

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
20th Day

Thursday, March 2, 1967.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, today again the Member for Hanley is not in the House and again I point out to the House that I realize that the school that is in the west gallery is not properly a part of Saskatoon constituency, but I do not want them to go unwelcomed for lack of their own Member here and I on behalf of all the Members here and you, Mr. Speaker, would like to draw your attention to their presence here and wish them welcome and wish them a very happy day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to welcome the Greystone Heights School students, 67 of them with their vice-principal, Mr. Manley, and teachers Mr. Harman and Mr. Bergen. If Hon. Members could have been in Room 267 about an hour ago, they would have been impressed by these young people, especially how keen they are in social studies. They were good enough to sing for me, Bobby Gimby's Centennial song. I hope sometime the Members of the Legislature can hear this fine group of students sing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the Members of this House, a group of students from the Archerwill District. There are some 40 of them along with their teacher, Mr. Clements and their bus driver, Mr. Hnetka. This is the first trip here for a good many of them. I would like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that over fifty years ago my father was a steam engineer and hoisted most of the stones in this building when this building was being built. Well today, my daughter is among the group from Archerwill visiting here so I wish to welcome them all here on behalf of you and wish them a pleasant trip and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, not to be outdone or outspoken or out anything, I'd like to take the opportunity of introducing 15 students from the Mazenod High School. they are sitting in the

Speaker's gallery in the top row and I can assure you that they are a really wonderful bunch of students, particularly since the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who is not in his seat of course, has left the district, the results are outstanding. I'd like the Assembly to join with me in welcoming them to Regina today and I'm sure that their trip will be most fruitful and that their return home is healthy, wealthy and much wiser for the day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of introducing to you and through you to the other Members of the Legislature, a fine group of students in the two second rows in the Speaker's gallery from grade 12 of Beatty Collegiate in Swift Current under the guidance of their teacher, Mr. Woodard. You will recall that we had another group from the high school down here the other day under the guidance of Mr. Pappas and you will recall that on that day we had very good Swift current weather here. We hope that these people from Swift Current keep coming down here and bringing us some of the Swift Current weather here in Regina. I hope that this group today enjoys their stay with us and they find it profitable and educational and that they will come back again sometime to see us here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: SAVING BONDS SALES

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to announce that Bond sales are now \$6,100,000 as compared to \$5,000,000 a year ago. I wish to announce that sales of the 1967 series of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds will be extended one week as they were a year ago. This means that sales will terminate with the close of business on Friday of next week, March 10.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

Mr. Thatcher: — While I'm on my feet I'd like to make an announcement about rail line abandonment. I wish to announce that the Saskatchewan Government will establish a special committee to ensure that rail abandonment proceedings in the province are carried out in a fair and equitable manner. Under the new railway legislation of the Federal Government, the railways would like to abandon about 1,000 miles of branch lines in Saskatchewan between now and 1975. Our Government believes that, under these circumstances, we must ensure that economic hardship does not follow in those communities if abandonment takes place. The Hon. J. C. McIsaac, Minister of Municipal Affairs, will be chairman of the Committee. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association will also be asked to have representation on the Committee. In addition, the officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs will be members. In general the Committee will have three key functions: first,

to ensure that any rail abandonment carried out works for the over-all good of the province; secondly, to recommend to the new Federal Transportation Commission criteria that should be applied, when considering applications by the railways to abandon branch lines; thirdly, to ensure that when hearings take place, these criteria are in fact applied by the Commission. It is our hope that the communities affected by abandonment proposals will be considered before a final decision is made. At the same time we believe that the communities in question must take whatever steps are necessary to prepare a sound case to put forward to the Commission. For our part, the Provincial Government will do all in its power to make certain that a fair hearing is given by the Commission to all parties appearing before them. That will be the chief function of the new Committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: CENTENNIAL PINS

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, just in case some Members may have inadvertently opened the package and find half of the pins on the floor maybe. there have been requests to the Centennial office by some Members for some of these pins to give out to the people that are coming to their offices and so the Corporation decided to send over some for all Members. They are on your desks today and I might say that the students that come do get them through the girls downstairs, so it will not be necessary to give them out to the students that come. But we thought that there are other people that come and would like to have these pins and the Members would like to be able to give them out. So that is what is contained in the package.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 5 – REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTION EXPENSES

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the appointment of a Committee composed of Members of the Legislative Assembly to conduct an examination, following prorogation of the Assembly and during the inter-sessional period, into the Report of the Committee on Election Expenses 1966 for the purpose of drafting equivalent province recommendations to serve as a basis for province legislation to make the democratic system equitably available to all, the said committee to report its recommendations at the session next following December 31, 1967.

He said: Last year I availed myself of the opportunity of presenting a Resolution in this Assembly regarding the disclosure of the

source of money for the operation of political parties in Saskatchewan. In presenting my Resolution, I did not cite any examples of corruption of the political system by reason of political parties accepting campaign contributions with alleged strings attached. It was only a moment after I had resumed my seat, when accusations were being tossed back and forth in this Chamber about improper contributions to political parties. I soon realized that that Resolution was doomed. This year I am submitting a Resolution that I believe will be acceptable to all Members of this Assembly. First, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate that the need for legislation is still evident, I will read one paragraph of the news report from the Star Phoenix of the date, November 29, 1966 which shows that the report is relatively current. Date line, Ottawa, Canadian Press. "Questions are being asked in the Commons about a tax case in which a Montreal construction firm admitted giving \$300,000 to two political parties in order to obtain contracts." I think, Mr. Speaker, the need is still evident. Some abuses still exist in our democratic system. Last year I mentioned that the Federal Government had established a committee to enquire into and report upon the desirability of implementing practical measures to limit and control Federal election expenditures. The Federal committee as you are no doubt aware was composed of prominent Canadian citizens with different political viewpoints. And I would suggest to this chamber that the gentlemen were not primarily picked because of their differing view points, but because they were men experienced in the political scene in Canada and they were men held in relatively high regard by Canadians. The committee transmitted its report with recommendations to the Secretary of State in October, 1966. I believe the recommendations have merit and should receive serious consideration, particularly by responsible politicians. I said, Mr. Speaker, that I believe my Resolution would be acceptable. Why? Mainly because when enacted it will allow the widest possible latitude for discussion by the proposed inter-sessional committee. What of the recommendations, Mr. Speaker? To begin with, they are seven in number. Before placing them on record, all Members of this Assembly should realize that their implementation on a Provincial basis may not be possible in each case nor may it be desirable in the eyes of the proposed inter-sessional committee. The recommendations are as follows:

1. Political parties should be legally recognized and through the doctrine of agency, made legally responsible for their actions in raising and spending funds.
2. A degree of financial equality should be established among candidates and among political parties by the extension of certain services and subsidies to all who qualify.
3. An effort should be made to increase public participation in politics by broadening the base of political contribution through tax concessions to donors.
4. Cost of election campaign should be reduced by

shortening the campaign period, by placing limitations on expenditures on mass media by candidates and parties and by prohibiting the payment of poll workers on election day.

5. Public confidence in political financing should be strengthened by requiring candidates and parties to disclose their incomes and expenditures.

6. A registry under the supervision of a registrar should be established to audit and publish the financial reports required and to enforce the provisions of the proposed election and political fitness act.

7. Miscellaneous amendments to broadcasting legislation should be enacted to improve the political communications field.

If I could just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on some of the recommendations that are made by the committee on election expenses. On the recommendation No. 1 that political parties be legally recognized, once the importance of political parties is admitted, there is a need to make them responsible for their actions. Because of the nature of Canadian parties it appears that only the doctrine of agency can be invoked to bring about the desired results and I think this is the gist of the first recommendation of the committee. On the second recommendation of the committee dealing with financial equality, considerable evidence was adduced, suggesting that lack of finances eliminated many serious candidates from seeking election in the Federal fields. The committee therefore considers it desirable that certain basic necessities of a minimum election campaign receive public support. Funds are to be made available to candidates for whatever purposes they determine, but funds will only be made towards the basic requirements of communicating with the electorate. There are a considerable number of safeguards listed in and around the recommendations of the committee. For instance, only after elections will subsidies be paid and the parties that are making application for the subsidies will have to receive a certain minimum of electoral support from the public.

The third recommendation, Mr. Speaker, has to do with tax concessions and this is self-explanatory. There is one particular note that I want to bring to the attention of the Members of this Assembly here. This tax concession to people who support political parties by donations would be operational only within certain limits. In other words, the Federal committee suggests donations over \$300 would not be eligible for tax concessions.

Cost of election campaign should be reduced, this is the fourth recommendation. There are a number of recommendations here, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that the length of the campaign be shortened, that only a limited amount of funds be allowed to each candidate for putting across his story to the electorate.

The fifth recommendation, public confidence in political

parties should be strengthened by requiring candidates and parties to disclose their incomes and expenditures. This particular recommendation, Mr. Speaker, suggests that a registry be set up and a registrar be empowered to receive reports on the collection and dispensing of money for political purposes.

The sixth recommendation is the recommendation of establishing a registrar. The registrar should then be in the position to enforce the proposed election and political fitness act which will direct the operation when implemented.

The seventh recommendation has to do with broadcasting legislation. The committee recognizing that the modern political campaigning takes place to a great extent in the field of television and television being a very expensive media, the committee recommended that certain conditions be attached to television communication and that certain expenses be absorbed by the public. The report itself contains not only the recommendations but a considerable number of tables and historic material that the committee gathered in its searchings. It refers in the report to Quebec and this is particularly interesting because Quebec has taken steps to bring some reform to the political arena in that province. It refers to Quebec as the high-cost area as far as politics are concerned and I think we all recognized that. The legislation that was brought into the Province of Quebec and finally approved unanimously was that limitations be put on election campaign expenses, that reimbursement be acknowledged and that the Provincial Treasurer will support all legitimate political candidates to a certain minimum extent. They have endorsed in their Act the principle of agency. Certain election expenses will be paid back to each legitimate candidate. Returns and the publicity that will be given to them, by returns, I mean by reports to the people who enforce the Quebec Act, will be given publicity. And the other sections of the Quebec Act of course deal with the enforcement that will be necessary to make this particular act work.

I just wanted, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some tables that are printed in the report that make a rather interesting picture. After a recent Federal election all of the candidates that ran in the election were canvassed and of all of the candidates, 454 answer a questionnaire. Table 13 lists the opinion of these 454 candidates ~~on~~ "the likelihood that large contributors may corrupt a political party." And those that responded with "Yes" were 73 per cent. Those that said "No" were 21 per cent and those that had no opinion were six per cent. I would refer to Table No. 15 in the Report of the Committee on Election Expenses and ~~the~~ "attitude toward requiring o parties to report their expenses" out of the 454 candidates that answered the questionnaire, 75 per cent were in favour of political parties reporting their expenses, 17 per cent were opposed and eight per cent had no opinion. Table 18 the ~~attitude~~ "toward requiring political parties to report their receipts" – in favour 71 per cent, opposed 21 per cent, no opinion, eight per cent. Finally,

Mr. Speaker, referring to Table 22. —“Do you think that election expenses are exorbitant in Canada?” the response of the 454 candidates was as follows: Yes, 72 per cent; No, 21 per cent and no opinion, seven per cent. I think it is evident, Mr. Speaker, from my remarks that there is a desire to bring reform into the Canadian electoral system and I think that the general conclusion arrived at by the committee in one of its sections sets this out very clearly. —“Three democracies have adopted systems of direct subsidies as a means of solving the problems of political financing. It is not a task of this study to decide whether this solution is the best. These systems are all new having been adopted by Puerto Rico in 1957; by Germany in 1959 and by Sweden in 1965.” A comparison with the one recently adopted by the Province of Quebec may clarify the adaptability of such formula to the Canadian electoral system.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if Canadians are to have confidence in the democratic parliamentary system of government, something must be done to make more open and available to all people in Canada an understanding of the operation of the political system and how it can be supported. With those few words of introduction, Mr. Speaker, I beg to remind the Assembly once again that this Resolution allows for the widest possible latitude in discussing the matter of the Report of the Committee on Election Expenses.

Mrs. M. A. Hunt (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I think the matter was covered very ably by the previous speaker, but I have a few things I’d like to say on this matter and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 – INCREASE IN OLD AGE SECURITY PENSION

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North) moved, seconded by Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that any increase in the old age security pension by the Government of Canada should be payable at age 65 without a means or income test.

He said: Mr. Speaker, introduction of an income test by the Minister of National Health and Welfare at Ottawa, the Hon. E. A. MacEachen, which this Resolution condemns, has been so badly received and is so out of step with progress that it has dimmed any possibility the Minister may have had of becoming leader of the Federal Liberal party. And why not? Mr. Speaker, it was introduced against the wishes of many of the Federal Government’s own private Members, against the combined opposition of the New Democrats, the Conservatives and some Members of the smaller parties. Mr. Speaker, it has been rejected by senior citizens’ organizations, by welfare councils, it has been rejected by every conscientious organization which has the welfare of

Canadian senior citizens as a first consideration.

this latest change in the old age security pension based on an income test – a procedure incidentally that we thought this country had banned forever away back in 1951 – means that recipients of the old age security pension may receive a maximum of \$105 per month. To being with I question whether \$105 is enough. The senior citizens' organization of this province and of Canada has said, and unanimously, and in resolutions, first in Saskatchewan and later in the Canadian organization and I quote the September issue first of the Pensioner and Senior Citizens magazine when they passed this resolution:

Be it resolved that owing to the rising cost of living the old age security pension should be not less than \$125 a month at age 65 and over and tied to the cost of living.

And later on, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian organization passed a resolution that reads as follows:

Resolved that we petition the Federal Government to increase the old age security pension to \$125 per month without a means or need test and tied to the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are not unreasonable. Welfare agencies who speak with authority and from experience say that with the present cost of living in Canada, a minimum of \$138 per month is required for a senior citizen to live in security and in decency. This \$105 per month, therefore, is not nearly adequate. No one of us would suggest that it is enough, particularly when the cost of food alone has jumped more than ten per cent in the last 12 months and there is no indication that we can look forward to any curtailment of this rapid increase.

But the feature of the recent legislation, Mr. Speaker, which my Resolution protests – and we state emphatically as well that \$105 is not enough – the objectionable feature of this legislation is the fact that you cannot get it without passing a means-income test. There is plenty of argument about this. The pages of Hansard are full of the embarrassment of Liberals income test. There may be a difference but it still adds up to humiliation regardless of what you call it. I am opposed to the means-income test for the following reasons:

1. Universal payment as a principle and as a right has been established and should be continued.
2. Canada is an affluent country and can afford payment to everyone without any test.
3. Those in a higher income bracket – a small group – would return the payment in income taxes in any case.

4. Payment of the \$30 supplemental will go to those who cannot or perhaps are unable to work, but it will discourage others from working. If a pensioner earns \$360 a year, the supplement is reduced by \$15 per month, but if he stays at home he gets the full \$30 a month supplement.
5. Introduction of the income test will institute an unnecessary and heavy expense. In answer to a question in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that it would require 675 additional people to administer the test. This cost is unjustified.
6. When the Canada Pension Plan is in full force, payments under the plan will eliminate the need for the old age security supplement arrangement by the year 1975. Universality would be more practical for this short period of time between now and the year 1975.
7. The whole idea of means-income test is humiliating to the applicant.
8. The procedure for challenging a ruling when the income is disputed is very involved and could be very costly.
9. People who have savings and who held small annuities to supplement the present \$75 per month cannot qualify. Thrifty people are discriminated against.
10. Taxes are levied against people to pay this supplement but not all the same people will be allowed to enjoy these tax benefits because of the discriminatory income test.

Mr. Speaker, may I expand on the points that I have made. The universality principle was established more than 15 years ago. It has been followed in raising the old age security pension for \$46 to \$55, from \$55 to \$65, from \$65 to \$75, as applied to Canadians when they reach a given age. Those in a higher income bracket have returned most of the pension to the people in Canada in the form of income tax – a very small percentage of the public is in this category. An application accompanied by proof of age was all that was required prior to the introduction of this income test. Canadians have been happy with this arrangement, Mr. Speaker. A retreat from this position even though it is only for eight years or so is a retreat from progress. Canada is a wealthy country and yet we spend less of our gross national product on our senior citizens according to statistics than any of the following countries. In spite of statements made by Federal Members, a report published by the Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare, January, 1965, Table 3, page 5, gives the following facts: This is expenditure as part of the gross national products.

New Zealand spends 3.6 per cent; the United Kingdom, 3.4 per cent; the United States, 2.7 per cent; Australia 2.3 per cent; Canada 2 per cent.

Canada comes last of these five countries – figures taken in January, 1965.

Announcements by the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is now the Minister of Welfare in Saskatchewan, I think have a hollow, ineffective, propaganda sound, when we realize that senior citizens in our midst are being handed this deal without so much as a protest by the Provincial Government or a single verbal objection by the Minister. What a disappointment his activity in this regard has been. He is more likely to object to taxes on solution mining for potash companies.

A former Member of the Liberal Government, who sat as deputy leader of the group opposite and who now occupies a seat in the Senate, objected to senior citizens seeking a higher pension. On December 6, 1965 in Regina he said that \$100 a month is too much for a senior citizen. Members of Parliament from his own party have pointed out that they think it is unfair to pay this particular supplement, this old age security pension to Senators. Well, who is in favour of having Senators anyway? I can promise the Senator who objected to senior citizens getting \$100 a month that when the New Democrats are elected federally, the old age security pension he is getting is going to be jeopardized, and he will not even have an opportunity to make an application for a supplementary increase because he is nothing more than a political drone. Less than three per cent of Canadians in the pensionable years are in the higher income bracket. It would be far better to overpay a few of these than to deny thousands of citizens in lower income brackets what is there as a universal right.

Mr. Speaker, under the new legislation a person may sit around and qualify and draw the \$30 a month without working. He may be ill. This may be the reason. Canada needs skilled people, and senior citizens in many instances are skilled people. Some of them are nurses, some of them are tradesman. They are people who can make a contribution to this country. This legislation discourages their making a contribution because if they work, and probably it would be part time and earn as little as \$360 a year – their supplemental payment is cut in two and reduced to \$15 per month. The legislation, in effect, discourages them from working.

Mr. Speaker, if the pension were provided on a universal basis, the same staff that is handling the old age security payments could administer a universal increase with ease. But introducing this complicated, fantastically involved application will institute a procedure which the Minister indicated will require an additional 675 people in the initial stages. On page 11085 in December 13, 1966 copy of Hansard when he was asked the question point blank, the Minister said and I quote him:

We think that we shall need at the beginning to get the program under way some 675 casual workers.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that this bureaucratic, illogical

policy is aimed at providing employment for civil servants rather than supplying a service to senior citizens.

Under question in the House of Commons, the Minister-in-charge said that the Canada Pension Plan by the steps set out in the legislation would probably take over and supply a pension at age 65 equal to this amount by the year 1975. It is hardly conceivable that any Government but a Liberal Government would consider setting up this involved machinery with an extra 675 employees to pay senior citizens an income-test supplemental pension for a period of eight years. This is one more reason, Mr. Speaker, why on a short-term basis the income test arrangement is administratively impractical and adds up the usual Liberal ineptitude.

Mr. Speaker, most people including those in the 65-70-age bracket, find difficulty in filling out forms and applications. I am holding in my hand the Guaranteed Income Supplement booklet which has been mailed to senior citizens. And under the heading "Guide for Filling out Application form," there are five pages of small print. Let me give you a sample of the instructions that have been printed for filling out the application form. And I quote: The following explains what income you should include (1) to (8):

Show here any pension or other payment you received in 1966 as a result of your former employment or, if you are widowed, the former employment of your spouse; any amount received in 1966 under a pension or retirement income plan you arranged for privately: all annuities received in 1966, whether from a Government department, a trust or a company; taxable benefits of any kind from another country such as retirement benefits from United States social security programs, etc., etc.

To add to the complexity of applying for the supplement, there is a short statement on the application form which is bound to cause some misgivings. I am holding up the application form and I look at Section 10. Imagine, this is a Centennial project for a senior citizen. Allow me to quote the section:

Anyone who knowingly makes a false or misleading statement in an application is guilty of an offence under the Old Age Security Act.

After pages and pages of conglomerated fine print, they are told, anyone who knowingly makes a false or misleading statement in an application is guilty of an offence under the Old Age Security Act. What a way to recognize their need! The application for the supplement is nothing, though, compared to the procedures you have to follow in case of appeal proceedings if you feel that you have been unfairly treated. Only one in a thousand who considers he has been unfairly treated would take such action. Allow me to quote a Member of the House of Commons who was describing his whole position, and incidentally a Member of the Liberal party representing the Federal constituency of

Brantford and I'm quoting the Hansard, December 12, 1966, Page 11023. Mr. Brown the Member for Brantford says:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks on the second reading of the bill. I need not remind the house of the work I have done in an effort to have the Old Age Security Act amended in order that the monthly payments to old age pensioners be increased to at least \$100 without a means test. I have not been very successful in my efforts but I have been successful in urging the government to go on as far as to introduce this bill.

However, I know one thing for sure, mainly, that in my fight for an increase in old age pensions without a means test, I have the support of an overwhelming majority of the people of Brantford, Ontario. I find that a good many of them have doubts about the effectiveness of the bill to establish a supplement to the old age pension. Last Saturday one man said to me that no one has said how much it will cost to enforce the provisions of the bill and how much will have to be paid out to check applications for the supplement and to fight the contested cases through lawyers. He also wondered about the cost to the provinces to pay lawyers to act for indigent persons under legal aid in support of their cases against the government.

No one has mentioned how many civil servants will have to be hired to police the provisions of this act.

What a way to celebrate, Mr. Speaker, Canada's 100th birthday by discriminating against and embarrassing those 65 and over through bureaucratic legal procedures. I have interviewed many people in my riding who are in this age bracket who have been making these applications. Some of them are in senior citizens homes. I have dozens of letters and I have had many phone calls. Allow me to quote the key paragraph of a letter which I think sets it out very well:

I feel that people such as myself are being penalized by this means test since in order to purchase a small annuity which I now have, it was necessary for me to strive to save during my earning years and thus had to do without certain amenities of life in order to save my money for older years.

With few exceptions, Mr. Speaker, these people have tried to make provision for this period of their life. Many have small annuities to provide them with \$30 or \$40 per month. They have saved their money, they cannot qualify and they know it. They are resentful and bitter, disappointed and annoyed to find that someone else who didn't save or was unable to provide for his later years, automatically gets the \$30 supplement. What a reward for thrift this income test provides. Only a mixed-up, undemocratic, unconscionable Federal Government would introduce such half-baked legislation.

Everyone will pay an extra levy in income tax. No one can escape it regardless of your station in life. When you file an income tax return, you will have to pay for this increase which is being doled out on the means-test basis. Although all of us have to pay for it, only those who can qualify, only those who can complete the application to the satisfaction of the Federal Minister of National Health and Welfare, will get any portion of their funds back. Mr. Speaker, this is discrimination and this is unfair. The Government's policy is tax everyone, but pay only those who can qualify.

Mr. Speaker, more and more people are living longer, the cost of living is invading and curtailing their chances to live happily and in security. Saskatchewan honour its pioneers. Saskatchewan gives them full credit for their accomplishments. But in this income test, the people of Canada including Saskatchewan through the Federal Government, harass and embarrass and humiliate them by introducing legislation that is discriminatory, unfair and unwise. One does not need to look very far for one of the reasons the popularity of the Federal and Provincial Liberals is falling rapidly. You would think that they would remember Six Buck Harris, that they would understand that senior citizens have pride and want to be treated the same as everyone else. But the callous indifference shown by this income-means test legislation indicates that the Liberals at Ottawa have forgotten everything and have learned nothing.

In the past, Members on this side of the House have had to administer as a Government, Federal legislation that was humiliating to our citizens, but it was the type of Federal legislation that was handed to us down through the years. Mr. Speaker, this new legislation is a repeat performance. In the past we protested the legislation, and in this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, we ask all Members of this House particularly in the Centennial Year to unanimously protest this degrading procedure for granting a necessary concession to our pioneers.

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — I just desire to say one or two things about this motion this afternoon. I think it probably involves a little further study and can be given in just a few minutes in one sitting of this Legislature. But I think there are a few points that I would like to make this afternoon before this debate is possibly adjourned and that has to do with the holier-than-thou remarks of the speaker that has just taken his seat. You know for a Member of a party who almost immediately after they came into this office in this Province in 1944, when on the first occasion a Federal Liberal Government increased the old age pension, reduced the supplementary allowance paid by the Province of Saskatchewan from \$5 to \$2.50, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that he should be ashamed to stand up in this House and accuse others of actions with regard to the older citizens of our Province. Mr. Speaker, when he belongs to a group which had the worst means test of any Province in Canada that I know of so that old age people in this province could obtain a measly \$2.50, then I think

the remarks he has come forward with this afternoon in connection with the Government in Ottawa are certainly and definitely uncalled for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — It was a Federal Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, that first instituted old age pensions in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Secondly, it was a Federal Liberal Government that first instituted universal old age pensions in Canada in 1951.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — And I'm going to say that I can remember back between (I'm not going to say exactly which year) 1956 and 1960 when finally our Socialist Government in this Province decided to increase its supplementary payment. Is there any easy way, was there any universal way of the old age people in this Province getting this wonder gift of up to \$10 for an individual or \$20 for a couple? No, there wasn't. They weren't even treated in a decent way of having a form sent to them that they could fill out and send back. They were herded like cattle into community halls and some cases into barns, places that were no better than barns in this province. They were investigated, they were asked questions by pip-squeaks that shouldn't have been allowed to ask questions of anyone. And I know because in my own town, I donated the use of my office so they would have a half decent place that they could use without charge. I heard some of the questions that were asked of the old age people that came in there seeking a mere pittance from the Provincial CCF Government of this Province. And yet my friend stands up there on the other side of the House and says what a terrible thing to do to the senior citizens of this country in this our Centennial Year. Did they do any better in the 50th Anniversary of our Province in 1955? They certainly didn't, Mr. Speaker. They had a means test on many occasions in this House, the Opposition asked them to drop their means test. Was it dropped? No, it wasn't, Mr. Speaker. They never dropped their means test. They were in office in this Province for 20 years. They had one of the worst means tests of any Province in Canada and for the most part just so our senior citizens could get another \$2.50

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — I can remember, Mr. Speaker, the case of a person in my constituency who had one Legislature, was 85 years of age and had to be assisted into a hall where there were ten steps to climb, where she had to sit waiting in line so that someone could question her out in the open — not closed in — not private with other people

in the community and be questioned about her means. Do you know what happened? She had her allowance cut from \$2.50 to \$2.00, a loss of 50 cents. These are the humanitarian first people that we have heard from for many, many years that sat first here as Government and not sit in the Opposition. You had 20 years. Only four it that you were sitting in the Government's side of the House, thank goodness, but your party had 20 years to do away with means test in this Province, if they believe as you say they believe that there shouldn't be a means test with regard to payments of this type and they didn't do it, Mr. Speaker. Now he stands up in this House and he cries crocodile tears for the people that they did more to bring down to the lowest level they possibly could in this province in order that they might have a livelihood and have a fair means of living. He criticizes those that down through the years in this country of ours have provided old age pensions, have provided universal pensions and are now providing a further \$30 a month to anyone who requires it in this country. And I want to say that they don't have to go to any hall. They don't have to be investigated by any officials of the Federal Government. They don't have to go through the processes that the old age people of this province had to go through when the CCF Government was handling the matter a few years ago. All they have to do is fill out a form in their own home and send it in. I can assure the Hon. Member across the way that there will be nobody coming out to see them, that there will be none of the great investigations he talks about and there again will be none of the great expense that he refers to either. But the majority of the people, and I think all the people that need today and require the extra \$30.00, will receive it. And I know that under legislation that other people, as the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) suggested the other day, will be receiving greater benefits, because of legislation that it has been put in effect by a Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa.

And so this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that it comes very poorly from a Member, who for at least four years sat in the Government, which refused year after year to agree to draw up a means test for a measly \$10.00 or \$2.50 or 50 cents that they were giving the old age pensioners, to stand up here today and shed crocodile tears and try to indicate that he has the well-being of the older people of this province in his mind and in his heart.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the gentleman today has shown that he is a hypocrite in the statements that he has made in this House,...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — ...talks out of one side of his mouth and acts the other way when he is in office.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of order, I don't think the word hypocrite, to say that anybody has been shown to be a hypocrite, adds anything

to the stature of this House or the Members. I would hope that you could say that we'd be better with out it.

Mr. Gardiner: — I would say, Mr. Speaker, that a hypocrite is a person who talks one way and acts another. If the shoe fits, wear it.

An Hon. Member: — You are a hypocrite!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Gardiner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your reference. I just want to say at this moment that I believe that more consideration must be given to this Resolution and at this point I move leave to adjourn the debate.

Motion to adjourn agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 52

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Thatcher | Gallagher | Thibault |
| Howes | Breker | Willis |
| McFarlane | Leith | Whelan |
| Boldt | Radloff | Nicholson |
| Cameron | Romuld | Kramer |
| Steuart | Weatherald | Dewhurst |
| Heald | Berezowsky | Gardiner (Melville) |
| Larochelle | Link | Guy |
| Hooker | Baker | Merchant (Mrs.) |
| Coupland | Wooff | Loken |
| Gardner (Moosomin) | Snyder | MacDougall |
| Mitchell | Larson | Grant |
| Lloyd | Robbins | Coderre |
| Hunt (Mrs.) | Pepper | Bjarnason |
| Wood | Brockelbank (Saskatoon City) | Trapp |
| Walker | Pederson | McIsaac |
| Brockelbank (Kelsey) | MacDonald | |
| Blakeney | | |
| MacLennan | | |

NAYS — Nil

Debate adjourned.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — That's doing it the hard way.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 – RE: SASKATCHEWAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City) moved, seconded by Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):

That in order to encourage further development of

Saskatchewan's economy and to provide an opportunity for all Saskatchewan people to participate more fully in the ownership and benefits of that economy, this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to the establishment of a Saskatchewan Development Corporation which would utilize a reasonable proportion of the funds from the following currently available sources: (a) Canada Pension Plan; (Board) Workmen's Compensation funds and provincial pension funds; (c) Annual Saskatchewan Savings Bond subscriptions; and (d) Individual equity investment in the proposed Saskatchewan Development corporation.

He said: The Resolution I am presenting to this Assembly deserves the earnest consideration and study of every Member whether they sit to your right or to your left. Not long ago, the Regina Leader Post carried an editorial headed: "Pro Canadianism the Better Approach." While I agree with the general tenor of thought in that statement, I do not agree with the assumption of an editorial in relation to the use or possible use of a publicly owned development corporation to widen the ownership of industry and commercial development amongst our citizens. I once heard the Member from Prince Albert, or is it Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) assert that it was assumed we would become a great country, with British parliamentary traditions, French cultural traditions, and the drive of American business traditions. Somehow he claimed we got a bit mixed up with French politics, British business and American culture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, errors can be corrected. What we must do is make a beginning. At one time most of the investment in Saskatchewan and in Canada, which came from abroad, was fixed interest-bearing debt. Later the trend lines changed and particularly since World War II, the inflow has largely been constituted in the form of direct equity investment. While no one would argue that some of this equity investment is not required, it has been and continues to be an increasingly important factor in establishing a measure of economic control over our economy.

I am well aware that there are those who express little or no concern over this apparently well-established economic trend. Their line of economic reasoning is incomplete, Mr. Speaker, and I may add not very convincing. As a nation we have a very severe problem in our balance of payments on current accounts, and we are extremely vulnerable to fluctuations related to capital in-flows. Any person who doubts this should review recent economic history. In April of 1962 we ran into a catastrophic balance of payment problem which forced a rapid and precipitous devaluation of the Canadian dollar. To suggest, as it is sometimes done, that it is immaterial as to who holds the equity investment in companies and organizations operating without borders, particularly those who are heavily engaged in the development of natural resources, is simply a contradiction and an apparent inability on the part of such people to face up to the economic facts of the case.

One of the major economic problems for our province is the reasonable retention of a measure of ownership of commerce and industry within our province boundaries. If we are to retain the younger generation, job opportunities are required here to enable them to remain. If we do not retain ownership to a reasonable degree, economic decisions outside our province may well prevent reasonable attainment of this necessary and desirable goal. It is true that in Saskatchewan we have accomplished a measure of ownership and therefore, local control, through the cooperative movement. Nevertheless it is readily apparent that there are limitations in this regard particularly where large pools of capital are required. Public ownership in the form of Crown corporations is another method which has been utilized and which has, despite statements to the contrary from the Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, enjoyed some degree of success.

The gas distribution system of Saskatchewan Power corporation in 1955 could have readily been turned over to a private out-of-the-province, yes, out-of-the-country, operated concern. This concern would have retained ownership of the distribution system indefinitely through retention of all or nearly all of the equity capital. They too, would have required loan capital as did Saskatchewan Power in the form of fixed interest-bearing loans. Eventually such loan capital is repaid, as the users of natural gas not only pay the operating costs of the system, but the interest costs and the amortization of debt as well. Had this approach been utilized, and it could have been, Mr. Speaker, ownership outside of the Province of Saskatchewan of the province-wide gas distribution system would today be a reality. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we had the economic good sense to retain it within this province. Utilization of a Saskatchewan Development corporation would assist in increasing local ownership particularly in fields where relatively large pools of capital are a necessity. It is well known the Premier and his Government are opposed to the publicly owned or Crown corporation approach. At least they say they are. A Development Corporation such as this Resolution envisages and suggests consideration of, would however assist in the creation of sufficiently large pools of capital required, particularly in resource-type industry.

The Premier threatened a year ago, or at least he implied there was a probability of the sale of the Sodium Sulphate Division of Saskatchewan Minerals to private enterprise. The danger here, Mr. Speaker, would lie primarily in the probability of ownership of the enterprise going outside of this province. The Member from Morse, the Hon. Premier, admitted it was a highly successful enterprise. In fact I think he referred to it as Sodium Socialism, and said, "This is the kind of Socialism I like."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the initial investment of \$1,085,000, I admit it is now being extended with an expenditure of an additional \$1,500,000 in the new plant at Ingebright Lake, I suggest the return of some \$5,500,00 over the period of the operation of this sodium plant to the Provincial Treasurer of

this Province, clearly indicates that it is perhaps the most successful commercial enterprise in relation to invested capital, operating in this province today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — If it were sold, Mr. Speaker, what better approach could be devised than a Saskatchewan Development Corporation which could market the equity in such an organization to Saskatchewan residents who may well have an interest in securing some ownership on a direct equity basis in such an industry. The means to achieve such retention of ownership and control within the boundaries of the province would then be available. In addition, Mr. Speaker, such a Development Corporation would enable private industry to ensure that some of the ownership in resource industries was held by local residents in the area where the development was taking place. This is also a preferable position for incoming capital, wherein a measure of partnership is developed with local resident capital. The Provincial Treasurer has informed this Assembly that his Government borrowed \$19,380,000 from the Canadian Pension Plan during 1966.

In response to a question I asked in this Assembly, he informed us that the sixth series of Saskatchewan Saving bonds realized \$12,336,300. The Government has investment responsibilities with respect to a whole series of superannuation or pension trust funds such as Workmen's Compensation, the Public Corporation Fund, Government Telephone Pension Fund and the pension funds of what might be termed the commercial Crown corporations such as Government Insurance, Saskatchewan Transportation, Saskatchewan Forest Products and Saskatchewan Minerals.

It is not unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, to assume that monies from all such sources could well range from \$40,000,000 to \$45,000,000 per annum. A portion of such funds might well be considered as a reasonable capital base for a Saskatchewan Development Corporation which would stimulate investment and to some degree, retain economic decisions over Saskatchewan-based industry and development to a more reasonable degree that currently occurs within the boundaries of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — In examining this motion there appear to be two areas that I would like to speak on. First of all there is the overall question of such a development fund and second the use of public funds and private funds for such a purpose.

The idea of a Development Corporation is not new by any means. I am a little surprised that the Hon. Members did not see fit to introduce this type of corporation to our economy when they were in power, rather than wait until we are in power

before they come forth with the suggestion.

Some years ago, Walter Gordon announced the formation of the Canadian Development Corporation. I haven't heard too much about the Corporation since. Alberta established the Alberta Investment Fund Corporation in 1966. the only one which seems to have any lengthy duration and activity is the Commonwealth Development Finance Company Limited, established some years ago in England.

This Government has a number of occasions since taking office considered the type of financing suggested and has examined the possibilities closely. It has been our conclusion that it is not acceptable at this time and the idea has been set aside. I will admit that there is some merit, but there do exist numerous problems which we feel a responsible government must consider and which we feel suggest to us that we should not proceed with the type of financial institution suggested, bearing in mind the best interest of the people of this province.

To start with, we have the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, which was commenced by our friends opposite and includes in its act of incorporation the authority to sell securities to the general public. We are pleased to report that the Corporation is economic, as its name suggests it should be and we propose to keep it that way.

Our experience with SEDCO and our observations of similar funds, particularly in the Province of Alberta, have been strong guides to our consideration of the type of institution proposed in the Resolution.

Let us first consider the Alberta scheme as it is perhaps the closest to us and a fair parallel to the organization proposed.

The Alberta Investment Fund was launched in February of last year. The intent of the fund was to take citizens' savings and make them profitable by investing them. This seemed to be quite an attraction to quite a number of governments. The citizens would buy investment certificates, which would be redeemable at any time at face value. The fund was to commence with \$10,000,000 worth of investment certificates, and officials were confident that they would be oversold on the first issue. The investors would earn a guaranteed return of 3 ½ per cent annually on their investment paid twice a year. If the securities that the investment fund was to purchase proved to be very profitable, a larger dividend would be paid. The fund would invest in existing businesses but the amount of that type of investment was limited to 25 per cent of the fund. Up to 50 per cent would be for new or expanding businesses and the balance would be invested in bonds and debentures of municipal or other governments, hospitals, and first mortgages on industrial commercial and residential property in the province.

They started out with an excellent, well-qualified Board of

Directors. The staff was kept to a minimum to keep fixed costs low, at least on paper. The fund had all the earmarks of success. Here was an opportunity for small investors to pool their resources and get into something worthwhile. A guaranteed return could be expected, with a promise of better returns in the future. By regulation, a diversified portfolio of investments would be available, first mortgages to provide a continuing source of revenue to meet fixed costs, sure-fire investments in debentures of responsible institutions and governments to provide funds for the guaranteed return of the investors. And some 75 per cent of the money was to play with, to invest in risk situations to capture a high return, the table pot as it might be described – the benefit of that growing economy, money to provide for the promise of a better return for the citizens of Alberta.

Well, in the recent February 11 issue of the Financial Post, it was disclosed that instead of raising \$10,000,000 they raised \$2,054,600 and the word that we received and read in the news releases, is that the fund will be closed down shortly, approximately one year after it started.

It appears that the people were not prepared to invest in the fund, the competition for investment was just too keen. In fact I suspect that too many people for the benefit of the fund have decided to adopt the do-it-yourself attitude of investing their money as they have in rumpus-room buildings and home workshops. I don't think the investing public in Alberta were satisfied to turn their money over to the Province to invest in the hope of capital gain.

I won't speculate any further on why the Alberta plan was unsuccessful when on paper it appeared so good. Let us just say that the time was not right, there were unforeseen factors against it. I have no doubt that Mr. Manning in his tenacious way would hold on to the fund or amend it to make it work if he saw any way to do so. As a Government we are not so foolish as to think that we would be successful and would not get burnt when we look at the recent burns on Mr. Manning's hands in this endeavour.

The Resolution presented does not limit sources of funds to the private individual investor but includes Canada Pension Plan, Workmen's Compensation and Provincial pension funds as well. This Government is providing sinking funds against Canada Pension Plan money. We believe that this is a responsible and practical attitude to take, as funds received from the Canada Pension Plan have a short-notice redemption clause. As the fund builds up this will not be quite such a problem. However, in the future, these funds will have to be paid back and possibly before their normal retirement date.

A corporation using such funds may decide, and it is common practice, that a sinking fund is desirable or mandatory. Because of the redemption clause, a higher degree of liquidity in the sinking fund would be necessary. Naturally if you are going to have a liquid investment the yield of liquidity in the sinking fund would be necessary. Naturally if you are going to have a liquid investment the yield is going to be reduced and the Canada Pension funds, while seemingly low in cost, have

hidden costs which would reduce the return to investors in the corporation.

Workmen's Compensation and Provincial pension plans have in the past, been very careful how they have invested their funds. The funds that they hold are truly in trust for the people to whom this protection is provided. Accordingly, the money is invested in sound investments of low risk factor which provide a reasonable return.

I believe that investment of these funds in risk ventures would be doing the citizens of the Province and members of pension funds a disservice by gambling with their money, and I do not figure that we should be in that business.

The same is true of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, the very nature of the bonds in that they are fully guaranteed as to redemption suggests that the investor does not want to risk his capital, but rather wants a return on his investment. Gamblers in bonds would buy on the open market where this suggestion of higher return and capital gain is present.

Now just a further word on public funds. It is suggested that the new corporation would be owners of business through, I presume, share purchases. We all know that in any share purchase and particularly in new enterprises, returns in investments are often of long duration and slow in coming. It is a rare occasion indeed when a new venture blossoms overnight and is able to pay a dividend. Other venture capital companies show this very plainly in their annual reports with small profits in relationship to investment. Venture companies must be content to consider the long run rather than the short-run. Investments we are sure, would want short-run profits from a Development Corporation. Many of the investors would need short-run profits if they were going to attract the type of investor suggested in the Resolution. this type of investor cannot afford to wait for capital appreciation for the long-term gain. The needs and desires of the investors would be at odds with the necessary policies of the Corporation.

Our experiences with SEDCO, which is perhaps the closest parallel with the proposed Corporation in the province, bears out what I have said previously. The Corporation is functioning well, along the lines envisioned by the previous Government and supported and sustained by this Government. I feel it is doing a good job and should remain in the area that it is and not get into risk ventures. It is not engaging in providing risk capital at the present time. However, if it were to be involved in this area I can assure you that the income would be materially reduced. Its return on investment, although adequate at the present time in the function it is performing, would be must lower and quite probably undesirable from an investor's point of view.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has considered a Saskatchewan Development Corporation but, as I said previously, deems it impractical at this time, particularly along the lines proposed

in the Resolution. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the Resolution.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — I would like to say something about this and I would like particularly to deal with the remarks made by the Hon. Member from South Regina (Mr. Grant) who has just spoken and I wonder if at this stage Your Honour would consider adjourning the debate.

Adjourned debate.

RESOLUTION NO. 9 – RE: PRICES REVIEW BOARD

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mrs. M. Hunt (Regina West):

That this Assembly seriously concerned by the sharp increases in consumer prices in Saskatchewan, fearful of the impact of price increases on the real wages of working people and on living and production costs of farmers and particularly on the well-being of those on fixed incomes, urges the Government of Saskatchewan to initiate immediate discussions with the Government of Canada with a view to establishing a Prices Review Board to determine the extent to which price increases are not justified and to take appropriate steps to reduce such prices accordingly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which has just been called urges the Government of Saskatchewan to consider a request that the Federal Government establish a Prices Review Board. It is understood of course that this Board, if it were to be effective in its operation, would require a large measure of Provincial cooperation and at times it would require some joint action by the Government of Canada and Provincial Governments.

May I, Mr. Speaker, suggest some six facts as to why such a Board is needed and would be useful in helping to control the cost of living of Canadian and Saskatchewan people we are concerned with in particular. First of all price increases are a fact, nobody surely can argue that fact. Secondly, the rate of price increases has in recent years been very drastically and severely escalating. The rate of the general price increase in 1966 was more than twice the average of the annual increase for the previous ten years. The rate of the food price component of that general increase in 1966 is more than three times the annual increase for the previous ten years. The rate of increase of the housing components of that general increase was in 1966 four times the average of annual increase for the previous ten years. So, Sir, not only is the general price index increasing rapidly, but those components of that increase, which are universal, which everyone is faced with meeting, have increased more rapidly than even the general or the average increase.

My third point is that there is no end of this in sight. There have been recent increases and there are signs of further

increases. This too is an important fact. Let's note for example the following: Housing – the interest rates, if one can burrow through the National housing Act, were raised from 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent to 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent in November of last year just a few months ago. This in itself will add some \$1,600 to the cost of the house when the mortgage is obtained for the period of 30 years. Farm machinery on November 8, 1966, the Star Phoenix carried a statement by the representative of the International Harvester Company saying that tractor prices would be increased in 1967 by \$150. It added the combine prices would increase by \$325. Margarine – I quote from the Leader Post of December 28, 1966.

Lever Brothers Limited is raising the price of all its margarine products by one per cent January 1, attributed to the higher sales tax.

Gasoline – retail prices in Regina have increased during the past three-month generally by one-half to one cent per gallon. Members will recall that they increased earlier in the year for the application of an added one-cent per gallon of Provincial tax. Steel – the prices of some steel products were recently raised by two to six per cent. We were informed of this by the Financial Times on January 9, 1967. Those of you who have had the honour of getting a bill from the telephone company in the last day or two will have received a little note there informing you that your telephone rates are going to be increased. The result of the decision of the Government has been increases on March 1 of this year. Soft drinks – wholesale prices we are told in the Leader Post on January 3, 1967 rose by two to five cents per case in the city of Regina. Further, the concern, the growing concern, of larger numbers of Saskatchewan people with regard to these price increases is a further fact. I remind the Members first of all of the action of housewives throughout the province in organization boycotts of supermarkets just a few months ago. I remind them of a news item carried in the North Battleford News Optimist on September 6, 1966. It was a front-page story. It's the story about a group of farmers who had met in the Ruddel District between Saskatoon and North Battleford. The news comment said:

This group of farmers called on the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to make a survey of the province to determine what support there may be for a strike to call attention to the cost price squeeze presently being experienced.

This is symptomatic of the concern felt by many Saskatchewan farmers. Thirdly, some Members will have noticed that the Cooperative Consumer on October 5, 1966 carried a questionnaire with respect to high food prices. It published a report on the responses in the November 29 issue. I submit it is extremely significant that over 2,000 people were sufficiently concerned about this problem to send in a comment on it. Fourthly, across the province and in our neighbouring provinces of course, organized farm groups at this very moment are considering a buyers' strike with respect to the farm machinery. I quote those four items as evidence of the growing concern of Saskatchewan people in all

lengths and all walks of life. Fifthly, the impact of these increases on everybody's pocketbook is a fact regardless of income, high, medium or low. The impact is an important fact, and we should note with this the cruel effect of these increases on those least able to carry them. It may be that to some people this added increase is only one added cost which doesn't both them too much. But let's not forget that for many people these increases in prices mean a denial of necessities or of goods or services which if not necessities are near necessities of life. The denial of necessities must be the effect of any increase in living costs on an elderly person or a couple on a low fixed income. Consider the impact on a farmer with limited acreage already caught in the cost crush squeeze. He must pay in 1967, \$150 more for a tractor, \$325 more for a combine. Consider the young married couple attempting to finance and equip a home, facing the fact that an increase in interest rates has added \$1,600 over 30 years to the cost of that new home. They face on a \$15,000 home the repayment of the principal that's obvious. They face also an interest bill of \$21,018. That is more than the total capital involved. They face this provided they can get an NHA loan. If they can't get a NHA loan then their interest bill is even higher. Sixthly, may I suggest that these cost prices while of great concern to individuals, while they make severe personal problems, are in fact much more than that. Let me quote from an article which appeared in the 1966 summer issue of the Canadian Co-operative Digest. The issue is part of an article by Sidney Margolius who is recognized as a consumer expert in the United States. He's a member of the Consumer Advisory Council to the President of the United States. He was at this time addressing a conference of people interested in the cooperative movement and the trade union movement in the city of Toronto. Here are the paragraphs I refer to: "Exploitation," he said, "is not too strong a word to describe the consumer situation today. Never in the 30 years that I have been covering merchandizing and consumer problems has the public been as widely exploited as today." He added, "This is serious business. It involves a division of resources that is helping to frustrate vital family and national goals such as education, better housing, and more health care." May I suggest that if there is something that we ought to be concerned about in this House and in the Parliament of Canada it is anything that helps to frustrate the national goals in education, better housing, and more adequate health care. And I submit that unless we do something about this, then every person who sits and does nothing shares some of the blame and the responsibility for not enough schools, not good enough schools, not enough houses, not good enough houses, and not enough health care, which the citizens of Canada deserve.

These then, Mr. Speaker, are six facts which are I suggest dominant reasons for this Resolution which urges a Prices Review Board. There is however, a further reason. The consumer and particularly the unorganised consumer stands exposed and unprotected in the marketplace. Further more, it is those consumers who are most exposed, who are most unprotected, who are most frequently unorganised, who are also more inarticulate in that they lack spokesmen. It is a function of Legislature such as

ours to speak for such groups. Governments have a responsibility to minimize the exposure to exploitation and to maximize the protection of such groups. This Resolution asks this Government to do something about protecting these people from exploitation and to maximize the protection which governments make available to them. Through governments after all, people can have some opportunity to influence and to take part in decisions affecting their welfare. If people are denied such action by governments their only resort is to accept decisions made somewhere else by someone else, to accept decisions without any opportunity to take part. They are cut off from any chance to have a say about the matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some who find it easy to select some particular group on whom to blame the increasing costs. For example it's suggested by some that farm returns are closely identified with increasing food costs. However, if there is one certainty it is that the farmer is not getting any disproportionate share of increased costs of foodstuffs. The farm share of the food dollar has dropped from 60 cents in 1949 to 40 cents in 1965. The Economic Council has noted that only a small portion of increased food prices since 1949 has found its way back to the pockets of those who produced that food.

Then there are others, and this is a favourite of Members on the Government side, who put the blame almost exclusively on higher wages of the people who work as producers in the factories and other places. Yet if we look at a report of the Federal Government (The Department of Labour) in April 1965 we can find this conclusion. I quote:

In the past decade at least on the basis of what little evidence there is, wage movements do not appear to have exerted a serious push on prices.

And the reason they haven't of course, is that productivity has more than balanced the increases in the wages.

There are others, and admittedly this includes people on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who note the frequent reports of large profits. We in turn suggest that these are a determining and a reducible factor of consumer costs. For example one reads The Financial Post of December 30, 1966. There we can find an analysis of the Massey Ferguson Company's year ending October 31 of 1966. This shows sales were up 15 per cent; it shows that pre-tax profits were up 33 per cent and added to this analysis are these words:

They had expected an even better showing on the profits markets and believed Massey can still improve on these.

They expected a better showing. They believed these can be improved on. Let's be reminded that this showing, to which I have referred of pre-tax profits of 33 per cent more than the year before is followed a whole series of years in which the company showed very favourable increasing profits year by year.

This wasn't any sort of flash in the pan profit. This showing based on that kind of experience in previous years was followed by the announcement of a price increase for 1967. And this, Mr. Speaker, is a price increase which has not been challenged by the Liberal Government at Ottawa. It is a price increase which has not been challenged by the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. They have sat quietly and so kindly in their seats and said nothing whatsoever about this. One would have thought they would have been talking to the company saying this can't happen, This must be explained. But not a single word of challenge to the right of this corporate enterprise to take this much more money out of the pockets of the farmers in Saskatchewan.

There is a great deal of evidence, which may be found, of the relationship between payments as wages for work compared to payments as wages for investment. I want to refer to one table extracted from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports covering the years 1957 to 1964. This is a table which deals with various costs based on per unit of output, based on one ton or one other kind of unit of measurement. It refers to corporation profits and corporation wages and salaries, it refers also to wages. Now the years are 1957-1964. Dealing with the mining industry of Canada it shows that during that period the profits per unit went up by 33 per cent. It shows that wages and salaries during that period per unit went down by 13.8 per cent. It shows that salaries went down by 8.8 per cent. If we look at the manufacturing industry, Mr. Speaker, it shows that the corporation profits per unit produced in that period went up by 10.2 per cent. During that same period wages and salaries went up by only 3.3 per cent. If we take wages alone they went up only by 1.7 per cent. There are many people who have tried to analyse and to generalize from this kind of information. One of those is The Prairie Messenger, published in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is a newspaper which has its roots deep in the Saskatchewan agricultural scene. It commented on September 7, 1966 in these words:

Figures prove that profits generally across the country are better than ever. If the business barometer is better than ever, why shouldn't the labourer be more worthy of his hire than ever. If the labourer has more than enough to get by, won't his additional spending power contribute to the consumption of goods and general productivity. Canadians are having their patience put to the test by the growing number of strikes. In our opinion it is unfair to put the blame on labour for the present labour-management unrest.

In addition to these kind of factors, Mr. Speaker, there are other factors which are not made clear by any superficial examination and which require more intensive examination than they are now getting. I think of a factor such as the corporate structure of industry. By this means, industry may very well conceal arrangements which result in increased consumer costs. I think of a factor such as promotion costs. There is one United States study which cost, I think, a million and one-half dollars which indicates for example that advertising and promotion of breakfast

cereals takes 10 per cent of the sales dollar. Now surely this is too much for the consumer to pay. The same study indicates that food manufacturers in that country spend \$10 in advertising to every one dollar that they spend in research. Mr. Speaker, surely this is an unbalanced use of the consumer's dollar.

Obviously then, there is value in getting better answers to increasing questions about more surveyor cost increases. Obviously too, this getting better answers to increasing questions by a public agency is only going to be done if you have a public agency with a well-qualified staff to make some analysis.

This Resolution submits that we should use the institutions of parliamentary democracy to see that people are informed. We should use the institutions of parliamentary democracy to see that people have a chance to protect themselves. We should use the institutions of parliamentary democracy to see that people are protected as best we can. In our opinion a Prices Review Board responsible to the Government of Canada, acting with cooperation from provincial governments could perform this function for the Canadian people. This Board would review proposed price increases before they are put into effect. This Board will satisfy itself as to the reasons behind these proposed increases. If it were in doubt as to the validity of these reasons this Board should have some restraining power. It will see to it that the real reasons and the real effects were made known to the public of Canada.

After all, Mr. Speaker, organized workers through the collective bargaining process do bargain to justify their requests for income changes. Unfortunately, the unorganised workers and to a considerable extent the farmers get no opportunity to even bargain for increases they could justify. On the other hand, corporations aren't required to bargain or to justify in public the increases which they are free to impose. Our conclusion is that the public has a right to some guarantees, the public has a right to be assured that price increases if they are to be made can be justified. The public shouldn't be required to accept in its entirety the decision of the seller without some chance to have a say in that decision. Consequently, we urge the establishment of a Federal Prices Review Board.

The purpose and the function of such a board would be to propose price increases of significant commodities. Hopefully, it might also review some increases made in the immediate past. My reference is to increases in such commodities as steel which have such an effect on other commodities, increases on such matters board may require supplementary provincial action and will require inter-governmental cooperation. We suggest that proposed price increases of commodities having a widespread impact on living costs should be examined by this board and examined in public hearing. Those who are proposing such increases could hardly refuse the requests of the Government of Canada to appear. If they can justify their proposals, they should have no hesitation in submitting these to independent scrutiny and discussion in

public. Such a procedure is one way in which the consumer can exercise some influence on matters which are vital to general welfare. It's one way in which the consumer acting through his government can take some part in making decisions on matters which are vital to his general welfare. It's one way which the consumer acting through his government can develop some marketplace strength to curtail monopolistic or near monopolistic influence. The mere fact of public discussion itself will have a beneficial influence. The board as I intimated earlier should also as a minimum have the power to delay price increases.

Eventually, I suggest that the activities of the board should be combined with those of other agencies. They should be combined with the activities of agencies concerned with the qualitative standards of goods and with public information, so that you will have one agency concerned with this great area of cost and quality and information with regard to goods which people have to buy in order to sustain life. Such a combination as this would be a marked advance toward giving the consumer at least partially a square deal.

It's because, Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House believe that a square deal for consumers is needed that we believe a Prices Review Board and associated activities would move in this direction that I move, seconded by the Member from Regina West, (Mrs. Hunt) the above Resolution.

Mrs. M. A. Hunt (Regina West): — I think the mover, the Leader of the Opposition, presented a very convincing case for a Prices Review Board, with power to act in an effective way to prevent unwarranted price increases on essential consumer goods. Now as a housewife, and speaking on behalf of housewives, I feel that I would have been remiss in my duty if I didn't have something to say about this, because I have many things that I would like to say.

All across the country, as you know, housewives have very much been concerned, angered, frustrated and puzzled, by the constant rise of the price of almost everything they have to buy. The majority of housewives, as you know, are having an increasingly difficult time to feed and clothe and to house their families in the light of the rising prices, and for people on fixed income, and for people with large families and even moderate income, the situation is tragic. As the former speaker pointed out, in 1966 prices rose very steeply. As he stated they rose two and one-half times more than the average increase over the last ten years and food prices three and one-half times more rapidly than in the past ten years. I talked about the rise in NHA loans' interest rates and I will mention it again. The increase in the price of tractors, combines, margarine, gasoline, steel products is everywhere you look.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, the last steep rise in prices was at the close of the war. You remember at that time the boys were coming home from overseas and they had rehabilitation credits coming to the. They were setting up their

homes starting a family life, they needed to buy everything, clothing, furniture, everything. And at that time also, you will remember that due to compulsory saving that had been instituted during the war, there was a lot of money coming back in compulsory saving to the people. So there was a great deal of money available at that time to spend and there was a great scarcity of consumer goods. And because of this situation our party, the CCF, in the House of Commons, pled and begged with the Government not to remove price control until such time as consumer goods were in more plentiful supply. They warned that if this was done, that prices would skyrocket, that the boys coming home would only get half value for their money and that there would be a killing in profits and the consumers would suffer.

But the Government in power at that time, and both the old-line parties supported this, removed price control and we know that what we predicted certainly happened. Now that was in a period when consumer goods were short. But at present there is no shortage of consumer goods. Consumer goods are plentiful, consumer goods of all kinds. So it isn't much wonder that in this situation people and housewives in particular are very much concerned about the situation. And all across Canada and the United States, women have showed their hostility in a very dramatic way.

Now top-news headlines in fact, for 1966, the housewives made top headlines. In some cases there were boycotts, in some cases they were called ladycotts. And here is a quotation from the Cop-operative Consumer that expenditure expresses the situation, I think quite well. Not since 1910 for vehemence, verb and vigour, nothing like the housewives' revolt has been seen since the days of the suffragettes early in the century when the women of Canada, Britain, and the United States fought a determined and successful campaign to obtain voting rights. Placards, fighting songs, and statements by picketers indicated that tempers were flaring. Said one housewife, Have you ever seen a woman angry, I mean really burnt up, boiled over mad? Well, that is me.' Placards of the picketers read, Help stamp out stamps, We are tired of playing games, Jack and Jill went up the hill and so did grocery prices." And of course as a result of all this furore the Federal Government set up a Senate Committee to study prices and the focus turned to Ottawa. And in Ottawa the hearings became mostly a matter of each group saying, Who? Me." Here are some newspaper headlines describing the fantastic buck-passing. A & P blames higher costs on manufacturers and suppliers." Dominion joins A & P in the sand, Don't blame us." Meat packers plead innocent." Food packers blamed for high grocery bills." Price hikes blamed on labour or packages." And the Financial Post said, Housewives are the cause of the misfortune. They are poor buyers." The vice president of Loblaws put his case very bluntly, Women like adventure and romance in their shopping," he said. So they have to pay for it. The Housewives should be grateful for the modern supermarket chain," he said in an interview. Not only do supermarkets provide the housewife with the best food available, at reasonable prices, but they give her the excitement and adventure of playing games, winning prizes, and collecting stamps.

This relieves the boredom brought on by grubbiness of routine household chores.” But I agree with the lady who said she preferred to have her romance at home and get things cheaper in the stores.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of provocation to unite women to work together for any cause. But it takes not only provocation, it takes a lot of courage. I would like to express my congratulations to the women who had the courage to take a stand and go out and boycott and picket.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Hunt: — I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this isn’t any permanent solution, but it is a healthy sign when people can get aroused enough to do something about it. And it did dramatize the intolerable situation we face, as nothing else could have been done. It focused attention on the public and what’s more important, it alerted governments, both federal and provincial, that there was widespread dissatisfaction and that women expect and have a right to expect that the governments will take positive action. And they are not going to be satisfied with phoney excuses from governments or supervisors. They want information, they want honest facts, they want action and they want it soon.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the urging of the New Democratic Party and in particular, the dramatic action of the housewives finally have persuaded both the federal and provincial governments, to set up a Commission. Now certainly this investigation was needed and we on this side of the House welcome that investigation. But when the facts are available and when obvious abuses are shown, the sixty-four dollar question is going to be this: what action will the federal or provincial governments be prepared to take? It is good to know what prices are unwarranted and unreasonable, but unless the government is prepared to take the necessary action to deal with these prices, the investigations themselves could well prove to be an exercise in futility.

I think perhaps you will all remember the time when we had a major drug investigation and a lot of things were brought out that could have been corrected, but nothing has happened, just the investigation. We hope that it won’t be the case here.

And, Mr. Speaker, I’m afraid I am somewhat sceptical about the kind of action a Liberal Government in Ottawa or a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan will be prepared to take. Will they have the courage, Mr. Speaker, or the desire to interfere significantly in any effective way, with their sacred cow, so-called private enterprise. Because I am afraid that too many people in both Governments hold the philosophy that private enterprise monopoly, enterprise, business generally has a divine right to charge what the traffic will bear and left alone, the law of supply and demand will eventually correct the situation. But it is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this isn’t doing so, that it

isn't working and it can't work because of administered prices and various business techniques. There is no free play of the market and we certainly have had lots of opportunities to see that. So in the meantime, the situation has been let drift, let the chips fall where they may. And where do they fall the heaviest, Mr. Speaker? On our low-income families, people with fixed income, all those in the lower income bracket and our old age pensioners.

Now the New Democratic party has for years, and our CCF party here, advocated a Prices Review Board with the power to act. When manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers want to increase their prices, they would have to appear before this Board, show justification, and if they couldn't show justification, those increases would not be allowed. Now we expect and don't object to reasonable profit. Business people have to live and we are aware of that. We agree with that, but excessive profits at the expense of the consumers should not be tolerated. Public protests will help, but only government action can succeed that it's the only positive way to get results.

Now looking again for a moment or two at the situation we face. Housewives concentrated on food, but there are many other areas that need investigation. It is understandable that housewives looked to the food because this is an essential something that they buy every day and they notice the price rises as they are more obvious. But not only have prices risen, Mr. Speaker, we have no assurance that the spiral won't continue. Even forecasters are saying that it is going to continue.

Now in determining whether or not a price rise is granted, a Prices Review Board would take a searching look at many things, at merchandising methods, at profits, at labour, at all the factors that go into making up the cost to consumers. Advertising, often misleading, sometimes dishonest and certainly excessive, is one big factor in cost. I was very interested in reading some of the reports of the hearings of the Senate Committee and I found this, when the Colgate Palmolive people were giving their evidence. Advertising expenses on their products in 1960 were 10.6 per cent of gross sales. In 1965 they had risen to 16.1 per cent of gross sales. In fact in dollars they rose from \$3,242,000 to \$5,552,000. A 30 per cent rise. Now that's just one firm. When you think of all the firms that are advertising all across Canada, unquestionably advertising is a great factor in cost. I think the only way to deal with that, is to cut down the amount to a reasonable figure that companies are allowed as income tax deductions for advertising.

Now speaking of Colgate Palmolive this brings me to soap. You know I went into a supermarket one day. I went over one shelf, just one shelf, in one supermarket, and I am only referring to detergents that are used for washing, but I found on that shelf 23 brands of detergents. Now many of them were manufactured by the same company and they were all advertised separately at great cost. They are all, if you listen to the TV, the best, they all get clothes whiter than white. But this fantastic cost

is passed on to you and me and of course the Thatcher tax of four per cent doesn't help.

Hon. D. G. Stuart (Minister of Natural Resources): — What tax?

Mrs. Hunt: — The dirty tax. I find also some interesting facts from the investigation. Senator Crole said, ~~“In~~ spite of the fact that your wage rates are going up, your total wage cost is down in 1966.” Answer, ~~“Yes,~~ our staff was cut from 1,100 to 800.” And then he is asking a question about some of these sleazy towels and face cloths and things that you find in your soap. He picked up a package with a wash cloth in it and he said to the manager, ~~“Now~~ how much would this wash cloth cost?” And he said, ~~“I~~ don't know, but about 5 cents.” then the Senator noted that the package with the washcloth cost 10 cents more. So you paid ten cents for a five-cent washcloth that you didn't want in the first place.

Mr. Stuart: — Don't buy the soap then.

Mrs. Hunt: — Then another thing that Senator Crole asked was this: ~~“We~~ all know that when we go into a store we see signs, 20 cents off, 5 cents off, 40 cents off the regular price. We know that it is phoney.” But he asked this question pretty pointedly. ~~“If~~ I were to go into a store and see a box marked 40 cents, 8 cents off, I would expect to get 8 cents off the 40 cents. I would want my 8 cents. Would I get it? The answer of course was No.

Now I want to go back to my little list of when I went into the store to get the soap. I found this and I think it is quite interesting. Of these 23 brands, and I'm not going to give you the whole 23 brands, but I'll give you a few and let the mathematicians here figure out just what is the cheapest. Ajax — 5 pounds, \$1.95 — 30 cents off; Azax — 2 pounds, 10 ounces — nothing off — 99 cents. Now you would think of course that the large package would be the cheapest, but the large package is 2.8 cents an ounce and the smaller package is 2.3 cents an ounce. Omo — 2 pounds, 10 ounces, \$1.95, 15 cents off; Omo — 1 pound, 4 ounces, 55 cents — 2.75 cents an ounce; Breeze — 3 ounces, got a bath towel in it, \$2.09; Breeze — 12 ounces with a terry towel, 10 cents off; Breeze — 15 ounces with a face cloth for 55 cents; Feb — 5 pounds for \$1.95 or 2 pounds, 10 ounces with a terry towel, 10 cents off; Breeze — 15 ounces with a face cloth for 55 cents; Fab — 5 pounds for \$1.95 or 2 pounds, 10 ounces for \$1.09; Oxydol — 22 pounds, 12 ounces, \$1.12; Extra — 3 pounds, 3 ounces, \$2.05 with hand-cut stemware; Duz — here is a good one, 1 pound, 14 ½ ounces, 10 cents off, it has a terry towel in it — \$1.09; Surf — 40 cents off, \$1.95 for 5 pounds; Tiger — 93 cents, 2 pounds, 1 ounce. We not only have tigers in our tanks but in our washing machines now. To one of the other complaints that a lot of these packages are only half full, the explanation given was that there is shrinkage and I think there is, but not that much.

During the height of this controversy the Agriculture Minister Greene decided to go on a shopping trip. In one shopping

trip he was going to find out what was wrong and of course he ended with an alibi for the food markets, that the trouble was that housewives were poor shoppers. In one trip to the stores he found out how to shop. Well he found out that oatmeal porridge was cheaper than cornflakes, Mr. Speaker. But who wants to eat oatmeal every day? It's too fattening to begin with and if you eat too much porridge you'll get hives. And the women generally speaking didn't appreciate his efforts or his comments. I think after their comments, he won't go shopping again. I think he will leave that to someone else.

But what the women wanted to know was not whether they were good shoppers or poor shoppers – there are good shoppers among women and they are poor shoppers – but what they wanted to know was why the article they bought last week cost 6 cents more this week? That's the kind of thing they wanted to know. They wanted to know why, and this is my own experience. I went and picked up cartons of Ajax and they were two for 45 cents and when I took the little slip off the price, right underneath it, they hadn't even bothered to take it off, two for 39 cents. So that had gone up 6 cents. Why? That Ajax must have been in the store so, if the manufacturers raised the price, they didn't need to raise the price. But these are the kind of things they wanted to know about. So I would challenge Mr. Greene to take this list, go into a supermarket, figure out what is the cheapest soap he can get, count the cost of his time, then see how much he saves.

Now then of course, there are these promotional gimmicks and giveaways. That's another area that should be examined. I have here on my desk, and I'm not going to give them all to you, these are all from one paper, one issue of one paper, and they appeared all over Canada I presume and in issue after issue, –Everyone wins cash, play treasure-quiz; Bonus Bingo game, \$30,000 given away; Enter now, a Quaker Flour contest, free silver dollars; Mothers double your money if you spend your family allowance cheque at this store. All sorts of things. Now how much does that add to the cost? these are the things that should be examined, because this sort of thing has got out of hand and remember, surely we are not foolish enough to think the company pays. You and I pay. When we have a compulsory arbitration giveaway like some of our stores, who pays for that compulsory arbitration? There is one winner and maybe a couple of thousand losers. you and I pay for it and I don't know why we are foolish enough to continue doing so. These are things that enter into the costs and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it's time that the real competition in consumer goods was in quality and price rather than advertising and promotional gimmicks.

All these promotional gimmicks add nothing to the value of the goods and they cost plenty. As I stated before, it's not only food where the problem lies, that's only one area. What about drugs? The price of drugs? I was getting a prescription here in Regina, that cost me \$12.00. I had that same prescription filled in London, England for \$2.25. Now why the difference? Surely this should be investigated.

And now clothing, children's clothing. Out of all reason in price. Shoes, I bought a pair of shoes this fall comparable to the pair I bought a year ago, and they were \$5.00 more. When I said, why, they said the price of leather has gone up. I'm not going to take off my shoes and show you, but I'm sure there isn't \$2.00 worth of leather in my shoes, but \$5.00 more cost.

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Wear sneakers. They are cheaper.

Mrs. Hunt: — Yes, could be. And now furniture. The price of furniture is fantastic and the quality has gone down. I have had many people come to me saying that they have bought a new chesterfield and in no time at all it is worn, the cover is not good, but the price was high. Again I say, competition is too much in advertising and not enough in quality.

We mentioned farm machinery, meat. Now in this price investigation I read in the transcript, the meat packers stated that they could charge what they like for bacon. They admitted they charged what the traffic would bear, because women have to buy bacon anyway. And when it comes to steak, Walter Kraft said this, and he is from Canada Safeway. he admitted that the prices were placed out of reach for lower income groups to force them to buy the less popular cuts. Also the investigation showed that Canada food chains operated almost double the United States counterparts. There may be a reason why, but we should find out. And Mr. Speaker, I constantly wonder, I can't understand how large families, maybe four, five, or six children, I don't know how they are managing at all. When you consider the rent or their house payments, insurance, increased property taxes to pay, staples – that is house wares, sheets, towels and so on that you have to buy, furniture which has sky-rocketed in price, repairs that you have to make on your home, repairs to appliance, clothes, shoes, overshoes, winter costs for their family and children, some money for church and birthdays and Christmases, even small allowances for their children which they need, the cost of utilities, a little bit of money for holidays which every family should have, I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, how anyone with an income of less than \$6,000 can do it at all. I think that anyone on an income of less than \$7,000 or \$8,000 is having a real struggle.

Now as I said before, Mr. Speaker, I think and I know we'll all agree, that business firms have a right to a reasonable profit, but consumers also have rights. They have a right to protection against unreasonable costs, unreasonable and expensive promotional gimmicks, and unreasonable levels of profits. Consumer education will help. We have asked for a Department of Consumers' Affairs, in Ottawa, and we would like to see a branch set up in Saskatchewan to work with that consumer education group.

But, Mr. Speaker, a Prices Review Board, on a continuing basis, a Board that has the power to act when price increases are

asked for and not warranted, is in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the only really effective method of controlling prices and protecting the consumer from exploitation. I would urge all the Members in the Legislature to support this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few brief comments and remarks in respect to this Resolution and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 12 – RE: ROYAL COMMISSION ON FARM MACHINERY

Mr. L. M. Larson (Pelly) moved, seconded by Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):

That this Assembly views with growing concern the ever-increasing costs of farm machinery, fertilizers and chemicals, as well as other goods and services required by farmers, and urges the Provincial Government to make strong representations to the Federal Government to include fertilizers and chemicals within the scope of inquiry of the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery; and recommends for the consideration of the Provincial Government such further investigations as are necessary to supplement the federal inquiry in order to provide information on those aspects of farm costs within provincial jurisdiction.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to introduce this motion, I feel that I am expressing concern with one of the ever-increasing problems of farmers. That is basically the cost of farm production including farm machinery, fertilizers, chemicals and all other goods and services that farmers use. In doing so I feel that I am talking about one of the major farm problems confronting the Saskatchewan farmers today. That the problem is acute and getting worse is borne out by several very ominous facts and signs. Farm organizations as well as individual farmers have been concerned and worried for a decade over this very same problem. Several approaches have been made both to the Federal and Provincial Governments. These approaches have taken from time to time various forms. The results however of these attempts have been very unsatisfactory. The results if there are any, have left farmers entirely alone, to cope with this production-cost problems. the only recourse that has been open to farmers has been for them to react as best they could while the costs of production have continued to soar ever upward. The Royal Commission on Farm machinery will be of little value if it doesn't include the wider spectrum of farm production costs.

The use of fertilizers and chemicals as well as repair parts costs do constitute, I submit, nearly as large an item as farm

machinery. The continued use of these items is a must in today's farming operations. The advent of soil testing at the University will, in my opinion, promote the use of fertilizers. I have had the opportunity to view some of the recommendations that are being made in my own home area. As a result of these recommendations, farmers are making plans to substantially increase their use of fertilizer. With the increased demands created by the reports it is already evident that fertilizer prices are rising higher than they were a year ago. Now, I have no quarrel with the principle of soil tests; I think they are valuable and I think they are very good; but I do believe at the same time, that possibly a word of caution as to the amounts recommended should accompany these test reports. The amount of additional costs that the farmers will have to bear, and the fact that yield return per acre is an unknown factor warrant some exercise of caution in my opinion.

That there is real need of strong representation by the Saskatchewan Government to the royal Commissions hearings should be self-evident. There is plenty of evidence available to substantiate this need. I wish to quote just a few examples. Between 1951 and 1965 we find the following changes having taken place in agriculture and particularly with regard to production costs. The farm machinery price index is up 49.4 per cent; total farm production costs exclusive of farm machinery are up 38.3 per cent; average level of farm prices up only 5.5 per cent; the farm production index up 48.8 per cent; realized net income up only 22.3 per cent. Now as has been pointed out already in this House today, the farmer's share of the consumer dollar is down from approximately 60 cents in 1951 to approximately 40 cents in 1965. These figures indicate very clearly what has happened. Farm production is up to an all-time high. But in spite of this increased production, Mr. Speaker, farmers have not been able to produce themselves out of financial difficulties. Borrowings are at an all-time high. Taxes and interest rates are climbing. The most important factor in all this is the unprecedented high cost of farm machinery and farm chemical costs included. While the price of machinery is continually rising, the ratio of productivity and ratio of the wages in manufacturing tell an interesting story when related to constant dollars. In the year 1960, real wages increased by 2.4 per cent, while real worker output increased by 3.5 per cent. In 1961, the wage increase was 1.6 per cent output, 4.5 per cent. In 1962, wage increases were 1.7 per cent, output per worker increased 4 per cent. In 1963 the ratio was 1.4 per cent of wage increase to 3.9 per cent of worker output. In 1964, the ratio stood at 1.7 per cent increase in wages to an increase in productivity output of 3.7 per cent. In 1965, the ratio stood at 2.5 per cent increase in wages while the output was 5 per cent. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that since 1949 with the exception of the years 1952, 1953 and 1957, the productivity of workers has increased more than real wages!

That there has been concern about the cost and prices of farm machinery for a long time is shown by the following facts. On March 2, 1963, a special committee of the House of Commons

was set up to make an intensive study of the manufacturing distribution costs and other related factors to farm machinery industry. This committee made 36 recommendations. These are far-reaching and very broad in scope. Unfortunately little if any action has been taken. On February 3, 1939, a select special committee of this Legislature was set up to enquire into the costs, sale and distribution of farm implements and parts and repair parts thereof, within the Province of Saskatchewan, and all other questions incidental to the buying and selling of farm machinery and repairs. On February 6, 1952, a special select committee of the Saskatchewan Legislature was set up; this committee held 19 meetings and made several recommendations. The Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in 1955 said this, as found in volume No. 1, Report No. 2 on page 127: —On the basis of its examination of previous investigation into the farm machinery industry, the Commission recommends that should any further studies be considered in the future, specific attention be given to a thorough analysis of the economies to be realized to one or more of the following alternatives: 1. reform within the farm equipment industry and distributing systems as it now exists; 2. cooperative manufacturing distribution; 3. nationalization of the industry.” Now out of these three recommendations the only one that we find in effect today is the manufacture of a very limited line, Mr. Speaker, of farm machinery through the Cooperative Implements Limited. The other two recommendations are lying dormant. It is very obvious that recommendations made by several of these Commissions that would in my opinion have done an excellent job of ferreting out, looking into, assimilating facts, and exposing the problem, have not to date been acted on. That there is urgency and that there is need for a broad and exhaustive and comprehensive study that includes participation not only by individual farmers, but by Provincial Governments is very obvious. The action in the whole field of farm production must, if it is to bear fruit, be included in this kind of investigation. As I have pointed out, chemicals and fertilizers are becoming increasingly important. Facts related thereto at the moment point to a real need in again bringing forward the very important role that is being played in the production of food that is so essential and necessary in this whole agricultural picture, and isolating and bringing forward the problems and recommendations that can be acted on. These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, and there are others that are equally relative and equally important. I won't at this point attempt to go into the whole field of farm machinery manufacturing profits. I want to reserve this for a later date. However, I feel that because of the urgency I would move, seconded by the Hon. Member from Kinistino, Resolution No. 12.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the mover. It is a very important Resolution and I think we are all aware of the need of some review in these prices but I am not ready to make a speech now so I will beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 13 – RE: APPROPRIATE EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City) moved, seconded by Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry):

That this Assembly believes that every child has the right to develop his potentials to the maximum, and recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to encouraging school boards, through the grant structure, to accept the responsibility of providing an appropriate education for exceptional children; and further, this Assembly believes that because of the importance of this type of education to Canada, the Government of Canada should be urged to share with local and provincial authorities the costs of education for exceptional children, be they mentally, physically, or emotionally and socially exceptional.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Hon, Members will have read the Resolution No. 13 after my name. Last session I introduced a Resolution which had the same introduction but recommended that the Government give consideration to amending the School Act and other legislation necessary to make mandatory the education of all educable and trainable mentally handicapped children and to recognize in its grant structure, the initial costs of such education. My Resolution was amended by the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) substituting the identical wording which you now find in the first half of Resolution No. 13. The amended Resolution passed the Legislature and since that time the Government has offered to at least Prince Albert and Saskatoon, additional incentives to improve the quality of the educational facilities available for exceptional children including the mentally retarded. In view of the very high cost and the importance of this kind of education to Canada, it occurred to me that in this our Centennial Year, the Government of Canada might be persuaded to share with local and provincial authorities the costs of education in these fields since the Federal Government is already committed to sharing with the provinces the costs of university and vocational education. I explained last year that one of the reasons that Resolution No. 9 was moved in the Assembly was because of the national crusade for Canada's mentally retarded. As a centennial project, the Canadian Association for Retarded Children organized a campaign to raise and spend \$15,000,000 to make a major assault on this important health education and welfare problem. The Federal Government was committed to contribute \$5,000,000 and the various Provincial Governments another \$5,000,000 in the hope that the public would contribute \$5,000,000 over a three-year period.

A group of 150 specialists representing all the Canadian provinces worked for almost two years and came up with 13 one-of-kind demonstration projects across Canada. It is the aim of these various projects to investigate, test and apply new knowledge toward the detection and prevention of mental

retardation. Secondly its goal is to set up more effective methods of treating, training and caring for the retarded. Two of these 13 projects are being established in Saskatchewan and I will say something about them later. It has been effectively proven that when properly rehabilitated, many of the retarded can perform simple jobs in society making them self-supporting taxpayers instead of a drain on the economy in our institutions. Each retarded adult who is rehabilitated means a savings of more than \$50,000 over a normal life-span to the taxpayers of the country and when given the chance, a retarded worker is often steadier, more reliable, more punctual and more responsible than many of his more gifted co-workers. At the annual meeting and banquet of the Saskatchewan Association for Retarded Children in Saskatoon on February 15, a certificate was presented to Mr. H. Crittenden, Manager of CKCK TV, who was the Saskatchewan Chairman of the National Crusade. In making the presentation, the Association mentioned that Saskatchewan has now reached a higher percentage of its total objective than any other Canadian province and it is expected that before the end of 1967, all the provinces would have reached 100 per cent of their respective objectives. Mr. Crittenden in accepting the award received it on behalf of the volunteers throughout the province, who presented the needs of the retarded in their respective communities and those who responded so generously. Hon. Members will recall that the day I moved my Resolution last year, Hon. Members had on their desks, a picture of Michelle, the 16 month old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Mike Siba of Middle Lake, near Humboldt, and her mother. I am very sorry to report the death of such a charming young person. Little Michelle was as beautiful a child anyone ever saw; she was normal in every respect except that she had phenylketonuria (PKU) an inherited metabolic disorder which unless treated early causes irreparable brain damage. At 20 months Michelle visited the University Hospital and had the tests which are usually given to two-year-old children. She did exceptionally well in all these tests and was well above the average. I'm sure Hon. Members would like to have on the record of this Assembly, a letter which appeared in the Humboldt Journal on January 26 written by Mrs. Pearl Isabelle, the executive director of the Saskatchewan Association for Retarded Children, under the heading:

—A Remarkable Child” – Everyone says so; she was indeed a remarkable child, this little girl with a mission. Michelle was born with phenylketonuria, a metabolic disorder which, unless discovered early and treated by special diet, results in severe mental retardation. She was the first child in Saskatchewan to be detected by the Guthrie blood test which is now routine in the province. God chose wisely when He gave this special child to Mr. and Mrs. M. Siba of Middle Lake. Mrs. Siba's careful attention to the care and feeding of little Michelle resulted in a beautiful, healthy, normal child. Mrs. Siba has been generous with her time and experience, sharing her knowledge with parents who might have the same problem. Michelle also made a tremendous contribution by appearing publicly, a living symbol of hopefulness for those so

afflicted. This two-year old child was truly remarkable. She seemed to know that she had a limited time in which to perform her mission and wasn't to be distracted. She sat through long meetings, luncheons and posed like an experienced model for photographers all without whimper or complaint. Michelle walked amongst us, even this short while to set our feet upon a path of hopefulness that other children might lead normal, happy lives. She was truly a child of God. If you look closely, you might see a new small bright star for Michelle's star will surely shine out over the land.

As I mentioned, Michelle had phenylketonuria; it's quite a rare disability. The organism of a person having this disease is unable to utilize one substance, an amino acid called pheylalanine. Pheylalanine together with other amino acids takes part in the formation of proteins. Various kinds of proteins are important food products and are present in almost everything we eat. Pheylalanine is therefore present in various quantities in nearly every food in our diet. A normal organism can use it with benefit but in phenylketonuria the mechanism for using it is faulty. This is an inherited disability from parents in the same way as the colour of eyes or hair is. For each of these qualities a person inherits a pair of genes, one from the father and one from the mother. Genes are tiny microscopical particles through which the inheritant characteristics are transferred. Every person has thousands of these pairs of genes which determine his whole physical and chemical make-up. Most of these genes are perfectly normal. There is however, a scattering of abnormal genes in the population. The existence of these genes in many cases is not apparent because they are what is called recessive, in other words, not strong enough to produce a disease. This type of abnormal or recessive gene causes no ill effect as long as it is paired with a normal gene. People who have these un-recognized recessive genes are called carriers. About one person in 80 is a carrier of one phenylketonuria gene. When two carries marry it is anticipated that if they have children one would be perfectly normal, two would be carriers and a fourth would be phenylketonuric. While Michelle was very young, the family physician, Dr. Rodomski of Humboldt and the child specialist, Dr. Gerrard of Saskatoon suspected phenylketonuria. When the parents were tested, it was found that they were carriers although o all appearances they were perfectly healthy individuals. Of course the diagnosis for Michelle was confirmed.

Hon. Members will be interested that in the Annual Report of the Department of Public Health for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966 which was placed on our table the other day, there's a paragraph dealing with PKU —Tests to detect phenylketonuria in the newborn are important for the prevention of a few cases of mental retardation each year. Blood from more than 92 per cent of the infants born in Saskatchewan in 1965 tested for elevated amounts of pheylalanine by the Guthrie procedure. Two infants were identified at birth and placed on special protective diets that should allow them to develop normally. The cost of making these discoveries, plus the cost of the diets that must be

supplied for the first years of life, is less than 1/20 of the cost of life-long care in an institution. This PKU test service and the supply of special diets were supported with a National Health grant.”

I am sure it is of interest to this Legislature to know that Dr. J. W. Gerrard, head of the Department of Paediatrics, University of Saskatchewan was selected a few years ago, in 1962, as a recipient of the John Scott award. Others who have received this recognition include Sir Frederick Banting for research leading to the discovery of insulin, sir Alexander Fleming, for the discovery of penicillin, Dr. Salk for his discovery of polio vaccine. Dr. Gerrard and two associates at the Children’s Hospital in Birmingham, England were honoured for discovering a method of controlling the condition of phenylketonuria which causes mental retardation in children and accounts for retardation in about one per cent of the inmates in institutions. More recently, Dr. Guthrie, a medical bacteriologist of Buffalo, made another very important discovery. He was promoted to start his research after his sister’s child was discovered to have PKU and after a good deal of brain damage had been done before the protein-free formula was introduced. I understand that little Michelle was the first baby in Canada to have been identified by the Guthrie blood test which last year 94 per cent of the babies born in the province had before leaving hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed PKU in some detail because the Michelle story emphasizes the importance of three levels of government being involved in and discovering causes of, and treatments for rare disabilities. As I mentioned, the Federal Government by the health grants indicated an interest in this important subject. The Provincial Government has taken advantage of the Federal Health grants and according to my information, no other province in Canada has as high a percentage of the children having these tests before leaving the hospital. Mr. Speaker, may I now call it 5:30 o’clock.

The House recessed until 7:30 o’clock.

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned at 5:30, I was mentioning the fact that Saskatchewan took advantage of the National Health Plan to do some very exciting work in the field of PKU. I’d mentioned that little Michelle Siba of Middle Lake was the first baby to be identified in Canada by the Guthrie blood test and we were very fortunate that Michelle had parents, brothers and sisters who were so very interested in this remarkable case. Mrs. Siba is a trained nurse. She, her husband and other children took every precaution to see that the very strict formula was followed. As I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, it was a great tragedy that such a very promising little girl should have her life cut before she reached three. But during her brief lifetime she had demonstrated that this is a disability that need not necessarily lead to retardation. It wasn’t until I heard about Michelle that I discovered that Pearl Buck’s only child was a PKU victim. Although Pearl Buck has

written a number of best sellers, her most touching book is the story about her own daughter, entitled, "The Child Who Never Grew." One cannot read this book without really realizing that if this child had been born in Saskatchewan in 1966, the story would be quite different. I also mentioned that very close to 100 per cent of babies born in Saskatchewan last year had this test. If only one or two babies per year are identified with this disability, this is a great blessing to the people of this province and mankind. As might be expected when new discoveries are made, they're not accepted immediately. I was interested in reading the table showing the numbers of babies screened in various countries throughout the world by the Guthrie Test. As of December 31, 1965, I find that the only country in the world that had a larger number of babies tested than Canada was Poland. In all of Canada about 65,000 babies had been tested but about half of those had been tested in Saskatchewan during the years 1963, 1964 and 1965. I submit that the remarkable case history involving little Michelle has demonstrated the value of the Federal Government deciding that substantial sums of money should be available from time to time to a province that is interested in a particular project. I'm sure that in the years to come other great discoveries will be made.

I mentioned earlier that I would say something about the two Centennial projects based in Saskatchewan. One will be the Alvin Buckwold Memorial Retardation Unit at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. It will provide the best possible training for our medical nursing students in the field of retardation. As a result of the very generous and immediate response to the crusade in Saskatchewan, early in 1966 a pilot work-training project was started in Prince Albert. Funds from the Federal, Provincial and local authorities will be available for this type of project if its success can be clearly demonstrated. I'm satisfied that the experience in Prince Albert last year and again this year clearly indicates that this type of activity is in the public interest all across Canada. Early in 1966 about 12 teenagers in the 16 to 18 age group who would never be able to reach high school were members of the Prince Albert work force in the mornings and were back in school in the afternoon. I visited them shortly after Easter last year. I happened to be there the day when for the first time the employers, representatives of the Chamber of commerce and the Prince Albert Labour Council met with the teachers and students to review the two months' program. A very attractive 16-year-old girl and a 17-year-old boy had been selected by the teachers to report on their work experience. The girl had been working in one of the hospitals. She made two points and made them very well. First, the nurses were very kind to her. Secondly, there was work in the hospital which had to be done that she could do. For every meal, trays had to have customary utensils placed on them. She was able to do that work. The boy had been a meat cutter in one of the large department stores. He had worked for two months without an accident and had cut nearly as much meat as the man on the next block. The employers, without exception, intimated that in this age when employing new staff, the first question asked by the personnel officer regarding the education qualifications would have ruled

out every one in this group. However, the employers accepted the fact that society must accept some responsibility for the socially handicapped for a variety of reasons. It is in the public interest that they should be given a chance to do some of the world's work during their lifetime. While the initial cost of establishing a program such as is in operation in Prince Albert for the second year, would present something of a burden on the local taxpayers, it must be agreed that it is in the public interest to have this type of program available not only in Prince Albert, but in every community in the country.

Mr. MacEachen, the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, on the program SUNDAY recently intimated that the Federal Government was contributing immediately \$2,500,000 to share with the projects which were mentioned earlier. I realize that I've spent a good deal of time in discussing the needs of the mentally handicapped, one of that group mentioned in my Resolution last year. I thought it important to refer to this group since the Federal Government recently has for the first time made a commitment to contribute on quite a substantial basis for Canada's retarded. The Provincial Government I understand this year is sharing with the local authorities in Saskatoon as well as Prince Albert under a new formula the exceptionally high costs of providing education for the emotionally disturbed as well as the mentally handicapped. I would expect that, if the Government of Canada could be persuaded to share with local and provincial authorities, the costs of education for all exceptional children, the Saskatchewan Department of Education and every Department of Education in Canada would be glad to offer greater incentives to all the local authorities in the province to provide better educational facilities for all exceptional children. I am indebted to Dr. L. M. Dunn, a native Saskatchewan boy who in his book "Exceptional Children in the Schools" defines exceptional children as "those who differ from the average to such a degree in physical or psychological characteristics that school programs designed for the majority of children do not afford them opportunity for all-round adjustment and optimum progress, and who therefore need either special instruction or in some cases, special ancillary services or both to achieve at a level to commensurate with their abilities." Dr. Laycock in his 1963 Quance lecture also set out the importance of the Resolution which we are discussing this evening. He interpreted one of the objectives of the World Health organization as follows, "Every child has a right to develop his potentials to the maximum."

All children, irrespective of whether or not they suffer from mental or physical handicap should have every access to the best medical diagnosis and treatment, allied therapeutic services, nursing and social services, education, vocational preparation and employment. They should be able to satisfy fully the needs of their own potentialities and become as far as possible, independent and useful members of society. The best authorities on the Continent seem to be agreed that between 8 and 15 per cent of the school age population would be in one or more areas of exceptionality as to need special education and services. The

Dominion Bureau of Statistics has come up with an estimate for Canada of about 9.24 per cent. They break this down as follows: mentally retarded, 2 per cent; mentally gifted, 2 per cent; emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted 2 per cent; speech impaired, 2.1 per cent; hearing impaired, .54 per cent; visually impaired, .13 per cent; physically impaired, .47 per cent. I understand that less than 20 per cent of the students in these various groups in Saskatchewan are receiving the type of education which would make it possible for them to make their greatest contribution in the complicated society of the second century of Canadian history.

One of the reasons that so many communities have not attempted to provide education for their exceptional children is because of the very high costs in these special fields. According to a letter which was written to me by Dr. Gathercole, Director of Education for the Saskatoon Public Schools on January 27 of this year, I am advised that the per pupil cost to Saskatoon for pupils registered in regular classes was \$250 per pupil to the Saskatoon taxpayers, after deducting Provincial grants. The cost of educating pupils in the educable mentally handicapped classed for enrolment per room where the enrolment is lower, was \$406 per pupil after deducting Provincial grants, \$406 compared with \$250. The cost of educating children in the classroom for hearing-impaired was \$902 per pupil after deducting the Provincial grant. Teachers for exceptional children are in very short supply and it would appear to be in the public interest for the Federal Government to be sharing with Provincial and local authorities the costs of training specialists in these various fields. Specialists are being trained at the expense of Federal and Provincial authorities in the field of health and social work.

On January 24th this year, I visited the Brunskill School in Saskatoon to meet the principal, teacher and pupils in the classroom for the hearing-impaired. I was especially interested in meeting a little six-year-old girl who had started school in September of last year. She had made such excellent progress that she was permitted the day I was there for the first time to spend part of the morning with the regular grade one class. The teacher said that she was so excited at this prospect that she hadn't been able to enjoy her breakfast at home that morning. She was good enough to give me an exercise that she completed the day I was there and this is a very difficult exercise for a little six-year-old who had quite a serious hearing disability. A list of words ending in at, words like cat, bat, mat, rat, hat and so on. The pupil has to fill in a word ending with at: A _____ says meow! And right enough Sharon put in cat. My mother's _____ is pretty. Now I am at Brunskill School. A grade one child who started school last fall with this disability who had a mark of 100 per cent in this exercise is something that should give the taxpayers in Saskatoon a good deal of satisfaction. I asked the teacher who sort of career do you see for this little girl. -She wants to be a nurse and I hope to be at the graduation exercises", replied the teacher. I hope to keep this exercise until Sharon does graduate, and I would like

to give it to her as a souvenir of our visit on January 28.

Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1964 the Council for Exceptional Children, Saskatchewan Federation, submitted a brief to the Government of Saskatchewan. I am indebted to this organization for their excellent presentation. The purpose of the submission was to draw the attention of the Government to some needs and inadequacies in the education of exceptional children in Saskatchewan. I'm sure that the existing educational system compares favourably with what's available in other provinces. But as we enter our second century we must not be satisfied with less than our best. I'm aware that it will require a good deal of money to carry out the recommendations contained in this brief. But I point out that it is costing the Canadian taxpayers a great deal more to ignore so many of our exceptional children. I've read the most recent annual report of the Commissioner of Penitentiaries. the number of inmates seems to increase each year. I note there are 800 in the Federal Penitentiary in Prince Albert which of course serves both Alberta and Saskatchewan. There were 550 in the Saskatchewan Provincial Correctional Institution on March 31, of last year. The annual expenditure to the taxpayers of the province for our correctional institutions is \$1,446,927 per year or \$2,630 per inmate. The total cost to Canada for maintaining the Federal Penitentiary is much higher. For 7,000 in the Federal Penitentiary according to the last report that I found in the Library, cost Canada over \$5,000 per year for each inmate. There's no doubt in my mind that if all children were given the kind of education suited to their needs when they're young, we would greatly increase our gross national product and reduce our expenditures on crime and welfare. The Council for Exceptional Children made several important recommendations: that the term exceptional be employed in the wording of legislation; that there be differentiation of the financial provision of the School Grants Act; that the School Grants Act be amended to allow the payment of grants for special education services as well as for special education classrooms; that transportation grants be provided for exceptional children regularly enrolled in a special education facility within urban areas. The final recommendation called for bursaries for training. There was also a recommendation for the training of personnel as well as bursaries.

There should be a system of training grants and bursaries to stimulate the supply of psychologists, social workers, speech and hearing therapists and remedial reading consultants as well as special education teachers. In Saskatoon, in Albert School a pilot project has been authorized by the Provincial Departments of Education, Health and Welfare for the teaching of emotionally disturbed children. The Provincial Government is paying the difference between the average cost per child in the Saskatoon Public School system and the actual cost of this pilot project. If the terms of this Resolution could be accepted, I am sure that the Federal Government would find it in the public interest to be sharing in this type of activity with the local and Provincial authorities. Just as it has been demonstrated that Federal involvement in assisting in the education at the university and

vocational training level has been in the public interest of Canada, I am sure that the Federal Government will be assisting Provincial and local authorities in providing the best possible education for all exceptional children before living very long in the second century of our history. I hope that one step to hasten that date would be to have this Resolution receive the unanimous support of the Assembly.

Mr. H. A. Broten (Watrous): — Mr. Chairman, last year we had a Resolution somewhat like this. I related a bit of what happened in our community regarding finding oneself not having too much contact with this type of child and in short three years we found that we had four children inside of seven miles of home. One of the mothers being a young aggressive lady took upon herself to interest other people who joined in. We finally got a school started in the town of Viscount. At the moment there are six children going to this school. Last winter we had five. The school board had occasion to continue the support based upon the average cost I believe and I think this has been sufficient for three afternoons a week at the moment. We would like to congratulate the school board of the Lanigan Unit for doing this. It is much appreciated by the parents. The parents find that their children are improving in speech immensely. They find that they can do the average chores of daily life much better than they have before. I feel as if there are many more children if they are found. Sometimes we don't even know that they are in the community. I think that by encouraging school boards to provide grants, I'm sure that we could interest the school boards more in, shall we say, digging out different children in this area, and to encourage the parents themselves to enter into the education of these children.

Being so close to a couple of these families I would like to say that the ones that we do not think about too much are the parents themselves. I would like to say that I don't think we realize the sacrifice that these parents have in the responsibility of these children. I think it should be well in the public interest to consider the small improvements that are seen, in the light of the responsibility that these parents do have for not only the first few years but for ten to 20 years. If these improvements will come by concerted efforts in educating the child, I'm sure that these parents will be much better off and the child better off and the society as a whole much better off.

I would like to think that by incentive grants and I'm sure by the Federal Government entering into this, the burden won't be hard. The first think we have to recognize is the responsibility. I think that all of us in this Legislature should probably acquaint ourselves more with the need, with the very great need that there is in so many cases throughout Saskatchewan.

We are not leaders in this area. I'm sure the Province of British Columbia has done much more. I think they do pick up quite a bit of the responsibility, I am not too sure how much. We did get help from the lady that is hired by the Provincial

Government to assess the children. They are assessed by this social worker who is well equipped to do this and she has had many meetings with parents to encourage the parents and to generally organize the thing. We want to thank the Government for this help. and we feel that this type of thing could be of greater use all over the province and I am sure that it has been repeated in several areas. I just don't know how many, but the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) does know how much is done in this area. I would like him to say how many school units do enter into this type of help. I think that the material that we should go by is that probably the grants are just as important and should be just as readily available in this area as they are at the university level. I think that in many ways the weight on society may be just as heavy, because these children do not get the proper training, as it will be in the higher levels of education if the university student doesn't get his training. I would encourage the passing of this Resolution and I'm sure that Canada and Saskatchewan would benefit by so doing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that a similar Resolution was presented to the Members of this Legislature. This Resolution that has been moved by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) probably has certain additions to it which had been deleted by the amendment when the Resolution was brought down last year. I think, Mr. Speaker, a Resolution of this type is of vital importance to a certain group of our boys and girls in the Province of Saskatchewan that do require special attention and care. I think that as a schoolteacher I realize that this group of children is fairly extensive, embracing boys and girls that are exceptional due to mental retardation, due to physical handicap and so forth. Local schools and school jurisdictions find it extremely costly to provide special education to this group of young boys and girls, therefore I think that we as the Legislature should be giving serious consideration to a Resolution of this type. I would request that all Members give this Resolution serious consideration and if at all possible to contribute something to this debate. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that this Resolution is of such great importance and due to the fact that I have not devoted time in preparing to speak in this debate, with your leave, I beg to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 14 – POLLUTION OF AIR, LAND AND WATER

Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon city) moved, seconded by Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):

That this Assembly realizing that the effects of the pollution of air, land and water in our Province and our nation are already posing a grave threat to the best interests of society and public well-being, thus indicating the pressing need for quick action to protect these

invaluable natural assets, recommends for the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan (a) the preparation and enforcement of a thorough program under provincial authority, designed to prevent as far as possible the contamination of the air, of the land and of our water supplies; and (Board) the development, in cooperation with the Government of Canada, of a coordinated program to prevent pollution of air, land and water.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am moving this Resolution because I believe that the whole area of pollution is of real concern to all the people of Saskatchewan. I move this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of this Legislature may have an opportunity to discuss a subject that is becoming of more and more concern to the people of this Province irrespective of their political affiliation. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to see the Government proclaim "The Air Pollution Control Act" on February 7 of this year. This Act was passed in this Legislature in 1965. The reason given for the delay in proclaiming the Act was because it was difficult to obtain the necessary personnel. Let me make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that I fully appreciate the problem that the Government no doubt encountered in this regard. Let me also make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the fact that some steps have been taken to do something about air pollution in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this problem is of such magnitude that it is not good enough for the Government to scream and shout that the CCF had 20 years to deal with this problem. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals realize that whether they like it or not, not all the problems faced by the people of Saskatchewan were solved by the CCF during the 20 years that they were in office. Let me assure them, Mr. Speaker, that I am also convinced that whether the Liberals or the CCF should happen to be in office for the next 20 or 40 years, not all the problems facing the people will be solved. There will always be some new problems that will arise and will have to be dealt with from time to time. The subject of pollution, Mr. Speaker, affects everybody, not just the urban dwellers or the people of this Province, but all the people of Canada, all the people of North America if you like. As I see it this is a subject that surely the Members on both sides of the House should be concerned about and I see no reason why this should be a controversial topic. Pollution affects everybody. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the comments on pollution made in this House during the present session by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson). It was obvious he had given this matter a lot of consideration. He made some good points and I trust he will participate in the discussion of this Resolution. As the Member for the city of Saskatoon it is very tempting for me to discuss water pollution. All the Members in this House are no doubt aware that we are having some real problems with river pollution at the present time. The new water project that is planned within a few miles of Saskatoon, which was briefly mentioned by the Member for Arm River, makes water pollution a matter of natural concern to a Member from that city. Then of course there is a matter of soil pollution.

Mr. Speaker, tempting as it is to talk about water pollution, I will confine my remarks primarily to the problem of air pollution, Mr. Speaker, because I sincerely believe that the present Act does not give the people of Saskatchewan the kind of protection that they will require in this province in the years that lie ahead. Mr. Speaker, in the February, 1967 issue of the "Rural Councillor" I found an article on page 14 which I thought might interest the Members of this House. The article deals with air pollution in connection with potash mines in Saskatchewan. I quote in part:

There's a genuine fear that the soil for some miles around the mines will become polluted by the salt fumes in the air. The RM of Langenburg says according to farmers living in this area, there's no doubt there's damage. Well crop damage is difficult to determine. There is no doubt of damage to metal objects. One farmer hung his saw in an open granary six miles from the mine. The next morning the side of the blade facing the mine was completely rusted. A farmer living much closer to the mine has to have the mine buy and install a new T.V. antenna every six to twelve months when it becomes unusable because of salt deposits.

I could quote many more examples. Mr. Speaker, in the annual report of the Saskatchewan Research Council for the year 1965, I find on page 78 the following comments by Professor G. M. Simpson. I quote part of this article which refers to the dust from potash mines. And I quote:

During the past year a machine was developed for spraying small field plots with known amounts of dust. Replicated field trials using 14 levels of dust application were Canada carried out on wheat, barley and rape. Significant reductions in yield occurred at levels of dust deposition that could induce easily recognizable leaf and spikelet damage in both cereals tested.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this potash dust is going to affect metal objects, crops, water and cattle. And of course who knows as yet the effects on humans? If these tests that I have referred to are showing damage to crops and metal objects when the mines have been in operation only a short time, what will happen in the years to come unless stricter controls are enforced. I have mentioned potash mines only briefly because in the whole area of pollution, this is only one small part of this problem. Mr. Speaker, according to statistics every city with a population in excess of 50,000 has a pollution problem and in the United States of America it is estimated that 7,300 cities have serious problems. I suggest Canadian cities are not that much different. While I will primarily quote from American sources the matter of pollution of course affects other parts of the world. For example, according to an article in the December issue of an American magazine called "Agenda" I find these statistics: In 1942, 4,000 died in London, England in one week; in 1948, 43 per cent of the population of Donora, U.S.A.

were sick from pollution and 17 died; in 1953 in New York City, there were 200 statistically excess deaths and in June of 1962, another 400 died. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the Leader Post dated January 31, 1967, the President of the United States in addressing the United States Congress is reported to have said: "America is losing its struggle against poisoned air." The President asked Congress for legislation to give the Federal Government the power to control air pollution. He went on to say: "The states, the cities and private industry must commit themselves more fully, more effectively and with a new sense of urgency to America's struggle against poisoned air."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, let me make two comments. First, I am fully aware of course that due to the population density and the great industries of the United States, naturally the problem of pollution is infinitely greater in that country. Secondly, I'm also aware that in Saskatchewan some steps have already been taken to cope with this problem. However, Mr. Speaker, having said this, that is no reason why we should be complacent. This is no reason why we should not try to improve on what we are doing. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Government is not, and has not been, doing as much as possible to protect the citizens of Saskatchewan, not only from air pollution but from water and land pollution as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the first thing that we in this Legislature must realize is that voluntary control with regard to pollution simply will not work. This control in my opinion will have to be legislated. Furthermore, to be completely effective it will not work if legislated only on a provincial basis but rather it will have to be eventually done on a national level. It is simply not good enough for one province to have good legislation and the neighbouring province poor or no controls at all. It is also obvious to me that to fine industries that are guilty of pollution is useless. I'm convinced that large industries consider this just a slap on the wrist, in fact they include these fines as part of their costs of doing business. The only effective means of dealing with industries should they not conform to pollution laws, would be to close their plants until they did. A tax incentive to those industries who establish good controls might be considered. Mr. Speaker, industries and agencies cannot continue to use the air as expendable resource that it is. It is interesting to note what the United States is spending on air pollution. The American Congress authorized a \$3,900,000,000 expenditure of Federal funds over a five-year period on water pollution. Out of this \$3,900,000,000, \$3,500,000,000 will go to construct sewage treatment plants, \$150,000,000 this year and \$1,250,000,000 by 1971. At the same time they are going to spend \$186,000,000 over the next three-year period for the battle against air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, besides what the American Government is spending to fight pollution, it is estimated that as a consequence of air pollution in the United States, the people in paying for painting of homes, tending their gardens washing their cars,

etc. spend an extra \$11,000,000,000 a year. This of course does not include the cost of absenteeism due to illness and the extra cost of using expensive pollution resistant material in place of the cheaper substance that would be satisfactory in clean air. This does not include the price for accidents and delays in ground and air transportation, corrosion of metal structures of all kinds, soiling of national monuments and priceless paintings, loss of property values and civic pride. It does not, Mr. Speaker, include the loss of mountain views, disappearances of blue skies, the offence of nauseating odours, the besmirchment of recreation areas, the impairment of natural beauty. It does not, Mr. Speaker, include the immeasurable drain on vitality and the impairment of human health. Mr. Speaker, the statement has been made that the Americans are using the sky as a cesspool. The same statement goes on to say that in 1965, the United States of America tossed 133,000,000 tons of waste into the air – 85,000,000 tons produced by buses, trucks and cars; 22,000,000 tons by industrial plants; 15,000,000 tons by electric power generators; 8,000,000 tons by space testing and 3,000,000 tons by burning garbage. This year it is predicted that there will be almost a ton of rubbish in the air for each person in the United States. Mr. Speaker, at the present rate of growth in the States, this problem will be greatly increased in the next few years. At the present time there are some 85,000,000 vehicles in use. There will be some 120,000,000 vehicles by 1980 and furthermore there will be some 60,000,000 more people. I could go on for a long time giving examples of what is happening with regard to air pollution in the States. However, I think I have made my point. Air pollution is a tremendous problem. Here I believe is a case where we should be able to learn a lot from the problems that our neighbour to the south is faced with. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that now is the time for us in this province to do everything within our power to prevent the kind of situation that I've described from happening in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned some figures earlier in my talk as to the amount of money the Americans are spending on fighting pollution. and in the same article that I quoted from earlier, the article appearing in the Leader Post, January 31, 1967, I see that the Federal Government in the United States is spending \$16,000,000 in research grants and President Johnson has asked Congress for a 50 per cent increase in these research funds. Mr. Speaker, what did we spend on research in 1965? Well, according to the 19th Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Research Council, the Liberals spent \$8,695.16. I'd say this is not enough. Mr. Speaker, I find that other people in other parts of the country are disturbed about air pollution. I'm referring now to a state that I have mentioned in this House before, and that is the State of Montana. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that a bill to deal with air pollution came before the Montana Legislature in 1965. It was vetoed by Governor Tim Babcock. However, this year due no doubt to the concern that the people of Montana expressed about this problem, an act to control air pollution was passed with hardly a comment. It was considered one of the most important pieces of legislation to become before their Legislature during the 1967 session. It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that

their act will have more teeth in it than ours has. I mention Montana merely because from the size of their cities and their industrial development, they are perhaps as close a comparison as I can make. I could make other comparisons, but they would, I'm afraid have nothing to do with air pollution. Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, I realize that the problem in the United States is perhaps of greater urgency than ours. But really when our neighbour is spending almost \$4,000,000,000 in five years, the expenditure of \$8,695.16 by the Government of Saskatchewan on research in this field in the year 1965 is really a pretty pathetic effort. I suggest to the Members of this House that we would be well advised to spend a reasonable amount of money now in order to avoid the expenditure of millions of dollars in the years that lie ahead. Not only would this save a lot of money, it would in my opinion help to save the lives of many people in the Province of Saskatchewan. I would like to remind the Members of this House that some 800 delegates, observers and representatives of the news media attended a conference on pollution in Montreal on October 31 to November 4, 1966. This conference was sponsored by the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers. I understand some 504 experts were invited to attend this gathering. Reporting on this convention, I find in the monthly periodical called "Water and Pollution Control" dated January 1967, on page 32, some interesting comments. The Council of Resource Ministers, while admitting the difficulty of establishing accurate figures of the cost of pollution in Canada, nevertheless came up with the following figures. These figures, Mr. Speaker, only include water pollution, not air or soil pollution. Province by province then here are the figures:

Ontario, \$437,500,000; Quebec, \$370,800,000; British Columbia, \$91,800,000; Alberta, \$71,300,000; Nova Scotia, \$49,300,000; Manitoba, \$47,500,000; Saskatchewan, \$42,500,000; New Brunswick, \$38,600,000; Newfoundland, \$20,300,000; and Prince Edward Island, \$3,300,000. A total for Canada of \$1,173,000,000.

This I suggest is a staggering figure, and may I suggest, Sir, that air and soil pollution would probably double this figure.

And the same article goes on to say that even if it were idealistically possible it would cost far more than \$1,700,000,000 to correct the present causes of water pollution. It is also time, no matter how much it would cost today, that it be done, as it will cost much more to achieve the same results tomorrow and by then the problem would well be much more extensive. Speaking at the Montreal Conference, Derrick Sewell said, "Pollution is a problem which some people are concerned about, a few try hard to solve and most people are either unaware of or do not care about." Mr. Speaker, although the Montreal Conference no doubt was useful and I'm glad it was held, I must however agree with the last paragraph of the same article that I have been quoting from which says and I quote:

The next step is up to the Resource Ministers who may – or should – be better equipped to grasp ramification of

pollution on the nation's economy than any other arbitrarily selected group of experts.

Mr. Speaker, as you no doubt have gathered, I feel the matter of pollution is of great importance.

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few more words with respect to this motion, I can just say first of all I think that I want to thank the Hon. Member for more or less congratulating the Government of this province for the measures that have been taken this far both with air pollution and water pollution. He is going right along exactly with what the Government has been doing for the last two or three years in this province and I want to thank him for bringing this to the attention of the people of this province that this Government has been taking some action whereas the party that he belongs to was here for 20 years and did very little about the problems except talk.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member mentioned the fact that The Air Pollution Act was passed in 1965 by the present Government and of course just recently that Act has been placed into effect. I'm not going to say much about this particular legislation because it doesn't involve the Department that I happen to be concerned with because of the fact that air pollution is not in the Water Resources Commission, which of course has charge of the problem of water pollution in this province. I find myself very confused by some of the information my friend read about the conference that was held in Montreal to which many individual, representing the Province of Saskatchewan were present. Both Government officials, officials of our university, attended to discuss with officials of other provinces, the problems of pollution, air, water, and ground pollution. I think water and ground pollution pretty well go side by side and air is probably pretty well separated from the other two. But there were experts from this province, Government experts. There were the Ministers from the various provinces represented at that conference. The Ministers did not take part. We sat and listened to the discussions that took place so that we would be in a position when we came home to better understand the problems that the officials of our Department had in discussing with us and bringing about changes with regard to pollution control.

I want to say to my friend that from 1943 down to 1964, there was a problem in his city that the previous Government did very little to resolve or very little to see that it was resolved. Action will not be taken after discussion with the people, not only in that centre but in other parts of this province. Action is now going to be taken under the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission to protect the people of this province from water pollution, which of course at the present time, as I have indicated earlier in the session, is not the problem in this province that it is in some other areas of this continent. But it could

become a problem and we want to make certain, as the Hon. Member has pointed out, that it does not become a problem and your Government is taking the action to do exactly that. We want to make certain that the action is taken in time so the problems do not arise such as we find south of the border where they haven't the pure water and the clean water to use for industry, to use for their municipalities, to be able to drink in their own communities, to have healthy communities. Of course this is the reason for the legislation which is being placed and has been placed before the Members of this Legislature with regard to matters of water pollution by myself during this session with the first reading of The Water Resources Commission Act, which of course gives to that Commission full power and control over matters relating to water pollution in this province. I'm not going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule this motion out of order for that reason because of the fact that I think all this motion does is really congratulate the Government which has been taking all the action since 1964, not by the Members that sit opposite but by this Government to do something both about air and water pollution.

And I can assure my friend that in the next few months the Water Resources Commission is going to be spending a good deal of its time dealing with this problem of water pollution, meeting with people in our province, trying to find solutions that will affect the people of this province for many years to come. It is a problem that could become serious, a problem that we all know could affect the lives of every single citizen in this province and I can assure my hon. friend from Saskatoon that the Water Resources Commission, as I stated before, is quite prepared to meet with any groups, any responsible municipal groups in this province that feel that they have a problem to discuss to solve it, once the legislation that has been placed on the books provides the authority to the Water Resources Commission to undertake controls with regard to pollution in this province.

With regard to the suggestion that these programs should be coordinated, I think I can quite rightfully say that the conference that was held in Montreal this fall was definitely a first step in this regard. It was a conference called by all the Resource Ministers in Canada to discuss these problems. I can assure the Hon. Member that in The Water Resources Commission Act in this province, we are given authority to work with other provinces and to work with the Federal Government in order to bring about solutions to problems that he has mentioned here tonight. So again I say we have already taken care of the problems that have been mentioned by the Member in this Resolution and I can assure him that any Members of any Government be it our Government on this side of the House or be it any other Government in Canada, no matter what political flavour they might be, would not refuse to work in a cooperative way together to try to solve these problems where they affect all provinces. I'm quite certain any Government that took that stand wouldn't be retained very long by the people of their province because these are problems that are associated, that are of interest to every province in Canada and are of interest to Canada as a

whole.

I say here tonight that I am very proud of the fact that I can say to the Member that I'm pleased that the Government has already taken the initial action to bring about the improvements with regard to air, ground and water pollution that the Member has referred to. and I can assure him that the Government of the day in this Province will cooperate with any other Province and with the Federal authorities to see to it that in the future proper protection is given to the people of our Province and the people of Canada from the evils that he has mentioned in his remarks. So at this time, Mr. Speaker, I am just going to state that as there is nothing in this motion that was new – pretty well already taken care of by the Government – I can see no reason for opposing the motion and as far as I am concerned, I will support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — I'm happy to see that there is not going to be any controversy over the Resolution, but there has been reason as the mover pointed out why the Resolution was brought in and because the Government has had a whole year and has done nothing about it except to appoint a Commission, must the usual Liberal talk and no action. They always talk and make promises – lots of promises that we have had. I think that in spite of what the Minister who just sat down and who tried to leave an impression that everything's just fine, hunky-dory, that we don't have to even talk about it, or that the Government has everything under control, in spite of all this even if true, I'm of the opinion that we should do a tremendous public relations job not only Saskatchewan, but right across Canada. The Resources Ministers of course, have done their job and they are continuing to carry on a program that had a lot of publicity in the press. I think that it is very necessary that this Legislature take a very active part, and I think that every Member should participate, if not here, at least in his community to point out to the people the importance of saving the situation, because I think that the pollution of our air and our water and our land is more dangerous to society today, to our country, our province, to the world than the atom bomb. You see, Mr. Speaker, man has interfered with nature. Nature had a way of cleansing the streams and the land in her own way. But with civilization, with industrial development, with the progress that we made in technology, man has been contaminating these special and precious resources faster than nature can cleanse them. And therefore, if humanity is to survive as a civilized humanity and a growing humanity with larger cities and more industries and so forth, it is not only urgent, I think it is absolutely imperative that the Government step in, bring in the necessary legislation, the necessary controls to see that we can at least stop further pollution. Some people say you can't stop it entirely. Maybe so, but certainly we can do something about it to see that the future of mankind is protected from this very great danger that faces us all in this world. I will have a lot more to say, I'd like to take about

land pollution as well as water and air pollution and I would therefore ask you, Mr. Speaker, if I could adjourn the debate.

The question being put on the adjournment motion, it was negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS – 17

| | | |
|----------------------|------------|------------------------------|
| Lloyd | Willis | Wooff |
| Hunt (Mrs.) | Nicholson | Broten |
| Wood | Dewhurst | Larson |
| Brockelbank (Kelsey) | Berezowsky | Pepper |
| Blakeney | Michayluk | Brockelbank (Saskatoon City) |
| Thibault | Link | |

NAYS – 31

| | | |
|---------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Thatcher | MacDougall | Radloff |
| Howes | Grant | Romuld |
| McFarlane | Coderre | Weatherald |
| Boldt | Bjarnason | MacLennan |
| Cameron | Trapp | Larochelle |
| Steuart | McIsaac | Hooker |
| Heald | MacDonald | Coupland |
| Gardiner (Melville) | Gallagher | Gardner (Moosomin) |
| Guy | Breker | Mitchell |
| Merchant (Mrs.) | Leith | Pederson |
| Loken | | |

The debate continued on Resolution No. 14 Re – Pollution of Air, Land, and Water.

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Natural Resources): — On a point of order. The Member has lost his place to speak when he made that motion, I appeal.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I haven't spoken yet.

Mr. Steuart: — I'm just going to make sure you don't.

Mr. Speaker: — A Member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate which has been negated cannot speak on the original motion.

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I realize that the Premier for some reason or another has a great desire to curtail discussions. His desire however, should not be allowed to play fast and loose with the rights of free speech of Members in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — All that was asked for was the right to adjourn the debate which was entered into for the first time in this session in this House. That has been refused. The Government has taken refuge in the size of a small majority.

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Sour grapes.

Mr. Lloyd: — To talk about a problem which is an outstanding one in this province and across the country, I'm afraid that they are going to have to do some further listening and to do it this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) put before this House matters which are surely worthy of some thought. May I say they were worthy of some attention, but scarcely a Member on the other side of the House saw fit to listen at all to what was being said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Look behind you, we are all here.

Mr. Lloyd: — This group of people are so certain that they know all of the answers, so arrogantly sure that there is nothing they can learn from anybody, they sat there not only not listening themselves, but at times making so much commotion that it was almost impossible to hear on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — So it seems evident they are convinced in their own minds that they know everything.

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): On a point of order. Rather than Members on this side of the House receiving a lecture, possibly the Member would speak on the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat that

there were times when the Hon. Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) was speaking, the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) went over telling funny stories or what they thought were funny stories, to some of his colleagues who were around various parts of the House.

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — On a point of privilege. I don't believe that it is any concern of the Leader of the Opposition what the Member from Athabasca is doing. It is none of his business.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I would hate to think that I had to be worried or take the trouble to be concerned about the activities of the Member from Athabasca...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — ...but I do so only to provide evidence to back up the statement which I have just made. There were times when he was moving around and having discussions, and people were laughing and joking that it was difficult even on this side of the House to follow what was being said. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are things which these honourable gentlemen, in spite of what they might believe, may be able to learn about themselves. In spite of what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) has said — and I agree that the Water Resources Commission is moving — perhaps they are going to move some more. In spite of all that there is still some faint small possibility that there may be things they haven't thought of. I don't think that this debate should be shut off until Members have had the right to suggest what we think, some of these things as yet, possibly unheard of, maybe.

There are constituents of ours who are bothered by these problems. Part of our job as Members of the Legislature is to stand up in this House and say what our constituents are worried about, and what the problems are. No simple use of the majority is going to prevent us from saying to this Legislature what those problems are.

Mr. Thatcher: — We just didn't want you to say them tonight.

Mr. Lloyd: — The Premier is glib with the tongue and he is loud with the voice, but he is not always very clear in what lies inside along with the tongue and the voice. And it is quite possible...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It seems to me that there is a considerable echo across the way, Mr. Speaker, and the loud voices certainly don't reveal depth of thinking in particular. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that there are constituents of ours who are greatly concerned about the problems of pollution here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I welcome this opportunity to talk about it. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) stood in his place a few minutes ago and tried to leave the impression that all that could be done has been done. All that needed to be done in the future was going to be done as a result of some legislation which he is proposing, legislation which is as not yet printed. Well I doubt very much if that is the case, Mr. Speaker. I can recall just one year ago in this House that there was discussion about difficulties with water supplies in the city of North Battleford, possibly in the city of Prince Albert. This is not the first time this has happened. It has happened over the years. This has happened because of difficulties which arise further up the river, because of the excess of effluent put into the river by industrial plants in Alberta. I don't remember that Members opposite were able at that time to make any contribution for controlling or improving the situation.

Mr. Steuart: — How much contribution did you make when you were in government?

Mr. Lloyd: — I have admitted it, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — You didn't make anything as I was the Mayor of that city.

Mr. Lloyd: — Don't start polluting the air anymore. You have done your share.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the unsolved problems and it shouldn't be above the Hon. Members opposite to listen. Perhaps there are some ways to solve it. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) introduced the Resolution which is now before us, he had in mind something that would make a contribution to it. I have reference particularly to the latter part of his Resolution which calls for the development, in cooperation with the Government of Canada, of a coordinated program to prevent pollution of air, of land, and of water.

The problem which I was talking about a minute ago, the pollution of water, which makes it at times unusable in North Battleford, unusable in Prince Albert, is certainly not something that's going to be solved as a result of the activity of any one Province. The situation at the moment is, however, that the jurisdiction is left largely in the hands of the individual Provinces. And certainly until we have some change in our laws so that we can consider our water streams as regional resources and not a Provincial resource, we are going to have a continuation of this kind of problem. One of the matters which are called for in this Resolution is a look at this kind of coordination which may mean some new laws, which may mean recognition

of jurisdiction in a different way than is the case today. If not, we are going to have difficulty in seeing that the water is adequately protected when we have streams running across various provinces. That is one of the points which I think it would be worthwhile for this Government to bear in mind at future meetings of Ministers or some Federal-Provincial Conferences.

Let there be no doubt about it. Unless we as a Provincial Government are prepared to give up some aspects of our local, sometimes parochial jurisdiction, then this problem is going to continue to rise up and haunt and bother the people of Canada for a long time. I hope the Government will see fit to do something about this in the conferences and the discussions which they have. They have suggested that they have done everything possible to prevent pollution of water in Saskatchewan, but I suggest that there is at least one example of how this statement is at least unproven. And I refer to the condition which is included in the agreement with respect to the construction of the pulp mill at Prince Albert. This was the cause of some discussion and some comments in the House last year. I think we need better assurance than we've had from the Government of Saskatchewan, that this does protect Saskatchewan waters, waters which flow on into the Province of Manitoba as well.

You will recall that we were told what the provision in this agreement was with respect to pollution, and I read it to you: The mill is required to take only, here I quote, —Steps conventionally employed by other similar kraft pulp mills in Canada.”

Now the Government may be satisfied that steps conventionally employed by other similar kraft pulp mills in Canada is good enough, but I for one, Mr. Speaker, am not. The history of pollution in Canada, if it's looked at, will show that one of the worst despoilers of water is industries of this kind. It's not just the fault of the industries, it's the fault of Governments who have been content with such generalized provisions for the industry to carry out, as this one which is in this pulp mill agreement in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I suggest that it is impossible to measure any kind of activity against such a meaningless standard. I suggest that the Government in effect has no real knowledge as to what the effects of the pulp mill may be on the waters of Saskatchewan. And if one accepts the attitude of the Government tonight it is not only just no, but it doesn't care and doesn't pretend its going to find out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Lloyd: — This I submit is not good enough. This is not good enough. Now I want to turn to some other examples of pollution in Saskatchewan, to which the Government would be well advised to turn its attention. One of these has to do with a condition of the South Saskatchewan River, in the area on the other side of Saskatoon. I agree with what somebody said a minute ago,

that there were conditions which were allowed to develop and allowed to exist with respect to the way in which the River was used in Saskatoon while we sat as a Government. but that doesn't mean that they should be allowed to continue. That doesn't mean that we shouldn't have a chance to say things ought to be improved quickly even if we didn't improve them. One of the communities which have been added to my constituency for purposes of the next election, is the community of Warman. It is as Hon. Members know a town which now has a population of 800 or 900 people. It is undoubtedly a town which is going to grow in population because of its closeness to the city of Saskatoon, and it is a favourable residential area for many people who work in the city.

Most Members who have followed the situation in the newspapers will know that this town within recent months discovered that its wells, the water in its wells, were becoming polluted. The structure which they had used for many years to provide their water supply and sewage disposal system was no longer adequate. They have to start looking around for a different way of doing it.

Naturally in their looking around for a different way of doing it, they looked to a great river which runs some four or five miles from that community. This would be a good way to solve their water problems. It would be, I say, Mr. Speaker, provided the water was satisfactory. Unfortunately, however, tests which were taken showed that the water is not safe for human usage at this time. Furthermore they are advised even after the city of Saskatoon spends \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 in developing some adequate sewage treatment, the water still won't be satisfactory for a period of another four or five years. The advice which they had said it will take a number of years after adequate pollution treatment is provided in Saskatoon before the river has been able to cleanse itself to the extent that it can be used for human usage.

As a result they are denied the use of this particular resource, and they won't be able to wait that long. They (and the Province, I hope) are going to have to spend more money than would otherwise be necessary in order to provide an adequate water supply for that community or other communities which may be in the same kind of situation.

And so it is important that Resolutions of this kind be discussed in this Legislature. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that Members of the Legislature on this side have the opportunity to try to tell, and I say try, because I think that's all that's possible with this Government over there, to try to tell them, what the problems of some parts of the people of Saskatchewan are.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature on this side voted each and every one against the motion which would prevent the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) from adjourning this particular Debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some other reasons why I submit that there is some further discussion needed on this Resolution. Some of you will recall that during the last fall months there was a conference in the city of Moose Jaw. This was a conference at which there was a considerable amount of discussion about water. As a matter of fact that was the purpose of the conference, to talk about water. And one of the speakers at that conference was the manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That perhaps we could overlook, but the fact is that the same person is also by statute a member of the Water Resources Authority. This was a deliberate decision, Mr. Speaker. I had the opportunity of introducing into this Legislature, legislation on which this Water Resources Authority is based. I had very considerable connection with weeks and months of research study which went into the framing of that legislation.

Since of course power is of such importance in Saskatchewan, since water is of such importance to power, it seemed logical to have on that board the manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It was logical for another reason at that time, Mr. Speaker. It was logical because the manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation at that time was one of the most knowledgeable persons in western Canada and possibly in Canada about water.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Lloyd: — This is appoint which would be recognized...

Mr. Steuart: — Too bad he didn't know anything about power.

Mr. Lloyd: — ...by almost everybody in Canada except the Hon. Members across the way who at that time, as now, refused to listen to anybody except their own little small, and I mean small in many ways, circle. So the manager of the Power Corporation was on the Water Resources Authority. He was one of the persons who spoke to this conference at Moose Jaw on water, in the fall of 1966, to which I referred.

And I find it somewhat frightening because of what he said. I find it even more disturbing and frightening that the Government has not to this day disassociated itself from the remarks which that gentleman, unfortunately I think, made at that time. Perhaps you remember those remarks, Mr. Speaker. He warned the people there against attempting to do too much by way of preventing pollution. He warned them that if they insisted on too effective pollution control in effect, then we might lose some industries. I think, and here I speak only from memory and I am subject to correction, that he used the phrase which some of my honourable friends love to roll off their tongues, "Don't kill the goose that lays the golden egg." As for this mythical goose that lays so many golden eggs, Mr. Speaker, you don't live very well or very long on golden eggs. The Premier applauds. I presume that in applauding he is, in other words, endorsing the

position of this person who said, "Now let's not push too much to see that our waters aren't polluted by industry." In other words, let the pulp mill put some more effluent into the waters of Saskatchewan. This is the sort of thing that the Premier just now was applauding. Mr. Speaker, the speaker on that occasion gave as an example, something that happened out in British Columbia. He told of an industry in British Columbia which wanted to discharge some effluent into a body of water there. Mr. Speaker, this particular industry was not allowed by the authorities of British Columbia and consequently this was a bad decision. And the moral of the story was supposed to be, "Now you people of Saskatchewan, don't insist on proper pollution or you may lose an industry." What was being said in effect, Mr. Speaker, was this, that we can make sewage drains out of our rivers and garbage disposals of our lakes, but for heaven sake don't scare away any industry, it's valuable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Lloyd: — Most people in this country and most people elsewhere will admit that industry is valuable but most of them also admit that good water is also valuable. I want to suggest again that I am disappointed at that statement, but even more disappointed that the Government has not as yet at any time to my knowledge disassociated itself in any way with that particular statement. The only response that we have had to it so far is the applause of the Premier a few minutes ago. and certainly that kind of philosophy which was represented in that statement represents very well the philosophy of the Government opposite. Take all the short-range advantages you can get and to blaze with the long-term needs of the country. That represents the philosophy of the Members who sit opposite. Time and time again they have given evidence to that end. Don't do anything at will interfere with short-term private advantages, even though it may be necessary to delay and defer those advantages that detract from them in order that the long-term necessities of the people and of the country may be met. That is one more reason why it is valuable to have some free discussion of this matter in the House. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner), the Minister-in-Charge of the Water Resources Authority may say, as is so frequently said over there, "Oh, it's all right Jack, you don't need to worry, everything is in our hands and will be taken care of." But, Mr. Speaker, their actions don't prove that particular point. It is simply not good enough.

Now, this is not, of course, all of the problems with respect to pollution in the Province of Saskatchewan. the Resolution makes reference not just to water pollution but it speaks of pollution of soil, and it speaks of pollution of air as well. Some Members may recall comments made by the Hon. Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) at an early occasion during this session when he referred to the problems of farmers because of pollution to the soil on their farms. In this instance it was of course pollution resulting because of certain activities associated with the production of oil. Nobody is suggesting that the production

of oil need to be curtailed in any way whatsoever, but certainly it is nothing short of sheer stupidity on the part of a group of legislators to say that there is no problem, that there is nothing more than can be done about it, that there is no need for the thing to be discussed in public forum. There is a problem with respect to the pollution of soil. As a matter of fact there are some studies which have been made which indicate that this is a much more serious problem than we think it is. Just the pollution that emanates from farm operations themselves is giving concern in some areas. I am not at all certain in spite of the assurances which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) has given this House that this is being adequately stopped. I would have much preferred and this House would have been much wiser, if the Minister when he stood in his place instead of saying over and over again it wasn't being done before, if he had told us something about what he intended to do about it now...

Mr. Gardiner: — I did tell you if you had been listening.

Mr. Lloyd: — ...it would have been more interesting. It's getting just a little bit senile on the part of the Members opposite to suggest that, simply because something wasn't done 15 years ago or five years ago, they have no intention of doing it in the future. One would think that there would be some horizons to their thinking, Mr. Speaker. One would think they would be willing to talk about and listen to some suggestions about things to be done five, six, ten and even fifteen years from now.

Mr. Gardiner: — A lot of hot air.

Mr. Lloyd: — But anytime anything of that sort is mentioned all they say is that you didn't do it 20 years ago or 15 years ago. All they are doing is proving their senility and the shortness of their whole thinking about the problems of the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is water and there is soil. The Minister-in-Charge of the Water Resources Commission said that air is separated from water and soil. That was the wisest thing he said, it is separated. Air is up there, water and soil that we are talking about are down there. There is a difference. Now this difference and the effect of air pollution is, as has been said, something that is not necessarily new in this province but this certainly shouldn't stop us from talking about it now.

Mr. Gardiner: — Nobody is stopping you.

Mr. Lloyd: — Simply because it wasn't adequately dealt with at some previous occasion. It's not new, not new, but one part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, is quite new and I refer here to the problem, which may arise as a result of the operation of the potash industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I know farmers in your constituency, Mr. Speaker, who are in deep concern about this problem of air pollution arising from the

handling of our very valuable, our very desirable potash material. I don't think there's any reason at all for shutting our eyes to the fact or for the Members opposite to try to shut our mouths to the fact that there is concern and that there is reason for this concern. Some of those...

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it's an insult for a man who has been in this House long enough and has just spent about 35 minutes in this to keep saying that somebody's prevented from talking. Nobody has been.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Gardiner: — This is an improper reflection on this House and an improper...

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, if my breath holds out, I may speak for another 35 minutes on a little more of this. The fact is that the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky)...

Mr. Speaker: — I don't want to be a spoilsport or a killjoy. I think that everybody's had a wonderful time and I would draw your attention to the fact that what's settled was settled according to the rules of parliamentary procedure and I would suggest that from here on in we apply ourselves to the Resolution.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely that it was according to the rules of parliamentary procedure. It was according to the rules of parliamentary procedure that the majority in the House have a right to make certain decisions and the majority made that decision. Certainly anything that I have said, Sir, does not reflect on you or any ruling that you've made at all. What the majority decided to do I submit, Sir, was in effect to prevent the Member from Cumberland of having his wish to adjourn the debate. The Member was not prepared to speak further this evening. He thought he would be allowed to adjourn the debate if he asked for that right and consequently he lost his right to speak in the Debate. There is no argument with that at all, Sir, or with any ruling you have made. My argument is with the action taken by the Members who sit on your right who use their majority in order that this particular incident took place. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was beginning a few minutes ago when I was interrupted by the Member for Melville, (Mr. Gardiner).

Mr. Willis: — Third time!

Mr. Lloyd: — For the third time at least!

Mr. Gardiner: — The fourth!

Mr. Lloyd: — I was beginning to talk about

the problem of air pollution. I was beginning to talk about air pollution as a result of the operation of the potash industry in this province. We had some evidence that this was quoted in this Legislature. My colleague, the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) made some reference to it. How equipment which is exposed to the air at all is feeling the results of pollution by deterioration because of air in which there are remnants of potash or remnants of something or other that comes as a result of the potash in the air or potash particles or substances from the potash operation in the air. This is important. During the last session of the Legislature we had some discussion with this. As I recall it the discussion was largely with the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) and at one time with the Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Research Council. It began, we got the same story. —We're watching it, don't worry. Everything's all right, Jack, no need to talk about it." The old, old answer.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that everything is not all right Jack, with respect to possible pollution from the operation of our potash mines. I submit, first of all that the Government that sits opposite is not spending enough money to make possible adequate measurement of just what is going on. I submit it doesn't know the extent to which damage is being done to crops, to trucks, to machinery, as a result of certain effluent coming out of the refining process with respect to potash. There are a great many people very much concerned about it. There are farmers who are convinced that they're losing money because of this situation. There are farmers who are convinced that their trucks are wearing out sooner than they would otherwise because of this situation. They're convinced that some of their machinery is deteriorating and needing replacing sooner than it otherwise would because of this. The best that the Members of the Government who sit opposite can do is to say that it's all right. They don't even want to talk about it except you can talk about it on a minute's notice. I know, Mr. Speaker, a number of farmers in my own constituency west of Saskatoon who are greatly concerned. Potash mines are being developed on the edge of that constituency. They've heard some of the results from other places as a result of deterioration of equipment and machinery, of possible damage to crops, of possible damage to other vegetation. They're worried. They're very much worried. It's impossible to get anything out of the Government except —It's all right, Jack, just let it go, don't worry about it whatsoever." It's the same kind of attitude here that caused them to object to the Member from Cumberland having the right to adjourn this debate tonight. You really shouldn't talk about these things. They refuse to listen and I submit that they really refuse to think about it. This attitude is not nearly good enough. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution is not only one which should be adjourned this evening, it is one in which we might very profitably continue the discussion for some time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, reference was made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) the Minister-in-charge of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Act, which would lead one to believe that everything started in 1964 after the election. You know

the Liberals have tried, Mr. Speaker, to rewrite history on several occasions now. You will recall that in connection with the Saskatchewan River Dam project they tried to rewrite the history there. They felt that it was necessary to remove from a film, the pictures which showed the Hon. Alvin Hamilton representing the Conservative Government of the day, the Hon. T. C. Douglas representing the CCF Government of the day when signing the agreement about the dam. They saw fit to remove from the film the scenes showing my colleague, the Mayor of Regina then and the Mayor of Regina now (Mr. Baker) saying what this would mean to the people of Regina. They saw fit to remove from the film, scenes in which I sat in the office of Premier and said what this water would mean to the Province of Saskatchewan. It's not new that they should rewrite Saskatchewan history, try to do so. It certainly shouldn't be news to us that they're in the business of attempting to rewrite history. And so it's quite in line with the tradition of the Government that when the Minister got up tonight, he started to talk as if all of this started with the Liberal Government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out some comments which I made in the House in 1964. And I have here the Debates and Proceedings for that year, the official report of the session for 1964. At that time I introduced the Bill on which the major activity of the Government has been based since it took office, the Bill for ~~the~~ Establishment of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission and respecting the Administration and the Planning of the Use of the Water Resources of Saskatchewan." Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Government on what it has done. This is one of the few cases in which it has done almost everything precisely in the way in which the Bill suggested it would be done at that time. The plan was all there for it. All it had to do was to proceed with it. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, it took eight or nine months before it got the Commission to do anything but that wasn't too bad under the circumstances, particularly for them but there it was. Well, I want to note, Mr. Speaker, some of the reasons which I expressed at that time as to why this Bill to provide for the better administration and the better management of our water was important. And it's still important now.

I was able for example, Mr. Speaker, to quote from an article which came from the publication of the organization to which my colleague, the Member from Saskatoon, referred earlier. The Council of Resources Ministers had this to say: ~~The~~ great rivers, the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa, the North Saskatchewan, the St. John and the Great Lakes as well continue as giant receptacles for man's foul discharges. Canada's precious resources are threatened across the Border, ocean salt water pours into the lowering water tables supplying the city of Baltimore. New York is forced to ration its water when the supply all but runs out. Canada, despite the fact that it has less than one quarter of the world's fresh water supply, finds her stocks, which are readily available to her people, being rapidly depleted through neglect, mismanagement and lack of knowledge. Canada has officially declared her intention to participate in the International hydrologic Decade 1965-75 thus starting the member countries of the United Nations

educational and scientific organizations in a global study of the resource.” Mr. Speaker, those words are as relevant in 1967 as they were in 1966. And it’s because they are so relevant that it’s important that we in this Legislature exercise every right to talk about this as a problem.

One of the big problems facing people in the use of water is of course how we use the water to begin with. The problem is in other words the kind of respect which we as people have for this natural resource. As a matter of fact whether or not we have enough water in the future of adequate quantity and adequate quality depends a great deal on our total attitude as a people toward conservation – a kind of response that we build up of people for our resources including water. And we’ve been tardy, all of us in recognizing the importance of water. We’ve been tardy, all of us in putting enough restrictions and inhibitions on man and his institutions and his industries. We spoil too much of this great resource. It’s because we must not wait any longer, because we must do more about it than we have in the past, that this Resolution is so extremely important. That’s another reason why it’s important for us to have the right to talk about it here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, on introducing this Bill in 1964, I had occasion to refer to a conference which the Government of the day had called in January of that same year. This was a conference at which we considered resource use, proper resource use, in the Province of Saskatchewan. Water of course was one resource that was considered. One of the papers given at that conference was written by people in the firm of Crippen and Stevens of British Columbia. They are people who do a great deal of consulting with respect to water problems here in the Province of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan well elsewhere. I think it’s worthwhile that we quote, as I quoted on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, from that report. Here is in part what they had to say: –Of the factors tending to limit or reduce the supply of surface water, pollution is probably the most serious.” That’s what we’re talking about this evening, Mr. Speaker, pollution, the most serious of the factors which tend to limit or reduce the supply of surface waters. To go on with the quotation, –Wastes released into rivers and lakes may render a whole downstream flow unsuitable for other uses unless an adequate minimum flow is maintained to dilute the pollution.” That’s something we need to talk about in this province. I go on with the quotation, –The necessity for maintaining those flows makes pollution or rather the control of pollution one of the major uses of surface water. Control of pollution is therefore one of the necessary processing measures which must be enforced to conserve our water supply.” It’s because that statement is so true that we must be so concerned when a member of the Water Resources Commission of this Province says to a meeting in this province, –Don’t press too hard the case for controlling pollution.” It’s of great concern, Mr. Speaker.

I’m told that we have a satisfactory pollution control, you need a dilution factor of ten as sort of a minimum guarantee.

Obviously, we must watch then, not only what actually is done to water, we must watch also the amount of water which is stored up in the province and which is transferred from one part of the province so that the flow can go to the areas of heavier population and heavier industry.

I want to read one further statement which I quoted at that particular time, Mr. Speaker. It was a statement from the president of the Resources for the Future, an organization in the United States. It had had a meeting, just shortly before our meeting which I spoke of, shortly before I introduced this Bill in the House. In the statement made by the president of that organization, I find these words, ~~that~~ in many parts of the world, pollution has become the most serious aspect of water management. The affluent society, he said, is in danger of becoming the effluent society." I ask the Legislature to note and to note again and to underline and to underline again those words, ~~in~~ many parts of the world, pollution has become the most serious aspect of water management. The affluent society, he said, is in danger of becoming the effluent society." And when one tries to get water for a little community like Warman out of the South Saskatchewan River, one gets impressed as to how true those particular words may be. The time is must later than most of us think. And because that is true, Mr. Speaker, it's important that there be a wide range of opportunity to discuss this matter in the Legislature and to prepare for discussion here in the Legislature in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if it is necessary to urge at too great length. I'm prepared to do so with regard to the value of water and its many uses. I'm not thinking just of the obvious values which are perhaps more measurable. We lack the need for good water for irrigation purposes. I think it is entirely possible we'll find ways and means of irrigating many areas which are now considered to be non-irrigable. Technology improves there as in other things. We know the great pressure on food-producing resources in the world. One of the ways in which we can guarantee a more constant certain supply foodstuff for the world is to have enough quantity of the right kind of water.

Nobody needs to tell people in Saskatchewan how important water is in under-girding our kind of economy. We need water if we're going to meet the needs of industry, industry such as the solution mine between here and Moose Jaw for producing potash and at other mines at which it may be advantageous to use this same process, huge amounts of water. I forget the exact figures but it seems to me that the Kalium mine uses about 25 or 30 per cent of water that the entire city of Regina does, water for industry, water for agriculture, water for homes.

As the standard of living goes up in the country so does the use of water go up. Take devices such as automatic washing machines. Every time somebody in the country buys an automatic washing machine the total consumption of water in the country goes up and this is going to continue. As a matter of fact I'm told that one way in which they measure the popularity of

the Liberal propaganda programs on television is that whenever they're on, the consumption of water goes up in the city of Regina. A good effective measurement, one of the best that has been worked out.

One of the great uses for water in which pure water, good water is necessary is the use for recreation. Let us not be under any illusion as to the desire of people for better recreational possibilities in the Province of Saskatchewan or elsewhere. Let us not forget either just how valuable recreational opportunities are in an economic sense. For example, Mr. Speaker, let me refer you to some of the results which have been observed in the United States to the south of us with respect to this particular possibility of recreation. There are those who say that the economic value of water for recreation is greater even than its economic value for irrigation for farmlands. Let me give some reference to what happened. A study was made of the attendance for recreational purposes at the Lewis and Clark Reservoir in South Dakota. This study showed that from 1958 to 1962 the attendance increased by 114 per cent. From the year 1958 to 1962 – that I think is a period of four years, Mr. Speaker, - in that period the attendance at the reservoir of the dame, for recreational purposes, increased by 114 per cent. It is quite obvious that this is good for the health of the people, quite obviously this is quite good for the health of the economy as well. That increase of 114 per cent represents an increase of one million people over that period of time who attended there. Now, if you look at the Fort Peck Dam in Montana you'll find, Mr. Speaker, a repeat of that same kind of encouraging and helpful situation. There during 1958 to 1962 the attendance for recreational purposes was more than doubled. Again, you can't have this kind of use of a resource, you can't have this kind of addition to the economics of an area unless you have an ample supply of water. You have to have water not only in terms of adequate quantity, you have to have water also in terms of adequate quality. That's another reason why it is so important that this Legislature have a full and complete opportunity to talk about this matter of pollution here now in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, there are a great many further comments that could be made on this subject. I think perhaps I have said enough to indicate that I have every intention of supporting with considerable enthusiasm, the Resolution which the Hon. Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) has brought before us. I want to commend him for making a contribution to this Legislature in giving us the opportunity to talk about a problem which is so big and so real and so imminent for the people of Saskatchewan. We need to talk about it, we need to have the opportunity to present the points of view of our constituents by doing this and hopefully we may come up with some better solutions that we have in the past or that we would otherwise have in the future. I support the Resolution.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for that profound lecture, especially at the end when

he was seeing if he could run out his record. Some of those statements he made I thought were tremendous and made a great contribution to the record of this House, like: —We need more water for more washing machines and you need more water if you're going to have more dams to have more people to go swimming in those dams, you need more water.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — It was much more preferable to the tantrum that he threw at the beginning. You know it was quite humorous this afternoon when they voted, or attempted to vote against us continuing a debate, but then when they found out that we had enough...

An Hon. Member: — You didn't have one...

Mr. Steuart: — Oh no, you didn't vote for us. When you saw that most of your Members were missing why you decided to go along with the inevitable and vote for it. But, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member makes this of great importance and it is of great importance, it's of tremendous importance, this subject of pollution of our air, our water, our land. If it's of such tremendous importance, where are their Members? Take a look across the House, they're the ones that brought this up, they're the ones who put it on the Order Paper, they're the ones that knew it was coming. Where are they? Well, they're out polluting the air with their special kind of Socialist politics and wasting their time.

Mr. McFarlane: — All they've got is 13 Members.

Mr. Steuart: — I'd like to get the record straight and keep the record straight, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution was put on the Order Paper by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) and...

An Hon. Member: — You said that once.

Mr. Steuart: — ...he's a Member of the Opposition, surely they couldn't have been taken by surprise. they evidently hadn't done their homework or they came in here with another purpose in mind and this is the one I suggest. Mr. Speaker, if you will follow the pattern tonight, they've got most of these Resolutions on the Order Paper. One Member speaks on them and before any of our Members can get up and speak, another Member jumps up and adjourns the debate,...

Mr. Walker: — Nonsense!

Mr. Steuart: — ...the reason being they're attempting to get headlines, they want to drag these things out, they're more interested in the headlines they can get about pollution or about other serious problems that face the people of this province than they are

about getting any action. I would like to clear up the situation the Hon. Member for Biggar, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), brought up about the pulp mill. They do love to bring the pulp mill up. They couldn't get it when they were in the Government. This is a sore point with them. They hope and pray every day that it fails or that something will go wrong with it. Again they brought it up. I can assure the Hon. Members opposite that we have taken steps, we've ensured that in the contracts with the pulp mill the pollution problem, any pollution problem, any pollution problem that might exist because of that pulp mill has been amply taken care of. We have the necessary safeguards in the contract we have written with the Prince Albert pulp mill to ensure this will not happen; that there will not be future pollution in the North Saskatchewan River because of...

Mr. Lloyd: — Will the Minister permit a question?

Mr. Stuart: — Oh, you had an hour there.

Mr. Lloyd: — I just want to know.

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a look. The Hon. Members says why do we always hark back to the record, why do we go back to the 20 years. If I had put their 20 years in an had their sad record, especially in this regard, I would get up and protest every time the Government brought up the record too. I don't blame them. I don't blame the Leader of the Opposition for throwing a tantrum and acting like a displeased school teacher who wanted to keep the children in after school because they had been naughty, and saying, "Please, don't bring up our record, please don't hark back on our record, but talk about what you're doing." Well, we will talk about what we're doing because, Mr. Speaker, in this regard we have taken action. The Socialists talk, the Liberals take action. Let me go back to pollution, let us go back and look at their record on pollution. I happened to be the Mayor of Prince Albert back in 1954, 1955, and 1956.

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Don't apologize.

Mr. Stuart: — I don't apologize, I was proud of it. We had a pollution problem and the city of North Battleford has a pollution problem. The North Saskatchewan River was so badly polluted that we had to bring in water for the public to drink and it had to be delivered in wagons around the city of Prince Albert every one of those winters. Now this was a tragic situation; it was a health hazard to both our city and the city of North Battleford. Let's see what they did about it. We came down here and we talked to people in the Health Department, we talked to Mr. Douglas; we got Mr. Douglas to come up there, T. C. Douglas the then Premier, and I want to tell you what he said when he arrived in Prince Albert. I want to tell you what he said when he came to Prince Albert about pollution. The press met him and asked, "Mr. Douglas,

have you tried the water you've come up to talk about?" "Oh yes," he said, "I've heard about your terrible water." The press said, "What action are you taking?" and he replied, "I took two baths before I left Regina."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — That is the exact statement quoted from the Prince Albert Herald.

An Hon. Member: — That's the Leader of the NDP.

Mr. Steuart: — "I took two baths before I left Regina." Mr. Speaker, what help did we get when we came down to these great humanitarians? The best they could suggest was: "Go along the North Saskatchewan river and see if you can find a farmer whose cattle have been affected by this pollution and get him to sue that company or get him to sue the city of Edmonton. We can't do anything." When the late John Cuelenaere was the mayor of the city of Prince Albert, he came down here at that time. He came down here time after time to try to get some help. We never got financial help, we never got legal help. All we got were lousy jokes from T. C. Douglas, the then Premier of the Socialist Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I would like to remind the Members of this House about another action. When we were in the middle of this terrible pollution, the Leader of the Opposition of the Federal Government, Mr. Diefenbaker, stood up in Prince Albert and said: "If I am ever the Prime Minister of this country, one of my first acts will be to make it illegal, I will make it a Federal Offence to pollute inter-provincial streams and waterways." He said, "I will charge those responsible \$25,000 for the first offence and \$50,000 for a second offence." Well, you know, he became the Prime Minister of Canada in 1956 or 1957, and 1957 went by and 1958 went by and 1959 went by and 1960 and 1961.

Mr. Gardiner: — And John went by.

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, and John went by. We never got the act. When they brought it up in the House, he did nothing. The Socialists did nothing. The conservatives did nothing.

An Hon. Member: — You've been in the Government for three years and you've done nothing.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, they like to talk about pollution and how

important it is, and how terrible it is because we suggested that they should keep on debating this problem tonight. If it is important, let's get on with the debate and make some suggestions to the Government. We've got a bill coming up later in this House that will take some positive action in this regard. But let me point out to this House that it was the Liberal Government that passed the Air Pollution Act, not the Socialist Government. It is a Liberal Government that will introduce a bill in this Legislature to do something at long last about water pollution. Again the Socialists talk and the Liberals act. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, and this is twice he's done that, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) quoted out of context, twisted and turned the statements made by the present manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation at a Water Pollution Conference. What Mr. Furlong said at that time, or what he inferred, or what he meant by his words, and the Hon. Member knows this because he has had the correspondence from Mr. Furlong, should have been cleared up to his satisfaction. He pointed out at the Conference that we must be concerned about pollution, pollution could be a tragic thing; that pollution, when allowed to run rampant, had done serious damage in some parts of Canada, some parts of the done serious damage in some parts of Canada, some parts of the United States and in fact all over the world. First he said he hoped that this Government and other governments would tackle pollution in the very near future, in fact that they would take immediate steps. but he did urge them that, when they did tackle pollution, they would do it in a sensible way; that they would do it in a practical way and not tie it up with so much red tape that they would in fact strangle industrial and other kinds of development, or they would strangle the very development of natural resources that we want to protect. Mr. Speaker, he brings this into this House, he brought it up before in the press and he did correspond, as I am aware, with the manager of the Power Corporation. He received the correct interpretation of what the man said but he persists in attacking an individual who can't protect himself. Typical of the Socialist, typical of the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You're the last guy to talk.

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, I'm the last guy to talk tonight, and I'm the first guy to defend anybody.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — ...people who can't talk back, you're an expert at it.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, at least if I'm an expert I'm better than he is because he didn't do a very good job. You know, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we must be kind to the Socialists, we don't want to be unkind, unfair. The reason they took no action about pollution of the air or waterways is because they didn't have any industry to be concerned about. We had an agricultural economy. We are now getting industry. We will continue to get industry. This is a problem

now, and it will continue to grow as a problem. Our Government, I can assure the people of this Province, won't just pass resolutions for ten or twenty years after the horses have been stolen, the barn burned down, and the gate closed and everything else. We are talking some action now. One of the first things we did when we became the Government was to pass an Air Pollution Control bill and start to work with industry to see what we could do as these industries located in the Province, potash industries included industries here in the city of Regina, new industries that are coming into Saskatoon, new industries that are coming in all over this province to see what we could do when the industries located, so that they would build the proper controls into their factories, into their mines, into their mills, so that we would not face the terrible pollution of our air such as we find in other parts of the world and in other parts of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about pollution. We have shown by our actions that we're concerned about this. We recognize that one of the greatest single resources we have is our water, and we are controlling the use of our water and we will continue to control it. We will continue to do what we must do to control pollution, air pollution, water pollution and land pollution. I think it is too bad that we have had this quarrel over this particular subject because I think we are unified on this. We intend to support this Resolution, but we don't need lectures from the Opposition about what actions we might or might not take, because in fact we have taken action and we will continue to take action. Liberals don't just talk about problems, they do something to solve problems.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, there will be ample time and opportunity for anyone in this House to discuss every aspect of water pollution, every aspect of water control. We could have made a motion and attempted to have this ruled out of order. We didn't want to do that. We wanted to let the Members talk about it, and they've had ample opportunity to do so and they will have ample opportunity to talk about it when we introduce the Bill. We'll do more than talk; we'll take action about this problem, action in this province about a problem that, if it isn't serious now, could be tragically serious in the years ahead. We are concerned; we are taking action and we will support this Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose that you can read my mind and decide right at this point that I'm going to say that I had no intention of taking part in this debate on the Resolution. When the Members on your right attempt to cut off the debate after a Member has talked about the Resolution on that side, in a very superficial manner, he attempts to cut off the debate so that no

one else may speak, I'm suspicious, Mr. Speaker. I hope to stay a little closer to the topic than the Hon. Minister (Mr. Steuart). He strayed far and wide from the topic of pollution. I just happen to have three clippings here from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, a fairly reliable northern paper in Saskatchewan,...

An Hon. Member: — It's an old speech though.

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon): — ...and this has to do with pollution. All three articles are of October 29 in the very same paper. —Cole to Attend Conference; Mayor E. J. Cole leaves Saskatoon Sunday to attend a week-long conference in Montreal on pollution control. The conference was the annual meeting of the Resolution Ministers and this year is making a concerted effort to discuss ways and means of solving pollution problems. Mayor Cole is one of 400 who will attend." Coupled together with this particular news report on Mayor Cole read as follows: —Caution Urged in Pollution Fight." Now I hope that the Minister from Prince Albert, (Mr. Steuart) sends over that clarified version of what the general manager of the Power Corporation said because we want to have a look at it but if I could just quote from this clipping in the meantime:

Moose Jaw. D. B. Furlong, general manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Friday, warned agencies responsible for water resources not to go overboard about pollution or industry might be lost as a result. In an address to the Annual Meeting of the Saskatchewan Rivers Development Association, Mr. furlong said, —Water is for use and if some is polluted in the process, people should try to live with it. If industrial firms were forced to install costly discharge control machinery as a condition of locating in the Province, they might go elsewhere. No pollution could mean no jobs." He cited an instance in British Columbia of a mining company which proposed to build a smelter on the shore of a lake not used for any other purpose. —The effluent from this smelter would have gone into the lake and on into another lake, also not used for other purposes. but too stringent regulations against pollution forced the company to abandon its plan and this industry was lost to the province, —Mr. Furlong said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is, congratulations to the Government of British Columbia. Regardless of the results of their decision they said you cannot pollute that water, and they should be congratulated for that. Another quote from the very same article: —Don't let anti-pollution get out of hand," he told the meeting.

I promised you a third article from that same paper. It reads as follows: Ottawa, Prime Minister Pearson announced Friday, the appointment of David N. Cass-Beggs, 58, of Montreal as special advisor in his Science Secretariat. The British-born engineer has for the last two years directed science and technical exhibits in the Expo '67 Pavilion, Man the Producer." Another manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon): — You saved a lot of money on that one, I must admit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I came across a very interesting article in the Resources special issue. The Resources special issue is put out by the Canadian council of Resources Ministers and it seemed to put the problem of pollution very squarely before the people who would happen to be reading this article. I'm quoting now and this is the issue, volume three, No. 11: "Polluting creates or saves things of value; pollution destroys things of value. This is the essential dichotomy facing every organized society on earth. How the society resolves the question of pollution depends entirely on the system of values held by that society." I think we can all safely subscribe to that paragraph. The problem of pollution is one of the most complex problems facing humanity. There is the straight physical aspect. What is the biological effect of altering the amount and kind of materials in water, air or soil? This alone is difficult enough leading us down some extraordinary avenues of biological research. There is the engineering aspect, the development of means whereby pollution or the causes of pollution may be reduced. There is the organization aspect, the devising of institutional and administrative forms and procedures which are apropos to the problem. Finally, the compounding of the complexity of all aspects in the aspect of values and judgments, for the ways are manifold in which individuals of a society use and view their environment. To some, the death of fish in a river, gulls on a lakeshore, song birds in a forest may not seem an intolerable price to pay for the economic benefits of herbicides and pesticides or from certain forms of manufacturing or for ease of disposal of domestic wastes. Others believe that while they are unfit to support natural life they prove in the long run detrimental to the economy, to human physiology and perhaps even more detrimental to human psychology. Discussions of this must inevitably consider the two kinds of costs and pollution. Dollar values and costs must be equated with more abstract and philosophic concepts of what constitutes the good life.

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — There was a little boy named John.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon): — Apparently the daily newspapers of this province have some concern about pollution. This is interesting, Mr. Speaker. I just want to quote an editorial that appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix on November 7, 1966. Pollution Complacency.

Complacency is one of the biggest in a series of complex problems to overcome in the anti-pollution battle.

Some provincial spokesmen at the pollution conference in the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers in Montreal last week exhibited a complacency which, if maintained in

official attitudes on the problem, will negate much of the potential results of the conference.

The Canadian Press reported that provincial resource ministers were generally agreed that the battle against pollution is going in the country's favour, an attitude which scarcely encouraged hope that the conference would result in the kind of action it was designed to stimulate.

This editorial includes a paragraph quoting Derrick Sewell of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science at the University of Victoria, as saying: Delegates

had hoped for a great deal more federal government leadership than had been provided.

The editorial continues:

There has been progress in the fight to limit and control pollution in the country, and constitutional limitations are imposed on the federal government in that the matter comes under provincial jurisdiction. But there is no room for complacency at either level of government.

Pollution is a menace that increases with the growth in population and industry. Not many years ago concern about it was limited to a very few persons. A common attitude was that there was no harm in dumping waste into vast bodies of water that make up our lakes, rivers and streams. It was felt that there was nothing wrong with belching smoke and exhausts into the seemingly limitless atmosphere in any quantities.

These attitudes are changing as we see our rivers becoming clogged with these wastes, watch the fish dying and the scum forming on the surfaces of once beautiful lakes, and choke on the fumes that sometimes fill the air.

Much remains to be done in impressing on the public the extent of the problem and the dangers of increased pollution in future unless adequate measures are taken before hand. This task is not made easier by spreading an impression that all is well.

A week earlier, the Saskatchewan River Development Association was warned by D. B. Furlong, general manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation not to let anti-pollution "get out of hand." He cited an instance where a mining company abandoned, etc., I read the particular example to you. It is precisely this attitude against which governments and their senior officials should be on guard. One of the serious difficulties in obtaining adequate pollution control lies in the need for concerted action by the various governments, Provincial governments. If they fail to act together and if competition for industrial development can influence the severity of restrictions against pollution, the cause for developing clean water and a clean atmosphere for the benefit of all people will be delayed indefinitely. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think

that clearly sets out the picture as I view it with regard to water pollution in the Province of Saskatchewan and in Canada. I have one place where I must contradict my Leader of the Opposition. He said that the consumption of water is bound to go up with the installation of washing machines. Now this is true in other provinces, but in Saskatchewan we have a new tax on detergents, and ladies, I understand, are using the water two or three times so the consumption rise is less rapid in Saskatchewan than in other provinces. I have one final paragraph I would like to quote from this bulleting I referred to earlier, ~~the~~ Resources special issue on pollution: The problem faced by the Conference” – this is the conference in Montreal – ~~is~~ to define the limits of water, air and soil pollution that are acceptable in various areas of modern Canada, and to develop guide lines which will enable us to remain with these limits.”

I take great pleasure in supporting the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worthwhile and I think the government would be well advised to speak on the matter as well, rather than glossing over it and really not saying anything about it except you had 20 years. If the Liberal Government should stay in power any longer than this year, I’m certain that ten years from now, if that is the unfortunate circumstance, they will still be saying you had 20 years and you didn’t do anything about pollution.

Mr. H. A. Broten (Watrous): — One of the reasons that I’m getting up and that I find it quite easy to say a few words on this is that I hate dictatorships.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Broten: — That’s right, I have a tremendous hate for this type of thing. I find that the attitude was to hold down, snuff out, to stop us not to understand the democratic processes laid down by the House rules, and I think that this is not right. A couple of years ago, that would be a year ago last summer, I went to the New York area visiting the World’s Fair; I have some family that live there. As we went by two bodies of water that should be a tremendous source of water, a tremendous source of drinking water for human consumption, I learned two startling things. One was that one of the lakes, I think it was Lake Erie, cannot be used as drinking water and the other body of water was the Hudson River. When we saw the Hudson River in New York City, it seemed to me that it was about one-quarter of a mile wide. I asked the neighbour where we were staying if the water was used and he said ~~no~~.” My sister lives out there so we went to their home and I asked her what the source of water in the community was and they said their water was from wells. The neighbourhood as a whole got their waters from dammed-up areas in the mountains that were close by. The next day we went downtown to the city of New York and I noticed that we didn’t get any water to drink when we sat down in a restaurant and so I asked for a drink of water, if we could get water to drink and they said ~~No~~, not unless you asked for it.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Broten: — So I asked for a drink of water and I was told, —Well, since you asked for it, we can give it to you.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Broten: — This is the condition — it’s all right for the Opposition to laugh, but these are serious things.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Broten: — You know if there were as many people that would have paid attention in the areas down in the States, they wouldn’t have this problem of lack of water where you have to ask for a drink of water in cafes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Broten: — And I’m sure that the people in that area wished that their Government and the people in the legislature had taken things seriously many years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Broten: — I have another thing that I am tremendously interested in as a citizen of Saskatchewan. We are getting the water from the South Saskatchewan Dam right through our constituency, and I’m sure that it will be much more palatable if it’s water that’s been guarded by legislation and by interested legislators. When I was down in California about three years ago we found that the most expensive thing that the municipal people had to deal with was the bringing in of water into the area of Los Angeles. One of the things that we found was that they were taking water for hundreds of miles in a very expensive manner. I’m sure that the reason for it was that the water that they did have near to them was not looked after in a proper way at the right time. And I do believe that the people in that area and in every area that has seen their waters polluted by carelessness wish there was better pollution legislation in their areas. I can remember about four years ago when there was a question of the division of the river in British Columbia that our Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) played a great part and took a tremendous interest in the powers of the water that was going to be given to the people of the United States. I think we can be very proud that we have taken an interest in the waters of our land. the year before the present Government came to power, we created the Saskatchewan Water Commission that was formed to look after the water distribution in the Province and I’m sure that it will also look after the pollution.

March 2, 1967

At 10:00 o'clock p.m. Mr. Speaker, interrupted proceedings and adjourned the Assembly without question being put pursuant to Standing Orders 5 (3) until tomorrow at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

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