

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
33rd Day

Thursday, April 2, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — On behalf of all the Members of the Legislature I would like to extend a warm and cordial welcome to 32 students from Holliston school, Saskatoon, in the constituency of Nutana South, represented by the Member, Mr. Estey, under the direction of their teachers Mr. Krause and Mrs. Van Janff; 42 students from Riverhurst High, Riverhurst, in the constituency of Morse, represented by their Member, Mr. Thatcher, under the direction of their Principal, Mr. Krislock; 40 students from Wetmore school, Regina, in the constituency of Regina South East, represented by the Member, Mr. Baker, and under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Thompson; 83 students from Lakeview school, Regina, in the constituency of Regina South West, represented by the Member, Mr. McPherson, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Muirhead, Mr. Barlow and Mr. Pledger; 73 students from Central Collegiate, Regina, in the constituency of Regina South East, represented by their Member, Mr. Baker, and under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Johns. I am sure all Members wish to extend a very warm welcome to all of these students and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here in our Legislature both interesting and informative and that it will add to their education. We wish them the very best and a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding Saskatchewan citizen. Dr. W.P. Thompson was a distinguished scientist and a respected university teacher and administrator. Above all, he was a great man and a man of great understanding. No lesser terms are adequate.

Dr. Thompson's early research was the basis for development of rust-resistant grains, the value of which cannot be estimated in terms of welfare of people in Saskatchewan and in a much wider area.

My closest association with Dr. Thompson was while he was President of the University and I was Minister of Education,

April 2, 1970

University and government relations are extremely sensitive and complex. Dr. Thompson understood this and, as a result, the role of both university and government was more productive. I count myself fortunate in having had the opportunity to work with him in his capacity as university president.

When he retired from direct university responsibility, he accepted the arduous and important position as chairman of the Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Medicare, the report of which formed the basis of the medicare legislation we now have in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Following that he continued his interest in this subject. He established himself as an authority on medicare plans and continued to research and write on this subject.

Members will know he died a few days ago. He leaves a family of two, a son who is in a senior position at the College of Medicine, Toronto, and a daughter, Mrs. Smith who lives in the United States.

I am sure all Hon. Members would want to join in recording at this time a special note of our good fortune in having had such a distinguished public servant as Dr. Thompson with us for so many years and extending our sincere regrets and condolences to his son and daughter.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate Members of the Government with what the Leader of the Opposition has just said in regard to Dr. Walter P. Thompson. I knew Dr. Walter P. Thompson throughout my life. He attended Harvard University with my father, they came west at the same time both to teach at the University of Saskatchewan. Dr. Thompson had a rather unique experience through his lifetime in that he only had one employer and that was the University of Saskatchewan. He came as a professor in Biology, subsequently headed the Department of Biology, was for a few years the Assistant Dean of Arts and Science, subsequently Dean of Arts and Science, then President of the university of Saskatchewan.

Anyone who attended the University knows that Dr. W.P. Thompson was regarded as amongst the leading teachers that the University has ever been privileged to have within its buildings. After proving himself to be a very able teacher, he was an able administrator. He took a year's leave of absence I believe in his last year of presidency to be chairman of an international symposium on genetics which I believe was held in Montreal.

The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned Dr. Thompson's work in regard to rust. I am not an agriculturalist or a farmer, but I understand that Dr. Thompson was one of the first persons to realize that there was some connection between rust and genetics. Saskatchewan in both the field of education and in the field of education administration, is I think

much richer because Dr. Walter P. Thompson passed our way.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) in paying my respects and tribute to the last Dr. W.P. Thompson.

I first had the privilege of meeting the last Dr. W.P. Thomson about 1950, shortly after he became the President of the University of Saskatchewan. It was in connection with arranging for the use of the University facilities for a trade union education institute. His cooperation in making arrangements for the use of the facilities was greatly appreciated. He always wanted the University to become a much more meaningful place for the people of the province as a whole, not just for the students and the faculty. I can recall the day that particular educational project was opened. He was personally there to ensure that all the arrangements were taken care of. We had him address the group that participated in that particular educational project.

Mr. Speaker, my next and perhaps much closer experience and association with Dr. Thompson was when he was appointed chairman of the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care. I had the privilege of representing labour on that committee. The two years of service on that committee were difficult years. It was his steady and calm role as chairman that made the committee's study and report possible. As everyone knows there were sharp differences within the committee from time to time. As chairman he played a leading role in helping to make medicare in Saskatchewan possible. For this the people of Saskatchewan will forever be grateful. For that matter the people of Canada helped found the basis of the medicare plan and laid the foundation for a national medicare plan. Dr. Thompson will be remembered as a scholar, a great scientist and author, a very gentle person who make Saskatchewan a better place to live in.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 17 – ESTABLISHING A PRAIRIE INSTITUTE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn):

That this Assembly, recognizing the present and potential threats to our natural environment posed by chemical waste and other pollutants, urge the Government to initiate discussions with the University of Saskatchewan and the Governments of Alberta and Manitoba with a view to establishing and financing, under joint auspices, a Prairie Institute on Environmental Problems.

April 2, 1970

He said: Mr. Speaker, motion No. 17 subject which has had such frequent reference that to some it may have become almost trite to try and talk about. But trite or commonplace, the implications with respect to pollution in our society are so immense that better we talk about it much more. It is in order to get some discussion in the Legislature and hopefully in the public that I place this Resolution on the Order Paper for consideration at this time.

Certainly there is ample evidence, Mr. Speaker, that, in our larger centres of population at least, where the population are highly industrialized, the evidence is that we are literally choking on our own technological and biological excrement. It is not just however in areas of industrial concentration or population concentration that the problem is making itself known. Here in Saskatchewan the evidence admittedly on a large scale is somewhat less dramatic than that which we frequently read about. But the evidence is here and increasingly it demands our attention. The evidence is becoming more and more dramatic right here in Saskatchewan and I shall have some specific reference to make to that later on.

Certainly the effect of some of the procedures which are used with respect to agricultural practices is causing more and more concern to farm people and to other people. One thinks for a moment of the increasing number of feedlots in the province, some of these close to centres of urban population. One thinks of the feedlots, some of them adjacent to waterways and water basins. That in itself is enough to give us some additional concern.

Because we are likely to forget about the impact and the fact of pollution in our agricultural areas, I thought I might refer to a news item which appeared in The Regina Leader Post on March 10th. It tells of a lawyer, Mr. John Vance, speaking in Winnipeg. He was speaking at a conference on pollution sponsored by the Universities of Manitoba and North Dakota. The news item says that the North American prairies should be particularly cautious about pollution because agriculture pollution often is more extreme and dangerous than in urban areas.

Mr. Speaker, I think, if we view this in its widest context, which I suggest we must do, we will be reminded that pollution is a consequence of human society. It is in a sense a symbol of the technological age in which we live. It is in one way a symptom of the extent to which we have allowed technological factors to override human and environmental factors in making our decisions. It is certainly a challenge, as it increases in intensity and extent, to many of our existing values; it is a challenge to many of our methods of production.

We have to be reminded too that if we are going to meet with effect this challenging situation, then we must deal with

the total environment. We have, as a result I think, to beware of trying to fragment either the problem or the solution. The question is, indeed, one of total environment, some of which is natural, some of which is created by technology, an important part of which is human. Man is a part of the human environment, he's a part of that equation, he's very much at the centre of things, I hope. We have allowed man to be shunted from the centre too frequently and this is one of the instances.

Because, in my opinion, the topic has that kind of consequences I thought that it was important for the Legislature to discuss this matter of the development and the protection of the environment in our province. The Resolution which suggests one course of action might admittedly have suggested a number of others which would have served perhaps equally well to initiate the kind of discussion I hope can result. May I suggest some of those other courses of action.

It, I think, would have been well to discuss the possibility of asking the Government to associate itself with the University, the Saskatchewan Research Council, local governments and organizations such as wildlife organizations to sponsor a public conference at which the evidence and the problem and the possibilities of correction could have been discussed. Secondly, it would have been possible to have simply asked the Government to increase the testing program and the research program so that we know more about the extend and causes of our pollution difficulties. Thirdly, I think, we might have urged the Government simply to provide more adequate information because the public needs to be informed and the public, I think unfortunately, is not being informed. The public deserves to know more about the problem. It deserves to know more about the responsibility both of individuals and of organizations if we are going to meet this serious problem. I want to say to the Government that if the public is going to be asked to support the regulations and the costs which are necessary to protect our environment, then the public has to know and to accept the dimension of that problem. The fourth way in which we might have been able to discuss this would have been to ask the Government to establish in the province a continuing Council on Environment; to ask the Provincial Government to ask the Government of Canada to set up a Canadian body for that purpose.

However useful any of the above would be the decision has been to urge the Government to establish a Prairie Institute on Environmental Problems. Since it is a Prairie institute that is proposed, this would involve the Government in discussions with the Governments of Manitoba and Alberta; it would involve discussions with the University of Saskatchewan and ultimately, I would expect, with the other Prairie universities as well. Such an institute would be regional in nature and the Prairies would be the region. It would be regional in financing since it could hope to get support from the three Prairie Provinces. I think the regional approach is important because pollution after all doesn't respect any boundaries.

April 2, 1970

An organization, such as is usually meant by an institute, located at a university would be able to undertake some of the testing and research and from this would flow some definition of the problem; from this could come some means to guard against the extension of the problems of pollution. At the very minimum the work of the institute could state some of the consequences of just doing what we are doing. Hopefully it will also devise some remedies which might not now be in effect. It would serve as a collection centre for research and for the dispensing of information and of ideas about this problem which is of increasing concern.

I hope that we do take it with increasing concern. I get worried when people shrug it off. I recall, Mr. Speaker, an incident in the Legislature last night when, in the face of discussions about this, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) said, "That's life" — an acceptance of things as they are — I had to feel the comment was not really impressed of the need for some greater action on it. Certainly an institute of this kind would undertake some scientific study in nature. I think it is important to note this because, while the physical and chemical sciences are naturally intimately involved, so too are the social sciences intimately involved. If in looking for solutions or prevention with respect to pollution we overlook the role of the social sciences, then we invite defeat before we start. I emphasize again that what we deal with in this matter is the total environment. The total environment is more than physical. Our total environment has a social component and a part of that social component is man, all his habits, all his hopes and his values, all his laws and his institutions.

I said earlier that there was a danger in fragmenting our approach and I think we have done just that too much to date. There is a danger in tackling this from a point of view of a single resource such as looking just at the effects on soil, or just at the effects on forests, or just at the effects on water. There is danger in trying to do this through the means of any single professional group, such as just the agrologist, or just the forester, or just the hydraulics engineer. The approach must be of physical and chemical sciences along with social sciences. I can't say too often how important it is to deal with our total environment. That means that the work must be interdisciplinary and the institute approach which we are recommending is of course fitted to this interdisciplinary use.

Now so much admittedly has been said and so much screened and so much written, there is so much evidence of difficulty and danger, that little argument for more action should be needed. And yet, as I said a minute ago, those who claim there is not much of a problem are probably the greatest danger. I regret that I have seen reported in the newspaper from time to time statements of the Premier and some statements of other persons of the Government of Saskatchewan, suggesting that we haven't got much of a danger from pollution in Saskatchewan. I submit that the greatest danger of all is from too many people saying that there isn't much danger, and I hope we can overcome

that handicap.

It is encouraging on the other hand to note that there is a very marked increased interest and awareness on the part of many people and some that has been expressed already in this Legislature during this Session. This takes different forms depending undoubtedly on the particular interests of people or organizations. For some it is simply a matter of being interested in preserving a certain species of wildlife; for some it is the concern that we may continue to enjoy clean air and water; for some it is the entire quality of our environment. There are those indeed expressing their concern because to them it is the preservation of all life, including the life of people.

I want to refer to some of the references that have been made in relatively recent times. One person who has written widely on this subject is Dr. Paul Ehrlich of the Department of Biology at Stanford. In an article published just last fall, Dr. Ehrlich, looking into the future and basing his expectations or his predictions on what has happened already had this to say:

The end of the ocean came late in the summer of 1979, and it came even more rapidly than the biologists had expected. There had been signs for more than a decade, commencing with the discovery in 1968 that DDT slows down photosynthesis in marine plant life.

Mr. Speaker, he is one of the acknowledged, foremost world authorities on what is happening to our environment and he begins his article on looking into the future by saying, "The end of the ocean came last in the summer of 1979." While that is a startling sort of prediction we don't need to go to the ocean or we don't need to wait until 1979 for evidence. We have it right here in Saskatchewan, right in our own back yard in increasing amounts. We know from news reports that fish in the Saskatchewan River system have been destroyed to the extent of some \$500,000 worth in recent months. They have had the paper a little while ago a warning by the minister of Health. He pointed out that pike and pickerel in the Saskatchewan River system from Saskatchewan to Manitoba should probably not be used for human consumption. As I say some \$500,000 worth of fish has been destroyed in recent months.

Most of us here or many of us here who from time to time like to enjoy the very great beauty of our Qu'Appelle Valley, one of our most beautiful valleys of all Canada, are aware of the extent of the problem there because of the algae in the lake. I think it is correct, according to news reports, that the Hon. Mr. Lang who was at one time not so long ago the Minister in charge of Water Distribution or water concern in Canada included both the Saskatchewan and the Qu'Appelle Rivers in the list of what he called "polluted rivers." I can tell the story, Mr. Speaker, of a man in Saskatchewan whose pasture was this past year made unusable because the stream which watered the

April 2, 1970

cattle there was polluted. It went by some of the disposal from a potash plant, the water became brackish, the cattle were unable to drink it and the pasture wasn't usable last year. Action had already been taken, perhaps not to the law courts, but certain legal action has been entered and discussed because of it.

Last evening in this House my colleague from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) put on the record something of a story of a woman who has had to go to hospital because there was too much hydrogen sulphide in the air due to the operation of an industrial plant nearby. I could add examples of this kind but will not take the time of the House to do it right now. The point I want to emphasize is that while we hear much about this in other parts of the country and because we are liable to shrug this off and say, "But that's there and not here," we have to be reminded that we have a problem here in Saskatchewan. We don't yet know how much of a problem here. The question has to be: are we prepared to make the effort and provide the machinery of imposing the necessary penalties, of introducing the necessary protective and curative measures? It is a big job. It will require public support. The institute proposal which I am suggesting would provide some of the essential information. It would give the public a chance to respond, it would guide the Government in its doing.

I wanted to read also, Mr. Speaker, some excerpts from an article or a series of articles really in the January 13th issue of Look Magazine. This is a magazine which is based on the theme entitled "*Mankind's last and best chance*." Pollution is one of the problems dealt with in that series of articles. The lead paragraph in one of these articles goes like this:

What if some foreign power threatened to poison every major stream? What if this enemy threatened to cast noxious clouds over our cities so that many old people would die outright and children would huddle indoors on sunny days? What if this enemy also boasted that he had the means to inject cancer-producing agents into our food, kill off our wildlife, destroy our most beautiful hills and clog up our lakes? Would we then be willing to get ourselves together against this enemy?

Now I submit that there is no doubt about the fact that we would be willing to join together with respect to defeating this enemy. But we have that kind of an enemy in all the different ways in which we pollute and consequently destroy our environment. I think that the challenge is to us to get something busy and do something about it.

Now, I don't want to go too far afield in all this argument about how serious pollution is, but I submit that, if we are serious about having a quality environment, about having a quality environment for our use and leaving this as part of our heritage, if we accept the evidence which is here for us from the highly industrialized and urbanized centre society

such as we find in parts of Canada and United States and elsewhere, then we will begin to profoundly question some fundamental assumptions of the kind of society in which we live. We will begin to raise questions such as: how should we regulate economic activity? You know one of these questions is facing the Canadian people right now with respect to oil in our Arctic regions. The question is this: should we try to develop that oil or are we better off to leave it in the ground where it is? There are a great many people in Canada and there is a rising body of opinion which says that the best thing for Canada is to leave that oil there until we know something more about producing oil under those conditions. The danger of not doing this is very, very great. We have to ask more and more the question of what sort of social and economic goals should we accept. If I may go back again to the article in the magazine *Look* from which I read before and read this paragraph:

The West has told its sons, 'Take from this earth as you wish, the more the better. Consume what you wish, the more the better. Build what you wish and where you wish, the more the better. Dominate as many markets and as many people as you wish, the more the better. Make as much profit as you wish, the more the better.'

That is the sort of value which we have accepted and I submit are accepting to our peril and we continue to accept.

The same article poses the answer which it says the living earth gives to this kind of value-based activity:

The living planet answers: 'Please stop. Turn around. You can't keep on doing any of these things. This isn't addressed to your altruism. Just for you and your children to survive, you'll have to stop grabbing at every natural resource; they are running out. You had better consume more carefully. You can no longer build, dominate and profit without considering the true long-term consequences of your acts. All people are tightly linked together on this spacecraft now. What hurts and costs others will hurt and cost you.'

Mr. Speaker, one could read on and on and talk on and on in this vein. I am doing it obviously to try to convince people that this is an important problem, that this is one that, I think, we have for too many years been delinquent in recognizing, facing or trying to do something about.

Some Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, one institute won't solve all of our problems and one institute, of course, won't work any miracles. But I think that the kind of action which the Resolution proposes — to establish an Institute on Environmental Problems — can give us some of the tools which we need to protect and

April 2, 1970

develop quality environment in Saskatchewan. We can do more than that. Let's remember that here in Saskatchewan we are indeed fortunate. We haven't lost nearly as much of the quality of our environment as has been lost in many parts of Canada. And the pleas behind this Resolution is, for heaven's sake let's not lose any more of the quality that we have lost to date. Let's keep it; let's improve it; let's preserve it.

Back on 1964 we had a conference held in the city of Saskatoon which was called the Resources for People Conference. The keynote speaker at the conference was a Mr. Irvin K. Fox who was at that time the Director of Resources for the Future, Washington, United States. And in emphasizing what I have just said about how fortunate we are here in Canada, I read a paragraph from Mr. Fox's address at that time. Speaking to the delegates there he said:

You are fortunate in being removed from the congestion and the environmental problems of many other areas. But implicit in what is happening elsewhere is the need to preserve and enhance the amenities of space, clean water and clear vistas which you now enjoy. This is one of your great assets which has economic significance while contributing to the quality of life of those fortunate enough to live here.

One further quotation, Mr. Speaker, comes from Dr. W.A. Fuller now of the University of Alberta. Dr. Fuller, a Saskatchewan resident originally, Professor Zoology at Alberta, speaking to some of us at a conference in Prince Albert in November, 1969, had this to say:

Man is capable of destroying his own life-support system and has begun to do so. It is not too late to reverse this trend, but to do so will require positive action. A start must be made somewhere; why not in Saskatchewan?

That is essentially the question which I asked the Legislature to consider today — to recognize that man is capable of destroying our life-support system and has begun to do so. We to some extent, a lesser extent than in many places, are guilty here in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is not too late to reverse this trend, to reverse will require a more positive action than we have yet taken. We have to make a start. Why not now? Why not to a greater extent in the Province of Saskatchewan?

I submit that the endorsation in this Resolution is one such step. Consequently I urge your support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this Resolution, which has been moved by the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd), I

do so because I feel there is a great deal of need to make our people aware of and to take immediate steps in safeguarding their life against this huge problem that threatens our natural environment – the problem of pollution, a problem that is not just in any specific area, but one that is spreading like fire in all areas of the world. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that only by joint effort can we ever hope to control it successfully. If we do not act now it can prove to be too late, because I firmly believe that we are altering man's environment in ways that we do not understand and in ways which may prove very disastrous. Unless we begin to match our technological power with a deeper understanding of that environment, we run the risk of destroying this planet as a suitable place for human inhabitation.

Dr. Barry Commoner, director of the Centre of Biology of Natural Systems at Washington University in St. Louis, stated that the youth of nuclear reactors had to be evaluated in a light of hidden cost to human health from the release of iodine 131, a radioactive substance that could settle in the thyroid gland and possibly cause cancer. He then went on to say that, because of our illusions, we have become unwitting victims of environmental pollution, citing the damaging effects of automobile smog, insecticides, detergents, radioactive fallouts, chemical weapons. All these are examples of technological affronts that are made, not out of creed, but out of ignorance.

I say, Mr. Speaker, we must have immediate investigations and continued research to give us a more accurate knowledge of the consequences of our actions. This is what this Resolution sets out to do. People today are becoming very disturbed because they begin to realize that we have reached a critical point in human habitation of the earth. In Princeton University, as far back as 1947, there was a question before a conference on the fate of man. The question was: would man go the way of the dodo and the dinosaur, or would he take his destiny in his own hands and make a better creature of himself? Even at this time the opinion was divided.

At the UNESCO headquarters in Paris last year, more than 200 experts from 50 countries met in conference. They decided that within 20 years life on our planet would be showing the first sign of succumbing to pollution. the atmosphere will become un-breathable for men and animals. Life will cease in rivers and lakes, and plants will wither from poisoning because of man-creating far-reaching imbalances.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, as cities become larger and spread in monstrous fashion, this total problem of pollution becomes greater, and is accelerating at a very crazy speed. Carbon dioxide and all the air-borne industrial wastes are fouling the atmosphere and poisoning fresh water. My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: what are we going to do about it?

I would like to refer at this time to an article in the

Saskatchewan Business Journal, the winter edition, page 9, entitled *The Challenge of Pollution*:

Pollution in North America is shaping up as the biggest challenge of 1970s. We in Saskatchewan have traditionally felt relatively untouched by this problem. Many of us have maintained that the prairie climate is one of the healthiest. Admittedly we have less of a problem than some of the more industrialized areas, but we need not be smug about this, according to university biologist in Regina, Dr. D.H. Shephard.

Dr. Shephard goes on to say that mercury pollution in the Saskatchewan River will cost the taxpayers at least \$1 million and represents a risk to human health to an extent as yet unknown. He continues, saying that in the south of the province we have very little water. We cannot afford pollution, yet the Qu'Appelle lakes continue to be fertilized by sewage effluent from Moose Jaw and Regina and other places. Perhaps what is needed in Regina is an independent Task Force, says Dr. Shephard, similar to a recently formed group of concerned scientists in Manitoba, the group which calls itself "Manitoba scientists to control pollution." It has set itself two prime objectives: one to encourage collation of facts about specific pollution problems, and the other to stimulate the interchange knowledge and ideas to help solve or reduce the problem. Saskatchewan has a tremendous amount of scientific talent, but this brainpower must be mobilized into a coherent action team to provide concrete and constructive expertise on how to abate pollution.

Mr. Speaker, when we think of the areas that are more apt to be faced with this great problem, we think of our perhaps larger urban centres. But let me remind you that this is not only happening in our urban centres or urban areas. There are examples or symptoms of this great danger and its effects taking place in our rural areas and our rural industrial areas. As I mentioned last night in Estimates, Mr. Speaker, I have had brought to my attention a case in my own constituency where a family is living in the oil-industrial area. Their farm area is in a northwesterly direction of some 40 to 50 rods from what we refer to out there as a water flood plant, but it is an oil-collecting plant where oil is gathered from some 600 oil wells. This gas is burnt off in flare pits, water is injected down into the surface of the ground some 4700 to 4900 feet in depth in order to build up pressure so as to force out more oil. Some of this poisonous gas escapes and pollutes the air. It is believed that this is the cause of the lady of the house who lives in this farm dwelling having to be hospitalised on various occasions. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Health as well as the Minister of Mineral Resources has information regarding this case, and I fully understand that they are trying to come up with some solution or cure in co-operation with the oil companies at least to lessen or control the poisonous fumes to a point where they will not be injurious to human life.

I am only trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, the great necessity for further study and immediate research work into this whole problem, and why I think that a resolution such as this one, which we are asking the Members to adopt, is on such importance at this time. I believe that a joint effort of establishing and financing a Prairie institute on environmental problems would benefit the provinces and would co-ordinate the findings of this institute, save on any overlapping that might take place rather than if each Province tackled it individually. It would certainly assist in the financing of such an institution and its benefits could certainly be more rewarding.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we seem to look today upon smog and air pollution as incidents of urban life. Until such public health disasters as the death of some 4,000 people in London — I think it was in 1952 — takes place, we forget that this can be such a killing negligence. At least one hundred air pollutants have already been identified. The cost of air pollution in Canada alone has been estimated at from \$20 to \$65 per person, depending on where he lives. This, Mr. Speaker, is only for laundering, painting, cleaning of buildings, filtering of air, and doctor bills.

But I do not think the costs and loss in dollars and cents tell the whole story. Air pollution as I have stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, constitutes a serious hazard to health. It lowers resistance to disease, it reduces vitality, and it increases sickness. It has been stated that relatively low levels of air pollution may be involved in the development of chronic degenerative diseases, including skin and lung cancer, heart and vascular disorders, as well as chronic bronchitis. These to me are the main reasons that we should be taking some immediate action toward the correction of this very serious situation. I think this can only come about by more research or into the causes of pollution and how we can take proper steps and measures to alleviate them.

When a situation becomes so desperate that it demands attention, we seemingly are usually satisfied to treat the symptoms rather than to try and discover the fundamental causes. I am sure that our natural resources constitute a delicately balanced system in which all parts are interdependent, and we cannot upset one factor without causing widespread repercussions in unsuspected areas or places. I fully believe that the time has come when we must take a closer look at enhancing the quality of life. We must take measures to restore the balance of nature. There is a work, Mr. Speaker, which some people seem to shy away from because they think it means 'stop using.' This work is 'conservation.' but resource conservation means nothing more than the wise use of our resources in accordance with the laws of nature. Nature maintained her balance for many years, but she is now up against something new. I am afraid that man today is taking too much for granted and is trying to manage things and is forcing things into new ways. His interference has brought about the deterioration in living

April 2, 1970

conditions which alarm us. We see the extinction of many animals and plants and the defilement of air and water. In order to have continued existence, Mr. Speaker, man must be called upon to re-think many things, to re-learn lessons long forgotten, and to get back on the right road.

Government programs are being established, but I am afraid at a snail's pace, Mr. Speaker. The problem of pollution is growing and spreading at a much faster pace. What we need — and we have no time to lose — is to take immediate steps with a view to establishing and financing a Prairie institute on environmental problems, which I believe can be best accomplished under joint auspices with our neighbouring Provinces and our University of Saskatchewan, just as this Resolution calls for. We need people rich enough in understanding and imagination. We need people strong enough in fibre that they will insist that adequate forests and outdoor space be left to be admired and not to be destroyed. Unless natural outdoor spaces remain, young people will be denied their instinctive wanderings. They will be cheated of experiences that are by nature necessary to them, and in many cases end up by turning their energies to protest and evil.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, unless we recognize and teach that it is more important to enhance the quality of life than to raise the standard of living, I am afraid we will go on creating conditions where wealth accumulates and men will decay with the final result of having an affluent society dwelling in an environmental slum and perhaps perishing in it. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge all Members to support this Resolution, because I feel this problem of water, air and land pollution is one of the greatest problems facing us today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the mover and the seconder of this Resolution for the interest and the concern that they are showing for the problems of pollution I spoke at some length on this subject in another debate this Session, and I really only want to re-emphasize my own feelings of concern at the bleak future which faces all of mankind, if we fail to meet the challenges of providing adequate environmental control. I would like to endorse almost everything that has been said on the necessity of focusing our attention on the environment during the next decade. Unfortunately, we have a problem, and it is a problem that is fairly new to society. It is a problem that all of our TV people face, it is a problem of overexposure and the possibility of having a subject discussed to the point, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, a subject discussed to the point where it becomes meaningless and people just tune out. This we do not want to do. I don't want at this time to go into a lengthy discussion again of the dangers of pollution; I think these have been adequately pointed out to us, in almost every magazine we pick up. I

would like to suggest that we in Saskatchewan are remarkably fortunate, no real credit comes to us for this — we just happen to have been born in a situation where we have a scattered population and a relatively limited industrial development, so that we don't have the massive and sometimes almost insoluble problems which face more heavily industrialized areas.

I was quite impressed with the suggestion, the reiteration of many other suggestions which Mr. Lloyd gave, that studies of the environment must include the total environment. There is very little use in cleaning up a situation as far as the physical part of our life is concerned and finding that we are really in a state of moral turpitude, which doesn't allow us to enjoy in the fullest sense that clean physical environment which we may or may not be able to create. Here I think we have a much broader challenge. One could quote from almost every magazine that one picks up on some aspect of pollution. I think I have a file about so thick, and I am certainly not going to bring any of this before the House, except for one small suggestion that I would like to read. *Saturday Review* is a very respected journal and I have a good deal of respect for Mr. Norman Pleasance, the editor of this journal. He has seen fit, starting with his March 7 issue, to run a regular section on environmental problems and the first section, which appears in the March 7th issue, is very frankly headed, "*Cleaning Humanity's Nest.*" The editorial which accompanies this section — I would just like to read the first paragraph of it — and Mr. Cousins says:

Philosophy precedes ecology. What is most needed today are new realizations about man's place in the universe, a new sense of life, a new pride in the importance of being human, a new anticipation of the enlarged potentialities of mind, a new joyousness and the possibilities for essential human humanity and a new determination to keep this planet from becoming uninhabitable.

I was most interested in the alternatives which Mr. Lloyd presented, the possible alternatives which he could have presented to this Resolution, and frankly I think in almost any of them I would have been more interested than in the one which he has chosen.

I feel that we in Saskatchewan have a breathing spell, we are fortunate in this respect, we have legislation on our Statute Books which is for the most part adequate. We are moving towards an interdepartmental structure which assures us of a coordinated approach by the people in government who must cooperate in order to make meaningful action possible. In other words, I think we have the mechanics of a good environmental program. I hope we don't take too much pleasure in this. I think that we must learn to use the mechanics that we have.

The Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) made mention of the need for more research. This is one field where I have a

April 2, 1970

feeling that research has gotten ahead of action. Very often it is the other way around – we tend to act without having researched our position. Here I feel that we are almost in a position where research may be way ahead of action and, when one reads the writings of people like Dr. Erlich from Stanford who was mentioned, one gets to the point of feeling that these men have a definite program to offer and their fear is that they cannot arouse politicians to action in time to make the research which they have done a meaningful thing.

This is why I am rather doubtful about the last part of the Resolution which is before us. I think I would endorse wholeheartedly the first part but it seems to me that there is a possibility that we are creating just another tier of committees and another lengthy series of researches which might be desirable but which really would not help us in getting any action immediately. I think immediate action is required. I therefore must reserve my comments on the last part of the Resolution and, because I would like to consider it further, at this moment I will beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 19 – JUDICIAL INQUIRY RESPECTING RELEASES AND FOLLOW-UP CARE OF MENTALLY ILL PATIENTS

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords) moved, seconded by Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government the establishment of a judicial inquiry into the programs and policies respecting releases and follow-up care of patients known to be potentially dangerous from Saskatchewan mental hospitals and other institutions.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I shall not in moving this Resolution spend a great deal of time in discussing it. I think the less that is said at this particular time about the unhappy situation that brings this Resolution to the House the better. I have evidence of too many cases where there have been known violent psychopaths who have been institutionalised, treated, and then released upon an unsuspecting public, and the results of some of these releases are only too well-known. I don't think that anyone in this House is aware, possibly the Minister may be aware, of how many people there are in Saskatchewan today that are in the category of a time bomb and the people that may have them in their homes or in the community do not even know about them.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not talking about all the people who are released from institutions and I want to make this point clear. There is a small group of people — and the situation isn't peculiar to Saskatchewan — that have committed some of the more violent acts and have possibly repeated the offences of rape, murder and arson. I believe that these people should be in a special category and

subject to some special study and special care and special supervision. It isn't good enough, Mr. Speaker, for society to say we have to treat them exactly the same as we do everybody else; because these people are helpless, they have to be protected from themselves. There are as I say many instances -the Minister has been good enough to supply us with some of them — there are a good many instances of tragedy that are on record. There are some that I know about that are not on this record that have been supplied by the Minister to the Leader of the Opposition.

I think the law enforcement people are demanding that some better liaison be established, so that they know when these people are released that they are being supervised by a social worker — if in fact they are released — and also that the people who do harbour them should know what their potential is. There has been one recent tragedy which I think cannot be discussed. I don't want to abuse the privileges of the House — I believe that the Attorney General would tell me if I alluded to the incident byname that it was sub judice at the present time. I only want to outline a situation where we seem to have in many instances, cases where a patient, that has been proven psychotic, has done considerable damage in the areas that I have mentioned, where he is declared, or she is declared, to be fit to stand trial but potentially dangerous. I am not expert enough to know what this means but I am expert enough to observe what the results have been in many of these cases. I am simply saying in this Resolution to the Attorney General, to the minister of health, to the Minister of Welfare — because all of these are concerned — I am simply saying that we must look into this — if you want to amend my Resolution to say that it should not be a judicial inquiry, that it should be some kind of a study along the line of the Frazier Commission. But certainly we have not got much further along the way since the Frazier Report. I suggest that in moving this Resolution I sincerely hope that the Government will take the matter up and assist the law enforcement people, the judges, and the people in the field of psychiatry to devise a better method of protecting the public, not only the public but these unfortunate people who do not really know what they are doing. The public must be protected and, Mr. Speaker, I believe these people must be protected from themselves to prevent further tragedies.

I must repeat here that the incidence of tragedy in this province over the last five years has been considerably higher than it ever has been in the past. The Frazier Report — I wonder sometimes how often the departments concerned take a look at it; there were several recommendations in the Frazier Report. I don't want to belabour the points that were raised, but I think in view of the present Budget, for instance, that we have to raise them again, draw them to the attention of the Minister. I look at this year's Estimates for psychiatric services and I see that the estimate is down by \$155,000. I look at last year's spending and I see on the Frazier Committee recommendations that it was under spent by \$100,000. I remember

April 2, 1970

that Dr. Frazier said that in order to meet the minimum requirements \$2 million must be injected into — at least \$2 million — must be injected into this psychiatric service program, if not immediately, then over a short period of time. This year I look at the Estimates and I see that there has been no budget. The \$500,000 that was there for the Frazier recommendations last year, Mr. Speaker, was not there this year and I suggest that this is some cause for worry.

I suggest that the Minister should be reminded that Dr. Frazier recommended that the salaries of psychologists be raised by 15 per cent, that the salaries for social workers be raised by 20 per cent, and that other workers be raised 10 to 15 per cent and that, I would assume, based on the salaries and wages of that day and not considering the natural increment of 6 per cent that is usually entertained by the Government. These objectives have not been met. I don't know at this point because I was not present yesterday when the Minister's Estimates were read. I hope the Minister will tell us how close he has come to those recommendations.

I wonder if I could refer the Minister for a moment to another section of the Frazier Report which says something more about the situation and I think it points up what some of my worries are. On page 35, I believe it is, it is part of recommendation No. 43 in Long Range Planning. Dr. Frazier said:

We failed to find evidence of long-range plans or projects. Despite lip service to the Saskatchewan plan it was clear that this plan had never been fully implemented. Furthermore there was much uncertainty about which unit would be developed next, why the Prince Albert centre was not in operation, what the priorities were among the many critical needs.

I wonder if that situation has been changed with the meagre amounts of money and the under spending even of that meagre amount of money that was allocated last year. I wonder too if — getting back to another recommendation which was part of recommendation No. 36 — No. 3 under (d) and again on page 32 and this goes back once more to the subject at hand. No. 3 says, quoting Dr. Frazier:

That there are no adequate provisions for the handling of psychopaths, sex offenders, and similar troublesome individuals. They do not fit well in a mental hospital.

Hear this. He says:

They do not fit well in a mental hospital in a ward primarily set up for the treatment of functional psychotics.

and my Resolution does not concern myself with those.

One manipulatory psychopath can undermine the treatment

program for 30 schizophrenics. Yet magistrates and law enforcement officials feel that something should be done with these individuals to protect society. This is a worldwide problem and is in no way unique to Saskatchewan.

And that again is beside the point. We are here conducting the affairs of Saskatchewan. I think that we have to put our hands and minds to curing this problem in Saskatchewan. And I think especially so when we have a situation and a continuing situation such as the cases that are on record and some of the cases that are not yet on record but will be, that in my opinion create a hazard and a danger and a worry.

I cannot go home or travel without hearing people express concern. The scare talk is surging at a higher pitch now among people who say surely something must be done about the situation. Certainly the public must be protected against further incidences of this kind.

I want to say at this point that the people who are concerned in this work in psychiatric services, whether it be the social workers, psychiatric nurses, or the doctors concerned, are doing the very best, in my opinion, that they can with the material at hand, but they lack the personnel, as was said in the Frazier Report. They lack it now, they lack the sinews of war and the finance to do the job. The Department lacks it and I think the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is no doubt aware of this, but more supervision has to be done. I am talking about the dangerous psychotics. I do want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, in no way is anything I am saying today a reflection on the staff in any institution that I know about. They are doing a cardinal job and I congratulate the Department, the whole Department, for this. But in spite of the job they are doing, we have these incidences of tragedy which seem to come about because of a lack of cohesion, a lack of communication between the various areas of car and law enforcement. Somehow or other we just don't seem to be able to allow the left hand to know what the right hand is doing. Somebody slips through the mesh and then you find another situation where lives are lost and a situation develops where no one can be happy and a family or a life is ruined or lost.

Mr. Speaker, I said I wasn't going to speak at any great length on this. I hope that we can approach this Resolution with the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan in mind, without any political controversy. If the Minister or the Attorney General chooses to amend this Resolution so that the spirit of it can be carried out better, I would welcome this, but I plead with you to take a look at this situation in order that the general public of Saskatchewan can feel safer about the entire situation and that these unfortunate people can be protected from themselves and their families from further embarrassment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 2, 1970

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have some observations I would like to make in this debate and I would therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 82

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West) for Return No. 82 showing:

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

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health):

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

- (1) Whether the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre will be preparing an annual report for the year 1969.
- (2) If so, whether the report will include details of the amount of money spent by the Centre for architectural fees and of the name or names of the architectural firms to whom these payments were made.
- (3) If not, the amount spent by the Centre for architectural fees during the year 1969 and the name or names of the architectural firms to whom these payments were made.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — The report in question has been tabled and I don't know whether the Hon. Member wishes to make any comments on it, but the answers to the question are contained in the report that is in his hands.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, the information that I asked for in the

motion that is the fees and the other material from the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital is contained in the report as the Hon. Minister says. It arrived on my desk about 15 minutes ago. All the material is contained in the report so I am in favour of the motion as amended.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 14 – STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF FEED GRAIN MARKETING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook):

That this Assembly urge the Federal Government and the Governments of the Prairie Provinces to consider a joint study of the problems of feed-grain marketing with a view to devising a plan, under the Canadian Wheat Board, which would permit movement of feed grains on a uniform basis both within and between the individual Prairie Provinces.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my argument I would like to point out to you, Sir, today, the Farmers' Union are having a meeting here in Regina, I regret that as a member of the association I am not able to attend because of this Resolution on the Order Paper. If the president is here I might, in spite of what he said concerning certain Members of this House, assure him that every Member on this side of the House is quite aware of the farm problems, whether it be grain marketing or whether it is prices, and they do not have to have any concern about us.

Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members will remember that when I adjourned the debate on this Resolution the other day I had indicated that many farmers of Saskatchewan, and many whom I represent, already have a problem with marketing feed grains as well as oil seeds and wheat. I said at that time that the Wheat Board followed a policy which obviously does not meet all the needs of coarse-grain producers. I mentioned that different policies are enunciated by such organizations as the Federation of Agriculture, UGG and other organizations as well. I stated at that time that most people would agree with orderly marketing of feed grains but, because we as farmers were uncertain of the best policies to pursue in the area of marketing, it appeared to me to be a good idea to have a joint study by governments on this whole subject of marketing in order that farmers producing feed grains could be assured of some kind of security. When I think of security for producers, Mr. Speaker, I am thinking of not only efficiency in farming

April 2, 1970

but of the prices received for farm products in whatever markets these products may be sold.

Today we hear much talk about wheat farmers and their income deficiencies. We now have Operation LIFT from Ottawa which is not going to lift anybody out of this despondent situation, I'm sure. Let me say that it is obvious, particularly for feed producers such as myself, that we are in a much worse economic situation than even the wheat farmers, much worse than we should have been. I would say it is partly because a great deal of wheat has been sold at ridiculously low prices in competition with feed grains. So far we have not seen the Federal Government inject any cash into the farming area and I would say again that assuredly the feed producers are the ones who have been hit most. We are presently being asked by the Hon. Otto Lang to grow more barley and feed grains in order to help remove the wheat glut on the Prairies. It is clear to me, at least, that the problems of wheat marketing will be shifted now to coarse-grain farming and to oil-seed producers. Now the Wheat Board maybe somewhat relieved of headaches of one kind, but it will find that it will have headaches of even a greater kind when the crops are gathered because the surpluses of feed grains and of oil seeds will be such as it will not be able to handle at all.

Now let us look at the supply and disposition of barley and oats for example over the past three years as given by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I'm not going to bore you, Mr. Speaker, with a lot of figures, but I would say this that in the case of oats Canada's share of the world market has dropped from 51 per cent in 1953 to only 5 per cent in 1967, a tremendous drop in sales. The world market dropped from 35 per cent in 1953 to 14 per cent in 1967 for barley. This is a tragic situation. It is much worse than the situation is with wheat. I can say that Canada has been practically eliminated as an exporter of feed grains. When I look at the reports in the Press and elsewhere I find that we have lost our markets to Britain and we have lost our markets elsewhere. Therefore it is quite a serious situation. The reason we would want this whole problem studied is because different organizations of farmers have different answers. For example the Pools say this in their policy and I read from the Pool's Yearbook, 1968-69, on page 7 at the bottom. They say this:

International commodity agreements are in the best interests of producers. The current International Grains Arrangement should be supported and renegotiated for the future.

The second point they say is:

The Canadian Wheat Board should be retained and its jurisdiction extended to cover all grains as defined in The Canada Grain Act. There should be Board control of marketing of all Prairie grains through public elevators

and mills, feed dealers and any other merchants or feedlots that purchase grain. The quota system should be retained; improvements may be necessary and the Pool will put forth some ideas.

That is one point of view. We find a point of view of the Farmers' Union of Alberta and I presume this is the Farmers' Union view in Saskatchewan. Now may I refer to a press release in the Free Press Weekly of March 21, on page 4, under the heading "Constitutional Obstacles to Feed-grain Pricing." This is not what the farmers said. This is the attitude of Ottawa. I will read just a paragraph or two.

The Federal Government is prevented from establishing minimum and maximum price of feed grains within a province by constitutional obstacles, Canadian Wheat Board Chief Commission MacNamara said.

So here is the problem. Here is the way Ottawa looks at it. Maybe I should read a little more of what Mr. MacNamara said in that article because I think it is relevant to what we are discussing. I quote:

Mr. MacNamara said he does not believe minimum-maximum feed-grain pricing within a province would solve the current low prices of feed grains resulting from a glut of international grain markets.

In other words he agrees with what I've said and he agrees that they don't seem to have the answers. It says here that he took exception to M.P. Gleaves' description that the current method of price and feed grain is about as ineffective a method as could be conceived. Although not perfect, Mr. MacNamara claimed this pricing system provides for usage with a higher overall return than they were to receive under a price flexibility scheme proposed by some critics. Now there are some that propose price flexibility schemes. But such is not the policy of the Farmers' Union. I agree that we must have a system that is going to satisfy the needs of the farmers. Now we find Mr. Babey, who is the president of the Alberta group, speaking and I quote from the Western Producer, Thursday, March 19, on page 14 under the heading, "Babey Supports Curbs on Feed-grain Movement." He says and I quote:

There is an urgent need to stabilize prices and to do this in an excess supply situation, such as we are now in supply management, along with regulations that provide for orderly sharing of the market and becoming more and more essential.

He says this also in another paragraph referring to feed grains:

We discussed this matter fully at the FUA Convention and at the AFA meeting in Calgary and the majority of delegates agreed that lifting of provincial boundaries

April 2, 1970

in the movement of feed grains would further erode such orderly marketing systems as we have.

And I agree but many people maybe don't agree. Mr. A.M. Runciman, for example, as quoted by Mr. Babey apparently said this and I read a paragraph, Mr. Babey referring to a statement by A. Runciman, president of the United Grain Growers, to the Commons Agricultural Committee which advocated changes in regulations to permit free movement of grain outside the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board.

Then you have a section on nonsensical statements such as I read the other day by Dr. George D. Friesen.

Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — I wonder if the Hon. Member would permit an interjection?

Debate interrupted by leave.

ANNOUNCEMENT

FARMERS' UNION DELEGATION

Mr. Thatcher: — I have just come from the rotunda and there are four or five thousand members of the Farmers' Union, who are meeting in Regina. They are very anxious to speak to Members of the Legislature. I suggested to them that we would be adjourning at 5:00 in any event, but Mr. Atkinson is very insistent. He would like all members to join him. He is speaking from a balcony. I would with unanimous consent, and only that way, like to move that the house do now adjourn for the balance of the day until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. Lloyd: — I am quite prepared to second the motion.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:15 o'clock p.m.