

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

Thursday, March 7, 1974.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G. F. LOKEN: (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and to the Assembly a group of 60 Grade Eight students attending the Division III School at Rosetown. They are seated in the east gallery. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. McIntosh and teachers, Mrs. Wickett and Mr. Brumwell. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this is a total of 120 students from the Rosetown Division III School that have attended the Legislature this year. I know the Assembly will join with me in extending to them a hearty welcome and wishing them a pleasant and informative and a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. G. WHELAN: (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to this Assembly 42 Grade Twelve students from O'Neill High School in Regina North West. This group of young citizens is seated in the west gallery with their Social Studies' teachers, Harry Berezny and James Hudson. My three children attended this school and my son Timothy completed Grade Twelve in that school at the end of January, this year. Members will join me I am sure in welcoming this group to the Assembly. I hope their visit here this afternoon will be pleasant, informative and educational.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the Assembly a group of students from Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. They are from St. Edwards School and I believe they are situated in the Speaker's Gallery opposite you. They are accompanied today by two of their teachers, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Drabyk and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome them to this Chamber along with the other Members and hope that they have an educational day here and hope also that they have a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ELECTIONS—SASKATOON UNIVERSITY

MR. D. G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make an announcement that I'm sure will be of great

interest to the Members of this Assembly and they'll join with me in my happiness on this occasion. In the recent election that the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus held, the Liberal Party won 21 seats, NDP 17, and the Tories 10.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — I'm sure all Members join with me in congratulating the Liberal Party on the Campus and wishing them well.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) in his noting this very rare occurrence which I think we should all take account of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

GRANTS TO METIS SOCIETY

MR. J.G. RICHARDS: (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I intend to address a question to the Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman).

Before the question, I might say that one of the skeletons in my political closet was that back at the University of Saskatchewan I was Prime Minister of that mock parliament in an NDP-Tory coalition against the Liberals, back in 1963.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RICHARDS: — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address a question to the Hon. Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) with respect to the confusion which may have arisen this week on the question of grants to the Métis Society. There was a statement in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, March 5th to the effect that you were cutting off the accounts of the Métis Society until there had been audits done. There were then verbal statements from you in various radio reports which I heard to the effect that that was not the case and that you would be continuing as at present. Would you be willing, for the sake of the House and the clarity of this issue, to state where you stand, where the Government stands with respect to ongoing grants to the Métis Society and what auditing procedures you intend to undertake? The normal ones or anything in particular before or at the end of the fiscal year?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I did say that the group which had come to see myself, here at my office in Regina, had requested that we do three things. That was that we stop future grants to the Métis Society. Various members of the Métis Society had asked us to do that. Secondly, they asked us to undertake an independent audit and thirdly, that some action be taken with respect to their organization under the Provincial Secretary's Department. I did indicate there was no way we could stop grants, because grants issued in this fiscal year have already been granted as of the 1st of January and no more grants

therefore would be forthcoming to the Society until after the beginning of the fiscal year. Therefore, this matter, as far as stopping the grants was concerned there would, be no way that we could do that at this particular time, but that the requests which they had made would certainly be considered by the Government and we will be taking those matters into consideration.

MR. RICHARDS: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I assume that there are regular accounting procedures undertaken with respect to these grants. For example in the Auditor's Report this year, there is discussion on the adequacy or inadequacy of the accounting procedures in some of these grants. Are you planning any special, long, drawn out auditing that is not part of the regular auditing procedures that you have conducted in the past?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Under the provisions of the contract which we have with the Society for the provision of grant funds to the Society, there is the requirement that they provide the Human Resources Agency with a progress report and an audited statement. The information which has come to us by the way of the group which is representing themselves as members, former members of the Métis Society, but nevertheless very interested members of not only that organization but of an organization representing Métis people in Saskatchewan, is that there have been irregularities. There have been irregularities in the accounting and as well there is information which they have presented to myself, that I will subsequently be considering and will be presenting to my colleagues in the Government. A decision will be made at that time.

THERAPEUTIC ABORTIONS

MR. E. G. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I had a question for the Minister responsible for Public Health, but I see he is not in his seat. Perhaps I could ask the Attorney General this question.

Mr. Attorney General were you aware in 1973 that at the City Hospital in Saskatoon there were 566 therapeutic abortions performed? This is more than 50 per cent of all the abortions that were performed in that year in Saskatoon and Regina and I believe at the University Hospital there were also 166 abortions and at the Regina General Hospital there were only 277 abortions. In view of these rather alarming figures, I am wondering whether you or the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) has made a request pursuant to Section 251 (5) of the Criminal Code for information concerning these abortions and if not, why not?

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, just speaking for myself, there has been no request made under the particular Section. I do know that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) does have under active consideration the abortion figures. I'm not able to tell the Member precisely the nature of his discussions or deliberations into this matter. I think it would be best to wait until he returns to ask him specifically.

FLOODING SITUATION IN REGINA

MR. D. G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers) about the possible flooding situation in Regina. Now we have asked several questions on this and I've listened to the answers and I've watched them on television and he gave a fairly detailed account. I've listened very carefully but so far, all I can gather is that the Government is saying to the people of Regina and really in effect, Lumsden, but certainly the people of Regina, were going to monitor it. We'll let you know. In other words we'll let you know when the flood is coming. I presume the Minister will be out on the hill in Pilot Butte and he'll say, "The flood's coming boys, run for the high ground!" What are you going to do? This is the most potentially dangerous situation we've had here for probably half a century. Has the Government got any plans, not monitoring, not warning. I'll tell you when that flood starts they won't need any monitoring, they'll know it's coming. What are you going to do? What are you planning to do besides just monitor or let us know when the flood is coming?

HON. N. E. BYERS: (Minister of Environment): — One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that we did shortly after assuming office, a little over two years ago was to commission a study known as the Wascana Flood Study to determine what measures ought to be taken to cope with any potential flood damage on the flood plain in Wascana Creek, and we have got that study finally completed this year and it was released a couple of weeks ago. It does lay out a plan to cope with the problems of future floods in Regina and I invite the Hon. Member to look at the recommendations in that report. May I say that he may hear within a few days of some very concrete measures that are being proposed to act on that report which we do not intend to put on the shelf and gather dust or gather water. In addition to that the Department of the Environment, the Emergency Measures Organization, the city of Regina, Wascana Centre Authority, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a number of government agencies and commissions have banded together and the Department of the Environment is acting as the Chairman of the co-ordinating committee to plan action in the event of a flood. The Department of the Environment as head of that co-ordinating committee has met with the city officials, they have met with the Power Corporation, they have met with the Wascana Centre Authority, they have met with the city officials, they have had a number" of meetings and. they have laid out a plan to assist the citizens of this city in the event that a flood does occur. The Department of the Environment within the last two years has greatly accelerated its forecasting and monitoring equipment so that we will now know when a flood is coming and we didn't have that source of information two years ago when the water of Wascana nearly washed away the Legislative Building.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — The City of Regina has laid out an action plan so that the various agencies of government know what their marching orders are. Each one knows what it has to do and the Department of the Environment working with the EMO and the city officials

March 7, 1974

have put a very comprehensive plan in place to deal with any flood that comes and that's what we are going to do this spring and we hope to be getting on very quickly with the recommendations of the Wascana Flood Study so that this sort of menace doesn't materialize for the people of Regina again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question which I'm almost afraid to ask because by the time I get the answer the flood will be here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — What the Minister is really saying is that they've had all kinds of meetings, they've had all kinds of studies and they've got a plan, but if he read the plan himself, it won't really start until in the summer of 1974. By that time this Legislative Building might be in North Dakota or somewhere else.

What you're really saying is you'll be able to tell us two days ahead of time and since the snow is about ten feet higher we're going to be in five times as much trouble. What I'd like you to do, but surely not today, would you kindly write out a nice simple straight forward explanation and tell us what the plan is, or better still, tell the people of Regina.

We've got a plan. What is the plan? That's what we want to know. Never mind, we've got a plan and you've had meetings and you've got a Chairman and you had all these wonderful task forces and studies. Who is the Chairman, what is your plan? Have you got sandbags, are you going to move the snow out of here, what are you going to do? If you've got a plan, good, I'm pleased you've got one and I'm pleased you're going to let us know, but I think the people expect a little more than that, that you're going to jump up somewhere and say, "It's coming, get going." That might be the plan, I think that's all it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J. R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) ever got around to really posing the question, but I know as acting Minister of Municipal Affairs that the department has been involved in putting together the plan that the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to make some mockery of.

There have been ordered and are now being moved into place 75,000 additional sandbags to what are now available. We are stockpiling and moving on to sites sand, not only to fill those bags but to hold in reserve. When the Minister of Environment relates to Saskatchewan Power Corporation being contacted and other departments such as Agriculture . . .

MR. STEUART: — You are stockpiling bags?

MR. MESSER: — Yes.

MR. STEUART: — Where?

MR. MESSER: — I don't know where it is being done, but I know that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Well now the Hon. Member doesn't expect the Cabinet Ministers to know exactly where these things are taking place. Officials tell us that these undertakings are underway and I think that we can expect that that is in fact what is being done.

When the Minister of Environment (Mr. Byers) refers to other departments that have been contacted, such as Agriculture, Natural Resources, Highways and Power, they are being contacted so that they will be able to have their equipment ready to help in any way in order to offset the flood and also to have the human resources that these departments may be able to provide in order to sandbag or whatever other duty they are called upon to carry out. I know that there are other activities that are being put into place at this time, but those are some of the concrete things that are being done at this point in time.

ANNOUNCEMENT

HOCKEY—SHELLBROOK ELKS

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN: (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Shellbrook has, since my coming to this Legislature in 1967, provided me with a number of opportunities which I have been both honored and privileged to announce to the Assembly and to Saskatchewan as a whole.

Last evening in the home arena the Shellbrook Elks hockey club, once again for the sixth consecutive year won the northern finals in the Saskatchewan Intermediate B hockey playoffs. The Shellbrook Elks won the finals in a rather hard fought game against Biggar in a two game total goal series. They won that series by three points and this moves them to the provincial finals which they have taken, Mr. Speaker, for five consecutive years. They will certainly be contesting very hard for their sixth consecutive year to become the provincial winners. Shellbrook is one of Saskatchewan's very lively rural urban centres, has a population of just over 1000 people, Mr. Speaker, and is now completing one of the very finest hockey arenas in Saskatchewan. It will probably cost the people in the community \$250,000. To show you the interest of the fans in the Shellbrook area, I am advised that the attendance at last night's game was 861 paying spectators in attendance to see that final game and I suggest to you I was there and indeed it was a fine game. I am sure that many of the Members in this House will want to congratulate that club as one of the main hockey contenders in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 52—**An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1972** be now read a second time

MR. E. KAEDING: (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to comment on a couple of sections of this Bill. Section 57 of the Act presently requires that the Reeve of the Municipality must call a special meeting if 20 voters petition for such a meeting. There is no provision, however, in the Act which permits the Reeve of the Municipality to call a meeting at the instigation of the Council. The amendment in Section 57 will add this flexibility for the Council. Members who have served on municipal councils will know that from time to time there are matters of concern to the council on which they may wish ratepayers to express their opinions. There are also situations, Mr. Speaker, when a disagreement of council with certain actions of the Reeve or other members of the council could best be resolved by referring the matter to the ratepayers of the area. This amendment will reinstate the provisions of the former Act.

The present Section 72 of the Act requires that every member of council must permit any resident of the division to inspect copies of the minutes of council meetings. An amendment is being presented in this Bill will require that minutes must be made available for inspection after the minutes have been approved by the council. I recognize that this has been the effect of slowing down any examination of the minutes by ratepayers. However, it must be recognized that minutes are not official until the council has had an opportunity to scrutinize them in order to be able to intercept any possible misinterpretation of the recording secretary. Such misinterpretation can at times have very severe implications for individual councillors. This amendment should give some added protection in this respect.

Under Section 366 of the Act, revenues from special taxes or licenses levied against trailers, mobile homes and so on are divided between the school units and the municipalities on a 50-50 basis. This Government has progressively increased the amounts of the Property Improvement Grant to the point that it now provides approximately an 18 mill repayment of taxes for school purposes. Certainly this is a move that meets with the approval of most of the taxpayers in this province. However, as a result the ratio of school tax and municipal tax has become somewhat disproportionate. The new Section 366 provides that the proportion of tax collected for the school system and the municipal council will be shared on the basis of their share of the total tax.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that these amendments as proposed goes some way in correcting some of the deficiencies of the present Act and I would like to support the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 59—**An Act to amend The Snowmobile Act, 1973** be now read a second time.

HON. J. R. KOWALCHUK: (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding Bill 59.

As stated by the Attorney General, The Snowmobile Act when introduced as well accepted by the public in spite of it being new and quite encompassing and, as most other laws of that kind, compete with an assessment of minimum and maximum fines for infractions against the Act. Everyone knew then that we were breaking new ground and new amendments would have to evolve as the experience gained showed where the weaknesses were. Now evidence is piling up that changes to The Snowmobile Act must be made, evidence such as greatly increased numbers of snowmobiles in use in Saskatchewan. Today we have over 60,000, Mr. Speaker. The spiralling increase in the number of snowmobile accidents and the number of deaths attributed to them, inevitably, Mr. Speaker, lead to amendments and strengthening legislation to stop some of that human slaughter. Although laws, Mr. Speaker, will not do it all it must be a process of the public becoming more involved in voluntary control and restraint of these vehicles and becoming educated in their proper use.

The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) the other day brought in a most vital observation, Mr. Speaker, the use of snowmobiles for hunting. When that question was debated in the House some years ago I personally took a dim view of the possible use of the snowmobile for this purpose, made permissible through the rural municipal offices by issuing of hunting permits. Now evidence is piling up all around us, Mr. Speaker, that we must once again take a real hard look at all the angles of the use of snowmobiles for hunting purposes. I agree that the use of a snowmobile to a legitimate hunter must be found but I am afraid that the evidence that is confronting us that abuse of this right is definitely going to lead to some specific and more stringent laws in that area of use of snowmobiles for hunting. Just as a car is a lethal vehicle that must be operated under many firm and tough laws, I am certain that laws for the operation of the snowmobile will have to be strengthened and toughened particularly in view of the fact that the snowmobile is also a lethal vehicle that can go at great speeds, can go anywhere and does not even need a road, Mr. Speaker.

I approve of the changes to this Act, Mr. Speaker. I say that we should be looking very long and very hard towards stronger measures and amendments for use of snowmobiles for hunting, whether that be done through amendments to The Snowmobile Act or The Games Act, the approach to these future amendments should be a combined effort of all people, keeping in mind what is best for the people of the province and not forgetting, Mr. Speaker, humane and fair treatment of our animal friends as well.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

March 7, 1974

The Assembly resumed, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that Bill No. 15—**An Act for the provision of certain Dental Services in Saskatchewan** be now read a second, time.

MR. H. H. ROLFES: (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, the other day before I adjourned debate on Bill 15, I had made a comment that I really didn't know where the Opposition stood on this particular Bill because the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) said that he supported the Bill and I had at that time mentioned that I thought the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) had said that he was not going to support the Bill and he asked me to read his speech and find out where he stood. So I am going to read to him exactly what he said on this particular Bill. In Hansard I read the following for the Member from Moose Jaw North. First of all he says:

I would like to make my position of the Dental Care Plan very clear. I also want to make it clear that I will not be supporting the Dental Care Plan that is proposed by the Government opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — He also said, "To conclude I would like to repeat my opposition to the Dental Care Plan as proposed."

MR. MacDONALD: (Moose Jaw North): — Exactly . . .

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, we know exactly where the Member for Moose Jaw North stood when he spoke to this Bill. He was going to oppose it until there was a discussion in their caucus and. I am sure that the Member for Moose Jaw North will be standing up when in second reading it comes to a vote on this particular Bill. The Members opposite know that the majority of the people in this province want this type of a plan and. they can't afford to vote against it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the other day I also mentioned that maybe society has been somewhat hoodwinked, into thinking that all professional people are necessarily competent. I just want to make it absolutely clear that I did not by that statement want to indicate that necessarily all professional people are incompetent or competent. One can always pick out I am sure an incompetent teacher who has two or three or four degrees. One can certainly pick out a competent individual doctor who might have very little training as opposed, maybe to a specialist. My remarks, Mr. Speaker, were directed to a specific professional dentist whom I had the experience of going to, and I was not very happy and as I said, I have two missing molars to show for it. My present dentist tells me that if I want to save my other two molars it would cost me a further \$400 in order to protect my molars. All I am saying is that that was due to the incompetence of one professional dentist. Certainly I am not making an accusation against the whole dental profession.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say from the outset again that I

support the Bill and again I want to congratulate the Minister for bringing in a Bill that is reasonable, that is acceptable and that we can afford to put into effect. There was no question, Mr. Speaker, about the need for such a plan. The 1971 survey, as indicated by many of the Members on this side of the House showed a very, very dismal picture. I think if we took that survey and projected it right across Saskatchewan there is absolutely no doubt in anyone's mind that anywhere from 25 per cent to 40 or 50 per cent of the people in this province cannot, and I say again, cannot afford to get the type of dental care that is required. That is what this Bill intends to do, at least to help those people in low and middle income groups who will now be able to get an equalized opportunity of dental care. Action, Mr. Speaker, was needed and action is being taken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — However, Mr. Speaker, financial means is not the only reason why people have bad teeth. Certainly the lack of good personal care, the lack of a good balanced food diet and also the inaccessibility to qualified dentists, all have contributed to the poor condition of children's teeth in this province.

Bill 15 in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, will go a long way in guaranteeing all children without any regard to family income that they all receive good quality dental care. The present high cost, Mr. Speaker, of extractions, fillings and simple cleaning, as I referred to the other day, are not within the financial means of many of the people of this province. I related to the House the other day that it may be all right for all of us here to be able to pay \$12, \$15 or \$20 for a filling but, Mr. Speaker, we know that there are many who simply cannot afford this. The low and middle income group, Mr. Speaker, will welcome this legislation and will see it as one more step in providing universal health care for all without regard to financial means available.

But the Members opposite say, unless fully qualified dentists do all the examination we don't want the program. We support the status quo is what they are saying. What the Opposition is demanding, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is simply too expensive. It is impractical with only about 200 dentists and in my opinion it is certainly unnecessary. What they are doing is denying the 25 per cent or 30 per cent of the low income people in this province the right to have a full range of preventive treatment of dental services which otherwise they could not afford. Bill 15 is the first attempt in Canada for any province to try to come to grips with the problem of dental care delivery. The concept of using dental nurses to deliver some of the basic dental care services is not new. For over 50 years dental nurses have been used in New Zealand to successfully deliver services to young children. As other Members have already alluded, Britain and Australia are following in the same direction. Our own Oxbow project has shown conclusively that certain dental care services can be provided very effectively and efficiently by dental nurses and there is no deterioration in quality. I have every confidence that the young men and women who will select dental nursing as a career in this province will continue to keep up the high standard that has been experienced to date by the dental profession. The notion that we can deliver dental services solely by using the existing dentists in the province is simply ludicrous. We have a well

known shortage of dentists and those whom we do have are not evenly distributed in this province.

Other Members already have indicated that rural areas have a dentist to a population ratio of 1 to 7,000. The advent of our dental plan will relieve the dentist of the repetitive services that can be done by trained dental nurses and will allow more professional time for services that are now not being met. I am of course referring to orthodontic services and periodontic services. A dental plan has also created an increased awareness among our people regarding dental care and demand for more services by more people will become a reality. These facts evidently escaped the comprehension of the Member for Moose Jaw Perth (Mr. MacDonald) when he claimed that rural dentists would be adversely affected by this plan. The fact of the matter is that rural dentists will have a more diversified and rewarding type of practice than the mere repetitive type of drill and fill that is expected of them now.

For further diversification many rural dentists will be involved in our plan, both as employees and as providers of covered services on a fee for service basis. We welcome, Mr. Speaker, their participation.

Bill 15 deserves the support of all Members of this House. Let none of us be guilty of wilfully neglecting the welfare of our children. Statistics show that our children are in desperate need of dental care—the same statistics show that they are not getting the necessary care. Logistics show that they are very unlikely to get the care under existing manpower resources. Experience here and elsewhere shows that there is an efficient, effective and high standard alternative to the program we have now. Bill 15 provides that alternative. Let us for once submerge our party differences and then perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we can all see the future benefits of Bill 15 reflected in the pleasant smiles of our future generations.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said you will gather that I will support Bill 15.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. G. MacMURCHY: (Minister of Education) Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support Bill 15. Pleased because the Department of Education and the Department of Continuing Education will be closely involved in the new services it establishes in at least two respects:

- (i) the training of the dental nurses and
- (ii) operating the clinics in the schools.

Saskatchewan's training program is the first of its kind anywhere in North America. No one else on this continent trains or employs dental nurses. We are pioneering, we are breaking new ground. Mr. Speaker, we are restoring Saskatchewan's leadership in health care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Dental nursing, Mr. Speaker, is experimental, dental nursing is innovative, dental nursing is a new high quality

service to meet the needs of our people.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, what did the Liberals ever do in health care to compare? What did they do in the seven years? That was the most imaginative thing they introduced? Mr. Speaker, deterrent fees. A negative, regressive, destructive deterrent fee, a tax on the sick. The contrast between deterrent fees and dental nursing illustrates the scrooge-like cash register approach of the Liberal Party. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that they only have 15 seats in this Legislature.

Dental nurses are trained in the new Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences here in Regina. The Institute is built around health care and I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals planned it, but the Liberals fiddled and they diddled, then they put in a foundation, but it took the NDP Government to get the institute into operation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: — Today it is the centre for some of the most progressive new programs in health training anywhere.

Work on the training program began in 1972, and Mr. Speaker, we started from scratch and to gain the benefit of experience in other countries, Mr. Lew Riederer of the Department of Continuing Education and Dr. Tom Currie of the Department of Public Health went over to New Zealand and to Australia. These countries have been running dental nursing services for 40-50 years. They came back with a lot of valuable information and with some experienced staff to start our course. The first dental nurses enrolled in the fall of 1972. The intake was 35 students, very carefully selected from among the top high school graduates in the province. Mr. Speaker, there were 170 applicants for the openings and as I recall the average mark for admission was nearly 90 per cent. After one year's experience and development of the program, the intake last fall was expanded to 60 students.

The second year of the course involves practical experience in a clinic. Thirty-six dental operating chairs are part of the facility, open to any children whose parents approve. The nurses, Mr. Speaker, receive a very useful training in the actual daily work they will be performing under the supervision of dentists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the dental nurse service will be available to children six years old this fall. And some people have criticized this program. The Liberals have criticized the program. I suspect the reason that they criticize the program is because they are sore since this is a very highly attractive program to the public. They say we should offer an insurance plan, instead of an operating service. Now this criticism deserves to be examined and examined closely. What happens when a service is insured?

Let's take the example of medicare. Without question insuring medicare has abolished a financial barrier to good health. It has made it possible for anyone to receive service without charge, except of course, for the period of the Liberal Government, that I mentioned a few minutes ago, when they tried to scuttle the operation with deterrent fees. Except for this period this principle of free access has stood untouched.

March 7, 1974

I do not question at all the immense value and the benefit of free medical care, but it is one thing to make service free and remove the burden of medical bills, and it is something else again to change the nature of the service provided. To the extent that people no longer have to wait until they are seriously ill before risking the expense of medical attention, we have increased the preventive aspect of medicine. Medicare insurance took the service and made it free to all comers. But insurance does not in itself promote prevention rather than cure; it merely pays for existing types of care.

I say, Mr. Speaker, in the dental nursing program we will avoid this pitfall. We are supplying an entirely new type, of care. Dental nursing is more similar to a public health service than to medicare. It is not simply insurance, it is an active outreach service, available to all who want it. You don't have to wait until your tooth aches before you receive care. You could receive regular check-ups. Dental nursing, Mr. Speaker, is prevention, not just cure.

A service program offers, it seems to me, another benefit, less expense. Insuring dentists would be costly, it would offer little in the way of prevention and it would be completely inadequate to meet the needs of rural Saskatchewan in particular. Dental nurses are less costly, they are active in prevention and we can train and we can distribute them to meet the needs all over this province.

Approximately 160 new dental clinics are opening in schools this fall. An information program for parents will be implemented in these schools and through these schools. No child will receive a check-up or any other service without permission from his parents.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, dental nursing will be accepted by almost 100 per cent of the parents and of the public. It is a creative approach to a very serious, widespread problem and, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A. MATSALLA: (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments and observations on this what I would refer to as a very beneficial piece of legislation. I feel confident that the Members on this side of the House are very pleased with this Bill, and they are optimistic that the new dental program will prove very successful with the people of Saskatchewan. This program was a part of the 1971 New Deal for People and it is another major election promise becoming a reality.

I believe, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that by now the Opposition would begin to reassess its position on this legislation. To start with, it did seem that the Liberal Members opposite would be against this dental program. But now, as time goes on and as the debate nears the end, I would gather, at least I would hope to gather, that the Members are becoming more and more convinced that if their group is to survive another election, they had better turn themselves to supporting programs that are beneficial to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MATSALLA: — I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that there is a change of mind (I hope by some), by the Members opposite, but I want to warn that it is only a change of mind. Knowing the past performance of the Liberals to your left, Mr. Speaker, there cannot be a change of heart on this all-important issue before us. We know full well their relentless attitude towards the medicare program and the unfortunate sick and poor of this province. They fought medicare, tooth and nail. They attempted to scuttle it with the imposition of deterrent fees. With this in mind, I cannot help but accept the support of the Liberal Opposition if we will have it, with some reservation.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the legislation under this Bill is very clear. First, it recognizes the great problem we are faced with; that is the lack of good dental care in Saskatchewan. This could well apply, not only to Saskatchewan, but throughout the entire nation, especially in areas that are less populated.

Secondly, and more important, the legislation is an effort to solve the problem by setting up a children's dental care program.

The Dominion Council of Health has recommended that provincial governments act to implement auxiliary dental care services for children to fit their own particular needs. This Government, the New Democratic Government, Mr. Speaker, has accepted the challenge of carrying out the recommendation. This Government is in tune with the times. It is forging ahead with a province-wide dental care program for children between the ages of six to twelve. This program is the first of its kind in Canada and North America.

Mr. Speaker, when a dental survey shows that 76 per cent of the children at the age of seven need further fillings, and 39 per cent further extractions, and that at age 11.75 per cent of the children required further fillings in their permanent teeth and 26 per cent further extractions, then it is time to be concerned and ready for a government to act in a responsible manner. I say for a government to act, because you can be sure that no one else will. And you can be sure that those across the way would not act for fear of possibly stepping on the toes of some of their dentist friends.

Mr. Speaker, a dental care plan for children is not absolutely new, as mentioned by my colleague who spoke before me. Over the years other countries in the world have been faced with the problem of poor dental care and they tackled it through programs similar to the one we are proposing. Trained dental nurses provided dental health education and treatment services for children up to twelve years of age. Since 1921 New Zealand provided denticare for elementary school children, and since 1961 Great Britain instituted a dental nurse services program. In both these countries the programs proved very successful.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can recognize that there are two prime reasons why we are faced with the problem of lack of proper dental care; these are:

1. Shortage of qualified dentists;
2. The extremely high cost required to be paid for the

dental service, particularly by these in the low income group.

Dental service experts tell us that an ideal dentist population is one dentist to every 1,500 people. In the cities of Regina and Saskatoon the dental population ratio varies from one dentist per 4,450 to one dentist per 7,000 people. This is a far cry from the ideal ratio of one to 1,500. With this in mind one should readily understand why Saskatchewan people, particularly children, are unable to obtain proper dental care.

Mr. Speaker, when dental costs over the last decade have skyrocketed from about \$2 to \$12 and over per filling or extraction and costs for other dental services have risen in a like manner, I must say that the rates charged for some of the work done by dentists are unreasonable and excessive. When a dentist charges \$12 or more for a filling that has taken him a few minutes to do, and then the same tooth has to be refilled within a month or two, or perhaps has to be extracted due to a poor filling, then I say that the charges made are excessive and unreasonable. People get disgusted and develop an attitude of what's the use of going to a dentist, it's darn well a waste of time and money. It is through this kind of situation that our dental profession has failed to provide good dental care for not only our children, but for our population as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of providing dental care through the team approach by using qualified dentists, dental nurses, and certified dental assistants, I believe, is a good one. I feel that under proper supervision by a qualified dentist, the dental nurses will do as good a job as a professional dentist in the field of minor fillings and examinations. Maybe in some cases, a more careful job. The team as well will be in a position to provide a preventive education program which presently is severely lacking, and yet it is a very important aspect of a good dental program.

Bringing the dental service program, into the schools will make dental health an integral part of the school program. The presence of a dental clinic in the school will, in itself, contribute to the consciousness in the minds of the children and the parents the necessity of good dental care at an early age. Needless for me to say, proper care of teeth early in life will pay dividends in later life. The proverb of "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" could well apply to the principle and philosophy of this new denticare legislation for the children of Saskatchewan.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to give my full support to this Bill in second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

MR. A. OLIVER: (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to this very important Bill that we are debating. The previous speakers have pretty well outlined all the important features of the new program, but I don't think we can overstress the need for better dental facilities in the province. The importance in terms of money, time and most important is the one that involves the general good health of the child.

himself, or herself. There is no question that dentists are overburdened. All you have to do is try to get and appointment and find out how long it takes to get down on the waiting list. Sometimes it's weeks before you can get near the place and then when you do you sit in the waiting room and wait for hours on end, only to find that you get part of the work done today and then you are sent out and asked to get another appointment a few weeks in the future.

Then in the area of dentistry, I should like to remind Members opposite how scarce dentists are in the broad sprawling Shaunavon constituency, which takes up 40 per cent of the American border and 50 miles north. There is only one dentist in that whole area of 14,700 people.

I think this program will bolster that particular area of the province. Denticare is nothing new to the southwest, because we have had it for a good many years, we have coverage for children up to the age of 12 now. This program will take nothing away from the Swift Current Region, but will augment it.

I wonder how many Members in this House, who have lived in the Health Region No. 1 remember the times when the dentists, we used to call them the travelling dentists, and how we hated them, used to come around and set up shop wherever he could get it, sometimes in the school or some community hall. The curling rink is where we had it. I remember very distinctly having to march down there, the whole rural school, and we children sat on benches according to grades. The dentists had a little partition set up along the chair, so that you could see the poor little devil's feet sticking out. You could tell every time he hit a nerve, for the kids' toes would curl and you could see him squirming around. I don't know why they always chose the lower grades first.

I remember one particular instance and it was quite an experience. There was a young Swedish boy who was called up first this particular time. His mother always dressed him just very neatly, very spic and span. This particular day he had on a little white shirt, short pants and a clip-on bow tie and he started off to the dentist's chair. Of course the older boys, and I was one of them had to encourage him with such phrases as "Now don't cry," "Don't be a cry baby," "We'll come to your funeral," "Can I have your harmonica after the funeral?" and this type of encouragement. A real encouragement to the little youngster. The teacher soon shut us up. The thing was that as soon as the dentist started to work on him, he started to get excited and you could see his feet going and then he started to whimper, then he started to howl and finally he just bolted right out of the chair and out the door. As he went past us he had blood all over the front of his little bib and all over his shirt, and horror written all over his face. Of course, we tittered away and giggled away. The grins certainly vanished pretty quickly when the dentist came out and grabbed the biggest boy and dragged him into the chair. I can tell you there were no smiles in Cadillac for the rest of that day.

Dentistry has come a long way from those days. We have seen some improvements in the attitudes towards good dental health in the schools. It has been accepted by some parents, unfortunately not all, how important good dental health is to

March 7, 1974

the general health and welfare of the child. But there is definitely more room for improvement. Health has always been given a very low priority in the school curriculum and on the school timetable. We have not devoted enough time to the aspect of good physical and mental health of the child. In direct contrast to the progress in attitude is the progress we have made in the delivery and actual operation of dentistry itself, better drugs, anesthetics, and the painless method of having a tooth removed or filled. We have come a long way in the refinement of dental braces to straighten teeth when the child is young, partial plates and full plates. They can make plates now so that it is very difficult to tell them from the original teeth.

The new program as explained by some of the Members, will build clinics in I believe every school unit, preferably in the schools. It will definitely make it a more efficient operation if this can be done. The children will be treated from one classroom, one at a time, just like the public health nurse does now with very little disruption of classes. The one child goes out and gets his shot or checkup and goes back in and tells the next guy to go out. I think the advantages of this type of clinic are going to save money in the long run.

The important features of the dental program as I see them is first of all the immeasurable improvement in the general health of the child. I think that is of major importance. The second one, is the financial relief to some of the larger families and the poorer families on lower fixed incomes. And the third, is the non-compulsion of the program. If the parent does not want the child to go through the program, he definitely has that right to take the child to a family dentist and have the work done there.

Mr. Speaker, we have now arrived at another milestone in our ever on-going health program. This was a major objective of our party's policy from the very formation of the CCF. Mr. Speaker, our government will continue to be the leader in health services in North America. I would urge Members opposite to reconsider and support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA: (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of this Bill, which will initiate free dental care for Saskatchewan children. I have been very proud, to be associated with a government which presented a program to the Saskatchewan people in the election of 1971 and, which carried out that program as promised. I want to commend, the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) on the initiative and the enthusiasm of his department and his many endeavors in the field of health services. As the Minister has already explained, Saskatchewan's first denticare program for children will begin this September. Some 15,000 six year olds will be invited to take part in the program which stresses dental care at reasonable costs, under proper and close supervision of dentists. I say at reasonable cost, Mr. Speaker, because the program will use the services of certified dental assistants and qualified dental nurses as well as dentists. Dental nurses and assistants; will be fully qualified to do the many lesser tasks, now performed, by dentists such as taking X-rays, checking for cavities, cleaning teeth and

giving sound advice on care of teeth.

The principle of using dental nurses and assistants is a very sound one. Just as one does not hire a brain surgeon to deal with a minor cut at a highly specialized fee, so one does not need to hire a dentist to clean teeth at a specialized fee when a dental assistant can perform this task properly with ease and confidence at a much more reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, interest in Saskatchewan's denticare program is very high. Teams of public health officials from other provinces and the United States are already indicating their intention to visit Saskatchewan to see if they can learn from our plan and see if they can implement one in their own areas. Mr. Speaker, after seven long years of regressive and retrograde government by Liberal Members opposite Saskatchewan is in the forefront once again with progressive social change and innovation. Once again Liberals in Saskatchewan are opposing this progressive program of denticare for Saskatchewan children. They opposed hospitalization back in 1946, they opposed medicare in 1962, they imposed deterrent fees in 1969 and were deposed in 1971.

I look forward to 1978 when all children ages three to twelve will be covered by this plan. I can assure you that we will all be around in 1978 on this side of the House to grin with pride as we see our free dental program in full swing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take the time of the House to discuss a matter related to dental care which has been brought up by the Minister and other Members of the House, the matter being none other than fluoridation of water supplies. I want to caution the Minister and other Members of this Assembly who believe that fluoridation of our water supplies is a cure- all for dental cavities and that it could save us a few dollars.

Fluoridation of water supplies was a catchy panacea about 10 years ago. Today the resistance is growing daily as the silent majority are beginning to expose the hoax of fluoridation. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose fluoridation on moral grounds and medical reasons. Fluoridation of water supplies is nothing more, in my opinion, than legalized pollution of streams, rivers and lakes and oceans. I abhor it as I do the use of insecticides, pesticides, sprays, food additives, white bread, white sugar and the rest. In other words, I love good clean, unrefined, unpolluted, wholesome food and no one is going to make me drink fluoridated water or any other kind of water that I don't want to drink.

When I am finished with my presentation today I hope that Hon. Members will see why millions the world over oppose fluoridation. Why would I take this stand, Mr. Speaker? Is it just for the sake of being different? Is it because I am against dentists and their stand on fluoridation? The answer to those questions is definitely "No". I have scientific, medical and moral reasons for opposing fluoridation of our water supplies.

I first became interested in fluoridation of water supplies when a lady knocked on my door in Lloydminster some four years ago and asked me to sign a petition in favor of fluoridating the city's water supplies. Playing dumb I asked her why, to which she replied in a stereotyped answer that you often hear,

March 7, 1974

"Because fluoridation reduces dental cavities." That has been the whitewash job that has been done on the masses in North America, "fluoridation reduces cavities." The truth is, Mr. Speaker, according to all my research fluoridation postpones cavities for about two years and that's all.

Well, after I signed that petition like 99 per cent of the others in the city, I began to ask myself some questions, like: Who says fluoridation reduces cavities? What is fluorine? How much is added to the water supplies? I learned by my research that the recommended dosage is one part per million in water supplies. I decided to find out how much natural fluoride there was in Lloydminster's water supply, if it had any. I found to my amazement after phoning the City Clerk that the Lloydminster water supply already had .64 parts per million of natural fluoride—more than one-half the so-called required dosage, whoever recommended that dosage. Someone was asking me to sign a petition in that city to fluoridate the city's water supply. I realized I had been had. It served me right for not researching this matter thoroughly before accepting somebody else's opinion on the matter.

So I spent the next two years in spare time that is, reading and researching all the information I could lay my hands on. I wrote to the United States, Mr. Member from Lumsden, he doesn't write or listen to anybody else. I wrote to England and Sweden and I consider my research comprehensive and thorough. The first point I want to make is that much more Canadian research is needed regarding fluoridation, much more research is needed. I quote from the Ottawa Citizen of Wednesday, February 16, 1972, "Fluoride Effects Probed," they say:

A National Research Council study calls for concerted scientific investigation of the effects of fluoride on man. It suggests that man may be adding more fluoride to that already naturally occurring in his environment than he should, with possible negative effects to his health.

And that newspaper goes on to say that the effects of fluoride on Canadians have been difficult to document because of limited analysis.

There may be a total lack in Canada of documented statistical data but in the United States and over in the European countries there is plenty of up-to-date information on the effects of fluoride. Ten years ago it was the fad to fluoridate the water systems. Everybody thought it was a marvelous cure-all for dental cavities until about the last five years enough documented evidence has proven that there are extreme dangers in fluoridation, dangers to man, to animals and to plants.

This documented evidence has led many American cities, European countries and Canadian cities to vote down fluoridation or to cancel their existing programs outright. Yet, many Saskatchewan communities being some years behind in these matters are considering expanding this program. What are the facts of the matter, Mr. Speaker?

1. Sodium fluoride is a tricky element, causes mottled teeth and I could show you pictures of mottled teeth, maybe you have seen them. It can cause illness and even death.

2. The American Food and Drug Administration classified sodium fluoride as a drug unsafe for self-medication.
3. Fluoride emitted from pollution stacks of oil refineries and steel mills has been proven to kill cattle, kill fish in nearby streams, to wither crops in the immediate area and to sicken people.
4. This one made me take a second look. Fluoride is a poison found in pesticides and rat poison.
5. Death has already been caused by the use of artificially fluoridated water in kidney machines.
6. In the United States the sale of fluoride products has been banned to pregnant women.
7. The Journal of American Dental Association reports that 15 per cent of the children in fluoridated water systems have dental fluorosis, that is mottling of the teeth. Not a very pleasant sight.
8. In a test carried out in January of 1970, by a Dutch scientist—gladiolus leaf tips turned brown and died when watered with fluoridated water at one part per million of concentration which is supposed to be the safe level for human consumption. I said there is danger to plants, that is what I mean, I have proof.

In an article Rational Fluoridation News, January-February 1970, I quote:

Those who doubt that fluoridated water is ever harmful to any form of plant life can stop being skeptical. From two independent laboratories in different countries convincing evidence has been presented that even the recommended one part per million fluoride in water markedly decreases the keeping quality of such popular household flowers as gladiolus and rose cuttings.

At the Ridge Ornamental Horticultural Laboratory of the University of Florida, associate horticulturist W.E. Waters, Ph.D., has found that of the many different ions present in various Florida well waters, dissolved fluoride is by far the most toxic to gladiolus and rose cuttings.

The principal fluoride toxicity symptoms exhibited by gladiolus cuttings include delayed floret opening, petal discoloration and deterioration, and stem and sheath burning. A decrease in vase life of about 20 per cent for each part per million fluoride in the holding solution was noted by Dr. Walters.

From the institute for photopathological research at Wageningen in the Netherlands, Dr. F. Spierings has reported similar findings. In his work, Snow Prince gladiolus cuttings showed mean tip burning of 21.2 millimeters (nearly one inch) when they were kept for four days in the municipal one part per million fluoridated water as opposed to only 9.5 millimeters of such damage in the controls maintained in nonfluoridated water.

Parallel findings with Tropicana Roses are also reported by Dr. Waters in his most recent studies. I have, Mr. Speaker, pictures of the plants to show you that they did not progress

March 7, 1974

using the fluoridated water and what happens to them if you water them continually. This magazine, I refer to anyone who is interested.

Fact No. 9—Fluoride has already entered the food chain in the North American continent and. is readily found in fish, vegetables and fruits that we buy over the counter and we find that leafy greens collect sodium fluoride from fluoridated, water. When you are eating leafy greens you are getting lots of fluoride in them.

Fact 10. I also found out that India has been spending millions of dollars annually removing fluoride from their water supplies.

Another fact for those people who like to drink tea – and I want to caution the Leader of the Opposition that he shouldn't drink too much tea because if you have fluoridated water and you boil the kettle, the water evaporates, but the sodium fluoride keeps concentrating in that kettle and if you don't dump it out each time you are going to have a build up in the tea kettle of fluoride, which in effect could make you sick, very quickly.

The 12th fact—The Swedish Parliament has banned fluoridation. The Swedish fluoridation law in effect since November, 1962, was repealed by the Riksdag (Swedish Parliament) on November 18, 1971. That is not so long ago. Only one experiment has been carried, out in Sweden in the town of Norrköping from February 1, 1952 to February 1, 1962. This experiment was declared illegal in December, 1961 and. halted, on February 1, 1962. The promoters then pressured the Riksdag to pass their fluoride bill to allow communities to request permission to fluoridate. No community had made such a request.

During the two half hour meetings of the Swedish Parliament on November 18, 1962, a large number of Members joined in the debate, most of them against fluoridation. The majority of arguments dealt with the principle of using forced medicine on people and the possible side effects from fluoride.

Mrs. Ingrid Sundberg, who drew a parallel with the adding of contraceptives to the drinking water, maintained that the principle was the same. She also pointed out that the World Health Organization, which did now recommend, fluoridation, had also at one time recommended. DDT and. she felt convinced, that this organization would in the future change its stand on fluoridation.

Another Member for Parliament, Bengt Bengtsson, while dwelling on the possible medical injuries which may result from fluorine, especially when used in large doses stressed the point that pure and. good water is one of the fundamental requirements for the substance of all human life on this earth. He pointed, out that thalidomide had been once hailed as a wonder drug. Often the proponents in the United States have given the impression that fluoridation is as widespread in Europe as it is here. The following is an accurate and up-to-date position in Europe. The information has been carefully checked with every Embassy in London by the National Pure Water Association.

There is no fluoridation in Austria, Denmark, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Yugoslavia, West Germany, Belgium. In Holland permission has to be obtained

from the Secretary of State for Social Affairs and Health. Because of several appeals instituted against the granting of such permission, the Government has recently decided that these permissions will have to contain the conditions that for those in the area who object to the use of fluoridated drinking water, unfluoridated water must be made available.

Fact 14—What about fluoridation and dental decay? Are the results all that impressive? I have a report on my files of the September—October, 1971 issue of National Fluoridation News from the British Ministry of Health, and it says:

As everyone knows, its proponents- constantly claim that fluoridation will reduce tooth decay in children by 60 to 65 per cent and that dental benefits from it will continue throughout life.

Yet facts such as those reported, neb long ago by the British Ministry of Health for its official government fluoridation studies in the British Isles hardly bear out these contentions.

In the Department of Health's own report entitled, "The Fluoridation Studies in the United Kingdom and the Results Achieved after 11 Years," published in July 1969¹ plainly reveals the ineffectiveness of fluoridation in Great Britain to reduce the rate of tooth decay in children compared, to those living in nonfluoridated control areas. The study that they did, 11 years, checked out two groups of children from ages 8 to 10 and 11 to 14, and this is what they found and I quote:

On the average after 11 years, fluoridation has reduced tooth decay in either the first or second, group of children by only 0.1 DMF (decayed, missing or filled) tooth per child. It is clear that all fluoridation accomplished by this report was to delay by one or two years the onset of decay in young children. The rate of decay, or the increase in the DMF teeth each year, continued exactly as it did with fluoridation.

In other words, fluoridation did not reduce the rate of decay but merely delayed, its onset by a year or two, just as has been noted, previously by Dr. Charles Klint and others reviewing official United States' fluoridation data. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I claim that the statement that 60 to 65 per cent in reduction in dental cavities is absolutely false.

We have a Saskatoon-Regina comparative study, closer to home, done by our own Department of Public Health. I was interested and I wanted to read everything that is available on fluoridation. The report states that in Saskatchewan 332 areas have water distribution systems, that 117 centres in Saskatchewan are adjusting the fluoride content of their water supplies as of December 31, 1971, and this represents a population of 324,000 covered by fluoridation. So about one- third of Saskatchewan's water systems are fluoridated.

Now let's get down to the report and what they found statistically. They did one survey in 1965 and another in 1969. They did the 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 year olds, consistently in this survey. Regina was compared with Saskatoon and what did they find?

In summarizing the statistical data the average reduction

March 7, 1974

in Saskatoon where the water is fluoridated as compared with the average reduction in Regina where it is not fluoridated for the ages 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 done in the study, average reduction was .72 DMF, like about three quarters of a tooth per child.

In the survey of 1969, four years later, it went down to .56 or an average reduction. It is my contention that if a study was done today on these two cities with the same age groups it would probably be down to .3. Now that is not very impressive.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of fluoridation are saying, dentists and doctors across Canada favour fluoridation and they should know what they are saying. In my opinion, the dental and medical profession has simply jumped on the bandwagon that was started some 20 years ago and they have failed to do their own serious research on the matter. That is in Canada. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the studies that I have quoted there is really very little reduction in cavities in fluoridated areas, as the 11-year British study revealed and the one even here in Saskatchewan. So what have the dentists got to lose anyway? Their work load and yearly earnings will not drop significantly if fluoride is used so why not appear to be the champion of the people and go along with the program. At least that is the way I see it.

I have a letter here on file and I want to put it on the record, so all Members could hear it, from the American Medical Association, May 13, 1965, written in response to Mr. Fulton, 70 Throne Street, Toronto, New South Wales, Australia. He is checking with the American Medical Association and he is asking what they have done with fluoridation. Their reply was, and I quote: From the Assistant Director, Department of Environmental Health American Association.

In acknowledgment of your letter of May 10, 1965 to the Secretary of the American Medical Association. I am attaching a copy of the AMA policy statement on fluoridation of public water supplies. The American Medical Association is not prepared to state that no harm will be done to any person by water fluoridation.

The American Medical Association has not carried out any research work, either long term or short term, regarding the possibility of any side effects.

Documented proof from the American Medical Association, not one study and they will not say there is no harm in fluoridating water supplies.

I have a letter from the College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, you have one too. We got it last year dated March 24, 1972 and they ask for all the Members support of this program, a harmless program of fluoridating the water supply. It said in the letter and I quote:

We know it to be of NO proven danger as a health hazard (and before I am done there will be more on record to show what the health hazard is, they say there is none.)

There are no creditable documented scientific studies available which contra-indicate the use of fluoridated

water as a dental health measure of vast benefit to all our citizens, both young and old.

I have my files full and I am laying some before the House today. It is interesting about this young and old bit and I would like to know what use fluoridated water is to an old-timer with false teeth or a young person with false teeth for that matter. What is this nonsense about good for the old and the young? I can't see it. I think the point is clear there. They have no research. They just go on the bandwagon and appear to be nice guys.

The following is a partial list of cities in the United States which abandoned fluoridation after a trial period, which I think is important for all of us to note: California, San Diego after two years; La Jolla two years; part of Coronado after two years, kicked it out, Rio Vista after five years, King City after seven months; Illinois, Minnesota, Montana, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, there are cities in all these states which have abandoned it, and what about Canada. Sillery, Kingston, Ontario, out it went after one year. In Andover, England after three years; places in Scotland, New Zealand, Edmundston, New Brunswick, Canada, after one year quit it; Calgary, Medicine Hat, North Vancouver and others in Canada, out it went. It is a fad that is long gone, it is dead, it is dangerous.

The list I have comes to about 152 cities that stopped fluoridation. Mr. Speaker, we have the dental surgeons saying there is no documented evidence anywhere, scientific studies, whatever have you, that say fluoridation is dangerous. I want to put some of this evidence before the House, documented and I want to read the articles and I can show them to you here in my files. The first one:

I have an article from a magazine called "Air Pollution Injury to Vegetation," in which it deals in some detail with fluoridation by the United States Department of Health, Public Health Service. I have another pamphlet, "A Statement on the Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies." It is a six-page document originally issued on February 20, 1957, under sponsorship of over 500 United States practitioners and scientists. Following a limited circulation the sponsorship increased to 1,500—that is 1,500 American doctors and scientists. And to just briefly quote from it, to put it on the record one or two of the points they make and they say:

We, the undersigned are opposed to the fluoridation of public water supplies. As members of the medical, dental, and related public health professions, we are as concerned as anyone over the prevalence of tooth decay, and as anxious that it be prevented; but each of us, for some or all of the reasons set forth here and discussed more fully in the appended memorandum, believes that fluoridation of public water supplies is not a proper means of attempting such prevention.

Item No. 8 in this same article says:

The function of a public water supply is to provide pure, safe water for everybody, not to serve as a vehicle for drugs.

March 7, 1974

I have another documented, pamphlet, "A Water Supply Perspective of the Fluoridation Discussion"- Benjamin C. Nesin—Director of Laboratories, Department of Water Supply, city of New York, February 8, 1956. This document gives evidence very plainly. One case I want to put on the record for which all Members -would be aware:

A young man was originally admitted to an Army hospital for a very minor condition. His only outward symptoms were his mottled teeth and the fact that he tired easily. He had no other complaints. Autopsy following his demise confirmed fluoride osteosclerosis and a complicating anemia which failed to respond to treatment, kidney damage and other degenerative abnormalities.

What was the background of this fellow who died of this disease?

For the first seven years of his life he lived in Spur, Texas with water supply containing 1.2 parts per million. He had severely damaged mottled teeth. His sister who was brought up under similar circumstances had mottled teeth but exhibited no other symptoms at the time of the investigation. There is therefore evidence of an unusual susceptibility, by this one man to fluoride, different people react in different ways. It is most likely that his teeth became mottled during this period. Following his seventh year he spent two years in Post, Texas, with water supply 5.7 parts per million fluoride, and at the age of nine he moved to Lubbock, Texas, where the fluoride content was high again 4.4 ppm where he remained for seven years. He then lived for two years in Washington, D.C. At the age of 18 he returned to Texas, entering the Army there at the age of 21. He died at the age of 22 in an Army hospital. It is quite evident that at no time during his existence was he subject to a fluoride intake exceeding 5.7 parts per million. An examination of the report of this case indicates that if the physicians in attendance had not only taken an extraordinary investigation it could have been easily misdiagnosed and its association with fluoride poisoning would have been missed altogether.

I have another leaflet called "Fluoridation Fraud" put out by Doctor Robert J. H. Mick, Laurel Springs, New Jersey. He says, and it is a challenge to anybody and no one has refuted it:

The following are only several of many statements that have been made by Dr. Robert Mick regarding the fraud of fluoridation. No denial has ever been made of the accusations concerning State Dental Directors and the part they took in the promotion of the fraud of fluoridation in 1951. This promotion is carried on by the use of half-truths and complete falsifications getting fine people to want fluoridation and then getting those same fine people to demand it. State promoters of fluoridation and certain dentists tell you about experiments that have taken place with fluorides that show that poisonous fluorides are safe. This is a gross lie (he says in his article). If I am wrong, then the promoters of this fraud of fluoridation will submit a controlled experiment with the recommended fluorides and water at the state's recommended parts per million that

has been conducted that shows that the consumption of these fluorides are safe and will cause no future body harms.

Do not vote for fluoridation. Both the United States Public Health Service and the American Dental Association have made and are making every effort to deny you the right to vote. (I will bring that point up a little later.) This is a fact. The American Dental Association even instructs promoters of fluoridation how to keep newspaper editors from publishing anything regarding the harmful fraudulent story of fluoridation and its promotion.

And he continues to say:

Do not sign any petitions requesting fluoridation. You have been misinformed by your state dental director. (He adds a footnote) Oh yes—the teachers in Florida are now being taught by the State Board of Education how to promote fluoridation throughout the school system.

Just to back up what Dr. Robert Mick of Laurel Springs, New Jersey has said, I want to bring to the attention of Members of the House another document which I have. It's called the, "Fourth Annual Conference of State Dental Directors with the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau," held June 6 to 8th, 1951, Federal Security Building, Washington, D.C. This is where the hoax of fluoridation actually began according to my research.

This booklet discloses the secret meeting of the United States Public Health Service at which the American Dental Association was represented to educate the dentists in the promotion and application of water fluoridation. It was revealed that the main speaker at this meeting was a certain Dr. Bull, who did not know that the meeting was taken down by a stenographer. This is the origin of fluoridation. The contents of this booklet disclose such things as denying the people the right to vote and that the poisonous results of fluorides to the body were unknown and not to be discussed.

Just to show you the type of discussions that went on in this so-called secret meeting which started the fluoridation going I want to quote some excerpts, statements made by Dr. Bull, who was the main spokesman at this so-called meeting. I quote:

In regard to toxicity I notice that Dr. Bain used the term "adding sodium fluoride." We never do that. That is rat poison. You add fluorides, never mind that sodium fluoride business because in most instances we are not adding sodium fluoride anyhow. All of those things give the opposition something to pick at. They have got enough to pick at without us giving them any more. But this toxicity question is a difficult one. I can't give you the answer on it. After all you know fluoridated water isn't toxic. But when the other fellow says it is, it's difficult to answer him. I can prove to you that we don't know the answer to that one because we had a city of 18,000 people which was fluoridating its water for six or eight months, then a campaign was started by organized opposition on the grounds of toxicity. It ended up in a referendum and they threw out fluoridation. So I would hate to give you any advice on that deal.

March 7, 1974

(And it says in brackets, "laughter").

It's tough. I don't believe you can win approval of any public health program where there is organized opposition. I mean clever, well thought out opposition. I think it is possible to beat most anything and I know that this is what has happened to us.

So when you get the answer to the question of toxicity please write me at once because I would like to know. We have answers but apparently in some places they don't work.

Again from this same meeting, page 17, verbatim, quotes from a person who didn't know it was being put on tape. He says to the dentists at the secret meeting—another Watergate. Page 17 says:

Why should we do a pre-fluoridation survey? Is it to find out if fluoridation works? No. We have told the public it works, so we can't go back on that. Then why do we want pre-fluoridation surveys?

Page 18 of this same document says, I quote Dr. Bull again:

A medical audience is the easiest audience in the world to present this thing to. They are used to carrying on public health activities. This worry about toxicity doesn't mean much to them because of all the human experience we have had.

Page 19, putting the finishing touches to all the dentists that he had there to show them how to promote fluoride in the world and the United States, he says:

Let's get into a couple of don'ts. We have had a little experience on some things to avoid. Don't use the word artificial, and don't use sodium fluoride. You don't know when a community is going to end up using this fluoridating agent. But don't let them raise the question of rat poison if you can help it. And certainly don't use the word experimental.

Another quote, page 20 of this same document:

If it is a fact that some individuals are against fluoridation you have just got to knock their objections down. The question of toxicity is on the same order, lay off it altogether. Just pass it over. We know there is absolutely no effect other than reducing tooth decay you say, and go on. If it becomes an issue then you will have to take it over, but don't bring it up yourself.

Finally, I quote from this same marvelous document which is the root of it all, page 22:

If you can, I say, if you can, because five times we have not been able to do it, keep fluoridation from going to referendum. That is the way you promote it.

And this is the organization, Mr. Speaker, the United States Public Health Service and the Dental Association there,

this is the same organization that our own Minister of Health, Members of this Assembly and the general public in Canada and elsewhere are basing their decision to fluoridate water supplies. This is the same organization that has been spending millions of American tax dollars on the promotion of fluoridation in foreign countries. You say, I wonder why that? I have some research done on how many American tax dollars have been spent or siphoned off into other countries for the promotion of fluoridation since 1958. I have it for 1958, 1960, 1963 after that my research failed to find any more.

How much money was spent from the United States in a country like Sweden. Sweden is one that voted it down. In 1958, \$87,000 to promote fluoridation in Sweden by the American Public Health Service. In 1960, way up, \$507,000; to promote fluoridation. In 1963, \$1.5 million, that is in Sweden. In Great Britain in 1958, \$232,000; \$900,000 in 1960, \$2.7 million in 1963. The bit push was on.

What about Canada? Better look at how much money came in from the United States Public Health Service to promote fluoride in Canada. 1958, \$8,640 to get going. By 1960 it had gone up to \$810,000, by 1963, just ten years ago, \$1.2 million to promote fluoride.

The big question in my mind when I researched this was, why? What's the big idea? I will answer that later as far as I could find out.

I want to place on record in this House also another documented research article, "Eleven Years of Fluoridation." I have it here, "Errors and Omissions in Government Report, 1969" by the British National Pure Water Association, Another one called "Medical, Dental, Political, Moral Aspects of Fluoridation of Water Supplies." This one by Lord Douglas of Barlock, England.

Out of this pamphlet, I want to put three facts on the record. Lord Douglas who did the research here found that in Japan in a district where the water supply contained only three parts per million of fluoride, that is three times what the recommended dosage is, the incidence of goiter was found to be higher than a similar district with less fluoride in the water supply. In Spain where the district water supply contained 1.1 parts per million fluoride almost all inhabitants in the fourth and later decades of life suffered from a disease somewhat resembling rheumatism frequently causing deformities and especially attacking the spinal column.

Another point in this same article was that in the United States a careful research covering the population of 7 1/2 million people and a second research covering 333,000 births showed that more children were born suffering from mental deficiency known as mongolism in the high fluoride areas than in the low fluoride areas. That is in the United States, that as a study done by their own people.

I want to place on the record also, another pamphlet called, "Fluoridation" published by a firm in New Jersey, it has interesting information. Another one called "Fluoridation Quotes and Comments" and this is the pamphlet that shows you what mottled teeth are like when you get too much, for certain people can't even take 1 part per million and they get mottled

March 7, 1974

teeth.

Also another document "Current Status of the Fluoridation Discussion, 1963" by Dr. Allan London. This pamphlet discusses in detail a lot of his findings. Another one by Albert Burgsthaler in the spring of 1970. This little pamphlet is very interesting because it brings to light the types of things that people feel minor irritations and illnesses when they drink fluoridated water and they don't even know they have been taking it. It has been controlled this way. And these illnesses go away when pure water is given back to them. I want to quote from it because it is pretty basic

The incidence of dental fluorosis, the mottling of teeth, which is one of the first and most sensitive signs of fluoride toxicity is higher in fluoridated than non-fluoridated communities.

He has got a study documented here, it is called "The Evanston Oak Park Study" in which a significant increase in the incidence of dental fluorosis has been recorded. Adults with kidney impairment were found, on the average, to excrete only 60 per cent as much fluoride in their urine while drinking 1 part per million fluoridated water as those with normal kidneys. There is a tie-in between weak kidneys and fluorides.

Also severe gastro-intestinal, arthritic and other side effects resulting from administration of as little as 20 milligrams of fluoride per day for therapeutic purposes certainly make the finding of related ill effects from the continuous long- term ingestion of smaller amounts, especially in hypersensitive individuals, not at all unreasonable.

Although the diagnosis of fluoride illness in the earlier, reversible stages is often difficult, some of the symptoms that have been observed in varying degrees from the use of 1 part per million fluoridated water include such familiar complaints as the following: headache, frequent headaches, numbness, soreness of arms and legs, stiffness and pain in the lower spine, extreme tiredness and loss of memory and mental acuity, visual disturbances affecting the retina, abdominal distention and gastro-intestinal and lower urinary tract irritation, dryness of the throat and consequent excessive thirst, mouth sores and various forms of dermatitis.

The fact that the symptoms are found to disappear without medication shortly after fluoride-free water is substituted in the diet, and invariably return when it is restored, constitutes one of the first and most easily conducted steps in the diagnosis of such illness. These are some of the findings of that particular report.

I want to place on the record in this House another document which I have telling about fluoridation of water supplies, "Excerpts From Controlling the Potential Hazards of Government Sponsored Technology" by Michael Wollan, July 1968, George Washington Law Review Society.

Another one, an article from a magazine which all Members should read from the Saturday Review, March 1, 1969 edition, by John Lear. He discusses in detail one cause of death of a New York nurse resulting from the use of fluoridated water in kidney machines. Documented evidence can be found in the Archive

of Internal Medicine. This was in February 1965. The study of the autopsy that was performed was ordered by the United States Public Health Service, because she was a New York nurse who died in an Ottawa hospital. The autopsy was performed and reasons for death noted. The results of that autopsy were never printed. I recommend this article for serious consideration for all Members of this House.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, with this particular incident is that we can learn from mistakes of all other cities. We don't have to make them ourselves.

There are just a few other pertinent remarks I would like to make regarding the topic of fluoridation. I want to remind Members of the House that Mr. Ralph Nader, American consumer protector advocate, if you like, is against it. Even ex-mayor Jean Drapeau would not allow fluoridation. Our own Mayor for Regina does not support it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record too how the idea of fluoridation actually originated. It is a short little incident and it is very interesting actually because it has a connection to all the money that has been poured into promotion of it.

I find that back in 1939 a certain fellow by the name of Mr. G. J. Cox, a biochemist at the Mellon Institute in Pittsburg, accepted a commission from the Aluminum Company of America to find a use for sodium fluoride wastes produced by aluminum companies, the world over. Some 50 other industries had fluoride disposal problems too. Many were bedeviled by damage suits arising from the noxious effects of the poison on crops and livestock surrounding their factories. The cost of elimination of the chemical was extremely high. Couldn't this byproduct be put to some profitable use instead? Now that was Mr. Cox's job. He took it on.

Cox found that it could, and very simply why not dissolve the stuff in drinking water. Fluoride might be specifically required for healthy teeth, he thought. Cox had no medical background and had made no clinical researches on its behavior in the human body. But his idea rang a bell. A rash of company executives and eager scientists soon brought good news. The discovery would be a perfect shortcut to glowing, everlasting teeth for all. And absolutely safe. Alcoa began advertising fluorides for water treatment. Can you imagine? Not the Department of Public Health but a chemical company!

Public Health officials in the United States jumped on the bandwagon in a hurry. In 1945, the city of Newburg, New York was invited to try out mass fluoridation using untouched Kingston nearby as its control for comparison.

The test they said would last ten years. The public health services were going to give it a try. But even half-way through that ten year period experts couldn't wait to announce a sweeping success without properly documented evidence. At the end of the ten year stretch no complete figures had yet been published on this study. There has never been a fully documented report on the Newburg-Kingston results and there never will be. The big question is why not?

A certain Dr. James G. Kerwin of the Department of Public

March 7, 1974

Health, New Jersey asked the Bureau of Public Health Service of New York for the final Newbury-Kingston results. That was supposed to be the study for the United States. The Bureau head answered with unexpected frankness in a letter saying:

Almost 50 per cent more dental defects in Newburg than in Kingston.

Now he said dental defects, he means erosion of teeth, rotten teeth, crooked or pulled or whatever, all kinds of thing, 50 per cent more. Just one more fact to add to the whole case.

In the meantime a certain attorney for Alcoa resigned to become head of the United States Public Health Service and started promoting fluoridation in earnest. The United States Public Health Service has been promoting fluoridation ever since. Now this documented evidence is found in the magazine called "Natural Foods and Farming," December 1969 edition in the article, "Look Ma, No Cavities".

Now, Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization – and we say, Oh, these are sort of holy bodies you don't tackle then, nor does one tackle the medical profession because they say something or the dentists – has offered a statement in support of fluoridation. I think even our own Minister in this House has said that. But I sincerely doubt the credibility of that organization and I'll tell you why. It stated definitely some years ago that thalidomide was not harmful as well as DDT. As you know both of them are now banned. I don't need to remind you of the thalidomide babies and the court cases involving chemical companies in Sweden, Britain, the USA and in Quebec. Yet WHO, that is the World Health Organization, was right behind these two chemicals in saying, yes, they are okay. I don't accept it.

Mr. Speaker, my speech this afternoon has two aims. One was to support the Dental Health Care Program being introduced by this Bill. The second aim was to place before the people of Saskatchewan and the Assembly my views against fluoridation of public water systems. Mass medication through our water system is dangerous, in my opinion, immoral and nothing less, as I said earlier in my speech, legalized pollution of our water systems, all in the name of reducing a few cavities in our children, indeed that is the case.

What value is all this fluoridated water, I ask you, to the plants that we water, negative. I showed you plants, roses, and gladiolus, none at all. You can't help it for if you turn on your tap, water your lawn, there go your flowers. What value is it to our pets, the animals that we feed? What value to the elderly and all those who have false teeth? I say, let those who feel so strongly about fluoride one way or the other, let those who are positive for it, let them take their daily dose in tablets. They are cheap, economical. Let them take their daily poison by their own free choice but don't ask all the other citizens to do it along with them. What's wrong with that? Well the answer will be, "Oh, but the children will forget to take their fluoride tablets." That's fine, that's their problem, you take them, you want them, you buy them. You can get them cheaply.

Before I leave this very important topic I want to report the effects of fluoridation of water supplies as summarized by

Mrs. Arthur R. Robinson of Seattle, Washington in April of 1965. She reports on 152 communities that rejected fluoridation and these reports that she got, formed the basis of her testimony in the congressional hearings held in that state in 1965. Just a brief run down. What did she find with people in communities that had fluoridated water supplies? From Martinez, California—it was voted out there and the physician printed statements about the hazards to his patients in the newspaper and he said: "Sore tongues, sore mouths, stomachs," five months after fluoridation. He was getting masses of this type of thing. Also in that same city, water mains bursting, water heaters eaten out, lawn sprinkling systems gave trouble, dishwasher had three new pumps. Now this is what they are saying. Repairman said "Something in our water was eating up the metal."

Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, she finds from people commenting on it: Chinchilla herds dying—we have heard this one before—dwarfs, stunted, sterile. Skin rash, kidney damages, heart troubles. Press letters: "There are Human Lives – Remember the Sulphas, They said my Wife is Bedfast—Is this America or a concentration camp?—Public Health—Or Money Interests? Burning throats, mouths, eyes, displays of stunted chinchillas- small animals sensitive to poison." You know, people talking about the way it was after fluoridation.

Geneseo, Illinois—At urgent request of Father Sheen, Pastor, who stated:

I have been asked by a large group of outraged citizens to present the case. I am on dangerous ground, not because I may be wrong but rather because I am right and so many important people are wrong. Many good men were deceived, foisted on trusting Americans by political agencies.

Knoxville, Iowa—On radio KRNT, Ben Gholson, Water Commissioner stated:

Clogging trouble with fluoride, couldn't clear the clinkers, no uniformity of dose, costs too high, health officer stated, 'We got a lemon.'

Williamstown, Massachusetts—"Equipment clogged and failed." At least two known cases of clogging. Now you can imagine what would happen if that ever happened to any system in Saskatchewan if you drank the water.

Saginaw, Michigan. Many had stiff joints which were relieved after drinking well water even though well water contained natural fluoride, proving that there is a difference between the two, natural and chemical. Many burning throats, stomachs, severe headaches.

Beatrice, Nebraska. This one was rather interesting. "Elephant's illness laid to Fluoridation in Water." That was in the World Herald:

Rosa, a 3 year old elephant so sick and such stiff joints, yet we didn't know what was wrong. We had to haul pure stream water and her illness went away.

Gastonia, North Carolina. Time Magazine states symptoms attributed to fluoride:

March 7, 1974

Excessive thirst, spine becomes stiff, nausea, mental alertness deteriorates; nails become brittle and peel, vision blurred.

Akron, Ohio. Many complained they suffered from kidney trouble to violent headaches because of fluoride. Many itched all over. A lawyer stated: "My wife became ill, her mouth inflamed. A doctor told us she was suffering from fluorosis." Judge Wanamaker said: "Those who want it can buy it." He has suffered headaches from fluoridated water.

Wichita Falls, Texas. Minnows died in fluoridated water. You could expect that to happen here. H.E. Weakley Fishing Camp reported that one. Dr. L.D. Parnell: "Unable to make Kolmer-Wasserman blood tests—has to obtain rain water, even after being distilled three times." They couldn't distil the fluoride out and couldn't perform the Wasserman test properly. Wolfe Kennels: "Lost stunted purebred puppies, mother paralyzed, puppies died." And Chinchillas—litters died. People said: "Our loss was great."

Well, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts of the case. I have attempted to bring as many facts as possible to the Members opposite and our side too and, hopefully, the people of the province, so they can make a wise decision in the future. I hope that I have made my point and I hope that I have enlightened all Members of the House to the extent that perhaps fluoridation of water supplies will be stopped henceforth and maybe, outlawed in the future. This would be my hope.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. G. STEUART: (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this Bill before the Minister closes debate.

Some of the Members over there wanted to know where we stand on this Bill. I'm not sure where the last Member stands. I have a feeling that the speech that he just delivered himself of was a speech he had ready about two years ago when the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) was intending to bring in a Bill about fluorides and I guess a politician with an undelivered speech is like a pregnant woman with an undelivered baby. He had to deliver it or something had to give.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — Some of those symptoms that he was talking about sounded like the outbreak of NDP-ism, but all the time it really is just the result of fluoridating the water supply.

I want to welcome though the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) to those people who believe in freedom of choice and I hope from now on when the Government that he supports brings in compulsory legislation to do with marketing or with health or with any other thing I hope he stands up and delivers the same kind of speech giving people freedom of choice. Because in that I agree with him. I may not agree with him in regard, to the problems of fluoridation or the results of fluoridating the water supplies but I certainly agree with him that people should, have all the facts and then should be given the

freedom of choice.

However, to talk about the Bill that is before the Legislative Assembly in regard to a dental care program, we've heard some great speeches on the other side. Most of them had more heat than light in them attempting to play politics with this piece of legislation and with the dental program that will grow out of this legislation or will be based on this legislation. To begin with the history of the dental nurse program goes back to 1964, as a matter of fact when I became Minister of Health in 1964 after we assumed office.

I found that there had been some planning in regard to a study being done in the department in regard to a program of dental care based on the use of dental technicians. I found many other plans and we advanced them. Some of the Members opposite have put on their record and have told the public and attempted to mislead the public by saying that little or nothing has been done in the seven years we 'were the government in regard to the very serious shortage of dental care that exists in this province now and has existed ever since it has been a province. I am aware of the fact that 60 per cent or 70 per cent of the people in this province do not now or have they ever received adequate dental care and this has been an ongoing problem and one that has concerned the Department of Health for probably 20, 25, or 30 years. It has concerned Ministers of Health, many Ministers of Health both CCF, Liberal and now NDP. We sent people, when I was Minister of Health, over to New Zealand to study the dental nurse or the dental technician plan in that country. Later on when we were still the Government the Hon. Mr. Grant, thanks to the help of the Federal Liberal Government, set up the Oxbow Pilot Plan.

At the same time we did many other things in an attempt to alleviate the dental shortage in the Province of Saskatchewan, especially in rural Saskatchewan. We spent about \$100,000 sending people over to allow dentists in the United Kingdom in Great Britain to sit the exams. We found that when British dentists came over here, we had a scheme, in fact it was in vogue when I became Minister of Health, that they could come to this country, British dentists could come to Canada and they could practise dentistry in Saskatchewan for up to a year. Then they were required to sit the Canadian examination. As a result of some of them failing it, a controversy arose and the College of Dental Surgeons withdrew their support of the plan and said that before people could operate or become licensed to practise dentistry in Saskatchewan they had to write the exams first.

I was sorry at the time. I was opposed to the attitude to the dentists at that time because there had only been about one or two incidents where dentists had come over here from Great Britain and had failed to pass the exam and had caused any problems. But there had been some. But there had been far more who had successfully come over here, practised for a year, been given the opportunity, to study the Canadian system and the Canadian methods and upgrade themselves if this was necessary, and had been very successful in passing the exams. Some of them are still here practising dentistry in Saskatchewan today. But when the permission was withdrawn we then sent our people over to Great Britain, •we were recruiting in Great Britain. We sent our people over there at a considerable expense and recruited them and allowed them to take the exams over there. Because we found what was happening and British graduates were

March 7, 1974

saying to us, and I think rightfully so, we are not prepared to pull up our roots, we are not prepared to move to Saskatchewan and then find out when we get there that we can't pass the examinations and have all the expense and dislocation of going back again or going somewhere else. I think that was logical. So at considerable expense we sent people over there to sit the exams but again it didn't prove practical. We got some people to sit the exams and come over here but the recruiting was not successful enough to warrant the expense and the time of the people who were over there.

We also set up a plan whereby we would encourage dentists to go into rural Saskatchewan by giving them a forgivable loan, I think it was up to \$5,000, some fairly large sum of money and if they stayed there five years in the areas that were designated as 'under dentist', areas where there was a serious shortage of dental care available, the loan would be forgiven, about one-fifth of it a year. I think they had to stay five years to qualify for the forgiveness of the total loan. We were successful in getting dentists to go into many small towns as a result of this.

But again all these things merely scratched the surface. We recognized then as the present Minister of Health and the Department of Health recognizes today that none of these things were sufficient. We went ahead with the dental college, it was planned before we became the government, we continued it, we continued the plan, laid out the money and started the College of Dental Surgery in the Province of Saskatchewan at a very high cost. It is still in operation today because we were told then, and I believe it, that one of the solutions, certainly one of the best solutions would be to get more dentists and if we had a dental college here studies show that dentists tend to stay where they take their training, where they obtain their professional degree and that was why we went into a very expensive college of dentistry in this province. That was begun during the seven years that we were the government.

Now I want to put these things on record and point out to some Members that we did take action, we were concerned, we spent a great deal of money and we tried a variety of things, including the study that has now culminated or will culminate shortly in this particular plan, the legislation which we are debating today. But again I want to make it very clear that while we can support this Bill and we will support this Bill, but it does not necessarily mean that we can support the plan that grows out of this Act. This Act is very general as of course most acts are. The plan that will arise out of this Act is a plan that we support the general philosophy of as do the dentists, as do I think most people in this province. However, there are some very clear failings in the plan that has been proposed by the Minister up to this point. It is very interesting, the Oxbow Pilot Project was carried out and it was successful but we are not following the Oxbow Pilot Project. There will not be the supervision, the professional supervision by professional, registered, licensed dentists. The plan as it is now proposed by the Minister of Health and I am sure will be instituted by the NDP Government is not the same as the Oxbow plan.\

The NDP have pioneered in the health field and no one denies that. The old CCF and later the NDP have pioneered many health plans in this province and they pioneered them often in

the face of great political pressure. There is no doubt that one of the reasons for the defeat of the old CCF in the 1964 election was the aftermath of the medicare dispute. But I often wonder why they can't learn a lesson. Because whether they want to admit it or not the facts are there clearly for any fair minded person to see that the medicare plan we had after the terrible fight that this province was subjected to in 1961 and 1962 was a different plan. After the province had been ripped apart from one end to the other, town against town and family sometimes against family, then the CCF Government came into session and they amended the original medical care plan. Now we find this sort of thing happening again. The idea of a dental care plan for children across this province is sound and a good step forward, an outgrowth of plans that have been developed for some years. Why do they have to confront the people who dedicated their lives to better dental care of the citizens of this province, the dental profession? Why can't they sit down with them and evolve a plan whereby there would be proper supervision? Proper supervision doesn't necessarily mean one or two or three technicians with a dentist overseeing them in the same office. There could be a whole variety of plans worked out where one dentist could properly oversee the work of a large number of dental technicians. I don't think the Minister of Health or anyone on that side of the House should try to kid anybody that while this plan will bring better dental care in some cases and in some cases where they have had no dental care at all, to thousands of children, there are dangers involved. I think that those dangers can be overcome if you would sit down with the profession and propose some plan where there could be supervision by the dental profession and as I say this does not need to cripple the plan. If the Minister worked out a plan where eight or nine or ten or twelve technicians could be supervised by one dentist or groups of technicians would be located in one centre and then move out to other centres in teams and a dentist could go with them. If the dental profession couldn't or wouldn't make dentists available for this kind of supervision then I think the people of Saskatchewan would welcome it if you came back into this Legislative Assembly in a year or two years from now and said, look, we have tried, we have taken the dentists at their word and their proposal for supervision is impractical and will continue to deny to thousands and thousands of people, young children or other people, in the Province of Saskatchewan any kind of dental care whatsoever, then I for one and I think most fair minded people would go along and say, okay, do it your way. But almost every time they bring in some plan they can't resist this confrontation, whether it, is a marketing board for natural products, or it is a health plan to bring new dental care to children in areas which are now not being offered any dental care at all.

I want to make it very clear our qualifications of supporting this Bill and I want to read what the Member for Moose Jaw said and I quote, February 27th, Wednesday, from Hansard, Mr. D. F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North):

First of all I support and the Liberal Parry supports a dental care plan. Secondly, I support the concept of using dental nurses as technicians to assist the professional dentist.

We can support, and we do support, the idea of this Bill. If the Minister insists on the plan that he has developed up to

March 7, 1974

this point, we cannot support that plan because it does not give the freedom of choice and it does not give adequate dental supervision. It could do that, the plan could be amended to do that and it would not cripple the plan and it would not deny the thousands of children who are not getting dental care now, the dental care that they need that was planned for about the last ten years in the province and is now culminating in a school to train the dental technicians and the Bill before us and the plan that will emanate from this Bill. So we support the Bill and I ask the Minister to reconsider the plan and sit down again with the dentists. It is not too late by any means, it wouldn't slow the plan down one day. Develop a plan that safeguards the health of the people that he is trying to serve and still brings dental care to the thousands and thousands of children who up to this point in time have been denied access to any kind of dental care.

We do support the Bill but we cannot and we will not support the plan as it is outlined up to this point by the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I must tell the Leader of the Opposition that he can't have his cake and eat it too. On the one hand he says he supports the Bill and on the other he says he opposes the plan. I would advise the Leader of the Opposition that I haven't heard of the opposition from the dentists. I don't know whom he was talking to because we have met with the dentists. I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that I get the distinct impression from the dentists that they do support the plan.

MR. STEUART: — They don't.

MR. SMISHEK: — Well, I tell you that and I am sure that the leaders of the dental profession will tell you that as well. Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the Leader of the Opposition was and whom he was listening to when he talked about the Oxbow project and that somehow he interprets this proposal as different from the Oxbow plan. I would hope that for the next few minutes he will stay glued to his seat when I explain the program again to him and to the Liberals. Obviously they weren't listening when I tried to explain the plan to them the other day.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) and the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) in their remarks on this Bill made much of the fact that the Oxbow project was approved while the Liberals were in office. Neither of them told the whole story. In fact the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park said that with initiating the Oxbow project the Liberal Party made a commitment to develop a public dental care program. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this House that this is just not the case. You know they didn't tell us in either of their speeches that the Treasury Board of the day under the Leadership of the Leader of the Opposition attached some very strict conditions to the Oxbow project. I want to read those conditions to you:

1. The Government of Saskatchewan's involvement is predicated

on the continuing financial assistance of the Federal Government through national health grants.

2. The \$3,595 that is not reimbursable should be absorbed by the Department. That is to the extent that the Liberals when in government committed themselves to the Oxbow project.

3. The Government of Saskatchewan may at any time depending on the results of this pilot project, terminate the program regardless of whether or not federal assistance may be forthcoming.

It was understood (and note this) that if federal assistance should be stopped the Government would discontinue the program as well. No commitment, in fact the reverse, Mr. Speaker. The opposite, if the Federal Government stopped providing the grants the Government of the day took a clear cut position that they would stop the project and there was no commitment whatsoever to develop any kind of a program for children.

4. Staff to be employed in this pilot project should be told of the possibility of the termination of the project by either the Federal or the Provincial Government at any time prior to a three or five year length of study.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals made no commitment whatsoever to develop a program for dental care for children. So much for the so-called enthusiastic support given to this project by the Treasury Board headed by the Leader of the Opposition and at that time the Minister of Health, the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park.

Federal funds for the Oxbow project ran out on March 31st, 1973. I think we know what the Liberals would have done had they been in office with the Oxbow project. It would have stopped at that time. The words of their Treasury Board leaves no mistake, Mr. Speaker. Let me quote again:

It was understood, however, that if federal assistance would be stopped the Government would discontinue the program as well.

Very clear in the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the optimism of the Members opposite for the Oxbow project now that they are in Opposition is less convincing than it might have been had they been more full-hearted in their support when they were in government. The support of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) for the dental program is couched in such terms that it appears that he is a firm supporter really of the status quo.

I want to remind Members that the dreadful statistics regarding children's dental health have come about because the present system is in fact not working. I cannot stay with the status quo and we as a government don't propose to stay with the status quo. The problem is not going to be solved simply by putting more auxiliary personnel into the private dental offices. The poor distribution of dentists combined with their shortage in this province makes it abundantly clear that a new system of delivering dental services on a province wide basis is necessary and required.

The Member for Moose Jaw North says he would involve

dentists in the plan. Let me repeat for the benefit of the Members that the initial proposal calls for five regional dentists for the program. Only five, that was the initial proposal. In view of the representations to the Paynter Committee and their subsequent recommendations to myself, this number has been increased to 25 dentists, not including the dentists involved in the instructions in the dental nurse training program. I should add that these dentists will, of course, be involved in the clinical work that is part of the nursing training program. In addition services that are considered out of scope of the dental nurses like the extraction of permanent teeth can be referred by the plan to the private dentists of the parents' choice.

Our Government is concerned about the small number of rural dentists. We, therefore, have sent invitations to all the dentists asking them if they would give some of their time to help out with the program. Contrary to the allegations by the Opposition we are involving the dentists in this program and we have a good number of dentists who will be actually working in the plan. These are dentists that are now in private practice. I am confident that rather than diminishing rural dental work the dental plan will greatly increase their work both for children in the plan and after they leave the plan.

It would appear from the remarks of the Liberal health critic (Mr. MacDonald) that he is trying to confuse the people of Saskatchewan regarding certain aspects of the Dental Care Plan. The Dental Nurses Act was passed last year and the Saskatchewan Dental Nurses Board has been set up under that Act. It is that Act and the regulations they are under that established the dental nurses and give them certain rights. Not the Bill that we are discussing today. It seems to me that ant comments regarding dental nurses and reservations as to their ability should have been expressed when that Bill was considered. For the benefit of the Members whose memories may be short I should point out that The Saskatchewan Dental Nurses Act received second reading on April 5th of last year and according to the Debates and Proceedings the Member for Moose Jaw North voted in favour of the Bill and no Member from the other side of the House voted against the Bill. I find it strange, therefore, that the Member for Moose Jaw North should now begin to attack the dental nurses.

The Member for Moose Jaw North has apparently missed the fact that all children enrolled in the plan will be examined by a fully qualified dentist holding a valid Saskatchewan licence. Dentists will do all the diagnosis and treatment planning that is required. They will also decide, using their professional judgement, when they wish to see a particular child for examination be it three months or six months or a year or later, whatever their decision will be. In any case it is spelled out that each child in the program will have an examination by a fully qualified dentist at least once a year in the initial years of the program. The Member for Moose Jaw North should be further aware that we have always maintained an open-door policy with respect to the training program and the Oxbow project. Dentists from all over have visited and examined the procedures and some of the children. If there were any deficiencies we would very quickly have been told about those deficiencies. We would want to hear about them as well. We are not interested in a second rate program, we will not be putting a second rate program into effect Mr. Speaker.

Let me say a word about supervision. The Member for Moose Jaw North and the Leader of the Opposition support the position and say that we should have supervision such as in Oxbow. Well let me tell you about the Oxbow project. There we have two dental nurses and one dentist, there is a ratio of 2 to 1. I particularly ask the Leader of the Opposition to listen—there we have a ratio of 2 to 1. Two dental nurses to one dentist. In our plan in the first year we will have 25 dentists and 50 dental nurses and it will be exactly the same kind of a ratio, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRANT: — Ten of them are in the office.

MR. SMISMEK: — No sir, they are not in the office. In fact I invite you to come and find ten dentists in our office. Mr. Speaker, the ratio will be identical, one dentist to two dental nurses and then we will have working with each team four dental assistants.

Mr. Speaker, let me also clear up one point that was referred particularly in the Star-Phoenix when I moved second reading of this Bill. The newspaper report, as I recall it, said that the plan will not cover the people in Swift Current, northern Saskatchewan or Oxbow. What I did say is that they will not come under the administrative districts that will be established. But certainly the children of Swift Current and northern Saskatchewan and Oxbow will be covered by the dental program. What we will have because of the different experience, and because children in Oxbow and Swift Current are now covered up to the age of 12, and because of a separate program in northern Saskatchewan, we will use the existing structure primarily, rather than put them under the proposed administrative structure.

Mr. Speaker, with the overall ratio that I have reported in this case of Oxbow it will also apply to the province as a whole in the first year. In any event our ratio for supervision is certainly much higher than it is in other places where dental nurses are involved in a dental program.

For example, in New Zealand, they have 17 dentists supervising 1,400 nurses—a ratio of 17 dentists to 1,400 nurses. They started out with close supervision, but found it unnecessary. Australia uses dental nurses and they do not consider close supervision to be necessary. Britain has also moved away from close supervision. Their reason, and I think it's valid, if you train someone to do a good job properly; there is not the same need for continued close supervision. But in any case, it is our intention to have a very close degree of supervision in the early stages of the program, much the same as in the Oxbow project.

As time progresses we shall be able to assess the position in the future to decide from the experience that we gain the exact supervision that may be required in the future. Dental nurses will also have the right of referral for any matter that arises that is not within their scope, referral can be to the nearest dentist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Members opposite, that the dentists were concerned when the initial report was first presented. The

March 7, 1974

initial proposal was five dentists to supervise the whole program. Based on the Paynter Committee's Report, based on representation that was made, we as a Government, increased the supervision, we increased the number of dentists and I have not heard any opposition to a ratio of supervision from the dental profession.

Mr. Speaker, let me touch on another aspect mentioned in the remarks of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald), namely, the quality of care. There is no question regarding the technical ability of dental nurses. I am shocked to hear that the Hon. Member brings this point in question by innuendoes. Surveys by independent dental observers in the Oxbow project involving over 1,000 fillings done by the dental nurses, have again shown what we expected, namely, that the quality of work is excellent. The reports of the two dentists who supervised the quality checking for the College of Dental Surgeons, said that the work done by the dental nurses was "excellent". It is unfortunate that the Member for Moose Jaw North attempts to belittle and condemn the work of dental nurses before the plan even gets under way.

It appears that the Liberals are prepared to write off the dental health of our rural children by sowing seeds of doubt in the minds of people. They do this by inaccurately portraying the plan and questioning the ability of our young people to perform tasks as well as their counterparts overseas. I have every confidence in these young people that we are training and I am satisfied that they will do excellent work.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North also raised some question about the number of parents who have enrolled their children in Regina, where the practical work is being done and practical training of our dental nurses is at the present time. I told this House that 65 per cent of the parents enrolled their children. This is an extremely high ratio and in fact, it is a higher ratio of enrolment than we find in any dental school where dentists who are training do their practical work on patients who come in. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the interest of the parents in this program and their willingness to co-operate with the dental nurses' school in the Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the high degree of co-operation. Incidentally there hasn't been a single complaint so far, that has reached us, about the work that has been done by the dental nurses, who are really practising at the moment, the work is of high quality, there is excellent supervision, and I am grateful for the co-operation that we are receiving.

I trust that my references in my speech on second reading to letters received in my office regarding people's problems with getting dental care and paying for it, pointed out some of the problems we have in this province for the provision of dental care. They are not intended, and we're not intending in any way, to belittle or degrade the dental profession as the Member for Moose Jaw North tried to portray it.

I have endeavored, to keep good relations with the College of Dental Surgeons. I know that as a dedicated group they will support the dental plan and they have said. they will support a dental plan.

The response to our invitation to dentists to participate in the plan indicated that they do support the plan. It is regretted that the health critic opposite does not offer any alternatives, that he is not constructive in his criticism, that he insists on trying to play small politics at the expense of the dental health of our children.

Mr. Speaker, there were a few other items that were raised during second reading by the Members of the Opposition.

MR. STEUART: — Walter, tell us about those signs in the dentists' offices.

MR. SMISHEK: — I'm glad that you raised that. Sure, several months ago, the dentists did post signs about the question of supervision and about the freedom of choice.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that that the response to those signs has been almost negligible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — How do you react to it?

MR. SMISHEK: — How do I react to it, if the Hon. Member really wants to know the last time I checked was about two or three weeks ago, all we received was seven letters from people.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) raised the question of the cost of this program. I do want to comment on the cost.

It is true, I don't deny it, that the cost will be high to start out with. I also point out that the Oxbow project is now an ongoing project. We wish to compare their first year's cost with projected dental plan costs for the first year we find the same kind of an experience. The investment that was made was very high, buying the equipment and this is what is happening here. The plan in its initial stages will be costly. Administrative staff to get this program on stream together with the 15 additional dentists—the cost of this will increase sharply as compared to the initial estimates that were made with less supervision.

Province wide delivery patterns necessitate additional travel in the early years. Phase-in programs over five years gives only coverage to small numbers of children spread over a wide area. The Oxbow project was administered centrally and did not include any administrative costs. The Oxbow project also included pre-school children which brings costs down. More of them will have little or no work to be done as compared to the higher age group that we are including.

Mr. Speaker, I admit quoting a figure of 15,000 as the divider but this is only valid if we can say that we will stop at age 6 in the first year. In the event that the work force completes the six-year olds we will advance our schedule and phase in other ages hopefully in the first year. And this is our hope and speculation. Using the 15,000 figure also omits one important point in using that figure and that is the fact that the plan will be providing preventive services for many thousands

March 7, 1974

more. We expect to enrol in the preventive services in the first year 70 000 children. These services to be provided, will include preventive and educational services, tooth brushing and flossing instructions.

I would also like to emphasize the total preventive program that we are going to embark on initially.

MR. GRANT: — That is not new Mr. Minister.

MR. SMISHEK: — It is new to the extent of the number of children that will be covered because while it is true that we do have existing programs through regional health, there are 13,500 children covered at the present time under preventive services but in the case of the program that we are proposing to introduce it will cover over 70,000 children.

I should advise the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park that we have accepted the advice of the College of Dental Surgeons and have increased the number of dentists for supervision. This will cost money. We are prepared to spend the money to have a good program. But now the Liberals are saying we are going to spend too much money on the program. I wish they would make up their minds and decide what they want to do. We propose a plan, they oppose it, saying not enough dentists. Now we propose to spend more money to hire more dentists and now we are being attacked that the plan will cost too much money.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that the Liberals wish to prolong the agony of tooth decay and misery among our young children. Mr. Speaker, they will not succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said that he gives credit to the CCF and to the NDP for pioneering programs, but that somehow we go about it in the wrong way. Mr. Speaker, if you are going to pioneer programs you are going to make some mistakes. The truth is the Liberals never pioneered anything, never started any programs and therefore they couldn't make any mistakes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this is going to be an excellent program. I am prepared to make a little bet with the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Whitmore Park that within five years this program is going to be copied by the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS—45
Messieurs

Blakeney
Dyck
Meakes
Smishek

Engel
Cody
Robbins
Tchorzewski

Flasch
Steuart
Coupland
Loken

Rowanow	Taylor	Guy
Messer	Matsalla	Boldt
Snyder	Owens	Grant
Larson	Mostoway	MacDonald (Milestone)
Kowalchuk	Gross	McIsaac
Brockelbank	Comer	Gardner
MacMurchy	Rolfes	Weatherald
Pepper	Lange	Lane
Michayluk	Oliver	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N.)
Thorson	Feschuk	Wiebe
Whelan	Kaeding	Malone

NAYS – 00

Messieurs

Nil

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 28—**An Act respecting the Agricultural Machinery Institute** be now read a second time.

MR. D. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for bringing in Bill 28—An Act respecting the Prairie Agricultural institute.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is Saskatchewan's primary industry. Because of this orientation farm machinery constitutes a major capital investment next to land costs of our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, were it not for the unfortunate seven years that this province had under the Liberal Government . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — . . . the AMA program instituted by the CCF Government in 1958 would have been greatly expanded by this period in time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, during the period 1958-'65 Saskatchewan was the only province in Canada or in North America for that matter to operate a machinery testing program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — The independent role of this unique program was mainly in the role of performance and comparative testing. The testing program was to provide as it did, a direct service to farmers by providing performance data on the machine that was tested during that period, Mr. Speaker, farmers received information and counsel on all matters relating to expenditures of the farm- income and farm machinery, in addition to this, Mr. Speaker, an indirect service to farm people was carried out by assisting the manufacturer to improve farm machinery that was sold in the province.

March 7, 1974

It must have been as obvious in 1958 as it is today where the expenditure for the purchase of machinery represents almost \$100 million of the farmers' net income. Information of this type should be available to farmers.

Machines that were tested, were submitted voluntarily by the manufacturers. Mr. Speaker, at no time were restrictions placed on sales of machines nor was there any particular machine recommended or approved in the sense that it passed some accepted rating.

What the AMA test reports did offer was comparative buying information which would be of enormous assistance to the farmers in getting value for his investment.

Mr. Speaker, the AMA testing program did not decide for the user the specific type, the size and the make of the machine that the farmer should buy, but on which he could base his decision. Under this program prior to its abandonment, by the friends of the major machinery companies, a farmer was able to obtain professional and unbiased evaluation of machine performance in typical Saskatchewan working conditions before he made the purchase. He was able, Mr. Speaker, to obtain information on adjustments and operator hints that would have aided him in obtaining better performance after he had made the purchase. He would have information available, Mr. Speaker, regarding modifications that the company has made or proposed to make in respect to the machine in question. He was also able, Mr. Speaker, to obtain data on capacity and power requirements which assisted the farmers in selecting the size unit that best suited his operation.

In fairness to the agricultural industry a testing program should consider, Mr. Speaker, both functional and durability aspects of farm implements. Farmers, Mr. Speaker, are not only interested in how well the implement will work, but they are also concerned with how long the implement will perform.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — As was intimated, by the Minister many prairie farm machinery manufacturers have inadequate design and development facilities and staff. The proposed institute would help these machinery firms by providing technical information and assistance in developing improved equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) speaking on Bill 28 gave birth to yet another Liberal reason for discontinuing the AMA program and may I quote:

We did have a machinery testing program, a small one here at one time. I think it was obvious to everybody that at that time it couldn't survive on a provincial basis.

I want to agree with the Hon. Member for Moosomin that it must have been evident to the people of Saskatchewan that any decision that the Liberal Government made would be in favor of the free enterprise vested interests of the large manufacturing companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — The Liberal Party does not want to jeopardize its position with free enterprise friends.

What did the AMA program provide, Mr. Speaker, to the farmers. Well, firstly under the administration of AMA contracts with the purchase of farm implements it gave some form of protection in respect to performance up to a year. It also provided a form of assurance that implement dealers carried replacement parts for machines sold. If not in totality some of the major parts had to be on hand in the dealer's shop. Liberals did not favour and approve the AMA testing program because of probable pressure when they were elected to office by their friends.

That is the reason and the only valid reason or pretense that the transferring of the AMA program to the University of Saskatchewan would be broadened in its scope in the field of machinery testing as was given to us in this Legislature.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the budget revenue allocated to this program was limited. In 1958 and 1959 when the program was initially set up \$103,140 was allocated and in its last year before its transference to the University of Saskatchewan a budgetary estimate of \$177,000, so that over the years the amount allocated to an agriculture machinery testing program did not increase considerably.

The moving of the AMA to the University of Saskatchewan automatically stopped the availability of test reports to some 17,000 farmers in Saskatchewan and in Alberta and in Manitoba who had made use of these reports.

Not only farmers in Saskatchewan, but as I said the neighboring provinces, the farmers in our neighboring provinces used the test reports to assess some of the machines that they were going to purchase. And, they found them of value contrary to what the Liberal Government of the day stated.

Mr. Speaker, the then Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. A.H. MacDonald., Senator MacDonald now, speaking to a resolution introduced by the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Nollet, on February 18, 1965, when he asked for the reinstatement of the machinery testing program by a resolution, stated and may I quote what the then Minister of Agriculture said:

The machine companies themselves are spending over a million dollars in testing and research. How much of this work -were they doing in Saskatchewan when he . . .

He was referring to the former Hon. I.C. Nollet.

. . . was the minister responsible for this branch of the Department of Agriculture? How many machines were being tested in Saskatchewan during the regime of my hon. friends opposite? Virtually none. Why?

And here is the Minister's reason:

Because they refused to be dictated to by my little friend, that sits across the way.

This was the reason. They weren't going to submit themselves. Not to you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, you were "the little

March 7, 1974

Fellow” on this side then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — And to quote further: "We have a commitment from the machine companies." They had a commitment. There in collusion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear. Hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — They had a commitment, so what was the commitment?

We have a commitment from the machine companies to greatly increase the number of machines that are going to be tested in Saskatchewan, but there will be virtually a hundred times as many hours spent in testing machinery next year as was spent last year and it will not cost the government a red cent to have this testing done.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it did not cost the Saskatchewan Government a red cent and the Saskatchewan farmers did not receive a cent's worth of information.

True to form, Mr. Speaker, allocations in 1965 Estimates from AMA testing amounted to nil. This was the year, Mr. Speaker, of the meat axe as you Hon. Members will recall. Not only did the friends of the agricultural industry cut off allocations to AMA, in the same budget the Plant and Industry Branch, which in 1964-65 under the NDP Government was allocated \$77,870, my Liberal friends allocated in the same year, nil. The year of the meat axe.

The Conservation and Development Branch of the department received the same treatment. NDP, 1964-65, \$143,820, in 1965-66, the meat axe fell, a precious nothing.

Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that the then government would have had its ears to the ground and would have heard and sensed the pulse of the farmers at least, who were so directly affected. No, they heard not and they saw not. If they didn't hear they could at least have read. But they didn't. Might I, Mr. Speaker, bring to the attention of the Hon. Members, as the Members of this Government did in 1965 the feeling regarding the transfer of the AMA program to the University of Saskatchewan.

On November 10, Mr. Speaker, 1964, appearing in the Western Producer under the heading, "They Want Continued Farm Machine Testing" and may I quote:

Regina, Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool delegates, at the concluding session of the fortieth annual meeting here November 13, unanimously agreed to ask the Provincial Government to continue testing machines under the Agricultural Machinery Administration.

The Wheat Pool delegates sensed that the Liberals were going to do away with the AMA testing program. Wheat Pool delegates are farmers, they speak on behalf of farmers.

Further, Mr. Speaker, an article, datelined January 4,

1965 in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, "SFU Head Thinks Farmers will Question AMA Move." And, of course, this was when the Press release came out that the testing program would be moved to the University. This was at the time that our farmers began to worry what might happen to the AMA and may I quote again:

The announcement leaves no doubt that the most valuable part of the program has been eliminated, he said.

This is the President of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union.

A joint statement says that the net effect of the move is to discontinue the comparative testing of farm machinery.

MR. STEUART: — Who said that?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Roy Atkinson.

MR. LAKE: — Who is he?

MR. MICHAYLUK: — He is a farmer. One of the farmers. Are you a farmer Dave? You're not a farmer. May I quote:

This was curious wording, Mr. Atkinson said, in view of the fact that AMA reports had never compared one make of machine with another. And he doubted, he feared that there would be very little value of the testing of the farm machinery at the University to the farmers, because the reports would not (as they were not) made available.

To reinforce my contention, Mr. Speaker, as to the value of the AMA program to the farmers, might I, Sir, make reference yet again to the Star-Phoenix of November 22, 1967, under the title, "Survey Shows Farmers want Machinery Testing Agency." And this is datelined Regina:

Western Canadian farmers would like to see some form of machinery testing agency established.

And this was two years after you had abandoned, transferred it to the University.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — You as a government maintained that this would be available to farmers, two years after the transference of this program to the University they are requesting a machinery testing program. And it says, may I quote further:

A recent survey carried out by the United Grain Growers . . .

Not Atkinson, United Grain Growers.

. . . in which 761 farmers were questioned was released Tuesday. A study which included . . .

Just listen to this, Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

. . . 130 Manitoba farmers, 295 Saskatchewan farmers, 323 in

March 7, 1974

in Alberta and. 13 miscellaneous persons indicated 88.8 per cent favored comparative testing of farm machinery sold on the prairies.

88 per cent of those questioned and the number of people that replied was almost 800.

54 per cent of those who replied said the three prairie provincial governments should administer such an agency. 24 per cent advocated federal control and 15 per cent wanted a farm organization and 3.4 per cent suggested a joint body of provincial and federal.

Now, I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the prairie governments of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are jointly entering this program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — As was indicated in the 1967 survey, 54 per cent of those who replied said the three provincial governments should administer such an agency. In another report on November 25, 1967, under the heading, Machinery Listing, may I quote:

761 farmers questioned said that 82 per cent of them favoured machinery testing in western Canada.

Bill 28, Mr. Speaker, includes the three western provinces who will jointly participate in setting up the Machinery Testing Institute, and is exactly what the majority advocated by the farmers of western Canada in the survey I just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, like many other firsts introduced by the CCF and the NDP Governments, the AMA machinery testing was an American first. A first in the sense that it did not limit its testing program to one implement as does one other program which I am aware in the state of Nebraska to the south, which limits its testing program to farm tractors only.

I must congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), Mr. Speaker, for being able to centralize the location using Saskatchewan and the community of Humboldt for the location of the institute

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Although smaller institutes will be considered in the two neighboring provinces, Humboldt will specialize in research of new machinery and will be a focal point for major testing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, might I once again give full marks and congratulations to our Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for making it possible to once again provide to the agriculture industry, a program which had provided a valuable service to the farmers for the period 1958 to 1965 until it was abandoned by the Hon. Members that are now sitting to your left.

This new institute will once again provide a service that the hon. gentlemen denied or curtailed, among many other programs, to Saskatchewan people and to our farmers during the years when they were the government.

I will support the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. OLIVER: (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill, but also in opposition to the Member for Moosomin's (Mr. Gardner) remarks, particularly those he made on February 28.

The excuses the Members have put forth from that side of the House to get rid of the AMA in 1965 are very, very weak. As the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) has quoted, where on February 28 the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) stated and I quote:

It was obvious to everybody at that time that it couldn't well survive on a provincial basis. There was room for too much duplication, the prohibitive costs and it was a bit ridiculous for one province to be testing machinery of this type.

Now I should like to take those remarks one at a time and examine them. The first one is, "It couldn't survive on a provincial basis." Now this was ridiculous because it was surviving on a provincial basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — I have a number of the reports here. I got all the back issues when I was farming and I've got them here from back in 1962, '63, '64 all on various machines, swathers that I was interested in at the time, a few combines, disc harrows. This program was providing us with a service. It was doing a tremendous job.

The next point, he stated there was too much duplication. Now, I don't know what he meant by too much duplication, because there was no one else in the province providing this service. He stated the costs were prohibitive. This again is not, in my opinion, costly if you are looking at the future, preserving the family farm and this was one way of doing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — They provided important data for a farmer to make a wise decision on the purchase of any kind of farm equipment and this is even more important now when farm machinery costs have gone sky high.

The third one, where he states that it is ridiculous for one province to be testing machinery. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a ridiculous statement that is it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — After all, Mr. Speaker, where would we be in this province if we waited for a federal policy before we moved into

March 7, 1974

our policy fields, for instance in health, any of the Crown corporations, SGIO, SPC. We would still be waiting, we would be writing on our own grave stones.

The next portion of his speech which I took exception to, he said and I quote:

When we -were the Government we started negotiations very actively with Alberta and Manitoba to try and get a machinery testing institute of the three provinces, and it seemed that these negotiations were going to have some success very shortly. I am rather surprised that it has taken the socialist government almost three years to complete these negotiations because it was fairly obvious that they -were about to get it three year's ago.

I wonder about this. I don't think that the Member was serious when he made these remarks, not &t all. If you were, then why did you get rid of the AMA program before you started negotiating -with other provinces? It is something like the employee who would resign his position and then turn around and try to renegotiate a new contract. I think this is strictly just Liberal policy.

MR. ROMANOW: — I bet Sonny is opposed too.

MR. OLIVER: — Well, I often wondered about that after the speeches that he and the Leader of the Opposition made in Shaunavon, or at least is reported to have said that night. I wonder where they stand.

The fifth quotation I should like to quote, Mr. Speaker is:

I would hope that the socialist government here and in Manitoba have not so antagonized the machine companies that it is going to restrict this testing program. I hope that the testing program will not suffer because of this and it is very, very important to have the co-operation of all manufacturers of machinery, whether they be large or small.

This particular part is another disturbing aspect, that we, here in Saskatchewan had, when we had the AMA. We were the only socialist democratic government in Canada at the time. We had good co-operation from the machine companies. I shall just read a few of the recommendations of the AMA report and this is on Test No. 1863, tested 1963, report issued May 1964, A Report of the Massey Ferguson 300 Self-propelled Combine. In it they go through the whole testing program and then they make a list of recommendations and in this case there were 12 recommendations that they had made.

One recommendation was relocating the stone trap to improve its operation, making it easier to empty. The company followed through and made this change and enlarged it to make a more efficient stone trap which is now available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — To show the other side of the coin where the Company

felt that a change wasn't necessary, the AMA recommended modifying the combine to make it possible to inspect the tailings during operations and the company felt there was no need for this and made no change.

Another one is correcting the tolerances of both joining the offset cranks, the shafts in the augur table. The Massey- Ferguson Company suggest no changes have been made because they felt that this was an isolated case of stress of the bolts breaking. Another one was providing a chart, which had been recommended by AMA, in the Operator's Manual regarding remedies for threshing and separating problems and they, of course, complied with this saying, "We will provide a chart in the Operator's Manual regarding remedies for threshing and separating problems."

So we did have co-operation and we were the only socialist government at the time. The machine companies recognized that there was a place to have their machines tested under actual field conditions. The corrections were made by some of the companies because they recognized the fact that if the farmers were satisfied with that particular machine that was the best kind of advertising they could get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — I find it very difficult to accept the crocodile tears shed by the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) as he supposedly sincerely regrets that his Government had to get rid of AMA. I strongly suspect there was some pressure put on by certain corporations to get rid of it.

The Member for Moosomin nor the other Members in the Opposition can weasel out of the fact that it was the Liberal Government that killed AMA.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — If they were serious about providing that kind of data to farmers, why then didn't they continue the AMA when they had the chance? You could have expanded it. You had seven years to negotiate with the other two provinces, but nothing happened. You have never been interested in the welfare of the farmer and I am absolutely positive of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. OLIVER: — The only concern is with the reaction of the large and powerful corporations and how it affects your campaign funds.

I am very pleased to support the reinstitution of the Agricultural Machinery Testing Institute, which will be of a definite assistance to the preservation of our family farms. Members opposite indicate their support of this Bill, but I find that their support is one of political expediency, rather than support of the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1974

MR. L. LARSON: (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, as one who has during my lifetime spent thousands of dollars on farm machinery, I couldn't miss this opportunity to say a word or two about the reinstating of something like AMA or AMI as it will be known from now on.

Some of the machines that I have brought have been good, some of them have been indifferent and some of them have been outright bad and I was the one who had to pay for finding out whether they were good, bad or indifferent. Nobody gave a damn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — When AMA was instituted we at least had some place where we could go for some comparison. I was one of those who thought that AMA didn't go far enough. I was one of those who wanted it expanded, a little more teeth put into it.

The Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) very obviously feels different about it. I happened to be in the House, as my colleagues have mentioned, when AMA was going out the window.

MR. ROMANOW: — Ruthlessly cut.

MR. LARSON: — Yes, it was thrown out the window very obviously to accommodate some friends of the people who sit opposite. They felt and tried to make the people of Saskatchewan, the farmers particularly, believe that they were getting a very good deal, that AMA wasn't really a very smart outfit, that they really didn't know very much about what they were doing. They were going to put it into the hands of the University where the intellectuals are, where we could really get some comparison. Of course, the farmers didn't swallow that, they knew from before what kind of intellectuality would come out of the recommendations from the University. But the Members opposite insisted and pushed it through without a backward look. They never realized and recognized that AMA was a very popular program. They didn't bother to listen to the farmers and to check into seeing the repercussions of what would happen. They thought this was an opportunity where they could pull the wool over their eyes and nobody would be the wiser. But it didn't work that way.

You know my friend for Redberry was quoting some of the statements, some of the Press releases and some of the things that were said at the time. I want to quote from the Farm Union presentation to this Government, June 29, 1973, and I want the Members opposite to pay particular attention to this because it almost amounts to a plea. It says:

Farmers throughout Saskatchewan until 1964 were able to avail themselves of technical information on farm machinery as researched and published by the Agricultural Machinery Administration. With the rising investment cost of farm implements it is imperative that farmers be in a position to make intelligent and informed choices in their farm implement purchases.

We recommend that your government take the initiative in re-establishing the Farm Machinery Testing Program in

conjunction with other provinces, if possible, in order that this service may once again be made available to farmers.

If you check the Wheat Pool recommendations you will find that they said very much the same. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture said almost the same. Farmers were pleading all over the country for some method of comparison, some method of testing, so that they could go with at least a little bit of knowledge to compare and look at machines before they were called upon to pay the prices that were being asked.

This is only fair and reasonable; this is only as it should be. It is not proper and it is not correct that a farmer should have to pay the kind of money that he has to invest in machines without knowing whether it has been tested, whether it has faults or whether it is a good working model.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — This ought to be done and the information available to him before he goes to purchase his machine.

It is very interesting, as it has been pointed out, that the machinery dealers were very much in favor of AMA. They found it assisted them in selling some lines of machinery that had virtues and that were of a better quality and class than others. They were not afraid and they stood behind the recommendations they made for their machines if they had been tested and approved by AMA. So this was very important, not only from the viewpoint of the dealer, but the viewpoint of the farmer.

I am very pleased that the Minister has put into the Bill the additional features where the new testing institute can go into the development of machines that are not correct and are full of faults and suggest development features that can make them better. This is one of the things I was asking about for the old AMA and I am glad to see that the Minister has included this.

If this is expanded it can become a means whereby machines can be designed and that are designed especially for many of the peculiar conditions that exist in farming in Saskatchewan. And, certainly this Bill enhances the whole agricultural industry. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to congratulate the Minister for bringing this kind of legislation in and I want to congratulate him for being able to get agreement from the other provinces..

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON: — . . . in spite of what the Members opposite prophesied and predicted. We have been able to get three provinces into this venture and certainly the whole western agricultural industry is going to benefit from it.

I certainly will be supporting the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1974

HON. E. I. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, the Bill that is being debated at this time The Act respecting the Agricultural Machinery Institute is one that is of particular interest to me for several reasons. Naturally, one of these reasons is because of its location which it was decided to be in the community of Humboldt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I previously mentioned, in this House, my pleasure and my gratitude on behalf of the community and the surrounding district for this particular decision which was made by "the three prairie provinces in the meeting in Saskatoon recently.

Such an institute in a community of almost 4,000 people will have many benefits, there is no doubt about that. Its impact will be significant, economically as well as socially.

The town of Humboldt is only 70 miles from the University of Saskatchewan, the Saskatoon Campus and no doubt these institutions will need to work in close co-operation and consultation. The easy access between the two of number five highway and the availability of an airstrip in Humboldt: which is to be further improved shortly will enhance the necessary contact between the University and the Prairie Machinery Agricultural Institute.

I said, Mr. Speaker, when I began that the institute that this legislation will make possible is of interest to me for several reasons. Although the importance of its location is of particular interest to me, the fact that the constituency that I represent is basically an agricultural area, makes me aware of the many problems that our Saskatchewan farmers have had to face up to over the years and, in fact, have to face even today.

One of those critical problems has been availability, the costs and the suitability of farm machinery. The concern expressed by the western Premiers regarding the performance of the major suppliers of essential farm production items, including farm machinery, was based on a long period of very inadequate performance by the suppliers, most of which have not located in the West.

The Federal Government's Royal Commission in 1966 which studied the problems on the manufacturing, the sale and the distribution of farm machinery in Canada, is only one example of the documentation that exists to support this, which I have just said. And that Commission recognized, Mr. Speaker, the fact that information pertaining to functioning and performance of farm machinery sold in Canada today is inadequate and their report recommended the establishment of a public program of farm machinery testing.

In the light of this recommendation I am very disappointed that the Government of Canada has taken no positive steps to indicate support for the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute. This seems to me like another example of the Federal Government's complete unconcern with the needs of Canada and particularly western Canada's farmers. Nevertheless, I do hope that through continued negotiations and the realization that the Federal Government is well on the way—and I

stress, is well on the way to losing its only Member in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, heart

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I hope that in light of that that there be some change in their attitude.

Agriculture should be of concern to all of Canada. It is one of the leading industries in this country and programs established to benefit this industry should be of concern to all governments. An important spirit of co-operation is developing between the three prairie provinces and the establishment of this institute is a good example of that co-operation. Hopefully, the Federal Government will soon recognize its responsibility and provide some financial commitment.

Section 20 of this Act provides that the Minister may enter into agreements with the Ministers of Agriculture of other provinces or the Federal Minister of Agriculture. I hope that this, in fact, will be possible at some future time.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is also of particular interest to me because as the Minister of Agriculture said, in his opening remarks when he introduced this Bill and I quote:

This Act is representative of the enlightened progressive legislation brought forward by this New Democratic Government over the last two and one half years.

This Bill will re-establish farm machinery testing which the former Liberal Government destroyed in response to the demands by the machinery manufacturing corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The strings, Mr. Speaker, in 1965 were pulled and those Liberal puppets, who then formed the Government of Saskatchewan, reacted accordingly. I submit to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that if they are given another opportunity in some future time, there is no doubt that the same thing will happen again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is no doubt that they would, once again, take on their very evident role as the apologists for the corporations who provide the campaign funds.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party made a commitment in 1971 that as a government it would give the highest priority to developing our rural agricultural communities. We disagreed with the Liberal policy makers, who in the name of economic efficiency were doing everything in their power to promote even larger corporately managed farms to lessen the population of rural Saskatchewan.

Every move that they seemed to make was based on such positions as outlining in documents as a Task Force on Agriculture that most people of Saskatchewan know so much about. It was they who supported such programs as LIFT in a world that was hungry and starving. It will be they, Mr. Speaker, on whom

March 7, 1974

will lie the guilt if we find our markets in this year or some near future year are jeopardized because of a shortage of supplies of grain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHOEZEWSKI: — We propose certain steps that we would take as a government in this area, Mr. Speaker. Many of those commitments have been carried out. The Land Bank Commission, FarmStart, the Hog Marketing Commission, the reduction of costs of education from property taxes to name only a few. This Bill is another in the series of promises that this Government had delivered on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We made a commitment to re-establish and expand the functions of the Agricultural Machinery Testing program and this Bill does just that.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is also of interest to me because with the rapidly increasing costs of production farmers are experiencing, there is an ever greater need for guarantees that the machinery being sold is of adequate design to meet the needs. One of the functions of the institute will be functional and performance evaluation of farm machinery. In Saskatchewan as in our neighboring provinces there are many small manufacturers and because of their relative smallness in operation they have little or no engineering staff. In my constituency alone there are four such industries, and those industries will benefit greatly from the services of this institute. This will help to make our prairie based companies more competitive and thus lead to increased industrial development. I see the data accumulated by the institute as useful in identifying unjustified prices that I am convinced the large corporate manufacturers are charging for essential products to the farmers. This should be of much assistance to the panels of review which the western premiers agreed to establish before which senior officials of major suppliers of farm machinery would be invited to explain their pricing and sales practices and to answer questions and complaints of western farmers.

Mr. Speaker, our Government has initiated many important undertakings since 1971 in many areas, and this undertaking on behalf of prairie farmers is one of the most important. I am very pleased, to speak in support of this Bill to establish the Agriculture Machinery Institute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Agriculture) Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this Bill I said that it was indeed, a very progressive piece of legislation for the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — When I said., there was silence, from the Members

to your left, silence as there has been during the debate and discussion that has followed since this Bill was given first reading.

I don't think it is really strange, Mr. Speaker..

MR. WIEBE: — We agree with you.

MR. MESSER: — The Member for Morse says he agrees with us, Mr. Speaker. I say the Member for Morse and the few other speakers who spoke to this Bill say that for one reason only and that is they know they made a grave error in 1965 when they terminated the benefits of the Agriculture Machinery Testing Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — They know, Mr. Speaker, that they didn't really warm the hearts of farmers last year when we introduced legislation to establish a machinery board that would give protection to farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan, because they succumbed to the wills and the directions of the corporations who make and manufacture that machinery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:: — That's who wags the tail of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, two Members to your left, two Members of the Opposition had the courage to speak in regard to this particular piece of legislation and in a watered down sort of way they tried to indicate some support. The Member for Moosomin and I believe the Member for Rosthern had a few short remarks to say and I don't really know whether he spoke directly to this Bill. It could have been that he was participating in some other debate. He sometimes rambles around a great deal, but he however did make some reference to the machinery testing Bill. He said, Mr. Speaker, that in his mind the farmers were the best people in the world, the best people in the province to test machinery. I don't really disagree with him. But he stopped there. Yes, the farmers are the best people to test machinery and the machinery companies for decades have been using them to test that machinery and at the expense of the Saskatchewan farmer. We had an Agriculture Machinery Testing Association Act that gave some protection to those farmers so they had some basic knowledge and some basic information in regard to what machinery would do before they purchased it. That government, those Members to your left when they were the government between 1964—71 terminated that activity, Mr. Speaker, at great cost. At great cost not only to Saskatchewan farmers, but to prairie farmers, Canadian farmers, to North American farmers because those reports were sent not only to farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan but to farmers all across North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Moosomin had a few other

things to say. He talked a little longer than did the Member for Rosthern. He said that their reason for terminating the AMA in 1965 was that they realized it couldn't survive as a provincial agency only. Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no truth to that. There was no financial problem, there was no staff problem in regard to the operations of the AMA in 1965. None whatsoever. It was a decision made deliberately on behalf of the Liberal Government because the machine companies had told them that they didn't want this thorn in their side, Mr. Speaker. He tried to tell us that they had to expand and because they couldn't expand they had to terminate it. He even had, Mr. Speaker, the unmitigated gall to state in the House that they had attempted to negotiate with the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta to have a prairie regional machinery testing institute. I am sorry the Member isn't in his seat, Mr. Speaker. I have asked the staff of the departments of Agriculture in Manitoba and Alberta whether they could ever recall any sincere endeavor or at least indications to negotiate with those provinces from Saskatchewan during 1964 and 1971 in regard to establishing a prairie institute for machinery testing. In both instances, Mr. Speaker, they could recall no communication, no endeavor, no intentions coming from the Liberal Party of the day to establish a prairie machinery testing institute. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is again talking from his seat and I note he didn't want to take part in the debate. Perhaps he is the only one that doesn't really agree with the formation of the Prairie Machinery Institute for testing farm machinery.

If he will recall, he was sitting as a Member, a backbencher of the Government when I came into this Legislature in 1967. I believe it was at the first session that I introduced a resolution asking that they reinstate the Agriculture Machinery Testing Association, and if they couldn't do it on a provincial basis that they endeavor to do it on a prairie basis. The Members of the government of the day, Mr. Speaker, 'spoke against that resolution and they defeated that resolution, Mr. Speaker. Defeated that resolution! It was one more nail in the coffin of the Liberal Government when their election came along in 1971. They voted against it, each and every one of those Members who was lucky enough to return to this House as Opposition Members, voted against that motion at that time.

Another resolution that was introduced between 1967-71 . . .

MR. WEATHERALD: — On a Point of Order. I am enjoying the ramblings of the Minister, but I understand the rule that you are not to introduce new material in closing debate. He can go ahead if he wishes, but we will do the same when we have the opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: — The rules are that you can't introduce new material but you can answer charges or statements made during the debate. You can't introduce new evidence altogether.

MR. MESSER:: — Mr. Speaker, I think we are getting to the soft underbelly of the Liberal Opposition right now. Because he knows full well he sat in his chair while the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) said that they had endeavored to establish a prairie machinery testing institute. He knows full well that

they made no such endeavor and no such effort, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — It hurts them to have brought to their attention resolutions that were introduced by the Opposition, if they had been a responsible government which accepted them but they did not. It hurts them to have this brought back to their attention knowing that their ignorance and their refusal to recognize and accept these resolutions was one of the reasons that they weren't returned to power in the last provincial election.

The Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) says that he doesn't agree with me that it wasn't really ignorance. I must admit I should retract that, it wasn't ignorance; it was taking orders from those corporations that manufacture the machinery at the cost and sometimes the detriment to prairie farmers.

Mr. Speaker, there was another very, very interesting resolution and some interesting debates that were carried on with regard to the need for the testing of farm machinery in this Legislature in the late 1960s and early 1970s. They related directly to the Barber Commission, the Royal Commission in regard to farm machinery. That Commission was established in 1966 and there was various information coming from Dr. Barber in the Commission between the years 1966 and 1971 when a final report was tabled. When that final report was tabled a resolution was introduced by the New Democratic Opposition in this Legislature to have the provincial and federal governments take action in regard to establishing machinery testing institutes across Canada, one of them being located in the Province of Saskatchewan, or at least in the Prairie Basin. Again, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day refused to agree to and allow that resolution to pass, because again they were showing where their sympathies were and where their real concern was and that was with the machine manufacturers and not the farmers who were purchasing those machines and who were so highly dependent and relied to such a great extent on those machines to carry out the duties that they had to have them do in relatively short periods of time in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Again the short debate that took place by the Members to your left, I think only in an attempt to indicate to the people of Saskatchewan that they really aren't all bad. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if they ever had an opportunity, and I doubt very much whether they ever will because I don't expect to see them sitting to the right of you again, Mr. Speaker. But if they ever had an opportunity we can be sure that they would do exactly the same thing with the Prairie Agriculture Machinery Institute as they did with the AMA (Agriculture Machinery Association). That is one good reason for having not only a Saskatchewan Machinery Testing Institute, but a Prairie Machinery Testing Institute, so that they would have to contend with the governments of both Alberta and Manitoba before they would be able to again destroy a most valuable service for all farmers of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1974

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, after having said those brief words in closing debate on the Act to establish the Prairie Agriculture Machinery Institute, I take great pleasure in moving second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS—44
Messieurs

Blakeney	Kwasnica	Feschuk
Dyck	Carlson	Flasch
Meakes	Engel	Steuart
Smishek	Cody	Loken
Romanow	Tchorzewski	Guy
Messer	Taylor	Boldt
Snyder	Matsalla	Grant
Kramer	Faris	MacDonald (Milestone)
Larson	Owens	Gardner
Kowalchuk	Mostoway	Weatherald
Brockelbank	Gross	Lane
Pepper	Rolfes	MacDonald (Moose Jaw)
Thorson	Hanson	Wiebe
Whelan	Oliver	Malone

NAYS—00
Messieurs
Nil

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. E. L. Tchorzewski that Bill-No. 50—**An Act to amend The School Act** be now read a second time.

HON. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI:(Minister of Culture and Youth): — Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions spoken on some of the issues that are included in this Bill, but I want at this time to say a few words in support of it, in this debate.

The Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) deserves, I think, a great deal of congratulations for having in the past and now in this legislation brought in legislation that meets the needs that evolve with the changes in our society. The amendments to Section 105(a) and 118 are certainly very welcome.

In a democratic system all communities involved in any institution should have a right to be represented in decision making. The amendment which will provide representation for Indian Reserves on school boards where there exists an agreement by which educational services are provided by a school district will certainly be welcome by most people. I submit that this provision is long overdue.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, society has looked upon our handicapped as people apart and we have tended to remove these

people from the mainstream of life. I welcome the amendment which gives recognition to education of the handicapped as an integral feature of public education.

Mr. Speaker, if I may touch on the part of the Bill that I want to spend the most time on, I want to begin by saying that for a long time in North America, particularly in Canada, we have been looking at something in a mistaken way. We have looked at Canada and we have called it a Canadian mosaic. Yet if you look at the situation as it really is, Mr. Speaker, I think you would find that that is not really so. You would find that as early as 1958 and even today in the United States there was more radio broadcasting in languages other than English or French than there was in Canada. I think that that seems to be a contradiction of the melting pot versus the mosaic. I think if you look further at incidents that have happened recently in Canada, it is very unfortunate that they have in fact happened. You will find that there is another contradiction. As I mentioned in the previous debate in this House, several months ago, there has been an incident where the CBC because of direction by higher management has cancelled the program in the Maritimes, that was broadcast to a large number of people who spoke the Gaelic language and therefore the program was being broadcast in the Gaelic language. That program has now been cancelled. The excuse or the reason given for the cancellation of that program was that if it was allowed to continue it may serve as a radio tower of Babel, particularly in western Canada. So you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think that the old attempt at definition at the cultural composition of North America which attempted to say that there was a total melting pot in the United States and a Canadian mosaic in Canada is completely accurate. Because I do not believe that there has been a total melting pot in the United States and I do not believe that we have really conscientiously made the kind of strong effort that we should have been making, although there are certainly things happening in the last very few years, to really develop a truly Canadian mosaic.

I see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in society today a revitalization for a renewed interest by the people who live in North America in their cultural heritage and in their background. I think that when the early people came to western Canada, I know that some of the first people who immigrated here did not understand or speak the English language. Their children who are the second generation began to learn that English language but they retained the language of their homeland. The third generation on the other hand, because of the kinds of social pressures that in some situations existed and because of the emphasis put on the fact that in order to become part of the mainstream of life in the society in which they were living or in order to have a share in the power structure of that society, they had to become assimilated and become stereotyped and so by the time that this third generation was growing up and getting into the mainstream of life in this country and throughout North America, in many cases they had forgotten the language of the homeland of their grandparents or great grand- parents. But an interesting thing has been happening and the interesting thing is that in the fourth generation there is a renewed interest in that past and there is a renewed desire to find out more about the origin of their ancestors. I think that is very exciting and very worthwhile. Because of this there is, as I have said, a revitalization of the desire to maintain the heritage of our forefathers on the part of all of

the different peoples who have come to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned before in this House that I consider there is very great value in the concept of multiculturalism. I think it leads to many things and one of them is that it leads to a greater understanding by people of each other. I think we have in this country and particularly in Saskatchewan a better example of the United Nations and what the United Nations should and could be doing than the United Nations itself because we have people who have come here and have lived together and have got to know the differences that exist one from the other because of their particular cultural background and have gotten to understand them. I still think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that because of that there is probably less prejudice and less suspicion and less hatred in this province and in this country than there is in most other countries of the world.

Now some claim that stressing the development of multiculturalism within a Canadian concept takes away from a Canadian identity. I don't agree. I don't think that is the case at all. I don't think that everyone in this country has to totally give up their cultural background in order for this country to develop a Canadian identity. I don't think that that has to be totally given up in order for this country to have a strong unity. I think that in the diversity that is found in a multicultural society we can have a stronger unity because of the understanding that is created. A stronger unity that is based on that unique kind of diversity. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I think that this amendment to this Bill which will provide the opportunity for people at the local level, for people in their communities to decide if they want to teach some of the subject matter in their schools in a language other than English or French depending on the composition of the community. I consider this amendment as small as it may seem written into this legislation to be one of the most significant pieces of legislation that will be presented in this House in this Session. I think it will have far-reaching impact. I think it will have more impact in the long range than a lot of the legislation that has been introduced into this House for a number of years.

It is not new, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this provision was in The School Act of Saskatchewan prior to 1919 but it was in 1919 when it was removed and it was removed..

MR. CODY: — Liberals . . .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes it was, Mr. Member for Watrous, but it was removed not so much because it was a Liberal Government in power, I'm not saying that, it was removed because of the tone of that particular day. It was removed because it was the time of the World War and it was removed because people were more concerned about the 'isms' of the day, be they Kaiserisms or Bolshevism or whatever other 'isms' were predominant in those days. It was removed because those 'isms' led to suspicion and hatred in the world that I think we are very fortunate that we have gotten away from in 1974. So it is not a new provision. It is here again because we have gotten over that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think we are better off because of it.

Now I want to say a few more words on this matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and therefore at this time I wish to adjourn

the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Robbins that Bill No. 29 – **An Act to Establish a Saskatchewan Development Fund** be now read a second time.

MR. D. G. STEUART: (Opposition Leader) Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are attempting to make a great deal out of the idea of a Saskatchewan Development Fund. As the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) pointed out, the Fund is not only unnecessary but I think it is unfair. To begin with, there are a great variety of mutual funds or other ways of investing if the people want to invest their money in Saskatchewan enterprises, if they want to invest in registered saving plans or registered pension plans. There are a variety on the market, they have been tested, you can find out how safe they are and you can have your investment about any way you want it. You can have it in a growth fund where you take some risks and they invest a great deal of money in so-called growth stocks, you can invest it in funds that will give you a guaranteed return, or you can invest it in Canada Savings Bonds or debentures that are on a fixed rate of interest for a fixed length of time as far as the investment is concerned. Now when this was first talked about I thought that the Government opposite was really going to do something exciting, that they were going to talk about taking things like the Power Corporation and Telephones and their shares in the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, which are very profitable, and their shares in the Sodium Sulphate Plant which includes the mine and plant, which have been very profitable over the years, and make them the basis for a development fund. Invite people to take part in these not only in an investment way but also to give them some control, maybe at the beginning not total control but as they developed the Saskatchewan Development Corporation would eventually control all the Crown corporations we have and would also seek out new investments. I thought this was the idea behind this when it was first talked about but it isn't. This is an investment fund and, as I say, if it was really going to add something new to the Province of Saskatchewan I think that we would welcome it but it is not.

There is another interesting part about it, they are going to guarantee the investment. Well, if anyone looks at the performance of investment funds, of mutual funds over the last two or three years since about 1968, their performance has not been that good. As a matter of fact some of them have had a very poor performance. Their performance is based on the bond market and the stock market and the performance of both the bond market and stock market has been anywhere from fair to poor since about 1968 and they don't show any great signs of improving.

Now if we are going to be involved in the same kind of thing through this investment fund there will be considerable risk involved. There is wide latitude for the investment of funds in bonds and equity shares and so on and we would be taking the same risk. I don't know who is going to run this fund, who is going to manage it. The defeated candidate from Lakeview, Mr. Keith . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — How about the candidate from Prince Albert West?

MR. STEUART: — Well, you could do a lot worse, but he is a doctor, he is practising medicine. His name is Hjertass (the defeated candidate from Prince Albert West) and I don't think he is really interested in running this fund. The one before that is a lawyer and he might be interested but you should leave him in Prince Albert. So I guess this is what Mr. Keith is going to do, I don't know. Outside of his qualifications as a school teacher and as a defeated NDP candidate, I would question very seriously his ability to manage or be one of the senior management consultants or personnel in the operation of such a fund. I hope that he is not the manager. I don't object to him being given a job after he was defeated, in fact even before he was defeated he was given the job, but certainly it could be a disaster for the people of Saskatchewan if they put him in charge of operating this fund and I hope they won't. Regardless of whom they put in charge, to attract the kind of people that can run an investment fund like this is going to be very difficult.

On top of that they say they are going to guarantee this fund. Well, what does that mean? It means that they are going to place the money of the people of Saskatchewan behind the performance of this fund. They are prepared to take the investment that people have in this province in their pension plans, they can raid pension plans, they can do all sorts of things, they are given very wide powers under the Bill that we are now considering. They are given equally wide powers the way they are allowed to invest the money, both that they can take from these trust funds and the pension plans and also the funds that are entrusted to them by the people of Saskatchewan and they are going to guarantee them. They won't have any more wisdom, in fact they will be lucky if they have the experience of the Investors' Syndicate and the experience of which a whole host of other mutual and trust funds have, and they haven't always been that successful. So if this fails, and it can, if it loses money it means that eventually the people of Saskatchewan will have to put up the difference. The people who put up the difference will be all the people; they will be the people who invested in this and the people who didn't invest in it. The people who didn't invest in it would be mainly poor people. You are not going to get your investment from the people in the lower income bracket. First they haven't got the money to invest and second, they don't think about investments. You may educate some of them, you may convince some of them that this is the way to save their money but by and large your investment will come from people in middle and upper income brackets. And so you are saying to these people: "Invest your money and we will take the credit of the province and will guarantee it." You are saying to the poor people: "If anything goes wrong we will take some of the money you pay in the Education and Health tax, some of the money you pay in gas tax, some of the money you pay in normal taxes, and we are prepared to use it to back up the investments of people in the middle and upper income brackets.

If you said, we are going to have an investment fund and we are going to invest in the following securities, the following equity stocks and so on and then you invited the people to invest and said, you can trust us, we will hire sound people, we will do our best to see that they invest money in sound,

growing and safe enterprises, that would be one thing. If you said, we want to take this money and invest it mostly in enterprises that are here in Saskatchewan but clearly pointed out the risk, I wouldn't agree with it, I would think it was unnecessary, I would think that it was wrong, not an activity that the Government should be involved in but at least the people would be paying their money and they would be taking a chance and there would be no risk for people who can't invest. There will be a risk for people of the province who don't invest because they are guaranteeing it. When the Province of Saskatchewan guarantees something they put all the money of all the people in this province behind it.

Let's take a look at some of the things they have invested in already. I hope that the Premier will turn this over to a totally different set of people than those who have been advising him up to this point on investments. I go back to Intercontinental Packers. I don't suppose in the history of the province has there been a poorer investment, a more outrageous investment by any government including the Big River Mill investment for \$10.2 million. You could have bought five Big River Mills for that amount. I notice that the Timber Board, and the Big River Mill is a very integral part of the Timber Board, made over \$1 million this year. So I guess it hasn't been too bad. However, I challenge the Premier to table the last financial statement, profit and loss sheet, of Intercontinental. We have \$10.2 million worth of Intercontinental shares, we are 45 per cent owners, but for that amount of money we should be 120 per cent owners. We not only should, for \$10.2 million, own 100 per cent of Intercontinental, we should have owned at least 120 or 130 per cent of it. However, let the Premier show the people of Saskatchewan what keen judges they are of a good investment, let him show the people of Saskatchewan what wisdom they have in investing their money. We know the financial statement of IPSCO, they bought shares of \$16 or \$17, which have dropped in value since. However, I am sure IPSCO is having an excellent year. I hope they are. Their statements are public, but we don't know what Intercontinental is doing. So I would suggest, though the Premier of course won't, nor will any Members of the Government press him that he make public the statement of Intercontinental as their competitors' statements are public. If they did, I think they would find out from this last year that it was not only a terrible investment from the point of view that we paid two or three times too much for what we got but also the return on our investment would be something less than one per cent. In fact I would predict that it would be less than half of one per cent on the amount of money we invested. The Premier is frowning but I am sure if he tabled a profit and loss statement of Intercontinental we would see that 45 per cent of the net profit would be less than one-half of one percent of \$10.2 million that we invested in buying 45 per cent of their shares.

However, I merely point that out to say that we hope, and I am sure the people of this province hope, that that isn't the type of investment that this fund will be involved in. So please when you find some people I hope you don't depend on Mr. Keith, I hope you don't depend on the people on each side of you or back of you. I hope that you go out and find some people outside of the Government and your immediate advisors to operate this fund. If you don't, you can't hurt the people who have invested in it because you have guaranteed it. But it certainly will be a bad investment for the people of the

Province of Saskatchewan.

Somebody over there mentioned the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds and two or three of the backbenchers talked about why we had stopped when we were the government, the offering of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds. If it is such a good thing why don't they reinstate it—put it back on the market. The reason was very simple: There was nothing wrong with Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, in fact they were an excellent investment both for the public and they were a good venture for the Government at one time. But two things happened, the interest rates grew so rapidly that all we were getting the last two or three years was people rolling over or selling the investment – the Saskatchewan Savings Bonds they had bought one year to buy the ones next year because the interest rate was 1½ or 1 per cent higher. At the same time under the Federal Liberal Government, and the institution of the Canada Pension Plan, a great deal of money all the money that comes from Saskatchewan or almost all of the money invested in the Canada Pension Plan is offered back to the Province of Saskatchewan to use for the Power Corporation and the telephones and so on. This was an excellent source of funds and with the result that the Province of Saskatchewan has had to go to the market for very little funds, with the result that we didn't need this kind of funds, it wasn't necessary. But if the Members want to see it instituted it might be all right now if interest rates level out or start to go down. But if long-term interest rates continue to climb the Saskatchewan Savings bonds would be in just as much trouble as they were in the last few years that they existed.

This is totally different. It is not money for the government – it is a form of investment for the people. I don't think it is necessary. I don't think you have shown us that you have the people to operate the fund. I don't think you have shown us that there is not money available for investment in Saskatchewan and if that is so it is your fault. There was lots of money available for investment in Saskatchewan. The political and business climate in this province has deteriorated very rapidly since you became the government and if there is any shortage and I am sure there is shortage of investment capital available to this province, I am sure that this little plan won't change that. What would change it is a change in attitude of the government opposite. What would really change it is a change of government which I am sure the people will take advantage of at the first opportunity.

Anyway I am not going to support this. I don't think it is necessary. I think it is unfair to the people who will not be investing in it. You are not giving them any choice of what you are doing with their money and the chances of it succeeding, I think, are extremely slim.

I hope that when the Minister, whoever is in charge, gets up to close the debate, he will tell us exactly who the top two or three people are that are going to operate this fund, the kind of money you are going to pay them; and what experience and what background they have. Because I think it is important for the people of the province to know that this fund will succeed, if the people that you hire to operate the fund know what they are talking about and have some experience. You may have told us who is going to operate it, I don't know. If you have, I have missed it. All I know is that the rumors are that you hired Keith, whether you hired him to run this or to be

one of the senior people in it I don't know. I hope the Minister when he closes debate will give us this information.

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY: (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Are you gentlemen finished. Okay. You were finished years ago.

Mr. Speaker, to me Bill No. 28 embodies in it a principle which no true citizen of this province can argue with. This is the principle allowing Saskatchewan citizens to invest in their province through a fund which will belong to all the people of the province.

It will ensure to all people in the province wishing to invest in the fund, that capital would, in the main, remain in the province and not be drained off across its borders either to other provinces or foreign countries.

May I say this knowledge would be very desirable because many investment companies operating in the province today have the appearance of being Saskatchewan or Saskatchewan based or Canadian, but in reality they aren't. They are American owned.

Mr. Speaker, why should hard earned Saskatchewan money be drained out of this province? Why do Members opposite wish this to be so? Will contributions to their party possibly dry up if they do not plead the case on behalf of big business? Mr. Speaker, the prosperous and efficient Crown corporations which operate in Saskatchewan help keep Saskatchewan money in Saskatchewan. Would Members opposite advocate that they be dissolved? I know they did at one time. They said they wouldn't get off the ground. Now they want to take a little bit of credit for some of them. Anyway, I think not, because all people know that they have been, are and will continue to be tremendous successes.

Mr. Speaker, I predict the same tremendous success for the Saskatchewan Development Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the other day the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) mentioned something about corporate food chains and what a sorry situation they find themselves in. I think he mentioned that their rate of profit wasn't very great. I should like to remind him that maybe percentage wise it isn't very great. But based on the tremendous volume that they have, the profits really are fantastic.

I should also like to say that for the most part, when people in Saskatchewan do invest, money usually ends up in the pockets of Americans. I think Canadian pockets, Saskatchewan pockets should come first.

MR. LANE: — Where are your statistics?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Don't bother me with statistics at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that there are in reality, contrary to what the Member who is now talking said the other

March 7, 1974

day, very few Canadian investment companies. I think this is evidenced by the fact that even the Federal Government is very concerned about this. I believe that they have in the past given serious consideration to setting up -wholly Canadian investment companies. In fact, they are bending over backwards to try and keep money in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to mention something on Canada Savings Bonds. There you have an example of a Canadian government that asks people to invest in the country. I say that the Saskatchewan Development Fund is simply asking the same thing. It is odd that you would oppose this but I don't think that you would oppose Canada Savings Bonds or not advocate of the buying of them issued by the Federal Liberal Government.

MR. LANE: — Freedom of choice . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Freedom of choice, that is exactly what; it's going to be, Mr. Opposition Member. It is going to be freedom of choice for the people here. If they want to invest, they may. If they don't, they don't have to. There will be absolutely no compulsion.

In regard to some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, I should like to say to him that the performance of many of these investment companies which operate in Saskatchewan really are not known, by the average layman. I believe there was a CBC program a couple of weeks ago where a group of independent experts from the business world came out with a list where investment companies were put in order as to their possibly being desirable for people to invest in. I can truthfully say that some of the opinions that I had about these private investment companies simply had to go down the drain after listening to that particular program.

I believe that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned something about the political and. a business climate not being conducive to investment in Saskatchewan. I really don't know to whom you fellows talk, but if you go out into the country, to the small towns, and if you go to the cities, that just isn't so. That is just a bunch of hogwash. Even Liberals are now openly admitting in this province that the political, the business, you name it, any kind of climate, has never been as good as it is now in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I will have some more words to say on this; therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 26—**An Act to provide Assistance for the Promotion and Development of markets for Agricultural Products produced in Saskatchewan.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the proposed Agricultural

Products Marketing Development Act, I wish first to review the objectives which the Government of Saskatchewan has established in the area of agricultural marketing. And to outline briefly the role the market development fund can play in achieving these objectives.

The concept of an agricultural development market fund is not really new for the Government of Saskatchewan nor for the Department of Agriculture. A number of projects similar to those anticipated under the proposed Bill have been carried out during the past year or 'more using funds provided in the Department of Agriculture budget. Assistance was also provided to a number of agricultural co-operatives and companies operating in Saskatchewan to encourage the production and development of markets for new agricultural products, new primary products of this province.

Assistance to these agencies resulted in the development of promising new markets for products such as field peas, fababeans and winter wheat. Our experience with these programs indicates that a market development fund can be a most valuable tool in improving and developing markets for our agricultural products.

The Government of Saskatchewan has established a number of production objectives for agricultural commodities produced in this province which it feels are necessary to develop a stable and more prosperous agricultural community, economy and industry.

However, it is evident that achievement of these production objectives will necessitate significant improvement of the present marketing systems that we have. As an example, the Government; would, like to expand the marketing of hogs from their present levels to 3 million annually within, the next 10 years. I think that objective may be a difficult undertaking, Mr. Speaker, in light of the prosperous grain sales at the highest prices that farmers have ever had. However, I think it is during these times that if we are able to establish and expand a livestock industry that we will truly and surely be able to reach a viable agricultural economy in this province.

Another important objective of the Government is to expand the cow herd by 7,500 head per year over the next 10 years, with a greater proportion of our beef production finished and slaughtered, processed and packaged in this province rather than to have them shipped out of the province to our sister provinces of Manitoba or Alberta. It would, be preferable to have the jobs filled that are needed here in order to slaughter and process those animals rather than by people who emigrate from Saskatchewan to those provinces.

Similar objectives are desirable for other commodities, such as sheep and milk and poultry and specialty crops. It is clear that the present marketing systems in some cases will be unable effectively to handle these increases in production as our dependence on export markets will be much greater in the future.

I believe that a market development fund will be a most important; tool in developing markets for commodities in years ahead. While a sellers' market exists for all commodities produced in Saskatchewan at the present time, it is also obvious that developing markets for these commodities in the years

March 7, 1974

ahead will offer a tremendous challenge. This challenge will necessitate the continued development of new food products, merchandizing techniques and improved market organization. Many overseas buyers of our meat and grain products are now contemplating ways of securing products to service their countries and customers on a continuous basis and in a manner that will give them confidence in us as a continuous supplier.

If Saskatchewan and other exporting provinces of Canada do not quickly determine the long-run opportunities which exist in all markets of the world for the types of products required in the years ahead we may find our products being purchased only as a residual source when our competitors fail to meet the total demand by purchasing or importing from other places.

The Market Development Fund will provide new means to insure that Saskatchewan agricultural products have the opportunity of being marketed in a manner which will maximize producer return and yet satisfy our customers with the type and quality of product they desire. This fund will be available under the proposed Market Development Fund Act, to contemplate marketing assistance, provided by the Federal Government. It will be sufficiently flexible to permit us to act virtually on any type of bottleneck in our marketing system. As well, it will permit joint projects to be undertaken by two or more companies and with assistance from our Department, marketing specials.

It will also undertake and promote joint participation on a regional basis, joint participation not only coming from regions within Saskatchewan, but participation coming from other prairie provinces such as Manitoba and Alberta.

I have stated our objectives to increase agricultural output in general as a means to increase the well-being of producers; increased opportunities for employment in secondary industries and enable maximum retention of family farms and prosperous rural communities.

The fund, under the Market Development Fund Act, will offer the opportunity for better resource utilization in all regions of the province by ensuring to a greater extent that new crops and products have an opportunity for succeeding and to reach success in Saskatchewan. With this in mind, I should like to outline some of the specific objectives of The Market Development Fund.

Grants from the fund will be made to agencies and to individuals in Saskatchewan to encourage the identification and the development of potential markets of agricultural products. This type of assistance will contribute to the overall objective; of achieving: a sustained increase in exports from the province of agricultural products. Grants will also be made from the funds to encourage and to assist in the innovative development of new products that have a potential in a new or existing marketplace.

The major emphasis here will be to encourage additional processing of agricultural products within Saskatchewan, not only in the larger urban centres, but also in the smaller centres which are in so great a need for some sort of supplemental activity in order to sustain or allow their population to grow.

The Market Development Fund will also provide the initiative for the analysis of existing marketing systems. Studies in this area will identify problem areas and propose correction action with respect to existing institutions and traditional marketing procedures.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, assistance will be available from The Market Development Fund to enable producers to design improved marketing systems for their products and to assist marketing agencies in improving their marketing techniques.

The proposed legislation will establish a committee responsible to the Minister of Agriculture, with the authority to disperse funds and to initiate projects which will contribute to market development for all agricultural products. The proposed legislation will significantly improve the effectiveness of efforts in market development and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that this Bill receive the unanimous approval of all Members of the House.

MR. E. F. GARDNER: (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, in looking at this Bill we note that there are a lot of very worthwhile sounding projects. We are certainly not opposed to grants to any organizations or groups of people to further the marketing of agricultural products. In fact it is being done now and it could be expanded without a group or a fund such as this.

Our chief objection to this particular Bill is that there seems to be almost no participation by anyone except the people completely under control of the Minister. It is dominated by the Government. You will notice the committee is made up with a Deputy Minister of Agriculture, employee of the Department of Finance", an employee of the Department of Industry and not less than two persons appointed by the Minister. There doesn't seem to be any provision for producers, there doesn't seem to be any provision for major farm organizations or other farm groups who would have some input to this committee. It appears that this is further strengthening or making additions to the Government bureaucracy, more control of the affairs of the rural people by the Minister of Agriculture and the people who are directly under his control.

You will notice in Section 9, for example, the Minister may appoint an employee of the Department of Agriculture for secretary. You will notice in Section 17 that he may appoint or engage consultants and the engaging of consultants has been a favourite ploy of this Government in the past year to pay out a lot of Government funds to political people for some project that is of dubious value.

The fact is there doesn't seem to be any rural participation in it; there doesn't seem to be any place for producers to elect people to this committee, to have any say in who is going to be on it; or how the funds are going to be distributed and in view of this we should like to take a further look at the Bill and at this time I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

March 7, 1974

HON. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services) moved second, reading of Bill No. 60—**An Act respecting Government Purchases.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 60 respecting Government purchases, maintains the function of Government purchasing under the Bill as it was in the past, the Act being known in the past as The Purchasing Agency Act, which will upon passage of this Bill be repealed and be henceforth known as The Purchasing Act, 1974.

Contained within the Bill there is no major change in policy, if in fact any change in policy. There is some clarification with regard to the dispersal of funds obtained in the sale of goods by the Purchasing Agency.

In the past if funds were obtained from a consolidated fund in the original purchase, upon the sale of the item the funds went back to the consolidated fund. If the funds came from an accountable advance they went back to the advance account upon sale of the item. This clarifies that funds coming from other sources as going back to those sources upon the sale of any particular item by the Purchasing Agency. This would also cover Crown corporations. The practice was carried out in the past and this merely seeks to clarify what has been done.

There are some new provisions with regard to establishing of standards in the Bill and this deals with standards for supplies which may be purchased. It was felt it was necessary to establish and maintain standards and this Bill will provide that.

The other changes in the Bill are of a housekeeping nature and, as I said in the opening remarks, the essential functions of The Purchasing Agency Act, will be continued in the purchasing function under the Department of Government Services rather than as a separate agency.

With those brief remarks I would move second reading of this Bill.

MR. H. E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I probably have a few words to say on this Bill, so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 61—**An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Telecommunications Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this act has solely to do with the statutory borrowing limit of the Saskatchewan Crown corporation, Saskatchewan Telecommunications. This Bill, in essence will raise the statutory borrowing limits from \$175 million to \$250 million. We anticipate that this will be sufficient limit on the statutory size for the foreseeable and predictable future.

With those words I would move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Minister of Government Services) moved second reading of Bill No. 62—**An Act to amend The Rural Telephone Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 62 an Act to amend The Rural Telephone Act is a Bill put forward with a number of amendments which are intended to further enhance the principle of the Bill, which I think, in part, can be stated as assistance to rural telephone companies in Saskatchewan to carry out their programs that will benefit the people of rural Saskatchewan.

The Government of Saskatchewan has followed an aggressive policy of late with regard to rural telephone companies and assistance thereto. Recently grants have been increased from 33 1/3 per cent to 50 per cent for rural telephone companies with regard to the cost of wire and cable. This program has shown good progress and we anticipate that the increase in the amount of grants will further increase the amount of work that is done by rural telephone companies in Saskatchewan.

SaskTel now does all of the engineering for the rural telephone companies with regard to new installations and this is also responsible, in part, for advancing the principle that we would like to make rural Saskatchewan a better place to live for the people of rural Saskatchewan.

At this present time along the same line, the Government has put forward through SaskTel a pilot project which is being implemented in the Saskatoon area dealing with rural telephone companies. This is a program designed to meet the unserved demands for service in areas that are serviced by rural telephone companies.

I might say in regard to this pilot project that very good progress is being made at this time and we anticipate an acceleration of the whole area of rural telephone development in Saskatchewan.

The Bill, in particular, I would say has a most important feature and that is to remove the eight per cent limit on loans that rural telephone companies require for their programs. There was a statutory limit suggesting that rural telephone companies could not pay more than eight per cent for money for projects which they wished to carry out. We find some rural telephone companies are having difficulty obtaining sufficient funds to carry out their rural telephone program at that present interest rate.

The other items which are dealt with in the Bill are of a miscellaneous minor nature, such as membership rights to a non-farm subscriber, as is the case more and more in this day and age; discontinuance of a \$5 membership fee, which in practice is hardly ever paid anyway. The practice will be that when a person engages the service of a rural telephone company they will automatically become a member and they will cease to be a member of the telephone company when they cease to contract that service from the rural telephone company.

The Bill seeks to clarify the rural telephone company's right to place telephone wires underground on public roads. No serious problem is being felt in this area but, as I say, clarification is required.

March 7, 1974

Another Section deals -with the permitting of urban municipalities to tax pole yards of rural telephone companies. There was some unclear section of the Act, which I think will be clarified by the changes that are made in the proposals. The final item, of miscellaneous nature in this particular Bill, deals with payment of short-term loans out of a special account without the countersignature of the Minister, which was the case in the past and is really quite unnecessary in the operation of the rural telephone companies.

I might say that the amendments that are being offered here have been discussed thoroughly with the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Telephone Companies and they find themselves in agreement. As a matter of fact they probably initiated most of the changes themselves. This will assist them carrying out their work in rural telephones in Saskatchewan.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. G. B. GRANT: (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister has properly described the Bill and it does tidy up a few sections that need updating.

With reference to subsection (1) of Section 26, I would expect that the Minister would give a little more detail in Committee because this is an area where there could be a conflict between his Department and the Department of Highways when we start crossing roads and it seems to be a pretty straightforward authority to cut through roads to lay cables and telephone wires. I know the relationship has been fairly good between Highways and Telephones, but on one occasion in 1969 or '70 when we last had a big flood, the relationship wasn't very good between EMO and Telephones when we breached a road out at Craven to let the water through and we cut all the services between Regina and Saskatoon. Feelings ran quite high because no consultation had taken place with Telephones and we cut their main cable. That wasn't the Highway Department, that was EMO.

We certainly support these amendments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse): — I'd like to make a few comments regarding this Bill and voice my objections to some portions of the Bill.

Parts of the Bill I can certainly agree with, parts which allow for more assistance to rural telephone companies in terms of technical assistance and hopefully financial. The removal of the eight per cent limit on loans I definitely cannot agree with. I think this is one area in which Saskatchewan Government Telephones in light of the fantastic surplus which SaskTel is showing this year, could aid rural telephone companies in Saskatchewan.

What we have seen in Saskatchewan this winter has been one of the hardest winters that the farmers in the rural areas have had to face. This winter has been an extreme hardship on rural telephone companies in Saskatchewan. Repair bills for lines and other facilities are going to mean substantial increases in 1974 rental rates and also into 1975. Some of the

rural telephone company equipment throughout the province is outdated and is going to require a massive injection of funds in the following years. If they are to keep up the standard of telephone lines which we now have in the province they are going to require funds.

One of the biggest expenses that rural telephone companies face today, of course, is their interest rate. It is quite true that because of this eight per cent limit they may not be able to obtain money from banks and credit unions because of the high cost of borrowing today. This is where I feel the Provincial Government should step in and provide the funds necessary for the rural telephone companies to finance their expansion and their upgrading of their rural telephone lines.

As well, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to reflect on what is happening to the rural telephone system in Saskatchewan. It is quite evident that it is vital, I feel, that cable be laid to every rural farm and subscriber in Saskatchewan. Here again we are falling far behind Alberta.

Alberta this year was able to announce that each and every subscriber in the Province of Alberta was serviced by cable. This, Mr. Speaker, I think is an accomplishment that by far brings credit to the Province of Alberta. We in Saskatchewan, should follow that lead, our efforts should be directed towards installing cable to every farm in the province. One can look at the cost that may be involved. Certainly it's not going to be a cheap exercise, the total capital costs are going to run around \$60 million. It is something that this province can do in light of the fact that we this year are going to be experiencing one of the largest budgets this province has ever come down with.

I think as well, Mr. Speaker, the profits which SaskTel has enjoyed over the years are certainly ample enough to help finance the burying of cable throughout this province.

These are just a few of the comments which I would like to say tonight. There are many more comments and many more suggestions and ideas regarding cable and some of the problems which rural telephone companies find themselves in in Saskatchewan and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 64—**An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this is a . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is that your fan section?

MR. ROMANOW: — That's right.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You've got to get a cheer somewhere.

MR. ROMANOW: — That's right, I need it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You and Cody.

MR. ROMANOW: — That's right. Any time I

March 7, 1974

look over at you guys, I need lots of encouragement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Pretty hard to take, I'll tell you.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I hope this is a non-controversial amendment to The Conditional Sales Act. The effect of the amendment is as follows, rather there are basically three major effects of this amendment. I think we can discuss more details of it in Committee of the Whole, but one effect is to limit the time that a secured party has to provide a discharge on demand.

The Act presently requires a party secured by conditional sales agreement to provide a discharge where all of the other party's obligations under that agreement have been fulfilled. However, the Act does not provide any procedure for the obtaining of the discharge if the secured party does not provide it.

What we are proposing in this amendment is that the secured party must provide a discharge to any person having an interest in the items that form the security under the contract within ten days of that person demanding the discharge if all of the obligations under the contract have been fulfilled. If the secured party does not provide the discharge within the ten days, the proposals provide for an application to a judge of the District Court or Queen's Bench who may then order that the conditional sales contract be discharged.

The proposals further provide that anyone suffering damages because of the wrongful failure to provide a discharge may recover those damages from the secured party by way of a court action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — So, Mr. Speaker, really it's a three-fold amendment. One, it limits the time the secured party has to provide a discharge. Two, it allows the judge of the District Court or Queen's Bench to discharge the sales contract when the secured party has not provided the discharge within the time limited. Three, it allows the recovery by court action of damages suffered by the wrongful failure to provide a discharge within the time limited.

This request has really come to us by way of two or three members in the practising Bar and I think that the amendments are good and will likely improve the situation with respect to our Conditional Sales Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE: (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in light of the overwhelming support of this Bill of Members opposite, the impassioned plea of the Attorney General which developed that support, unfortunately in the absence of our Mr. MacLeod, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:10 o'clock p.m.