the Province of Saskatchewan through its medical plan, paid out about \$1,000 on my behalf. Now, do you want to know my total contribution to this hospital bill? \$36. I was wheeled out of St. Paul's Hospital having given the medical plan of the Province of Saskatchewan \$36 as my personal contribution.

The Members opposite ridiculed the statement of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) when he said that a patient ought to participate to some degree in his recovery. Through personal experience I find that I was glad to participate. All I was interested in was that I got the highest degree of care and to St. Paul's Hospital goes my highest commendation and to the most skilful doctors available who were performing the operation.

Now if you want to carry this arithmetic a step further, it's well known to this House that there is a ceiling of \$180 on the amount of utilization and deterrent fees to be paid by any one family in one year. It works out to a computation like this: 30 days at \$2.50 a day for \$75, 60 days at \$1.50 a day for \$90, and a further 10 days at \$1.50 a day for \$15, for a total of \$180 and that's the most I personally could have paid if I had been held in the hospital for 100 days.

Now what would the cost have been to the Government? In addition to the \$600 already stated there would have been 18 more days at \$50 a day for \$900; 60 days at \$50 a day for \$3,000; a further \$10 a day at \$50 a day for \$500; total \$4,400 and together with the initial \$600 - \$5,000 could have been paid on my behalf to the hospital and my participation would have been \$180.

Now I ask in all common sense and for all classes of people, who are interested in their recovery, do they want to participate, do they want to co-operate with the medical people and the doctors. Is that asking too much? If in my case, I paid \$36 to \$1,000 by the Government or at the maximum for a year - \$180 to \$5,000 by the Government. On those figures I feel that there is very little complaint on the part of the average family which has the misfortune to have to make use of a hospital. After all, hospital plans are known to save the individual or a family from catastrophic hospital costs; that is why we have these schemes. I am quite certain, as I stand here in this House, that most of us on both sides of the House are glad and proud that we have such a hospital scheme operating and if the individual or the family is called upon to make a very modest contribution towards the cost he is glad to do so for the maintenance of these hospital schemes.

This has been on my mind ever since I have had this personal experience and I told the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that I would support him either in Committee or in discussion of the Estimates in respect to deterrent fees. They are criticized out of all proportion when they say they are a tax on the sick

**April 6, 1971**

and that is some way it is a sin to participate in your own recovery. From personal experience and for the amount of money expended in the modest amounts which any family would have to undertake, there is just no way that this can be criticized in the manner that it has been and subject to the ridicule that has been given by the other side of the House.

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

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add just a few comments at this time in support of this very important Resolution.

It was just some three years ago, I believe, I think it was the session of 1968, in which a Bill was introduced in this House which I think we all remember. It was perhaps the highlight of that session but it was one of the darkest moments ever witnessed in the history of our Saskatchewan Legislature.

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

**MR. PEPPER:** — That was the presentation of a Bill introducing deterrent fees, an added tax, Mr. Speaker, on the sick and on the unfortunate people of our province.

This introduction of deterrent fees was looked upon by many citizens of Saskatchewan as a backward step in the promotion of good health. And it could, and has, only led to greater confusion, frustration and an added tax on those requiring medical treatment. I think what is most important of all, it is on those least able to pay in many cases.

I well remember at that time taking part in the debate, at which time I tabled letters and petitions signed by hundreds of our constituents in Weyburn, asking that this Government to your right, Mr. Speaker, should reconsider its stand and not to implement this added tax on our people, because by doing so it deters many of them from securing necessary health care at an early stage of their sickness. Particularly the aged, the pensioners, who are struggling each day to make their meagre allowance cover their expenses.

These people, Mr. Speaker, know that they are going to be taxed extra if they have to enter the hospital or seek medical advice. And in many cases they postpone it until it is very often too late. To me, this is not an advance in our health programming, nor is it fair to those people who have given time and energy and who have sacrificed in unlimited measure, their lives and their resources that you and I might be privileged to benefit from their great contribution.

In this Resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Government once more to reconsider their stand. Very seldom when a mistake is made are you given more than one chance to rectify it, before a final judgment is handed down.



Mr. Speaker, this Government has been approached each year since 1968 to reconsider the abolishing of deterrent fees that they imposed. And this is another, and perhaps a final chance, that they are given to reconsider and to act before another election.

This request, I am sure, will be endorsed by not only the Opposition Members on this side of the House, but it will be by people of all political parties, as was proven by names and petitions which have been tabled in this Chamber on past occasions. Many people have stated that they would consider having less money budgeted in other areas of government if our health program could only abolish deterrent fees. So I ask the Government sitting to your right once more to reconsider its values and its priorities and to make way for all of our citizens to secure and maintain happiness in life. They can do this by abolishing deterrent fees on the sick and let all of us share in equal proportion the cost of health care. And might I add that those who never need to be hospitalized or have medical care are the most fortunate. It is a cheap and beneficial insurance to all.

In 1968 the argument for the imposition of deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker, was that our system was being abused and many were being hospitalized who should not have been, and could be just as well cared for in other areas or other types of nursing homes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I invite you to look at our waiting lists today. Our waiting lists today to get into hospital are just as long as they were in the past. I cannot see any change because of deterrent fees being implemented. You still have to be admitted by a doctor and you are discharged by a doctor. So if there ever was any abuse, I certainly cannot see the patient as the guilty one, Mr. Speaker. Our doctors and our nurses when given the proper facilities to work with are doing a very commendable job. I believe that it is our duty to see that these buildings and the facilities are adequate and meet the needs required.

In this area we need further expansion. But while this expansion is being provided let us not forget that we have an obligation to look after our citizens. And when they require health care then every effort must be made to provide it for them. Saskatchewan once led the way by providing the most complete comprehensive hospitalization and medicare programs in North America.

Our people will settle for no less and are waiting for an opportunity to prove to the Government that they mean business. I can only say if the by-election in Kelvington was not sufficient warning to the Government as to their desires, I am sure that a general election will provide ample opportunity for the people to spell it out in a most decisive manner.

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

**April 6, 1971**

**MR. PEPPER:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, it may be argued that utilization fees are not a large amount of money for an individual to pay. But this certainly depends on the circumstances of that individual. In the case of many of our senior citizens, who are living and depending on their pension cheques, these people just cannot afford any added expense, any added expense that might be incurred by them by becoming ill, therefore requiring medical attention. And perhaps more important than this, as I have mentioned earlier and I think that we must never forget, that these same citizens often postpone medical checkups until it is too late in many cases, definitely because of the deterrent fee charges which means added expense which they cannot afford.

The same thing happens to the low wage earner where there is not sufficient money available to cover any added expense that might arise for medical checkups for his family, because through these checkups he finds the necessity of having hospital care and quite often surgery. It is to these two classes of citizens in particular, Mr. Speaker, our senior citizens and those low wage earners that I feel deterrent fees are very detrimental to securing good health. So I urge the Members opposite to support this Resolution, if for no other reason, than on the principle involved. A strong nation is a healthy nation, Mr. Speaker. By abolishing deterrent fees we return to our people a better opportunity to secure both health and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion and urge all Members to do likewise.

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

**MR. W. McIVOR (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, the Member from Weyburn has given forth once again one of his great Socialist theories. Not just the poor and the aged get sick. Young and wealthy people also have illness. No one who can't afford to pay has been turned away. However, if he knows of such a case, let him come forward with the parties involved.

Mr. Speaker, I spent several years on the RM Council and was able to see the benefits of having a utilization fee placed on the doctors' calls. Being at the local level of administration we saw many cases of abuse.

As I have more to say at a later date on this debate, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

## **RESOLUTION NO. 5 - PRAIRIE GRAIN CASH RECEIPTS STABILIZATION PROGRAM**

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

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the proposed Prairie Grains Cash Receipts Stabilization Program does not provide Saskatchewan farmers with a minimum acceptable net income that would have continuing relation to cost of production; And that this Assembly favours a program, based on a minimum guarantee of net income, that is flexible enough to provide for sound land practices and that gives incentive to the Federal Government to reduce costs of farm inputs for Western grain producers.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Leith:

That all the words after the word "Program in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Will assist farmers in adjusting to changing farm conditions and will provide a degree of stability in years of low production and limited markets; and particularly that the 100 million dollars payment to farmers, expected this spring, will be welcomed by the agricultural community at this time.

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, the previous speakers, the Opposition speakers, at least, have said a great deal in this debate about farm income. The Government is perfectly aware of and deplores more than anyone else, the sharp drop in farm income that occurred in 1969 and again in 1970. However, I suggest that to imply that this is due in any way to the action of this Government, or to imply that no attempt has been made to meet it, is very far from the facts.

If we are to be held responsible for the recent decline in farm income, perhaps we could be given credit for the remarkable increase in farm cash income that occurred in 1964 and the years following. And for the first time in the history of Saskatchewan, farm cash income exceeded \$800 million in 1964. In fact, in the five years 1964 to 1968 inclusive, the average farm cash income was \$910 million. The average for the five years preceding 1964 which were conveniently forgotten by the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), was not \$910 million but was \$635 million. And so, truly, Mr. Speaker, 1964 was a year that ushered in better things for the economy of the province.

However, farm income has dropped seriously in the last two years. Our estimates are that it was \$722 million in 1969 and \$725 million in 1970. Now the three years before that, 1966, 1967 and 1968 were the three years with the highest farm cash income in the history of Saskatchewan. Our income in 1969 and

**April 6, 1971**

1970 shows a 23 per cent decline from the average of those three years. But we have had even more difficult years before that. What about the years 1954 and 1955, if you are going to make comparisons? They also followed three good years, 1951, 1952 and 1953. Now the average cash income in those three previous good years, was \$689 million, substantially less than the last two which brought us in \$722 million and \$725 million that the Members opposite are complaining about.

So the average income in 1954 and 1955 was \$451 million, not \$725 and a long way from the \$910 million, a drop of \$238 million or 35 per cent. Now what was done by a Socialist government to relieve the income situation in those disastrous years? Absolutely nothing. In fact while we deplore and have done what we could to relieve the present income situation it is perhaps worth mentioning that in only one year in the history of the NDP did farm cash income exceed that of either 1969 or 1970. And that was away back in 1953. Only once did they ever exceed our two worst years.

The average cash receipts for farms were \$6,553 as compared to \$8,419 in 1969, a difference of roughly \$2,000 per farmer in this province. Now we have heard a great deal of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, about the decline in farm numbers in Saskatchewan. And again it is only necessary to make a brief reference to the records. The 1941 census showed that there were 138,713 farms in Saskatchewan. Twenty five years later, the years under the NDP and in 1966 the figure had dropped to 85,686. That is about 53,000 less farms in the 25 years, an average of more than 2,000 farmers per year for the whole period. A period of 25 years, 20 of them under the government of the Opposition.

What was done to arrest the fantastic exodus of our farm families. This was the period of the wholesale slaughter of the farms as far as the history of Saskatchewan was concerned. The NDP in those days, and you recall them, Mr. Speaker, you used to sit on the other side of the House, we reminded them every day during the sessions and we pointed out year after year, and day after day, that the NDP tried to get rid of the farm problems in the province in those days, by getting rid of the farmers. And they did just that.

Well, what else did they do? They set up The Royal Commission on Agriculture. This was appointed and it was brought in a report about five years and hundreds of thousands of dollars later. But there was not a single positive step to halt the decline in the farm numbers of our province. Of course, the fact is, that with today's machinery a farm family can handle 1,500 cultivated acres as readily today as they could manage 600 or 700 acres a few years ago. These farm families will naturally strive to reach their most efficient size of unit and will probably make more progress towards it in good times than in bad times.

Now we recognize that this is a trend, that this Government

has taken positive steps to arrest that trend by encouraging the expansion of secondary or livestock enterprises as a means of expanding the farm business, instead of adding extra acreage.

This approach has been emphasized through the Extension and Farm Management programs. We have offered cash grants to encourage the building of modern hog barns that are ridiculed and discounted every day by Members opposite. We have offered guarantees on bank loans for the purchase of breeding stock. Something that was never heard of in the days of the Socialists. We have greatly expanded the community pasture programs to give the small farmer a chance to expand without having to buy extra land. We introduced a point system in land allocation to be sure that the smaller farmer got this consideration.

These are just a few, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite have suggested that we have done little to assist agriculture. Well, let me review the record just briefly. Here are some of the things that we have done since 1964. They talk about the Government guaranteeing loans to big industries coming in to the province and say that this has never been done for the farmer. But let me point out to them, it was never done for the farmer under the Socialists. But it was given to the farming sectors of our province long before it was given to the industries since 1964. Let's start out. Farm water and sewage grants paid - \$2,289,000; fodder storage shelter grants paid. Instead of having the farmers go to Manitoba and Alberta and all the taxpayers paying for the movement of fodder, in years when we should have had it in the province, programs were set up where they got 15 per cent of the cost of the shelter - \$106,000 there, never heard of under the Socialists. Swine barn grants paid - \$1,500,000.

**MR. DEWHURST:** — Whom are you kidding?

**MR. McFARLANE:** — Whom am I kidding? You have objected to that program ever since it came into effect, too. South Saskatchewan Irrigation Construction. Not one penny from the Socialists, but \$14 million in that item alone. Potato storage and machinery for the farmers that were getting into diversification at Outlook - \$300,000 there. Government share of the Veterinary Laboratory here in the city of Regina - \$350,000. Government share of the Soil Testing Laboratory, Saskatoon - \$90,000. Community pastures, when you left the Government in 1964, you had about 30, today there are over 50 operating pastures. One item alone to help the farmers of this province - \$8 million. Assistance to community grazing and fodder projects - another \$500,000. Clearing grants to small farms. We don't hear you complain about that now, you complained last year because it was done away with - \$562,000. Grants for seeding sub-marginal land to grass - \$676,000, not one penny from the NDP. Guaranteed loans for livestock, not one penny from the Socialists, over \$29 million as of this date. Grants to borrowers under this program in subsidizing of interest - \$133,000. You never even had a program to resemble it in the 20 years you were in power.

**April 6, 1971**

Grants for sewer and water for hamlets and villages, to maintain the farm service centres in this province. You had maybe four villages and not one hamlet. Today we have given these people \$2,857,000. Those, Mr. Speaker, are just a few of the items that add up to over \$60 million of direct assistance to the agriculture industry of our province.

Now I could go on and list many more millions of dollars spent in expanding programs of flood control, small irrigation projects, irrigated fodder projects, the crop insurance program expanded five or six times what it was when we took office in 1964. Increased grants to veterinary service districts. Veterinarian inspection of small abattoirs, unheard of under the NDP. Expanded extension services and so on in our extension department.

Now this Resolution as it stands before the amendment, obviously had in mind the mathematicians dream, more Socialist arithmetic that was put forward by the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture as an alternative to the Federal proposal. I am well acquainted with it because I sat down there in Ottawa and listened to him expound all these Socialist theories.

I should like to . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . St. Vital?

**MR. McFARLANE:** — For your information there are no farmers in St. Vital, because it is a Winnipeg seat. I should like to make a few comments regarding this program.

One comment is that it is obviously a Manitoba plan. They suggested in their proposal three limits, 300 acres, 400 and 500 acres. The lowest limit would include more than two-thirds of the farms in Manitoba. The highest limit would include 84 per cent of Manitoba lands and only 70 per cent of ours. A second comment is that they derived a calculated revenue figure from which it subtracted per acre cost plus \$10 per acre. Now on studying their plan, we find that this calculated revenue per acre - and remember this is from grain - it is just as high in the year ending July 1, 1969 and July 1, 1970 as it was in 1964-65 or in 1967-68, and so, of course, this whole plan is ridiculous.

A third comment is that a large payment would have been forthcoming in 1964-65. And it is a fact that cash income from grain sales in both 1964 and 1965 were among our best ever and only exceeded again in 1966 and 1967. And certainly the plan as presented does not make sense and this is what they are trying to force upon the people of this province.

There are two other basic weaknesses of such a plan. First, it does not recognize the basic economic fact of the agricultural industry. It would aim at fragmenting our economic family-sized grain farms here in Saskatchewan. It does not recognize

that there is a simple reason behind the expansion in the size of farms and that is, that with today's technology and equipment a farm family can manage more acres than he could at any time in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, if we were to adopt this plan, should we go back, should we turn the clock back in Saskatchewan to the old John Deere DW, to the old International 1530. Because this is exactly the kind of agriculture that they are asking us to endorse by way of this Resolution. Should we deliberately set out to reduce our efficiency, as the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) would have us do, to put our agricultural industry and our farmers in the position of having to depend on the whims of government at Ottawa for their income. There is plenty of evidence that our main competitors in the whole grain market, the United States, Australia, even France and Russia are adopting the opposite approach.

Secondly, is that a guaranteed net income per acre will, as every Member and every farmer knows, be immediately reflected in land prices. Is it good land or poor land? Is it Regina heavy clay or is it sand dunes? And wouldn't every farmer plough up every piece of land that was available to him, if he could get in on this type of a bonanza. And then one thing would follow, for sure, on such a plan, namely controls would have to come in. Controls on the price of land, controls as to who would buy land, and other factors if such a policy were introduced.

The Minister from Manitoba, himself, recognized this fact and stated that land controls would be a necessary part of this plan, conveniently not referred to by the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer). And furthermore, he not only said, land price controls would have to be brought in but he suggested a price of \$50 per acre would be the price that the farmer would be asked to sell his land for when he retired.

So I am going to ask the Member for Kelsey and the Members for Northern Saskatchewan - you name me one farmer who can go into that area of the province, clear and break and work down and get land ready for seeding at a cost of \$50 per acre? You go out to the Regina Plains, you go out to the Rosetown area, out to the Kindersley area, and ask the farmers out there after they have spent a lifetime on their farms to turn around and accept a price of \$50 per acre for that type of land. And so this is the idea behind the Manitoba plan and it has no place, and no business being introduced or even suggested, as far as Saskatchewan is concerned.

Now Saskatchewan took the other approach in dealing with the Federal income stabilization plan. We recognized that it was at least an effort, the first effort of the Federal Government since P.F.A.A. was introduced to do something to relieve the drastic swings in income that our farmers have been faced with periodically. We knew that the basic principles of the plan had been approved by the Federal Government. And so instead of

**April 6, 1971**

refusing to discuss it by bringing forward a plan of our own, we made every effort towards improving the proposed plan. At meetings, both on the official and administrative level, we strongly advocated a number of proposals that we felt would substantially improve the original plan.

They were summarized through the statement that I made at the Agricultural Congress held in Ottawa late last November. And briefly they were as follows: We concurred in the basic quota system proposed, but recommended some sort of limit on forage acreage be included. This point was accepted and the limit of one-third of the designated acreage has been established. We concurred, of course, in efforts to develop market information and particularly in the Federal Government making a firm substantial commitment to market research and development. Here is a line of approach that we have recommended for some years. We concurred in the concept of increased emphasis on food aid. And on the stabilization plan itself we said, first, the suggested three per cent farmer contribution was too high. We argued for two per cent as an absolute maximum. That point has been accepted and reduces the farmer contribution by one-third.

Secondly, we said that the concept of the Government contributing to the fund only when the producer contributions are exhausted, was not acceptable to us here in Saskatchewan. And that point has been accepted and four per cent will go in from the Federal Government annually.

Thirdly, we said that the \$10,000 limit on the participation was too low to meet the needs of our family farm units. That point has been accepted and raised to \$15,000.

Fourthly, we suggested that further consideration should be given to the method of payout from the fund and that a three year average sales would be too short. That point is still under consideration. It is at least partially accepted.

Fifthly, we said that we could not accept the proposition that losses in grain pools be recovered from future pools. And that point has been accepted.

Sixthly, we asked that a policy of the Federal Government paying carrying charges on minimum quantities of major grains held in commercial storage be adopted.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, that point was not accepted because the Federal Government are not in favor at present, at least, and willing to devote more funds than are already committed in the plans to the Western grain industry. However, Mr. Speaker, we shall continue to press for further changes in the plan as the time allows.

I want to deal with the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), but once again he has flown the coop. A great deal of complete nonsense has been said about the report of the Federal Task



Force on Agriculture. Ninety-nine per cent of it in this House coming from the Member for Riversdale, who by his many speeches and many remarks has proven that he knows absolutely nothing about the agricultural industry.

I gather from some of the comments that people have been making in regard to this report that he, in particular, would never have made them if he had read the report. At most it seems, and I am sure that he is one, they leafed through it and found some paragraph they didn't like and proceeded to condemn the whole report. They said that the entire report should be rejected. Well, I remind the Member for Riversdale that the report has never been accepted, so what is he talking about. It was written with projections and estimates of our market potential in various products. Were these to be rejected? Do you want to throw that out? Or are they to be used sensibly in developing agricultural policies? It was not a document to accept or reject in total. There is a lot of useful information in this report if you would care to go through it. There were certainly some recommendations that we, as the Provincial Government, could not possibly agree with. There are others that we could. For example, they made quite a case for protein grading, so he said that should be rejected and thrown out. But we accept that and so do the farmers of Saskatchewan.

They made quite a case for market research and development. They would throw all that out. They don't believe in it, but we shall accept it. It is going to help the farmers of the province. And then it made a case in the assistance for low income farms. Sure, you got rid of the farm problem but by getting rid of the farmers - 2,500 a year. We accept those recommendations. Are these to be all thrown out and the whole package as you say? I should draw your attention to the section on Tariffs and International Trade. It says what the Government of this province has been saying for years. In Eastern Canada, your political friends would strenuously object to it and want that part thrown out and you're speaking on their behalf every time you get up and condemn that report in this House and this province. And so we undertook, and listen to this Mr. Mouthy Member from Riversdale, we undertook with the co-operation of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the University of Saskatchewan, to stimulate study and reading of the report by the farmers. And you have condemned these reports so, in fact, you have condemned the University and their whole extension service. You have condemned the Wheat Pool in this province, you have condemned the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture because they had the courage to go out throughout Saskatchewan and present the contents of these reports to the farming segment.

With the initiative of the Federation a joint committee was established to plan these projects. Our Agriculture Representatives whom you condemn and the Economic Statistics Branch which you condemn, carried out the brunt of the load in attempting to explain and summarize this report. And I might mention again, the Wheat Pool, which you condemn, had done precisely the

**April 6, 1971**

same thing three months earlier when they went across the whole province. And so again, he is condemning the farm organizations, the University of Saskatchewan, along with all extension branches of the Government. They, like ourselves and the Federation, took no position with respect to the various recommendations. Both exercises were constructed to familiarize farm people with what was in the report so that when the policy discussions did take place, they would at least be reasonably informed.

I make no apologies for the fact that the Extension Branch of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture took part in these 40 meetings. I make no apologies that they had taken the time and the effort to put in some of the recommendations in all the weekly newspapers of this province so that farmers could decide for themselves what they should ask the Federal Government to do based on the recommendations in the report. I make no apologies for other organizations acquiring TV time so that they in turn could let the farmers of Saskatchewan know what was involved.

Just an example, the stabilization plan suggested in the Task Force Report was plainly poorly conceived, and that was the original plan. But the report did say and did demonstrate that some type of stabilization plan which had never been a part of the agricultural policy before was necessary. The materials balance approach to agriculture contained in the report has been widely accepted as a sensible approach. And we can see some results in the recent announcements by the Federal Government. They have set out two months before seeding, initial prices for the next year. This is what you are condemning. Target acreages and target quotas based on the best possible estimates of sales during the next twelve months or so, which you so soundly condemn every time you get up on your feet in this House.

This never happened before in the history of this province. I have no doubt the farmers of this province appreciate the effort that is being made to tell them how much they might expect to sell and at what price before the crop is even put in the ground. Surely, this is worth something.

Have the Members opposite read this section on low income farms in the Task Report? No, you haven't, you never even looked at it. Do they think that there is any merit in our agricultural industry using the latest and best technology to compete in the world grain market? You condemn that part too. If they can turn the clock backwards and reduce the size of farms in our province, this is what we'd like to hear. Do they propose an absolute rigid control of agriculture as to the price of land? Do you? As to the size of farms? Do you? Who can own land? Will you tell the people that? And with a guaranteed net income? No! You struck out on the whole four. In other words, the farmer becomes, to all intents and purposes, not even an employee, but rather a dependent in your type of proposal. A second class share cropper as far as the NDP and their new deal is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I think that I have indicated that I shall not be supporting the Resolution but will be supporting the amendment.

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

**MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):** — Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to this motion that was moved by my hon. colleague, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), I think he put forth his arguments with precision and accuracy. He spelled out the very difficult and impossible position that our farmers find themselves in, in this year 1971.

Before going into my main address, I just want to deal with a few of the remarks that my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) made. You know the Minister and I came into this House the same time. I've heard him give a few weak arguments in that time, but I think this one beats anything that he has ever tried.

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

**MR. MEAKES:** — I was extremely interested, in particular, when he criticized what he calls the Uskiw Plan or the Manitoba Plan. He says that my hon. friend from Kelsey is sponsoring this plan. He might not think the plan is very good, but yesterday there was an election in Manitoba, in one of the rural ridings of Manitoba which had been held for 44 years by the Liberal Party and something happened. They apparently rejected Liberal policies and accepted the policies that were handed out by the Manitoba Government.

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

**MR. MEAKES:** — He can say what he likes about the plan being no good. Apparently the farmers of Manitoba think it's all right, or at least they have said so. Very interesting election, that. I've been thinking, Mr. Speaker, for the last few weeks some of us thought that we'd have an election pretty soon. But I really believe that after those two defeats that the Liberals got in Manitoba, we shall be lucky if we have one by October 11, 1972. You know the interesting part of it all is, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to relate it to what we are debating, is that in the rules of the Manitoba Legislature, a party has to have four Members before they are even recognized as a party. The poor Liberal Party is down to three Members. They are not even considered a party in Manitoba any more.

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

**MR. MEAKES:** — Well, you know, the Minister went on and he talked about the drop in the number of farms from 1941 to 1966 and he said it was an average of 2,000 a year. I think when the next census

**April 6, 1971**

comes we shall find that the drop of farmers from 1966 to 1971 will be closer to 3,000 or 4,000 farmers a year in the last seven years or last five years of Liberal Government.

And then he went on and he talked about all the things the Government had brought in since 1964, and one of the things I think he said was that he talked about the water and sewage program that had been brought to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I want to remind him that that was a program that was started long before he was the Minister of Agriculture. It was started by a CCF government back in, I believe, the early sixties.

Also, before getting into the main part of my address, I should like also to deal with some of the remarks that were passed by the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), when he spoke on this motion the other day. I am glad to see that he is in his seat. In his introductory remarks he said and I quote it from Hansard: "I'm not going to trouble you with the names of the Members of the Task Force, but if you want to check their achievements and their representations, you will find them to be leaders in their respective fields."

**MR. LEITH:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Member a question?

**MR. MEAKES:** — I'll answer at the end of the speech.

**MR. LEITH:** — At the end of your speech.

**MR. MEAKES:** — This is what Mr. Speaker ruled a few minutes ago.

**MR. LEITH:** — Very well.

**MR. MEAKES:** — I can well understand why he worded his statement the way he did. "If you want to check their achievements and their representations, you will find them to be leaders in their respective fields." I can understand well why he didn't give their names and their occupations. The fact is there wasn't one farmer on the Task Force who studied agriculture. The choice of this group is like getting a couple of lawyers and a couple of accountants to diagnose whether the patient has an ulcer, a nervous stomach, or food poisoning. I say that the fact that not one farmer was placed on this study is an insult to the whole farming community.

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

**MR. MEAKES:** — The whole point is the Government chose their men because the Government wanted a report made from an economic viewpoint only. They didn't want a report based on justice or human feelings or common sense. The Hon. Member then went on and he wanted to praise the Hon. Mr. Lang and said that we

seemed to mistrust him. He's the man who, a few years ago, said the farmer didn't need a good income because he had lots of fresh air. He is quoted in the Star-Phoenix of January 28, 1963 speaking to the Saskatchewan Agricultural Graduates Association and I'm going to quote from that article: "The family farm is not entitled to subsidy." With a man with views like that no wonder the farmers of this province are distrustful of him. In most areas of this province, his name is a dirty word.

The Hon. Member from Elrose went on to say that the LIFT Program was a good program. I invite him to come out in my constituency and tell the farmers that. He'll soon find out. I'll even supply him a personal body guard so that they don't hurt him.

Then he went on to say that he put cash into the farmers' pockets. Again I say to him come out to Touchwood and tell the farmers of that constituency that, he'll get laughed and booed out of the hall.

He then went on to say that the plan brought forward by the Member from Kelsey would be too costly. I'm getting sick and tired of this worn out, thread bare, Liberal argument. The Federal Government gives away hundreds of millions of dollars through tariffs to protect the textile industry, the mining industry, the automotive industry, but oh no, the agricultural industry must stand on its own feet or fall. I suggest this is typical Liberal philosophy.

The Hon. Members a few days ago voted to guarantee \$130 million for a pulp mill, but it's too costly either to bring in a plan to stabilize agriculture and to keep our citizens on the land. The Member doesn't take into consideration the costs of either retraining the farmers leaving the land nor the cost of providing housing or welfare in our cities let alone the breaking down of the spiritual and the moral fibre of those people pushed out of their own environment. And as I have said many times before, I wish the Liberals would take the dollar signs out of their eyes for once and think of people as human beings instead of a digit.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, I shall be accused of giving the same speech as I have before. For this I make no apologies. The plight of the farmers hasn't changed except to get worse. The actions of both Federal and Provincial Governments have changed only for the worse. More and more farmers are being squeezed to the wall. While such conditions exist, I shall continue to fight for a better deal for the farmers of my constituency, the farmers of Saskatchewan, and I make no apologies for anything that I say in this debate.

Where ever I go in this province and talk to farmers, I see fear in their faces and hear fear in their voices. Five years ago they thought they had security for their old age. They now wonder how long they can last. They were encouraged by the Farm Credit Corporation and the banks. The Liberals said grow

**April 6, 1971**

wheat and we'll sell it. The farmers did what they were told to do and a couple of years later the Prime Minister stated: "Why should I sell your wheat?" This is the worst betrayal in Canada since John A. Macdonald betrayed Louis Riel.

**MR. CAMERON:** — Gosh Sakes!

**MR. MEAKES:** — It is. My hon. friend from Maple Creek can laugh, but it is one of the greatest betrayals that has come to any group of people in the Dominion of Canada. The proposed prairie grain cash receipts stabilization program is, in my opinion, the first step to bringing about the recommendations of the Task Force on Agriculture. If the Task Force recommendations are carried out to their conclusion, by its own words, it will eliminate two thirds of the family farms by 1980. A Federal Liberal Government assisted by a Provincial Liberal Government is dedicated to the implementation of this report as you heard from the speech of my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture.

Here was a commission set up by a Federal Government with not one farmer on the commission. Rather they chose lawyers and accountants to study what was needed for agriculture. And did I hear any complaint from the Minister of Agriculture when this went on? No. And I'd like to deal with their recommendations in a few minutes.

If the family farm is to be saved, if farmers are to be classed as first class citizens of Canada, then something must be done in guaranteeing them a minimum net income. In most endeavors in society a man, if he has a job, at least knows that he will receive at the end of a week, a month or a year in return for his work so much money. Not so for the farmer. He can work 20 hours a day, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year, but he has no such guarantee. He faces the vagaries of nature, drought, flooding, hail, frost, Lang, Trudeau, Thatcher. He faces the vagaries of the market such as surpluses at home, surpluses abroad, tariff barriers, competition; competition not against the farmers of the United States or France or Britain or Australia or Argentina, but against the Treasuries of those countries. These exporting nations subsidize their farmers and then sell the agricultural products at lower prices. In fact, Canada is the only exporting country in the world that does not subsidize the production of agricultural products in their own country. Why don't they? The answer is plain. Ever since Canada became a nation, it has followed a plan of having a cheap food policy for its citizens. This policy carried out for 100 years has kept the farmers in the position of being second or third class citizens.

For years farmers and farm organizations have asked for a two-price system. They know that they have to compete against national treasuries. But at least they should not have to subsidize the rest of Canada for cheap food. And again, governments have failed to act on these requests. Under the proposed Prairie Grain Cash Receipts Stabilization Program, farm income

will be stabilized over a five-year average, and the farmer will pay 2 per cent of his gross income for grain into the fund. This is just not good enough. Let's look at this, I shall use an extreme example. Let us suppose that we have a five-year period such as 1930 to 1935, when farm income over much of the grain areas in Western Canada was nil. A five-year average of nothing is nothing. I shall admit that my example is extreme but it exemplifies what I am saying. A five-year period may have been very poor years, so that the average would be poor.

It was very noticeable that the Minister, when he was speaking a few minutes ago, referred to the years 1964 to 1968. They were very, very good years with grain sales rolling. Then he went back and referred to the years 1954, 1955 and 1956 and he said that farm income wasn't so high then. He went on and said that there was only one year when the farm income under a CCF government had been any higher than under their Government. But what he didn't talk about was that back in 1954, 1955 or 1956, the cost of production for the farmers was not nearly as high as it was in 1966, 1967 and 1968.

I come back to the cheap food policy in Canada. If this is a right and desirable policy to carry out, then Canada should be prepared to subsidize those who suffer under such a policy. One group of citizens should not be made to suffer at the expense of the rest of Canada. No, Mr. Speaker, this Stabilization Plan is not good enough. I say, again, that it is the first step to the implementation of the Task Force on Agriculture. I know that Liberals across the way don't like to hear about the Task Force. I don't blame them as, if I were a Liberal I shouldn't either. He has to go out and explain it to the farmer.

Liberal Governments at Ottawa and Regina are doing nothing but hasten the downfall of family farms. Their motto is to lend money to the farmer, keep him in debt with high interest. The next step is for banks and loaning institutes to push the farmer off the land. The provisions of the Stabilization Fund is not good enough to stop this action.

Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government that I face has done nothing to try to stop or change the actions of the Federal Government. As I said in the previous debate, neither the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) nor any other Liberal MLAs, with the exception of the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) attended a Liberal Policy Convention in Ottawa last fall. I ask the Minister; why did you stay home? Were you satisfied with the Task Force Report? He must have been from listening to him today.

Again at the Provincial Liberal Convention held here in Regina last fall, did the Minister of Agriculture put forth resolutions opposing the Task Force and Operation LIFT, or Lang's latest proposals? Well, I wasn't there but no news reports in opposition to the Task Force Report were noted. Has the Minister of Agriculture in any speech either in this Legislature or out of it, spoken up against Operation LIFT, the Task

**April 6, 1971**

Force Report or now the Stabilization Fund? The answer is No. Has he spoken up anywhere about the high cost of farm operations, the high cost of production? The answer is No. Has he talked about the huge profits of farm machine companies? The answer is No. What has he done? He has encouraged large feeding lot enterprises, enterprises that may well destroy the family farm if they get large enough.

He encouraged farmers a year ago to get into hogs, the same cavalier attitude as Trudeau uses - you grow them and we will sell them. I guess, Mr. Speaker, I am really out of order on that. There is another motion so I will knock that part out.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . out of order all afternoon.

**MR. MEAKES:** — If I am, I have had lots of company. What is needed to save agriculture from an economic crash are programs to do two main things. A program based on a minimum guaranteed income that would provide the farmer, first of all, with a decent standard of living, after all expenses are paid. A program where a farmer can best utilize his land resources by good land practices. The LIFT program of a year ago that forced farmers to summerfallow, summerfallow again, was the very height of stupidity. In some areas it created a dust bowl.

The second program needed to save agriculture, is a program for stopping the continuous upward rise in prices of the things that farmers must buy to farm successfully, such as farm machinery, repairs, chemicals, fertilizers. Year after year these commodities have climbed in price yet farm products have not risen and in many cases have decreased.

Let me quote from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of January 16, 1970, a heading which says: "Report Blasts at Business", by Erving Whynot. He was reviewing the Barber Commission Report and I quote:

Canadian farmers could have saved nearly \$15 million a year if they could buy tractors at close to those paid by their British counterparts. Wholesale dealers' prices in Britain range from 30 to 50 per cent lower than in Canada. The Report calls for direct government action to reduce prices in Canada from what it calls discriminatory artificial levels maintained arbitrarily by a few large corporations. But the Commission said that analysis of prices charged for tractors in different countries by the various multi-national corporations strongly suggest that prices charged for an identical tractor in different markets may bear no relation to cost.

As an example it mentioned John Deere Model 710 tractor manufactured in West Germany and sold both in Canada and in Britain. The net wholesale price of this tractor in



Britain is almost \$1,200 lower than it is in Canada even though it enters Canada duty free and the British importer has to pay \$450.

If the Government of Canada would act on these problems they would not have to bring in hare-brain programs such as LIFT and the Stabilization Fund. I am convinced that the two Liberal Governments actually want to see a giant migration of farmers off the land. They look on the family farm as a nuisance. They would be happy if two-thirds of the farmers landed in the urban slums of our cities to rot, both spiritually and mentally.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few more things that I should like to say, but I understand that you want to get on with other order of business and so I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 3 - LABOUR MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION**

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J.B Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government labour-management legislation designed to protect the public interest which incorporates the principle of the use of Independent Labour Courts and wards binding on all parties as a means of settling all labour disputes in Saskatchewan.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Meakes:

That all the words after the word "interest" in the second line (as it appears in Votes and Proceedings) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(1) by vigorous and substantially improved mediation and conciliation, as well as publicly assisted and encouraged management-labour consultation, including ongoing research and fact-finding, to identify and prevent problems in industrial relationships which are, or may become causes of disputes, in keeping with the recommendations and findings of the Federal Woods' Commission on Labour Relations and the Saskatchewan Labour Management Committee on the Construction Industry;

(2) and that, so as to further provide for the peaceful and positive development of employer-employee relations, the Government be asked to consider proposing to the Government of Canada the creation of a special committee representing the Saskatchewan and Federal Departments of Labour that would function and act in such a manner that management-labour disputes of particular importance to Saskatchewan such as disputes in the transportation and grain handling industries would so far as possible

**April 6, 1971**

be prevented and avoided.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS - 29**  
**Messieurs**

Thatcher  
Cameron  
Guy  
MacDougall  
Laroche  
Gallagher  
Breker  
Mitchell  
McPherson  
McIvor

Howes  
Steuart  
Barrie  
Grant  
MacDonald  
Hooker  
Leith  
Gardner  
Charlebois  
Schmeiser

McFarlane  
Heald  
Loken  
Coderre  
MacLennan  
Heggie  
Radloff  
Coupland  
Forsyth

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

Blakeney  
Messer  
Lloyd  
Meakes  
Thibault  
Michayluk  
Matsalla  
Byers

Bowerman  
Wood  
Davies  
Berezowsky  
Whelan  
Baker  
Wooff

Kramer  
Romanow  
Dewhurst  
Smishek  
Snyder  
Pepper  
Kwasnica

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.