

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**30th Day**

**Wednesday, March 22, 1961.**

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Premier Douglas:** — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of all hon. Members to a group in the west gallery. They are the students from Grade VIII and some Grade VII of the Souris School at Weyburn. They are here with their principal and some of their teachers, and with Alderman Miles of the City of Weyburn. I am sure all hon. Members will join me in welcoming them here, and in expressing the hope that they enjoy their visit.

**RE: NEWSPAPER CORRECTION**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a news item appearing in the "Leader-Post" this morning, and I'm making reference to a statement made by the hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, in which it was indicated that the charge for cleaning cereal grains at the seed plant at Moose Jaw is \$1.00 a bushel. The rates are 9¢ a bushel, where the grain is sacked, and 6¢ a bushel, where grain is cleaned and handled in bulk. One dollar a bushel is a bit out.

**RE: EARLY ADJOURNMENT TO WELCOME AND HONOUR CANADIAN WOMEN'S CURLING CHAMPIONS.**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Members, that it is my understanding, that the House will be adjourned at 5:00 o'clock this afternoon, for the purpose of honouring the Canadian Women's Curling Champions.

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 50 — An Act to Amend the Credit Union Act, 1956.**

**Hon Olaf A. Turnbull (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development):** — Mr. Speaker, these amendments arise from the request of the Credit Union League, and they deal with two subjects in the main. The first one, I understand, has to do with whether or not a lawyer may deposit his client's funds in the Credit Union, because the Act as it is now constituted, states that a person may deposit only their savings, and in consultation between the legal fraternity and the Credit Union League, there has been an amendment requested that we think will meet this requirement, so that if a lawyer has funds in trust, and if it is the understanding that these funds should be deposited in the credit union, it may now be done in the same manner as it is now done with a chartered bank.

The second general part has to do with the amount of loans that can be made without the usual type of security. Originally, when credit unions were first established, a secretary-treasurer could grant loans of up to \$100 without traditional security, provided of course that the right of the secretary-treasurer was granted by special bylaw. Since that time it was raised so that these amounts could be increased to \$200, if the total assets of the credit union were up to \$200,000, and up to \$300, if the total assets were over \$200,000. And, it is now my understanding that the desire of the credit union movement is, as expressed by the Credit Union League, to raise this so that an unsecured loan may be granted by the secretary-treasurer, of \$300, where the total assets are under \$200,000 in the credit union, and in those credit unions that have assets of greater than \$200,000, the total loan that may be granted by the secretary-treasurer would be \$500. And I herewith move the second reading of the Bill.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

### **Bill No. 51 — An Act to Amend the Brand and Brand Inspection Act.**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the Brand and Brand Inspection Act changes the figures from 10¢ to 20¢. This means that the brand inspection fees will be

raised by 10¢. The existing fees have been in effect back to the turn of the century, if not prior to the turn of the century. I think ever since territorial days, brand inspection fees have been at 10¢. We are receiving increasing demands to provide more brand inspection services, and with the advent of more auction selling of livestock and an expansion of brand inspection areas, the present revenues derived don't even half pay for the cost of this service, and it is felt that if people want this brand inspection service extended in view of the increased demand and increased price of livestock, as compared to the turn of the century, that we have justification for raising the brand inspection fees from 10¢ to 20¢. With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move a second reading.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister if he can tell the House what extra revenue he will likely derive as a result of doubling this particular tax? If, as he says the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You may ask a question at this time, the motion has not been proposed to the House, but you cannot make any comment aside from asking a question.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All right, could he tell the House then what revenue he'll get as a result of this increased tax, and at the same time could he tell the House, in the past year, whether or not his brand inspectors are catching very many irregularities? I think there's been a good deal of rustling going on in this province in the last year again, and I want to know if his brand inspectors are getting any of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We can have a debate after the motion is proposed, but it is quite in order to ask a question . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Those are two questions, if he'll just answer them.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the increased revenue derived will just about pay for the service. We may break even, we may be a bit under, depending on the number of cattle inspected within the year. With reference to the other question, we have had some convictions as a result of brand inspections, but it has been principally preventative — it's the kind of service that prevents stealing of livestock and this has

been the most useful part of the service, and further, Mr. Speaker, this is not a tax. This is a levy to provide for more brand inspection work to be carried on, on behalf of those people who wish to have this kind of protection against cattle rustling.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — With respect, Mr. Speaker, this Minister still hasn't just specifically answered my question. How many dollars extra revenue are you likely to get as a result of this Bill, by doubling the levy?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Somewhere in the amount of \$24,000 — \$25,000 — somewhere in that neighbourhood.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, on this motion, if I may . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you're asking a question, it's quite in order, otherwise the motion must first be put.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I haven't a question, I would just like to make a comment, while we're still in order on this motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I'll put the motion, if you don't mind. It's not open for debate yet; just a matter of questions for clarification. It has been moved by the hon. Mr. Nollet that Bill No. 51 be now read a second time. The motion is now before the House.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would just like to comment to the Minister regarding the raising of the fees for brand inspection and the securing of better inspection services, I hope that he will take into consideration the fact that there are many areas of the province, particularly along the Alberta border, where the Mounted Police used to do the brand inspection, and I understand that they are no longer obligated to do so under a directive from the Attorney General. Many of these farmers along the border are finding that when they're taking cattle across to the market in Alberta, which is their natural outlet, they first will have to go a distance of some forty to fifty miles east in order to get a brand inspection of their cattle, and then they

will have to backtrack and go fifty miles back to their home, and then sixty-five miles west of there, to the city of Medicine Hat, to their market. You will find that there's quite an area in there consisting of several municipalities and several hundred square miles where there is very little, if any convenience in the matter of brand inspection. I think you should take under advisement the fact that probably in some of these small centres, in the centre of the municipality, or one or two pieces within the municipality, the appointment of a brand inspector in that particular area, a businessman, a reputable farmer, or anyone at all who would have the authority to inspect these cattle before they are taken to market, would assist the marketing of cattle in that area.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

**Bill No. 55 — An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Act**

**Hon. J. Walter Erb (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, the only change contemplated by these amendments is to provided that a person who is not a beneficiary under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Act, will not be entitled to payment for hospital services for diagnosis and treatment of cancer.

I believe that since it is required by law that all residents of Saskatchewan pay the hospital insurance tax in order to become beneficiaries under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Act, that to be entitled to hospital services under any other statute, it ought to be contingent upon the payment of the hospital tax. I move second reading.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Erb that Bill No. 55 be now read the second time. Is the House ready for the question?

**Mrs. M.J. Batten:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't happen to have that Bill for some reason or other but from the information given by the Minister, this is another restriction on the people that make use of cancer diagnosis and treatment, particularly, the diagnostic services. It is certainly for the benefit of

the province, that people go in and are sent in by their doctors as soon as possible, and as often as the doctor should see fit. This amendment will prevent the very thing that the Act was passed in order to assist and this is again another burden on the municipalities because where these people are indigent and can't pay for this type of treatment, if they have to receive the treatment, well the municipality will have to pay for them. It's difficult to understand why this type of restriction would be put on them. Even in the dark days, as the Members on your right will recall, when the Liberals were in power, this treatment was always given to people free of charge.

The statute was in effect and there was always cancer . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . never paid a hospital bill.

**Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt):** — . . . diagnosis and cancer treatment without fee before there was a hospitalization, and certainly this is a backward step in the days when everyone is paying money into the cancer fund in order to enlighten people about cancer. We're paying through voluntary means for all sorts of advertisements and information which were being given out to people and people are being encouraged to diagnose cancer as soon as possible, and being encouraged to go in for treatment, or being encouraged to take steps, and at the same time, they're being discouraged if they haven't had the wherewithal to pay their hospitalization tax, or for any reason they come in from another province and haven't paid their hospitalization tax, or even worse, where they are too poor to pay this tax.

Now, there are many cases where the municipality doesn't know about people, doesn't realize they haven't paid their hospitalization tax, and in those cases, where they would have to receive costly treatment, the municipality would be stuck with this Bill. Certainly, I don't think that this Legislature would want to be in favour of that type of restrictive regulation in this Act.

The reason for this Bill was to give cancer care, diagnostic and treatment, to everyone in this province, not only to those who have their hospitalization tax paid up.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I must draw to the attention of the hon. Members that the hon. Minister is about to close the debate.

**Hon. J. Walter Erb:** — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not going to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the second restriction that this Government has seen fit to place on the free cancer treatment which was inaugurated and started by the former Liberal Government. That cancer legislation was passed in 1944 the regular Session, and came into operation on the 1st day of May, 1944. There was \$215,000 voted in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, and at the end of the year they had \$58,000 of the money voted left over.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — They go around peddling their lies, but it is the truth, and the Minister of Health stood on the floor of this House two or three years afterwards and told me that they were not able to enter into an agreement with the medical profession of this province until 1946, because the war was on. Mr. Speaker, the payment for hospital bills started on the 1st day of May, 1944, and he knows it.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — I do.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They can talk all they like, and they peddled that confounded lie all over this province. Now let us be honest about this thing, Mr. Speaker, it is on the record of this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's abundant living. The first thing, Mr. Speaker, was that they restricted the operation of the service of the hospital clinics. The service to people who were ordered by their doctors to go into the clinic and have diagnostic treatment has been free from the beginning. It took them two or three years to restrict that, and then they said that only persons who were directed by their doctors to the clinic and were found to be suffering from cancer had it free, and everybody else had to pay.

It was only last year, Mr. Speaker, that I got a return and there are thousands and thousands of dollars, during the years, that have been collected from the people that had to go to the clinic, and then found nothing wrong with them. No patient could go into that clinic and find

out what was wrong with him without being ordered to do so by his doctor.

That was only one restriction, and now they come in here and, if I have read this thing right, there are two restrictions in here. No person can get any free service from this cancer clinic unless he has been a resident of the province of Saskatchewan for six months. Well, I think that is wrong, because a restriction like this is restricting the services that the people have been glad to pay for in this province. There are probably more people convinced of the necessity for this service in the province of Saskatchewan than for any other service we have relating to public health. There is something about that disease, Mr. Speaker, and I don't need to tell you or anybody else, that when anyone is found suffering from this disease, probably not so much nowadays as a few years ago, that he was on his way out. There was no cure for this thing, and therefore, the public, the Government, and the people of the province took on the burden to see to it that everybody whether he has any money or not, would have an equal chance and an equal opportunity to see if any remedy could be found.

Then we have section 3A which says: —

“A patient to whom care and treatment are provided by a hospital shall not be entitled to that care and treatment at the expense of the province unless he is a beneficiary within the meaning of The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act.”

Now, if I understand it, and I may be wrong in this but, if so, the Minister can surely enlighten me on this point this means, that if a person is in the hospital under care and treatment he shall not be entitled to the free care and treatment that is provided by the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Service, that is unless he has a card. I don't really know whether I'm right in this thing or not, but I say to you again that so far as I am concerned, I will oppose this last section and I hope that every person on this side of the House will oppose the last section, because it is a restriction of service that is needed by the people of Saskatchewan, if ever a service was needed, and that is the service that we're dealing with here today.

For that reason I am going to oppose it and I hope that every Member on this side of the House will do the same thing.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister one question, for reasons of clarification at this point?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think it will be all right.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I understand by clause 3 that in order to get this treatment the citizen must be a resident for six months, and he must have a hospitalization card. Now is that a new provision, or was that in the old Act also?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — He must be a resident here for six months.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And he must have a card. Was that in the old Act also?

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — No. This amendment will provide that he must now become insured under the Hospital Services Plan in order to have his hospitalization provided for.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well then the only major change in clause 3 is that he must have his hospitalization card ahead of time.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — There is absolutely no change with regard to the benefit and the diagnosis or treatment of cancer.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! This exchange is entirely irregular. If the hon. Member wishes to speak on this debate, all he has to do is say so and you may proceed with this debate.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might as well make one or two comments. I think I'm going to have to agree with the hon. Member for Arm River and the hon. Member for Humboldt, when they say that this Bill is a retrograde step insofar as cancer treatment is concerned. I want to remind the Minister that all through the last election we heard Members of his party, particularly the Premier, talk about all the free services we were going to get in the field of health. Now instead of getting new services this Session, we've been getting one service after another cut down. For instance, the hospitals have been told that they can't expand in the field of construction. It's not so very long ago when all our

old-age pensioners were informed that instead of paying 20% of the costs of drugs, in future they would be obliged to pay 50%.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — You're getting a little wide of the mark.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — And, it's not very long ago when you told old-age pensioners that you'd only pay their medical bills in hospital for two weeks now. All these steps seem to me to be going be going backward, and this is one further restriction today.

I say, like the hon. Member for Arm River did, that the Liberal Government did bring in free cancer treatment many years ago, and free T.B. treatment. This particular Bill is therefore a retrograde step so I think Members of this group, as far as I'm concerned, will oppose this Bill all the way down the line.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, there is just one other reason that I will not support the Bill. Not only is it a retrograde step, but this is moving responsibility off the shoulders of the Provincial Government onto the municipalities. Again, you're going to find that if this Bill passes the House, and an individual who has no hospitalization card, or an indigent person, but rather than the Province accepting the responsibility for that individual, then it is going to become the responsibility of the municipalities.

Surely to goodness, if we have learned anything over the last dozen or more years, it is that the responsibilities of the load of municipalities is too great. The division of responsibility between the municipalities and the Provincial Government is not fair, and that there is a pressing and a crying need in Saskatchewan today for the municipalities, both urban and rural to be given either (a) more financial assistance from Provincial Government revenues, or (b) part of their responsibilities will have to be taken over by the Government of Saskatchewan.

We've had rural commissions, continuing committees, hired planners, who day after day, week after week, and year after year, have told the Government that sits opposite exactly what I'm telling you now, and yet they have the audacity to bring in another Bill, and this is just one of many that is increasing responsibility and the need for spending money by the local governments,

rather than the Provincial Government. This Government is doing the exact opposite to what their own hired planners have advised them to do. Now they haven't the courage to oppose this Bill. We have.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker I'm not going to try to convince the member for Arm River, because giving him facts is just a waste of time. When he talks about the cancer legislation that was brought in in 1944 and the fact that no agreement could be made with the doctors until 1946, of course, he's talking the most complete nonsense.

When this government took office in July 10, 1944, although the legislation was on the statute book, no agreement had been made with the hospitals, and no agreement had been made with the doctors, and not a single doctor bill or hospital bill had been paid, and no provisions had been made to pay them. No negotiations had been carried on; no agreement had been reached; and no figures had been set. An agreement with the doctors was reached during the summer of 1944 regarding a schedule of fees, and the machinery was set up to pay the doctors and also to pay the hospitals under the Cancer Control Program.

The Member for Arm River says there was a couple of other restrictions. He said first of all that no person could go to the clinic unless ordered by their doctor. This was in the original Act. Nobody at any time ever dreamed that someone could wander in off the street into the Cancer Clinic and say, "I think I might have cancer." Right from the very beginning all patients were screened through their own doctors, and were sent by their doctors to the clinic. All the doctor had to say was that I suspect this person's condition is such that it might be caused by cancer.

Then he went on to say that there was another restriction and that is, that if the person came to the clinic and didn't have cancer, he had to pay. This of course is not correct. What he did have to pay was a fee of \$10.00, not the cost of the diagnosis which might run into hundreds of dollars or even thousands of dollars. This was adopted on the recommendation of the Cancer Commission, who are looking after the cancer program. The Cancer Commission said that in too many cases the facilities of the cancer clinics were being used simply for diagnostic purposes, even where there was no direct suspicion that cancer was involved. They said in some cases they were giving these diagnoses, which involved

very large expenditures in some cases, in order to help the general practitioner locate the trouble. They said the person ought to pay some nominal amount. Certainly \$10.00 wouldn't pay for the first X-ray, let alone pay for the gastro-intestinal tests and the metabolism tests, and all the other tests which were involved. To say that these people had to pay if they didn't have cancer, is certainly not correct. For those who are found to have cancer, the treatment is completely free. Those who are found not to have cancer make this nominal payment of \$10.00, and this is paid after the diagnosis and after it is determined that they do not have cancer. Moreover they are not prevented from getting the tests and the diagnosis, even if they haven't got \$10.00.

He said that as a further restriction, the people have got to be in the province six months. Originally, they had to be in the province a year not six months, but a year. The six months provision is now to bring it in line with the hospital plan by which people have to be in the province six months in order to qualify. This is not a restriction. This is simply saying that we now have a hospital plan which covers most of the people of the province. Something over 97% of the people of the province are covered. There are people who are not covered who come under federal jurisdiction and so on, and who are not liable for the hospital plan tax. In actual fact, the Cancer Commission is not now paying the hospital bills. The Hospital Services Plan is paying the hospital bills, and this is simply a duplication.

It is true that there may be the odd case in which a person hasn't paid his tax. But, Mr. Speaker, we've got to cope with these people whether they have cancer or haven't got cancer. The only way they can be coped with is either to have them pay their tax, or if they're a provincial responsibility, the provincial government pays their tax. If they're a municipal responsibility, the municipality pays their tax. This is not a restriction at all. I think this removed a duplication. At the present moment the Cancer Commission is asked by legislation to have responsibility which it is not discharging, but which is being properly discharged by the Hospital Services Plan.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in these remarks but I happen to remember something about that and it seems true that

this Government put the \$10.00 down if you didn't have cancer. Now you can't deny that no matter how much you twisted it around. It is true that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Nobody denied it.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well I just wanted to make it clear.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division, and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting:

<b>Yea</b>		
<b>Messieurs</b>		
Douglas	Dewhurst	Brockelbank
Lloyd	Walker	Nollet
Kuziak	Cooper (Mrs.)	Strum (Mrs.)
Davies	Willis	Brown
Thurston	Erb	Nicholson
Turnbull	Stone	Whelan
Thibault	Berezowsky	Kramer
Johnson	Meakes	Thiessen
Snyder	Stevens	Kluzak
Dahlman	Michayluk	Semchuk
Perkins	Peterson	

— 32

<b>Nay</b>		
<b>Messieurs</b>		
Thatcher	Batten (Mrs.)	McCarthy
Barrie	McDonald	Danielson
Cameron	McFarlane	Gardiner
Foley	Guy	Boldt
Klein	Horsman	Coderre
MacDougall	Snedker	Gallagher

— 18

The Assembly adjourned at 5:05 p.m.