

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
24th Day

Thursday, March 9, 1967

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MRS. M.A. HUNT (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call to the attention of the House a very fine group of students up in the west gallery from Athabasca School. They're here with their principal, Mr. MacDonald. I'm particularly interested in Athabasca School because that's where four of my grandchildren either have gone through or are still there, and I think I've got a fifth one going to start there in the fall. I'd like to thank Mr. MacDonald for bringing the students. I hope they'll enjoy the afternoon here and I'm sure you'll all join me in welcoming them.

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I too have a great deal of pleasure in introducing to the House a group of students from the historic northern end of Long Lake, specifically from the town of Simpson, who are accompanied here this afternoon by their teacher, Mr. Matson, and the chairman of the Simpson Local School Board, Mr. Pat Parker. I hope that they will have a very pleasant stay with us and that they will have an opportunity to watch this House in operation and that they have a pleasant trip home.

MR. E.F. GARDNER (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of all Members a rather special group of students who are visiting us today. They're sitting in the Speaker's gallery and they're part of the educational upgrading class from the Cowessess Indian Reserve, north of Broadview. I'm sure we would like to congratulate them on their desire to further their education and I hope that their trip to Regina today proves to be a worthwhile part of that education. They are accompanied here today by three of their counsellors, Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Sparvier and Mr. Gunn. On behalf of the Department of Education and on behalf of the Indian and Metis Branch of the Department of Natural Resources and on behalf of all of the Members, I would like to extend a very warm welcome to these people here today.

MR. G.F. LOKEN (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you a group of grade seven and eight students from the Sovereign School who are located in the west gallery and who are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Rafas. I know the Assembly will join with me in extending a hearty welcome and wishing these pupils a very pleasant afternoon.

MR. G.G. LEITH (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I want to join

the Hon. Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) in welcoming this group from Sovereign although the school itself lies in the Rosetown constituency. I know many of the young people up there and some of their guides and I too wish them a safe journey home and an especially education and interesting afternoon.

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention and to the Members of this Assembly a group of fine students in the east gallery from Strathcona School, Regina. Strathcona School is one of the schools that's got an excellent reputation and one of our older schools but is one that has always kept pace with new and exciting ideas for our young people. On behalf of yourself and the Members of the Assembly, I'd like to extend a warm welcome to the students and to the teachers who are here today in the hope that their stay will be an enjoyable and educational one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity through you to introduce a group of students from Westmount School in Saskatoon. They're located in the middle section of the east gallery and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Sutherland and Mr. Peterson. There are a total, I believe, of 51 students in the group of two grade seven classes. I might remind the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) that this is another one of those schools that are within a stone's throw of my place, the one with the broken window. I hope too in a few years to be welcoming other groups of students from Westmount and possibly my own son will be in that class. I hope on behalf of the Members here that the students and their teachers will have an educational and a pleasant afternoon and a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — May I beg the indulgence of the House in order to introduce to you a group of high school students from the Potash Capital of the world, Esterhazy, Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — . . . under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Miller and Mrs. Pearson. I'm sure all Members of the Legislature would wish to join with me in extending to them a very warm and hearty welcome to the Legislature in expressing the very sincere wish that they will find their visit here enjoyable and education and wish to them a safe trip home.

March 9, 1967

STATEMENT RE: REPORT IN SASKATOON STAR PHOENIX

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to raise a question of privilege. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) criticized my professional conduct on Tuesday evening in this House and it is reported in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of March 8, 1967 and I quote:

He referred to a case in which he said Mr. Walker charged a welfare recipient the full tariff of \$200 for legal advice.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a client who unfortunately had to call upon the Department of Welfare for assistance. In fact this client, however, was not a welfare recipient as stated by the Minister at the time I was acting in this matter. My fee was not for advice as stated by the Minister but was for conducting a proceeding in court for this client. In this court action, my client obtained a judgement for substantial damages but before the damages were actually collected from the other party, my client applied for welfare assistance. When I succeeded in obtaining the money on behalf of my client, the Welfare Department seized the entire sum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — My fees, Mr. Speaker, which incidentally were not \$200 as stated by the Minister, were paid to me by the Department of Welfare out of these monies on the express instructions of my client. It will be observed, therefore, that not one syllable of the Minister's attack on me is true although seemingly he has access to documents which came into his hands because of his officials.

The alarming aspect of this whole matter is that the property and the affairs of a private citizen chanced to come into the hands of a Welfare Department official. This official apparently routinely passed the file to the Minister, who finding something which he thought could be exploited politically, blurted the matter into every newspaper in the province. The Minister's attention should be directed to Section 15 of the Department of Welfare Act which provides "no information pertaining to the personal history or record of a child or adult shall be made available to any person other than through the Minister." Does this Minister understand that to mean that conversely all information coming into the hands of his Department should be made available if it can serve the political purposes of the Minister? This is question which should be of grave concern to any Members of the Government who are concerned about protecting the rights of our citizens from the misuse of departmental files and confidential information contained in them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: GROUP KNOWN AS "VENTUROUS."

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make an announcement that I feel would be of interest to the Members of this House and the public at large. During the last several weeks there has been quite a considerable speculation from a group known as "Venturous" as to possible action that the Government might take by way of legislation. I would like to advise today that, in order to put everyone's mind at ease temporarily anyway, there is no legislation planned for this session to deal with this subject. As everyone knows it's a troublesome area and I can assure the House that it will be looked into with some considerable depth before any legislation will be introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE: BAKERIES STOPPING BREAD DELIVERIES

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Members saw in the Regina Leader Post an article appearing on the third page under the caption "Bakery Stops Bread Delivery." Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Government on this matter. I notice that the report says that the Weston Bakeries Limited will cease home deliveries of bread and bakery products in Regina effective Monday. Mr. Speaker, bakery companies in the past have claimed that home deliveries of bread have cost them approximately eight cents per loaf. I notice a report in the Consumer, a co-op journal, if I may, Mr. Speaker, that they are able to sell bread at 17 cents per loaf in the Moose Jaw Co-op where no deliveries are involved. Bread is sold in Saskatoon and Regina at 26 cents per loaf. What I'd like to ask the Government, Mr. Speaker, whether it is taking any measures to investigate this matter and whether, as a result of deliveries being discontinued and because of the service being reduced and no doubt the cost reduced to the company, the consumers will be able to benefit accordingly by having the price of bread reduced by eight to nine cents per loaf and will the Government check into this matter.

HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier): — No, Mr. Speaker, it will not.

MR. SPEAKER: — I doubt if there's a Minister that has the responsibility of the bakeries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE: OFF-SHORE WATERS

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to before the Orders of the Day, direct a question to the Premier. In view of the case that's now before the Supreme Court dealing with the British Columbia claim for off-shore mineral rights and I noted by the press that

March 9, 1967

Saskatchewan was not represented by legal counsel — I believe I have mentioned this in the House before — Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence for a moment to point out that I think that there may be further cases pending. Would the Government give consideration to perhaps having someone carry a watching brief at these hearings in case there are further matters to be dealt with insofar as off-shore limits are concerned with other provinces.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, this matter has been dealt with at various Federal-Provincial Conferences. Since Saskatchewan has no waters that are off-shore, we didn't think that it was particularly important to us, we see no reason why we should spend money on legal talent when we just have no off-shore waters. We have enough Provincial grief of our own.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — You'll have more in a few weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: SAVING BOND SALES

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would like to tell the House that the bond sales in our Savings Campaign on the seventeenth day, reached \$9,600,000 as compared to \$7,800,000 a year ago. This is an increase of about \$1,800,000. The sales close tomorrow night, but we are still hoping they will be substantially over the \$12,000,000 mark that we had last year. I would commend this savings drive to any citizen of Saskatchewan who wants to invest in our Province. I particularly commend it to my Socialist friends who are advocating a Saskatchewan Economic Development Fund. I haven't noted how many Socialists have applied for these bonds yet. I hope there are some.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina West): — Just on a point of information, does the application require that one should state his political affiliation?

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington) for second reading of Bill No. 08 — **An Act respecting Group Medical Services.**

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I will have some words to say in respect of this Bill. I have done some work on studying the Bill before us but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, due to a death that occurred in my family in the last few days, I have not been able to complete

the study and get fully prepared in respect of this Bill and I would beg leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — RE: SASKATCHEWAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon City):

That in order to encourage further development of Saskatchewan's economy and to provide an opportunity for all Saskatchewan's 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; (b) Workmen Compensation funds and Provincial pension funds; (c) Annual Saskatchewan Savings Bond subscriptions; and (d) Individual equity investment in the proposed Saskatchewan Development Corporation.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — I want to join with the Member for Saskatoon who introduced this Resolution and to support it for the consideration of the House at this time. The Resolution deals with what I think is probably one of the most pressing problems facing the people of Saskatchewan at this time.

The present Government was elected on a slogan "Make Saskatchewan an Opportunity Province." And after three years, Mr. Speaker, we ought to ask whether the Government has succeeded in implementing this policy and if so, opportunity for whom.

An examination of the facts show that Saskatchewan continues to enjoy a measure of industrial expansion. Of course except for the period from 1929 to 1933 and except for the occasional crop failure year, the history of Saskatchewan has been one of steady growth. But steady growth is not enough. As Saskatchewan was growing, the rest of Canada was also growing and growing more rapidly with the result that Saskatchewan today is still primarily an agricultural province with only the most rudimentary industrial development.

The objective of this Government and of the province should be to try to find the ingredients which will propel the growth rate of Saskatchewan ahead of the country as a whole, so that Saskatchewan can overcome the lag which occurred in the first twenty-five or thirty years of the province's history.

After World War II, we were still in the position in this province where we had no adequate highway system. We were still in the position where we had no adequate source of power, we had

March 9, 1967

no Provincial power grid to make power available for industrial, commercial and residential purposes throughout the province. This province at the end of World War II was still completely without natural gas. This province was without any adequate or indeed without any source of trained industrial workers. This province had no concentrated urban market which would attract consumer industry into the province. Regina was a city then of about 55,000 people.

During the period, Mr. Speaker, from 1944 to 1954 roughly, Saskatchewan established a modern system of highways. During this same period, Saskatchewan integrated the various power sources in the province, tied them together, expanded them, installed cheap generating capacity and completely integrated our power system. During this period, also, the first ten years after the war, Saskatchewan commenced to bring natural gas to the major industrial centres of the province. Also, in this period we underwent a major revolution in the system of education. We organized our rural areas to provide modern educational facilities similar to that provided in our cities by the establishment of the Larger School Unit. During those years by various measures of industrial and commercial development, we established cities which were rapidly growing. Indeed, the cities of Saskatoon and Regina were the third and fourth fastest growing cities in Canada. As a result of the educational measures, we greatly increased the percentage of our young people who completed high school. We established a trade training system in Saskatchewan to train young people at least in the rudiments of trade and technical careers. And so we set the base on which Saskatchewan could grow.

The Province then engaged in a program of encouraging industrial expansion and by proper incentives attracted oil exploration to Saskatchewan.

During the second ten years of CCF Government, very substantial industrial development was undertaken. The largest single industry in Regina, the Interprovincial Steel Mill, came into being as a result of leadership and policies of the CCF Government during the last half of its twenty years in office. Indeed this one industry is so large that it accounts now for something like 10 per cent of all the factory workers in the province.

So by direct aid and judicious use of incentives we got our resources under development. We attracted potash capital to Saskatchewan and got the first three or four test mines established and the first ones under production. The oil fields which were established prior to 1964 are continuing now to be drilled out by the present Government and the oil reserves are being used.

Apart from a tiny pocket of base metals in northern Saskatchewan which was made economic by a spectacular rise in the world price of copper, there has been no significant development of our resource industries during the last four or five years. I know the Government tries to represent that this is a major step

forward, this small operation near La Ronge but I was struck by an article in the Financial Post a week or ten days ago which referred to the major mining developments in Canada during the last five years and although it listed several hundred mining developments, Saskatchewan was lumped with the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. There were three or four referred to in that group, none of which were in Saskatchewan. And so this little operation which will be, as I understand it, completely mined out before the royalty-free period expires is a matter of really no economic significance to the province.

I think most Members of this House are reluctant to believe that the natural resources of Saskatchewan have now suddenly come to an end. Why is there not any worthwhile aggressive program of finding resources, or if there is a program of searching for resources, why is there such a dearth of discovery and development of new resources?

I think the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) sometime ought to explain to the House why in the past three or four years little or nothing has been accomplished. I for one refuse to concede that Saskatchewan's resources were all tapped under the previous Government. I know that the Government takes refuge in quoting the figures for increased production of oil for example. But its significant that the increase in the production are falling short of the rate of gain which was established during the previous Government. The annual increase in oil production, for example, has never since 1964 reached the peak which it reached that year, it has been declining ever since. As a matter of fact if one looks at the Government's own figures, the figures show that in 1960 the increase in oil production was 5,000,000 barrels, the next year it was 4,000,000; in 1962 it was 8,000,000; in 1963 it was 7,000,000 and in 1964 it was 10,000,000; in 1965 it was 7,000,000; in 1966 it was back down to 5,000,000. So it is perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that a watershed was reached in 1964. The general trend of increase was upward and then the increase commenced to diminish from 10,000,000 to 7,000,000 and from 7,000,000 down to 5,000,000. And of course the figures for 1967 are impossible to predict. The Minister may know what the trend is, but the fact that he is not saying anything about it in this House suggests that perhaps there are no grounds for optimism and that the declining trend will continue.

Natural gas production is something which the present Government undertook to do something about, and yet the figures show for example that in 1965, natural gas production in Saskatchewan declined by 5.5 per cent.

The situation with respect to manufacturing is worse in spite of general statements made by the Government, general assertions that everything is all right. But the figures show that Saskatchewan is not keeping pace with the rest of Canada in the rate of growth of our manufacturing industry. Indeed the disparity between Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada is getting wider with each passing year.

March 9, 1967

The Government tries to make a point of high per capita personal income in 1966, the year of the biggest crop in Saskatchewan history. I know that the Government wouldn't have the brass — at least I don't think it would, I may be wrong — to claim that they had something to do with the weather conditions that created the most magnificent crop in history in this province. And yet that crop was a major factor in determining the per capita income of the people of this province in the past year. And so the Government tries indirectly to claim credit for the bounties of nature by saying that 1966 per capita income in Saskatchewan was higher than it was in the rest of Canada. Yet I point out that there were years prior to 1964 when the Saskatchewan per capita income exceeded the Canadian average by a wider margin than it did in 1966, the year we had the biggest crop in history. And so even that claim of the highest per capita income in the history of the province doesn't really reflect any credit on the Government, but only upon the beneficence of nature and the bountiful harvest that our farmers took off in the fall of 1964. In 1963 when the crop was less favorable, Saskatchewan exceeded the Canadian average by a wider margin than it did in 1966.

The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — and I suggest that I can understand why our newspapers tend to downgrade the facts, why our newspapers tend not to report statements, objective examinations of the Province's shortcomings industrially and economically, because newspapers are a business, newspapers depend for their advertising revenue on creating the impression that across Canada, our province is a growing and a thriving community and so it doesn't serve their own interests to report the true facts of the situation. The true facts are, as I have said, that Saskatchewan's economic growth is less than optimum, is less than it ought to be. So many people are unaware of these true facts about Saskatchewan's economy and I don't think that I can recite the facts which I have just referred to with any degree of pride in our Province. I'm disappointed, I don't blame the people of Saskatchewan, I blame the leadership which they are getting here in Regina from the Government in office for this discouraging state of our economic statistics.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to be realistic enough to make certain that the people of Saskatchewan know about the disappointing record of this Liberal Government because the people of Saskatchewan may have an opportunity in the next few months or weeks — depending on our trigger-happy Premier — to do something about the sad state of our lagging economy and we ought to consider not just the interests of the Liberal party or the interests of the Premier in this matter. We together with the newspapers of the province ought to consider the welfare of the Province as a whole, and if it is in the interest of the Province as a whole to have a fair and frank disclosure of the facts, then that's what we should have.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, as any Member can, the years when we sat over on that side of the House. Why even the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was able to get front page publicity every time he referred to the population figures of Saskatchewan.

Every person who derided or criticized the population growth of Saskatchewan or said it was inadequate got front page coverage. Now of course the facts are that they have been mentioned in this House over and over again but never fully reported. The facts are that in the last 10 years of CCF Government the average increase in population was 9,800 per year, and the first year under a Liberal Government this figure declined to 7,000 and last year it declined to about 3,000. The present figures of the Department of Health and Welfare show that transfers out of this province now in the current year suggest that in the current year there will likely even be a decline in population for the first time since the war, Mr. Speaker,. These facts are kept from the people of Saskatchewan because it is considered to be bad for the image of the Province by the people who control the news media of Saskatchewan.

I would like to think that they are doing this out of a genuine interest in the image of our Province, but I'm afraid that I have to say that I think they are doing it in order to preserve and protect the cracking image of the Liberal party, the Liberal Government and the Liberal Premier. I'm sorry to say that I think this is the reason why these real facts are kept from the people of our Province. Because if it is a genuine interest in and the concern for the reputation of our Province, then it is strange and difficult to explain why you couldn't pick up a newspaper during the days before 1964 and see some Liberal politician somewhere quoting these facts and figures and getting headline and front-page coverage. But this is one of the problems of being a Member of the CCF party. We don't have as many influential friends as our friends opposite. The road is a little more difficult but achievement is that much more satisfactory. I say that we will have to make the fact of the dismal record of the Liberal Government with respect to industrial development fully and completely known to the people of Saskatchewan, so that they may do something about this when the opportunity comes.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): — I hope they do, Bob, they'll be here for 50 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — . . . The old song, twenty years ago.

MR. WALKER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Saskatchewan want a Government in office here that will do something constructive about this lagging economic growth in our province. I don't think they're concerned very much about the fate of the Liberal party or indeed about the fate of the CCF party. I think that the people of Saskatchewan are really only concerned with the welfare of the Province of Saskatchewan primarily as against that of any political party.

Now some may say: what difference does it make if industrial development occurs in Saskatchewan or whether it occurs in Saskatchewan or whether it occurs in Edmonton or Calgary or Toronto

March 9, 1967

or Vancouver? After all our youngsters can go there and seek their opportunity in other parts of Canada. And some may say the winters are severe and the climate is a bit inhospitable, and maybe it is better if our sons and daughters live in Vancouver or some other place where the climate is more equable, but I say that this is not a very sound attitude to take, because many of us will continue to live in Saskatchewan. If our most aggressive, most gifted youngsters are attracted abroad because of lack of opportunity in Saskatchewan, it means that the absence of these young people from our province creates a pall of gloom upon the fabric of the province, it deprives the province of their skill and their leadership that is their contribution, it depresses industry and society of the people who are left. So it is important not only for those of us who have to stay in Saskatchewan but for Saskatchewan's institutions that a way be found of keeping these young people from having to go elsewhere to look for satisfactory employment.

I submit that the Government must concern itself with the out migration of people. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics show that in the first two years of Liberal Government, 15,817 people, an all-time record, left this province, more than came into it; and the suggestion now appears that the number this year will be as large as it was for the two previous years. The Government must concern itself with this problem.

Now what is the Government trying to do about this? Is it trying to do anything? I suppose we should look at its incentive policies. Presumably this is its trump card so far as industrial development is concerned. We call them on this side its give-away policies and it calls them their incentive policies. Well are they working? It means that these incentives, these policies have got to offer a lower return to the people of Saskatchewan than the people of any other province are demanding for the exploitation of their resources. It means that the Province must bid for out-of-province capital, New York capital, Eastern Canada capital on terms which are more favorable to the exploiter than they can get in Venezuela or Panama or Guatemala or any other place in the world. This is the kind of auction market, the kind of slave market which the Premier took the people of Saskatchewan into and puts our resources upon.

This is his policy, this is his means of trying to induce resource development in Saskatchewan. Not only are the terms of this development unduly favorable to the speculators that are enticed to come, but almost invariably this largesse which the Government of Saskatchewan offers almost invariably falls into the hands of speculators who are not even Canadians, into the hands of foreign speculators, promoters who are looking for something for nothing.

Most Saskatchewan people are concerned that this policy is not getting industrial development in Saskatchewan. Most Canadians are concerned about the growing domination of our economy by foreign promoters and speculators. And so this problem has two aspects, Mr. Speaker. First of all it does not

succeed as far as our province is concerned and secondly it places our country in thralldom to foreign exploiters and speculators.

Now the Hon. Walter Gordon, who is a senior Minister of the Pearson team, expressed this concern in his book and I suggest that the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) . . .

MR. STEUART: — I've already read it.

MR. WALKER: — . . . should go down and have a talk with him because he could learn something.

MR. STEUART: — I've had several.

MR. WALKER: — And who won?

MR. STEUART: — Well, I thought we did but it . . .

MR. WALKER: — The author whom I quote, the Hon. Walter Gordon says on page 80 of his little book called, "A Choice for Canada," as follows:

Since the early 1950s direct investment has continued to flow into Canada in large volume. Foreign control has now reached very high proportions in certain key sectors of the economy. The latest figures available, which were for 1961, show that non-residents control 69 per cent of the value of investment in petroleum and natural gas, 59 per cent in mining and smelting, and 59 per cent in manufacturing.

The Minister of Mineral Resources might find out why it is that the Boards of Directors of these foreign oil companies aren't promoting the interest in and development of Saskatchewan's oil resources, why they're sitting on what they've got. He might find out that he'd have to go to New York to find out. He can't find out in Saskatchewan or he can't find out in Canada. And then it goes on to say:

There are of course some important industries where capital from abroad is of less significance. This is the case in primary iron and steel, textiles, transportation, public utilities and construction. But looking at the picture as a whole it is evident . . .

Now mark this, Mr. Speaker,

. . . that no other economically advanced nation has such a large proportion of its industry controlled from outside its borders.

Now, that's not the speech of a member of the Russian, of the Soviet presidium, that's a speech made by one of the senior

March 9, 1967

Ministers of the Pearson Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . portfolio.

MR. WALKER: — Well he's not in the position where he gets his portfolio yanked away from him once in awhile . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — . . . where he gets assigned to a smaller portfolio.

MR. STEUART: — Bob, don't apologize, I know how you felt when you got everything yanked away from you.

MR. WALKER: — Mr. Speaker, an example of the result of this kind of unfortunate situation is familiar to the people of Moose Jaw who saw their flour mill closed and their people laid off and their . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — . . . To some Members of this Legislature this may not seem so serious but I happen to know a chap who worked there for about 30 years. He was just one month short of his 65th birthday when he would have got his pension, and being a company pension he's out, he's out of a job and he's out of a pension because of a decision which was made by a company whose headquarters is in the eastern United States by a company that does not recognize any obligation whatever to observe the national policy of Canada, a company that deprives the Canadian farmers of a market for wheat, just because it was the policy of the U.S. State Department to sell wheat to Soviet countries. And there you have this mill simply shut down. Now the Premier may say that this is not any fault of his, but I say that this kind of thing is an inevitable result of the kind of imperialistic development policies which this Government adheres to, which this Government follows unswervingly. This is the kind of thing which is part and parcel of economic serfdom, economic dependency which this Government appears willing to shackle on the people of this country, of this province.

We have other examples of Canadian companies owned by foreign corporations who have defied the policies of our country simply because it might offend the U.S. State Department. Most Hon. Members will recall when the Ford Company of Canada refused to sell cars to one of the Soviet countries because the U.S. State Department frowned on it, even though Canada negotiated the treaty which permitted the sale. And so we have this situation of a conflict of interest between these Canadian enterprisers and the interests of the people of Canada.

MR. STEUART: — What law did they break, Bob?

MR. WALKER: — Well this is exactly the point. The Minister of Natural Resources is part of a Government that isn't willing to make laws to defend against the interests of foreign investors and foreign corporations.

MR. STEUART: — How many laws did you break when you were the Attorney General?

MR. WALKER: — This is just exactly the point. The present Liberal Government in Ottawa is trying to bring forth a law now which will curtail the opportunity of the Rockefeller interests to bank in Canada and the Government has backed down on the law of this country, refused to even enforce the law which we already have against this great banking empire from the State of New York. And so my hon. friend asks what law? I refer him to the Bank Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How about the Ford Company?

MR. WALKER: — I refer him to the activities of the Canadian Cabinet and his friend, Mitchel Sharp who is willing to put the pride of this country under the table and go down, marching down to Parliament and repeal a law which offends a group of American bankers.

My hon. friend can ask what law they break. They don't have to worry about the laws of Canada, they can get them repealed any time they interfere with their unabridged freedom. The Hon. Member ought to know what the record of the Liberal Party is in this matter. And so there is only one Member of the Liberal Cabinet who is willing to insist that the rules which apply to all other banks should also apply to the Rockefeller interests from New York.

Well, Mr. Speaker, foreign ownership of Canadian industry has many other disadvantages. We often criticize the Saskatchewan and Canadian investors because of their evident unwillingness to invest in common stocks, because they would rather put their money into Government Bonds than buy blue chip stocks, General Motors and IBM and these American industrial giants. Well, Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that most of these companies don't exist so far as Canadian prospective investors are concerned; no Canadian can invest in Canadian General Motors because Canadian General Motors is simply owned by the General Motors Corporation of America and Canadians wishing to invest in the common stock of industries of their own country have no opportunity to invest in an industry which would be regarded as a blue chip investment, IBM, a wholly owned subsidiary of an American Company, General Foods, Coca Cola, Proctor and Gamble, Canadian Kodak, Canadian General Electric just to mention a few that don't offer stocks in this country on their Canadian operations, so Canadians are deprived of an opportunity to invest in the common stock of these

March 9, 1967

companies. International Nickel for instance is reputed to be a Canadian company; it is a Canadian company, most of their holdings are in Canada, but its registered office is in New York, its stock trades there and so if Canadians want to buy that they've got to buy it, again subject to the laws of the United States; they've got to buy it subject to the laws of another country, even though that company comes about as close as possible for an American company to be regarded as a domiciled Canadian corporation.

And so this fact that a large part of our industry is simply a colony of American corporations is part of the reason why Canadians have no opportunity or at least no comparable opportunity to citizens of other countries to invest in top-grade industrial equity stocks.

The approach of this Liberal Government has been to promote foreign ownership, the pulp mill is an example. I don't know very much about the corporate set-up of the pulp mill, but I was struck by one item that appeared in the paper about a year ago of a news item that emanated from New York. It suggested that there was a law suit going on in the city of New York that involved some \$20,000,000 between a group of New York stock promoters and a group of Saskatchewan promoters. And what was the law suit about? It was over who was going to get the gravy in the pulp mill at Prince Albert. Apparently both groups claimed that they had been promised or given the concessions and the promises of financial backing. So they were going to litigate over who actually had the rights. The headline referred to this, and the sub-headline said Saskatchewan Government favors the New York group. I thought this was just typical because I don't know anything about the merits of these two groups or what legal position either of them was in, but I thought it was just typical of the fact that this Government would be instinctively on the side of the foreigners, the outsiders, rather than on the side of Saskatchewan interests.

With regard to the pulp mill everyone on this side of the House sincerely hopes that the pulp mill will succeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — As a matter of fact some of the history of it causes a little anxiety as to whether it will or not but the pulp mill is an example, Mr. Speaker, of the kind of approach or philosophy which this Government takes. Here the people of Saskatchewan are called upon to put up all of the loan capital which gives them no control, no influence at all in the policies of the company or the future of the company or control of the company. The New York interests are simply called upon to plow back their profits on the building of the plant and their interests are all equity capital with the result that they have the controlling interest. They have the dividends. If the plant succeeds they make the profits. If the plan fails every one of us in this room and everyone in Saskatchewan pays for the mill. I think

that the present Government might have been a little more circumspect and had a little more of the interests of the people of Saskatchewan at heart and little less sympathy for their friends in New York than they did; I would have thought that any Provincial Government that was going to act as . . .

MR. STEUART: — Why didn't you do it?

MR. WALKER: — . . . trustees for the people of Saskatchewan would have felt or would have believed that its duty was primarily to concern themselves with the security and the benefits of the people of Saskatchewan.

MR. STEUART: — Why didn't you do it, Bob? You tried hard enough.

MR. WALKER: — Well, it may be that, it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the Members on this side of the House feel a little more strongly about ensuring and making certain that the people of the Province won't come off second best.

MR. STEUART: — Oh no, you offered to let them off tenth best.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government, no provincial government ought to attempt to rehabilitate or restore ownership in Canada's resources and Canada's industry by discouraging or discriminating against capital coming into the province, or into the country. But I think that this province, this Government ought to adopt some constructive policy to encourage the ownership of Canadian and Saskatchewan resources by Saskatchewan people. This is what I criticize them for.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have to put together a policy which brings the savings of the people of Saskatchewan and the resources of the people of Saskatchewan together so that they may produce for the benefit of the people of our province. The trouble is that these resources lie so far away from New York and Toronto that we can never really expect the boards of directors who control the capital of those great financial capitals to take very much interest in Saskatchewan. They are more concerned with developing resources which are closer to home and which are better known to them.

For example, take a look at Alberta. In the 1940s the Leduc discovery in Alberta attracted the attention of oil companies all over the world. No board of directors and no group of investors could be immune to the knowledge that here had been tapped probably one of the world's best oil deposits. And so oil companies moved branch offices into Alberta and commenced a tremendous exploration program there. Even then, Mr. Speaker, these companies

March 9, 1967

felt bound to constrain themselves by the boundaries of the Province of Alberta. They didn't venture very far into British Columbia or into Saskatchewan. They stayed in the province where their offices were located. And I've been told by people who are in charge of exploration by some of these companies that, it was reported back to their head office in London or New York that they had an exploration project in the Province of British Columbia or in the Province of Saskatchewan. The next question came back "Where in the world is that? We sent you out to Alberta to look for oil." The tendency was then to stay there within that one jurisdiction. So you had them coming right up to the borders of the Province of Alberta but staying within that province.

I think it is a fact that investors tend to direct their investment to places that they know, that they are familiar with, rather than to spread them dispassionately and objectively where the best sources of investment may lie and I think Alberta illustrates that point. The royalties were practically the same in Alberta as they were in Saskatchewan with really no reason, except that there was a provincial boundary and they tended to stay with the jurisdiction that they know.

Now, the proposal of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon is a proposal that I think is a realistic way of coping with the problems which I have outlined. I see in my law office every day clients who have tens of thousands of dollars to invest in securities of various kinds and for the most part these funds are invested in securities which come from outside Saskatchewan. They come from Winnipeg, they are invested in funds which have their headquarters in Calgary or in Toronto. I don't suppose anybody knows to what extent monies in this province are invested in companies outside Saskatchewan and which are used for the development of resources and industries outside our province.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a massive amount of capital can be assembled right in Saskatchewan by a proper campaign, by proper incentives and inducements. I believe that the people of this province could be persuaded to invest many millions of dollars in debentures, in stocks whether guaranteed debentures or not, of a development fund which would be aimed at developing our resources and our industry.

I think that people in Saskatchewan would regard this is a tremendous challenge. You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that people are selling farms for \$100,000 and then they are turning around and putting the money into savings and debentures issued from Toronto. I think those people would like to be able to put their money into some Saskatchewan fund.

The Minister of Industry (Mr. Grant) referred to the Alberta Development Fund and I'm not too familiar with it, but he did say that the guaranteed interest rate on that fund was something like 3 1/2 per cent. It seems to me that the Alberta Government probably hasn't given a fair trial to this kind of operation.

It should be remembered that the Government of Alberta has been in the fire insurance business longer than the Province of Saskatchewan and yet the Government of Alberta doesn't sell as much insurance through its Government Insurance Office as my friend, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) sells in the city of Weyburn from the Government Insurance agency there. It seems to me that the success of a program of this kind is governed more by the attitude of the administration than by anything inherent or inherent fault or defect in the idea. So what I would like to see is a Development Fund in this province aiming at accumulations of capital amounting to tens of millions of dollars. I think it could be done. Indeed I think that it has to be done if we are going to develop our resources, if we are going to repatriate the resources which are being developed. Some countries have demonstrated the practical utility and workability of this kind of a plan and I don't know how many Hon. Members have read anything about the history of the Republic of Mexico, but from 1880 to about 1910, the Mexican Government under the presidency of Porfirio Diaz did carry out and practise the kind of policy which the Liberal party is now following. They gave great tracts of land to foreign speculators who came in from the United States and from Britain and France. They gave to foreign capitalists franchises for the development of railroads, canals and things of that kind. They auctioned off the resources of the country to the lowest bidder, much as my friend, the Member for Maple Creek, does with his mineral rights. As a result of this there was developed in Mexico a vast network of railroads. They did get tremendous mining development in Mexico but it was all owned by Americans, British and Dutch and French investors. Well President Diaz as result of this obtained money for the treasury of the country, not a large amount but enough to satisfy a backward or primitive social system and he did amass huge personal fortune as a result of gifts that he received from these favored visitors as a result of the alienation of the resources of the country. He always explained to the poor disheartened Mexican workers he was bringing about industrial development, modernizing the country and he was creating jobs for the people of Mexico. These people were getting their pesos — one peso a day for working in the mines and building the railroads and living in depressed starvation conditions but there was some industrial development.

The Mexicans realized in 1910 that this wasn't doing them any good or their country any good. It was just like the fur trade here in Canada under the Hudson Bay Company. The Indians were just as poor the next day after they gave away their furs as they were before they gave away their furs. The only people who were getting rich were the people in London who were making a profit. So the Mexicans decided that this had to be stopped. They had a revolution, they drove out the foreign investors, and they decided that the resources of Mexico should be owned and developed by the people of Mexico. They passed a law which absolutely forbade the alienation of any mineral rights in the country to anyone except a Mexican, or a Mexican company. Then they found that there wasn't enough capital in the country to develop these resources by their own boot straps. So they set

March 9, 1967

up a gigantic industrial fund in the 1920s — I think it's called Financiera de Mexico and it encourages the savings of Mexican people. It also accepts investments from Canadian and American sources, but this fund insists upon a majority interest or insists upon control of any enterprise established in that country. So when American Westinghouse builds an industry, that industry is owned and controlled predominantly by the people of that country. It may be thought by some Hon. Members opposite that this kind of policy discourages industrial development. But I say this, that over the past fifteen years the currency of that country has remained stable. The exchange rate is still the same as it was fifteen years ago, their currency hasn't devaluated and what is even more important, Mr. Speaker, they have had year after year, a growth rate in excess of eight per cent per annum. When you consider that two-thirds of the people of the country are peasants living on farms and are not affected by this growth rate, the effective growth rate is much more than eight per cent per annum. They have done that by encouraging the patriotic efforts of the people of their country to put their savings to work for their country and by insisting that the resources and the development of that country be owned and controlled by Mexicans. Now I don't think that we have to have a revolution to get rid of Thatcherism here in Saskatchewan. I think we can get rid of it by a more peaceful method than that. But I think that we have to come to the realization that we cannot expect to remain a free country, a Province that can call its soul its own as long as we sell out to Americans, as long as we sell out to British interests and ownership and control of our resources.

When the Premier says that foreign investment keeps this Province prosperous and keeps our people working, he is making the same mistake as a farmer made who had seven quarter sections of land. He was having trouble making his expenses, and he kept selling a quarter section every two or three years in order to make his expenses. He was very prosperous as long as the quarter sections lasted, very prosperous, but there came an end and that end was when he was not master in his house. The time comes when we have no control over our own Province or of the destiny of our own people. If we are going to preserve control of our own Province and our own country, we must, I believe, not become hostile to those who would invest in our province, but we must become concerned with the future of our province to the point where we are prepared to direct our own efforts, to direct our own initiative, to direct our own savings, or the leadership of our Government to the development of our own resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — I am surprised that the Liberal party hasn't the vision to even express any interest in any other kind of program for industrial resource development except the give-away program. A party which believes in free enterprise ought to be trying to think of some other way of encouraging Canadian free enterprise, Saskatchewan free enterprise to prosper and to thrive and to

Improve the economic climate of Saskatchewan.

This Government seems to be content to whip the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) into going down to his office and trying to figure out some more favorable terms to give away the resources. It seems to me that the limit of their imagination is to send the Premier down to New York or some place to offer fresh give-aways, at the same time when the money and the savings of the people of Saskatchewan are being frittered away in outside companies, outside corporations, money which could be used to repatriate our resources and our industry. I would not be satisfied, Mr. Speaker, until I see a Government in this province that is willing to take a chance on the fate of Saskatchewan, which is willing to gamble on the future of our Province. I will not be satisfied until I see in the Government of this province a policy of marshalling and leading an interest in the financial resources of Saskatchewan into the development of Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if the Liberal Government won't do it, the people of Saskatchewan will put in a CCF Government that will. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people of Saskatchewan are not adequately participating now in the resource development of this province. How much good is it to Saskatchewan to be able to count the number of people who are employed in Canadian industries or in Saskatchewan industry when the real control of that industry lies elsewhere, when the profits of that industry flow elsewhere, because it's very important that these things be made a part genuinely of the Saskatchewan economy. It means that the tax revenues that come from these industries are being paid in New York or Toronto or some other place when they should be paid here.

Now I know that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) argues that, as long as you can give something away and get some development, it isn't costing the people of Saskatchewan anything. I saw him get up and say that as a matter of fact

MR. CAMERON: — How long are you going to harp on it, Bob?

MR. WALKER: — I'm going to say some more about it. I'm going to say enough about it to try to put stop to this criminal alienation of the Province's resources. I've heard this Minister say, Mr. Speaker, that by granting a royalty-free period it isn't costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan anything. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's not costing the taxpayer anything to give away a royalty-free period, the Minister must feel that the oil that has been taken away, royalty-free is not worth anything.

I say that it's worth something. It's the property of the people of Saskatchewan, not his. And if it's going to be taken away, it should be taken away in return for some compensation to the people of Saskatchewan. I know that he can tally up his figures and say that he's getting a little more royalty from the

March 9, 1967

upper level. So what if they are getting away with the oil at the lower levels, we are getting a little more from the upper levels and it hasn't cost us anything.

It's costing us the value of that oil, Mr. Speaker. We will have an empty hole after the Minister's policy has been carried out. It won't cost us anything but we won't get anything for it. And this Minister's duty is to represent the people of Saskatchewan to see that they get as much as they can get for their resources. That's his duty. Talk about not costing anything, you could give away the whole resources and it wouldn't cost anything except that you'd lose the revenue that you are entitled to have for those resources. If all those fine people who will take them away without cost to you, if that's all you want then I say that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to fair recompense for these resources. That's what the CCF Government will insist upon when in due course one is elected in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this Resolution wholeheartedly because I say that this is the only constructive proposal that has been put before this Legislature to do something about the lagging Saskatchewan economy, to do something about rehabilitating our resources to gain possession of them and control of them by the people of Saskatchewan. I would earnestly hope that the Liberal Government would adopt a similar policy as was adopted by Walter Gordon in Canada.

Unfortunately he wasn't able to get the policy implemented. He was able to get it past Parliament but he wasn't able to get it carried out. Well, the CCF Government will not only enact such a policy and implement it but will carry it out, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A.C. CAMERON (MINISTER OF MINERAL RESOURCES): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to take part in this Debate at all. In fact I didn't see that the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) had too much to give a rebuttal to. I think the House would be interested to know this, though. He talks about a so-called criminal offence, of the Minister of Mineral Resources, the criminal act of giving away the mineral resources of this province. Now if he thinks the Minister of Mineral Resources did a criminal act, it's up to him to take the proper procedure to see that the Minister of Mineral Resources, if he did a criminal act, should be held accountable for it.

MR. WALKER: — You were right the first time.

MR. CAMERON: — So having answered that, then he says, "If you elect the CCF, we will see that we will stop this giving away of our natural resources. Why," he says, "the Liberal Government instituted this. They think it's fine because you get some royalty from the upper zones that it's all right to give away the royalty

from the lower zones." If the Liberal Government looked for an example as to how to devise incentive programs and give away our mineral resources, they certainly found it in the action of the CCF Government when he was the Attorney General. Let me look at these so-called criminal offences which they indulged in. We are, Mr. Speaker, as you know producing helium in Saskatchewan . the plant was producing last year and it's producing this year. My Department has not yet collected one nickel in royalties from helium production. Why? Because the former Government exempted the company from royalties for three years on their production. They gave away the helium resources, in his language, to the helium company and they are not giving us one nickel in return for this production. Now he talks about incentive on the Devonian exempting them from royalties. I want to go back again. If you look back to the regulations, the CCF exempted the company from royalties on the Devonian for the life of the permit and the life of the permit if five years. If they'd had struck oil in the Devonian on the discovery well under the CCF, they wouldn't have paid royalty on it for five years. Who gave away the resources?

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — One well.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Shame, Bob, shame.

MR. CAMERON: — Who established the principle of exempting the companies from royalties? Now we turn to the mineral industry — we turn to mining. The former Minister of Mineral Resources who should have know the answer asked a question: "What royalty have you collected to date on Anglo Rouyn?" He knew what the answer would be. It is nil, it is nil. I was sure that this was the information that he wanted, so I put in the question that it is nil because of an Order-in-Council in 1961 exempting all mining companies from royalty in the Province of Saskatchewan for three years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — That's why we are not getting royalties from Anglo Rouyn because the CCF Government exempted them from royalties for three years on their production . . .

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. CAMERON: — Sit down, I've got the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — It's about time . . .

MR. CAMERON: — So let me take it. No. 1 — helium, they gave away the helium resources according to their argument. The company is not

March 9, 1967

paying royalty for three years. They gave away the Devonian oil for five years. Every mining company that brings in a new mine in Saskatchewan is exempted from royalty for three years because the CCF Government gave it to them. Then they talk about the giving away of resources. I'm going to be honest. I agree with that policy but I'm not going to be hypocritical and try to blame the Government for something which you did. I would think you'd be proud to stand up and say that you too were interested in encouraging mineral development in this province. I would think that you'd be proud of that. Now of course they want to hide it under the rug and they are so jealous of the resource development of this province. They are jealous of the royalty that's coming in now as a result of the Devonian discovery. They are jealous of the money that we are getting on the permit sales as a result of this discovery and they are envious of the fact that the people of Saskatchewan are welcoming these moves with open arms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — They are jealous of the fact and they are envious of the fact that in northern Saskatchewan today the mining firms have moved in. They are blazing new trails and opening up new frontiers, they are giving our Metis and native people employment. They are developing these resources for the people of Saskatchewan. Go up there and tell that story of the give-away of resources. I told here in the House not too many days ago of another give-away that the CCF had, a line, known as the A-B Line drawn from Lloydminster to Esterhazy. If a company wanted an oil permit north of that line, all it had to do was come in and file, it didn't have to pay a nickel. Who instituted that give-away program? The CCFs. Who eradicated that program? The Liberal Government. We said to the oil industry that this is enough. Anyone who wants oil permits north of that A-B Line must compete with their neighbor for the privilege of renting it. As a result of that policy we have brought in almost \$1,000,000 in sales of that land which you people were giving away. That change in policy alone brought in almost \$1,000,000. The sale of land north of the A-B Line is more than carrying the incentive program for all of Northern Saskatchewan. You talk about the give-away of resources. You've been hollering that ever since we formed the Government. I would think you'd realize if you took a survey of the people that they are tired of those tactics. They see the oil industry moving in now in every area of Saskatchewan. You name an area and I'll tell you an oil company that's in that area. Today the exploration continues from the US border right up to the beginning of the pre-Cambrian shield in the rock area. That's what exploration means to this province. And today in the same area which they were giving away for nothing, the companies are moving in. They are testing the Winnipegosis reefs in search of oil.

We last year produced 96,000,000 barrels of oil compared to 71,000,000 when we took office. We are producing oil at a capacity never thought possible in this province a few years ago. And there are royalties coming in from that oil. When we

talk about give-aways, people keep phoning me and writing me wanting to know what development is coming to their area. What are my mineral rights worth today? Is there oil interest? Is there a potash interest? Is there a helium interest? The people are watching this with great interest, because they know of the revenue that the province is going to get and they know today of the opportunity the farmer has to lease or to sell his minerals at fair and proper prices.

They remember the day when hoards of landmen were turned loose exempted by the Attorney General from The Security Act, where you couldn't prosecute, to rob the farmers' minerals for ten cents per acre. They talk about give-aways. What about the 15,000,000 acres that was given away to a friend in Toronto for one tenth of a cent an acre. He was able to take these 15,000,000 acres and became the czar of the oil industry in Saskatchewan. The legitimate companies couldn't even get a permit or a bit of land unless they went to this czar who got it for one tenth of a cent per acre. They had to pay him his pound of flesh. Every one of them today pays two and a half to three per cent overriding royalties to this czar on every bit of oil that is being produced in that whole area of 15,000,000 acres, because they gave away 15,000,000 acres of the province's resources to a czar in Toronto at one tenth of a cent per acre. He today has made millions and millions of dollars . . .

MR. WALKER: — That speech is 50 years old.

MR. CAMERON: — . . . on this give-away of the resources. I would think that this would be the last group that would talk about the give-away of the resources. When you look to some of the scandals in the North, that happened under the CCF Government when you look at the give-away of 15,000,000 acres to their friend in Toronto, when you look at the royalty rights that were given away here, then I ask them, how can they have the audacity to stand up and accuse this Government and this Minister of criminal negligence and of giving away resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I also did not prepare myself to speak to this motion. I notice that we have an argument about incentives. I say now some incentives are necessary and I think we have to recognize this fact. But the thing that I argue with is when we granted incentives for northern mines, it was on an understanding that when they made \$2,000,000 more, then they would after that start paying some royalties. I do remind the Hon. Members that the first mine in Saskatchewan which wasn't the Anglo Rouyn but was the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company and operating on the Saskatchewan side for a number of years never paid any royalty. By the year 1944-45 some \$600,000 was levied. That's all that we obtained. It was the CCF Government which felt that of these resources too much was given away, and we felt that a share must belong to the people of Saskatchewan. At that time

March 9, 1967

we initiated a policy of royalties. Since that time we have been getting anywhere from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 a year of revenue for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now this is what we are talking about. The Minister need not get angry because he feels guilty. What we are saying is this. When we have a mine such as Share Mines for example which has commenced operations at Mile 174 Hanson Lake Road and which according to published figures has an estimated 300,000 tons of ore, though only a little mine, it will produce \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 of net profit. Surely after they have recovered a \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 of cost, surely the people of Saskatchewan should get something back, instead of just leaving us a hole in the ground.

This is what we are arguing about and this is what the Minister had in mind. Your friends for example from Regina will take ore out of Rottenstone and though you helped them with \$25,000 or more of grants to get a winter road, yet we will not get one cent back in royalties, and this is what hurts. This Province is like a farm and no farmer would clear his land and put in a crop yet and let someone else take the complete crop away. This is what we are objecting against and this is what we ask the Minister to take a look into. Give incentives where necessary but not give away all the wealth that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan as you have been doing under the present regulations which you have set up.

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the Resolution before us is one of the most important Resolutions that has so far appeared on the Order Paper and for consideration of this Assembly.

I believe that Canadian people today are very much concerned about the future of our nation. They are very much concerned that Canada should become master of its own house and be able to control its own economy. The Resolution before us does propose a way which would on a long-term basis help us regain control of our own future. Mr. Speaker, I become frightened when I read reports that appear in various newspapers to the effect our economy is foreign controlled.

I bring to your attention an article that appeared in the Toronto Star on October 30, 1965. It said: "Two out of three Canadian firms worth \$25,000,000 or more are under foreign ownership or control." The Los Angeles Times of July 25, 1966 stated this: "The statistics show that 75 per cent of Canada's industry is foreign controlled." Of this amount 85 per cent is American.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): — I wonder if the Hon. Member would permit a question?

MR. SMISHEK: — Yes, I will.

MR. STEUART: — I wonder if you can tell us what percentage of the trade unions in this country are controlled by the Americans?

MR. SMISHEK: — I will answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I can tell the Hon. Member that approximately 70 per cent of unions in Canada are affiliated to unions in the United States.

MR. STEUART: — Controlled, controlled.

MR. SMISHEK: — Affiliated, affiliated! Mr. Speaker, you know the Hon. Members opposite should take some lessons and should recognize some facts about the labor movement. I'd also like to bring to the attention of the Member of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) that a Member of his own party who was the chairman of the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects, I know he is a Member they don't particularly like to talk about, it was Walter Gordon, a Federal Minister . . .

MR. STEUART: — . . . to you Socialists.

MR. SMISHEK: — . . . he looked into this question, in the report submitted by the Commission that he chaired. They said in their report that despite the fact that 70 per cent of the Canadian labor movement is affiliated to the American labor movement, there is no evidence whatsoever to support the claims that the trade union movement is under control, domination, or under direction of people from outside of our border.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — I can tell the Hon. Member that it is the trade union people of this country who determine their leadership, they determine their policy, for the people in Canada. I think it is important to recognize the reasons why part of our labor movement is associated with the American labor movement. It is because of the corporate structure. And I can also tell the Hon. Member that I am concerned about this. I would prefer — and I make no bones about it — that as soon as possible I hope that the trade union movement of Canada will make a decision — in fact it has established a commission of its own — to investigate its own structure and the shape of its organization. I am hopeful that within not too many years the Canadian labor movement will have completely separate identity. This is my hope, and I make no bones about it. But one of the facts is that the labor movement in Canada has been very dependent on getting financial assistance, research assistance, from people across the Border. But you take a look at the conventions of the Canadian Labor Congress and take a look at the national conferences that are held by the labor movement in Canada and you will find that we are determining our own future, and the Royal Commission on Economic Prospects concurred in that very fact in

March 9, 1967

their examination. They have also said in their investigations that, despite all the charges and all the allegations, there has been no proof whatsoever at any time that Canadian members have ever been ordered by officers from across the Border to require any local union in Canada to go on strike. I am prepared to discuss these matters but, Mr. Speaker, let me continue with the whole question of the economic domination and control of our nation.

I am concerned when I read reports that 66 per cent of our petroleum and natural resources are foreign controlled and dominated, that 98 per cent of our rubber industry is under foreign control, 97 per cent of the automobile industry is under foreign control. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have now come to the point that 90 per cent of our food canning industry is under foreign control and domination; 55 per cent of the agricultural machinery manufacturing control lies outside of our border.

These are things that we must be concerned about if we believe in this country and this country's future. You know there are those who try to suggest to us that somehow the people from outside our borders, when they come and invest money in here, are being big benevolent brothers.

An article appearing in the New York Times on November 19, 1965 had this to say. "Probably no U.S. industry has fared better overseas than the oil business. From 1957 to 1962 American oil companies spent \$4,200,000,000 on foreign nations and brought home earnings of \$7,600,000,000." Not a bad deal within a period of four years to invest \$4,200,000,000 and bring home \$7,600,000,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd suggest to you it is not benevolence; it is sheer motive of making a profit on the investment and not a small profit, but exceedingly large profits.

You know there are also people led to believe that somehow foreign industries who invest large sums of money are doing us a favor. An article appearing in the Leader Post a few months ago had this to say:

U.S. investment in affiliated Canadian enterprises increased by a record of \$1,370,000,000. Out of this vast total only \$126,000,000, represents an actual inflow of U.S. funds. The U.S. subsidiaries raised \$500,000,000 for growth purposes by borrowing operations on their credit in the Canadian market.

The balance, Mr. Speaker, obviously came from the profits made in Canada. It is interesting to note that while their control last year increased by \$1,370,000,000, the actual inflow of American money was \$126,000,000, less than ten per cent. The balance of the money came from Canadians and from Canadian profits.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an area for real concern. I am concerned about the food industry. A few months ago I read an article that some 14 canneries in Alberta and British Columbia were bought out by an American canning company. The canning

factories in these two provinces, the 14 of them, were closed down. The decision was made outside of the border. The workers who were employed in those factories lost their jobs. Now we know that in the Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, large quantities of food are produced and today these canneries have been closed down. The company retained the patents and they are now importing the cans from across the border and selling them here.

Now if we allow that situation to continue on a long-term basis we will find that, while the Canadian farmers will be growing tons and tons of food, it will be rotting away in the fields for lack of processing facilities. Now no matter which sort of area you touch there is cause for us to be concerned.

The proposal before us is only one of the ways in which we can start retrieving the control of our nation. There are other proposals. It seems to me that as Canadians we have a responsibility, particularly Members of the Legislature, to create an awareness among Canadians of the depth of the problem of how foreign control affects Canadian independence. Governments should take legislative action to restrict the escalation of this foreign control of our industry and resources and prohibit the sale of Canadian companies to foreign and non-Canadian residents. Governments should stop making financial grants out of public funds to foreign corporations who wish to come to Canada or want to expand their holdings. Governments should take positive steps in promoting development of co-operative ownership as well. We should develop more publicly owned enterprises. We could also take deliberate action so that in the future, foreign interests could invest only loan capital, not equity capital.

There is also a possibility, as some of you are aware, the one-time Minister of Finance, Walter Gordon proposed the levying of special and additional taxes on foreign companies.

We could institute a deliberate, comprehensive, short-term and long-term policy of economic planning for full production, for full employment, improvement of our social services and raising the standards of living.

If there is anything we as parliamentarians should be concerned about particularly this year on our Canada's Centennial and our 100th birthday, it is that we should do things for Canada this year that will have lasting values.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — It is the year to start doing things, those things which will result in Canada becoming master of its own house. This is the year to take the necessary steps to regain control of our economy. Up till now, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Members of the Government have not seen fit to make such proposals for action.

If being a Canadian is to mean anything, Canada must belong

March 9, 1967

to us, be free to make its own decisions, to make its own contribution to the world, yes, to make its own mistakes. In saying this, Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear I am not advocating nationalism in any narrow sense. The day of domination of one nation by another, of one people by another, of one color by another, is dying slowly but die it must. Yet each nation has both the right and the duty to maintain its individuality and national character, to make its own characteristic contribution to the community of man. It is my conviction that we as Canadians cannot make our full contribution to a better world, if we permit our country to become an economic and political appendage of another. Yet the bonds are growing tighter with each passing day.

I suggest that we must take action now or we will soon reach the point of no return. As a CCF Member of this Legislature representing Regina East and being a candidate for the Regina Northeast constituency, I believe that Saskatchewan's and Canada's natural resources are the rightful heritage of the people, not a preserve of private enterprise. I believe that Canadians should own and control the tools of this nation's production and distribution industry. This is not being anti-American or anti-anybody else. It is being pro-Canadian and, Mr. Speaker, this I am. This must be done if we are to achieve a higher and higher standard of living for our people. We have a wealthy nation. This nation can provide good homes for all, security for our senior citizens and full employment at fair incomes for our wage earners and professionals, guaranteed prices for our farmers and equality of opportunity for our youth. This can be done through establishing a twentieth century education, through adequate research and planning, through team work where all Canadians are pulling together, by taking those measures which will result in the profits of our labors remaining in Canada, through equitable distribution of our wealth and national income by strengthening our democratic institutions and extending the rights and freedoms of all our people, and finally by governments taking action now to ensure that Canada belongs to us.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution before us does propose those measures which will on a long-term basis ensure or help ensure that Canada does belong to us and I do ask the Members of this Assembly to give it unanimous approval.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (MINISTER OF LABOUR): — I don't like to say this, but if ever I have seen the red flag of nationalism flown, just this last few minutes I certainly have.

MR. SMISHEK: — It also has a maple leaf, Sir.

MR. CODERRE: — Surely the Hon. Members are not conversant with the activities of their party when they formed the Government in 1944. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if the former Administration had taken the proper steps at that particular time, the need for this

Resolution from the point of view of the Socialists would not have arisen and it would not be on the Order Paper today.

For example, it is estimated that were it not for the oil and gas revenue, Albertans, for example, would have to pay an additional \$160 to \$200 per capita or \$600 to \$800 per family in 1965 to maintain the existing levels of government. Now here in Saskatchewan we did not have the opportunity to benefit from this oil development that they did and we have to pay the extra taxes for it. Apart from this, Mr. Speaker, we have lost employment opportunities for our young people. It is no wonder that our population dropped continuously up until recently. If the CCF-NDP when they formed the Government in 1944 had not gone out on an anti-business, anti-capitalist, anti-investments warpath, which they very much and very vigorously advocated, the oil development, for an example, the Leduc field which developed from what was an operation which was then established in Saskatchewan, would have taken place in our own province. Our Socialist friends across the way have chased the oil development out of our province and oil exploration too. So you can see why now they are bringing this type of resolution in.

They want, or I should say, the Hon. Member who brought in the Resolution, seems to want to utilize in high-risk ventures the hard-earned funds of pension plans, compensation board funds and others. As I said had it not been for the attitude of the former Administration, for every 100 new jobs that would have been established in the oil industry we would have created in other sectors of the economy another 242 jobs. Just as an example, in Calgary alone for every 100 jobs in industry there are 651 other jobs created. We missed that because of your attitude in 1944 when you chased the oil exploration people out of this province. I think the Members opposite should bow their heads in shame instead of grinning and smiling for having chased out of this province this development.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You should have gone with them.

MR. CODERRE: — In the early stages of post-war development it was the most important industry that we could have had. This is why we in Saskatchewan today are twenty years behind, Toby, you were in that Government, you were in that Cabinet, and you are equally responsible for it with the others.

MR. NOLLET: — I used to ride a horse too.

MR. CODERRE: — Now at long last we are catching up with it, thanks to the policy of this present Administration.

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon): — Catch that car yet?

MR. CODERRE: — Now what they are proposing in this Resolution is to use

these funds. You tried to develop this. You got your box factory, fish factory, shoe factory, horse-meat packing plants and what have you and many more. Remember that our Premier had a certain debate in Mossbank with your leader at that time. You know the one up and one down principle of all your famous industries that you tried to establish with public funds. Now you want to waste the pension funds and Workmen's Compensation Board's.

MR. STEUART: — Are you going to rob the widows and orphans?

MR. CODERRE: — Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to mention. I am not concerned in the least with what happens to the investment from the outside into our country. I am not because it does provide jobs and it broadens our tax base. But how ridiculous can the gentlemen across be, Mr. Speaker? I believe that we, the Members of this Legislature are masters of this province and we can decide, if our industry is not doing well, to do the right thing through taxation and control it and develop our resources.

Let the public, the people themselves, the private sector, the corporate sector, the co-operative sector, develop the industries. This is as it should be and we can control it the proper way through the legislative method.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . Co-op oil wells.

MR. CODERRE: — I have no fear of outside investment, it provides jobs.

If you leave it to the Socialists, Mr. Speaker, I have great fear that they will be masters, but masters of what? Everything will have gone out and left the province. If they had been here much longer, there would have been nothing left. They are concerned, for what? Just to raise a bogey and to divide.

It is quite evident that I wouldn't support a motion like that.

The motion was negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Lloyd	Hunt (Mrs.)	Wood
Nollet	Walker	Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Blakeney	Davies	Thibault
Willis	Whelan	Nicholson
Kramer	Dewhurst	Berezowsky
Michayluk	Smishek	Link
Wooff	Snyder	Brotten
Larson	Pepper	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)

NAYS — 31
Messieurs

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

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. L.M. Larson (Pelly)

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.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, now that we are done with the Department of Criminal Resources . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — . . . I guess we'll get back to farming. I want to congratulate the mover of this Resolution . . .

MR. STEUART: — What for?

MR. THIBAUT: — . . . to have included in this inquiry fertilizers and chemicals, and I think it should be included — my remarks are going to be very short — on account of the sky-rocketing prices that have taken place in the last few years.

We all know that fertilizers and chemicals add tremendous cost to farm operations. In the last year fertilizers have gone up about \$8.00 a ton, and it is being recommended that they use quite a bit more than what they have been using. So if you look at these costs, it brings the cost of farming at about \$7.00 an

March 9, 1967

acre higher than if one went without it. But nevertheless it is impossible to farm without these chemicals and fertilizers. You take for instance wild oats which costs somewhere between \$3.00 and \$4.00 an acre to treat. The other chemicals such as 2-4D is not given away either and they run you up as high as \$1.00 and that is for the chemicals alone. Now you take for instance fertilizer, it will run you up another \$4.00. So here you have a cost of approximately \$7.00 per acre yet there doesn't seem to be any control over the prices. They have gone up and up and nobody seems to care too much about it. I feel that as a seconder of the motion that the more we protest the more likely that we are going to have a Price Review Board to look into these matters and to lay the blame where it belongs.

We like to blame labor for a lot of things, but I think the investigation should bring things out quite clearly. Now we all know that farmers have no control over the price of things they buy and they have no control over the things they sell, with the result that we are right into the cost-price squeeze. This is one of the reasons why I am supporting this Resolution. The sooner that we have price control the better off we will be.

We all know that the ones who voted price control out were the old line parties and I am sure that they aren't too interested in trying to control some of these prices. And another thing that has happened since the Thatcher Government has come into this province is that prices seem to have gone on the rampage. I think that the people who thought they were being held back a bit; as soon as the CCF Government was defeated they thought well now this is the time to really go to town. And we have seen it in the price of combines going up \$1,000 in one year. They know that this little group of Socialists that are here in Saskatchewan, they felt that they have no more worry about them. But I think that as soon as the Premier pulled the plug, as you might say, he'll have a lot of worries.

MR. STEUART: — Down with the purple gas.

MR. THIBAUT: — So I want to say that I am strongly in favor of this Resolution.

MR. STEUART: — Of purple gas.

MR. THIBAUT: — As far as the purple gas, you can come and campaign in my constituency solid on purple gas, if you want to. It doesn't worry me a bit, because I think that in my constituency we have a lot of things to talk about besides purple gas. We've got Thatcher patches that are in very bad shape, and cars are losing their pans and mufflers on account of these big grants that they are supposed to be getting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — Oh well, he is looking after

the crash. I want to say that since CCF Government was defeated in this province, as I said a moment ago, the companies seem to think that there is nothing more to stop them. So I say let us complain and on this side all we can do is protest. This is why I am speaking to this Resolution, because I am here representing a farm community. I know that this year we have quite a few farmers that went out of the business; and if these prices continue to rise there will be a lot more. I mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, that some 400 people left one municipality in two years. And it is farmers that have left. So it is just on account of the prices being completely out of control, they have gone berserk ever since we've got a new Government in Saskatchewan and especially because we have a Premier that roams the country and says, "She's for sale, come and buy it. If you don't want to buy it we will give it to you. And if you don't want to take it, we'll pay you to take it."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. THIBAUT: — So on it goes. I hope we'll get unanimous support for this Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 14 — RE: POLLUTION OF AIR, LAND AND WATER

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon City):

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 (b) the development, in co-operation with the Government of Canada, of a co-ordinated program to prevent pollution of air, land and water.

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few moments of the Assembly's time to place on the records some views that I have in connection with pollution, a subject, that I touched on in a previous debate, very briefly, which I think is of real concern to us here in Saskatchewan, although perhaps not of dangerous proportions as yet.

I think there are two general areas that I would like to direct to the Government's attention, two general areas of

March 9, 1967

Pollution that I think will develop and become very serious as time goes by.

The first of course is in the question of water pollution. I believe that it is time for the Government to start taking a look at the problems surrounding financing of sewage disposal systems for those urban centres in particular who are using our main river, the Saskatchewan River, as an outlet for their waste deposits. I believe that it is in the public interest for the Government, and I am sure that they are doing something in this regard, to continue to keep a close watch on the amount of pollution that is taking place in our rivers, with a view to planning for the provision of services that will keep it at a safe level. I referred once before to the work that is going on in Ontario in connection with the Ontario Water Resources Commission, where they have established, under the Commission, a grant system for the provision of supplying, not only water supply systems, but also sewage disposal units in those communities and areas that find that they are unable to handle the massive sewage problems that they face.

The Saskatchewan River may seem to us to be a river that could absorb a tremendous amount of sewage without becoming contaminated. But in spite of the fact that we are told that within so many feet of the outfall the dispersement is so great that the contamination is almost infinitesimal, the fact of the matter is that in a river system as long as the South Saskatchewan River, containing as it does the substantial number of dead animals and dead fish which are a natural hazard, in a river system such as ours, containing as it does the outfall from various communities along that river, by the time we get into the northeastern part of the province, I believe that contamination is substantial enough that it warrants investigation and it warrants the Government keeping a close tab.

I would hope, as I mentioned once before, that something would be done to look into the proposal of establishing a grant system for the supplying of this type of service that I referred to, a service that the city of Saskatoon, for example, could use in building sewage disposal units that would not require them dumping semi-processed sewage into the river and creating a health hazard, as was referred to by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) the other day, in moving the Resolution, to the community of Warman to the north of us, who might want to use that water.

I don't want to say anymore about that because I am quite certain that the Government Members as well as those on this side of the House are very much aware of the dangers of water pollution. I would like to direct to the Attorney General the proposal that some studies be carried out in connection with pollution, air pollution, from the exhaust system of automobiles. The latest models of automobiles are generally equipped with what is known as a positive crankcase ventilation system. this system is supposed to take the hydrocarbons that are created in the motor of a car and run them through the motor again, burning

them so that they emerge as a carbon monoxide. Carbon monoxide is not nearly as poisonous, nor is it as apt to pollute the air, as the hydrocarbons which are given off under the old type of exhaust system. Now this new setup that is coming out, and is mandatory on all new automobiles, is all very fine except for the fact that it plugs up very quickly after coming in use in dusty Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact it has been proven that after three or four thousand miles of driving, unless there is a servicing job done, we are in fact finding this system completely inoperative and we are, in the winter time in particular, subjecting people who are sitting in closed cars and so on, to the hydrocarbon fumes that are being emitted from the exhaust systems of the cars in front of them. I believe that if you were to check with the medical profession you would find that, in the case of most deaths resulting from monoxide fumes in a car, they result from the hydrocarbon rather than the carbon dioxides which are coming from the exhaust system.

The suggestion that I would like to make is that in the carrying out of vehicle inspections by the law enforcement bodies of this province, when they stop a car on the highway to check it for brakes and lights and so on, it would only take one moment for them also to check for the proper functioning of this positive crankcase ventilation system. There is a gadget on the market which only costs about \$1.00 or \$1.50 that can just be screwed into the filter cap on top of the head of the engine. With the motor running it will indicate immediately if the system is working or not. And I believe that such a thing is well within the bounds of the inspections that could be carried out. It has become mandatory in the list of prepared inspections, that must be carried out by police, in many states in the United States. I think it is the same type of safety check that could be made here, when the law enforcement bodies are making these sort of spot checks.

These are the type of things, Mr. Speaker, that I believe — perhaps in themselves insignificant — must be watched in order to reduce or to erase if possible the problem of pollution in this province, where incidentally, as everyone knows, we have enjoyed a relatively free type or pure type of atmosphere in which to live.

I don't want to belabor the points that have been made by other Members, Mr. Speaker. Pollution, in all aspects, both in the pollution of the air and the water, as well as pollution insofar as our soils are concerned, and I am now referring to the continuing use of highly toxic poisons for the management and control of insects and weeds and so on, must be of concern to all Members at all times. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some very exhaustive studies made of the degree of contamination of our soils that have resulted from the spreading of sprays that we use for weeds, the type of sprays we use in the control of grasshoppers, the type of chemicals that we are using to treat our seed grain for cutworm and so on, so that we do not start to build up a substantial residue of insoluble poisons in the soil which will eventually find their way into

March 9, 1967

our underground water supply.

I am sure that all Hon. Members are aware of several areas in the United States where this has happened, where the poison build-up in the soil has reached the underground water supply and has made underground waters unfit for either human or animal consumption for a radius of 50 to 60 miles in all directions from the area that has been contaminated.

I would hope that in the case of chemical plants producing these types of poisons, particularly those north of Saskatoon, that a very close watch will be kept to see that spillage and that type of thing do not penetrate the soil and find its way into the South Saskatchewan River, making it unusable from that point to its outfall in Hudson Bay.

I am extremely concerned about these matters, Mr. Speaker, because after reading many articles and studying this very carefully, I can readily see how quickly we can build up a residue of poisons in our soil that could ultimately destroy not only human habitation or the opportunity for human habitation in vast areas of our province, but would destroy wild life of our province.

I am sure that all Hon. Members who are farmers, like myself, have noticed as an example the fantastic decline in the number of song birds that we see in the prairies over the last few years. I am certain that all Hon. Members who have ridden on a tractor in the spring, and looked back and remembered the days when he would be followed by literally hundreds of Franklin gulls, will realize that over the last two or three years, it is a rarity to see one. This, Mr. Speaker, is because we are poisoning them. And we are poisoning them at an unprecedented rate. These are things I believe that fall within the context of this Resolution that is before us this afternoon.

There was an article written not too long ago referring to the "silent land," and, Mr. Speaker, I am one of those sons of the soil that dread the day when I shall come out early in the morning to get on my tractor, and hear an absolute deathly silence greeting me. I believe that that day is approaching, Mr. Speaker. Some serious steps and some serious consideration must be given to the continuing use of these very useful and yet deadly poisons that are being spread not only on the ground but in the air in order to control nature, as it were.

It is certainly true we need to increase our production, and it is true that we have to do everything we can to aid and assist in the production of food and the decline of those things that tend to destroy the production of food. But let us not do it at the price of destroying the very land in which we live.

These are some of the things that I wanted to place on the record, Mr. Speaker, and very naturally I will support the Resolution.

MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I shall only take a minute or two to make a statement or two on this Resolution.

It has already been debated at some length and most of the things that I wanted to say on this have been said and possibly said better than I could have said them. However, there are one or two things that I cannot let go by. I understand that it has been said that we suffer from practically no water pollution from rivers that have their source outside our province. This is not true and it has not been true for a number of years; I remind the House that we had a pollution problem in the North Saskatchewan River back in the fifties. The situation is worsening. I am sure that some companies that are situated in Alberta are attempting honestly to do something about it, but not enough has been done yet. We certainly must have a program that the Federal Government is not only interested in but certainly a program and a law that will provide the Federal Government with teeth, that will definitely do something about preventing further pollution of both North and South Saskatchewan Rivers in Alberta.

The town of Fort Saskatchewan is now contemplating a very costly pipe line to bring water from the North Saskatchewan River, above Edmonton down to Fort Saskatchewan to give them a water supply because their wells can no longer produce the necessary water supply for their use. This town has only 4,000 people and the industries that are there also require fresh water.

The city of Edmonton and the Government of Alberta are providing a subsidy to the town of Fort Saskatchewan to dig wells there, indicating that they have admitted that there is too much pollution. The Department of Health in Alberta has admitted that there is so much pollution that the river water at Fort Saskatchewan is unfit for human consumption. This is why Fort Saskatchewan has successfully made the case and received an actual payment from the senior governments to assist them in providing a better water supply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it isn't good enough for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) to say that there is very little pollution and it is not too much to worry about. It isn't good enough for the General Manager of the Power Corporation to say, "You're bound to have a little bit of pollution, if you are going to get industry, you have to learn to live with it." This is a disgraceful statement. This is something that we cannot and must not fail to cope with. We must be more alert than ever in order to prevent the growing problem of pollution in our inter-provincial streams.

It is far more important that we have this section in this motion which deals with co-operation from the Federal Government than anything we might do on the Provincial scene. We have control provincially and I think that we can see to it that we do control the Provincial areas under our jurisdiction, but federally we must have more action, more definite laws to control pollution.

March 9, 1967

My city of North Battleford, and especially the town of Battleford, which gets all its water supply from the North Saskatchewan River has suffered from this problem now for many years. It is a chronic one, it is a perennial one. I sincerely hope that we will have action and determined action to see to it that this situation does not continue to worsen. In fact we must have action to see to it that the present situation is corrected.

I will support this motion.

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a word or two on this Resolution.

First of all I think that all Members of the House are in agreement that this is a good Resolution. And pollution of course, is a problem which Canada is going to have to face not only today but in the future.

When we consider the fact that Saskatchewan today is industrializing very rapidly and when we consider the fact that much of our water originates from outside our boundaries, certainly we are all in agreement that water is one of the richest natural resources that this Province has. Certainly we must protect it, not only for health reasons but for all the other reasons that are involved in the future.

I think too that this Resolution contains two or three very good ideas. It includes all pollution, not only in the air, but also in the water and on the land. I think, too, it emphasizes one of the major areas of concern which is co-operation with the Federal Government.

Therefore, I think that most Members of this House will support this Resolution. However, I think there is one factor that should be mentioned when we talk to the Federal Government and pass on this Resolution and that is the fact that this Government has passed in 1965 The Air Pollution Act. Therefore I would like to move this amendment so that this would be included, so that the Federal Government would be aware of the steps that have already been taken and so that they would have a bit of background as far as our Province is concerned.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move the following amendment, seconded by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron):

That the words "commends the Government of Saskatchewan for passing The Air Pollution Act in the Session of 1965 and" be inserted between the word "assets" and the word "recommends" in the fifth line, and that the words "of the air" in the eighth line be deleted.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina West): — Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word on the amendment which I think is really a rather silly amendment. All it does is

commend the Government with respect to The Air Pollution Act of 1965. It would have been just as sensible for one of us to get up and commend the previous Government for the passage of The Pollution of Waters (Prevention) Act of 1962 and when we could have talked about the amendment to The City Act of 1964 which dealt with air pollution and we could have thereby listed all of the Acts by which this Legislature has dealt with pollution of one kind or another. Water pollution, which was the urgent problem, was dealt with by a specific Act in 1962. It appears that this has escaped the notice of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) who stood in his place and said that an Act was going to be introduced and spoke as if it was the first time there had been a Water Pollution Act. Well, of course, we all know or all should know that there is now on the books a Water Pollution Act. There was provision in The City Act with respect to air pollution when the present Government took over. It then passed an Act dealing with air pollution. This sounded like a good idea. No one objects to the Bill on air pollution. As a matter of fact I think everybody unanimously supported it. I think the difficulty with this amendment is two-fold. The first portion of the amendment is superfluous unless we're going to list all the Provincial legislation and commend all of the Administrations which have dealt with pollution in one of its forms. There's no particular reason for picking out air pollution, since I think it would be generally conceded that water pollution is a somewhat more serious problem at this time and therefore it would be more sensible to insert "commend the Government of the day of 1962 for passage of The Pollution of Waters (Prevention) Act."

MR. STEUART: — No, we'd never do that.

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I'm sure you wouldn't because you're anxious to obscure that previous Act. I'll deal with that when I speak on the Resolution as a whole. But that is really the difficulty with respect to the first portion of the amendment. The difficulty with respect to the second portion of the amendment is that he wants to delete any reference to co-operation with the Government of Canada on air pollution. It seems he can't seem to envisage any sort of a problem involving air pollution which would involve the co-operation of the Government of Canada.

MR. STEUART: — We get along good.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Oh, yes, I've noticed that. I've noticed the overwhelming confidence which the Government of Canada appears to repose in the present Administration. Not enough to supply it with any funds.

MR. STEUART: — All the Socialists they got down there.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now, to return to the Resolution, Mr. Chairman, I note

March 9, 1967

that the mover, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) apparently believes that there can be no circumstances under which the Government of Canada would need to co-operate with the Government of Saskatchewan with respect to pollution of the air. I simply don't believe that to be true. I think that there could well be circumstances

MR. STEUART: — He didn't even take it out. What are you talking about?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I think you can read the amendment or get your seat mate to read it for you and perhaps you can check.

MR. STEUART: — Not here.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I wasn't thinking of him, but I don't think he can read either, speak to the Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) I simply don't believe this to be the case. I think that it's useful for us to co-operate with the Government of Canada with respect to pollution in all its facets, be it land, water, or air. And accordingly since the second part of the Resolution I think is positively harmful and the first part of the amendment is frivolous and to make it complete would need the addition of a fair number of other statutes. I'm not dissuaded by such a feeble effort. I simply want to say this. Since the first part of the amendment is superfluous and since the second part is positively harmful, I will find it necessary to oppose the amendment.

MR. STEUART: — Oh, all right for you.

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Cumberland): — I thank the Hon. Member who just brought in the amendment

MR. MacDONALD: — That's why I did it, Bill.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — . . . because it gives me an opportunity to say a few words which I think I'd like to have said before. The amendment as has been pointed out by my colleague from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) is both superfluous and a poor amendment. But the fact is brought out concerning the required participation in any pollution problem with the senior government. It just so happens that in yesterday's paper there is an article in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, March 8 on page 13 under the title of "Saskatchewan River Pollution Denied by Edmonton." That is a reference to what the Hon. Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) had been complaining about his city. Mayor V.M. Dansard of Edmonton said here "Pollution of the North Saskatchewan River frequently complained of by Prince Albert citizens should be a major concern of both Federal and Provincial Governments."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Well, if you mean hear, hear, we'd like you to take it in the original motion. I agree with Mayor Dansard that you can't resolve the pollution problem yourselves in the Province of Saskatchewan and to just prove that you haven't been able to do so, the Hon. Member who just said hear, hear, was the Mayor of the city of Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) at one time and he's got a friend who is the Mayor now.

MR. STEUART: — I told you, I've got that cleaned up.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Oh yes, you cleaned it up all right. You mentioned that you did clean it up, but the last paragraph in this same report, Mr. Speaker, says this. And I would like the Hon. Member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) to listen very, very carefully. "The city of Prince Albert has set up a study for treatment of raw sewage now being dumped in the river," note that "now being dumped in the river." "The city has been dumping raw refuse into it

MR. STEUART: — That's Prince Albert East.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — . . . since it was founded 100 years ago." And the Minister has the gall to say he's done something about it and cleaned it up.

MR. STEUART: — What about the water? When we get it it's clean.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I think if we are to perform our duty as good Canadians, then we should act immediately in co-operation with other governments to clean up the insidious mess which we find threatening our province, ourselves and future generations. And every day, every week, we see articles and reports in the press which I think should make the Members of this Legislature aware of what is happening in our province and our country. Just to refer to a few of these, Mr. Speaker, Financial Post, May 1, 1965, "dollars just beginning to flow in our water crisis and national policy, much more money may be the only way we can clean up filthy mess." Every day we see something like this in the press. Here's another one and this refers to the Province of Saskatchewan. "Millions drinking used water and used virus."

Here's a map I just picked up and it shows Saskatchewan is part of a polluted area in Canada. Well, it's not very funny because first of all, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Canadian and I love this country because it is my home. It's the home of my children and I want it to be even a better country for my children and my children's children. I am sure that you would all want it to be that way. But I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that I don't love a Canada which has been spoiled, contaminated, polluted, exploited. I could say or controlled by questionable

March 9, 1967

free enterprises. Maybe that's got nothing to do with the Resolution but it all adds up

MR. STEUART: — Don't bring that in, Bill.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Well I brought it in.

MR. STEUART: — Well, take the levels out of it.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Just to show you how much concern this Government has had in the pollution problem there's a question asked of the Government the other day, on March 6. This is what the question was, "Who are the Members of the Air Pollution Advisory Committee?" Because the Hon. Member's amendment says they passed an Act, so this sensible question had to be asked, "Who are the members of the Air Pollution Committee?" "How often have they met since this committee was established, and what is their salary?" I wish there had been some answers to that question. But what are the answers? Firstly, "The Air Pollution Advisory Committee has not yet been appointed." A year has gone by and they have not been appointed. That's how concerned this Government is with the welfare of the people of this province.

MR. STEUART: — We don't need an advisory committee. We're doing it ourselves.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — So you know all the answers. The little Minister from West Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) he knows all the answers, he's a Canadian, he's concerned about his children and future generations, that's how he's concerned. He's done nothing for a whole year, and the other two answers are the same, nothing's been done.

Here's an industrial magazine, December 1956, it talks about pollution. What does it say?:

"Unsightly expensive dangers" and I wish the Hon. Members who got this magazine would read it and then maybe they'd smarten up a little bit and wouldn't think that this is not a serious problem and that it's not something that they need not be concerned with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I join with the previous speaker to point out as the previous speaker did that if we're going to make any kind of progress then we must act immediately before any further harm or pollution is done to our environment. Apparently there is a disregard of the situation, from what we have seen it is a 'could care less' attitude by the Government. I think we should prod, we should all prod this Government and I hope the Members opposite will prod their executive to get moving in the right direction on this matter. Let me remind this Government that every day and every month and every year that they delay taking appropriate action (and they've already lost some time in the

controlling or eliminating pollution of our resources) is that much of a failure to the people of Saskatchewan. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are the trustees of the resources and we do have a responsibility to our society which elected us. If we do not do what is necessary to be done, then you in the Government and we in the Opposition will be judged as guilty in failing to carry out our responsibilities. Finally, I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that any delays, such as we have seen, will only cost future generations that much more money and that much more loss in good health, and that much more loss of industry with which the Government is so much concerned. Now the situation is very clear. We know that Canada's BNA Act clearly spells out the responsibility for water supply and pollution control at the present lies with the Provincial Government and that's why I'm appealing to this Provincial Government. And, of course, there are certain subjects, certain Federal standards for international water control and so forth, but it does stand very clear that the Government of this Province is responsible for the pollution in this Province, whether it be of air or of land, or of water. I can only say at this time that any laws that we bring in shouldn't be the kind of law you put on the statute books and then set aside in a pigeon-hole somewhere. They should be the kinds of laws that are meaningful, and mean something. They should be strict enough to see that we get some results in whatever programs we bring about. There have of course been national conferences on this matter as Hon. Members know. There has been much research both by public institutions and in private spheres. We all know what the problem is. If I'm going to talk anymore about the problem of pollution of our resources, then it is only, Mr. Speaker, to bring more emphasis to this House so that some of the Hon. Members opposite who are apparently asleep will wake up to the seriousness of the situation. As has been mentioned, everybody talks about pollution, everybody talks about pollution control and the Government talks about it, only it has done nothing about it. This is the danger in the future which we are face to face with.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will watch what is happening to our province. I flew over to Creighton some time ago and I could see the smoke there. I didn't think it was very serious but the people of Creighton are up in arms at the present time and the people of Flin Flon are up in arms and they're demanding that the Manitoba Government do something about air pollution, for the simple reason that they can't grow gardens; their vegetation is destroyed and human beings suffer. I do hope Manitoba does something about it, and I hope that . . .

MR. B.D. GALLAGHER: — Poor soil.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Yes, poor soil but there's some good soil and it's very costly for them to make gardens there. People are entitled to a little bit of happiness in the world not just to make dollars as Hon. Members opposite think. They can't have previous gardens or flowers because of the fact that there is pollution of air in that particular area.

March 9, 1967

Everyday we see more and more industry, industry which came to this province quite a few years ago which is now beginning to produce. You're going to have smoke, you're going to have sulphuric acid gases, you're going to have all kinds of dust, and there is already pollution of the countryside bringing death and destruction to our province. Something's got to be done about it. It's not sufficient to say well, certain companies are putting in filters and we are satisfied with that. I doubt if you even inspect those mines where they have filters. But what about the ones that haven't got filtering equipment, the ones such as the chemical plant in Saskatoon? What have they there?

MR. STEUART: — A rock.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Yes, like you! Now, science and technology, Mr. Speaker, have the know-how and all we need is the awareness and the determination to do the job in dead earnest. Now, I went through some material and found that Ontario has taken steps to eliminate water and air pollution and I congratulate the Government of the Province of Ontario. It's going to cost them three or four times the estimate of the St. Lawrence Seaway, but, Mr. Speaker, they will be protecting Canada and they'll be building Canada by investing money in that area to stop pollution of Canada's resources. As I said before, I am sure the Federal Government will come to the assistance of Ontario because it isn't only a Provincial responsibility but is a Federal responsibility as well in spite of what the BNA Act says. Mr. Speaker, recent studies indicate that Saskatchewan people are already paying a tremendous amount for the pollution that exists and we don't even know it. I doubt if the Government knows about it although I suspect that it did have somebody attending the recent conference of Resources Ministers. The estimate, whether they know it or not, is costing the people of Saskatchewan right now \$42,000,000. That's the estimate. Ontario of course, Mr. Speaker, is ten times that much larger but I do say to this House that if Ontario can go ahead and try to resolve the problem and try to find the necessary finances to control, if not eradicate pollution, then certainly we in this Province should be doing the same even if it's only 1/10 as much. We all know, Sir, that our rivers are polluted. We know that to be so in Prince Albert. We know that is so in North Battleford. We know that is so here in Regina — I can hardly drink the water here. Yes, it may have been treated, but the fact remains that even if you treat water you can't get rid of all the viruses and we are, as one of the papers here says, "drinking manmade sewage."

What is the future of our society in this beautiful land of ours? Our lakes and rivers are becoming depositories for every kind of waste, garbage, detergents and now industrial waste. Our soils are being contaminated, as pointed out by the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson), with insecticides, pesticides, chemicals, sprays, fertilizer residues, such as phosphates and other powerful poisons. Some of these actually, Mr. Speaker, maybe most of these, are death to living things. Not that I am so terribly soft but I have seen birds lying dead in the fields, and I too

Am a son of the soil like the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson). It makes one sad to see what is happening to this land. And what about the water courses and the rivers and the streams and the lakes? We take pride in saying Saskatchewan is a wonderful land for the tourists and we invite them to come here. How long will it be so? Will it be like it is in the United States where in one lake, Lake Michigan, 18,000,000 fish were found dead. Is this what we're going to have in Saskatchewan or is this Government going to do something at this time to immediately try and correct some of the situations that have been developing and try to stop contamination of our future.

While flying over northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, not in the South — the South is worse — I've seen algae around the shores of our northern lakes, blue-green, and we know that fish in algae lakes cannot exist very well. It seems to me that we're going somewhat overboard in the field of agricultural science by sometimes adopting agricultural stupidity. We're always thinking about the dollars and the increase in production and not thinking what we're doing for our land and for the future of this province. Think of some things that have happened, some of the things we have seen, some of the things that are written about, these should warn us all. We know of cattle having died, we know of milk having been contaminated. All this is leading us where, this chemical revolution? The only thing I can say to this House is this. It's fine for chemists to tell us what we can destroy with certain kinds of chemicals, insecticides or pesticides, but I think before we adopt the recommendations of these scientists we should have advice of our biologists as well. This is where the Government can do something. Let us have our biologists do some research to see just how far we can go with the treatment of our soil for, say, weeds or insects or whatever it may be. Farmers are not experts and don't know which chemicals are safe and which are not, and we must have somebody to tell us. This is where the Government can do something about it.

MR. STEUART: — That's if you're in the same boat.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Certainly the discoveries of industrial chemists and the research knowledge of our biologists should be made available to us by the Government. Now, if the Government contemplates doing something about this whole problem I'm quite prepared to commend it at any time, and I think it should be commended. But if it fails of course, then it should be criticized in this House and all across our province. I'd like to refer to just a paragraph in the book called "The Harvest That Kills," on page 185 I think it is, and I think that this is very well put. And here's what it says at the bottom of the page:

We must stop cutting off the branch we are sitting on. The expectation that increasing chemicalization can (referring to the poisoning of the land) produce more and more food from fewer and fewer acres is erroneous and dangerous.

March 9, 1967

This is an expert. I'm referring to expert opinion, Mr. Speaker.

The final challenge therefore, is to the planners and these are people the Government should find.

MR. McFARLANE: — A mistake there, Bill.

MR. BEREZOWSKY:

Agricultural land must be looked upon as a golden belt that is sacrosanct to the growing of prime crops and the rearing of healthy cattle.

I could go on and on and I'm glad to see the Hon. Members opposite agree with just what I have read.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it 5:30, Sir.

The House recessed until 7:30 p.m.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Before I called it 5:30 o'clock, I think I was dealing with the defiling and the contamination of pure air and of course other resources by poison and smoke, gases and various chemicals which cannot benefit humanity or life. I'd like to point out to the House that humanity in order to survive must have pure air and of course pure water and soil. And for society as a whole it is essential if we are to have growth development of good physical human beings and citizens with good mental ability be they farmers or city people, then we must have pure resources for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think that man has interfered with nature. He's not conservation-minded generally. He's a spoiler. He has been the instrument of pollution of our resources. And nature can no longer keep up with man by cleaning up the mess that he creates. That is why I think man himself through his government must intervene to stop the poisoning that is rapidly increasing as population increases. I said before and I say again that I'm trying to impress upon this Government that first and foremost there is a situation that must be looked at very carefully and immediately. Secondly, I must point out that there is a basic law of retribution. As we find weapons to destroy and annihilate, wiping out pests and undesirable plants or funguses resolving certain problems, we simultaneously destroy other valuable life and fungus.

Sometimes one wonders whether the researchers who find the means to destroy these various pests should not be telling us how to control the pest controllers. We are experimenting too much, I think, with expediency and not giving enough attention to cause and effect, so that we may learn to use what we have the best way possible without upsetting the balance of nature and of course everything else. Industry and every industry including that of farming, I think, can and should be made to clean itself up. The trouble appears to be a problem of money to do what I've

suggested. However, in spite of the fact that money must be spent, dividends will come in the long run. It would be better if we could have prevention, but maybe we passed the point where we could have complete prevention and maybe all that we can expect is some kind of controls. I'd like to point out something that is generally known about pollution of air. Our modern society has developed industry across Canada and across the American continent as well as in Saskatchewan.

We have mechanical transportation, all of which is contaminating the air with carbon monoxide and with other vicious poisonous gases. These have affected the blood streams of taxi-drivers in the cities and of other people who drive vehicles. We are told that a taxi-driver who generally works an eight hour day has from eight per cent to 20 per cent of his blood level affected with carbon monoxide poisoning. And the maximum concentration is estimated to be 100 parts per million. Now, of course, if a person works more than eight hours he can't stand up, can't take as much as I've pointed out in his blood level. We all know that carbon monoxide combines with the haemoglobin of the blood of human beings so that when a person absorbs 10 per cent of carbon monoxide, in his blood stream he is no longer an effective driver and he hasn't got normal efficiency. That may be one of the reasons why in Saskatchewan we have such a terrific toll of accidents in the past year among car operators. We are told that this condition is worse than if a person was 10 per cent anaemic and we are told that a 50 or 60 per cent concentration brings on unconsciousness which is often followed by death. This in itself should make us smarten up and see that something is done in this particular area of pollution. It seems to me that we should carry on (in addition to what was previously said) some research in the best way of checking on operators of vehicles as pointed out by the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) as well as checking on industries to see that this gas hazard for our people is controlled if not eliminated.

Now, there's another area of contamination in the air by what we call aldehydes and two are known to all of us pretty well. They are formaldehyde and acetaldehyde. The maximum exposure is supposed to be five parts to a million. Now even five parts of formaldehyde in air is too much for good health, Mr. Speaker. They tell us that in some cases .025 produces irritation in the eyes of sensitive persons. For example, you get exposed and this brings on a cough and brings on bronchitis, general weakness, sleeplessness with sometimes serious consequences. Formic acid causes irritation of the skin and I know people who have frequently had this kind of experience. Failure in healing of affected parts, I think, in many cases can be the result of cancer and of course forms of other dermatitis or diseases of the skin because of this kind of pollution.

Another one that I've already mentioned is what I saw in Flin Flon and of course you have it in other parts of Canada and that's sulphuric acid. And this is a very common atmospheric contaminant, which is found over our cities and over mining communities and over all industrial communities. We are told that

March 9, 1967

sulphur oxide is formed by a combination of many kinds of fuel through use of coal, gasoline and other fuels. They form an ozone and peroxides in the air and paraldehyde, and these when combined with air we breathe cause a condition, as I said, that people in the mining communities complain very bitterly about.

One other dangerous gas that hasn't been mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is oxide of nitrogen which is found in the exhaust of vehicles and motors. In the same way as carbon monoxide, it gives no warning when inhaled. And it is the result again of many industrial processes. For example in electric and acetylene-torch welding. As well, of course, we have the combustion of industrial furnaces and engines and the concentration of two parts of a million causing damage to vegetation. Two parts to a million of this gas will kill vegetation, we are told, and I submit it certainly is a serious threat to mankind and life across the board. We are told that hundreds of people have their lungs affected by nitric acid.

MR. T.M. BREKER: — Mr. Speaker, would the doctor permit a question?

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — No. when I finish, the Hon. Member can ask. I know my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) is a member of the pharmaceutical association and I admit he knows a lot more about it than I do, but if he has something to contribute, Mr. Speaker, I wish he would get up. If I make any errors, correct me, but he can certainly speak up for the people he represents so that this House will have something on record that will make the Government opposite take some action. I think he's the kind of man that should be the first one to get up and speak on this subject of pollution whether it's air or other resources. Now, I know what he's asking for, probably I've made a little slip in some technical term. So, I'm not a doctor, I'm just a farmer. As I said, I have taken this out of textbooks. If errors crop up and I am wrong, I hope I am forgiven and corrected.

There's another field of contamination, Mr. Speaker, which we know all about. I'm glad most Members on this side don't participate in this vicious habit and that is the habit of smoking. Of course, there is nothing much we can do here, but I have seen this in my own family. We are told that people who have been smoking excessively have been so contaminated that their lungs are just like stove pipes. This kind of thing happens too often, but there is nothing much we can do about these vicious human habits. I am sure I don't need to talk about the contamination of air by nuclear energy. I know that our people have had difficulty with body swelling. Maybe someday we will safeguard our soils from atom bombs. But even if we be, Mr. Speaker, safe from this threat to society, we can't do much about it at this time. As a country, Canada can't do much about it because of the powerful nations who control nuclear energy. If we do protect ourselves and somehow find the answer to atomic pollution of the air, there still is as I've said, the danger that we may destroy civilization with these other pollutants that are around us. I

Hope I'm not out of order, but as I said my intention was to impress upon the House some of the dangers in the pollution of our resources. I hope I've said enough, but, maybe not. But I do say this, that we can't afford to pollute our water or our land any more and something must be done about it. I'd like to point out that down in Vancouver Island and on the mainland of British Columbia the waste from the cities and pulp mills and the logging operations, is not only causing pollution, Mr. Speaker, it has already disposed of an industry. The oyster industry is gone to the people on the west coast. This is the information that I have obtained and I'm giving it to the House in good faith. I hope nothing like this happens in Saskatchewan. Once again I point out what is happening to our cities and in spite of the Member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) who said that they have no problem there. They resolved it, he said. But I want to bring out once more that something should be done to see that the people of Prince Albert don't have to take jugs and bottles and go out all over the country trying to get something to drink that tastes like water. I can't drink the water in Prince Albert and I don't think you would. And you haven't done much about it, and I speak on behalf of the people in that particular city. I am asking you as Members of the Executive to do something about it. I would also like to point out that the Red River down Manitoba way, is so heavily polluted and the Assiniboine is such a source of vicious contamination, that these rivers are entirely useless to the cities of Winnipeg, St. Boniface and others. Also our entire Great Lakes Region has suffered from heavy pollution of one kind or another, as Hon. Members know, and this includes not only the lakes but the rivers that connect these lakes and flow into them. All this is not entirely the fault of industrial industry there, but the fault of the legislators and local governments and the Federal Government who didn't act at the time they should have acted. Ontario is now beginning to act and I give credit to them for what they are doing belatedly. I only suggest that this Government do the same.

We've also heard there's a shortage of water in the United States, and I just want to comment briefly on this if I may. I have some references to indicate that it isn't a shortage of water in the States. They've got plenty of water but it isn't water anymore. This water has been filtered and filtered and filtered, over and over again, and it just isn't usable anymore for people that need it. An American writer in this book, "Death of the Sweet Waters" says this, and I'll quote:

There's no such thing as a fresh water shortage in the United States. There is, however, an acute shortage of usable fresh water, and even a more acute shortage of intelligent water management and our present situation is desperate.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote at this time, a paragraph out of "Disaster by Default." I think it's a good title. Something to make us think. As I said at the beginning I want to live in a Canada that I can be proud of and that I can love where my children can live happily for a long time enjoying the opportunities of a

great country. But here's what is mentioned in the book about the United States.

American ingenuity has been uniquely destructive as well as inventive. No nation on earth has ever destroyed its natural resources with the speed which Americans of the 19th century did. Under the banner of free enterprise economic pirates exploited our forests, wasted our topsoil, contaminated our rivers. Devastation was justified by what Rachel Carson was to call the false assurances that whatever is financially profitable is good for the nation and for mankind.

I hope my free-enterprise friends will think about this particular paragraph I have read because there is a danger the same thing can happen to Saskatchewan. This is not the kind of future, Mr. Speaker, that I want to see for my province and for my country. I want to see the virgin lakes of our North and the fresh rivers that flow across our province to be clean and uncontaminated for the benefit of all of us. I don't want to see them contaminated the way it is mentioned they have been in the United States. Mr. Speaker, there is no cost too great to this Government or to any government or to any individual or to any industry to do what must be done. We must at all times run races against disaster and certainly we can run a good race to keep away disease and ugliness from the air, from the land and from the waters that God has given to the people of this province. Our sweet waters are good waters, very enjoyable waters. Our air is good. Let us try and keep it that way. May I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with just these words from Proverbs 29:18: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." I hope that this Government will have vision and that Saskatchewan will be a great Province for a long time to come, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Government and this Legislature will do all that is necessary to achieve that great end.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add a few words to that which I had said. Members will be relieved to know that I don't intend to make any extensive remarks on this. I simply want to comment on a few of the statements made by the speakers who earlier spoke on the motion itself. I heard with interest but certainly not assurance the earlier remarks to the effect that all governments were now co-operating to avoid water pollution. I heard that with some surprise because I'm really not aware of any effective co-operation on the North Saskatchewan River.

MR. GARDINER (Melville): — . . . they are co-operating . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — Oh, oh, I see, very well then! I'm sorry if I misunderstood the Minister. It's perfectly clear, I think there is a serious lack of co-operation with respect to interprovincial rivers. I think that we know that. Even now we can't even get a study going on the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin because, as I recall it, the Government of Manitoba is unwilling to put in its money.

This was so, at least, last week or the week before. If it is now putting its money in, so much the better. I appreciate that that study is not solely directed to pollution or perhaps not mainly directed to pollution. It's a study of the use of the whole resource. The fact that we can't get a study of the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin going on a joint basis doesn't indicate a high level of co-operation. I earlier remarked that there has not been any lack of Provincial legislation in the field. Certainly The Water Pollution Act of 1962 was an effective piece of legislation which gives the Government wide powers to prevent pollution of Provincial streams and Provincial bodies of water other than streams. I doubt very much whether any legislation which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) might introduce later in this session will materially strengthen his powers with respect to prevention of pollution. And I think that we can't look therefore to any legislation to assist us in this field. I think that the Act with respect to air pollution was a good Act. I have no quarrel with it at all. I simply want to make the rather obvious observation that Acts accomplish very little. It's only actions which count and I think that to paraphrase a comment which has been made by Members opposite from time to time, the Liberals tend to give us Acts when what we need is action.

MR. GARDINER (Melville): — We've got lots of action.

MR. DAVIES: — . . . Action?

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right! My seatmate points out that we can spell Acts anyway we like, acts or axe, it's all the same. That's what we get from the Government opposite when what is obviously needed is action. I think there has been no action or no significant action taken by the Government pursuant to The Pollution of Waters (Prevention) Act, since it assumed office. If it has acted it has kept it under deep wraps. And there's been no significant action pursuant to The Air Pollution Act. If there has, this too has been kept under deep wraps. I don't want to review this whole field. I had a number of comments I wanted to make, but the Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) has substantially made them. I was tempted to make some comments about street pollution particularly in our small towns and more particularly when the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) entered the debate, but I think that I will concentrate my remarks on one subject only.

What I want to deal with is one thing and that is with respect to the pulp mill. I do urge the Government to have a look at whether or not the pulp mill will be a source of pollution. The contracts which were introduced last year certainly give no real assurance on this score. All they do is provide that the mill shall provide the conventional methods employed by mills of a like nature. Now, some Members may know what the conventional methods are. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) purports to know, but I wonder if, when I read down the list of kraft paper mill companies, just how many people

March 9, 1967

would know what methods they use. I have here a short list of the sulphate pulp mills in Canada and doubtless when the Minister of Natural Resources enters this debate he will tell us what methods to avoid pollution are used by the Anglo-Canadian pulp mill, B.C. Forest Products, or the Canadian International Paper Company, the Columbia Cellulose or Crown Zellerbach, Dryden Paper, Fraser or KDP. He will doubtless give us a full review on these so we can make an assessment on whether or not their methods are adequate, because I don't know that they are, although he assures us they are.

MR. STEUART: — Take my word for it.

MR. BLAKENEY: — You'll forgive us if we would like some more substantial basis for belief. He indicated that there were perhaps some other agreements other than the one which he laid before the House last year. If there are I am delighted to hear it, but the words which are in that agreement are that the mill will be required to use only those methods conventionally employed by other pulp mills in Canada. I may just point out by the by that there are remarkably few kraft mills on any river such as the Saskatchewan River. Most of them are effectively on seaboard, and I think that the pollution problems when you are on a tidal stream or on a major lake like Lake Superior are a good deal different than those which occur when you are on a river like the Saskatchewan which doesn't have a major flow and certainly doesn't have anything like the pollution clearing qualities of a tide. I simply want to say that I think that a good number of people in the province are awaiting a statement from the Government with respect to the pollution which is likely to occur as a result of the mill and I hope that it will be forthcoming this session. I think that an air pollution bill is not going to solve the problem, I think that a water pollution bill will not solve the problem unless it is acted upon. I would urge the Government to give this matter careful consideration. I think all of us know what happened when people in Alberta did not give similar consideration when they established industries along the North Saskatchewan. Certainly the people in North Battleford and Prince Albert suffered grievously. We do not want to subject the people of Nipawin or any other settlement along the Saskatchewan River to any similar inconvenience. It is likely, of course, that the chemicals and other effluents which come from a pulp mill may be a good deal more than inconvenient.

Having just made these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, and having heard most of what I wanted to say said by the Hon. Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), I want to say that even though the motion has been amended with a frivolous amendment and one which, while it didn't deal with the Government of Canada, was still one which suggested that the Government had no obligation to introduce any programs with respect to air pollution — while this amendment has been introduced and while the motion has been weakened on that account — I still find it one which is worthy of the support of this House and I will be supporting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — RE: MINIMUM WAGE LEVEL

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution moved by Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw):

That this Assembly, recognizing that the sharp increase in living costs of the past several years has borne especially heavily on low-income earning employees and their families, recommends to the Government of Saskatchewan and its Minimum Wage Board, speedy action to (a) establish the \$1.25 per hour minimum wage level stated in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code; and (b) retain the Canadian Welfare Council to undertake a full investigation to determine the minimum wages required in Saskatchewan to furnish the necessary cost-of-living to employees.

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on Resolution No. 10. I think the Chamber should be crystal clear on what this Resolution asks. The Resolution is stating first of all that there is a sharp increase in the cost of living and that this is being borne especially heavily by the low-income earner. It asks that \$1.25 per hour minimum wage stated in the Canada Labour Code be implemented in Saskatchewan. Now \$1.25 is really not too much, it's \$50 per week or \$2,500 per annum and that is less than one-half of the usual MLA's stipend. However, in Saskatchewan there are three different kinds of MLAs. There is the second kind that draws three and one-half times that amount, that's the legislative secretary type and then there is the other kind which is best illustrated by the example presented to us by the \$18,000 per year MLA from Athabasca who draws seven times the minimum wage that we are suggesting in this particular Resolution. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, we are well insulated in this Chamber from the binding effects of a low minimum wage. Consequently many of us cannot fully appreciate the gravity of the situation in which persons working full time for \$1.25 per hour find themselves.

Taxes, fees, charges and interest rates have risen sharply over the last two years in Saskatchewan and that has been adequately portrayed in this Chamber time and time again to the dismay of those on your right, Mr. Speaker. The cost-of-living food price index rose three and one-half times more rapidly in 1966 than it did the previous ten years on the average. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, over the last weekend the cost of insurance and milk rose appreciably in my constituency. I can well imagine how some of my constituents felt about these announced increases giving an extra push to the spiralling cost of living.

In a crisis of this magnitude the worker at the minimum wage level looks to this Government for some relief. They look in vain, Mr. Speaker, because all they are getting is platitudes. Let me

March 9, 1967

illustrate to you, Mr. Speaker. Last year the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) introduced a Resolution on March 10 in this Chamber with the wording of the Resolution as follows:

That this Assembly endorses the Canada Labour (Standards) Code enacted by the Parliament of Canada and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take appropriate measures to establish conditions in Saskatchewan not less favorable than those provided in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, and to give first priority to raising the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour.

It was amended on the same day by the Hon. Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) the Minister of Labour, by deleting all the words after "this Assembly" and substituting therefore — "commends the Government for endorsing the Canada Labour (Standards) Code enacted by the Parliament of Canada and for measures it is considering to establish condition in Saskatchewan comparable to those provided in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code." There are two weaknesses within that amendment, Mr. Speaker. The first one is immediately evident. The amendment omitted all reference to the priority given to increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25 as it was in the original motion. The second weakness became glaringly apparent on March 2, eleven days later in the same session in answer to my question No. 368. The question was this: When and in what official manner did the Government of Saskatchewan indicate to the Government of Canada its approval of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code" Mr. Speaker, I know you were amazed as many other Members in this Chamber were amazed at the answer the Government gave to question No. 368. The answer was this. Official approval of the Code was not requested by the Government of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's similar to the answer to a question I received, I think it was question No. 329 when I asked the Government why the students of the University of Saskatchewan were not invited to hear the major addresses in the Chamber. And the answer that was given to me by the Government is that they did not indicate that they wanted an invitation.

The Government's amendment to our Resolution, had it been sincere and not a weasel-worded attempt to side step their obligation, we could have overlooked the deliberate and misleading statements contained in it. However, Mr. Speaker, since the cost of living is rising two and three times faster under a Liberal Government than during the time of the previous CCF Government, people working for \$10 per month less than the absolute minimum we suggested are now well aware that the Liberal Government is making them carry a burden not of their making. I would suspect that the Government Members will vote against this Resolution or amend it so it looks like an explosion in a printing plant and then they'll vote in favor of it. Whatever happens, Mr. Speaker, CCF Members realize that there has been a Liberal increase in the cost of living and we will take steps to raise the minimum wage at the first opportunity, and I expect that won't be too far distant. Since the Premier is here tonight I just want to take this opportunity to remind him that I was listening last night to the radio station at Billings, Montana. It was

reassuring to hear that the minimum wage in Montana has been increased from \$1.25 to \$1.40 per hour so I see no reason why the Government can't give its blessing to this particular Resolution and help it along on its way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. L.P. CODERRE (MINISTER OF LABOUR): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to start by reading part, or probably I should read the Resolution, that would be the best way. One particular part of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is: "Retain the Canadian Welfare Council to undertake a full investigation to determine the minimum wages required in Saskatchewan to furnish the necessary cost-of-living to employees." I just wonder who they are going to ask to handle the affairs of Saskatchewan. Is this what my Socialist friends think of their Province? Invite someone else to determine for ourselves what we should have. Today it's Canadian Welfare Council, tomorrow it might be by Tommy Douglas, the next day it might be by the UN, the next day it might be Mao Tse-tung, and then who? Are we not capable in this province to determine for ourselves what we think is best for ourselves without bringing in an outside body. Who is their master? Why should you go out of the Province to have someone determine for us what is wrong with the minimum wage. That's right, I think it is utterly ridiculous for the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) to ask an outside body to determine for us what we should do in this Province. I would just like to ask who is it that is telling them whom we should have. They should be ashamed of that.

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North): — Maybe they can find that car!

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, I intend to bring in an amendment to the motion and I would like to read this amendment striking out all the words after "families" in the third line and substituting therefor:

commends the Government of Saskatchewan for having raised the minimum wage on two occasions, and (a) recommends the Government of Saskatchewan to work towards a \$1.25 per hour minimum wage level; and (b) to continue its investigation to determine the proper minimum wage and hours of work necessary for Saskatchewan.

I think I should say at this time that we have raised the minimum wage two years in succession. We've raised them more in these two years . . .

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon City): — How about the cost of living?

MR. CODERRE: — . . . more than the former Administration ever did. I know, Mr. Speaker, that this is their perennial Resolution; I say perennial because it has been repeated three times approximately in

March 9, 1967

the last three years. The irony of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that no attempts were made by the Socialists opposite when they were the Government to establish a minimum wage level as indicated. They are the type of people who are the planners; they are telling everybody to plan but they didn't plan. It is truly shameful that in the 20 years that they were in office that they were so niggardly in that area. And yet when this Government took office within the two years action had been taken and the minimum wage had been increased twice. For some reason or another, Mr. Speaker, our Socialist friends opposite always seem to speak in anticipation so that they can claim credit for something that has taken place or will take place. We can say, Mr. Speaker, that for many of the major bills or pieces of legislation that have ever taken place, let us say in Ottawa for example, in the last 20 years, old age security they are taking credit for; pension, they are taking credit for; family allowances, they're taking credit for it. And every bit of social legislation that has ever been placed on the books by Liberal Governments, these fellows across the way, these Socialists are taking credit for it. They say Coldwell, J.S. Woodsworth or Tommy Douglas and I don't know who else. They are always taking credit for it but they weren't the Government. Now they're anticipating something and they're trying to get on the band wagon so they can get credit for something that has been done. The irony of it, Mr. Speaker, is that my Socialist friends across the way lay claim to every bit and every type of good legislation that has ever been brought in. still, they were not the Government. Isn't that odd? Here they have been the Government and have not acted properly and in the right direction. We have said time and again, Mr. Speaker, that it is better to raise the real wages and this has been done, as is evident, by DBS reports. In the year 1937 the average wage or the wage level in the province was \$35.35. In 1952 it was \$50.90; in 1957 it was \$65.26; in 1962, \$77.01; September, 1966, it was \$93.40. the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) claims that several people gave approval to the Canadian Labour (Standards) Code. I'm not going to argue with that but any reasonable, thinking individual who is honest with himself and sincere in discussing the matter should realize that this should be done in a very orderly manner without having to disrupt many areas of the economy. He mentioned something about Section 5 of The Minimum Wage Act that states "in exercising its power under Clause a or b and sub-section 1 of Section 6, to give a minimum wage, the Board shall determine such minimum wage on the basis of either, (a) what the Board deems adequate to furnish the necessary cost of living to the employees in the class of employment affected," "and the Board may, if it deems fit, use either basis in fixing minimum wages for employees in any classes of employment." In this section, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of what the Minimum Wage Board has to do but somehow, somewhere there should be a guide for the Minimum Wage Board in order to be able to ascertain whether it is considered adequate and necessary in all things pertaining to the conditions of the working man who is employed under minimum wage. And this is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, I mention in my amendment to the Resolution that the Government continue its investigation to determine the proper minimum wage and hours of work necessary. It is odd indeed that

we find the former Administration was so lax in this area, and when I took office there was no information whatever available as to the hours of work, the minimum wage, the conditions of work etc. in regard to the people who are not organized in this province. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) should be ashamed of himself to bring a Resolution like that, when he was in the Government, when he was a Member of the Cabinet, he made no effort to see that this type of information was available in the Department of Labour. Now, one of the first things he does is to agitate and promote dissension everywhere trying to indicate that we're not doing anything. One of the first tasks I undertook was to ask my staff to start gathering this type of information. It was not available in the past. We are proceeding according to plan and some information is available at the moment. I will admit that we are not going quite as fast as we can to gather this information, but this is hundreds and hundreds of times faster than the former Administration was doing in the field of research and information in that area of endeavor. They were doing absolutely nothing and you know it, Brock. Now you have the audacity to get up in the House and move year in and year out, Resolutions

MR. DAVIES: — At last I've got through. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we're discussing in the Resolution anything to do with hours of work but for at least five minutes the Minister has persisted in talking about statistics about hours of work.

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage is related to the amount of time that you work, in all cases, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — If I understand this correctly when we talk about a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour, we must I think, relate that to hours of work if we're going to have a proper understanding of this thing. I fail to see how one can do it otherwise.

MR. DAVIES: — I want to point out that the Minister has made reference to a question on the Order Paper, a question that I put to the Minister. Now that question had nothing to do in this respect with the minimum wage; it did have to hours of work and that's what I'm referring to here.

MR. CODERRE: — I'm quite aware, Mr. Speaker, but when you talk of conditions of minimum wage to the people who are in the minimum wage class, you have to consider all the aspects of it. However, Mr. Speaker, they were doing absolutely nothing. Now they have the audacity to get up in this House and move, year in and year out, Resolutions that we do something while in fact we are doing much more than they have ever done. As I have stated on a number of occasions, the Department of Labour is keeping the question of wage conditions in Saskatchewan under constant review; our investigation in this area will continue and we have indicated

March 9, 1967

That we support the principles embodied by the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. However, the question when to increase the minimum wage and by how much is really one of timing and ultimate objectives, as is evident again by the question put on the Order Paper by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker.

There are many problems associated with any changes in minimum wage regulations. In the first place we must always remember what the minimum wage aims to accomplish. The minimum wage concept was in the main inspired by the wide-spread exploitation of labor during the 19th century. The purpose of the minimum wage legislation was to put an end to abject poverty which existed in those days. However, this is the second half of the 20th century and, Mr. Speaker, conditions have changed. We have well organized social security programs to take care of special cases, but in the employment sphere we simply do not have sweat-shop conditions anymore. Wages and working conditions in this country have improved, Mr. Speaker, to the point where they are the best in the world. We have unions to bargain for their members. The incomes of self-employed individuals have risen as a result of higher productivity, greater industrialization in our province. Salaries have risen progressively to meet the requirements of what has been called the affluent society. Furthermore we have provisions relating to safety places of employment, holidays, hours of work and so on, and as a result wages and working conditions today are infinitely better than they were 50 or even 20 years ago. Our concern today is really one of priorities. We are living in an era of tremendous psychological change. If manpower policies are not developed quickly to cope with the problems associated with advancing technology, we could run head-on into disaster despite our high wages and comfortable working conditions.

We should not forget that two-thirds of the labor force in Canada have less than a high school education. At the same time more than two-thirds of the jobs in today's employment structure are skilled, technical and professional jobs for which many of these people are not properly trained. They must compete for the unskilled jobs available, a category of job that is diminishing and which includes those jobs for which the minimum wage is paid. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan has assigned a very high order of priority to education. It was well known, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is experiencing an average manpower shortage. A great many jobs are open with no one qualified to fill them and that is why, Mr. Speaker, the Government is increasing its education budget. That is why the Government is improving and expanding technical and vocational upgrading programs. That is why the Youth Agency has introduced a mobile counselling unit. These programs are intended to assist future entrants into the labor force and also employed and unemployed persons, as well as those who are on the minimum wage schedule.

I would like to point out that appropriate living allowances are paid to those attending courses operated under these programs. An unmarried person who is untrained, who is in the work force getting only the minimum wage can himself earn up to \$83 while he is taking training and then is able to put himself in a position

to earn better wages. This is looking after the work force in the proper direction. Give them the incentives to upgrade themselves and to get more education. These programs are designed to provide the expanding Saskatchewan economy with the qualified people it requires to ensure its continued growth. I am not ashamed to stand anywhere and repeat everything I have said in that direction because we can be quite proud, because it's thousands and thousands of times more than the former Government has ever done. They will also benefit individuals oh, I'll have something to say about minimum wage in a minute.

MR. DAVIES: — Well, I wish you'd get to it.

MR. CODERRE: — It has been estimated that a high school graduate, for example, will earn \$50,000 more in his lifetime than a person with grade eight. This is doing for our people a great deal more than increasing the minimum wage by a nominal amount, without making sure there will be enough jobs even at the minimum wage pay. What I have said, Mr. Speaker, does not mean that we're not interested in the minimum wage anymore or that we do not intend to take further action in the field at the appropriate time. The minimum wage, as I have indicated, has been increased twice since this Government took office. The second increase in September last year raised the basic minimum wage to \$40 per week. It is interesting to note that this increase caused the minimum wage to form a larger percentage of the average weekly wage than at any other time since 1957. As a matter of fact for the most of the period from 1957 to 1964 the minimum wage was losing ground to the average wage. The increase in May of 1965 and September of 1966 raised the minimum wage by 9.6 per cent. Between May of 1965 and the present time the consumer price index rose by 4.1 per cent. In other words the percentage increase in the minimum wage has been more than double than the increase in the cost of living. Other increases will undoubtedly take place at the appropriate time. And I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) the above amendment to Resolution No. 10, which was moved by Mr. Davies, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw.

MR. E. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — RE: RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to maintain through appropriate means a liaison with the new Canadian Transportation Commission to ensure that the effects of rail abandonment on Saskatchewan communities are minimized, and that the transportation network that evolves will meet the long-term requirements of

March 9, 1967

Saskatchewan's changing and expanding economy; and to make available the services of such provincial government agencies as the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Highways to attempt to provide adequate alternative transportation and communication facilities to local communities that lose rail service.

And the proposed amendment moved by Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):

That the motion be amended by inserting the following words after the word "ensure" in the third line:

that public hearings are held on all rail abandonment applications and that such applications are decided on the basis of all relevant economic and social factors and;

That the motion be further amended by inserting the following words after the word "economy" on the sixth line:

by measures such as the retention of the Crow's Nest Pass rates on grain; and

That the motion be further amended by deleting all words after the word "of" where it first appears in the seventh line and substituting the following therefor:

the provincial government in assisting communities with presentations to the Commission; in providing adequate alternative transportation and communication facilities and in obtaining federal assistance for communities that lose rail service.

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Saskatchewan, railways had been an extremely important factor in our existence. I remember after the First World War, together with a whole lot of other veterans, I homesteaded up in that area extending from Bjorkdale over to what is now the village of Weekes and we were anything from 15 to 20 miles from the rail line over almost impassable trails and roads. We were in that position until 1928 when the new railway line, the CNR from Reserve Junction to Crooked River was constructed. This was a real thrill in the life of the people who lived in that area. The railway just passed on the other side of the hill from our home and when the line was under construction I never heard that whistle blow but what I had to straighten up and listen to it with a real thrill and the greatest of pleasure that we were now going to have rail service within a few miles rather than 15 or 20 miles away.

People who have never done without rail service probably find it hard to understand just how much it means, just exactly the same as people who have never been thirsty don't understand too well what it is to be without water. And so railways have always been a great importance to the Province of Saskatchewan. There may be, there undoubtedly is some duplication because railways were constructed in this province in a most haphazard manner

without any planning at all, so that in many cases we had lines paralleling each other and in other situations quite large blocks of country without any rail service at all. We still have of course, that example of two railway lines paralleling each other from east of Saskatoon to west of Unity, well over a hundred miles. And in a great many places it is possible to stand on one railroad track and throw a stone across onto the other railroad track. But nobody has ever talked about abandoning one of these lines and they could be abandoned with the least inconvenience. Now one of these lines is the main line of the CNR, the other is a CPR line and to get situations like that faced and dealt with in a logical manner is something we can hope for in the future, but I'm afraid we don't see much hope of it coming in the immediate future as long as we have the two railways operating with the sort of imitation competition under which they do operate.

Now this railway line that I spoke about coming into the community where I lived for many years, came in there in 1928. It was one of the last railway lines built in the Province of Saskatchewan except for the extensions to potash mines or spur lines or something like that. This is one of the lines that the CNR had on its list for abandonment. Now certainly the roads are in better shape after 20 years of CCF Government, Mr. Speaker, but it's still a long way to haul grain and other products from one right across to the other line. This line comes under a group that is protected for the time being but it is not protected forever.

Now we had some considerable discussion and close to what you might call argument in regard to this Resolution. The resolution itself contains some good things, there's no doubt about that, and the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) deserves some credit for introducing it in this House. But I would point out to the Members that the amendments also contain some good points too. And on this issue of rail service, the best rail service that we can have for the people in the Province of Saskatchewan, I think we should pass a Resolution that is as strong as we can make it and hope it will be most effective. And I can't see anything offensive in the amendment. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) spoke as if the amendment was offensive, but I can't see that because we do want to see the Provincial Government assist communities with presentations. If the Government isn't going to do that, I'll be surprised, I would hope they would do it. I would expect it to make representations to provide adequate, alternate transportation and communication facilities and Federal assistance and compensation for this.

Now this is no more than bare justice to the people of Saskatchewan to put up the best case we can to get for these communities, that may be abandoned as far as the railway is concerned, some compensation by way of assistance in construction of good roads, better roads because of the hauling that they will have to do over them. The amendment is not offensive and on this I can assure you that our Members and in particular, the Member who moved the amendment have had a good deal of experience in

March 9, 1967

this question. The Member for Turtleford, (Mr. Wooff) who moved this amendment, I imagine, has had similar experience to what I have described to you in regard to settling and living without railways and this makes you really appreciate them. So I would hope that the House can without division adopt the amendment and adopt the amended Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. WEATHERALD (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take only a very few minutes of the House's time on this matter but I feel as one of the few Members here that I live on an abandoned railroad line, that there is one serious omission in the Act which is being passed by the Federal Government, according to the experience that we have had there. I suggest this because the CPR Reston-Wolseley line which passes through practically all of my constituency has been abandoned for some time. I don't want to go into any of the details before this happens to some of those communities. But I do want to say that at the time of abandonment the CNR put in a application for giving truck service in that area. Now the CNR was granted this franchise, although the railroad line had been operated by the CPR. I think that at the time of the hearings to make the pie a little sweeter, the railroads have frequently held out that alternative service would possibly be provided by trucking by some franchise or another. Now the CNR was granted this franchise. Unfortunately we now find that the CNR is not very willing to keep providing this service. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have the situation that the CNR is driving a truck right from Winnipeg to Regina, there is one coming from the west from Winnipeg and one from Regina east, and in such towns as Wawota of 500 population they have recently put out that they would like to abandon stopping there entirely, even though they intend to go right past that community. Other communities such as Windthorst have never been able to get the CNR truck to stop and deliver freight in their community.

Now these are some of the problems the people of that area are facing, but I think that the great danger is that under the authority of the Bill that has been passed, there is no real way of forcing the truckers to maintain service once they have been granted a franchise. I think there is great danger, once this franchise has been granted to the railroad, that an effort would be made in the future to probably abandon the franchise within three or four years. The situation on this line would certainly indicate this and I can find absolutely nothing and other people who are fairly knowledgeable in this say that other than any grievances that may be taken up by the RCMP that there is very little evidence that there is very little authority which is going to make the trucker give service on that line. Now what I am very concerned about is that there are probably going to be some lines abandoned just as the CPR Reston-Wolseley line was. It is quite likely that sweeteners are going to be held out to help their case for abandoning that line by saying they would provide truck service. But I am very concerned, in going by our experience that, while the franchise would be granted and accepted by

the trucker, within two or three years it is very likely that he would start to circumvent the franchise and try and make it look like a losing proposition and possibly not give the service that the public has expected when they lost their railroad. Really in the Act there is no Federal authority designed to ensure that the truckers do give the type of service that the people on an abandoned line should be able to expect.

I want to mention for example in my home town of Wawota what has happened. The town of Wawota for sometime this year has been in a running battle with the CNR. The community found that the CNR refused to actually make an effort to try and get freight delivered into town. Yet this town has a population of over 500 people. They for a good deal of time just delivered the freight, left it on the platform out in the weather, they didn't even go to the extent of hiring a place of storage. Any freight that was owing they delivered to the nearest station agent which was 16 miles away. Anyone who wanted to get freight that had charges owing on it simply had to go 16 miles. Any freight that was completely paid would be left outside. Now after this went on for three or four months and many complaints to the Highway Traffic Board who seemed unable to make the CNR comply, the CNR finally did rent a building. They paid \$50 a month rent and the next move was that they had put in for complete abandonment. Now the Highway Traffic Board has not allowed them to abandon this stoppage at this point and leaving the freight off. But the truth of the matter is that it has been unable to make the CNR trucking company live up to what the people of that area expected.

I am informed that a number of people who work with the Highway Traffic Board feel that there should be a stronger Federal agency that is going to listen to the people's complaints and ensure that the rights of the public, when a franchise is granted, possibly when the railroad is taken out, are protected and respected, because as of now it would certainly appear although the Highway Traffic Board that deals in these matters is doing the best it can in that it is somewhat like a flea on an elephant's back, as the saying would be.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the attention of the Legislature because it's been an experience right throughout my constituency on an abandoned line. I would sincerely hope that under this new Act that the Federal Government will make an effort to set up some form of enforcement that will ensure that a truck franchise is granted simply because of a railroad being taken out or that possibly truck routes will be granted even as small losing propositions because of the lack of railroad transportation. I hope that some effort will be made to ensure that this service is provided. I think that in the present situation that there is little guarantee to the people that when truck service is to be provided as part compensation for railroad being abandoned, there's any way of actually enforcing that the company give this type of service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 9, 1967

MR. G.G. LEITH (Elrose): — I want to say a few words on the proposed amendment to the Resolution that I brought into the House. I think first that what the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) has said tonight about abandonment should be noticed particularly by every Member of this House. I have no doubt that there are going to be a few lines abandoned and the ones that are now served by the CNR for freight and express can expect probably the same kind of treatment. I think that the Commission has been given the power in the Act to make regulations to govern this problem for instance the whole Transport Commission will deal with the problem of traffic, extra provincial motor traffic and in the case that he mentions, I would think that the Highway Traffic Board would have the authority to license these carriers. Of course they would lose their licence if they didn't comply with the regulations under which it was granted. Now of course, this is part of the problem because as the Member from Cannington has said, this is exactly what they may want to do. They may want to lose their licence so they won't have to supply the service. At any rate, these are things that will have to be ironed out when the Commission actually gets to work and when it starts administering the new Act C231.

It's rather interesting to remember that C231 is almost hot off the press. It's a new Act and it is much more acceptable to the western provinces and to the people who had something to fear under the former Bill. It is also interesting to note that none of the Members of the Commission have yet been appointed. I think it's difficult to interpret what the attitude of the Commission will be until at least the Commission has been appointed, and until staff has been appointed and until they have been faced with actual abandonment applications.

I was interested in hearing what the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) had to say about rail lines. His rail line was behind the hill from his home. The rail line that lies nearest my farm goes less than a half a mile from my house and I have grown up listening to the sound of the whistle of the CPR. That line which is the Mildren to McMorran sub is proposed for abandonment. If it goes, I too am going to miss that whistle. But I want to tell the Member from Kelsey that when my father and my uncle first came into this country in which I now live they hauled their grain to Hanley, which was a distance of about 80 miles. A few years later they were able to haul to Zealandia, which was a distance of about 18 miles. Several years later than this they were able to haul to Wiseton, which got down to a distance of 11 miles. In 1923 the Mildren to McMorran sub was put through and their hauling distance was three miles. This was a very necessary step forward in those days when everything was moved by horse.

I'm not sure that it is necessary for all of these lines to be retained now. For instance the Mildren to McMorran sub is paralleled by CN to the south within about ten miles almost all the way. The CP to the north parallels it about 12 miles away. This means that anybody in that whole area will have to haul an

extra distance of not much more than four or five miles. I'm not suggesting that it's necessary or a good thing to have that particular line abandoned, but I do know that in the last six or seven years people all down that line have been moving their permit books to larger points. For instance McMorran, I think, last year lost eight permit holders. Glamis out of a total of 52 lost six permit holders this year. The tendency, at least in our country has been to haul the grain to a better town, a bigger town where more of the services can be desired and had. As I said, I will certainly hate to see our line go.

I want to contrast the situation as it is now with the situation as it was three or four years ago, when the CN had the Elrose sub up for abandonment. Anyone that knows that country southwest of Saskatoon will know that to pull the track off the Elrose sub would have been absolutely without reason. There was no abandonment application for my CP line north of the CN, but the CN had an application in at that time. People were very concerned, especially people who hauled to the Elrose sub, and no one in that whole corner of the province could see any sense in pulling up that line. What I am trying to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to Members of the House is that if, in fact, the Mildren to McMorran sub has to go, it will be far better for us and for everybody in that whole area than if the CN had gone earlier.

I'm trying to tell the Members that I believe that some of the lines in this province are uneconomic. I think that anyone who believes that we are going to have every mile of track in 1970 that we have now is burying his head in the sand. I think that some of the lines that have been proposed for abandonment ought not to go. I think some of them ought to go and this is what the Commission is going to have to decide. The Commission, when it's formed will form into sub committees, one of which will deal with rail abandonment applications. We are hoping that they will have the hearings about applications on site. For instance they might hold a hearing in Rosetown to deal with our application and the ones in the Hon. Member from Biggar's seat. They might hold one hearing or several hearings at one time to deal with applications for abandonment in a whole area. These are things that are going to come whether we like them or not. These are things that have to come if we are going to improve and make efficient the grain-gathering system that will put our wheat in market position on the sea board at a good price. I'm not holding any brief for the railroad. I'm not holding any brief for the elevator companies who are concerned. They have a tremendous investment in some of these lines, but it is to their long-range interest to cut down on the number of elevators that they have to build and the number of points that they have to serve. I think you'll find that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool Directors, when they are acting in the interest of the Wheat Pool, would have to say that many of these lines ought to go. Of course, the railways will get the grain anyway. The railways will say that rail abandonment will have to take place. I think it's important that we as users of the service be prepared to be realistic and to be honest with ourselves. If we think that we can make a case for keeping a rail line that we think should stay, then we ought to

March 9, 1967

work hard at it. But to fight every abandonment application is sheer insanity as far as I'm concerned. In fact there's one abandonment application now against which there maybe no complaint by the people of the area. I think that there will be others, as Commission hearings are held. I think that there are other lines that the local residents will fight tooth and nail to keep and rightly so. Well I've strayed a little bit from the amendment but I wanted to make these few points because it seems to me that the Member who moved the amendment and even the Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) doesn't seem to be very well informed about what is happening.

In the amendment, they asked for various changes and various additions and I'm just going to go down through the amendments that they propose and point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that everything that they propose has already been accomplished. It has been made public either through debates in the House of Commons, or through the regulations and provisions in the Bill itself. The suggestions in the proposed amendments to the Resolution are superfluous because each is covered either in the Act in the House of Commons debates or by action of the Provincial Government to forestall certain foreseeable weaknesses and procedures. With regard to public hearings, the Member for Watrous (Mr. Broten) had something to say about this. These are assured in several announcements made by Ottawa.

I wish to refer you to a statement by the Hon. Mr. Pickersgill, in the House of Commons debates on Friday, January 13, 1967, Hansard No. 185, page 11,778 and I quote:

There must be a hearing under the provisions of this bill and it is the criteria in this bill that are going to apply to all of these hearings.

The criteria to be used in assessing abandonment proposals are clearly outlined in Bill C231. If you would like to make a note of these they are Section 314C, 1, 2 and 3. I want to particularly refer you to Section 314C, sub-section 3, clause (e), under matters to be considered by the Commission.

The economic effects of the abandonment of the operation of the branch line in the communities and areas served by the branch line.

Now these are the terms of reference for the hearings. I want to bring to your attention also that the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) who moved the amendment, suggested also that there should be some reference to the Crow's Nest Pass rates. Well I think that anyone who has been reading the newspaper would know that the Crow's Nest Pass rates are guarded and provided for in the Act and I think that any reference to them in the motion on rail abandonment, is superfluous. The less we can say about them the better. They are safeguarded in the Act so let's leave them there.

The further motion to include in the Resolution that the

Provincial Government assist communities with presentations to the Commission and also with the provision of adequate alternative transportation and communication facilities has been dealt with quite recently by the Provincial Government. A liaison committee has been announced, comprised of membership from Provincial Government agencies, the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association, to be chaired by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. This committee will be charged with maintaining two-way lines of communication and information between the Canadian Transportation Commission and local communities. This will enable Provincial authorities to attempt to forestall any lack of orderly economic investigation of each abandonment proposal, as outlined in Bill C231, and to ensure that each community threatened with abandonment of local rail service has adequate opportunity to present their case if they so desire in the most advantageous manner.

On the matter of Federal assistance to communities, the Act provides for such assistance. If in the opinion of the Commission the abandonment of an uneconomic line will create undue hardship, the Commission will order the railway to operate the line and the Federal Treasury will subsidize the railway to the extent of its actual operating losses each year.

Further assurance is given on this matter in the House of Commons debates by Mr. Pickersgill on Friday, January 13, 1967, Hansard No. 185, page 11,778 and I quote again:

However, they still have to satisfy the Commission (a) that there is an actual loss on the line, and (b) the line is unlikely to become economic in the future. The commission then has to decide whether abandonment is going to create so much economic disturbance or disruption or loss to the whole economy that the railway should not be allowed to abandon the line anyway. We are saying that if the railway can prove an actual loss and prove that the line is unlikely shortly to become profitable to it, then we as a parliament are asking the treasury to pay that actual ascertained loss and the railway will stay.

Mr. Speaker, I think that all of these matters have been covered in the Resolution in the first place. I think that the amendment although, I am sure, quite sincere, is superfluous and I am therefore, going to vote against the amendment and support the motion.

MR. WOOLF (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member takes his seat, I would like to ask a question. What section of the Act protects the Crow's Nest Pass rates?

MR. LEITH: — I'm sorry I cannot tell you the specific Act or part of the Act, but the Act is here and we'll look through it together and find it.

March 9, 1967

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member takes his seat, would he permit one question? He mentioned that he is aware of one rail line that the people have already resigned themselves to the fact that it will be abandoned. Could he name that line?

MR. LEITH: — No, I can't give you the proper name of the sub but it is below the South Saskatchewan River in the central part. I can find out and let you know, but I don't know the actual name of the sub.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak in this Debate so I'll make my remarks short as usual.

Now in my constituency there is a railroad from Aberdeen to Melfort that is unprotected. What is taking place along that line is that the elevator companies are not repairing their plants and the people in that area are going to have to haul grain further away and so on. I also want to compliment the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) for bringing out the points in their speech, also the people who spoke on this side. I can, also as a person who has tried to weigh this carefully and listen to the Debate, say that the amendment only strengthened the Resolution and I would hate like the dickens to see this House be divided. I think once in awhile if we showed a little more co-operation and say, here is when we could present a united front on the question. We are all concerned about this rail line abandonment. I say let's be fair about it. The amendments do strengthen the Resolution and I say let's vote for the amendment and the Resolution and I think everyone around would be much happier. So, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly recommend to the House that we support the amendment and the Resolution.

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife):— I certainly didn't intend to speak to this motion either, until the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) spoke again and took his seat. He indicated pretty clearly that the amendment proposed would not be acceptable to the Government side of the House and that they would vote against it.

I don't know why that they could not have accepted these amendments which certainly in every manner strengthen the original motion. The way I read the motion, Mr. Speaker, it is capitulation to the inevitable. There is nothing specific about it. If I wanted to dodge an issue, Mr. Speaker, I'd use those kind of words and be very general and be specific about nothing. Even if there were provision in the Act, as the Hon. Member for Elrose says to protect the Crow's Nest rates, what harm would be done if this House again went on record saying that we want the Crow's Nest Pass rates maintained.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that it has been mentioned in

this House that the future quantities of potash produced will be equivalent of some 340,000,000 bushels of wheat and in time perhaps much more than that. This has been a new bonanza source of revenue for the railway companies, and since these railway companies have already, particularly the CPR — I don't include the CNR in the same category — allotted millions of acres of land in western Canada together with the mineral resources from which they continue to enrich themselves, this was a part of the original deal. It wasn't the people in the communities affected that originally put the railway there. These companies put them there and when they placed them there and communities grew up around them, I say they have a continuing responsibility to those communities. No matter how we try to color this in terms of rosy glasses, the effect on these communities is going to be dire. The effect on the farmers is going to be more than serious. I haven't heard the Hon. Member from Elrose say anything about some form of compensation to farmers who will be compelled to haul their grain still further and be still further removed from markets. He hasn't said one word about what help will be given to the small businessmen who will be liquidated in these communities where rail lines are abandoned, Mr. Speaker.

One would have expected that at least some reference would have been made in this Resolution, regarding continuing responsibility on the part of the Federal Government who negotiated that original agreement under which the railways obtained huge resources of land and minerals as an encouragement to build these railways including the branch lines. Nothing was said about the Federal Government self-assuming its responsibility in the matter of paying for alternate communication and forms of transportation in these communities who will now be more isolated than ever, Mr. Speaker.

The Resolution is completely unspecific, completely general, and as I stated, it's a capitulation to the inevitable, it's forgetting the farmer completely, it's forgetting the people in these local communities completely. And no one on the Government side of the House has said anything about compensation to local governments, to local communities and the farmer who will bear the brunt of this inevitable loss. Nothing has been said, and I think it needs to be said. I think specific references need to be made in this regard. I am going to say to the Hon. Members opposite, you have no good reason for turning down these amendments and believe me you'll have to do some explaining to the people of this province and in particular to the farmers and the people in the smaller centres who will be adversely affected when their lines are taken away from them.

Yes, some lines may of necessity be abandoned. Nothing is said in here about what might be done to build up a more rational system of transportation to service these communities. Nothing is said about integrating the rail system into a proper rail transportation system for the future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEITH: — It is in the Bill.

MR. NOLLET: — He says it's in the Bill, but there is nothing in here, nothing specific. And if it is in the Bill specific mention should be made here again. You would think that in order to make the position clear to the people of this province, you would have incorporated specific things in this particular motion.

Mr. Speaker, it's another bunch of Liberal whitewash, an example of the Provincial Liberal Government wanting to whitewash Federal Liberal Government. Why they want to do so in this case, I don't know. They are in violent disagreement with the Federal Government against the policies of Mr. Gordon, for example. He is not nearly private enterprise conscious enough. He is not nearly pro-American enough. And they say hurrah for Mr. Sharp . . .

MR. LEITH: — Stick to the Bill.

MR. NOLLET: — . . . In the next breath condemn Mr. Sharp because the national medicare, the implementation of a national health scheme has been postponed. But here is one item where I'd think the Federal Government shouldn't be whitewashed by anyone. And I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that at least on this amendment and on this one occasion, we would have had some acceptance of proposals made from this side of the House, proposals that wouldn't have in any way embarrassed the Government but certainly would have strengthened the motion made.

MR. LEITH: — You read the Bill, Toby.

The amendment negatived on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 18

Messieurs

Lloyd	Wood	Hunt (Mrs.)
Nollet	Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Blakeney
Davies	Thibault	Willis
Whelan	Dewhurst	Berezowsky
Michayluk	Link	Wooff
Larson	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)	Pederson

NAYS — 29

Messieurs

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Boldt	Cameron	Steuart
Heald	MacDougall	Grant
Coderre	Bjarnason	Trapp
McIsaac	MacDonald	Radloff
Romuld	Weatherald	MacLennan
Larochelle	Hooker	Coupland

Gardiner (Melville)
Merchant (Mrs.)
Loken

Gallagher
Breker
Leith

Gardner (Moosomin)
Mitchell

The debate continued on the motion.

MR. LEITH: — Mr. Speaker, Crow's Nest Pass rates are guaranteed by Section 328 in the Bill. I just want to say three or four . . .

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Read the section.

MR. LEITH: — "Rates on grain and flour moving from any point from any line of railway west of Fort William to Fort William or Port Arthur, over any line of railway now or hereafter constructed by any company that is subject to the jurisdiction of Parliament, shall be governed by the provisions of the agreement made pursuant to Chapter 5 of the statutes of Canada, 1897." Do you want me to read the rest of it?

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Is that all?

MR. LEITH: — No, there is second sub-section.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — There is a little loop hole in it.

MR. LEITH: — "Rates on grain and flour moving from any point on any line of railway west of Fort William to Vancouver or Prince Rupert for export over any line of railway now or hereafter constructed by any company that is subject to the jurisdiction of Parliament shall be governed by the provisions of paragraph 1, of General Order no. 448 of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, dated Friday the 26th day of August, 1927." There is a third sub-section on rates on grain and flour. But I urge every Member of the Opposition at least to read this Bill and look through the relevant sections.

I have been in the House three times when Resolutions on rail line abandonment were moved, Mr. Speaker, and I am tired of frothy Socialist propaganda. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Members of the House that the formation of this liaison committee, Provincial Government Committee, and the passing of the Bill C231 are going to do more good for the people who are on branch lines that may be abandoned than anything that was ever done by Members sitting opposite in twenty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The motion was agreed to on the following Recorded Division:

YEAS — 47

Messieurs

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

NAYS

Messieurs

Nil

RESOLUTION NO. 4. — RE: NEW TRANS-CANADA PIPELINE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution moved by Mr. H.D. Link (Saskatoon City):

That this Assembly, believing that it is not in the interests of the people of Canada to have any part of the proposed new Trans-Canada pipeline constructed outside of the territory of Canada, request the Federal Government to act so that the whole of the pipeline is located within Canada.

MR. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take too long on this debate, but I think there are a few points of view that I have that I would like to lay before this Chamber.

I notice that the Resolution says that this Assembly believes that it is not in the interest of the people of Canada to have any part of the proposed new Trans-Canada pipeline constructed outside of the territory of Canada. It requests the Federal Government to act so that the whole of the pipeline is constructed within Canada itself.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that frankly I am surprised that a Resolution of this nature should find its way into a Legislature of western Canada. We are a part of the people of Canada. This Resolution, if it was so passed and acted upon, would be

directly contrary to the interest of western Canada.

Western Canada is a great producer of oil and gas in Canada. When you look at the position of oil and gas development in western Canada, both in Alberta and Saskatchewan, it gives us people in the west some cause for uneasiness about the whole national outlook on western oil and gas.

We notice a condition where Alberta has her wells plugged back operating at half capacity because there isn't a market for her oil. We find her gas wells plugged too, because of lack of markets. We are fortunate in Saskatchewan that we haven't reached that stage but pro-rationing could occur here the same as it has in Alberta.

We find in western Canada that the vast eastern market, the whole big market of Montreal and all the Maritimes, is denied to western crude oil and western gas. This market is supplied by imported crude, crude from Venezuela, Trinidad and from the Middle East. We find that Canada is importing 40 per cent of the consumption of oil and gas in Canada. Last year Canada imported 550,000 barrels of crude per day. We in western Canada were unfortunate in being able to export only 310,000 barrels per day. So we have an excess of import over export. Yet this difference between what we can export over what we import is causing an imbalance in our trade with the United States of \$260,000,000 annually. Now surely the least that western Canada can ask is that we have sufficient markets so that we are able to market quantities at least equal to the home consumption or the Canadian consumption.

Canada has been permitted to export only 13 per cent of the total import of foreign crude imported by the United States. Surely if there is anything we need today, it is a relationship between the authorities in Ottawa and the authorities in Washington, which will take a reasonable approach to western Canada's needs and will assure export markets in order that our production at least can be equal to the Canadian consumption. Anything which we can do to increase our exports to the United States is in the interest of western Canada. Anything which we do to restrict sales on the export market is against the interest of western Canada.

This pipeline looping through the United States is of vital interest to western Canada because it will give us an opportunity to export more gas to the United States. Now if there was something in the contract by which Canada could lose control of this pipeline or would not have any guarantee that her own supplies would be met, we may have reason to fear this looping through the United States. But anyone who is conversant with the contract knows that the Trans-Canada Company has given assurances to the Federal Government and agreed to certain conditions, namely that not less than 50 per cent of the volume of western gas will be transported through all-Canadian pipeline of the Trans-Canada Company. By 1976 this volume transported through the Canadian Pipeline is to rise to 60 per cent of the total and later on to

March 9, 1967

65 per cent and that the looping of the Northern Ontario line is committed in order to meet these targets to begin in 1970. Further the agreement calls that there be no disposal of Trans-Canada's interest in the Great Lakes project without Federal Government approval. These are the conditions upon which this pipeline is being permitted to construct a portion of it in the United States. Now if this route is denied them it means one of two things. It means increased gas prices to the markets in eastern Canada or it means lower price of gas to the western gas producers or it means both. This pipeline will result in the lower cost of gas to Ontario consumers, not higher prices. It will lead to increased export of gas to United States from western Canada, and this is so urgently needed. I think in summary we can say that to vote for this Resolution is to vote against the interest of western Canada. Surely if we are to look at our own interest as well as the national interest, we must concede that this line is essential and that to do otherwise is contrary to our own interest. This guarantee of the loop through the United States will provide more security, not less to the eastern consumer. I would remind the House that it is this very question of whether it will be looped into the United States that is now before the Federal Power Commission. Other interests in the United States are bitterly opposing permission by the American Government to permit the construction of this loop within the United States. They would just love to have a copy of a Resolution passed in a western Legislature which says it isn't in the interest of western Canada to permit this loop to go through the United States. They'd love to have this to support their position against this loop being constructed in the United States. Surely the least that we can do in western Canada is not to strengthen the hand of these interests in the United States who are opposing this particular move that is of such vital interest to western Canada. Such a Resolution as this passed in this House could be of sufficient magnitude to defeat the application before the Federal Power Commission. Such is to act contrary to the interest of both Saskatchewan and Alberta residents. We too are members of Canada and interested in this, so I say if you look at the interests of western Canada you have no choice but to oppose this Resolution. I am led to believe that this Resolution was brought into this Legislature, not in the interest of western Canada but to support the interest of a huge nationalist approach in western Canada and an anti-Americanism expressed by your national leader in the NDP. The people of western Canada are not going to be a party to this narrow nationalism of the NDP, to this anti-American nationalistic approach of the NDP. As western Canadians we can do nothing less than to give short shift to this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. M.A. HUNT (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Coderre (Minister of Labour) that Bill No. 2 — **An Act to assist Producers to Increase their Income from Production on a Co-operative Basis** be now read the second time.

MR. F.A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, regarding this Bill No. 22 which is before us, in the first place I would like to say as far as I am concerned this is a misleading title to this Bill. I have read the Bill through, I have some knowledge of what the Bill proposes to do and I see no way how it's going to increase their income. It may facilitate people in organized co-operatives or other types working together in production, but it will not increase their income from any co-operative because any co-operative, which the exception the number of people who may organize a co-operative, has been reduced in this Bill. Otherwise anything that could be done under this Bill can be done at the present time under existing co-operative law. We have in this province a number of co-operatives, production co-ops that have been organized on one basis or another and they have been done through existing co-op laws, so I don't see anything in this Bill which is new except, as I say, that two now can organize a co-op instead of the original number before.

There are one or two things in here which I would like the Minister to explain. In Section 24 in one part he talks of \$2,500 and in the next clause dealing with the same topic it talks about \$1,500. I won't read the sections. I think the Minister can explain these, or we can discuss them in Committee. But I do notice in the Bill the definition of patron. It says a patron means a person who is not a member but who uses the services of an association to the extent as may be provided in the by-laws. Now the Bill goes on to say that the association can levy a yearly fee on each member or patron for services provided for him by or through the association. A lot of the patrons of some of the co-operatives who may be buying eggs or butter or other things from those co-operatives are patrons. I don't see how you or the co-operative could have the right to charge a patron a fee for patronizing the co-operative. So otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I am telling the House that I don't oppose this Bill, but I don't think it is as important as the Minister makes us believe because there is nothing new in the Bill and the title is definitely misleading.

MR. CODERRE: — I just can't understand the attitude of the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker. Every time that there is a Bill they are going to support, they speak against it somehow or the other. I indicated when I introduced this Bill to the House that it had been requested by members of production co-operatives. Now if the Hon. Member belongs to a production co-operative and doesn't realize that it is a Bill that will increase their income, then he doesn't know what he is doing. It boils down to that. When I introduced this Bill I made it quite clear

March 9, 1967

that the purpose of the Act is to provide new sources of income or higher income through lower costs, and whenever you lower the cost, you're bound to increase your income. I don't know what more they need to be told about it; it's a good Bill, it's very well accepted throughout the co-operative movement, it's something that they have been asking for and

MR. NOLLET: — Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — That's right, Toby, and you vote for it. I hope you do, I dare you to vote against it. But, however, all the matters that were brought up in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I think, can be dealt with very thoroughly in Committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Premier) that Bill No. 36 — **An Act to amend the Liquor Act** be now read the second time.

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) for adjourning debate on this particular Bill. I had particular interest in a similar bill a year ago when legislation providing additional liquor outlets or liquor-vending outlets was introduced in this Legislature. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the shortest Bill introduced to this Legislature so far. As a matter of fact there is merely a numerical change in the Bill that was presented a year ago in increasing the number of liquor-vending outlets from 50 to 80. Mr. Speaker, I take the same stand but I presume other Members of this Legislature may hold that liquor-vending outlets are popular in communities where there are no liquor stores. I don't know about the popularity of liquor-vending outlets, but I do know that many people in business and particularly Boards of Trades have presumed that a liquor outlet in an urban community will bring more business to the area. I have no quarrel with the sale of liquor as the conditions by which liquor-vending outlets are brought to a community are left to the people concerned. The people are given the opportunity of expressing their wishes by a plebiscite or a vote. No liquor outlet is established where a vote is negative. My main concern is, Mr. Speaker, the same as in the past with how and where liquor is being dispensed.

A year ago I spoke about the town of Blaine Lake where there is a liquor-vending outlet. It is located in a drug store on Main Street. The drug store sells books and note-books and magazines and newspapers and medicine, chocolate bars, cigarettes etc. This drug store as I mentioned last year is frequented by students, young boys and girls. What do they see? Liquor vended.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — There are different types of

people that go into this liquor-vending outlet. Some just hang around the outlet to buy more. Yes, this is right. I say that liquor should be sold from public liquor stores and not by private vendors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — And there are figures, Mr. Speaker, to prove this should and could be done. Liquor profits in 1965 were \$16,500,000 and if you look into the Estimates for 1966 and 1967 it is anticipated that profit from liquor will be \$21,500,000, a \$5,000,000 increase. This may be due to two reasons, one being, that the Liberal Government has increased the price of liquor twice,

MR. D.G. MacLENNAN (Last Mountain): — You're going to have to cut down.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — and the other reason, Mr. Speaker, is due to an additional number of places from which liquor is being sold. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, and the Members will that I opposed sale of liquor from places other than liquor stores. I maintained that liquor should not be taken out of the hands of public control. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister at that time stated that it isn't so. I asked a question of the Government on February 13.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you get an answer?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — We'll come to that. My question, Mr. Speaker, was, what were the total sales of liquor at the liquor-vending outlet at the town of Blaine Lake? The other part of the question was, how much liquor was sold at the liquor store at Hafford? Probably I worded my question in respect to the liquor store at Hafford improperly the first time, but I received the answer to the first part of my question for what amount of liquor was sold at the Blaine Lake liquor vending outlet. The answer, Mr. Speaker, regarding the amount sold at the liquor-vending outlet in Blaine Lake was given: "Special liquor vendors are appointed under contract to sell liquor to the public under Liquor Board regulations. The outlet is operated as part of the druggist's or merchant's personal business operation and it is deemed not in the public interest to publish such information." In other words no one is entitled to know. On February 21, Mr. Speaker, I put another question regarding the Hafford liquor store and the Blaine Lake liquor-vending outlet. I was given the amount of sales for 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66 for the Hafford liquor store. My question regarding the Blaine Lake liquor-vending outlet was worded in this manner: what were the total sales of liquor by the Liquor Board to the liquor-vendor outlet. The answer that I received was the same as the answer given to the question submitted on February 15. In other words, this information was not given,

March 9, 1967

AN HON. MEMBER: — Never tell a secret.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — namely, the amount of sales of liquor in the Blaine Lake liquor-vending outlet, or the sales by the vendor in charge of this outlet, or the amount sold by the Liquor Board to the vendor. As I mentioned previously that sale of liquor by liquor vendors will be taken out of public control and it has been taken out of public control. I was given the amount of sales in the Hafford Liquor Store while this Legislature denied the amount of sales either by the Liquor Board to the liquor-vending outlet or the amount of sales by the liquor vendor in the town of Blaine Lake.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Maybe they wanted to cover up on income tax.

MR. I.H. MacDOUGALL (Souris-Estevan): — What was the referendum? Did the people want it up there or didn't they?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Now, I mentioned at the offset that there is a feeling in communities that the sale of liquor revitalizes business in the community, but, Mr. Speaker, in many of these communities, hotel operators have established beverage rooms and had to invest large sums of money in renovations of the buildings and premises. In communities where there are beverage rooms and licensed premises, an additional liquor-vending outlet causes financial hardship on the hotel owner. The very fact that the present Government has instituted liquor-vending outlets arouses animosity in the community between the hotel operator and the local vendor. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, where sales by private liquor-vending outlets are large enough that liquor stores be set up to handle the sale of alcohol. Where sales are small I would suggest hotels with licensed premises or beverage rooms be given the privilege to sell alcohol at a smaller commission than is given to the private liquor-vending outlets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I know what's happening in Blaine Lake.

MR. STEUART: — Do you want us to take it out of there?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I never said so and I'm not going to say to take it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — But I know, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister knows that the volume of sales for the private vending outlet at Blaine Lake is

large enough to put a person on full time in charge of a liquor store in place of the vending outlet at the Blaine Lake drug store. This is what I maintain.

MR. STEUART: — They won't tell me either.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Oh I know they won't tell you. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that I rose to participate on second reading of this Bill. I am again going to the Government and to the Premier who is the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board that in places where the volume of sales in private liquor outlets is large enough and liquor profits have been and are going up, that liquor be sold from liquor stores and in places where the volume of sales is small, the sale of liquor be from either licensed premises or beverage rooms.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 45 — **An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act:**

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are proposing several amendments to the Child Welfare Act and they are designed chiefly to increase the effectiveness of the child welfare program. I would like to enumerate them very briefly. First of all we are proposing an amendment to the definition "born out of wedlock" as it relates to a separated woman. At the present time a woman must have lived separate and apart from her husband for six months prior to conception or a total of 15 months prior to the birth of the child before it is considered born out of wedlock. In order that a child be free for adoption we must obtain consent from the parents of the child or of the mother only, if the child is born out of wedlock. In other words the husband may have lived totally apart from his wife 14 months prior to the birth of the child and is still considered to be the father of the child. As a result we need his consent. Frequently the husband will tell us he has not seen his wife for 14 months, he's not the father and wants nothing to do with it. Often the father has left the province or perhaps even left the country. It is thought that a three month period prior to conception, which means 12 months prior to the birth, is a more realistic definition. There often is uncertainty as to the actual date of conception but three months would allow sufficient leeway to cover these uncertainties. Twelve months prior to birth would be easier to explain to the husband and his consent would be forthcoming.

The second point being submitted for amendment deals with juvenile delinquency. For the past seven years juveniles have been dealt with as part of their family through The Child Welfare Act. The focus has been on assessing the reasons for delinquency and then working out a solution which could involve supervision in the child's home or the use of a foster home or an appropriate

March 9, 1967

treatment centre. We are not proposing to change the approach in the problem since the above approach seems to be the most suitable. There have been several problems arising which necessitate amendment to the Act, however, the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act seems to indicate that indictable offences should be heard under the Juvenile Delinquency Act. There is some variation of opinion on this point, which has led to a divergence of procedures with juveniles who have been committed on indictable offences. Some cases are heard under the Juvenile Delinquency Act and others under The Child Welfare Act.

The proposal is to develop provisions which will be uniform in the province, dissolve the differences between the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act and the Provincial Child Welfare Act, and also preserve the approach in treating juveniles as outlined. It is also suggested that offences be heard under the Juvenile Delinquency Act and that The Child Welfare Act be used to provide supervision, foster care or residential treatment, according to the needs of the delinquent. The Juvenile Delinquent Act provides for the possibility of such coordination through Section 21.

In addition there is another area in which we think a change is desirable. Generally speaking in our society we accept the principle that adults are responsible for their own actions and can make their own decisions. Presently when an unmarried mother keeps her child, receives money from the putative father the money is paid to the Department of Welfare and then disbursed to the unmarried mother. Since the mother is entitled to the money we think she should be able to receive it directly. In addition there usually is a delay of several weeks from the time that the putative father pays to the time the unmarried mother receives it. This is sometimes due to the fact that we must withhold payment for two weeks to make sure that such a check is cleared at the bank. We receive frequent calls from unmarried mothers saying that hardship results in the delays in payment. They would prefer direct payment. The proposal is to amend the Act to allow payment directly to the mother of the child or if they prefer to another person on her behalf.

There are several additional minor amendments of a technical nature. In the 1966 session the probation period in adoption was reduced to six months under certain conditions, but Section 73 still requires the adopting parents to agree to maintain the child for one year. This is now being brought into line. Appeals from the Queen's Bench judge are not allowed under Part 3 of the Act, which is inconsistent with the rest of the Act, and since this is sometimes desirable an amendment is proposed here. The importance for having a sound legal basis for child welfare services cannot be over estimated. The protection and welfare of children depend upon it and therefore I commend these amendments to the consideration of the House.

MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current): — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 59 — **An Act to amend The Forest Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Forest Act, merely brings up-to-date, readjusts in a minor way, the boundaries of two forests in the province, the Nesbit Provincial Forest and the Northern Provincial Forest. I am informed that from time to time over the years the boundaries of these Provincial forests have to be adjusted or realigned. When we go into Committee I will explain, if anyone is interested, and I am sure they will be, exactly what changes are taking place, how much is being added and how much is being taken away. This is the principle of the Bill. It is merely a realignment, a readjustment, of some of the boundaries of these two Provincial forests.

With that brief explanation I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. J.H. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the Minister if he would supply us before we consider the Bill in Committee with maps showing the additions and subtractions from the Provincial forests. It is impossible from the Bill, without putting it on a map, to understand what is being done.

MR. STEUART: — I'll be glad to do that.

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, if I'm not too late could I have leave to adjourn the debate. Time will not permit the remarks I have to make at this point.

Debate adjourned.

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