

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
33rd Day

Tuesday, March 23rd, 1965

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

ANNOUNCEMENT RE BILLS ON ORDER PAPER

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the house to the Order Paper, which is very thin, actually just over twenty bills still on the Order Paper. Many of them are small, some of them are in Committee of the Whole, and the motions certainly would not take long. If we were going to go ahead for two or three days, we would come to the end of the session. Now, I know there are estimates which will take some time, but if the government has a program of legislation to introduce, I would say, let us get it introduced and get it on the Order Paper, so that we can see the legislation and know what it is and be better prepared to deal with it when it comes.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE ARTICLE IN STAR PHOENIX OF MONDAY, MARCH 20th, 1965 RE SALE OF SASKAIR:

Mr. A. C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make reference to an article in the Star Phoenix of Monday, March 20th, 1965, in reference to the sale of Saskair, in which they quote:

The sale price, the minister said, was \$947,000, of which about twenty per cent, nearly \$300,000 is being paid in cash, with the balance paid over ten years.

I wish to correct this statement. I stated that forty per cent was the down payment, almost \$400,000. I wish to make that correction so that the hon. members would not be misled later on by reading this article in the Star Phoenix.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would ask the house to join with me in welcoming a very fine group of grade twelve students from Kinistino High School. They are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. They are lead by Pastor Reinhardt, and the school teacher, Mr. Dawson, the Bus Driver, Mervin Helstrom, and Mr. Lambert Holm. I am sure that the house is going to be on its best behavior and I want to wish the students a very informative afternoon and a happy trip back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw attention to a second group of students in the Speaker's Gallery — a group from the University school in Saskatoon, and everything the member for Kinistino has said about his students, goes twice as true for ours. We want to welcome them here.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. H. Baker (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has asked me to extend a welcome to his students. I am very pleased to welcome them on behalf of the city of Regina, and also the students from Saskatoon. I wish them well and that they will enjoy their stay in Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

March 23, 1965

Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the lady member and welcome the students from the University school to this assembly. I trust that their stay will be enjoyable and I wish them a happy journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

RESOLUTION NO. 12 — MOTION RE GUARANTEED FARM PRICES

Mr. Leonard M. Larson (Pelly): — moved,

That this assembly views with alarm the increasing higher cost of farm machinery and other goods and services required by farmers which in the light of declining farm prices has created an urgent problem of great national importance, and sincerely requests the Government of Canada to implement immediately a comprehensive program of guaranteed farm prices maintained in fixed relationship to farm costs.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, ever since the present Liberal government came into office at Ottawa, we have been waiting for the Minister of Agriculture to outline the agricultural program that the government intends to pursue. Various amending bills have been brought in which deal with sectors and sections of the whole picture, but we have had no indication that the government is either bringing in, or contemplating bringing in any legislation that will come to grips with the fundamental problem of farmers in Canada today.

I think it is well understood today that agriculture has, during the past twenty-five years passed through the same technological revolution and confronted industry in the past century. This revolution has seen tremendous changes in the industry of farming. It has seen the introduction of new machinery, new methods of farming, the use of electrical power, new varieties of seeds, new techniques of livestock — feeding and breeding, as well as a substantial increase in the capital requirements to operate a farm.

The net result of all this has been a steady decline in the agricultural population, and a steady rise in production, both per farm, as well as per farm worker. The 1931 census shows that better than thirty per cent of Canada's population lived on farms. In 1961, this had dropped to eleven per cent, and it is safe to assume that this trend is still continuing in 1965. This means that a little over thirty years ago, one Canadian out of three was living on the farm. Today, one out of nine lives on a farm. In terms of the labor force, there has been a tremendous change and shift in the population.

Prior to World War Two, about 1,250,000 persons were in the farm labor force. This has now been reduced to approximately 650,000, or less than one-tenth of the labor force in Canada. This means, in other words, that today only one person in ten is engaged in farming. If the criterion of the economists and the swivel-chaired farm advisers who for many years have been saying that, "really, all that is wrong with agriculture is to reduce the numbers of farms to the percentage of the national income that they receive and the farm problem is solved". If this is so, then the farm problem should be nearly solved, with less than ten per cent of the population in the industry, getting about six per cent of the national income, the magic formula is about here, and consequently, as I said, the problem should be solved.

The amazing thing is that this is not the case at all. The facts are that, side by side with this decline in farm population and the farm labor force, we have a tremendous increase in production. Again, it is not long between each time we hear arm-chair advisers saying that the problem of agriculture is that it has to become more efficient. There is no industry in Canada, Mr. Speaker, which has increased its production at the phenomenal rate which has been achieved by farmers.

It is estimated that prior to the war, every farm worker fed between ten and twelve persons. Present figures indicate that every farm person, working on a farm today feeds about thirty people. This is a fantastic increase in productivity. The increase has been in terms of quality

of goods as well as in quantity. There has been a marked increase in the quality and quantity of all goods produced on our farms. This has been brought about by increasing the size of the farms and by the use of expensive equipment and machinery. This makes it possible for fewer individuals to farm more land and to produce more and better products. No matter what branch of agriculture we investigate, we find that, without fail, productivity per worker has gone up at a very considerable rate.

Alongside this increased productivity, a great many problems have been created, because farms are bigger, and because more expensive equipment is required, the capital investment for land, machinery and equipment per farm unity has increased tremendously. The time has passed when anyone can start farming without a considerable amount of capital, if the farmer is to have any chance of making his operation a success.

I am quite prepared to admit that a considerable amount has been done, by way of providing loans, to meet the capital requirements of farmers. The amendments to the Farm Credit Act have gone a long way to provide capital for land purchases, yet it leaves something to be desired for the young men with only their youth, vigor and the belief that they can make a success of farming as the only collateral to qualify for the large amounts of money necessary. Nevertheless the measures proved welcome. The extension of the amounts of money that can be obtained from the Farm Improvement Loan Act is a good one. No one can quarrel with the principle that the government has adopted, that have made greater amounts of capital available for the purchase of land, machinery, or for the improvement of farm buildings and equipment.

I think that these are most commendable pieces of legislation. However, having said this. There are a few pertinent points I want to make with regards to an area where the government has, in my opinion, completely abdicated its responsibility and has shown no apparent desire to even consider.

The first point I want to make is related very specifically to the high and continually rising costs of farm machinery. To illustrate this point, I want to use some personal experiences. In 1946, I purchased a WD9 International Harvester Tractor with approximately 52 h.p. in the drawbar. It was a fully equipped machine, and to get it at that time I had to pay \$2,497.25. This figures out roughly to \$48 per horsepower. I recall, very distinctly, taking delivery of the tractor and making payment in full with a cheque from the car of malting barley that we had just sold. Out of the proceeds of the cheque I received some \$40 or \$50 change. Compare this to a deal I concluded the other day on a new 97 Massey-Ferguson tractor. This machine is rated at approximately 90 horsepower in the drawbar. The other equipment is identical, except, and I want to be fair about this, it is equipped with hydraulics. The price of this tractor was \$7,880 or approximately \$75 per horsepower. In other words, I find that I needed three cars of barley plus an additional \$1,000. In the first instance, the cost per horsepower, and this is what the farmer is interested in, has gone up approximately fifty-nine per cent. In the second instance, I find that the income from the barley has actually dropped by approximately thirty per cent. Even though the net return for wheat may be a little better, it points out that the ratio of machinery costs bear no relationship to the income position of the farmer.

No one will deny, Mr. Speaker, that there is value in making funds available to farmers for capital expansion, or to help him make better use of modern equipment. However, none of these, however valuable they may be, really come to grips with the basic problem, and that, Mr. Speaker, is that of farm income. Until we really tackle this problem, we are trying to mend old worn out clothes with silk patches, and the result will continue to be the mess we are in today.

One has only to look at two sets of figures to realize how serious the problem is. The D.B.S. has released some of these figures. In 1951, the farm products income index stood at 296.8. In 1961, ten years later, it stood at 261.2, a drop of 35.6. By 1963 the figure had declined to 259.1, with some possible adjustments at a later date. This is a total agricultural income drop of 44.7 points since 1951. This is a significant drop, Mr. Speaker, but it only tells a part of the story.

Let us look for a moment at the production costs index, as it applies to agriculture. Again, let us be fair and admit that there have been improvements in machinery and equipment, but at the same time, realizing that it has failed to keep the income index even at par with 1951. In 1951, again quoting D.B.S. statistics, the commodity index figure for

March 23, 1965

goods and services purchased by farmers in the course of their income production, stood at 230 points. By 1960, the same figure stood at 290.8 points. By 1963, it has risen to 298.7, and in January, 1964, the last figures available, subject to some revision, it stands at 299.6.

This is an increase of 69.6 points since 1951. These figures bear out why my tractor cost me 59 per cent per horsepower more this year than it did in 1946. This alarming trend in agriculture has not gone unnoticed. The C.F.A., in its July bulletin, makes these observations: The capital investment, is only slightly higher (7.8 per cent) in 1963 than it was in 1949. The real wages of the wage earners have gone up forty per cent, quotes the bulletin. It says this further, and the C.F.A. adds that the commodities and services used by farmers have gone up consistently since 1949, and in 1963, farm costs showed an increase of about 40 per cent, over 1949.

No industry, Mr. Speaker, can possibly stay in business when, over a nineteen year period, the price of the goods it sells drops by 44 points while the price of the things it has to buy rises by sixty-nine points. No industry, whose costs are rising, can stay in business when its net realizable income in constant dollars drops in a fifteen year period from \$1,500,000,000 to \$986,000,000. This is the actual constant dollar drop in farm income. This is the real dilemma in agriculture. The buying power of the dollar has been inflated but there is a lack of income in relationship to the continued rising costs of farm machinery and goods and services that farmers must buy.

In conclusion, there is one additional point I want to make. The principle of income assurance is not a new one in Canada. For years, the railroads, gold mines, as well as industry, have received subsidies, which amount to almost guaranteed incomes. It may be necessary to do these things in the national interest, I will not argue that it is not in the national interest to subsidize the C.N.R. to maintain communications. I probably would, or could argue the merits, or the demerits of subsidizing gold mines. The tariff regulations of the federal government are costing the consumer public of Canada something in the neighborhood of a billion dollars annually. These are all subsidies in one form or another. A good argument could be made both for, as well as against, this kind of subsidy, and I do not intend to make them here or now.

Events of the last couple of years when we were able to sell our grain, even if it was to Communist countries, have shown beyond doubt the tremendous impact of the power of agriculture in the whole Canadian economy. If agriculture is prosperous, it spills over into every segment of our economy, more than any other industry, or any other business. Every dollar spent to improve agriculture income is the best investment that can be made for the good of, not only the industry, but for the good of the country as a whole.

I therefore, move, seconded by the hon. member for Cutknife:

That this assembly views with alarm the increasing higher costs of farm machinery and other goods and services required by farmers which in the light of declining farm prices has created an urgent problem of great national importance, and sincerely requests the government of Canada to implement immediately a comprehensive program of guaranteed farm prices maintained in fixed relationship to farm costs.

Mr. H. A. Broten (Watrous): — As I rise to speak on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I do so with a strong conviction that remedies for this chronic problem are long overdue. Year after year passes, with thousands of farmers now being forced off the land by inadequate prices for the products they sell. Agriculture is going through a revolution like every other industry. There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that agriculture problems can be solved by efficiency alone, while other groups in our society solve their high-cost production problems by higher prices.

Let us take a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. The cost of motor cars has gone up from \$1,600 in 1946 to \$3,200 for a comparable car today, or a 100 per cent increase. The cost of farm machinery has gone up by at least 59 per cent, as the member from Pelly (Mr. Larson) has pointed out, while the prices for hogs are lower than they were in 1947 and 1948.

Shoes have doubled in price since 1946, the price of clothes generally has doubled, and most everything the farmer buys. In fact, in 1945, D.B.S. shows 123.6 points and in 1961 it had gone up to 262 points, almost double, and in 1964 it was 299 points. One sees a tremendous difference as to what one group in our economy gets to meet increased costs and what the farmer received for the same increased costs in his area of production. Let us for a moment look at the price of bread. Twenty years ago, bread was 12¢ a loaf; the farmer received \$1.83 Fort William for grain, and today wheat is about \$1.93, or 10¢ more, and bread has gone up from 12 to 23¢ a loaf, or nearly 100 per cent, whereas the wheat price has gone up just five per cent.

The bread-baker and the farmer live in the same economic climate as far as increased costs are concerned, and one solves the problem with a 95 per cent increase in the price of his product, and the farmer gets five per cent more. Mr. Speaker, this is hardly believable. Eggs today are lower than they were in the 1930's. In constant dollar value of 1935-39, eggs this winter have been as low as four and a half cents a dozen, or lower than in the 1930's, I repeat, Sir.

Good steers averaged 14¢ in 1949. According to increased costs they would have to be 25 or 26¢ a lb, but as we receive only 21¢ or 22¢ a lb. At the present time, they would have to be twenty per cent higher in order to meet the increased costs.

Mr. Speaker, we see a tremendous discrepancy here which has resulted in our farm people of Canada receiving four and a half per cent of the national income, and we, as farmers, are nine and one-quarter per cent of the population, and I ask, Sir, do we receive our share of the national income?

We would receive nine per cent of our national income if we got the same for investment, labor and managerial work as other groups, but we receive only one-half as much in this area as we should. Mr. Speaker, what is being done in other countries, and what is being done in our country to alleviate this problem?

It is admitted at once that some farmers fare chronically in the low income category. Why not, when the costs have gone up one hundred per cent, and in many cases the price of their products has gone up very little, if any?

Once again, I say this gap cannot be filled with political promises and little else. What have other countries done to alleviate the same problem? This is a good question.

The United Kingdom, two years ago, passed a bill which gave nonrecurring grants of up to \$2,700 per farm over a period of three to five years, based on \$16 an acre, to help the small producer to get more efficiency in his production, and also in Great Britain, in 1961-62, farmers received \$1,027,000,000 in the form of price supports. In 1962-63 farmers received \$964,000,000 in price supports. These farmers were approximately twelve per cent of the population and they received about twelve per cent of the national income.

Remember, Sir, we as farmers in Canada are nine and a quarter per cent of the population, as we get four and a half per cent of the wealth, and no subsidies to speak of. Last year, the total in this area was \$123,000,000, mostly to the eastern farmer.

The United States spends about thirteen per cent of its budget on agriculture. We, in Canada, spend about three and a half per cent. One sees that other countries have farm problems too, and the governments will, and do, spend large amounts to give the farmers an even break, but in Canada there seems to be a lack of understanding and the will to do anything about our low farm income.

A fundamental issue, here, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not competing against other farmers in other lands as farmers. We are competing against the treasuries of these other countries, and the governments of these countries do subsidize the farmer so they can get the same return for their investment as other groups in their own countries.

As far as policies are concerned, most farm organizations would advocate the following:

1. Price supports set according to some standards

of equity, such as parity prices based on the average efficiency of production of the family sized farms.

2. Guaranteed forward prices to cover the length of the production cycle, designed to minimize the risk and uncertainties in agricultural production.
3. A comprehensive farm credit program designed to help the family farm secure the financial wherewithal to modernize the means of production to maximum efficiency.
4. A program designed to help the beginning and lower income farmers, to secure economic units of production.
5. A system of all-risk crop insurance designed to lessen the hazards of production.
6. A board of livestock commissioners, similar in principle to the board of grain commissioners.
7. Enhanced bargaining strength for the farmers through federal and producer marketing boards.
8. Legislation to safe-guard the interests of producers, a standardization of contracts, negotiation of terms, and regulations of quality standards.

Mr. Speaker, we need farm boards and related measures to give the farmers strength and subsidies to give him justice, that he cannot otherwise receive, because of rural agricultural realities and internal problems. Much of our farm commodities are home grown and consumed in Canada. What is needed is an assessment of the problem and the will to solve it. We, as farmers, are sick and tired of promises and little else from our federal government. We demand action and action now.

I support the resolution.

Mr. K. G. Romuld (Canora): Mr. Speaker, I somewhat wonder the sudden interest that is shown by members of the socialist party. I see they have the same attitude that they had when they were on the government side of the house, so they always like to make references to all our ills and blame it on the federal government.

Now, I believe that this motion is worthy of some merit, but at the same time, I cannot help but think that the sudden interest now might be with relation to pending by-elections that could be held this summer in our rural seats . . . and because . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Are you worried?

Mr. Romuld: — No, not too worried. I believe that there are a lot of members on both sides who would like to take part in this debate. I certainly would like to have more time and therefore, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 11 RE QUESTION OF TIME

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution no. 11, moved by Mr. Pederson.

Mr. C. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this resolution, I do so with the knowledge that this is a matter of great concern to all the members of this house and to all the people of the province.

It is a subject that has generated a great deal of controversy across Saskatchewan and within this assembly — controversy that caused our friends opposite to avoid a solution to the problem like on might avoid

the plague. Yet, Mr. Speaker, despite this controversy, it is a subject that this assembly and this government must face, and the sooner, the better

This situation cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. Not only do we have different areas of the province on different times, but adjacent communities, school districts and even families. The problem has become more complex with the centralization of schools in rural Saskatchewan. It is not my intention to review the arguments for or against. They have been repeated, both in and out of this assembly, on many occasions. However, I do want to review the recent developments briefly.

All of us are aware, SUMA, the SRM and the Saskatchewan Trustees Association formed time committees to investigate this problem and subsequently prepared a joint brief. They presented it to the former cabinet in 1963. The cabinet at that time suggested that this question be referred to their respective organizations at the next annual convention. This too was done, early in the year 1964. This, Mr. Speaker, is the situation to date. This government has proceeded with caution in this matter to consider it in all its broad aspects. Arrangements will be made to meet with the time committees of SUMA, SRM, and the School Trustees. It is the hope of this government to make a decision as soon as possible, whether it be the mountain standard, or central standard, whether it be for all the province, or a portion thereof. Our election program called for a solution to this problem. It is our intention to bring about this solution at an early date.

Some Hon. Members:: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. E. I. Wood: (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to say a few words in this debate at this time. I certainly do agree that this question of the matter of time is indeed a very important one that does affect the lives of a good many people in the province, in one way and another. It is one that, I feel, governments must take cognizance of and must be prepared to take action.

We have had a good deal of trouble in Saskatchewan in regard to time, in the past, and this is due, not to the fact that we had a Liberal or a CCF or a Conservative government. I think it primarily depends upon the fact that our province has been split into two time zones. I have had occasion to study this question a good deal in the past, and we arrived at the decision, that Saskatchewan is actually in the centre of the mountain standard time zone, as it is outlined so many degrees west of the prime meridian at Greenwich, England. In fact, the sun is directly overhead around Pense, Saskatchewan, around 12:00 noon M.S.T. But in the early days of the development of the west, I think that the people of Manitoba did not wish to have the division of the time zone coming down through their province, where it normally would come, and it was by mutual agreement, I imagine, moved over into the Indian territory where it was not going to bother anybody. For years, the time changed on the Canadian Pacific mainline at Broadview, Saskatchewan.

We have inherited a split personality in regard to time. The provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, which actually do have divisions of geographical time zones within their boundaries, have been able to get along, without actually having these splits, and the question of time in the other provinces of Canada have been relatively minor because they do not have this division. Although they have had trouble with daylight saving and standard time, they do not have it complicated by this split right down through the province. Another reason that we have problems in regard to time, is because of local option. It has been set for many years in the province of Saskatchewan, by local option of the municipalities. I do not think anyone in the house can stand up and say that they have supported local government any more strongly than I have. I think, however, when it comes to setting of the time, that it is not a very good idea, that this be set by each locality, because you run into the pattern which we have at the present time.

I think that our legislation allowing each municipality to set their own time, is somewhat to blame for the situation we have now. We had this in Saskatchewan for many, many years. Again, I do not think this the fault of any special government.

Another reason for trouble with our time is because the people have a tendency to want uniform time throughout the province, as long as it is time that they themselves have. When people come to the place where they are willing to have uniform time, irrespective of whether it is their time or someone else's time, I think we would be able to make better progress.

March 23, 1965

Another reason we have trouble with time in this province is because it has been made a political football. I think that the members opposite, when they were sitting in opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Wood: — . . . if I may say this, and I think I believe quite correctly, Mr. Speaker, that instead of doing their utmost to solve the problem for the people of Saskatchewan, that they did their utmost to stir the matter up and muddy the waters.

Mr. Wood: — Not on time . . .

Mr. Cameron: — We couldn't understand the plebiscite.

Mr. Wood: — It may be, but I know that the members on the west side of the province talked about the government trying to force central time upon the people of the province and I know the people on the east side of the province, talked about the government trying to force mountain standard time on the people of the province. It was very handy for them to be able to do this, but I do maintain, Mr. Speaker, a good deal of the problem in the province at the present time is due to this having been made a political football in the past. I would hope that, if there is any solution brought forward by the present government, that we on this side, will have the good sense and the discretion to try to keep it out of politics, because there has been too much of this in the past.

Now, going back for just a short review of history, I will try to be as quick on this as I can, Mr. Speaker, because I know that it is an old story, and I know that we want to go on with other business. However, I would like to make a few points clear about this plebiscite which was held in the fall of 1956, and which has come in for a good deal of discussion. I, myself, was not too happy with it, because a person who comes into the legislature is always able to complain about what has been done by the people that were there before them. At that time, I was a new member. I understand, however, that during the 1956 session, a committee sat on the time problem and came up with the recommendation that a plebiscite should be held, but that the east side of the province be not disturbed. This was the reason for the wording of the plebiscite that was used that fall in the plebiscites to determine what Saskatchewan should do about time. As a result of this recommendation of the committee and the plebiscite that followed, we came up with rather a hodgepodge of results. Again, a committee sat in the spring of 1957. I happened to be a member of that committee and, Mr. Speaker, I was the seconder of the motion in the committee, to set up all of Saskatchewan on one time zone, that we have mountain standard time throughout in the winter time, and that we have central standard time throughout in the summer time. There was a good deal of feeling in the committee but, as recommended by the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson), we got away from division in the province, and we got one time zone. I think that this was the thinking at that time, but we all know what the results were I lie felt in the committee that this was something that might stand some debate, but was the most likely proposal to get support throughout the province, having one time in the summer and another time in the winter. The fact of the matter was that it did not make either side of the province happy, and as a result there was a good deal of antagonism throughout the province. The government, in the next session, repealed the legislation, and put the matter back where it had been for many years, as a matter of local option. Hind-sight is always better than foresight, but I am afraid at this time, that I do agree again with the member for Arm River that possibly the government should not have rescinded this legislation. I think that the situation in Saskatchewan would have been better now, if we had stayed with the legislation which we had at that time. *lye* would have had some provincial legislation in regard to it, rather than leaving it entirely to local option.

Now, back in the early part of 1962, I was approached by Mr. Connors, the secretary of SUMA, in regard to setting up a committee by the three organizations, SUMA, SARM, and the School Trustees Association, to look at the time question. The government agreed to help them with this, to the extent of paying the costs of the study and the cost of their committee. We felt it was desirable that these organizations should sit down and have a look at this themselves, without any interference on the part of us as the government, but we did supply the funds that were necessary. The government was interested in having a solution to the time question.

They spent a good deal of time in study and discussion in their committees and also in their groups when they met again in 1963. In June of 1963, they proposed a solution to the government in regard to it. It was basically that the province should be divided on the third meridian with those school units lying west of those that were split by the third meridian, being allowed to have whichever time they wished in the winter time but that all of Saskatchewan would be on central time in the summer, except in the far north area which could do as they liked. But that all of Saskatchewan be on central time in the summer time and that those school units lying west of the split by the third meridian would decide what they wished to do in the winter. They brought this proposition to me, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and we, at that time, asked them if they would take this back to their respective organizations, because at that time, it was solely the decision of the committee and had not been accepted by the organizations.

Last year, in 1964, I understand that it was accepted by both the SARM, by approximately two to one vote, and SUHA, by practically unanimous vote, that it was refused by the School Trustees Association, but not by a very large majority. They approached me again, after these meetings, and asked for an appointment to meet with the government sometime in June. I told them that I would be glad to do so, but as it turned out we were not the government.

I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that when I had a good deal of travelling to do, and having a little time for thought, I was debating about with myself just do about this time question after the election. I was assuming, of course, at the time that we would be the government. I reflected . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Never again!

Mr. Wood: — I reflected a good deal, and was endeavoring to come up with a solution. I realized that it was up to the government to do something about this question, when we were returned, and it would be necessary that we take some definite action on it and I was endeavoring to satisfy myself as what would be the best course to take. Whatever thoughts I had on the matter are entirely irrelevant at this time, because we are not the government. But I do maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is a good one, and that I agree that it is apparently in agreement with all concerned. The hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) in moving this motion, has advocated action, the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has also agreed that this is necessary and I surely think so at this time.

I think, in view of what has taken place on this, that the government will be able to see some of the pit falls of the past, and I think that they should be able to come up with a satisfactory solution at this time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 RE ROYAL COMMISSION ON HEALTH SERVICES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution no. 10, moved by Mr. Davies, and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Hon. Mr. Steuart.

Mrs. M. Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, after studying the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart), I find I must agree with the statements made by my colleague, when he discussed this and I think there is no doubt about it, that the amendment is not compatible with the motion.

In the motion, we say that we endorse in principle the recommendations of the Royal Commission, then we ask that a conference be called to implement those recommendations. We said in the main body of the motion, that the government should enter a cost-sharing agreement with any province whose medical care plan is in line with the recommendations. But the amendment which is proposed here, asks the government of Canada, to enter into a financial agreement to pay half the costs of a comprehensive medical care program, which may not be in line with the recommendations of the report.

Now what are some of the main recommendations of this report?

March 23, 1965

I think we should look at that first when we are considering the amendment. One recommendation is that it should be universal, not a voluntary plan. Some of the plans which are now in existence are voluntary plans. Should we be asking that the federal government enter into an agreement to pay half the cost of this type of plan?

Quoting from the Hall Commission report, it says this:

We believe it is essential that in those provinces not yet having 100 per cent coverage of all the residents, further steps should be taken to see that all are insured. We seek a method that will provide everybody in Canada with comprehensive coverage regardless of age, state of health, of ability to pay, and upon uniform terms and conditions.

And I think that statement regarding uniform terms and conditions is rather important here.

I am continuing to quote:

Coverage of health services should be continuous with portability of benefits, assured individuals moving from province to province, wherever the service is rendered.

I think this question of portability is very important, and the report goes on to say:

This objective can best be achieved through comprehensive universal health services program for the Canadian people.

Now these two points, I think, are very important when the federal government will be considering that programs they will share in the costs. The question of universality and portability, and anything less than this, is not in line with the recommendations of the report. It is a complete departure from the recommendations of the Hall Commission, and so I feel that we would be ill-advised to ask the government to share in the cost of that type of plan.

Then, we look at another main recommendation of the report, regarding means tests and subsidies. The report points out that, on the basis of the average earnings, that if you were to apply a means test, between 9.9 and 14.1 million people would need to be subsidized and means tested, so that in the words of the Commission, they say this:

This would pose a formidable task in terms of organization, administrative machinery, extra costs which Canadians cannot afford, and a method of examining the individual which in the opinion of many Canadians is contrary to the dignity of man.

Therefore they state:

that the method of subsidy is to be one that subsidizes the insurance fund, rather than one that subsidizes the individual. Secondly, that reliance on the method of voluntary insurance would be unnecessarily slow and inevitably incomplete. Third, that the number of individuals who would require subsidies to meet the total health services cost, is so large, that no government could impose a means test procedure on so many citizens, or would be justified in establishing a system requiring so much unnecessary administration. The health services alone will demand enough of our resources, and we must not waste them.

So here is another recommendation. We have endorsed in principle these recommendations. We can scarcely ask the federal government to enter into a cost-sharing agreement with a plan that is on a means-test basis. Another one of the most important recommendations which we have stated in the first part of the motion that we agree with, is a question of who administers

the plan — whether it be private companies or government administered. The Hall Commission recommends against financing a plan through a multiplicity of private insurance companies, and it states that this would be much more costly and less efficient, and again quoting from the report, they say:

the decision which Canadians have to make, assuming the claims of the health-insurance, the industry that it can provide universal coverage, is whether they wish to pay \$1,020,000,000 for physicians' services in 1971, for a program administered by an insurance agency, or \$837,000,000 for a program administered by the government agency. Accordingly, we have been compelled to conclude that government action is imperative, and we should move immediately to mobilize the nation's resources to establish efficient universal comprehensive programs in all ten provinces and the territories.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that you have to qualify the kind of plan of which you ask the federal government to share the cost, and that it must be qualified according to what is in the motion, that is, that it must be a plan in which at least the major recommendations are those recommendations in the Hall Report. I think I would like to mention again this question of portability. If you are going to have portability, and if it is going to be an all Canadian plan, then there must be a good deal of uniformity and, at least, the basic principles must be there. You cannot have a hodgepodge plan that sort of grew up like Topsy, and have it portable. I think that portability is one of the most important features about an all Canadian plan.

For these reasons, I feel that I must support the motion. I cannot support the amendment, because I feel that it is contrary to the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have been studying the resolution as submitted and the amendment that has been proposed by the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart), and I would like to suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is out of order. I do so for these reasons. It seems to me that the inherent principle must at all times be that the motion and the amendment must form a clear and a concise statement. It cannot be contradictory, Sir, and it must be a coherent whole in any case, because, as we see here, if the part of the original motion, as amended were to pass, we would have a statement here which would be thoroughly contradictory in its context.

Now I refer to the amendment itself, which talks-about the payment of half the costs of a comprehensive medical care program, which has been or will be introduced by any parliament in Canada. I think it is obvious that the mover of the amendment intended that this would cover plans of the nature of the one instituted by the province of Alberta, or of the one to be instituted by the province of British Columbia, or of the one contemplated by the province of Ontario. Now, if this is not the case, I would certainly like to hear a denial to that effect, but I think by the wording of this amendment, it is clear that that is what is intended. If that is what is intended, it completely contradicts the wording in the first portion which is the progressive implementation of recommendations of the report, and the report is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The member is speaking to a point of order, because he has already spoken to the question, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. Davies: — I am speaking to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rose on that point and I have been trying to stick very closely to it and with your indulgence, I will try and close my remarks and let you make a ruling, or let someone else discuss the point that I have raised. I am saying that there is no question but that the Hall Commission recommendations and the amendment as proposed by the Minister of Health, are contradictory, and, as such, the amendment is not in order.

March 23, 1965

Mr. Speaker: — In connection with the point of order that has just been raised by the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), I draw the attention of the house, to the fact that points of order should be raised as they occur. The house has debated the motion and has already begun debating the amendment and the debate continues therefore on the amendment. Points of order have to be raised as they arise. No point of order was raised when the amendment was submitted.

Mr. Davies: — Further on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to question your decision, but I respectfully would like to say that if points of order cannot be raised at this time on the substantive part of a motion, the assembly would be in danger of making some rather peculiar decisions simply because a point of order raised initially. It is my submission, Sir, that a point of order can be raised at any time.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order, I think, it is generally agreed, should be raised at the time, and I think the authorities will also back me up on this. However, I did, at the time, rule that the amendment was in order and I still consider that that was the correct ruling. If the member wants a ruling on the matter, I would refer him to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules in Form 6, citation 70, section 4:

Points of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

Now, I would consider that after the amendment had been debated by others, it would be out of place to deny the right to other members to debate the matter further. I rule that the debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, in that event, therefore, I will speak to the amendment. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the debate is on the amendment and not on the motion and amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. Davies: — I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, this assembly would be in an impossible position in agreeing to this amendment for all the reasons that have been suggested by the lady member from Regina West (Mrs. Cooper), and her fellow member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), who rose, I understand, before she did in this debate.

The Hall Commission, throughout its recommendations, has talked about a prepaid, universal, public plan. The amendment here quite clearly envisages a comprehensive medical care program which has been, or will be, introduced by any province in Canada, but certainly does not rule out those plans which are quite opposed to the reasoning and to the recommendations of the Hall Commission. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I could not myself agree to this amendment. I think that the members of this house are going to be in an extremely difficult position in approving the motion as amended if, indeed, this amendment does carry in the house, because then we will have the situation where an affirmation of the proposals of the Hall Commission are in effect denied by the amendment which we now have before us.

There is, of course, in the proposals of the Commission, not only the medical care program which is envisaged in the amendment, but the whole spectrum of the training of health personnel, of the development of a wide set of facilities for all kinds of health treatment and care which just does not come in to play at all in the terms of the amendment. Apart from all else, sir, it seems to me that in the absence of a spelling-out of what is the comprehensive medical care program and because my friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart), has not arisen to deny what I have said about the intent of the amendment, that this house should not accept what has been offered to us, as an alteration of the original terms.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to propose a sub-amendment. The sub-amendment moved, seconded by the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) is:

That the words 'consistent with the recommendations

contained in the said report', be inserted after the word 'program' in the third line of the amendment.

And here, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the amendment as it appears in the Order Paper, and will make reference from the third line. I think you will see where I am referring you.

Mr. Speaker: — The question arose in my mind as to whether this sub-amendment was in order or not, because it does, I believe, propose to insert words in the sub-amendment which otherwise were proposed to be left out. However, I refer you to Citation 202 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, subsection 2, dealing with sub-amendments:

As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, the new question thus created must, to prevent confusion, be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration, is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion, accordingly, is laid aside and the amendment becomes for a time, a separate question to be dealt with until its terms are settled.

Now, on that basis, I believe, the sub-amendment to be in order. The debate continues on the sub-amendment.

The question before the house is on the proposed Resolution No. 10, moved by the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies):

That this legislature endorse in principle the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Health Services and urge the Government of Canada to call a conference of Provincial Premiers and Health Ministers immediately with a view to the progressive implementation of recommendations of this report; and further urge the Government of Canada to enter immediately into a financial agreement to pay half the costs of a Medical Care program to, any province which institutes or has instituted a Medical Care program, that conforms with the Commission's recommendations respecting medical care plans.

And the proposed amendment thereto moved by the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart):

That all the words after the word 'report' in the fifth line be deleted, and the following substituted therefore, "and further urge the Government of Canada to enter immediately into a financial agreement to pay half the costs of a comprehensive Medical Care program which has been or will be introduced by any province in Canada."

To which a sub-amendment has been moved by the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), seconded by the member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney):

That the words 'consistent with the recommendations contained in the said report,' be inserted after the word 'program' in the third line of the amendment.

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 25

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Brockelbank (Kelsey) | Whelan | Snyder |
| Cooper (Mrs.) | Nicholson | Brotten |
| Wood | Kramer | Larson |
| Nollet | Dewhurst | Robbins |

| | | |
|----------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| Walker | Michayluk | Brockelbank (Saskatoon Centre) |
| Blakeney | Smishek | Pepper |
| Davies | Link | Pederson |
| Thibault | Baker | |
| Willis | Wooff | |

NAYS — 31

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

The question being put on the amendment, it was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the house is on the motion as amended.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word on the motion as it is now amended. I want to say that I regretfully have to admit that I have no choice but to vote for the motion as amended. But I realize that I am voting for a motion that is contradictory because the first part of the motion that is before the house now, says that this legislature endorses . . .

Mr. L. P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He is speaking on the motion as amended and saying that it is contradictory, which is actually challenging the ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh yes, I think the member is speaking on the motion as amended, and if he wants to say it is no good or anything else, that is his privilege.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Thank you sir. I did not quite go that far. I did not say it was no good, but I said it had some weak points and one of the weak points is that it is contradictory.

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Prince Albert): — Change the first part.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The first part of the motion before us says:

That this legislature endorse in principle the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Health Services and urge the Government of Canada to call a conference of Premiers and Health Ministers immediately with a view to the progressive implementation of recommendations of this report;

Now, it is pretty clear and straight down that far, Mr. Speaker. It is supporting the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and it is asking that we go ahead with the implementation of the recommendations. Then the Minister of Public Health, by his amendment which is part of the motion, says:

and further urge the Government of Canada to enter immediately into a financial arrangement to pay half the costs of a comprehensive Medical

Care program which has been or will be introduced by any province in Canada.

Now, this can be any kind of a medical care program, not at all in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal Commission on health services, and, therefore, the two parts of the resolution are contradictory but in spite of this, Mr. Speaker, and because of the inability of getting the members on the government side of the house to see that this is a ridiculous situation, I will have to vote for the resolution as amended.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — I merely wanted to add one, point to the comments of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). They really are that the resolution is in two parts, as he has pointed out. The first part is, as he has described it, a recommendation of endorsement of the report of the Hall Commission. The second part indicates a request to the federal government to share in the costs of any kind of a medical care program. One has to ask oneself why the government would, and why members opposite would, urge on this house the support of any sort of a medical care program as they evidently are doing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there can be only two reasons for this. Either they have a tender sensitivity for the treasuries of those provinces which operate, or propose to operate, different kinds of plans, namely Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario. Not one of which needs any help from the government of the province of Saskatchewan, in operating its financial affairs. The second alternative is that the members opposite propose to change the Saskatchewan plan so as it will correspond with their plan. Which is it? Are they proposing to look after the financial affairs of the province of Alberta? I think no endeavor would be more futile, since they manage to get along pretty well without our help? Or is it the proposal of members opposite to change our plan so that it would not correspond with the Hall Commission's recommendations, but they still want federal money for it? I think that it is highly unlikely that they are worrying about the financial affairs of Alberta and British Columbia. Therefore, I am suggesting to this house that it is very likely that they propose changes in our medical care plan which would make it not in conformity with the Hall Commission report but they still want to see if they can get federal sharing for it. That is why they are urging this resolution. Now, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Vote against it.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have to vote against it because . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Blakeney: — Indeed I do not, because I agree with the first part. I agree with any rational application of the second part, and I suggest that the members opposite will not have an opportunity to apply an irrational interpretation of it before they will be out of office.

So accordingly, I feel confident in supporting the resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, you know every time the . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of order. The hon. member is out of order. He spoke on the motion when he moved the amendment.

Mr. Steuart: — I have not spoken on the motion as amended.

Mr. Brockelbank: — He did. Because he moved the amendment and one cannot move an amendment without speaking on the motion.

Hon. A. H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, you know this is rather a strange set of circumstances in this house. This is the second occasion when my friends opposite have said, 'I don't agree with it but I am going to vote for it'.

March 23, 1965

If you feel that this government is going to do some of the things that you have already stated they might do, then why do you not oppose this? I know why you will not oppose it. Because, you have not got, the courage of your convictions to oppose it, that is why.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — And I want to suggest to my hon. friend from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) that he may want, to run the business affairs of Manitoba, Alberta, Ontario, and other places in Canada, but he is one of the people that had to come to Saskatchewan to get elected. If he wants to run other areas in Canada, may I suggest you go and run them.

Of course, this is a typical socialist philosophy. Not only do they want to run the affairs of the province in which they are elected members, but they would like to run the affairs of other provinces; for which they have no responsibility, and where people have no confidence in them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time that my hon. friends opposite made up their minds whether they are in favor or opposed to this particular motion that is before the house. And how any member can stand in his place and speak against it and then vote for it, I do not know. If I have ever seen hypocrisy, this is it. And here just a few days ago, a lot of my friends opposite took the exact same view, spoke against the motion and then voted for it. What on earth has happened to this party? This was once the great socialist part of Saskatchewan — the party that was united — the party that came into this house and anything that they opposed they voted against, and anything they supported they forced through the house. The great leadership — they have no leadership today — totally disintegrated. And not only have they spoken against motions and then voted for them, but in some instances, one member spoke in favor and the next member spoke against and then they both voted for it.

Why do you not make up your minds? I would suggest that you have a caucus once in a while and decide what you are in favor of and what you are opposed to. And if you cannot settle it in a caucus, then I think you should call a provincial convention and get your constituents to advise you. I think it is utter hypocrisy for any individual to stand in his place and say, 'Well, I certainly do not agree with it but I am going to vote for it.' If you do not agree with it, then have the courage of your convictions and vote against it. We will note how you vote in a few moments.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I note with interest the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) in this connection, when he endeavored to the best of his mean ability to defend a very poor case. He says to the members over here, 'Why do you not stand and speak up for your plan?' This is exactly what we are doing in the first part of the resolution. May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, it was they who amended the resolution, not we. It was they who attempted to embarrass, this side of the house, not we. Why did not they support the original motion as it was, if they believed that somehow the plan brought in by these reviled socialists was a good one which they now are attempting, by-devious means, to destroy. This is self evident in the amendment to the original motion, Mr. Speaker.

We on this side of the house stand by our original convictions. There have been no contradictions at all here whatever. If there were any contradictions introduced then an attempt was made, by the member opposite to introduce a contradictory amendment, but they did not quite succeed, Mr. Speaker, because the first part of the motion still stands and the principles embodied in it are the principles that we believe in. If the hon. members pursue any attempt to wreck the medical care plan; as we have it in Saskatchewan, as has already been said, they probably will not have the opportunity. They will be out of office in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to suggest to you, sir, that this is a motion which actually includes two questions. The first question is quite clear. It is the endorsement of the principles of the recommendations of the Royal Commission and the recommendation to call a conference, with a view to the progressive implementation of the recommendations of this report. Now, that is one clear question.

The second part is a different question altogether. The second part reads disconnectedly and puts into words that this legislature could accept and it would read:

And further urge the Government of Canada to enter immediately into a financial agreement to pay half the Medical Care program which has been or will be introduced by any province in Canada.

which is a different kind of a proposal altogether. Now, I know that there are very good precedents, I cannot quite remember. There was one quite recently. There was quite a famous precedent where a speaker saw fit to divide a motion because it contained two questions, the purpose being to allow every member of parliament at Ottawa to vote on each question the way he saw fit, and not have his vote on one question influenced by his opinion on the other. This is the purpose of division. I would suggest, Sir, that you let the motion stand on the Order Paper and that you take under consideration this question, whether or not this motion should be divided and made into two questions.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Now, we have another example of what I referred to a moment ago.

For seventeen sessions I have set in this house and asked this house to do the very thing that the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) is now asking you to consider. For seventeen years it has been refused and I suggest to you that if we were to do what the hon. member has asked for now, then for seventeen years, the hon. member himself has opposed the very move that he is asking you to make now.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — No, never.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Never for seventeen years consecutively, every year, this is what the previous administration prevented this house from doing. Many occasions then the speaker's ruling was challenged and the speaker's ruling was supported by my friends who now sit opposite. And I ask you to take this into consideration if you were to give a moment's thought even to the request of the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank).

Hon. A. C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I say this. I am amazed that the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) with all his experience in the house, should even consider that you for a moment would take time to rule on this point of order.

First, he spoke to the amendment as amended. He said he was going to vote for it. So he approved it at that time. In his own thinking the amendment was in order, the amended motion is now in order. He spoke considering it to be in order. Now, he is raising the point, after he delivered his speech whether or not it is in order.

First he is going to support it and then he is going to oppose it. They all got up and said they are going to oppose it but they are going to vote for it. They cannot make up their minds what they are going to do. Just like . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of privilege . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . picking petals. I love you. I love you not.

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

Mr. Cameron: — Make up your mind whether you love it or whether you do not.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) said I stated I was against it and was going to vote for it. I stated no such thing. I want the hon. member (Mr. Cameron) to cease putting words in my mouth. And I want to set the record straight. I did not say that.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), and then the comments by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald). He said that at no time had a resolution been divided by the Speaker. I recall when Speaker Johnson was the Speaker of this legislature, I myself moved a resolution on agriculture that had a number of A, B, and C clauses. At the request of the now Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) who then sat on this side of the house, the Speaker of the day did divide that question. I, myself, did not think he should have but the Speaker ruled and it was so done. So the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), if he reflects, will recall that that has been done by previous Speakers in this legislature.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, what the ex-Speaker is talking about is an entirely different matter to the resolution that is now before us.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Get the journal and look it up.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — I have looked it up. I wish you would do it too. If you look it up, I hope you can understand what you read, which I doubt very much. But I want to say to my friends opposite, that certainly, if the motion has A, B, C, D, E, F, and G, this has been done, but this type of a motion has never been divided in this house by the hon. Gentlemen opposite or any other speakers.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it seems to me, that what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) has said, and to some extent what the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) added to what he had said, is largely irrelevant. I suggest, Sir, that you have to make your decision as these matters arise, on the merits of each case. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) asks us here in this house to accept his recollection of what has occurred in this house, and suggests that you should abide by that recollection, and I say that this is very silly indeed, and I think, Sir, that you are quite capable of judging this matter on the merits of the case that has been raised. I think we do not need to listen to what I think are series of irrelevancies.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to thank the members for the submissions that they have made in connection with the point of order. I think what they are referring to is to be found in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, citation 200, subsection 4.

A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the house may be taken on each separately.

I do not wish in any way to abate the privilege of the chair in taking advantage of the rule at any time the chair sees fit. In regard to the reference which has been made as to what took place in another parliament, I am quite cognizant of what took place there and also of the results that occurred afterwards.

But I do not think that this is of sufficiently distinct nature to warrant the splitting of this particular resolution, and that is the ruling that I intend to make in the interests of good procedure and less confusion. Therefore this is the way that I have ruled that the matter will be done.

The motion was agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 55

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------|
| Howes | Grant | Cooper (Mrs.) | Link |
| McFarlane | Cuelenaere | Wood | Wooff |
| Boldt | MacDonald (Milestone) | Nollet | Snyder |
| Cameron | Gallagher | Walker | Brotten |
| McDonald (Moosomin) | Breker | Blakeney | Larson |
| Steuart | Leith | Davies | Robbins |
| Heald | Bjarnason | Thibault | Pepper |
| Guy | Romuld | Willis | Pederson |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| Merchant (Mrs.) | Weatherald | Whelan | |
| Loken | Larochelle | Nicholson | |
| MacDougall | Asbell | Kramer | |
| Gardiner | Hooker | Dewhurst | |
| Coderre | Radloff | Berezowsky | |
| McIsaac | Coupland | Michayluk | |
| Trapp | Brockelbank (Kelsey) | Smishek | |
| MacLennan | Brockelbank (Saskatoon) | | |

NAYS – Nil

Nil

SECOND READINGS

The order of the Day having been called for second reading of Bill No. 61 — **An Act to amend the Hours of Work Act, 1959.**

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that this bill will, in effect, affect the public purse both directly and indirectly. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill should be considered as out of order. The bill, as it is, will affect the Department of Public Works, the Department of Highways and public utilities of this province, and in effect, affects the public purse in that it is not in order for a private member to move such a bill. I would like to hear your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would point out that the bill does not state that it binds the crown and it is a well established legal principle that no statute to this legislature shall be deemed to bind the crown unless it expressly provides in the statute, that the crown is bound by the statute. Hon. Members will note that there are many statutes such as the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office Act and many other acts, which state that the crown shall be bound by this statute. There is no such provision in this statute, and therefore, this statute does not bind the crown. The crown is therefore, not affected by this, not is the public purse affected in any way.

Hon. J.W. Gardiner (Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would take some exception to the statement of the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). I would agree that probably the crown is not bound, but contractors who are working on contract jobs that they have tendered for, would not have the same protection as the crown itself. This could possibly result in increased prices — tenders that have been estimated for the coming year.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I suggest, Sir, that your decision here is of great importance to the rights of all private members on whatever side of the house and I certainly think that in your interpretation of what is orderly here, you would take this into consideration.

It seems to me that the objection taken by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) is drawing a very long bow indeed and if this is the kind of objection that is taken in this case, it could be taken in connection with almost any bill which was moved by any private member in this house, perhaps indeed, a person might be able to take the same kind of exception to an act to amend the Lord's Day Act, if one were able to take the objection that has been taken to this bill at this time.

I would say that if this is the contention, that there should be much better grounds than those that have been urged upon us here this afternoon, and I would respectfully suggest that your consideration here be directed to give the benefit of the doubt to private members.

Mr. Nollet: — May I further point out that when this bill was introduced in this house originally, it was not a money bill. We are not dealing with a money bill, and it is pretty far-fetched to say that government finances will be involved because of the ramifications of this bill, which is not a money bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to thank the hon. Members for their views on the point of order which has been raised in connection with bill no. 61. The point of order which has been raised is to the effect that this can no longer be proceeded with, because it has not received the recommendations from his Honour The Lieutenant Governor. That is the point of order as it has been raised.

I would ask the hon. Members to allow me to defer my ruling until I consult the dusty tomes. I realize that, as the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) so aptly said, the decision would be a far-reaching and wide-ranging one not only here, but probably in other jurisdictions in Canada as well. Under these circumstances I would ask the house to allow me to reserve my decision.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that the bill will stand on the order paper? Is that right then?

Mr. Speaker: — It will stand there pending a decision in regard thereto and I will reserve my ruling.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. Steuart: Bill no. 41 — **An Act to amend the Health Services Act.**

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, least Monday, when I adjourned the debate on bill 41, I said that I was opposed to this bill, an Act to amend the Health Services Act. The Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) did point out, in his argument that the bill proposes to eliminate the Saskatchewan Health Services Advisory Commission.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the legislature, generally and particularly for the benefit of new members, I consider it important to review briefly, the activities and history of the Health Services Planning Commission, the predecessor bodies to the Health Services Advisory Commission. At the 1944 second session of the legislature, a provision was included in the Health Services Act, for the establishment of the Health Services Planning Commission. The Commission was directed to:

- (a) To determine the costs of providing for health services with respect to which recommendations are received by the minister and recommended to the minister — ways and means of financing these services.
- (b) Outline the proposed boundaries of health regions in consultation with other departments of the government.
- (c) Work out in detail the needs of one or more health regions to determine the health services required to satisfy the needs of the regions and the costs of such services.
- (d) Make an inventory of municipalities and local improvement districts which have not adequate health services and recommend to the minister what action should be taken to provide better health services.
- (e) Plan a scheme of compulsory health insurance for the population of one or more urban centres.
- (f) Assist the government in planning health services from time to time, under the consideration of the government.
- (g) Recommend to the minister qualified young medical graduates for post-graduate studies, particularly in the field of public health, psychiatry, and cancer control.
- (h) Recommend to the minister qualified registered nurses for

post-graduate training in advanced obstetrics and public health.

- (i) Make recommendations to the minister respecting extension of the faculty of medicine by the University of Saskatchewan and the provision of adequate clinical facilities for teaching purposes.

The Act also provided that the minister may appoint an advisory committee to the commission. The 1951 health survey report, volume one, page 248, shows that an advisory committee to the Health Services Planning Commission was established consisting of thirty-one persons. The number of persons and organizations represented were as follows:

The Saskatchewan College of Physicians, two;
 The public at large were represented by three;
 Local unions of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and other workers, one;
 The Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association, one;
 The United Farmers Women of Canada, Saskatchewan section, one;
 The Chiropractors Association of Saskatchewan, one;
 The Saskatchewan Council of Building Service Employees, one;
 The Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan, one;
 The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, one;
 The College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan, one;
 The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, one;
 The Veterinaries Association, one;
 Weyburn and Estevan Health Region, one;
 The Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, one;
 The Provincial Council of Women, one;
 The Swift Current Health Region, one;
 The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Municipal Secretaries, Treasurers, one;
 The Catholic Hospital Conference, one;
 The Canadian Red Cross Society, Saskatchewan division, one;
 The Saskatchewan Optometrists Association, one;
 The Saskatchewan Association of Physicians, one;
 The Saskatchewan Hospital and Medical League, one;
 The Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, one;
 The Saskatchewan Physical Therapists Association, one;
 The Saskatchewan Trades and Labour Congress, one;
 The Canadian Legion, one;
 The Saskatchewan Hospital Association, one.

The major tasks undertaken by the Health Services Planning Commission in its first few years, arose from the 1951 health survey report. This included the establishment of a sub-committee on hospital costs. The sub-committee reported frequently to the main body, which in turn made a number of recommendations to the minister on hospital capital costs. It reviewed the comments and the recommendations made by the 1951 health survey report on health organization. It debated the facts of the survey report and reviewed further representations and received representations by way of briefs from certain organizations. It reviewed the hospital survey and master plan report of the health survey committee and met delegations to discuss hospital construction proposals. It established a sub-committee on appropriate services in small hospitals and considered the recommended review of the regulations under the Hospital Standards Act. Recommendations on this matter were submitted to the minister in April of 1956, but some questions remained under study for future periods. In October of 1960, the Commission established a hospital survey committee. This committee has no members of the commission on it. The Hospital Survey Committee's report was reviewed by the commission and transmitted to the minister in November, 1962.

It was customary for the commission to review annually proposed legislation on health matters and sometime propose changes to the regulations. Some of the subject matters considered by the commission grew out of particular events and projects. For example, report of the Water Pollution Conference of 1954; the federal-provincial conference on health insurance in 1955, and the federal proposals which followed; the World Health Organization Assembly of 1956 and the Saskatchewan provincial municipal conference of 1956. The commission also discussed and considered current events, such as the hemoglobin distribution, mass polio vaccine distribution, chiropractor practice, regional development of health services, protection of children whose parents refuse to allow them to have blood transfusions.

March 23, 1965

Many matters were referred to the Health Service Planning Commission for the advice by the Department of Public Health, or based on the working papers prepared by the department. For instance, the national health grants and the projects supported by national health grants, review of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan operations, allowances for disabled persons, the federal-provincial program of vocational training under the schedule R program, nursing education, the need for additional facilities for the care of convalescence and chronic patients, regional hospital councils, road ambulance services, hospital capital and operating costs, the mental health program — particularly the Saskatchewan plan, the work of the committee on ionizing radiation, the work and facilities of the provincial lab, hospital accreditation, staffing of public health regions and the need for school of social workers in Saskatchewan.

The commission studied many health questions raised by its members, for instance, the need for a school of psychotherapy at the University of Saskatchewan. The value of medical social workers in general hospitals was examined and the commission sent a statement to general hospitals supporting the use of social workers.

A closer examination of the depth, scope, and diversity of the studies and considerations of the commission in the health field is impressive indeed and warrants its continuation. I suppose that it could be argued and the minister did try to argue it the other day, that certain studies conducted in recent years by special committees, established by the government, such as the Advisory Committee on medical care for aged and long termed illness survey committee, might have been undertaken by the commission.

The minister should be reminded, however, that the commission kept in touch with the activities of these special committees. I am prepared to admit, that in more recent years, the activities of the commission were somewhat limited. The most important of its studies was the hospital survey report. The reasons for the commission's limited activities are well known.

The commission was awaiting the reports of the special committees. Many members of the commission became overburdened with other work and met difficulties in attending meetings. There were important and rapid changes taking place in the provision of health services in the province. The commission, Department of Health, and the government were well aware of these salient facts, and for these reasons, the Health Services Act was amended in 1963. The commission was renamed "The Saskatchewan Health Services Advisory Commission". Its powers and its duties were modified and membership on the body was revised to ensure better attendance at meetings and to give broader representation.

The function of the Advisory Commission now is to study and make surveys of planning, organization, operation and financing of programs and services authorized by or provided under the legislation of the province, respecting matters related to health; to make recommendations to the minister with respect thereto; to study and make surveys of the needs of and provision of health care facilities and personnel in the province, including the education and training of technical personnel and their employment; to make recommendations to the minister in this respect; to appoint committees and sub-committees from its members and to assign them such duties as deemed advisable; to recommend to the minister the appointment of other committees, consultants and technical personnel and the assignment to them of such duties and functions as deemed advisable.

The commission is required to study and make recommendations to the minister concerning proposed legislation referred to it by the minister for consideration, to study briefs and other submissions presented to the minister or the executive council by non-governmental agencies or bodies or members, of the public relating in whole or in part, to matters of health and referred to the commission by the minister for consideration. The commission is required to transmit annually a report to the minister. Those who have studied health plans in this country and in other countries, and where plans have been established in other countries for a period of time, recognize the need and the importance of providing an advisory body as part of an administrative structure representative of the interest of those who benefit and those who provide health care services.

Professor Evelyn Burns in a publication, *Social Security and Public Policy*, published by McGraw-Hill Book Company in 1956, stated:

That last and perhaps the most important of all the major administrative problems confronting countries operating extensive social security

systems, is how to ensure a truly democratic administration of these programs.

I submit, that the way to ensure democratic administration of health programs is through an advisory commission as presently provided in the Health Services Act.

Since 1960, I have had some direct experiences and have given more than average study to health plans of different countries. One fact stands out. Nations with long experience in the provision of health services in public programs have, or are, establishing health planning or advisory councils, committees, boards or commissions, tailored to meet the needs of their plans and representative of those providing and receiving services.

Let me cite some examples. In a publication, Health Service in Britain, of March 1960, the following was stated:

The minister is advised in the discharge of his responsibility by the central Health Service Council which reviews the general development of the service and makes a special study of any subject of which, in its view, the minister's attention could be called, and by a number of standing advisory committees, which he has established on the recommendations of the Central Council. Medical, dental, pharmaceutical and ophthalmic committees are professional in character, while others include lay members and review the whole scope of the services in their particular field.

In addition to the standing advisory committees, the Central Council sets up a committee of its own, as need arises. These have included a committee on the administration and organization of hospital services, on prescribing, on co-operation between hospitals, local authority and general practitioners services, on general practice and on hospital supplies. These committees may include co-operative members from outside the council and such bodies as the British Medical Association may be consulted.

The British experience with public health programs dates back to 1911. In an article, "Sickness Insurance Schemes and The Federal Republic of Germany" by Oscar Omrad, the following is said:

The federal committee on doctors and sickness funds and the provincial committees on doctors and sickness funds assisted by impartial advisors, draw up the necessary basic principles for the safeguard of medical care by the fund doctors, insuring efficient, proper, and economic care for sick persons with particular reference to the introduction of new methods of investigation and cure and provision of medical benefits.

The Australian National Health Services Plan provides for committees of inquiries. The function of the committee is to inquire into and report to the Minister of Health, or the general director of health, on any matter referred to it, arising out of services or conduct of medical practitioners.

A World Health Organization publication describes health services in the Soviet Union. I note with interest that there too, is a committee established advising on health services. The report states as follows:

The advisory function is carried out by a series of councils attached in urban and rural areas. These councils consist of specialists from within as well as from outside the units concerned, and they advise the ministry in regard to the adoption of methods of work and the introduction of new developments in medical science.

The advisory planning committee on medical care in Saskatchewan,

which studied the health services that now exist, or existed at that time in the province, made a recommendation that there should be an Advisory Committee established and I would draw the attention of the members to the Advisory Committee report on pages 91, 92, and 93. Here the committee makes extensive recommendations of the type of a committee that should be established and I might draw to the attention of this house that not a single dissension is recorded in the report. In this respect, the members of the Thompson Committee were in full accord that there should be that kind of a body established to advise on health services.

The Royal Commission on Health Services, the Hall Commission as it is better known, stated clearly and without equivocation in their recommendations, and I quote:

Provision must be made at the local, regional, provincial and federal level, for representative health planning councils to ensure democratic participation in the setting of goals and objectives and the meeting of human needs.

Mr. Speaker, nations and governments agree after years of experience. Committees, boards and commissions, also agree after years of study, that the important thing to do is to establish advisory bodies for the field of health. But our Minister of Health, after holding the health portfolio for only a period of nine months, says "no". He does not want anybody's advice. He says, "I am the hon. member from Prince Albert. I know it all." He is, in this bill, telling the house and the people of Saskatchewan that the organization, administration and provision of health services, rests in his private domain.

Mr. Speaker, health services, more than almost any other area of provincial government activity, are universal, they affect everybody. Moreover the collective experiences of people of this province in establishing and developing community health services is formidable. I think of the Union Hospital districts, the municipal doctor plans, health regions, and particularly the Swift Current health region, the College of Medicine, nursing training, the Medical Health Association, and so on. There are many people in this province who know a great deal about the need for health services and how these health services could be provided right down at the community level.

I have a considerable amount of respect for the ability of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart). He has been a municipal councillor and a mayor. He has accumulated a good deal of experience selling furniture and appliances and wheaties, but I do not honestly believe that he knows all there is to be known about health. I do not honestly believe that he is the best of all qualified men to decide in every detail how his department spends \$50,000,000 a year. I think that money will be spent better and give better satisfaction to the people of the province, if he heeds the advice, not only of his capable, efficient officials in his department, but also of the community health people and the professional people who make up the Health Services Advisory Commission.

Mr. Speaker, just whose advice is it that the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) does not want to hear? Who are the people and the organizations that the Minister would like to kick out of a formal advisory relationship to his department? Let us just run down the list.

First, there is Mr. H. H. Ellison of Gull Lake. He is a chairman of the board of the Swift Current Health Region. He has been a member of that board ever since the Swift Current Medical Care Plan started — several times the number of years the member from Prince Albert has been in this house. But, of course, the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) does not need any advice from that quarter apparently.

Then, proceeding alphabetically, there is Mr. H. H. Basinet, administrator of the Victoria Union Hospital, in the minister's own home town. He represents the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. But the man in charge of the hospital services plan does not need his advice.

Mr. C. H. Hallman of Kronau, a farmer, represents the inter-regional board commission of all regional health boards; and Mr. William Hamilton, Co-op Union secretary, who represents the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, but, of course, the farmers do not know much about health services, or do not know as much apparently, as furniture salesmen do. So who needs their advice?

The College of Dental Surgeons is represented by Dr. Walter Hancock

of Fort Qu'Appelle. Dr. C. Heal of Moose Jaw was named to the Advisory Commission by the Co-ordinating Council on Rehabilitation, but then the minister has a lot of other doctors to give him advice.

Here is another representative of the Hospital Association, Dr. Jamieson, Chairman of the Board of the Moosomin Union Hospital. Dr. D. H. McLeod, dean of Arts and Science at the Regina Campus, represents the University of Saskatchewan. The University has the job of training doctors and other medical personnel, and there is the University Hospital. Dr. McLeod, himself, helped organize and develop the first training course for hospital administrators in the province, but the minister, of course, has the Johnson Committee if he needs any advice on the administration.

Miss Lois Minor represents the Regina Nurses' Association, one of four women on the Health Services Advisory Commission. The other three are Mrs. L. C. Nelson, representing the provincial Council of Women; Mrs. Marian Sherman of Prince Albert represents the urban Municipalities Association; and Sister Margaret Marie, administrator of the Holy Family Hospital in Prince Albert. Provincial Council of Women, the Urban Municipalities Association, the Catholic Hospital Conference, but who needs their advice?

There are more names and more organizations . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hear! Hear! He knows it all.

Mr. Steuart: — What about your own name, Walter? Don't forget that.

Mr. Smishek: — I am coming to it. I am coming to it.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, the municipal men who pioneered tax-supported medical care in Saskatchewan — their representative is E. R. Murphy of Estevan. The College of Medicine is represented by the head of the department of surgery, Dr. Nansing. Another doctor is Dr. McKercher named by the Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour was represented by myself. Following my election to this assembly . . .

Mr. Steuart: — All that fuss, Walter, just to get your name mentioned.

Mr. Smishek: — I discussed the matter of my representation . . .

An Hon. Member: — You fired all the rest, Maybe you can fire him.

Mr. Smishek: — . . . on this committee with the chairman of the commission . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Sour grapes.

Mr. Smishek: — . . . and I also prepared my resignation from the Health Services Advisory Commission. My resignation, Mr. Speaker, has been awaiting a meeting of the commission — a meeting which this government has not called since taking office on May 22nd.

There are still others, Mr. Walker of Moose Jaw, represents the Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan. Mr. E. D, Wilkie a pharmacist of North Battleford, represents the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association, Dr. Riddell of the Regina campus, University of Saskatchewan, is named as a public representative on this board. All these people, Mr. Speaker, were prepared to give the benefit of their wide, collective experience, and knowledge as a guide to the Minister of Public Health.

Just what is it that he is afraid of, Mr. Speaker? These are responsible people — widely representative of the providers and the users of the health services. I believe they have made and would continue to make a real contribution to the rational organization of public health services in the province, but the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) does not want their advice or is it, Mr. Speaker, that he does not want to get his advice through the front door? Back door advice comes cheaper, and there is the added convenience that you can always take care of only those who you agree with.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal of eliminating the Advis—

March 23, 1965

ory Commission is an open admission that the Liberal party and its government does not intend to extend and improve health services in the province as they promised. This, in fact, is a proposal to start cutting back on the health services of this province.

I want to tell this house, and particularly the new members of the assembly the real reason for the government doing away with the advisory body. *You* will have noticed in my enumeration of organizations and group representatives on the advisory commission, the College of Physicians and Surgeons do not have, and have not named a direct representative. They are entitled under the Order-in-Council to name two. They have been requested to name two representatives, but they have refused. It has been said by members opposite that, after they took office in May last, co-operation between the medical profession and the government improved as if there was some magic.

Well, Mr. Speaker, magicians Wilbur and Davey in this connection reached into their hat expecting to pullout a rabbit and came up with a one way ticket to go, you know where, from the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The College has refused and still refuses to name members to this advisory commission, This, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is one of the principal reasons, if not the main reason, why the government is proposing to eliminate the Advisory Committee. Not because there is no need for it, but because the College is refusing to co-operate.

Mr. Speaker, the administration, provision, organization and extension of health services is a public matter in which every citizen is vitally concerned. It is not just a matter of concern or of interest to the medical profession.

I do admit that those matters of professional judgement properly should be kept in the hands of the professional people, but how health services are organized, administered and paid for, is the business of all citizens. We must, therefore, not eliminate an important and a democratic administrative structure, and bow to the dictates of one group in our society which refuses to co-operate. Democratic governments function best when people are given an opportunity to help. Doing away with this commission is eliminating democracy — eliminating those providing and those receiving health benefits from helping to govern.

It is acknowledged by knowledgeable people everywhere that the role of government is increasing and will continue to increase at a faster rate in this technological age, despite what the members opposite may have to say, or how much they may be opposed to it. Their compatriots in Ottawa reluctantly recognize this. The people opposite do not understand the function and responsibility of government when they propose to take this action. They may learn, let us hope . . .

An Hon. Member: — You will learn.

Mr. Smishek: — . . . because the scope of government is increasing. It is becoming more important and more urgent to involve people and their organizations to help government. This was the policy of the previous government. This is becoming more of a policy by most democratic governments.

Since May 22nd, the Liberal government has been eliminating people's organizations from helping to govern, but please don't in this case. It is too important to the democratic control of our health services. Also keep in mind that in case of the Hall Commission, their recommendation is very much on the point that advisory bodies of this nature should be continued and should be established.

There is much to be done in the field of health in this province. There are at least three major reports which were referred to this committee for further recommendations for staging various programs that have been recommended by the Thompson Committee, by the Age and Long Term Illness Survey Committee and by the Hospital Survey Committee. These reports contain a great deal of information, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that the advice that the government can receive from this body would be invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the bill and I would urge members from both sides of the house to oppose the bill. I would also urge the minister to reconsider this bill and withdraw it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to

cover ground that the member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) has already covered. I think he has made a very thorough case, and a case that makes it most difficult for the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) to answer, because so far as I can see, nothing was raised in the initial presentation for the till by him, that really substantiated an argument for the dissolution of this advisory body.

I think it is a fact that of all the organizations that my friend from Regina East (Mr. Smith) has enumerated, we have not heard of one body that has asked for the dissolution of this advisory committee. We know that this is composed of representatives of employees' bodies, farm bodies, farm women's bodies, the provincial Council of Women, professional groups, of health regions, and a very, very wide cross-section, when it is considered in its entirety.

I can see, Mr. Speaker, that there are occasions when the ad hoc committees that the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) referred to, when he first spoke of this bill, are quite satisfactory for particular purposes but they are not satisfactory when questions that involve the whole population have to be considered. Of course, the argument, as I understand it, of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) is that ad hoc committees can be created when necessary and, as a matter of fact, have been functioning in the past eight or nine months as they have been deemed necessary.

Of course, there is nothing inconsistent at all in having a Health Services Advisory Commission, as well as ad hoc committees, either created through or by the commission, or the government and the commission co-operating, or ad hoc committees that have no particular relationship to the Advisory Commission. But for the Minister to suggest that the ad hoc committees of themselves are a solution to the questions that have been so completely dealt with by my friend from Regina East (Mr. Smishek), it seems to me is not an answer to what we have before us this afternoon.

I want to remind the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) also that one of the integral recommendations of the Hall Commission is on this very subject. The Hall Commission talks about national committees, provincial committees, regional committees, local committees. The Hall Commission has done so with the understanding that it is extremely important to have the advice of a cross-section of all citizens that have to do with the health of the community.

Of course, the health community, Mr. Speaker, is not something which touches on only one aspect. It is a very, very broad spectrum indeed that is affected by health, and necessarily I suggest, requires the advice of some kind of citizens' body. Therefore, it is not sufficient to get the advice of say a physician's committee on some matter that might affect medical services. Even the advice of a committee representing the Hospital Association might not be enough in itself to cover all of the angles that could be involved in a question that concerns the health of a community.

I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the government in advancing this bill has made a mistake. It is not too late to correct that mistake by withdrawing this bill. I would like to respectfully suggest to the minister this afternoon that he might give some consideration to this suggestion and on that basis, the bill might be considered some other time after he had given that reconsideration.

I do think that if the Advisory Committee is taken away from the institutions that are part of the health bodies we know in this province, there is going to be a grave loss, and it will not be made up until a similar body replaces it. As I said when I got to my feet, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to repeat all of the excellent arguments that were given by the previous speaker. I do think, however, that an extremely solid point has been made and is apparent — that is, who has asked for the dissolution of this body? In the absence of a good cogent answer to that question, this bill should not be proceeded with.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the house to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now or he will forfeit his right to do so.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, what I have to say on this bill is going to be short. It has been suggested to the minister that he should withdraw this bill. I agree with that contention because of unhappy experiences that we had in my constituency a number of years ago.

March 23, 1965

Going back to 1956 and 1957, when there was considerable amount of difficulty because of decisions by a hospital board at that time, decisions concerning . . .

Mr. Steuart: — On a point of order, I think the hon. Member is on the wrong bill.

Mr. Kramer: — I am sorry. I do not think I am on the wrong bill, Mr. Speaker, this The Hospital Services . . .

Mr. R. H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) sponsoring this bill. Listening to the members of the government extol the virtues of local government on almost every hand and every issue lately, I would have thought they would have been falling over one another in support of commissions in an advisory capacity.

I am perhaps alarmed when we see one piece of legislation pertaining to public welfare being nullified. Not very difficult for me to see the hand behind the scene — that the brief that they refused to table from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, is the groundwork behind one after another of these pieces of legislation. As I said, I am amazed, Mr. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) — but knowing him as I do, I will leave the responsibility with him.

Mr. Speaker: — I must again draw to the attention of the members that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, if I would have honestly thought that the member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) felt so bad about getting off this committee, and made such a long and boring speech about it, I think I might really have reconsidered bringing in this legislation.

Mr. Smishek: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Steuart: — You were boring. I don't think that is a point of order.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, point of privilege, I made my position very clear, that I discussed the matter of my resignation with the chairman of the commission and I have had my resignation ready for a long time. The commission has never met since the government took office and I think it is a wrong insinuation and a wrong aspersion that the minister is trying to cast.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I will “expurge” that from the record. I am sorry. If I had known you were ready to do that I would have called a meeting. It would have been worth it. But the hon. Member from Moose Jaw suggests, “who asked to keep this committee going?” I can ask him “who asked to put an end to this committee?” The answer to this is that I had several members come to me when I suggested this. I asked them what this committee did and they said they did not know really what work they were supposed to do, but it was all part of a whole problem we found when we became the government. The Socialist, Mr. Speaker, were . . .

Mr. Davies: — Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Steuart: — Sure, go ahead. I'll answer . . .

Mr. Davies: — May I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, what organizations requested that this body be dissolved?

Mr. Steuart: — What organization asked that it be dissolved?

Mr. Davies: — What organizations (plural) asked that . . .

Mr. Steuart: — None that I know of and I do not know of any that asked

that it be kept going either. I said I had many individuals, and I will not name them because it might embarrass them. They came and sat at some of those meetings but regardless of whether the board — I think in the past, the committee may have done some good work, and I think the previous administration had to hire someone whose almost sole duty — not totally I understand, but a great deal of their duty was to keep this committee going and try to find some work for it to do.

The Socialists love these committees and boards. I think they had seventy-five or a hundred which we found. We have not found them all yet. There is a question on the order paper asking us to divulge how many boards and committees and commissions there still are, and as soon as we can find them all, I am sure we are going to answer that question. But I often wonder if they used these groups of people as sounding boards, if they really used them for advice, or if they used them for scapegoats. It was my experience with many of them over the years — the Continuing Committee and so on — that they gathered a group of people together and attempted to fit the plans they had already made and put them in the mouths of these people to try to give them some respectability by putting them out as if these independent boards or commissions had thought of the idea or were proposing a certain plan.

I do not agree. I never agreed particularly with many of the things the former administration did in the Department of Public Health, but I did not particularly disagree as to how they arrived at their conclusions and if they felt the need of such a board it was their business. It was their responsibility to run the department. I do not feel the need of that particular type of board although I am seeking advice and will continue to seek advice, and I think better advice in a sounder way from the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, from the Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association, from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and from the College of Dental Surgeons, and from other interested groups of people who have wide experience, and when I do ask them I give them a specific job to do. I ask them their advice on a specific subject. In other words, I ask them to do something tangible and to this point they have done it and I am very happy and very proud of the co-operation I have had.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see the need of this board. It costs money. It is just one more Socialist board although many of the people on it were not Socialists but I think the majority probably were. I think they were good people and I have sought their advice and will continue to see it. I do not see the need of the board, the commission or the committee. . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Will he be surprised . . .

Mr. Stuart: — . . . and so this is why we introduced this legislation and why we support it.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division and bill read the second time.

Yeas — 30

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

Nays — 25

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|--------|
| Brockelbank (Kelsey) | Whelan | Snyder |
| Cooper (Mrs.) | Nicholson | Broten |
| Wood | Kramer | Larson |

| | | |
|----------|------------|-------------------------|
| Nollet | Dewhurst | Robbins |
| Walker | Berezowsky | Brockelbank (Saskatoon) |
| Blakeney | Michayluk | Pepper |
| Davies | Smishek | Pederson |
| Thibault | Link | |
| Willis | Wooff | |

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. Steuart that Bill no. 42 — **An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act** be read the second time.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on March 15th, I think that was the date, I tried to outline to the house what I thought were some of the clear and evident consequences of the government proceeding with this bill. At that time, as I recall, I argued that it first of all concerned the patient, it concerned the Hospital Board, and it concerned professional people, in an adverse way. I said, with regard to the patient, that it would hurt him in his choice if a physician did not have hospital privileges, the patient would be barred from receiving the services of his physician in a hospital. It would also hurt that patient as a citizen, in his rights as a citizen-owner of a public hospital, or as a Saskatchewan citizen who in one way or another, was making a contribution to the running and capital costs of both public and private hospital institutions in the province.

I said too, at that time, that the consequences of bill no. 42 for the Hospital Board involved a means by which there would no longer be afforded that kind of action which would permit a board to seek advice when there was a question of hospital privileges for any professional person. I said that there would be, if this bill was repealed, a weakening of the real autonomy of a Hospital Board, since it would not have the reinforcement of valuable advice from the Appeal Board which, of course, under the legislation is permitted to give upon request, advice and assistance to the hospital authorities.

I said that also, as a consequence, it would expose the board to an allegation, that it would not be able to answer successfully because of the negative factors that are obvious in some particular situation involving hospital privileges and professional rights. I said, I think finally, that . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I thought there was a rule that a member is not to repeat what was said before. If he said all this before why is he repeating? Let us have some new material.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be concluding this portion in a minute or two. I think it is not uncommon for people that rise in this house to speak on a bill that they have talked about at some other time to try to recapitulate what has gone before. I have taken about four minutes to do that, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think it is going to be much longer than that before I sit down. I may say, Mr. Speaker, if they are worried about 5:30 I am surprised that the Premier and the Minister of Health should want to take such hasty action on such an important matter as the bill that is now before us. Indeed, I certainly have not repeated myself at any time that I have talked about this bill.

In any case, I said that the point of view of professional people was affected for the obvious reasons that have previously been advanced in this house on a number of occasions and by the physicians themselves before the Woods Commission

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there are clearly many other subjects that could be made part of my case in arguing against this bill. We have thus far been talking about instances where in most cases hospital privileges are refused or delayed or restricted on applications of professional people — usually those who are new to a community and are making applications for the first time. One could think about the application of a physician, or the rights of a physician, and the rights of the Hospital Board, because I think they are all involved in the case of this kind, where hospital privileges had been granted to a physician and were subsequently withdrawn. I suggest this is the kind of a case where the Hospital Board that was involved would be most anxious to get the best advice that it could before taking an action

On this type of case. They would look to the decision of a final tribunal, Mr. Speaker, beyond the opinion of the local professional body that guided it in most other cases.

When I spoke on March 15th, I reviewed some of the statements of the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) on this bill. There is one that I neglected to touch upon and this has been the subject of some news comment. I am going to talk about it at this time. The minister said, as I recall his statement, (and I would be glad if he would correct me if I am wrong) that the previous CCF administration had ignored local consultation and local discussion with hospital authorities and had chosen instead, the alternative of legislation. He left the implication, I suggest, of bureaucracy, of CCF preference for arbitrary solutions, whereas the Liberal government now in power, undertook, he suggested, a homespun, down-to-the-people sort of approach and down-to-local-government approach on cases of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) may have a matter to place before the house. I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Assembly adjourned at 5:29 p.m.