LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
38th Day

Tuesday, March 30th, 1965

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day

MOTION RE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — I should like to move that when this house adjourns today it stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 31st, 1965, at 2:30 o'clock. This motion is required, I understand, so that private bills committee may meet.

Motion agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the house that His Honour will be in the legislature this afternoon at 5:15, for the purpose, I hope, of giving assent to certain bills.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE LEGISLATIVE SECRETARIES

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I wish to announce the government's intention to appoint four additional Legislative Secretaries. These appointments will be made, of course, subject to the approval of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, of Bill no. 30.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — I hope they pass it.

Mr. Thatcher: — I am hoping they will pass it. Now as I intimated several weeks ago, these appointments will be effective for the balance of the year and it will be our intention to appoint some different MLAs for 1966. The first appointment will be to the Department of Natural Resources, Mr. Allan Guy, MLA for Athabasca. His prime responsibility will be the new Indian and Metis branch . . .

An Hon. Member: — Poor Indians.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Guy is 38, a graduate of the University of Saskatchewan, with a B.A. degree and a Bachelor of Education degree. Married with three children.

The second appointment will be to the Department of Education, Mrs. Sally Merchant, MLA for Saskatoon city. Mrs. Merchant has an Arts degree and an Education degree, two children. The third appointment will be to the Department of Highways, Mr. Bernard Gallagher, MLA for Yorkton. Mr. Gallagher is a farmer, married, with five children. The fourth and final appointment will be to the Premier's office, Mr. Don McLennan, MLA for Last Mountain. I am making these announcements today, so that these MLAs may immediately become acquainted with the departments. We have every reason to hope that they may help promote good government in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

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 congratulate all the members who are expecting to be appointed as Legislative Secretaries, and this morning, ahead of time, will give them time to get the right type of hat for the occasion, before they are actually appointed. Even though I, with others, oppose the general idea, when these are appointed, we do hope that they will serve Saskatchewan well.

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Modest people, Brock . . .

QUESTION RE LOST CAR, RETURN NO. 102

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Coderre) if he is making any progress and when we may expect the Return No. 102, re the lost car. I would like to ask the Premier also when we may expect the introduction of the bill to amend the Election Act, which was forecast in the speech from the throne.

Mr. Thatcher: — The return, I am informed, is on its way from the hon. Minister of Labour. As far as introductions to the amendments to the Election General Act, the Attorney (Mr. Heald) informs me that he hopes to give notice tomorrow so that the bill would be in the hands of hon. members on Friday.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — Further to what the Premier has said, the Election Act amendments have been, for some time, in the hands of the law clerk, and just as soon as they come back, I will give notice, and I hope this will be tomorrow, as the Premier has said. It will be in the next day or two anyway.

QUESTION RE LEGISLATIVE SECRETARIES

Mr. Walter Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I wonder whether the Legislative Secretaries have had license numbers reserved for them.

Mr. Thatcher: — No.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE RINK OF QUESTIONABLE CURLERS

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, perhaps a little lighter item might help a bit. It has become the custom to announce important athletic events in the house, and I have one to announce this morning as well. That is a rink of questionable curlers including Mr. Joe Moran and Mr. Hugh Munroe of Wascana Centre Authority, myself as second, and Mr. Larmour, the Deputy Minister as lead, who won the Public Works Curling Championship. The individual trophy is on my desk and I would just like to warn the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) that, come next fall, I think with a little more bowling, perhaps, this summer, that I hope I will be able to give him a good race.

Mr. Ian MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — I would like to question the minister and ask him if he curled and won this on Sunday.

Mr. Gardiner: — No, every game was on Saturday.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE BOOK WRITTEN BY A FORMER MEMBER, H. CLIFFORD DUNFIELD

Mr. Henry E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Before the Orders of the Day are called, 1 would like to bring to the attention of this house a book published by Mussons Book Company, and written by a former member of this house, Mr. H. Clifford Dunfield. Mr. Dunfield represented the Meadow Lake constituency from 1952 to 1956. During these nearly fifty years in Meadow Lake, Mr. Dunfield saw a crossroads fur-trading post grow to a modern urban centre, and the surrounding wilderness become one of the most productive agricultural communities of the province. Out of these experiences came the story of Rusty and Susie, and the efforts of one Indian family to hold fast to ancient ways and traditions of their forefathers. This is Mr. Dunfield's first book. It is a rare and rewarding labor of love, authentic to an amazing degree. Musson's say it is a story tremendously appealing for adults and young adults, to stand beside The Incredible Journey on every bookshelf in the province. I would like to congratulate Mr. Dunfield on the publishing of this book and to wish him every success on his second book, which he is now writing.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Harry D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are called, I would like to bring to the attention of the house the fact that we have some 30 students from Hugh Cairns School in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. East. I am sure that all members would join with me in wishing them a very happy afternoon in the capital city and hope they enjoy their stay in the legislature, and that they have a safe journey home.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Mr. Speaker: — The house will recall that on March 19th last, Bill no. 61, An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act, 1959, was introduced by leave and read the first time. Then the aforesaid bill came up for second reading on March 23rd, a point of order was raised. I listened with interest to the arguments and views by members upon the point of order and I wish to express my appreciation to them for the benefit of their ideas and opinions. Members will recall that I did, with common consent, reserve my ruling in order to allow myself time to consult the relevant authorities and to conduct that research which the matter required and deserved, and in order to give the problem serious contemplative consideration commensurate with its magnitude.

Objections has been taken that Bill no. 61, entitled "An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act, 1959" and standing in the name of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) is a "money" bill so-called: that is, that it proposes to appropriate a part of the public funds, or revenue or a part of any tax or impost to a purpose spelled out in the bill. In such case, a principle of our constitution is that the purpose of the bill must be recommended to this assembly by message of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. A corollary principle is that such a message can only be delivered to this assembly by one of His Honour's advisers who is a minister of the crown.

The effect of these principles is to preclude any member, other than a minister of the crown, from proceeding with such a bill upon a point of order taken. The broad principle is that the money voted by this assembly towards supply must be devoted to purposes approved by the executive. My problem then is to determine whether this bill, if enacted, would appropriate or require an expenditure out of public money received and collected or receivable and collectable by the province.

The immediate purposes of Bill no. 61, is to reduce the hours of work, previously established by The Hours of Work Act, 1959, for employees covered by that act, and to effect this reduction in work hours without any diminution of wages. The result is an increase in hourly wage rates, which is immediately borne by employers to whom the act applies. I will assume that this increase in wage rates causes an additional expenditure of employers' monies which they do not recoup from other sources or off-set in other manner. If, then, the Province of Saskatchewan is an employer within the meaning of The Hours of Work Act, 1959, there is a direct appropriation of public money to meet increased expenditures in the public service.

For the purpose of applying the "money" bill rule to Bill no. 61 — but not by way of a legal opinion which, as Speaker of this assembly, I cannot give — I must hold that the crown is not an employer within the meaning of the relevant act and, consequently Bill no. 61 would not directly appropriate public money.

It may be suggested that the bill, although not creating a direct charge on public funds or revenues, will nevertheless indirectly increase the public expenditures if we assume that the costs of goods and services to the provincial treasury will thereby rise. Admitting this hypothesis for the sake of argument, I am satisfied that an appropriation of public funds within the meaning of our constitutional principle means an authority given by this assembly to the crown to pay money out of the consolidated fund. I do not find such authority in this bill or the act it proposes to amend.

In reaching my decision I find the following recent precedents of other legislatures persuasive, although not, of course, binding upon me. Members may be interested to refer to the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, Chapter 38 of the 1964-65 Statutes of Canada. This act regulates hours of work, minimum wages, annual vacations, and general holidays. It is administered by the federal Minister of Labour, and, presumably, will indirectly but necessarily add to the general administrative costs of the federal labour department. This act, as a bill, was a government measure,

and, if a “money" bill, would have required to be accompanied by a recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General. There was no recommendation. It follows then that it was not regarded as a "money" bill.

Also, in the 1964-65 session of parliament, private members introduced in the House of Commons the following bills: Bill No. CIS: An Act to amend The Annual Vacations Act (two weeks after one year). Bill No. C30: An Act to provide for Pay for Statutory Holidays and for Pay for Work Performed on Statutory Holidays for Employees in Federal Works, Undertakings, and Businesses; Bill No. C36: An Act to provide for Minimum Wages for Employees in Federal Works, Undertakings and Businesses; and Bill No. C54: An Act to amend the Annual Vacations Act (three weeks after five years). The titles of these bills are indicative of their purposes. All of them were debated on motion for second reading and continue to be shown on the Order Paper of the House of Commons as awaiting adjourned debate.

In the United Kingdom House of Commons, a private member's bill to "provide minimum terms for severance pay for workers dismissed through redundancy or other causes beyond their control" was introduced in 1962, 1963, and 1964. It was lengthily debated on the motion for second reading on the 14th of February, 1964 and defeated on a vote. To none of these bills, although similar or related in purpose to the bill before this assembly, was objection taken as being a "money" bill.

I would further point out that section 7 of The Interpretation Act, being Chapter 1 of the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1953, reads as follows: "No provision in an act shall affect the rights of Her Majesty unless it is expressly stated therein that Her Majesty is bound thereby". Neither the original Hours of Work Act of 1947, the revised act of 1953, the substituted act of 1959, or the twelve amendments thereto have been considered as "money" bills. It, therefore, follows that Bill no. 61 is clearly not a "money" bill within the meaning of our Standing Order no. 45 and I so rule.

Thereupon it was moved by —

Mr. Walter Smishek (Regina East): that Bill no. 61 - **An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act, 1959,** be now read a second time.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to express my sincere thanks for your ruling and permitting me to proceed with introducing Bill no. 61, An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act, 1959.

The basic purpose of this bill is to introduce a 40 hour work week in Saskatchewan. It involves a relatively simple set of amendments to existing legislation, but it will have a beneficial effect on the lives of many Saskatchewan families.

The legislation is a step on the road to a 40 hour work week for all employees in Saskatchewan. The bill provides for a 40 hour work week for all centres of 1,000 population, or more. A 40 hour work week would also apply to mines and factories in operation, or under construction anywhere in the province. The hours of work in centres smaller than 1,000, generally speaking, would be reduced from 48 hours to 44 hours per week. It is to be hoped that a 40 hour work week will apply for employees in centres under 1,000 in population without too much delay. However, for the present, the bill provides for a 44 hour work week in centres with a population of less than 1,000.

The question of hours of work has long been a matter of controversy. Much progress has been made over the years in improving hours of work for employees along with a great many other facets of working conditions. The process of improving working conditions of employees has not been an automatic one. Often improvements have been effected grudgingly and sometimes only after bitter clashes between opposing factions.

In more recent years, there have been signs of growing maturity on the part of all persons concerned with working conditions — government, management and labor. This has been brought about through greater recognition of the rights of people who offer their services to an employer, and a greater recognition of the validity of their case.

I do not intend to dwell at any length with the history of the hours of work for employees as it has developed over the years. It suffices to point out that it is only 100 years or so when a 72 hour work week was the standard. "Sun-up to sun-down" was the rule. It was based on the

principle that idleness breeds evil and there was little value in leisure. There has been a considerable change since those times and today a forty hour work week exists throughout most of the United States, and in much of Canadian and Saskatchewan industry. In fact, the forty hour work week has been left behind in many instances, and in many cases a 37, 35, and even a 30 hour work week has been established.

A reduction in hours of work has been strongly favored by labor organizations and employees affected, and has been just as strongly opposed by management and owners of business. There has been a subtle shift in the position on the part of those who oppose reduction in hours of work in more recent years. At one time the opposition was quite adamant and now it is expressed in terms of opposition to the timing rather than to the question of whether or not a change should be made.

There have been cases where employers have recognized the case for a shorter hour work week but for the most part opponents of such a change could never recognize the present as being the right time. The present legislation governing hours of work in Saskatchewan was introduced by the CCF government in 1947. It provided for a basic 44 hour work week and provision was made for exemptions from it, under which the 48 hour work week for smaller centres and certain lines of work was established.

At present all employees in cities are covered by the legal 44 hour work week and shop and office employees in 71 centres have a 44 hour legal work week. The 44 hour work week applies to factory workers. The balance are under a 48 hour legal work week.

For some years labor and other groups have pressed for the introduction of a basic 40 hour work week. However, it was the decision of the government not to proceed with this change on the grounds, argued by some groups, that it would weaken Saskatchewan's competitive position in attracting industry and new development. This, of course, is a matter of some importance to Saskatchewan, since this province faces some economic and geographical problems in competing with other parts of Canada. This situation, however, has been completely changed as the result of the introduction of a National Labor Standards Bill in the House of Commons at Ottawa. This measure will establish a 40 hour work week for all employees across Canada who come under the jurisdiction of the federal labour legislation. However, its implications go beyond that since this measure is bound to influence other provinces to take the same step. The old argument that the 40 hour work week would hurt Saskatchewan's position on the national economic scene no longer exists.

The effect of this legislation might also be examined against the background of economic development in Saskatchewan. A number of years back, Saskatchewan benefited from a large oil and gas development program which took place. In more recent years the spotlight has been stolen by potash developments. Interest and development related to the exploitation of this resource has mushroomed ever since the initial technical developments were overcome by the I.M.C. mine at Esterhazy. The development of this resource has resulted in all sorts of glowing predictions about the industrial development in Saskatchewan. In recent months, the Premier has on a number of occasions drawn attention to the point that a shortage of skilled labor is developing in Saskatchewan and that it will be necessary to bring skilled labor into the province. I want to say to him that no better way can be found to encourage such labor to come to Saskatchewan than by demonstrating that the present government is not only prepared to maintain a high level of labor standards, but is also prepared to improve those standards.

Federal Bill C126, which was introduced in the House of Commons last fall, represented a distinct and long overdue step forward in labor standards in Canada. I was happy to see the federal government recognize the need for this legislation. In the event that it is suggested that Saskatchewan is not ready to take this step yet, I want to point out first that over the past number of years Saskatchewan has had one of the highest levels of income and production in Canada on a per capita basis.

Thus, it is obvious that there are many parts of Canada which have a lower standard of income and production than this province, but this did not stop the federal Liberals from applying this legislation right across Canada, and with the obvious hope that the provinces would follow suit very shortly.

Proof that Saskatchewan workers have a good record of productivity is best demonstrated by statistical facts. Productivity in the Canadian manufacturing industry, expressed by the net value of production per worker,

increased from $3,284 in 1944 to $8,124 in 1960 — a rise of 147 per cent. But in Saskatchewan, equivalent figures in 1944 stood at $3,305 and by 1960 this rose to $9,272. The increase here is 181 per cent, and it is the fastest rate of growth of any province in Canada.

The National Labor Standard Code enacted covers the complete range of minimum wages, maximum hours of work, vacations with pay, and general holidays with pay for the first time, and applies to that part of the labor force which is under federal jurisdiction. While there is only about nine per cent of the total Canadian labor force under federal jurisdiction, it is the most important group — such as trucking, and other forms of transportation, communications, shipping, grain elevators, and any work or undertaking that is declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada. The balance of the labor force, being under provincial jurisdiction, has had the benefit of provincial labor standards legislation.

It is readily apparent that the problems involved in amending existing labor standards legislation are far less than those involved in applying a completely new set of standards, where they did not exist previously. Thus, if Ottawa can make a jump from no standards to a standard which includes the 40 hour work week, as well as several other important features, then surely, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan should be able to jump from a 44 and a 48 hour work week to a 40 and a 44 hour work week with little difficulty.

It may be useful, at this point, to review the salient features of the Canada Labor Code in order to place the legislation we are considering today within its proper context. The Canada Labor Standards Code establishes, for the first time in Canada's history, a package of minimum standards covering basic working conditions for all those Canadian workers who fall within the federal jurisdiction. The Code applies to employees in works, undertakings, and businesses within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, including shipping, air transport, interprovincial rail and highway transport, and communication, as well as banking, uranium mining, grain elevators, feed mills and certain crown corporations. The Code provides for a minimum wage of not less than $1.25 per hour, a standard eight hour day and a forty hour work week, with time and one-half for overtime which is limited under ordinary conditions to eight hours a week, eight public statutory holidays with pay, and two weeks annual vacation with pay after every completed year of employment.

It is noteworthy that, in moving the second reading of the bill, the federal Minister of Labour, Hon. Allan MacEachen, paid tribute to the work done by Stanley Knowles, NDP member for Winnipeg North Centre, in pressing for the Canada Labor Standards Code.

In presenting this bill today, I, too, want to pay tribute to Mr. Stanley Knowles for his many years of effort in fighting for the rights and protection of wage earners throughout Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Smishek: — It has been estimated that approximately sixty-five per cent of Saskatchewan non-agricultural labor force are now under a 40 hour work week or less. This means that approximately thirty-five per cent or about 60,000 non-agricultural workers might be affected by a 40 hour work week law. Members may be interested in knowing that the federal Department of Labour survey, back in March, 1960, showed that seventy per cent of plant workers in Canada had a standard work week of 40 hours and more than 89 per cent had a five day work week. Since then there has been considerable improvement. Further proof that Bill no. 61 would be in no way a drastic move is demonstrated by existing conditions. Latest available figures for November, 1964, show that the average hours per week in Saskatchewan in mining, were 41 hours per week, in manufacturing 38.8 hours, in building and general engineering, 39.5 hours and in the service field, 37.9 hours.

There are many benefits to be derived for all people from the introduction of this type of legislation. The International Labor Organization, in its report a few years back, dealing with the hours of work, in part states as follows:

1. It is generally recognized that shorter hours of work frequently lead to an increase in productivity.

2. With shorter hours there would not only be less absenteeism but the pressure on the family would also be relieved.

3. Additional leisure is of greater importance today in the light of increase of fatigue and nervous tension in modern society. Shorter hours enable the worker to improve his qualifications in order to keep up with changing technological changes.

4. The most satisfactory work week is not that which provides the greatest number or amount of goods and services, but a sometimes markedly shorter work week that provides for the happiest combination of the production factor and the leisure factor.

5. Hours reduction tend to ease adjustments to major technological change, to minimize labor displacement and stabilize employment opportunities and to aid in maintaining generally prosperous conditions.

6. A shorter work week makes it possible for the older worker to compete more effectively with the younger one.

7. A shorter work week enables the husband to help with the family responsibilities, where the wife is working.

There are a number of strong arguments for the reduction in the work week in Saskatchewan. The first, of course, is that it is a means of equitably distributing available work, so that we do not have thousands of wage earners idle when others are working overtime. Reports show that at present there are approximately 22,000 wage earners who are unemployed in Saskatchewan. It has been estimated that if a universal forty hour work week were applied in the province, approximately 6,000 new jobs would be created.

While this bill does not propose a universal 40 hour work week, nevertheless the impact would be felt and many new jobs would be created as a result of its adoption. The second basic reason is that the members of the working force badly need extra time for studying. They need time to acquire the knowledge to keep abreast of the rapid technological changes occurring at an accelerated rate, practically in all lines of work.

There is an abundance of evidence of the need for extra time for vocational study. According to recent estimates, one-half of Canada's work force, including farmers and farm laborers, have an academic standing of grade eight or less. In Saskatchewan, over 80,000 wage earners are in this category.

Government, labor, management, educationists, as well as newspapers, radio, and television media, and others have aimed a barrage- of advice to the wage earners, particularly young people, urging them to improve their educational qualifications. Young people are being warned that anyone without a high school education is doomed to the disappearing manual kind of work, and to be the first laid off in times of recession.

We are told that even with proper educational standing, prior to the commencement of work, we are in a period where a considerable amount of vocational study will be required throughout one's working life to keep up with the technological changes and accompanying cultural changes. We are told that wage earners will have to change their jobs three to four times during their working life, and will have to up-grade themselves in order to stay employed. Reduction in a legal work week is taking a practical step towards providing more leisure time for workers to have an opportunity to up-grade themselves.

Aside from this problem, present workers have to compete with thousands of better educated young people, those born in a postwar period who are now entering the labor force. Workers need to place themselves in a position of being able to compete with better educated youth. They need leisure for education and up-grading.

The Saskatchewan Liberal party during the last election campaign promised to reduce hours of work. This bill gives to the government members an opportunity to fulfil the promise made to the electors. I am certain that many wage earners, particularly the ones that work more than 40 hours per week were left with the impression that the Liberal government would

take steps to reduce hours of work in the first session of the legislature, On many occasions the Premier, the Minister of Labor, (Mr. Coderre) and other government spokesmen have said that they are not opposed to labor. Here is an opportunity for them to demonstrate that they are prepared to support progressive labor standard measures. We are also aware of the fact that during the last election the Liberal party promised to create 80,000 jobs in four years - twenty thousand jobs a year. A reduction in the legal work week would be helpful to keeping this promise. Up to now, the Liberal government cannot take credit for creating a single job.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, Oh!

Mr. Smishek: — In the U.S.A. the federal Labor Standards Code was implemented in 1938, which provided for the forty hour work week, with one and one-half times overtime rate. The law to take effect in 1940 and required a general application of forty hours per week to all inter-state commerce. The act states that the purpose of the forty hour work week is:

1. To spread employment by placing financial pressure on the employers through the overtime pay requirement.

2. To compensate employees for the burden of the work week in excess of the hours fixed by law.

The hon. Premier has imported other things from the U.S.A. I suggest that importing the idea of the forty hour work week will be welcomed by the wage earners and others in this province.

We have heard people argue that labor costs are a factor when a measure of this nature is undertaken through legislative action. On January 31st, of 1961, a statement appearing in the Regina Leader Post said:

> Labor Minister Michael Starr said Monday, business men who claim labor costs are pricing Canadian products out of the world markets have not proved their point.
>
> Statistics show that wages now only make up 15 per cent of the total product costs compared to 15.9 per cent, 10 years ago.

There is reason to believe that the situation has improved considerably since 1961. The Canadian Labor Congress, several years ago did a study and found that labor costs in Canada are lower than in eight of the leading trading nations in the world, including Argentina, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, Philippines, the United Kingdom and the United States. The average output of the Canadian worker was nine and one-half times as great as for the Japanese worker. On the other hand, the wages for the Canadian worker were only five and one-half times as great as the Japanese worker. Only Australia, Belgium, and the Netherlands, where the difference was almost negligible, had lower labor costs than Canada. Labor costs depend not only on what you pay for your labor but what you get for it.

Mr. Speaker, a new and compelling reason for shortening the hours, of work has emerged in recent years. That is the development of the process of automation. Some people consider that what is called automation today is simply a continuation of the technological advances that have been characteristic in our economy ever since the industrial revolution.

There is another and more compelling point of view, that automation is a revolutionary new departure on the economic scene. In the past technological advances have replaced muscle power and have modified the conditions under which people have had to work, but the new process has a completely revolutionary characteristic, mainly that the human mind is replaced by computers. This is known as cybernation. This has profound implications on the future of our society, which no one can yet hope fully to appreciate, but we do see the evidence on all sides. In industry after industry, the story in recent years has been greater production with smaller numbers of workers. To carry this process to its logical conclusion there have already been authoritative predictions that by the year 2,000, only one per cent of the labor force will be required to produce all the material goods we need as consumers. That is that all of the work required to transfer raw materials into completed consumer goods can be performed by only one per cent of the labor force.

Now, it might be suggested again, as in the past, that it will be fine to introduce shorter hours, as we approach this millennium, but this argument simply does not hold water. The fact is that fundamental changes have already taken place in our economy as a result of automation, and its latest refinement known as cybernation.

It has been estimated that there has been more research and more development work within the past 10 years alone than all previous human history. This indicates the speed at which we are approaching an economy based on abundance. If this situation is not going to result in wide-spread dislocation and hardship, one of the first steps that needs to be taken is to reduce the hours of work and thus enable all members of our society to share in the abundance that is now possible.

Last year, Mr. John Snyder, President of U.S. Industries, which manufacture automated machinery, testifying before the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, pointed out that in the United States, automation eliminates over 40,000 jobs every week — over 2,000,000 jobs a year. Automation is not only displacing people directly, but also indirectly by what he called "silent firings", in reference to workers who would have been hired for jobs eliminated by automation.

Mr. Snyder then went on to say that many people find it easier to look for proof that these problems do not exist rather than grapple with the human problems caused by automation, he said:

> In the coming months and years, if we are to survive as a nation, we will need new sociological and economic ideas to solve the problems in this area.

The problems caused by automation and cybernation are not confined to the U.S.A. similar problems arise for Canada and within Canada. A recent study undertaken by universities in Montreal show that each week 4,500 Canadian workers are being displaced by automation. Those who have given our economic problems serious thought contend that a reduction in the work week is inevitable, and should be proceeded with as quickly as possible. An internationally famous economist, W. S. Woytinski, writing an article on how to end unemployment, 'among other things said:

> I see no other way of reversing this trend, (meaning unemployment) except by readjusting hours of work, shifting from the 40 hour work week to the 35 hour work week.

The overwhelming weight of evidence is for the governments to take action by law, to reduce the legal hours now. There is no justification whatsoever to hold back.

Mr. Speaker, the other features of the bill are:

1. It provides for maintenance of take-home pay when hours of work are reduced.

2. When the public holiday occurs in a work week, the work week is reduced by eight hours, thus making the legal work week 32 hours, where a forty hour work week applies, and a 36 hour work week where a 44 hour work week applies and providing for a full week's pay.

3. In order to facilitate rotation of shifts and where shift work applies, the hours of work averaged, then in such cases, the minister shall not give an authorization to average hours in shift rotation, unless the authorization has been requested in writing by a trade union representing the employees directly affected, or where no trade union represents employees, then by request of majority of employees affected.

4. The regular hours of work would be confined within a period of nine and one-half consecutive hours in one day, and no employer shall require or permit employees to work or be at their disposal on more than two occasions during that period. This means that there would be no split shifts permitted, since the eight hour day would be confined within a nine and one-half hour period, thus providing a maximum

one and one-half hour lunch period.

5. The bill to come into force on June 1st, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, since introducing this bill on Friday, March 19th, I have been flooded with telephone calls, telegrams and letters, commending me for introducing this bill, and urging members from both sides of the house to give Bill 61 unanimous approval. I hope that this will be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I now move that Bill no. 61 — An Act to amend The Hours of Work Act, 1959, be now read a second time.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate and to say a few words, I should like to say that I don't think that we need shorter hours of work to create new jobs.

The Liberal government is fully aware of the needs of the people of this province and the way to create jobs is to create industries and encourage the people of this country and the world to come in to our province and to establish industries and to create the jobs. This is the first requirement for jobs in the province. The proposed private bill, Mr. Speaker, seemingly aimed at limiting the hours of work by legislation. Let me point out, first of all, that the proposals seem to claim that more can be accomplished that way.

On the surface of it, of course, hours of work would be limited and this, it is suggested, will increase employment at a time when we have a tremendous shortage of manpower in this province, since more people will be required to perform the same amount of work which has been done before by fewer people.

In reality, things are very different. There are very many cases in which employers may find it more convenient to pay overtime rates to their employees by asking them to work an hour or two beyond the standard hours than to hire new employees. To the extent of which this happens, the purpose of the proposed bill probably should be delayed. However, this is by far not all. Limitations of the hours of work by law can never do more than sanction what is already happening as a result of the economic progress in the province. In manufacturing, in the service industries, and in certain building trades, the average hours of work in Saskatchewan are already less than thirty hours per week. In mining, the figure runs roughly forty-one hours per week. In the construction industry as a whole, the hours run roughly 40.8 hours per week. This is so because the economic conditions of Saskatchewan are such that industry can afford these hours and not because these hours were imposed by law.

Now, nobody is opposed to progress in general, and to shorter work hours in particular. The real question is not whether we want shorter hours for our working people but whether it is advisable to reduce the hours of work by legislation and if so, to what extent we should reduce them_ when, and in what manner. These questions, I can assure the members of this house, Mr. Speaker, are constantly under study by the Department of Labour. If a decision is reached to that effect, the necessary legislation will be drawn up by the government for submission to this legislature.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose an amendment to the motion that the word "now" be deleted and the words "in six months hence" be added to the motion.

I would first, Mr. Speaker, like to ask my friends opposite though, what they did while they were in office to bring about the many changes referred to in this bill?

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — We didn't give it a six month's hoist.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to enumerate the great strides taken by our friends across the way to alter these provisions of the act.

In 1953, they changed the definition of an employee and an employer. They updated two sections by one year. They confused the definitions of the expression and rates of wages and removed grain elevators from the classes of industries covered by the act. In 1954, cleared up a slight problem with respect to overtime on a public holiday. In 1956 they updated the 1953

updated provisions and lengthened the time limit for prosecution from six months to one year. In 1957 they updated the same provision dealt with in 1953 and 1956 and tidied up some of the technicalities in the penalty clauses. No mention yet, Mr. Speaker, of a forty hour week. The hon. member a moment ago said that there was a need of shortening the work week in recent years. No effort was made to shorten this work week in the recent years.

In 1958 they updated the updated figures dealt with in 1953, 1956 and 1957 and introduced a new provision empowering the Lieutenant Governor in-Council to limit the work hours to ten in a day. No mention of the forty hour week. In 1958 they updated the previously updated figures with respect of maintenance of earnings. Nineteen sixty was a vintage year. They updated again the updated figures dealing with the maintenance of earnings. They thoroughly confused the provisions regarding the rights of employees to enter into an agreement with his employer with respect to hours of work and rates of pay. Still no mention of the forty hour week.

In 1961, not even any updating.

In 1962, nothing - not even a forty hour week.

In 1963, no forty hour week.

In 1964, nothing - the confusing mess that they left, Mr. Speaker, was that in this province, people were earning as low as sixty cents an hour in their minimums to a high of $1.05. It was said in previous debates, and I say again, that the minimum wages will be raised . . .

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Are we discussing hours of work or minimum wages. I'm not clear from the hon. minister's statement whether he is talking about minimum wages or hours of work.

Mr. Coderre: — Are you scared that we . . .

Mr. Davies: — Just keeping you to the orders, that's all.

Mr. Coderre: — . . . might mention something about the minimum wages, because this does affect the wages of the people of this province. You didn't do anything about it. You've been the great fighter, the great knight of labor, what have you done? You've been in the cabinet. Mr. Speaker, he has been in that cabinet before and nothing has been done, 1961 — nothing — not even updating — 1962 — not even a forty hour week. He was in the cabinet at that time, Mr. Speaker. Nineteen sixty-three — nothing, 1964 — nothing. Now he tries to bring a little red herring, trying to say it's out of order or something.

Mr. Speaker, in all these years that this act has been on the statutes of this province, not once did our friends opposite, suggest even in a whisper, that a forty hour week was an important issue, But their first year in the opposition seems to have brought a change of heart. They have become the benevolent fighters of labor all at once.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some, and I repeat, may be some very good suggestions in the bill under consideration, but until I am satisfied that the provincial economy is ready for this and we have had an opportunity to conduct a survey to find out just what hours employees are now working, what rates of pay prevail, what changes are required to more effectively protect the welfare of the working man and his family, no changes to the present provisions can possibly be considered. The timing of a measure like this, like the one contained in the proposed private bill, is of an extremely important matter. I would like to know for instance, if the mover of this bill had approached the previous government to reduce the hours of work legislation? I would like to know why they did not do it.

If they did, what kind of a reply did you get from the previous government?

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — We are out of time . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Surely the member should have been asking for legislation of this sort? And I submit that at the moment, the time is certainly not ripe.

An Hon. Member: — Do it next year . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I would suggest to the hon. former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) that if he wants to get into this debate, he will have an opportunity to do so later.

Mr. Nollet: — Oh, you are really . . .

Mr. Coderre: — When industry comes into this province, Mr. Speaker, more jobs will be created for our people. Incomes will rise, and the hours of work will be progressively reduced. We are not short of ideas. We have proven that by stimulating the growth of industry in this province.

An Hon. Member: — Have you seen them yet?

Mr. Coderre: — And there will be more to come

An Hon. Member: — When?

Mr. Walker: — Newspaper talk.

Mr. Coderre: — And our ideas will be put into practice . . .

An Hon. Member: — Liberal . . .

Mr. Coderre: — . . . will be put into practice and not just be blabbed about all over the province and nothing done about them. We will put them into practice. It has already been done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — What we need, Mr. Speaker, at this time, is understanding of the manner in which the economic and social forces of our community interact. Without such understanding, we may be tempted to put the cart before the horse. If this reduction of hours had been merely a matter of good intentions, I am sure that possibly the previous government would have put it in, Mr. Speaker, or probably governments earlier than theirs. I submit, that if they had done it they would not be asking now, but conditions were not such as to make it practical. It is better not to have a law than to place a law on the books and then discover that it cannot be effectively applied. The government and I are just as concerned as anybody else of the well being of the Saskatchewan wage earners.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Prove it.

Mr. Coderre: — A suggestion has been made to prove it. We are proving it, Mr. Speaker, by providing employment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Coderre: — In the latter part of the year there were fewer people unemployed in this province, percentage-wise, than any other time in the history of this province. This proves that the Liberal government of this province is concerned by establishing and providing work . . .

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Legislative Secretaries . . .

Mr. Coderre: — The federal labor code that has been mentioned, is before the House of Commons. Much light will be provided in the debate that will have taken place at that particular time. When all this information is made available, and with the study that the Department of Labour will have made, then when we have all this information we shall determine what action is necessary and we shall proceed with it without delay, as we have done with other measures which have been approved, and will be approved by this legislature. I don't think that we need the help of the party opposite to help us decide what can be best for the economy, because the people of this, province, Mr. Speaker, have very emphatically told these people across the way that they could not do the job.

Mr. Walker — We had more votes than you did.

Mr. Coderre: — In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, our friends opposite did not seem to have ever conducted a survey in depth with regard to working conditions and the rates of pay in this province. Certainly they left no evidence whatever in the Department of Labour which concerns itself with these matters. There is no evidence anywhere in the records of the Department of Labour that any survey in any depth of any sort has ever been conducted. Until this is done, it would be putting the cart before the horse.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, to inaugurate at the earliest possible moment, a survey of our province to obtain the answers to these many questions, and until this has been done, and the results known, I will not be recommending further reductions in our present hour work week. I hope to have more to say on this at a future time, Mr. Speaker. With that I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Mr. Speaker: — You had better find the citation, I have been just looking for it. Yes, there is a citation in Beauchesne's that covers this business. It is such a rotten index, nobody can find anything. You will just have to wait until I find it.

Now section 165, sub-section 7 of Beauchesne's says:

> A member, who has already spoken to a question, has no right to move an adjournment of the debate or of the house.

Now I take it that the member has spoken to the question, in addition to which he also moved an amendment thereto. I would take it from that, that it is out of order for him to move adjournment of the debate.

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave at this time, to move adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER REGARDING BILL NO. 69

Bill No. 69 — **An Act to provide for the Establishment of a Commission to make Inquiries respecting a Plan of Income Maintenance for Persons Disabled by Illness or Personal Injury**,

The Order of the Day being called for second reading of Bill no. 69, Mr. Speaker made the following statement:

Hon. members will recall that on Thursday, March 25, 1965, Bill no. 69, standing in the name of the hon. member for Noose Jaw (Mr. W. G. Davies,) was introduced by leave and read the first time, its further procedure being subject to a Speaker's caveat as to its being in order.

A bill, if passed, becomes an Order of the House, mandatory and binding, and must, therefore, throughout its entire passage through the house, be considered in the light of its effect as law.

I have read the bill and considered the content matter thereof, and I find that the bill provides for: (l) the establishment by government of a commission, the appointment of commissioners thereto and a secretariat therefor; (2) the receipt of money, securities or other properties by gifts, grants, bequests or otherwise; and (3) the payment of such remuneration to the secretariat and remuneration and expenses to the commissioners as the chairman himself, a commissioner, shall see fit.

Section 2, subsections 5 and 6 of The Treasury Department Act, being Chapter 33 of the Revised Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1953, states as follows:

5. 'Public Revenue', 'Public Money', 'Revenue', respectively, mean all revenue and public monies, from whatever source arising, whether such revenues and monies belong to the province, or are held by the province, or collected or held by officers of the province for or on account of or in trust for any other province, or for Canada or for the Imperial government or for any other party or person.

6. 'Revenue Officer' means any person employed in collecting managing or accounting for revenue or carrying into effect

> any laws relating thereto or in preventing the contravention of any such laws: and, as regards accounting for and paying over such revenue, the said expression includes a person who has received or has been entrusted with public money, whether such person was regularly employed for the purpose or not.

In view of the foregoing, it is my opinion that: (l) the Chairman of the Commission would be deemed to be a revenue officer within the meaning of section 2, subsection 6, of The Treasury Department Act; (2) any money received and or disbursed would be deemed to be public money within the meaning of section 2, subsection 5 of The Treasury Department Act; and (3) the accounts of the commission would be subject to audit under section 22 of The Treasury Department Act.

Chapter 15, section 5 of the 4th Edition of Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure states in part in regard to bills involving public aid or charges: 'Under this rule, all bills providing for the payment of salaries or for any expenditure whatever out of the public funds of the dominion must first obtain the recommendation of the Governor General'.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, Citation 243, states in part as follows: 'Any bill providing for the payment of salaries or for any expenditure whatever out of the public funds of the dominion must first obtain the recommendation of the Governor General'.

Nothing is more firmly established or clear than that the right to initiate legislation involving the collection and or the expenditure of public money rests solely with the government, as indeed it must, for to be otherwise would produce confusion confounded. There is no surer way of destroying elective government than by destroying the power of elected government over, and its responsibility for the revenues and expenditures with which it has been entrusted by the people.

I find that the commission would be a public body, that any money received or expended by it would be public money, that notwithstanding any provisions contained in Bill no. 69, it is indeed a Money Bill which cannot be moved by a private member and I, therefore, rule it out of order.

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City) — Mr. Speaker, may I discuss your ruling?

Mr. Speaker: — Well, hardly. The ruling has been made.

Mr. Davies: — I did not want to dispute it, but I would like to discuss it

Mr. Speaker: — The Speaker's rulings can be challenged but they are not debatable.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you a question, Sir. I take it that the fact that this bill has been ruled out of order by you, that fact will not preclude a member from introducing in this house, a resolution asking that this kind of action which is proposed in this bill, be taken, or recommending it for consideration of the government?

Mr. Speaker: — It is well set out in all parliamentary authorities, that it is highly improper for the Speaker to answer a hypothetical question.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask when you made your ruling, if you took into consideration the bill on Ombudsman which is currently before the House of Commons and which contains these sections.

Mr. Speaker: — I will tell the hon. member this, that a Speaker decides points of order as they occur, and as they are raised. No point of order was raised when the Ombudsman bill came into the house, and I may say

further that I have established the practice now of placing a Speaker's caveat against any private member's bill. This I think is what should be done and I think it should have been done before. It was not done then but it will be done in future.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER REGARDING BILL NO. 71

Bill No. 71 — **An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act, 1954.**

The Order of the Day having been called for second reading of Bill no. 71 — The Act to amend The Pharmacy Act, 1954 — Mr. Speaker made the following statement:

Hon. members will recall that on Thursday, March 25th, 1065, Bill no. 71, standing in the name of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) was introduced by leave and read the first time, its further procedure being subject to a Speaker's caveat as to its being in order.

Mr. M. Breker (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, the amendments contained in Bill no. 71, are of a minor nature, and would be best dealt with in the committee of law amendments and delegated powers. Therefore, I move that the bill be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to.

An Hon. Member: — . . . amendments.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh, pardon me.

An Hon. Member: — Law Amendments Committee.

Mr. Speaker: — It is the wish of the member to have this referred to the Law Amendments Committee. Is that my understanding?

Mr. M. Breker (Humboldt): — That is right, Sir.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — It is the bill itself to be referred to the Law Amendments.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh, did I say subject matter?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — I did it inadvertently. I will instruct the clerk to make the necessary corrections, by leave of the house.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere, (Minister of Natural Resources) that Bill no. 37 **— An Act to Amend The Forest Act, 1959**, be now read the second time.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, it has been some time now, since the debate has been adjourned, but I believe the facts regarding some of the main points of this bill are still just as valid or possibly more valid than they were at that time. In introducing Bill 37, the Minister of Natural Resources, (Mr. Cuelenaere), the hon. member for Shellbrook, said a great deal about the monopoly that was held by the Timber Board and that this was a move to contain that monopoly and spoke of the timber in Saskatchewan, as if it was an annual crop, such as wheat.

Now, I want to tell hon. members of this house that they certainly cannot look at timber as an annual crop. It is a crop that takes a century or more to grow and this is where the problem arises, and this is where, I believe there is so much misconception about the situation regarding our

forest resources. This is why so many people have a rather bad understanding of what actually exists in our forest regions. In order to get the complete picture of what our problems are, we have to go back a good many years, because this is not, as I say, a crop that is grown over night. I am afraid with all due respect, that the minister is completely ignoring the facts of history, when he talked about our forest potential and the problems of our forest today.

Certainly, we have to go back to what the situation was not only twenty years ago, but what created that situation long before twenty years ago, and the sorry mess that existed twenty years ago in our forest resources.

Before I go into that particular matter, I would like to suggest that the Saskatchewan Timber Board is the least monopolistic of any board that we have, or any other that is known to be operating in Canada today. It causes some worry to me at least, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the members opposite blindly going about the destruction, if not the destruction, certainly the emasculation of the Timber Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this situation and the facts regarding the Timber Board and its reasons for coming into being, were because of the fact that some drastic action was necessary to save our resources twenty years ago, or what was left of them. This is why the Timber Board was instituted. Certainly a good many people at that time believed and still believe in the board method of marketing. I repeat, it worries me when I hear people opposite talking about destroying a monopoly. I wonder very much what is really down in their hearts when they think about such institutions, as the Canadian Wheat Board, which actually carries a great deal more compulsory legislation, by far, than the Timber Board. The Timber Board only markets timber belonging to the crown. It has no jurisdiction whatever over private property. It never has had. All the Timber Board ever was, was a vehicle to market the produce of the crown, and I see no reason and never have been able to understand the attitude of the hon. members opposite and other critics of the Timber Board, when they talk about the functions of this, as if it was an imposition on the people of the north and millers and workers and industrialists who are working in the northern part of the province.

The Timber Board is, as I said, simply a vehicle to accommodate the marketing of the crown production, and when one criticizes this method of marketing, and criticizes the government for hiring operators to harvest our timber, you are taking exactly the same stand as you would if a farmer who had a stand of grain on the section of land, who had tilled that land, who had sowed the grain, had done the summerfallow the year before and finally when the crop was ready to harvest, he had hired someone, or contracted with someone to come and take that grain off. And according to the philosophy and the arguments of the people opposite that crop then, should belong to the man who owned the combine. This is the kind of an argument that has been constantly put forward by the Liberal party in Saskatchewan ever since the Timber Board has been instituted.

They believe that the people of Saskatchewan should tend the forest, should plant the seedlings, should protect it from fire and pay all these expenses, and then after the tree becomes a mature saw log, it should be turned over to some operator or some monopoly as it used to be under their administration twenty years or more ago.

Hon. D. Steuart (Minister of Health): — You got it wrong.

Mr. Kramer: — Let us take a look at what happened under that kind of administration. Prior to 1944, prior to the establishment of the Timber Board, timber was sold by auction to the highest bidder and quite often, and in fact, in all cases, it was an actual monopoly, because no one could compete with the few big operators who were in the field at that time.

A survey made about that time, said this, and I would like the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) to listen very closely. This is only twenty years ago and twenty years is only a very, very short time in the life of a forest. I quote here:

> Depletion of Saskatchewan's forest resources has been rapid, particularly in the last ten years, as it is now estimated that almost twenty-five per cent of the accessible forest area has been logged off or burned over the past years. On these areas, the residual stand

> and reproduction of valuable tree species is insufficient to provide a future stand of merchantable timber within a reasonable time.

And the report goes on to say:

> If our present rate of consumption of timber continues, our virgin and mature stands of white spruce and fir suitable for saw timber will be exhausted in ten years.

And that statement was made just twenty years ago, or a little more than twenty years ago. The report continues:

> It has been estimated that the annual average depletion in the forest region during the past ten years has been as follows: 37.6 per cent was depreciated by use; 45.7 per cent by fire, the balance through natural causes.

The report goes on to suggest that we need protection and management of our forest resources, and when we talk about protection and management we have to talk about conservation. This was when conservation became the order of the day, and the government at that time, felt that the best way to conserve, not only to conserve but to market the best possible type of timber and further than that, to market timber that was acceptable, not only in Canada but all over - a consistent kind of product. There were a lot of mills at that time, that were sawing very inconsistently. The lumber from one mill would not match the tongue and groove would not fit the lumber from another mill, therefore, if you ran out of one mill's lumber and tried to change over, you ran into a box where you could not complete your construction. This was the situation. The minister has now all of a sudden discovered that, as he has said on more than one occasion, millions of feet of over-mature timber are lying there rotting because of the mismanagement of the previous administration.

Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) — I did not say that.

Mr. Kramer: — Well, if you didn't say it, if this wasn't said, it was certainly implied and if the minister didn't mean this, I am glad that he is correcting this now.

Mr. Chairman, another word on the Timber Board. This timber belongs to the people of Saskatchewan and there is no sin, there is no sin, Sir, in the people marketing their own products. If it is, then the people opposite better declare themselves on some other institutions of orderly marketing in the province of Saskatchewan, and in Canada.

Now the minister also attempted to answer a challenge that I had made to show a forestry report. I did not ask him to show the report of the Department of Propaganda that has been referred to a good many times by the people opposite. He calls his witness, a brochure, put out by the Department of Industry and Information on pulp potential — not saw timber potential at all. Then to back it up he had one letter. He brought to witness one letter from some character back up in the woods somewhere, and you know, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the boys up in the bush go on quite a binge once in awhile but it seems to me that this chap must have really out-done himself. I don't know what he really meant here, but this gentleman, the one that the hon. minister received the tabled letter from (I am surprised that he was only able to find one man to back up some of his wild statements) one man, and this man in writing to the minister was telling (I don't know what shape he was in when he wrote that letter) but he said that he personally fell over 1,000,000 board feet of timber this winter. I rather think that, that if he was in this condition, he couldn't have been out doing too much in the way of cutting timber.

However, I think the weakness of the minister's case is borne out by the fact, that he still has not produced any evidence from his own forestry branch to indicate that this situation did actually exist, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if he had not attempted to mislead the house, he would have certainly quoted from at least one of the annual forestry reports. These reports are completely filled with statements, year after year, where the forestry people are talking about the allowable annual cut. Well, why should there be an allowable annual cut? Why should they stress

the allowable annual cut so much, Mr. Speaker, when there is, according to the minister, so much over-mature timber being wasted now?

Certainly there are stands of timber in Saskatchewan that have not been harvested and certainly there is some over-mature timber and the only reason that some of this is becoming accessible now, is because, over the last few years, we have been able to build access roads and we have been assisted by the federal government. Again, no thanks to the Liberal party — these northern access roads, the forest Access Roads Assistance Program was introduced by a Conservative government at Ottawa, just as the Roads-to-Resources program was introduced by a government at Ottawa. Before this, over the years, the Liberal government at Ottawa, when they were in power prior to 1957, continually turned a deaf ear to all our requests to assist in the hundreds of miles of road we built in the north before 1957 in the development of the north. These people would now, because of their own failure of their party at Ottawa, try to blame us, because some of these more inaccessible forest stands had not been exploited.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister also decried the fact that we had been spending as much, or more, on the protection of the forest as we had in the value of the forest harvest. Well, again, I suggest that the minister is taking a very narrow look at this situation. First of all, we had been in the process of rebuilding and trying to re-establish our forest stand over the years, the results of good programs are obvious. The minister stated that timber revenues were too low but the by-products from the forest, (according to his own admission during questions on estimates) millions of dollars of other revenue from fur and fish, game and tourism, are a natural by-product of our northern heritage. In assessing the costs of fire fighting and forest management, the minister completely ignored this. He indicated and intimated that the only revenue that we derive from this forest resource was from the fact that we marked some timber. We have had to be very, very careful about the timber harvested, in order not to overcut, in face in our last year's annual report, and the minister is well aware of this, some experimentation was going on. The Timber Board proceeded with cutting of less mature timber, smaller timber, which the forestry branch then thought was safe and there was a considerable amount of worry and misgiving on the part of all mill operators who had to go back to using horses in order to take out these small stands, and there were certain Liberal politicians last winter who tried to make a great deal of this in playing politics with it. The fact was that a conservation measure was being introduced and they tried to turn this to their political advantage. I assume they must be quite surprised now to see the Department of Forestry still recommending that this kind of logging be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest here, to the minister, regardless of how good his intentions may be that he has not given the house the whole story, has not conducted the necessary investigation into the forest industry, and is making a serious mistake in forest management in the deletion of section 5 of the old act. I think this is a backward step. I see no reason why orderly marketing, regardless of how large or how new an industry is, would be hampered at all by the retention of the powers that are vested in the Timber Board by the previous act. I believe that the government should reconsider the repealing of this act.

There is a great deal more that can be said but possibly no words of mine will convince the minister to say no to the pressures that are being placed on him. I am satisfied that the minister himself probably has some misgivings on this situation but once again, because of continual pressure and barrage, because of the fact that they have to make good their propaganda statements over the years, this good institution, the Saskatchewan Timber Board must be sacrificed or emasculated.

I think that this is being done so that, once more, the Liberal party can gratify the rapacious instincts of a few monopolies that want to come in and take over what is left of our forest resources. When the minister said that they were doing away with the monopolies, I suggest that this was not the whole truth. What they are actually opening the door for, is the establishment of a real monopoly such as existed in the good old days, under Liberalism, every since mill operators moved into Saskatchewan back in the '80s and '90s and before that in some instances, when the forest was under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the minister can persuade the government to reconsider this, and I certainly do oppose the repealing of section 5 and at this time, I would also like the minister to comment on the schedule concerning the Cypress Hills forest, and the amendment to those particular sections and what this means. I certainly hope this does not mean that some more crown land is being alienated for the gratification of some

private pressure groups. I don't think this is the case, but I would like to have an explanation. That is all I have to say on this bill, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the minister will reconsider the introduction of this bill at least, section 2.

Mr. F. K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment to the Forest Act, I would like to make a few comments. Saskatchewan's forest resources are one of our proudest and most valuable possessions. Because of our wheat production, Saskatchewan is known as a wheat province, and the bread basket of the world and Saskatchewan may soon be known as a potash province. I sincerely believe that Saskatchewan has sufficient forest resources to become equally well known as a producer of forest products.

Now, under the previous administration, the harvesting and marketing of the forest resources of the province were vested exclusively in Saskatchewan Forest Products, better known in the north land as the Timber Board. Even though it enjoys a virtual monopoly of our forest resources, the Timber Board has made a profit of $406,932 during the 1963-64 year — a mere drop in the bucket. Something like 50¢ per thousand for the timber sold to the Timber Board yards and mills.

I am hard put to explain why our forest revenue is not greater, Mr. Speaker. To the best of my knowledge, the price of forest products is as high in Saskatchewan as it is in other provinces and yet the pulp wood cutters and the saw mill operators in my constituency are barely making a living.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what the hon. member is reading from?

Mr. Speaker: — I was not aware of the fact that he was reading . . .

Mr. Radloff: — There are only notes, the same as the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If he was, he is giving a remarkable demonstration of occular gymnastics and I wish I had his eye sight.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Radloff: — The answer seems to be that our forests are not being properly developed. Mr. Speaker, I believe the situation that was aptly stated by Robert Tyre, in his book "Douglas in Saskatchewan" at page 36, is appropriate, and I quote:

> The Timber Board is the supreme ruler of the northern forest. It decrees who shall cut the timber and how much. The sole market for the timber is the Timber Board, and the prices paid for timber are set by the Timber Board. This is a system the government employed to conserve the province's forest resources, and the system has worked to such an effect, that Saskatchewan has the most under-developed commercial forest region in North America.
>
> The present value of our forest production is virtually at the same level as it was in 1944.

Mr. Tyre's book was published in 1962. A comparison of the present figure with that of 1944 is even more discouraging. I am informed that production in 1944 was 63,000,000 cubic feet. I believe our present production is less than 24,000,000 cubic feet and these figures speak for themselves. According to statements made by recognized forest authorities, our production in Saskatchewan is about twenty-five per cent of our natural forest resources. The history of business ventures by the CCF administration proved that government should confine itself to governing and it should leave business to businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, government monopoly in business or in any other field should not be encouraged, unless it is clearly in the public interest. There is a strong feeling in my constituency, and I believe in the whole northland, that the Timber Board's monopoly is not in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the Timber Board's revenues have not been sufficient to lower significantly the burden of the taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, the Timber Board has not benefited the producers. The forest operators are forced to take lower returns and accordingly they are unable to adopt efficient methods, because they lack growth capital.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the abolition of the Timber Board monopoly would be the dawn of a new era in the development and the utilization of our forest resources.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky: —I think I should add to what the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) has said, also I should add a few remarks because I think he either was misled or he may not be aware of facts.

Now he made two particular points. He said the Timber Board is clearly not in the public interest and he is glad that it will be abolished in due course of time.

Now I would like to point out to him that the board exists for the public interest. I live in the forest region just as he does and over the years since the Timber Board has been in effect, we found a lot of local people such as farmers, who have gone into the forest, north of Candle Lake, down along the Hanson Lake highway and into different areas of the north. They cut poles and fence posts and they marketed them in an orderly way through the Saskatchewan Timber Board, and many of them have done very well. One of them, for example, who had only a quarter section of land, was able to improve himself to the extent that today he has a hotel near Regina which he was able to buyout of the profits, and I could name quite a number of them that have done just as well. So when the hon. member says that it is not in the public interest, I wonder what he means. In my opinion, when our citizens are able to make a good living, and make profits, that kind of enterprise must be in the public interest. I know on the other hand when you had private enterprises such as Hett and Sibbald and Northern Cartage and O.K. in Prince Albert, and the Sedgewick people down around Hudson Bay, that operators didn't have the same opportunity to make a good living, while the private enterpriser was only concerned about making a big profit for himself and not so much for the sub-contractors such as operate under the Timber Board contracts.

The other point that he mentioned was that the Timber Board has not been a benefit to consumers. Now, on this, I think, he is very much wrong because those of us who know something about the products that have been produced in Saskatchewan, such as lumber which has been disposed of through the channels of the Timber Board" or Saskatchewan Forest Products, which has wholesale and retail outlets, then we know that one is able to buy lumber of equal quality much cheaper from that source, than you can from ordinary lumber yards. This has been one of the complaints from private lumber yards that consumers have been buying considerable lumber produced by operators and marketed through the Saskatchewan Timber Board at a much lower price than they would be able to buy at such lumber yards, and so I can quite understand the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) saying that there has been no benefit when he thinks only of the lumber yard operators. Retailers may have not benefited greatly, but farmers and home builders who build their own homes, have been able to get timber products $20 to $30 cheaper than they would otherwise have had to pay. Certainly these people have benefited and I think he is very, very wrong in attacking this item in that way.

Now I would just like to add that the purposes of the Timber Board has not been only conservation. That is the field for the Department of Natural Resources, but they have their staff. They see to it that trees are cut at a proper height. I know the minister knows and will agree with me, that in the past it was not always so. If he doesn’t agree with me then he can go and see for himself — there are still stumps standing. In the past when the private enterprisers were cutting around Candle Lake they often left stumps two and three and four feet high. When the snow was higher they cut the trees so much higher, but under a conservation program, which was adhered to by the Saskatchewan Timber Board and their operators, these sub-contractors had to adhere to these policies. There was an odd one that probably broke the law, but few indeed, and certainly the Timber Board required operators to conform with the law under the Forest Act of this province.

One of the very important things that will be lost, if the Saskatchewan Timber Board is not in the marketing field, is the building of access roads. Now when there were private enterprisers operating in the north, they did not build roads into areas that later could become resort areas, or good fishing places, but the Timber Board has done just that. There has been a lot of co-ordination, Mr. Speaker, between the Department of Natural Resources and the Saskatchewan Timber Board and when an area of poles was being cut, or an area of lumber was being taken out, they always tried to get the road close to where there were lakes, so that later on, when the timber was gone, these other resources could be used for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan and for those who tour this province. I am quite certain, that once you take the Timber Board out of the picture, this will no longer be the case, because private companies, (we can all admit this) are only interested in making a profit. They are not concerned as to where roads are needed, say to East Trout Lake, or some other lake. They are concerned in taking out and extracting the timber.

Another point is this, that now the government may have to build these kinds of roads if they want to open up such areas, but in the past the Timber Board did open up these roads, which were later on improved by the Department of Natural Resources and are of great benefit to the people of Saskatchewan today. I can mention a few of them — for example, there is the road that goes down north of Candle Lake, past White Gull, past the Swan Lakes, down by Piprell Lake and back over to the Hanson Lake Road. Here is one road that would not exist had it not been for the policy of the previous government in taking the timber out through the facilities of the Timber Board and in that way these roads were constructed.

Now there is another important aspect. Through the Timber Board, we have given more employment to our people here in Saskatchewan. Now the government opposite has said that they are interested in more employment. They would like to find 80,000 jobs in the province of Saskatchewan. It was through the Timber Board that we were able to get considerable employment in various regions across the province of Saskatchewan. I am afraid that if the Timber Board is done away with and if they cannot contract anymore, (the minister, I think has said that they don't intend to wipe them out entirely) then I am afraid that the employment will go down. There will not be the same amount of involvement in the forest industry we have had heretofore.

The chance is that some big company or small company may come in and exploit the forests as they used to do many years ago, they may wait a few years before they really begin to exploit the resources of that area. Now in the past, under the policies of the previous government, when the Department of Natural Resources knew of an area where there were mature stands of timber, whether it be white spruce, or whether it" be fir poles, we find that arrangements were made with the Timber Board to open up this area. I don't quite agree that we have great big stands of standing, overripe timber or that it is rotting. I agree that there are patches and I know of some myself, and I have spoken in this house about this, but there were other reasons why some of this area was not opened up. I think some of it was protected, so that if a pulp mill should come in, they would have some of this larger sized timber. It was not cut with the knowledge of the government. I mean it was deliberately kept back for a purpose. It was reserved! But over all, whenever timber was mature, whenever it was ready to be cut, there were arrangements made with the Timber Board, the contractor, to go into that area, and take that timber out and then the Timber Board got sub-contractors and these sub-contractors did very well, as I have said. When you think of the day and age we are living in, I don't think that any government should go back to the old entrepreneur days. I think that in the case of all our resources, we are getting to a point that governments are becoming more and more involved and that there must be more co-operation between the government and operators in the forest. This is well indicated in Manitoba, for example, if I may just mention it, I don't want to be out of order, in the case of fisheries. You still have private enterprise people fishing there whereas in Saskatchewan we have come to a point where our fishermen co-operate. They have a marketing agency and through their marketing agency, they are able to get better prices which everyone will admit, including the government opposite.

The same thing pertains in fur, and in timber. I think that we must have orderly marketing, by keeping the Timber Board in Saskatchewan. If there have to be any changes made, (1 don't say there shouldn't be some made) then certainly it should not be wiped out. I think that Timber Boards should at least be a marketing agency for all the people producing timber on crown lands. It will obtain better prices for these people, it will bring more employment to the province, and it would mean that we need not give away these resources to a few companies from somewhere, who may be only interested in making big profits.

Now I don't think I can say very much more except to summarize what the Timber Board has carried out in the way of conservation policies. It has been good for the people of Saskatchewan. It has brought wealth to quite a few of them and I hope the minister will reconsider so that this act is not changed.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members 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.

Hon. J. M. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I think I can close the debate very briefly. I should emphasize once again that is not the intention of the government, or the intention of this amendment, to abolish the Timber Board. Some of the members opposite seem to think that this is tantamount to abolishing the Timber Board.

I think that I made it very clear at the time the bill was introduced and on other occasions, that all that was intended at this time is to abolish some of the monopoly features of the Timber Board, such as the granting to the Timber Board of almost exclusive rights to give permits to cut saw timber, to cut poles, and to cut pulp wood, and then compelling the producers of the lumber and the poles and the pulp wood to sell to the Timber Board.

Now, frankly I have been trying to study the effects of this section 5. I have come to the conclusion that it does one of two things. It either creates a monopoly or it does not. If it does create a monopoly, if it has the effect of creating or making the Timber Board the sole and exclusive agent of the minister, then I submit to the house that it is bad legislation, and that it should be eliminated. On the other hand, if it does not do that, if it merely creates the Timber Board as a voluntary agency of the minister, to which certain permits can be given or withheld, then it has no effect whatsoever.

The Timber Board was organized under the Crown Corporation Act, and it is the act which gives to the Lieutenant Governor -in-Council, the right to create certain boards, and the Timber Board was originally organized in 1945 by Order-in-Council which was subsequently amended in 1949. The Order-in-Council creating the Timber Board sets out the powers and the rights of the Timber Board. It is equivalent to the objects and the powers of an ordinary corporation. In the case of an ordinary corporation the powers and the object of the company are, of course, set out in the memorandum association. The Order-in-Council states, and it is still in effect, that the minister recommends that it is advisable and for the public good that a corporation called the Saskatchewan Forest Products, for the purpose of carrying on the business of cutting, logging, sawing and manufacturing or purchasing timber and timber products of all kinds and selling or otherwise marketing the same, on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan, be established with its head office in the city of Prince Albert. It goes on to create a board and a crown corporation having these powers. This simply means that the Timber Board will continue in operation with these powers to purchase timber, to proceed with cutting and logging and the utilization of timber.

So I suggest to the members of the house that this amendment to the Forest Act, basically, does not in any way diminish the powers of the Timber Board set out in the Order-in-Council which created the Timber Board. The only effect that it will have will permit the minister to grant to other companies, to other corporations, the right to utilize the product of the forest.

Now when the hon. member from the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) spoke, you would think that all we had in Saskatchewan was saw timber. I am prepared to admit that in certain areas of Saskatchewan there is only a limited quantity of saw timber. A good portion of it has been cut but study after study made of our timber resources indicate that our really valuable product in Saskatchewan is our pulp wood resources and that we should move towards the utilization of these resources. The entire purpose of the brochure from which I quote was an attempt to attract, not public industry, not to attract the crown corporation, but it was put out by the previous government for the purpose of attracting the very people that we seek to attract and that we hope to attract. I believe that, in order to do that, it is necessary to amend the Forest Act to make it very clear to industry and to all concerned and to all people, who may be interested, that the Timber Board does not have any exclusive rights to the cutting and the utilization of the forest products of this province.

I was quoted as having said that our timber is something in the nature of a crop. In doing so I am only referring to statements that are made in forest reports that it is in the nature of a crop and that a forest, like all crops, must be harvested. I did not imply in my statement that it was anything in the nature of an annual crop. Of course, that is evident, there is a great difference between forest and an annual wheat crop. At the same time, once a forest has become mature, it is necessary that it be harvested like all crops, and that is what I have been saying. Like all crops it will deteriorate.

When I was speaking of millions of board feet of lumber rotting and burning, I was referring to areas where so far there has been no cutting. I referred to some specific areas in the Cummins Lake and the Vermette area, which we hope to open up. These are the places where I say that there are millions of board feet of timber remaining to rot and to burn. I think it is important that we bring access roads to them . . .

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — We have a road in there.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — . . . and that these places be developed.

I pointed out and I still point out that we are paying a tremendous amount of money annually to protect that forest and as yet it is not being utilized. I suggest that the time has arrived when we must change the policy that has been in existence in this province and that we must attract industry to develop the resources.

I suggest that the government that was in power three or four years ago and is now sitting opposite, were moving in that direction. Their publicity and their brochures would indicate that they were doing so. We are going to move faster and I suggest, in a better manner and that we will by doing this attract the industries we require and create employment in an area which is now a depressed area.

When the former minister was speaking, he requested me to explain the amendments set out in the schedule. I stated at the time that I intended to do so in committee but the amendments are very minor. There is no intention of alienating any portion of the land in connection with the Cypress Hills provincial forest. The land that is recommended for exclusion from the Cypress Hills provincial forest area is land that is predominantly grassland with no forest potential, according to the report of the Forestry Branch. These lands, by some arrangement, can be exchanged for two patented quarters (and I have the description of them) which are situated within the Cypress Hills provincial forest, and have considerable forest potential. The purpose of deleting these small parcels of land is to give effect to this trade.

As to the Northern Provincial Forest, again we are only deleting a very small portion and I am told that the greater portion of the block has poor forest potential. The area can be easily developed for grazing and another area again has poor forest potential and the area is suited to grazing and can be incorporated into an adjacent pasture project. In committee I can give the full details of these areas.

Now, I move that, with this explanation, the bill be now read the second time.

The motion was agreed to on the following recorded division, and bill read a second time.

YEAS — 32

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	Pederson
Loken	Leith	

NAYS — 24

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Snyder
Cooper (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Broten
Wood	Kramer	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Walker	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Blakeney	Smishek	Pepper
Davies	Link	
Thibault	Baker	
Willis	Wooff	

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher on Bill no. 1 — **An Act to amend The Department of Natural Resources Act**, be read the second time.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate the other evening, in fact it was quite a few evenings ago now, I said I had no intention of prolonging this debate and if the member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) will keep his mouth shut for awhile I don't think that we will be prolonging it for very long. I said, that I had no intention of becoming involved in a political hassle over the affairs of the Indian and Metis people because, if there is any area of our society that politics should be kept out of, it is certainly the area which concerns the welfare of these people.

However, the members opposite have shown by their opening remarks, that they have no intention of doing this. They will be going about the province from one end to the other saying that we are setting up this branch for the sole purpose of carrying out political activities. One would have thought from the circumstances that the Liberal government should have been given a chance to show what they could do for our native people before the attacks began from members opposite. One would have thought that members opposite, who were members of a government who dragged their feet for twenty years, who gave only lip service to help these people, and who did play politics with the Indian and Metis Association, and the minority groups, and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, as I showed earlier on in this session, would adopt a "wait and see" attitude before offering their criticism or their advice.

The Liberal government, I am sure, after observing the former government for so long, have reached the conclusion that Indian and Metis affairs do not mix very well with liquor and politics. The statement made by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) is as follows:

> I hope hon. friends opposite will take a different attitude towards native people. Native people do need a great deal of help to get on their feet.

I can assure the member that the new Liberal government is taking a different attitude towards our native people and that is why this legislation is before us. We are going to give these people a great deal of help to help themselves. As has been pointed out by the Premier, the main function of this .branch will be a co-ordinating one. It is not our intention to set up a single agency, concerned with the implementation of all programs for Indian and Metis people, but we do need a structure where the left hand knows what the right hand is doing.

The member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) suggested that the Green Lake farm could be turned over to the Department of Agriculture. There would be nothing wrong with this except that this would not solve all the problems of the Green Lake people. There are problems of education, welfare, health, resource development and unemployment involved. While each department might have their own particular program for the area, it is absolutely essential for efficiency and best results to have some central agency planning, co-ordinating and supervising these various programs. This is true, I believe for many programs in many areas of our province.

I had the occasion to be familiar with the situation where this lack of co-ordination caused frustration for all people concerned. In my role as vocational supervisor for the Northern Education Committee, I have been responsible, among other things, to set up and administer upgrading courses for Indian and Metis people. I found at the outset that Indian Affairs had a similar program, that the National Employment Service were sponsoring a program somewhat similar and that in regard to these programs there

were different entrance requirements, different living allowances being paid, and many of the requirements and allowances, etc., did not coincide, with the result that confusion reigned supreme.

Things improved considerably after Indian Affairs officials and I got together and worked out a program, which was common to both of our interests. This is a field where a central branch could have solved problems in a number of days whereas it took several months of negotiating back and forth before we came up with a program that did away with much of the overlapping that was prevalent at the beginning.

Now, another area where co-ordination is absolutely essential is between the federal Indian Affairs Department and provincial officials. Our program will get nowhere until an atmosphere of co-operation is achieved with the Indian Affairs Department because after all, the affairs of Treaty Indians are still primarily a federal responsibility.

I have had many discussions with federal officials and I can assure this house that they are looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to working very closely with this new branch.

We are all aware that the constant attacks against Indian Affairs by the former government did not lead to an atmosphere favorable to carrying out joint programs or any other form of co-operation. This distrust, of course, has been dispelled since we took office and, as I said earlier, they are anxiously awaiting the opportunity to work together for the solution of the problems facing our Indian and Metis residents. This united planning of new programs with the Indian Affairs Branch, and of programs that are in existence, will be a major aspect of this new branch.

Finally, and most important of all, as a co-ordinating function, will be the co-ordination of the views and advice of the Indian people themselves, without whose co-operation no program of assistance will be successful.

I cannot and I will not subscribe to the thought that the Indian people hate us. Again this idea seems to be a relatively new one as far as the MLA for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) is concerned. He adopted it, after listening to an anthropologist who obviously knew very little about the Indian people of Saskatchewan, or of Canada, make a similar statement up in Saskatoon not too long ago.

Now no one will deny that they have reason to be impatient over the procrastination and malingering of former governments, both provincial and federal, in coming to grips with their problems. But they are a patient understanding people and hate is not a feeling common to their way of thinking I have confidence that our Indian and Metis people will co-operate completely and wholeheartedly in what we are trying to do to integrate them as equal partners in our society. Although planning and research will be another function of the branch, I must agree with some members opposite, that there has been considerable research and planning done and what is needed now is action. Under the former government, there were too many anthropologists and sociologists doing research and no one to translate their results into practical administration and development. I would have been pleased to assist them but as I showed earlier during the session, these reports were not for the Liberal opposition but were kept solely for the longhairs who had prepared them.

I think we must realize that there is no simple solution to the immediate pressing problems of our Indian and Metis people. Certainly, education will be fundamental in our plans. But an educated Indian without a job or without a fit residence to live in is not the answer. And conversely, an Indian in a poor house and without a job needs an education to improve his lot. So we do have the need for a branch that can develop and co-ordinate an overall program involving federal, provincial, and municipal authorities, as well as the many interested public association and, of course, the Indian and Metis people themselves. I don't think there is anyone who will deny, on the other side of the house, or this side, that there is a role for everyone to play. I would suggest that we should be getting at it and place the interests of these people ahead of any other consideration.

Members opposite speak against this legislation, yet they say they are going to vote for it. Even so, I am afraid they are going to do everything they can to hinder us in our attempts to help these people. I would hope, if they oppose the idea of this department or this branch, that they will have the courage to stand on their feet and say so and vote against it, so that we will know who is in favor of helping these people and who are in favor of the policy of the former government which was certainly not in the

best interests of the people concerned. reading of this bill. Naturally I will support second

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member (Mr. Guy) referred to something but he did not read the paragraph, and if I can, I will just read it. It is very short. This is what I said on page 638.

> I have already said that I hope my hon. friends opposite will take a different attitude towards native people. Native people do need a great deal of help to get on their feet and I don't think it is going to hurt to urge again, let us work together . . .

And that is why we have argued because we are afraid of your history but if you have changed - if you have changed, we will support you and give you a chance.

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabasca): — . . . one speech . . .

An Hon. Member: — Prove yourself.

An Hon. Member: — Sit down.

Mr. Berezowsky: — We'll give you a chance.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I intend to say a few brief words in respect to this bill.

Last week I had an opportunity of meeting two Indian chiefs and discussing with them, the legislation that is before us. In discussing this bill, I got the distinct impression from them that they are far from being enthusiastic about this legislation. They consider this legislation to be of the type that might bring about further segregation.

The member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has a good deal of advice to give us about any matter that comes up. He says we on this side of the house have to vote against it, if we express any concern or have any doubtful feelings about it. Mr. Speaker, I for one would like to wish the government success with this bill. I believe there is much to be done for our native people. In establishing the new branch, I would like to propose the following items for their consideration. I am not suggesting that this be done immediately but I think there are measures that can be taken in a positive way to help our Indian and Metis population.

Anyone who has studied legislation in other countries, that goes to protect, or give; security to people who are less fortunate will find that governments in other countries have been able to devise laws which do give security and protection to people who may have been discriminated against, or who have some unfortunate conditions. It is well known that in some of the European countries, laws do exist that employers are required by law to employ a certain percentage of people of a particular group or category.

I would suggest that the government give consideration in the next year, to bringing in legislation which would require employers in Saskatchewan to employ say three or four per cent of their work force of native Canadian origin. I know that this would not be something that could be accomplished immediately. The Indian people do need special skills to be able to work in our advanced and technological industries but there is precedent now where industry is subsidized for training people of particular categories. You are aware that the federal government, two years ago, enacted legislation which gives a bonus to an employer in the amount of $75 a month, who employs workers who are forty years of age and over. It would seem to me that a bonus system of this nature could be established, which would pay an employer who employs Indian people and who would be willing to train them in skills that are needed.

Another area that I would suggest probably needs some consideration is developing, on the reserves, cattle herds and teaching Indian people the best known agricultural practices.

A few weeks ago, we heard an announcement, Mr. Speaker, that in the city of Regina, we will soon have under construction, a large Hudson Bay

Company store. I hope that the government would be able to persuade the Hudson Bay Company to start training young Indian boys and girls so that when they open this store in 1967, that they will be able to staff that store with a good percentage of employees of Indian origin. If there is any company that owes the native Canadians a debt, I would suggest that the Hudson Bay Company does and this would be a step, I think, in the right direction.

There is a need for encouraging and taking special steps towards developing a training program for our native Canadians. The government should devise a deliberate program which would enrol as many as possible of our Indian and Metis people in technical schools to teach them new skills, and with this I suggest that they introduce an income maintenance program.

The other suggestion I would like to pose for their consideration is to do everything possible to bring the Indian people under the Saskatchewan Medical Care Plan.

A further item, Mr. Speaker, which needs a great deal of attention is a public education program, because I am afraid that in our society there still exists a great deal of discrimination towards the Indian and Metis people. I believe that prejudices can only be removed through an effective public education program. I would suggest that this be the first item that should be considered by this branch. We hear and see all kinds of unfortunate things happening, I have noticed that even our law enforcement people tend to be quite abusive when a person of the Indian or Metis origin has run into difficulty with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I do intend to support this legislation, but I wanted to pose these items for consideration of the government. As I said there is much that needs to be done for our native Canadians. This is a matter in which party politics should be set in the background, because when we have several thousands of our native people who are living in privation, I think that we should all do our utmost to remove the unfortunate conditions that they are living under.

I would suggest that steps be taken immediately to implement a large scale housing program for Indian people on the reserves and for people generally in the northern part of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I was going to let this go without saying anything but I want to say just a few words now.

First of all, I- approve and applaud the government's evident desire to do something to improve conditions among our Indian and Metis people in northern Saskatchewan and elsewhere. I am not sure whether this will do it but I think it is worth a try and if something can be done to integrate government programs, to improve the effectiveness and scope of those programs amongst these people so much the better. I, for one, will wish the government well in this undertaking and I hope that some substantial benefits may accrue to these people who are less privileged because of their racial ancestry and that we can look forward in three or four years to a substantial improvement.

I want to say something further, however, which I think is of an even more serious nature and that is the relationship between the executive, the political level of government, and the legislative level and with the implementing of government programs. I raise this because I was struck by something that was said by the legislative assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Guy) this afternoon. I would ask the house to recall that first of all, there is an iron clad principle, that people having contracts with the crown ought not to sit in the legislature, ought not to take part in decisions affecting the public and affecting public employees.

I raise this with some reluctance because I have no personal anxiety that this represents anything improper, done by the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) or that he contemplates doing. I simply ask the house to remember the basic principle involved here, and to consider the effect of the announcement which the Premier made this morning in this regard.

First of all, there is the general principle that people having contracts with the crown may not sit in the legislature, and, of course, therefore, may not sit in the cabinet, or as Parliamentary Assistants. Now the Legislative Assembly Act makes a number of exceptions and it excepts people of a type and class who are benefiting from some agreement with the crown in some, more or less, incidental way - people who by virtue of their agreement with the crown have no opportunity to exercise any influence upon

the crown or any influence upon the legislature, even if they were members of it.

For example, a person who receives benefit from the Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance Act, is in a large class of people — part of a large group of people who have no special vested interests as a class, they are merely members of the citizenry at large, who receive benefits under the Automobile Accident Insurance Act. Likewise there are a number of other exceptions.

The legislature has always as a matter of policy wanted to accord as many people in as many walks of life as possible the opportunity to take part in the deliberations of this legislature and take part in the government of the province, and that is a laudable objective, which I am sure every member approves. About 1961, in 1961, in fact, the legislature was confronted with the fact that a member who was engaged in the teaching profession in the far north, wished to sit in this house and was under some disability because his contract for employment was with the crown, or an agency of the crown, namely, the Northern Administration District.

Now, the legislature, at that time, regarded the Northern Administration District as being equivalent to a school district, even though a school district is controlled by an elected board, not in any way under the control of the government, and the Northern Administration District is controlled by a government department - the legislature was so anxious to ensure that teachers in that part of the province should not be disqualified, or disabled from sitting in the house, that a point was stretched and the Northern Administration District was treated as though it were a school unit, even though it is a creature of the government and under direct government control.

And so, an amendment was passed which said:

> That no person shall be disqualified from sitting in the legislature by reason of his entry into a contract . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I draw the attention of the member and also the attention of the members of the house, to the fact that we are debating second reading of a bill. It seems to me that the hon. member has been debating the eligibility of the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to cast his ballot thereon. The debate took place some time ago in regard to a bill which came before this house, in a previous session - I fail to see how this has any relationship to the motion that this particular bill be now read the second time. I hope the hon. member will bring his remarks into order as soon as possible.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Your Honour's ruling and I agree that my remarks would be out of order except that we are being asked now to pass legislation, which will place under the very Parliamentary Assistant that I am speaking of, control over this aspect of public policy, namely, the administration of Indian affairs. What I am saying is that the relationship which the hon. Parliamentary Assistant occupies, is one which is relevant to whether or not we should pass this bill. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we pass this bill, and ordinarily I would favor the passing of this bill, if we pass this bill, we are putting, we are delegating, we are vesting in the hands of a member who is really a government employee, to act as a Parliamentary Assistant to a minister, as a political head of a department, a function which is also his function as a civil servant. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here we are embroiled in a serious difficulty if we pass this bill, because first of all we. are involving the civil service of which he is a member, in a particular agency in northern Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Guy: — On a point of order, this question has been brought up on numerous occasions. I am not a civil servant, and I must admit that I would prefer to be a civil servant at this time, much more than I would have a year ago, I will tell you that. I am not a civil servant, I do not come under the Civil Service Act . . .

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, that is beside the point. He has a contract with the crown. His contract of employment is a contract with the crown, whether he calls it a civil servant or not, is quite beside the point. The point is this, that he is a public official, paid out of the revenues of the province as a public servant, and now he sits virtually as a cabinet minister

in charge of that department.

Mr. George Leith (Elrose): — On a point of order, I think that here the member from Hanley, must be reminded again, that we are debating whether or not we should establish a branch of the department, we are not debating the qualifications of a proposed head of that department, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that he should be kept in order.

Mr. Walker: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has indicated to this house that the particular public servant, or public official, that I am speaking of, will be minister, or Parliamentary Assistant to the minister, who will be administering this particular branch, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit, it is relevant, whether we pass this legislation or not, and I submit this to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) who I am sure is aware of the propriety of these things, and the propriety of keeping the cabinet and the public service separate. I am sure that this raises a number of problems. Are civil servants now, Mr. Speaker, to be encouraged to seek cabinet appointments, legislative election and cabinet appointments? Are cabinet ministers to give themselves positions in . . .

Mr. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey): — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Heald: — Well, I think it is, I am going to make a point of order, if I get the answer to the question. Is the hon. member raising this, as a legal question? Are you raising a question as the member to the propriety, or are you saying that it is illegal, are you saying that it is against the act for the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to accept this position? I would like to get your position clear.

Mr. Walker: — No, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that this goes to the public policy of this legislature in passing this legislation. When I say that the legislature excluded employees of the Northern Administration District from the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act, the legislature was contemplating that such employees would be in the role of ordinary teachers, ordinary instructors in a classroom.

Mr. Leith: — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of order. I think that the hon. member must confine his remarks to the principle of the bill, and the principle is whether or not we approve the establishment of a branch of the Department of Natural Resources. Now, we may sympathize, or we may not sympathize with his point of view about a particular member who may be appointed as head of that branch, but here in this part of the debate we must surely debate the principle of this bill and not a hypothetical situation.

Mr. Walker: — I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not in any way trying to cast any reflection on the member . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I think he is acting strictly according to law, insofar as it appears to me, I have no question about the legality of what he is doing, but I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this represents a new departure in the principle of government which we in this house ought to be cognizant of when we pass this legislation. Because when we pass this legislation we are accepting the principle that a civil servant can be an assistant cabinet minister, and that an assistant cabinet minister and a political head of a department can be a public employee . . .

Mr. Heald: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, he is not a civil servant, and the hon. member knows that. He has a contract with the government which is permitted under the Legislative Assembly Act.

An Hon. Member: — That is right.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, we think that he is out of order.

Mr. Allan Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, one gets a little tired of the quibble as to whether a public servant is a civil servant. In a Return filed in this house a few days ago, it was made clear that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is employed by an agency of the crown, he is supervised by a crown servant . . .

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we are talking about the principle of the bill, and this hon. member cannot . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . .talk . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You, too. Now the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was stating his point of order — now get up and state it.

Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was replying to the point of order raised by the member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald), the Attorney General. I was pointing out that for the information in the house, the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is a public servant, and whether or not one calls him a civil servant or a public servant, is a mere play on words. The point made by the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is that in point of fact he is a crown employee.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on the Point of Order. The member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) raised this point of order and said we should stick to the principle of the bill. Now you cannot consider the principle of any bill without taking into account the circumstances surrounding it, and one of the circumstances that is present, and that must be considered is the fact that this very day the Premier announced who was going to be in charge of this particular branch, that this bill sets up. So, it might be one thing that this legislature would decide, if the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) was going to be in charge of this, it might be another thing if somebody else was going to be in charge of it, because this has been injected into the debate and I think it cannot be separated from it.

Hon. A. H. McDonald (Minister of Agriculture): — Speaker, could I point out that I think the point that was raised by the member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) is well taken. We are discussing second reading of a bill to amend The Department of Natural Resources Act. We are not discussing at this time who shall head the branch of the department, and be responsible for the administration, and I think that any discussion on this point is irrelevant and I think it is out of order. This house is concerned at the moment with whether they support a new branch in the Department of Natural Resources, or whether they do not, and whether you head it or I head it, or who heads it, it is of no concern to this house at this time. Perhaps later, yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Now I think it is pretty plain that the house is discussing Bill no. 1, the motion for second reading thereof. Bill no. 1, as I understand it sets up another branch of this government, for the purpose of doing whatever it is supposed to do.

Whoever is going to head the department immediately upon its being established is not necessarily the person who may head the department at some later date or some future time. In fact, until the department is established, nobody is going to head it. Until the bill passes the house there will be no head of any department.

The question as to whether or not there should be Legislative Assistants, and who should be the Legislative Assistants, was a matter that was debated on another bill, at another time, and I think all hon. members are aware of the fact that you can't revive a previous debate. If there were to be Legislative Assistants, or not to be Legislative Assistants, there was a time and a place to discuss it. The question as to who should and who should not head the department - there is a time and a place to discuss that. What we are discussing is whether or not there should be an established branch. I fail to see how the remarks of the member from Hanley

(Mr. Walker) can be called strictly relevant to the motion for second reading of the bill, and I would ask that he confine himself to that.

Mr. Walker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. The branch that is proposed to set up will be co-ordinating a number of agencies in northern Saskatchewan. We don't know, but I suppose we shall find out in committee, just what those agencies are. I am sure that one of the most important agencies in northern Saskatchewan is the Department of Education, because God knows that if there is any place where the Department of Education ought to be functioning, it is in northern Saskatchewan, and we know, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most important aspects of education in northern Saskatchewan, insofar as this province is concerned, will be in the education and particularly in the guidance and the counselling services that are given to the Indians and the Metis in northern Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, the directors of this bill, the people who are in charge of this bill, the minister and his Parliamentary Assistant, will be responsible for seeing to it, not only that the Department of Natural Resources functions properly there, but that the Department of Education functions properly there, and so we will have the situation, as I foresee it, if this bill passes, where the minister will direct his Parliamentary Assistant, or his Executive Assistant, if he has one or whoever he has, and this Parliamentary Assistant will particularly if he is a resident of northern Saskatchewan, find it convenient to act as the liaison between the minister and these northern agencies.

So the Parliamentary Assistant for Natural Resources, will then be obliged to Mr. Hendsbee, who is the administrator of education for northern Saskatchewan, and try to get him to integrate his program with the programs of the other government departments, and this means that the Parliamentary Assistant will have to approach his boss and tell him that this is the wishes of the minister — this is the wishes of the government.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are finding a situation here in this branch which is made to order for the kind of Gauleiter that Hitler had in Bavaria in 1932.

Mr. Speaker: — Here – Order! Order! Now you withdraw that. That is the most unparliamentary . . .

Mr. Walker: — I will not. I will not.

Mr. Speaker: — All right, I made the statement in this house once before, and I make it once again, that a house maintains its own standard of decorum and conduct, and never has it sunk to such a low ebb as it has when you made that statement. This is a reflection on every member in this house. It brings every member in this house into disgrace and I ask that you withdraw it, and I ask that you withdraw it now.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if I may, I have cast no reflection on any member of this house. If I have I would like to know whom.

Mr. Speaker: — You cast it on all of them.

Mr. Walker: — I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, on whom?

Mr. Speaker: — I may have misheard you, but if I understand it, you said this was creating a situation which would make the member in charge the equivalent of a Gauleiter, or whatever you want to call it, in Hitler's organization.

Mr. Walker: — No, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that.

Mr. Speaker: — Very well . . .

An Hon. Member: — What did you say then?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The judgement on the matter is deferred until I get the record.

Mr. Walker: — What I said, Mr. Speaker, was this. . . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Tell the girls to get the record. You will not say anything more about what you said, I will get it off the record.

Mr. Walker: — The situation is this, that we are here in this house, deliberately setting up a situation, deliberately setting up machinery, which cannot, in my view, do anything to maintain or continue the separation which is essential, which is integral, which is essential and which is integral to a proper separation between the political heads of the government and the staff of government departments.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am informed that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor is prepared to enter the chamber.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 5:08 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the chamber and took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to certain bills.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying the legislation that is proposed here, contains many implications and many ramifications which are always difficult when a centralizing agency or a co-ordinating agency has to maintain relations with other branches of other departments. It is always difficult to delineate the lines of authority, the lines of responsibility and this particular situation .is even more complicated in that respect, than any other.

I want to say, however, in view of the apparent heated response by members opposite, that I, in no way, wish to be taken as imputing any lack of confidence in any of the members opposite. I want to make it perfectly clear that what I am saying makes no suggestion that there is anything illegal about the proposal, all I am saying is that the proposal is unusual, and it is contrary to the standard traditions which we have become accustomed to. I would ask that the government consider these aspects which I have drawn to the attention of the house.

I conclude this by saying that in my view, anything which can be done to make these various agencies dove-tail and to work better and will be applauded by the people of Saskatchewan. This may be the answer. I hope it will work. I have no hesitation in saying that I trust my instincts in this matter, and I am prepared to believe that it will result in some improvement in the administration of government programs. I hope so, I know the government is putting this forward more or less tentatively because it is an extremely complicated area. They put it forward for the purpose optimistically with the hope that it will produce some good. I share that view, I am sure that they will look at it critically and analytically in the future and if a better method can be found of improving the effectiveness of government programs in the north. I am sure the government will be glad to accept suggestions along that line from this side of the house in the years to come. I will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members of the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate, if anyone wishes to speak, he must do so now.

Mr. L. M. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this particular debate, but the opening remarks of the Premier, in introducing this bill together with the remarks of the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) practically compelled me.

I want to say to the Premier at the outset, that the conditions he described amongst the Indians was not a very pleasant or a very pleasing one. I want to say to him that this is not altogether true in all areas. We have three reserves in my constituency, and I want to say that the Indian children go to school with the other children and the Indians come into our cafes, into our stores and into our beer parlors. We do not treat them in any segregated way whatsoever. I want to say that they have worked for me. They sit and eat at the same table with my family, so the conditions that he tried to describe are not essentially a true picture of what is the

case with the Indians in Saskatchewan.

Now the member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) always seems to try to arouse controversy, he seems to take it upon himself to chastise everyone on this side of the house. He uses his nauseating form to almost compel people to reply to him. I was very interested in the remarks he made with regard to the programs. I somehow seem to gather he said co-ordination, he said research, he said education, and he said all the overall programs of federal, provincial and municipal governments, and to place the interest of the Indian people ahead of political interest and so on, then he challenged us on this side. Well, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, after having made these remarks, that I am going to wish the Premier and the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) well in the program of setting up this branch. I am going to say to them, that they will have my blessing and anything that I can do to help them, I will be only too glad to do so, because I do agree that the position of our Indians and the conditions that they live in are not something that we are very proud of.

Now, having said that, I find some conflict and some real contradiction in some of the things that have been said about our Indian programs and what is envisioned in this bill.

I hold in my hand here, Mr. Speaker, an eight point program that was presented to the Indians in my constituency. It is over the signature of the Ross Barrie Committee and authorized by the Pelly constituency Liberal Association. I am sure this group is well known to members opposite. I find some real conflict and some real confusion in this eight point program and what is being proposed in this bill. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I want to place on the records of this house what this eight point program consists of. I want members here to compare and use their judgement in deciding just what is meant by this bill. It starts out:

> Kamsack, Saskatchewan, April 10th, 1964.
>
> Dear Treaty Indians:
>
> You know our friend and your friend Ross Barrie. He has asked us to write to you. If Ross Barrie and his party are elected, they will do this for you:
>
> 1. Give the Indian back his trap lines, that were taken away from him by the CCF-NDP government.
> 2. The Indian will be one of the people that gives out trapping and hunting licenses. He will see that you get a fair deal.
> 3. If there are too many moose or deer in a park, the Treaty Indian will be given the first chance to go in and shoot some.
> 4. The tax on land rented to white men, will be done away with, or you will be allowed to sit .on municipal council, to see how the money is spent.
> 5. More Indians will be hired by the government to deal with Indians.
> 6. The Chief and Council will be given a lot more power in dealing with the provincial government.
> 7. More big jobs, like fence post cutting will be started to give the Indians more work.

I am wondering if the exemption of fence posts from the sales tax is going to facilitate this.

> 8. Some way will be worked out to give our Indians electrical power in his home.

And it concludes:

> Mr. Ross Barrie has helped you. He has helped your family, he has helped your friends, you can thank him by voting for him.
>
> J. Ross Barrie.

And then as a footnote, they have added this:

> The NDP government in Regina called this election at a time when they thought it would be hard for you to get

and vote against them. Mr. Barrie really needs your vote this time. You want him elected.

Yes, I agree, Mr. Barrie really did need the votes.

Mr. Thatcher: — You will need it next time.

Mr. L. M. Larson (Pelly): — Now, this is a direct conflict, Mr. Speaker, with the glowing remarks that have been made about what this bill is going to represent. I think it is only fair that we ought to know just what is meant. Just which is the true picture? Is it this eight point program that I am quite prepared to table and that all members opposite can pick up and look at, and read and study and use as a basis for their platform, or is it some of these high sounding phrases that we have just heard sounded during parts of this debate.

I think we have a right to know. Now as I said at the beginning, I am not going to oppose this measure, because I do feel that our Indians are in many ways, in trouble and need help. I want to reiterate, that if there is anything that I can do, I am quite prepared to assist in making it a success. But for goodness sakes, let us not try to accuse each other of misleading our Indian people, on both sides of the house, when this kind of a document is circulated to every Indian on the three reserves, and then come here, and start talking in such glowing phrases about what is going to be done. This to me is a shame and a disgrace and no credit to any man and I certainly would want no part of it, but I am still going to support the measure in the hope that this kind of thing will be done away with and that we have some program that will be of help and some benefit to these people who, in my opinion, need help.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Allan Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, the few comments that I wanted to make with respect to this bill fall under two or three headings.

Firstly, I am still troubled by the stated intention of the bill, being that of erecting a branch which will have as its essential role the co-ordination of services for Indian and Metis people. If, in fact, it is going to act as a co-ordinating branch I would have no objection to that. If, in fact, it is going to operate as a program branch, I would object to it and I would object to it for essentially the reasons which have already been stated — that to set up separate programs for Indians on any wholesale basis, is something which will, however benignly they are carried on, encourage the segregation which we are trying to eliminate. Now we have had the assurances of the government, that the branch is going to be co-ordinating branch, but I am just suggesting that the branch is going to have a very difficult time acting as a co-ordinating branch. I say this because of its location in the Department of Natural Resources. It will have to co-ordinate programs of the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Education, Co-operation and some others . . .

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Social welfare.

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, social welfare. Five or six departments which have a major interest in the north. Now if the co-ordinating branch was associated with the Premier's office or with some other agency which was not actively participating in the north, I would say its chance of achieving effective co-ordination would be better. But I just suggest to this house, that the person, or persons in charge of this branch, will be split personalities. They will owe part of their loyalty to the whole program and part of their loyalty to the Department of Natural Resources. This is just inevitable. The problems which will arise when these people try to co-ordinate a program when there is a divergence between the policy of the Department of Natural Resources and that of, say, the Department of Education, will be insolvable.

They will not be able to act as arbiters, or as effective co-ordinators, where the divergence is between a program operated by another department and the program operated by the Department of Natural Resources. I suggest that this practical problem of public administration is going to arise and is going to arise in a very acute way. However, I appreciate that any problem of public administration can be at least minimized, if the right people are obtained, and I would urge on the minister to select people who are not wedded to the program of any particular department in the north, and who do not feel a vested interest in the program of the Department of

Social Welfare, or the Department of Education, or the Department of Health, or the Department of Natural Resources. You are going to have to get someone who .can take the view that is overall and who will be able to recommend a firm line when there is divergence, as I call assure the minister that there will be, because there has been in the past. I don't think it is any secret to anyone that when you get four or five departments operating in a particular area, there are possibilities of some conflict of program.

Mr. Speaker: — It now being 5:30, I now leave the chair until 7:30 this evening.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege if I may? During the recess I have been considering some words that I used before the recess, and I would ask the assembly to accept my explanation, that I was concerned about the preserving of the integrity of this house and the government, and I may have been over zealous in what I said, and while the words I used, I do not believe were strictly unparliamentary, I take the view, that if they are found to be offensive by you, Sir, then I would unreservedly withdraw them. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize most sincerely for any disrespect I may have shown to you in the performance of your duties as Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. D. T. McFarlane: — Did you spank him, Toby?

Mr. Speaker: — I think the house will be prepared to accept this apology of the hon. member, and I would be happy to accept it myself. Where are we at?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I think I was speaking in the debate on Bill no. 1, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher, that Bill no. 1 be now read the second time.

Just before we rose at 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out some of the problems that I saw with respect to this bill, and more particularly, some of the problems that I saw in this agency acting as an effective co-ordinating agency. I now would like to pass along one or two suggestions with respect to things which might be done to improve the lot of Indians and Metis people in Saskatchewan. I will not direct my remarks to the problems of Indians in the southern part of the province. There are many members who are much better informed on these problems than I am. I did want to make a few comments on the native people living in the northern part of the province, and to say that the problems which have surrounded northern administration and improving the welfare of people in the northern part of the province, had been very complex indeed.

In the period after the war efforts were made to raise the economic level of those people, efforts which met with a good deal of success. The economic base of the native people in northern Saskatchewan improved steadily up until some time in the middle or late fifties. At that time, I think it would be fair to say that the economic level of the people in northern Saskatchewan stopped improving to any marked degree. This was not because of any lack of improvement in the economic base, which was continuing to improve, but rather it was because the economic base was not expanding as fast as the population was expanding.

We have heard a good deal about the post-war population explosion, and I think that the Premier in his. opening remarks pointed out that nowhere is this explosion more evident than it is in among the native people of Saskatchewan and among the native people of northern Saskatchewan. I do not know how much the birthrate increased, the dramatic thing was the increase in the survival rate, and this came about because of a rapid and marked increase in the health services made available to the people of northern Saskatchewan. Giant strides were made in bringing health in the form of hospitalization, treatment for T.B. and similar programs to the people of northern Saskatchewan.

With this change in the economic base, there arose a problem of a most serious nature with respect to education. In the north, clearly it was in the interests of the native people to improve their educational standards. It was similarly in their interest to provide gainful employment for them and to a considerable extent, these two ideals ran counter to each other. Because in order to provide education for the young in the north, it was necessary for the family to stay constantly around communities where educational

facilities were available. On the other hand, in order for the native to find gainful employment in their traditional occupation of hunting and fishing, it was necessary for them to leave the built-up communities. Their custom has been to travel in family units and they were accordingly faced with the problem of either breaking their family units and becoming less efficient as producers of fur and fish, or taking their children with them in the traditional way and depriving them of schooling. Now it seemed to me that there are some particular problems in bringing education to native people of the north. The problems really stem from a two-time limit within which the school system is working. The school system does not get the children and isn't able to educate them effectively until the children are eight or nine years of age. First, they do not get to the school until they are six or seven, and then they lose a year or so before they became fluent in the English language. They then, because of the exigencies of their economic situation, leave school at the age of thirteen or fourteen, and you, therefore, only had four or five years of effective schooling.

It would be my suggestion, that something could be done to lengthen this period of effective schooling. I take the position that it is no longer adequate to provide improved opportunities in the traditional skills of the native people of northern Saskatchewan, associated with trapping and fishing, these are not going to provide an economic base for these people. Many of the Indian and Metis people are going to have to find employment in what has been essentially white men's work. They are going to have to be equipped to come out of the north, and compete in an industrial society, if they so wish, and some of them are going to have to.

Accordingly they have to get a minimum standard of education. This cannot be done in a four or five or six year school system which has traditionally been available in the north. Obviously some years could be tacked on to the latter end, by improving the economic status of the people so that the children could stay in school until fifteen or sixteen, or seventeen, as we do in the southern part of the province, but that is not going to be easy and it is not going to be quick. I am suggesting for immediate consideration a way of increasing time available for schooling at the lower end. This would not be particularly expensive. It will cost some money, but it will not be excessively expensive. The suggestion is to provide kindergartens, offering schooling for young native children, at possibly the age of three or four, and to provide a substantially smaller ratio of students to teachers particularly in the lower grades. Thus a teacher could have eight or ten students of the age of five or six, and teach them the English language in one year. I have talked to teachers who taught in the north, and they felt that if they just had a small number of native children, they could take these children who may come to school speaking Cree or Chippewan, and in one year make them sufficiently fluent in English so that they could go on through the school system and be able to benefit from all the instruction that was available to them in a relatively short number of years in which, experience has shown, they stay at school.

As I say, this would not be excessively expensive. It would mean twenty or twenty-five more teachers in the northern area and this is not an excessive expenditure if it would work.

Need I say that the strides in education, in the last twenty or thirty years in the north, has been absolutely gigantic and anyone who has travelled around the north, even a little bit, will know this. The community of lIe a la Crosse was established in 1845, the province was founded in 1905, forty years after 1905. In 1945 that community which was 100 years old and which had forty years under the aegis of the province of Saskatchewan had no publicly supported school. There was a mission school there but there just was not a public school in that area. This is true of most of the communities of the north. In the twenty years which has followed this, the north has opened up and as members will know, new schools have been built, and schools in which people might take modest pride, in places like La Ronge, lIe a la Crosse and Beauval, even in smaller communities like Snake Lake, or perhaps I should call it Pinehouse Lake, where schools have been built, and in most places they are the best buildings in the community. In some cases their rival is the hospital, such as La Ronge or lIe a la Crosse. The fact is that the strides have been gigantic in the last twenty years.

I think that the teachers who have gone into the north, have some ideas, and among them are the ones that I am suggesting, of intensifying a program for the children who are four to eight years old, with kindergarten and with very small classes, so that these children can be made literate in English at an early age, because I think that for many years to come, most of them will be leaving school at fourteen or fifteen, until we can build up their economic status enough to make another breadwinner not necessary at that age.

May I also suggest that schools in the north operated by the department be provided with study halls, and that these be supervised in the evening. Many of the young people in the north simply cannot get ahead at school because their home environment is not conducive to study. There is practically nothing that we can do about that quickly. I would hope that in ten or twenty years substantial strides would be made, but in the mean time, study halls could be provided, supervised in the evening; — it would not need to be anything elaborate. Just use the gym if there is a gym, or even the classrooms that are there. If it could be arranged that these study facilities be supervised in the evening, I think that the educational progress of these students would be very much improved. I think that a lot of progress has been made in the vital area of motivation of the young people in the north. If we can give them a better start by making them literate in English quickly, if we make adequate provision for their studies during the years when they are in school, if we could introduce a school lunch program in some of the areas where malnutrition is a real factor, then I think we could make fairly rapid strides in this area. We can at least make a dent in this vicious circle where the student, because of poor home environment and poor economic environment, simply does not get the start in life, and because they do not get a start in life, they enter on their family building in a poor home environment and a poor economic environment and we simply repeat the cycle. This is familiar to us all. The only place we can really get a toe in to crack the cycle quickly is at the educational level and I suggest that the three programs which I have outlined, first — accelerated schooling at the kindergarten and primary level, second, halls to encourage all students whose home environment is not conducive to study, and a school lunch program where malnutrition is a factor, these three programs would be constructive programs which I would commend to the consideration of the department in the consideration of the problems of Indian and Metis people.

Now, as I think has been obvious in my remarks, my experience in this area is largely educational. Some other members will be able to make more penetrating comments in other areas of northern life and accordingly I will not attempt to foist on the house my undigested ideas of these other subjects.

I do have reservations about the branch for the reasons I have already mentioned. I do feel that the job needs to be continued. I, for my part, am prepared to see how the branch gets along, and accordingly I will be supporting the bill.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw to the attention of the house the fact that the mover is about to close the debate.

Mr. Harry Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reluctance to participate in this debate, because I do not, as you have gathered, rise to take part in some of these debates, and I only do so when I feel rather strongly about something.

This is one topic that I do feel strongly about. In my constituency, of course, the Indian and Metis problem is not perhaps as prevalent as it is in the northern part of this province, but nevertheless we have them and, perhaps, we will have more in the future. The member for Regina east has already dealt with some of the problems that also disturb me, and that is the matter of housing, education and employment. I feel that this proposed branch is perhaps the type of branch that is necessary to co-ordinate the program for these people and I certainly intend to support this measure.

However, as I see it, the problem that faces this province and this government is of tremendous magnitude. It has been with us ever since this province has been formed, I suppose. Many people have tried, I think sincerely, to do something about it irrespective of political affiliations. However, in view of the magnitude of this job, I was wondering whether the government, perhaps, might consider the establishment of an Advisory Committee, this would be exactly what the words would indicate, an Advisory Committee made up of people that are interested in the Indian and the Metis population.

I might suggest that prospective, or actual employers, members of the government, members of labor, church groups, teachers, and above all, members of the Indian and Metis themselves, might well get together and form a committee of some kind, strictly in an advisory capacity — because with all due respect to the minister in charge, I am sure that he cannot possibly

have the answers to all these problems, and help of any kind, I believe, might be of some assistance.

I think it is the duty of the opposition to pose alternatives and make suggestions at a time like this and that is why I have made this particular one. I think those of us that remember the incident that took place at Glaslyn, not so very long ago, will realize that something must be done and must be done reasonably soon, in order that this type of thing does not happen again in a country such as ours.

If this proposed legislation is even partially successful, only 50 per cent successful, then it certainly is well worth giving the government an opportunity to see what they can do and I propose to support this legislation.

Mr. Robert Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to dwell at any length on this subject. My colleagues have covered it very well, but there are several remarks that I would like to make in connection with the problem with the bill and generally.

For almost sixty years it has been my fortune to have many close associations with the Indian people, in fact, this is true every year. Our home has been open to them. We have shared our home with them on many occasions and the fare on our table has been shared with them many, many times. When we first settled in that particular area, these people, Mr. Speaker, were in business. You could go to their camps and they had articles to sell, moccasins, coats, gloves, mitts, belts, what have you, and as I said a moment ago, they were in business. Seldom if ever, did you find one who had to ask for assistance, and over the years, I have watched the hunting and the fishing and the trapping of our Indian people disappear. Wide open spaces in which they lived, and made their living, have narrowed down to the road allowances and the reserves, and now we have a once proud people who are in great need, often tragic need.

Long before appointments had any political connotations or overtones so far as our Indian people are concerned, I viewed with alarm many of the appointments of Indian agents and farm instructors, and I am not making any sweeping statements, Mr. Speaker, that what I am about to say applied to all of them. Many of them received these positions because of whom they knew, and not what they knew, about the work that they must take in hand and they were not appointed as to whether they cared about the people whom they were supposed to serve and to help in adjusting themselves to a new way of life.

Like many of my colleagues I intend to support this bill, but I do plead with the government to choose their personnel wisely, and well. I hope that this legislation may have the chance of bringing to fruition some of the ideas that have been written into the legislation, that it might even have a fighting chance to do a good job. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the government at the present time were in the opposition, they would cry to high heaven at the very thought of a member of the legislature having virtually full control over every department of government in the constituency which he represents.

Mr. Speaker, I want this bill to do something for our native people. Something that will raise their standard of living, something that is going to enhance their dignity, something that is going to bring hope out of despair, and last but not least, Mr. Speaker, I want it to be something that redeems the white man in the eyes of our Indian brothers. If this is going to be done, it is going to have to be lifted on to a pretty high level compared with much that has been done in the past.

I am going to support the bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I would like only two or three moments on this subject. It is fairly obvious from the speeches on both sides of the house that all hone members know that there is no easy answer to this problem. I doubt it does very much good for this side to blame the provincial CCF, or for that side to blame the provincial or federal Liberals, or for both of us to blame the federal Conservatives. The fact is that the condition of Indians in this province and country are pretty deplorable, and the time is long past due when something should be done about it.

The emphasis of this government in trying to find some solution to this problem will not be more social welfare. I would hope that not one ten cent piece of this $450,000 that we are planning for next year will go to social welfare measures, though it may be necessary. We do hope that the emphasis can be placed on education, and then on finding jobs for these people. Some of the authorities in the north have told me repeatedly that they have had cases of Indian children graduating from grade 12 and then not being able to go out and find employment. They had no choice but to return to the reserve.

The government is proposing to set up this branch, more or less as a co-ordinating branch. It will, of course, be under the minister, the hon. Mr. Cuelenaere (Minister of Natural Resources) who is in charge of the whole department. However, we have appointed a Parliamentary Assistant, or a Legislative Assistant, Mr. Allan Guy, to look after this matter specifically. Whether the hon. member has a sharp tongue, or whether he hasn't a sharp tongue, I think most members on both sides of the house would have to agree that he does know this Indian problem about as well as any member in the legislature. We think that he can do a job.

There were several suggestions made during the debate. I thought the hon. member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) had some very good, and very constructive suggestions that should be looked into. The suggestion of the hon. member for Saskatoon, that we should consider an Advisory Committee, will certainly be looked into. This suggestion could have some merit. I am a little dubious about Advisory Committees. However, we are trying to pioneer something and maybe an Advisory Committee would have some value and we will look into it.

I repeat what I said when I introduced this bill, that the number one job of this branch as I see it, will be to find employment for these people. I think the civil service itself must set the example. I think we must go out in our various departments and bring Indians and Metis into them — a percentage of them. Then this department must go out to the industry and business of Saskatchewan and ask them to do precisely the same thing. If we are fortunate in getting lumber development, or pulp development, or mining development in the north, we must ask these companies to hire a percentage of Indians.

I think Anglo-Rouyn has done remarkably well in this regard. I am told that about one-third of the people on the mine site today are Indians and they are trying to hire more as opportunities come up. I say then, Mr. Speaker, that this is a social reform that could mean something to the province of Saskatchewan. There is no one likes playing politics more than I do, but I think this is one department where we should not play politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I think we should have suggestions from both sides of the house. I think in the year ahead we should try and co-operate wherever we can. Perhaps an inter-party committee would be useful. This is a reform which is long over-due, but it can only succeed if the Indians themselves want it to succeed. I say again, that this government is not going to try and force anything on the Indians that they don't want. They must co-operate if this is to succeed.

But I say again I believe it is a reform which can do something in the years ahead.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. George Trapp (Minister of Education) for second reading of Bill no. 45 — **An Act to amend The School Grants Act, 1960**.

Mr. Allan Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to say a great deal about this bill. I think members will have seen it before them, As I mentioned before adjourning the debate, the bill is remarkable not for what it says, but for what it does not say.

When the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) introduced the bill, he advised us in answer to a question put to him that the government did not intend to introduce any legislation to provide a legislative basis for the proposed grants to private schools. As I understood his answer, it was proposed that section 5 of the School Grants Act be used as a legislative basis for providing grants for private schools.

Now, may I, Mr. Speaker, call to the attention of the hon. members of the house, the provisions of section 5 of the School Grants Act, which provides that:

> out of any monies available for education, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council may, either unconditionally, or upon such terms and conditions as may be specified in the order, on the recommendation of the minister, order the payment of an increase in any grant payable hereunder and the payment of a special grant for any purpose whatever, designated in the order, to any school, or to any group of schools, and the payment of a special grant for any educational purpose whatever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a look at The School Grants Act indicates that “school” means a public school set up under The School Act, so that none of the words in the section are effective to authorize school grants to private schools except the last few words "and the payment of a special grant for any educational purpose whatever."

Mr. Speaker, in my view, the provision of grants to private schools on a regular basis, is a major change in policy in the educational field in Saskatchewan. Heretofore, it has been provided that public money would be spent exclusively on any regular basis on schools which were publicly operated; that is, operated by publicly elected school boards. It has not been the practice to make any regular payments to educational institutions which were not so operated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have considered the matter of where I ought to discuss the principle of whether or not these grants ought to be made and I think that this discussion could best be held on estimates. I think I may be pushing the rules of the house somewhat further than I would wish to do, to discuss here and now the principle of what is not in this bill, by which I mean to debate the whole issue of whether _r not grants should be made to private schools. But I do not think there is anything untoward about me saying that in my opinion if the government proposes to make grants to private schools, and it has indicated both in the speech from the throne and in its estimates that it proposes to do so, it ought to have provided a legislative base. I do not think it is a proper exercise of the powers of the government to use what is essentially an incidental section, not by any means designed to provide a base for regular grants to private schools, as a basis for making such grants.

It seems to me that if a government proposes to make a major change in educational principle, as I suggest this would be, it should lay before the legislature a bill which would enable the legislature to debate this bill at every stage in accordance with the traditional practices of the legislature so that all members could have the full opportunity to debate the issue, and all interested groups in the province could have an opportunity to consider the matter in the way they do when a bill_ before the legislature and the way they do not when a simple estimate is being considered.

I, therefore, take the position that the government has acted in a manner which is essentially discourteous to the legislature in proposing a major change in educational principle and not providing any legislative basis for it, but using a section which is clearly not designed for this. The section authorizes a special grant for any education purpose whatever; I think the words suggest that it is not to be a continuing grant, but rather an intermittent grant or a one-time grant, and I think that this is really not the sort of provision which the government and the Minister of Education ought to use as a basis for his policy.

I want to say no more about this bill than that, except to say that with respect to the policy itself, it will come up again in the estimates and I will have an opportunity then to debate the wisdom, or otherwise, of the policy. My point now is simply that if a major change in educational principle is going to be introduced, in my view it ought to have been done by legislation, and not by relying upon this very thin reed of the last six or seven words in The School Grants Act.

The bill which is before the house contains provisions to provide for some small incidental changes brought about by the possible erection of boards of education, and further incidental changes in dealing with the calculation of school grants where fees are paid. I can have no quarrel with these and accordingly I will not be opposing Bill no. 45. I simply wanted

to rise on this occasion to suggest that the practice followed by the government in this case was, I think, unfortunate, and I would hope that if further occasions arise they would not repeat the practice.

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 they must do so now.

Mr. Trapp: — In closing the debate I wish to say that I think there is some truth in what the hon. member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has said. However, there are many precedents in the past in which this section has been used to payout special grants. It does say in the act "to any school or group of schools". Now, we are selecting a group of schools . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — They are not schools . . .

Mr. Trapp: — . . . payment of special grants for any purpose whatsoever.
I think there has been the precedent of paying grants to Yorkton school when it was not a public school system. I think, also, we are paying our building grants from year to year under formula, but not under legislation. Any special grants for science equipment are always done in the same manner; for libraries, or incentive programs that were established a year or two ago for TV sets, is under the same section. It is just a special grant. I think there is one reason why the department and I have agreed to this line of action, is the fact that we would gain in one year, some experience, and I would say that I would later, in a year or so, bring in legislation after we had had some experience in paying this grant to private schools.

For the reason of flexibility, I think it is a good thing not to have it in legislation the first year until you have some experience. You can work under this — in this area, with more flexibility than under regulations, and the sums paid out are as any other grants, under Orders-in-Council, so that the government will have a check on what is being paid out from time to time.

I now close this debate and move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. D. Steuart, (Minister of Health) for second reading of Bill no. 42, — **An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act**.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, on the second occasion when I rose to make some remarks on this bill, I had taken issue with the Minister of Health on the statements he had made earlier, leaving, as I suggested, implications of bureaucracy, and of the CCF government's preference for arbitrary solutions, whereas the Liberal government seemed to, in his contention, undertake homespun, down-to-the-people, down-to-the-local-level solutions. I said that, in my opinion, this impression was distorted and did not conform with the facts.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the most evident fact is that difficulties over hospital rights for professional people - that is at least those connected with the medical care question - arose in 1962. But it was not until 1964, Mr. Speaker, that any legislation for an appeal board was begun by the CCF administration. In the interim many discussions were held with hospital bodies and local authorities on solutions with regard to the hospital privileges question. I think it is accurate to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hospital boards themselves, felt that they were faced with a real dilemma in the exercise of their own power. But I say that there is certainly not the slightest reason to suggest that the CCF government did not explore with hospital boards and hospital personnel, a wide range of solutions to the hospital privileges question. I say any suggestion to the contrary is false.

May I also say that it is quite apparent on the record that the CCF government did not unilaterally make a judgement on the appeal board legislation. Rather in the first instance, it created machinery for a full and complete investigation by a judicial body before any legislation whatsoever was begun. Here, of course, I am referring to the proceedings of the Woods Commission. It is a matter of record again that the appeal board legislation is based on the findings of that commission.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is altogether reasonable to come to the conclusion that any success that the Minister of Health has had in the last year with regard to the hospital privileges question; any success that he has had in consultations with professional people and with boards, has been aided and has been accelerated by the existence and the presence of the appeal legislation itself. For the minister to ascribe to the former CCF administration a failure to communicate or to work with any person or any group concerned, is just super-refined nonsense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister (Mr. Steuart) says that if justice is not done for professional people with regard to hospital privileges, and any matters that are attendant to it, he will take steps and see that any omission is rectified. Mr. Speaker, why, if there is a slightest room for doubt in the mind of the minister, is he now presuming to disturb the provisions that were instituted last year? Surely, the fact that he has mentioned that there is a possibility that fair treatment might not be given, is illustrative of the presence of a danger that the pattern might develop if appeal board legislation is repealed.

I think that very many citizens of this province, and many perhaps who had little interest in the whole subject, and only a passing knowledge of it, are beginning to ask why is it necessary to disturb these amendments. Whom do they harm? Whom do they injure? What is the reason for their deletion from the statutes?

I have already given some passing attention to the question of hospital autonomy and the idea conveyed by the minister when he spoke, that hospital autonomy had in some way been injured and hurt by the appeal legislation. Now, I want to point out that the 1964 legislation did not fundamentally alter the rights of hospital boards in their assessment and awards of hospital privileges. True, the Woods Commission recommendations had been laid down and delineated in the legislation so that hospital boards would have a clear course to follow in their awards and in their assessments. That is, Mr. Speaker, that certain criteria had been produced but the awarding of hospital privileges was not disturbed for boards by the legislation. I think that point must be made clear here this evening.

Now, I have just a few more words here before I conclude. But I say that the idea that the autonomy, the authority of hospital boards, can be in any way decisively disturbed is a thesis that does not hold up on the basis of the record and on the basis of the legislation itself. Mr. Speaker, the whole idea of an appeal procedure is certainly not strange to local government bodies. Boards of Education, police commission bodies, city councils, town councils, rural municipal councils are examples. I believe that almost every public body is in some way exposed to an appeal procedure. Mr. Speaker, this is not a bad thing, I think it would be a bad thing if there were not these processes by which the individual and by which groups can question the decisions of public bodies, and remember that quite often, decisions of this kind are made by local bodies completely in good faith — sometimes misinformed, almost always without ill intent. But this really isn't the question. The fact is that quite often decisions are made with the best will in the world that are completely wrong from the public point of view.

May I once more mention that the repeal of the Appeal Board provisions leaves no effective way of coping with the kinds of problems that have arisen and I suggest will doubtless arise from time to time in the field that we are talking about. The regulations, with regard to conciliation boards and boards of inquiry that are part of the regulations to which the minister made reference, clearly don't cover the kinds of situations that have arisen. They can be bent to meet them but they are not effective for these situations.

In the first place they are created at the discretion of the minister. Secondly, they are purely recommendatory. Thirdly, they do not cover, nor do they apply, to all problems that arise, at least in the case of conciliation boards. The physician that is to be appointed to the body must come from organized medicine. The minister does not have discretion in the naming of the doctor representative. The implications where the case affects someone who may be in a minority position in the profession, is clear enough, I think, to everyone.

The best evidence, Mr. Speaker, that these tribunals are not effective for the job, that very evidently has to be done, is the report again of the Woods Commission because it, of course, said different supplementary, bolstering legislation was necessary. This is the legislation that we are talking about jettisoning here this evening.

My friends in the government, have over the years very loudly

proclaimed, often I think in a somewhat irrelevant context, their concern for the rights of the individual. In this matter under debate, there is a very clear and present opportunity, to range themselves on the side of this principle. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because in the ultimate analysis, the appeal board legislation is protection for the individual. It is good for organizations, I have said. It is good for hospital boards but ultimately it is good for the individual and it is a defence for the individual. It is our assurance that the individual professional's right to use the abundant and costly facilities that have been created in large by a public body of citizens shall not be denied to him or to his patients without valid reasons that have to do with his abilities and his conduct and his general enterprise. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the existence of the appeal board amendments, does not necessarily mean that there is any rampant discrimination in the profession or among professional bodies, or among individuals of the profession. It simply means that there is, in the analysis, some recourse for individuals who may feel that they have had discrimination in some way levelled against them, finding an opportunity for remedy.

Well, after all, Mr. Speaker, the law when making provision for the punishment of a number of offences, does not assume that all people commit those offences. It only seeks to protect society from the weakness of some men. I happened to read the other day, Mr. Speaker, something about a very famous physician in history by the name of Dr. Joseph Lister. I am sure every member in this house will have read about him. The physician that was very well known, in the middle part of the nineteenth century, he discovered that infection was due to germ organisms and that this could be controlled by disinfecting agents. I think it is fair to say that his theory, his practice of it, his vindication of it, changed, in many respects, the whole course of surgery and hospital practice. It is also a fact, Mr. Speaker, that both Dr. Lister and his American counterparts in the profession, were for years the victims of discrimination both from their professions and from the hospital bodies in both lands, because of the theory they held and because of their demand that they had the right to practice it.

It would have been an ill day indeed if Dr. Lister and his associates had not been successful because many millions of people would doubtless have perished because of their failure to establish the principles for which they were persecuted. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) here this evening, and his government, to jettison Bill 42. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) that he will be making a decision of wisdom. I say to him that failure to do so will not only leave a gap in the processes by which fairness and equity can better be realized but it will leave a gap in the confidence of the people of this province in governmental processes.

One last word, Mr. Speaker. If the government does not do as I have suggested, there will be few reasonable citizens in Saskatchewan who will not speculate and will not wonder on what motives the government may have in moving Bill 42, other than the unconvincing and fumbling explanations that have been provided the house by the minister, in speaking to this bill. Thank you.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, when Bill 42 came on my desk and I read the contents, I was very much disturbed and I found it almost impossible to believe that the hon. minister would bring such a bill before this legislature. I can see no good reason, not even any valid excuse for the decision of the minister to wipe out all the amendments passed to the Hospital Standards Act last year.

These amendments were passed unanimously, Mr. Speaker. They were supported by all the members of the legislature, both government and opposition, and I believe, including the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart). Following the passage of this legislation, a board of capable and highly respected citizens was set up to deal with complaints about hospital privileges. This board was subsequently dismissed by the minister, again I can feel no good reason for this action - the only excuse being that it was set up by the previous government. The minister had every opportunity to set up another board with personnel to suit himself but he choose not to do so. Again, Mr. Speaker, not satisfied with this lack of action on his part, in implementing a law that should have been implemented, the minister now wishes to erase the amendments that he supported last year and remove the power of the government to appoint an appeal board to deal with complaints of discrimination. I think, Mr. Speaker that this is a backward step and an exceedingly undemocratic move.

Before any recommendations were made by Mr. Justice Wood, there was a very thorough investigation, some fifty days of sitting, some 5,000

pages of testimony were gathered, and the evidence produced, Mr. Speaker, leaves no doubt in anyone's mind that flagrant discrimination did exist. Qualified doctors were denied privileges on various very flimsy pretext. Applications were turned down and in some cases, doctors seeking privileges were given no reasons at all. Some reasons given were alleged defects in the application form, very flimsy reasons. I do not want to go into all the evidence but Mr. Speaker, it was a very appalling and disgraceful recounting of some of the worst possible kinds of discrimination that was revealed in this evidence.

The sponsorship bylaw in certain hospitals was misused to prevent qualified doctors in obtaining hospital privileges and on this matter, the Woods report had this to say of the case of a certain doctor:

> the competence of the doctor in question was never in question, but he was unable to find a sponsor and so was not eligible for hospital privileges.
>
> Now, the evidence shows that the General Hospital Board in reviewing the case on March 26th, passed a resolution asking the medical staff to investigate and recommend

notice "recommend"

> an alternative method of supervision. This resolution was unacceptable to the medical staff and the vigor of their opposition and particularly the nature of their opposition

and the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) knows what the nature of this opposition was

> because of these reasons the hospital board was forced to back down and reaffirm their policy that sponsorship is a necessary requirement for staff privileges.

And quoting Mr. Justice Wood again he says this:

> It is the view of the commission, that on the face of the facts with which this application was dealt and the manner in which it was dealt with, the sponsorship bylaw did not serve a commendable purpose. It has, in the past, served to provide satisfactory type of supervision and it should be restricted to this purpose and not used as a means whereby individual members of the medical staff make decisions that are the responsibility of the board. Alternative procedures should be available.

But the minister (Mr. Steuart) wishes to wipe out this provision. Justice Wood goes on to say:

> The Board was in effect, forced to agree that these doctors, to agree with the medical advisors or lose the co-operation of its chief medical advisers. It should not have been faced with these alternatives. Dealing with it as they did, the Board of Governors was in an invidious position. The medical staff dealt with it in a manner that forced them to do so.

Now as hon. members know, hospital boards for the most part are laymen and they must lean heavily on the advice of a medical staff. Even if they are reasonably sure that discrimination does exist, it is very, very difficult to overrule the medical staff. This is why, Mr. Speaker, a competent appeal board, as recommended by Mr. Justice Wood and provided for in the Hospital Standards Act, is so necessary, and why it is so important that the decisions of such a board be final and binding. Because, Mr. Speaker, without an appeal board, or without even the power of the government to appoint a board, if circumstances warrant it, a group of doctors who already have hospital privileges, can create a little monopoly for themselves and' prevent legitimate competition. Don't say they can’t, Mr. Speaker, because this is just exactly what did happen prior to the passing of this legislation.

And there is no redress, Mr. Speaker, for a doctor who feels he is discriminated against. What kind of democracy is this, I would like to ask

the minister? What kind of democracy is this? What happened before could happen again and discrimination could be exercised against any doctor regardless of the manner in which he practices, whether he is practicing in a community health clinic or in any other manner, discrimination could be exercised.

If a doctor feels aggrieved, he should have a competent tribunal to which he could appeal. Then there is a question of written reasons, Mr. Speaker. A doctor also, and this is certainly proven by the evidence in the Woods report, a doctor also is entitled to written reasons for refusal or curtailment of hospital privileges. Again, it appears, that for some reason or other, the hon. minister (Mr. Steuart) wishes to have this protection wiped out, and I wonder why?

Now, if a doctor receives written reasons for a refusal it would eliminate the possibility of misunderstanding and it might prevent unnecessary and futile appeals to the board. If the reason given, as it was in some of the evidence we read in the report, is some technicality in filling out an application form or if more information is needed, the applicant could rectify this immediately. If the reason is lack of medical qualifications in some specific area, the applicant would be in a position to judge whether or not he should appeal. But if a doctor is not aware, or if he is confused about the reasons for refusing his application, he is in an impossible position and, Mr. Speaker, this was the situation in many cases that came before the commission.

Now objections have been raised that written reasons might damage the applicants medical reputation or embarrass the hospital board. However, the commissioner suggested that hearings could be held in camera and this should remove any such fear.

Mr. Speaker, appeal procedure in relation to hospital privileges is not new. It has precedents, as my colleague, the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) pointed out last year when he introduced this legislation. In the United States, for instance, there is a general law which allows right of action wherever there is restraint of trade and a good number of actions were taken against hospital boards and local medical societies by doctors who alleged that hospital authorities were acting in a restraint of trade, by barring a doctor from hospital privileges.

In New York state, he pointed out also, in February, 1963, legislation was enacted to prevent discrimination in hospital privileges and a commission was appointed to hear grievances and if discrimination was proved, they could require that the situation be rectified.

Also he mentioned, that in Quebec in 1962, a joint commission, it was called a conciliation commission, was set up but the decisions of this conciliation commission were final and binding.

In these cases that I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a medicare problem. There was not a problem of community clinics. Yet it was found that it was necessary to have a remedy and to have a proper tribunal to appeal to and certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary here.

Now the minister seems to rest his case on the question of local autonomy. I have already shown that local autonomy, in this sort of instance, can be badly frustrated. But Mr. Speaker, the only place where local autonomy may be affected is when there are complaints of discrimination and a competent appeal board is not going to interfere with local decisions lightly. If an appeal board finds that the applicant is not justified in his complaints such a decision reinforces the stand of the local board and I am sure it will strengthen the board's position and reduce further controversy, and remove a source of worry from the board. If the appeal board finds that there has been an error in judgement, then I am sure any fair minded hospital board would want to correct this situation immediately.

Now, there may not be many cases that would come before such an appeal board but if there is discrimination in even one case, Mr. Speaker, it is one too many. The very fact that a doctor knows he has the right of appeal is important and will remove a source of contention and frustration.

Now, the minister has stated, and this was parroted by the Leader Post in an editorial, that you cannot legislate co-operation. Of course, this is true, Mr. Speaker, but you can legislate to prevent flagrant discrimination and you can make it stick, Mr. Speaker. The minister wants, as he says, to keep the good will and co-operation of the medical profession and the hospital boards. He may think that an appeal board might jeopardize

this relationship. This may sound like a laudable ambition, Mr. Speaker, but whom does the minister wish to placate or satisfy? Doctors who feel they are discriminated against or those persons who may be in a position to exercise discrimination against the doctors seeking privileges? By the very fact that he introduced this bill, Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious that the minister's concern does not rest with those doctors who feel their privileges have been unjustly denied or curtailed.

Now, the minister has been patting himself on the back and pins a little halo around his head and suggests that he got the matter of hospital privileges settled without compulsion and that this is the better way. But, Mr. Speaker, this is very, very far from the facts of the case. He got co-operation for two reasons: First, because public pressure and rising indignation at the intolerable situation that existed regarding discrimination in hospital privileges. That was one thing. But even more important, he got co-operation because of the amendments passed to the Hospitals Standards Act in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

It was a long time after the new government took office before some hospital boards extended privileges to qualified doctors seeking those privileges. Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister got co-operation when and only when, he made public statements and public threats that if these differences were not settled soon, and in some cases I am told, the deadline was set, if the differences were not settled soon, he would set up the appeal board to deal with the dispute. This is when he got co-operation. Mr. Speaker. Not before.

Mrs. Cooper (Regina West): — The minister knows that this is correct, but now, for some unknown reason, he wants to remove these sections putting into effect the recommendations of Mr. Justice Woods and denying doctors the right to appeal or the right to written reasons.

May I remind the hon. minister again, of the discrimination that did take place. May I remind him that there are still doctors in this province who feel that their privileges are too restricted in the light of their qualifications, and whether they are right or wrong in their conclusions is not the point at issue. The point is that they have a right to be heard and judged by a competent appeal board, and this is the only just solution. I would like to call the hon. minister's attention to a story in the Leader Post last night which I am sure he knows all about.

> Departing doctor files suit against the hospital at Biggar.

I would like to read just a little bit from this. Here is a case where a doctor came in - I am not going to judge who was right in this. I don't know all the facts of the case so I can't judge who is right but I would say he had a right to an appeal. Here, I will read this:

> Earl Danichuck a Biggar district farmer and chairman of the Biggar District Medical Health Association, Community Health Clinic, said in a prepared statement. Dr. Raymon is being forced to leave because of discrimination of the worst kind.
>
> At a farewell banquet for Dr. Raymon, Saturday night, a United church minister said he felt Dr. Raymon had the support of the majority of the community and the matter should not be allowed to rest there.
>
> Rev. C. M. Campbell, United church minister in the nearby community of Perdue, said the elements of pride and political persuasion have been combined to attack medicine as such and produce a steady deterioration in the ethics of the profession in Biggar.

Mr. Campbell said the Community Health Clinic exists because of the refusal of certain professional men to subscribe to legally implemented medical programs. He was referring to the province's compulsory medical care insurance. The doctors have protested against legislative methods and measures, charging that they prescribe democratic freedom. Now they, themselves have adopted undemocratic procedures.

Without hospital privileges, the doctor cannot exercise his clinical responsibility, Rev. Campbell said. Mr. Campbell said, "this is the worst kind of discrimination, because it disinherits and disenables." Mr. Speaker, if the hospital appeal board had been set up when it should have been set up, this case could have come before the appeal board and they could have saved a great deal of misunderstanding and bitterness in this community and perhaps saved a very great abuse in denying this man hospital privileges.

So I would like to say again, Mr. Speaker, that an appeal board should be appointed. It is long past due and above all, the hon. minister should not be asking this legislature to remove the power of the government to set up such a board and take away the only lever he has to correct the bad situation. He said, if things go wrong, if there is a bad situation, he can introduce legislation. When? Next session? A year from now? He has the power now, why does he want to get rid of it. Discrimination did take place, Mr. Speaker — it could happen again. It may happen even when it is not intentional, but when all the facts are known, it may prove that there is discrimination, and the government needs this power to deal with this situation, when it does arise. The power to set up an appeal board, all these amendments that were passed last year, should remain on the statute books of this province, and I would urge the hon. minister to withdraw this bill and I would urge members on the other side, who have any regard for fair play, to speak to the minister and see if you could persuade him to withdraw this bill and barring this, Mr. Speaker, I hope that every member of the house in the name of justice and fair play, will vote against second reading of this bill.

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — On other occasions, Mr. Speaker, I have had reason to be impressed with the ability and the agility of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) in other presentations in this house. On other occasions, he displayed, I believe a measure of genuine sincerity, and although some of us on this side of the house might not agree with his point of view, I think he gave us the general feeling that he himself was convinced of the point of view that he was presenting. I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when he presented the bill for second reading several days ago, that the degree of sincerity which we usually expect from him, was absent. He did not seem to exhibit any degree of enthusiasm for the amendments which he placed before us.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we saw the spectacle of a minister of the crown grasping and straining and attempting to develop an acceptable argument for the amendments to the legislation which he has placed before us. The ring of genuine sincerity, I suggest was absent in his remarks. There seems to be an apparent lack of enthusiasm for the legislation which he offered to this house.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Speaker, the minister, however, did say that he conceded that a doctor should be free to practice his profession without interference and also that hospital boards should be able to make their judgement on the basis of competence and on the basis of ability and character of the individual doctor. With this sentiment, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house agree whole heartedly but unfortunately this just hasn't been the case in the past. Members on both sides of the house, I believe, are very much aware of the difficulties which were experienced by medical men in the medical care crisis, directly after the medical care crisis in 1962. Since 1962 the difficulties which were encountered have been more pronounced and delays in granting of hospital privileges have been more frequent especially for those doctors who differed with the opinion of the majority respecting the manner in which payment was to be received for the services which were rendered to patients. To illustrate, Mr. Speaker, I can give the example of a well qualified general practitioner who was denied the right to practice his profession in the hospital while his credentials and his references were being confirmed, not by wire, Mr. Speaker, or not by airmail, but by the use of regular mail with a five cent stamp attached, with communications going back and forth from Saskatchewan to Australia and I think we can recognize the countless days and months which went by while these communications were being sent from the province of Saskatchewan to Australia in order to check the credentials involved. By contrast, Mr. Speaker, the Wood's commission during its deliberation discovered that a large number of other doctors, practicing outside of the medical care insurance act, were successful in gaining privileges in a relatively short period of time, without the problems and without the encumbrances which were experienced by a large number of other doctors.

It has been suggested, both in and out of this house, Mr. Speaker, that the events of April the 22nd last, and the election of a Liberal

government at that time was the deciding factor in the more ready admission of doctors into hospitals. However, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the introduction of the 1964 amendments and the provision for adequate appeals proceeding was the dominant factor in alleviating these difficulties and I think one would have to be exceptionally naive to believe anything else.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, and there are many who agree with me, that difficulties may yet be encountered in the future and it seems that the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) is of the opinion that this may arise also. Elsewhere in Canada and the United States, doctors who have involved themselves in group practice have been frowned upon and they have found it difficult to gain privileges accorded to other doctors. One of the most publicized cases has been the refusal of the City Hospital, Belaire, Ohio, to grant privileges to a Doctor J. E. Sams.

Doctor Sams' credentials as a doctor and a specialist in obstetrics and gynaecology are outstanding. The Hospitals Credentials Committee found his credentials to be entirely in order when he first applied for staff privileges. But Doctor Sams joined a medical group, entered into group practice, and it appears that the society is determined to discourage new doctors from joining this medical group and to dishearten doctors who are presently associated with it, in order to leave the field free for the doctors in individual practice. The article written in this connection indicated that it had been the usual practice at Belaire City Hospital to grant automatic staff privileges to every qualified physician who opened practice in that general area. But Doctor Sams has been repeatedly refused privileges over a period of years, in spite of the fact that he is the only certified specialist in obstetrics and gynaecology for a considerable area around the hospital. The lack of privileges for Doctor Sams has been a severe hindrance to his practice and to the freedom of the patients to choose this specialist as their doctor. The foundation which operates the group practice clinics which are staffed by the medical group to which this doctor belongs, has made a public statement on the hospital's refusal of privileges to that particular doctor. I think in view of the legislation that is before us, Mr. Speaker, this statement is of considerable interest and I will quote only a paragraph of it.

> The obvious purpose of this reckless course of action is to destroy the Belaire clinic by forcing Doctor Sams to leave Delaire, by discouraging new doctors from joining the clinic and by disheartening those doctors who presently are associated with it, leaving the field once again free to the doctors in individual practice to dominate medical society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the foundation accused the Hospital Trustees of taking the medical society's side in what the foundation termed, "the open economic war it has chosen to wage upon the clinic". The foundation's statement concludes by saying "this is intolerable, we cannot sit idly by, and permit a boycott motivated by greed to destroy the clinic, nor can the public afford to have the concept of group practice and the open competition of ideas muzzled forever in Belaire".

Another case of discrimination against doctors choosing to practice in groups extended over a period of years in the New Kensington area in Pennsylvania. The medical group had ten full time doctors and twenty part time specialists, and the applications of these doctors for hospital privileges were turned down by the hospital staff and by the Board of Trustees. In the numerous exchanges between the medical group and the hospital, lack of qualifications was never given as a reason for the refusal of hospital privileges. There is no doubt in the minds of those who have observed this situation, that it is hostility to prepaid group practice which has kept these doctors out of hospital in the New Kensington area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the former Surgeon General of the United States, Doctor Thomas Parran, referred to this particular conflict between hospital and doctors as a despicable version of medical segregation. There are many other examples of doctors in group practice being denied hospital privileges or being restricted in their hospital privileges, for no other reason than their association with a group clinic. In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, it was the doctors associated with the community clinic medical groups who were being given the most difficulty in obtaining hospital privileges in 1962, 1963, and 1964. According to press reports which we see, some of these cases still exist in 1965.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, one can find many authoritative statements to the effect that group practice is one of the most effective ways of improving

the quality of medical service. The College of General Practice of Canada, a voluntary educational and standard setting body for general practitioners, commissioned a study of general practice in Canada. The study resulted in the publication in 1962, of a book entitled The General Practitioner by Doctor Kenneth Clote. A main conclusion of this study, Mr. Speaker, is the quality of medical care provided by general practitioners will be improved most by the development of group practice. This is a conclusion based on an extensive study into the organization of medical practice in Canada at the present time.

In the United States, the same conclusion was reached by President John F. Kennedy, in his message to Congress in 1962, when he stated as follows:

> Group practice offers great promise of improving quality of medical care, of achieving significant economies and conveniences to the physician and the patient alike, and facilitating a wider and a better distribution of the available supply of scarce personnel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's administration introduced into the United States Congress a bill encouraging group practice. The bill did not pass through Congress, and President Johnson has introduced the same legislation again during this current session of the United States congress. The introduction to the bill set forth clearly the advantages of group practice of medicine.

Returning to Canada, Mr. Speaker, we now have the report of the Hall Commission on health services, the most extensive and most detailed study which has yet been carried out into the health needs of our country. Among the recommendations of the Hall Commission report, is the recommendation that encouragement should be given to the development of the group practice of medicine. Here is one of the statements of the Royal Commission with respect to group practice, and I quote from pages 30 and 31 of the Hall Commission Report.

> We believe that the advantage of group practice so far out-weigh the disadvantages that the National Health program should offer such inducements that a larger proportion of physicians and surgeons provide their service through group practice clinics.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we find both in Canada and in the United States most authoritative endorsements of the value of group practice and the recommendations that the extension of group practice should be encouraged by government action. At the same time, we find both in Canada and the United States that hospital privileges as a weapon for discrimination is used very commonly against physicians who engage in group practice. It is of the utmost importance to the development of the high quality of medical services for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation be not repealed in order that there might be a proper safeguard against the discouragement of group practice through discrimination in regard to hospital privileges. Without appeal procedures to guarantee impartiality in the consideration of hospital privileges applications, it will be much more difficult I suggest to recruit doctors to meet Saskatchewan's increasing need. Saskatchewan has a shortage of doctors, Mr. Speaker. This has been recognized by the government in their statement to the effect that they intend to recruit doctors in the United Kingdom. Not only is there a shortage of doctors in Saskatchewan at the present time, the need for doctors will increase since the population is growing at a faster rate than the graduating classes from medical schools. Therefore, for some time in the future Saskatchewan will have to depend to a large extent upon outside sources if it is going to meet its doctor requirements. Since it is essential to attract doctors from other countries, a legal provision of impartiality in the consideration for doctor's applications for hospital privileges is extremely important. Unless doctors can be assured that they will not be discriminated against on the basis of race, color, creed or philosophy, I suggest doctors will be reluctant to settle in Saskatchewan. Doctors in the United Kingdom who have been negotiating to settle in the province of Saskatchewan have expressed concern over the reports that they have read about our hospital privileges disputes.

A considerable number of doctors, I am told, have made the decision not to come to Saskatchewan because they did not wish to become embroiled in these disputes. Medicine, I think it is agreed, is a demanding profession, the great majority of doctors want to be free to concentrate

on the care of their patients. The vast majority of doctors have no desire whatsoever to become involved in the kind of conflict over hospital privileges which have taken place in this province over the past two and one-half years. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Saskatchewan's doctors needs are to be met it is essential that a hospitable atmosphere be provided for new doctors. Legislation which is presently in force in this province provides a fundamental assurance to doctors that they can count on impartiality. Legislation makes it clear that qualifications, competence and character will be the factors determining hospital privileges which a doctor is to be granted. With such legislation in force, Mr. Speaker, the prospects for recruiting doctors to meet the needs in Saskatchewan, the ever increasing needs, will be a good deal greater.

I would just like to draw your attention to the report from volume I of the report of the Royal Commission on Health Services. It presents statistics to show the substantial increase in doctor supply which will be required in the years ahead if we are to meet the medical needs of Canadian people. This indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a genuine need to retain the kind of assurance that is embodied in the 1964 amendments if we are to recruit medical men to fill our needs here in Saskatchewan. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it must be recognized that the 1964 amendment filled, and still continues to fill a specific need if the rights of members of the medical profession are to be assured beyond doubt without harassment or without unnecessary entanglements. These existing provisions in the Hospital Standards Act provide also the assurance that the patient will enjoy a free choice of doctor in keeping with the terms of the Saskatoon Agreement. To keep these 1964 amendments intact, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, represents the most tangible assurance that the Minister of Health can offer to indicate his faith and his belief in the principles of fair play and good medical practice in which he purports to believe. The presence of these amendments on the statute books of Saskatchewan represent no problem, Mr. Speaker, even though they may never have to be used, but in the meantime I suggest that they provide a guarantee that the refusal of privileges to a doctor must be in writing and provides adequate machinery in the event that an individual is deprived of rights which he feels he is properly entitled. It is my sincere wish, Mr. Speaker, that the government will give consideration to the withdrawal of the bill which is before us. Failing this, Mr. Speaker, I find that I must oppose the legislation and the principle involved in it on second reading.

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I feel that there are some things that I would like to express myself on in regard to this bill which we have before us. I would like to go on record as stating my opposition to the repeal of the appeal procedures which are set out in the Hospital Standards Act.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is considered that these procedures were put in legislation to be used in cases where there were disputes concerning Community Clinics or disputes between groups of doctors in regard to the pros and cons of public medical care schemes. I think that in the most instances that we have had in the province do fit, more or less, into these categories. But I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that these appeal procedures are necessary and very desirable to have in our law and in our province in regard to situations which may arise in regard to situations which may arise which have nothing to do with community clinics or discussions or disputes over the medical health schemes or medical schemes. We have had for years disputes over hospital privileges of one kind or another between doctors in communities in the province of Saskatchewan that have had nothing to do with the troubles that we have had in recent years. These controversies have dragged on for years and have practically wrecked communities and I maintain that procedures which we have now in the law would have been very helpful in those cases if they had been available at those times.

You know, I made some statements here the other day in regard to local government. I believe it is a very good and a very desirable thing and I don't think anyone has spoken more favorably of local government and the necessity of it that I have, myself, in this house. But I referred the other day to the fact that I felt that the "time" situation was not one that could be handled by local governments. Well, I felt that a senior government could handle the situation and set up laws better than leaving the settings of times in various areas by the local governments. I see that some of our papers have come out with this idea as well. I feel, again, that here we have another instance where local authority and local autonomy are very good, but I think that an outside source of appeal, an outside source that can come in and give assistance and a ruling in regard to troubles that have arisen in a community is often appreciated. I have myself before now had conversation with chairmen of hospital boards that were very earnest and very sincere, and very worried, about situations under their control and they wished very much for some outside source to lean on, and to give assistance and

and guidance in the situation which they had before them. I think there have been many instances in the past where we have needed this sort of thing and did not have it. Those who have lived through these situations, and we all here have been through the medicare troubles, and we realize how necessary it is to have some outside source come in and rule in regard to these things that have taken place in many of our communities.

In many cases, Mr. Speaker, if there had have been an authority of this kind which could have come in upon invitation or could have been required to give a decision in regard to local troubles, many of these things which have gone on for years and caused a good deal of trouble in our province would never have existed in the first place. They could have been prevented and before they broke out into open sores they could have been prevented and healed.

I think that this legislation which we are proposing to repeal has been one of the good pieces of legislation that has been placed upon our statute books in the last few years. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that medical personnel have been lost to this province because of unsettled condition here. The doctors have failed to come in just because of the unsettled conditions that we have had in years past and I think that this legislation of which we are discussing the appeal would help and has helped to solve these situations.

Now, we think, at the present time things are smoothed down and are going along more or less smoothly, and our Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) feels that he is able to get along without these appeal procedures but I fear, Mr. Speaker, that instead of tranquillity settling over our medical profession and over our hospitals and doctors that we may be heading into more trouble in this regard.

In the United States there is quite a trend to squeeze the general practitioners out of the hospitals by the specialists, and many patients going to the hospitals have lost the right to be attended by their own doctors because their doctors do not have hospital privileges. There is a trend towards trouble in regard to this thing throughout the United States of America and also in Canada. These disputes between general practitioners and specialists are something which we may see more of in the years ahead. I think, aside from all the troubles that we may think of in regard to community clinics that we have to consider these other aspects as well, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make a point in that regard if I can tonight. I think that we should retain a procedure which is both authoritative and is available to the doctors hospital boards at times when it is needed.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, these amendments were passed unanimously by this house and I can see nothing which has happened in the last year which would have changed the thinking of the people opposite in regard to these things. It is very strange to me, indeed, tonight, that they are now proposing to repeal that which they were in favor of last year. No argument that I have heard so far, stands up in the face of the benefits that this legislation can do and has done for the people of this province, and which they could do many times over in the years ahead.

I think the government of this province has a duty to the people of the province, as Mr. Justice Woods has pointed out, and I think that by shirking their duty and repealing these amendments, they are failing in this duty. Last year the government in power saw their duty and did it, and this government, it seems to me, is preparing to fall down in regard to doing those things which they should do to safeguard not only the rights of the people, but to set up and retain procedures which could save a good deal of disagreement and trouble in the communities of this province in the years ahead.

I have received quite a bit of mail from my constituency, from organizations there who feel that these procedures should be retained and I am doing what I feel is in the best interests of my constituency and the people that I represent, in saying tonight that I certainly will not support this bill which is before us, and I would strongly urge the government to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members 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.

Mr. Fred Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I can see that the members want me to favor

them with a nice speech this evening.

Hon. D. Steuart (Minister of Health): — Three minutes . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: — I have lots of material ready, evidently the members over there, and specifically our new assistant to the department, are not prepared to take any part in this debate. It is a peculiar thing, Mr. Speaker, we had a year ago a good discussion on this bill, after a commission had studied the matter, and the members of this legislature after receiving that report, discussing it, unanimously passed amendments to this bill a year ago.

One year later, without any reasons given whatsoever, we see a government prepared to repeal all the amendments which were made last year. They have given no reasons whatsoever. Now, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, one can only guess what their reasons are, I would like to know what was in this doctors' brief that was presented to the minister? He won't come forward and tell us. He just sits and is not saying anything. Or is this the results of a bribe? Or a threat? Or is the Liberal government paying a political debt? These are some of the things which comes to one's mind.

An Hon. Member: — They are bankrupt . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: — Three amendments which were brought before this house last year, and the appeal board, which was set up under it, hold no fear for any person, or any doctor, or any professional person who wishes to practice their profession in this province, in a legitimate proper manner. The only ones who have anything to fear from the amendments of last year, are those who sought to practice in a manner which is, to say the least, a little bit shady. It also gave to the hospital boards the right of protection and it gave them also the right of advice from competent people in case they had problems which they didn't know how to solve. They could go and get what you could call professional advice. But the amendments did not force any of these rulings on to a hospital board where things went along amicably. It only was there in case of disputes, but for some reason or other, now, we see a government bringing in amendments to the bill, with a minimum of discussion when the minister moved second reading of this bill, and we have been waiting to see what reasons came out from the government's side of the house, for the reasons of these amendments being repealed, but none are given to us.

I have received several phone calls, letters and telegrams, from people, hospital boards, and others, protesting this bill which is before us now, bill no. 42, repealing these amendments.

I don't know why there is such a hurry to repeal this. If it hasn't done any good, Mr. Speaker, it sure hasn't done any harm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — A board was set up last year by the former minister, and the present minister cancelled their appointments. I am speaking from memory, but I don't recall that they had any cases referred to them. So if they didn't do any good at least they didn't do any harm. We have a dispute on today before us in this province, which, Mr. Speaker, properly should be referred to a board like that.

These amendments which were made last year were recognized as being a forward step in the administration of health matters and as a forward step throughout the rest of Canada, and also the whole of North America. I have here a news release which was released on May 20th, 1964, and I would like to read it into the records. It says:

> A delegation of six persons represented the Saskatchewan Community Clinics movement, at the 14th Annual Group Health Association of America, held last we k in Minneapolis, Minn.
>
> Papers were presented by Dr. Wolf of Saskatoon and Dr. Road of Regina. The Group Health Association is a forum for health plans, organizations and individuals interested in promoting prepayment of health care costs, the group practice of medicine, comprehensive high quality medical care and consumer participation. Reports from many

parts of North America indicate the steady growth of consumer sponsored group practice plans, similar to Saskatchewan's Community Clinics.

In a major address, Dr. William H. Stewart, Deputy Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, predicted the continued growth of group practice health plans because of the advantage they bring to both doctors and patients.

President Lyndon B. Johnson sent a message to the conference expressing his appreciation of the contribution of the group health movement to the improvement of health care in the United States.

One section of the conference was devoted to discussion of the discrimination in regard to hospital privileges encountered by group practice physicians in some centres in both the United States and Canada.

Keen interest was expressed in the appeal board being set up under the amendments to the Hospital Standards Act, as one means of ensuring that hospital privileges are granted only on the basis of qualifications.

The convention passed unanimously a resolution congratulating the Saskatchewan Legislature on the amendments to The Hospital Standards Act and urging the appeal board, established by the act, be speedily appointed and activated in order to permit citizens to choose more freely the doctors and hospitals of their choice.

The resolution which was sent to both Mr. Woodrow Lloyd and Mr. Ross Thatcher by Dr. W. Palmer Deering of Washington, D. C. the executive director of the Group Health Association of America, read as follows:

Meeting in annual convention assembled, we send our congratulations that the amendments to the Hospital Standards Act were passed unanimously by your legislature. We hope that the appeal board established by the act is speedily appointed and activated. Such prompt action is clearly essential for hospital privileges to be obtained by qualified doctors associated with group health plans. This will mean that your citizens will be able to choose more freely the doctors and hospitals of their choice.

So this, Mr. Speaker, as I say, is a topic which is of keen interest to people all throughout North America, and is a thing which is endorsed by men like President Lyndon B. Johnson, who sent to this conference his personal congratulations.

I believe that these are the kinds of laws which people who are thinking in the interest of the profession, the interest of the hospitals, the interest of the patients, the community at large, are prepared to back and endorse, and I see no reason why this legislature should appeal this year what it unanimously passed last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a number of other topics which I would like to touch on, but at this time I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the house is shall the debate on Bill no. 42 be adjourned?

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 25

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Snyder
Cooper (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Broten
Wood	Kramer	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Walker	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)
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 debate continuing on the motion for second reading of Bill no. 42, it was on the motion of Mr. Robbins adjourned.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Well, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I draw your attention to Beauchesne's Rules and Forms. Citation 165, sub-section 8:

> A member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of a debate which has been negatived, cannot speak to the original motion.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker . . .

An Hon. Member: — Sit down, sit down.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to look at your ruling, I had asked to adjourn it, I was speaking on the original motion, and I am speaking to a point of order. I had asked leave to adjourn my portion of the speech, but the house did not see fit to grant me that privilege, so then, as I understand the rules, and has been the practice in this house, if permission is denied by the house, the member must either continue to speak or vacate his place.

Mr. A. H. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will recall that I asked permission to adjourn the debate one night recently, permission was denied, and I proceeded according to the rules of Beauchesne and May, and other well known authorities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Let's put it clear, if it has never been enforced, it possibly should have. Now I will read it again, for the benefit of the house:

> A member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate . . .

Now there is no question, the member from Wadena moved the adjournment of the debate. When he got up to move the adjournment of the debate he was speaking to the debate . . .

Mr. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Would you give your citation, please?

Mr. Speaker: — This is Citation 165, subsection 8:

A member who has moved or seconded the adjournment of the debate . . .

and the member did move the adjournment of the debate —

which has been negatived, cannot speak to the original motion.

Now, there is only one motion, and that is the original motion. The motion is for second reading. The motion is that the bill be now read a second time.

When the member rose, regardless of what he said prior to moving the adjournment, how much or how little, he was speaking to the motion. I can only read the rules of the book as I see them, and this is my construction.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I would also draw your notice to Citation 7 of the same one, which was applied in this house:

A member who has already spoken to a question, has no right to move an adjournment of the debate, or of the house.

The Minister of Public Health has spoken in this debate some time ago, and on several occasions he has moved the adjournment of the house, and he has moved . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — . . . and he has moved the adjournment of the house. As House Leader he has moved the adjournment of the house, he has moved as House Leader, that the house do now adjourn. I think that one of the rules that we have followed in this house has been our Standing Orders and our precedent, which has been established, that was used the other week for the senior member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) and then, as you are well aware, we followed Beauchesne or other parliamentary authorities, and I am sure that on previous occasions when a member's right has been denied to adjourn the debate, he has proceeded to speak.

Hon. Lionel Coderre (Minister of Labour): — On a point of order, this afternoon the precedent was established when I was speaking, and I did adjourn the debate, and I was not allowed to get back to my feet after that. I think the precedent was establishing this afternoon in that respect.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member offered an amendment before he adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: — I will deal with section 7 first —

A member who has already spoken to a question, has no right to move an adjournment of a debate or of the house.

Now this is during the debate, this doesn't apply to a House Leader moving the adjournment of the house, or anybody else moving the adjournment of the house, when a debate is concluded or over, or held up for some other reason.

Now, I have quoted this citation, and I will answer what the member said in speaking to the point of order, regarding the fact that members have previously been allowed to move the adjournment of the debate in this house, and when the adjournment was negatived they proceeded to speak. This has been done on three occasions, I agree, and they were not called to order, but in view of the previous experience of the member who has just tried to do this, I thought possibly that he should be called to order, and I think possibly he should have been aware of the fact when he moved the adjournment.

After all is said and done, he has the experience of being Speaker of this house for three years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the experience in the house, I am sure that during the time you have been a private member and I have been a private member, it is that when the debate, when a member requests that the debate be adjourned, he is able to renew the debate on some other occasion. This is somewhat of a new practice, and if it is to be instituted, I would suggest that it not be instituted in the case of the member from Wadena, (Mr. Dewhurst).

Mr. Speaker: — It certainly is not a new practice, because it has been in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Guide for some considerable time. I think if my memory serves me correctly, I can recall it having been enforced in this house about three years ago. However, that is neither here nor there, there is the rule, there is the book, there is the authority. Now, if the house wishes the member to proceed, well, that is certainly within the competence of the house, because I would certainly think that the member should have been aware of it.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling, but I do say that we are not following the custom as we used to do in this house, that you pointed out, but I will bow to your ruling.

An Hon. Member: — Are you going to keep . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: — I'm not going to keep speaking, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, as long as those jackals over there keep yapping all the time, for if those jackals keep yapping . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think calling those people jackals is out of order, and I would ask that you withdraw the remark and apologize for it.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the remark that they are jackals, but they sure act like them.

Mr. Speaker: — I can assure the members of the house that, from here on in, this rule will be strictly applied, and I give that to you now for your future consideration.

I did not apply it to certain back benchers previously, for the reason that they have not been in the house before.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that the hon. members opposite want to kill the appeal board, there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Steuart: — Right.

Mr. Nollet: — Yes, this is right. Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I put this question, for what motive do . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Put an end to socialism . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Put an end to socialism, he says, put an end to human rights, put an end to all basic rights of free citizens of this country. This is what the hon. member is doing.

Mr. Speaker, the appeal board was established not hastily at all, but after a long experience of discrimination, not only against duly qualified medical practitioners, but against the patients whom they serve. There is a discrimination against a group of people and medical practitioners who felt that organized community group practice would be good for medicine and would establish good sound doctor-patient relationships. There is no question about that. The evidence, Mr. Speaker, is very clear. The Woods Royal Commission pointed this out, yet, Mr. Speaker, they don't want to listen to

these facts. They don't want to have any regard at all to the findings of the Woods Royal Commission and the result of experience. The people of this province know there was discrimination, and they well know that hon. members opposite wanted to continue that discrimination without any appeal to any one in regard to their fundamental rights.

The very fact, Mr. Speaker, that pressure must have been created on the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) in the government to abolish the appeal board, is evidence to me that the appeal board ought to remain, because the same forces . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — . . . that have moved the hon. members opposite from their original position when they voted unanimously for the appeal board, and now reverse it, indicates to me more clearly than anything else that we ought to retain the appeal board, and believe me, Mr. Speaker, if the fight is lost in this chamber, it will be continued. There are similar fights, perhaps of a different nature going on in Alabama, but I submit, that the fundamental rights involved here are just as important. It is all very well for the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) to say that we don't need this legislation now because the crisis has passed and good relations now prevail; he was busily engaged in establishing good relations. Now this indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that somehow or other the previous administration was being held responsible for creating bad relations previously and I am saying, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Nollet: — The hon. Premier says "Hear, hear" but I say to him, the previous administration was not responsible for any of these incidents at all. The previous administration wanted to do one primary and fundamental thing, and that was to bring universal medicare to the people of Saskatchewan and all of them. This is what we wanted to do. If there was any crisis created, it was not a crisis created by the previous administration, or the people that voted for the government at that time, and gave the government a clear cut mandate to bring in universal medicare for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the minister argues too, that this is a matter of local autonomy. With this, I disagree. This is not a matter of local autonomy, this is a matter of fundamental rights, the rights of fair play more than anything else, this is particularly true where a case is heard, and the proceedings are held in camera and no information is made available to anyone. It is an "in camera" sort of hearing that is held when doctors appeal to a hospital board, who are also under tremendous pressure, no doubt about that, as the minister was under pressure, and for this reason it is very important that an appeal board be established for them.

As already indicated, the minister says "the crisis passed" but at Biggar, Saskatchewan, we have a crisis again, and again I am not going to argue as to who was right or who was wrong, but this we know. We know that this doctor was refused the right of appeal, and he is leaving the country. We heard before of doctors leaving the province, because an administration brought in a universal medicare plan, and who threatened to leave without good cause, without good reason, deserted their patients, without good reason or good cause, and history will prove who was right or wrong on that issue.

Now we witness a doctor leaving because he hasn't ample protection to appeal his case to an impartial appeal board and he is leaving the province of Saskatchewan. According to this press report, he was a highly qualified physician, one who was duly licensed to practice in this province. He leaves the province and you say to me that there aren't fundamental rights at stake. There are fundamental rights at stake and the hon. minister and the government will never justify to the people of this province that they have done away with this appeal board on the flimsy excuse that the crisis is passed and that they want good public relations. Mr. Speaker, crises never pass. If this were true, we would be repealing our own Bill of Rights. The federal government would be repealing its Bill of Rights too. Everything is hunky-dory now, we have good public relations, the lamb is going to lie down with the lion, without any danger of becoming swallowed or being discriminated against at all. This is not true.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of public justice, and guaranteed

fairness to patients who wish to have a duly qualified physician of their choice to look after their welfare within a hospital. Both are citizens of a democracy and are entitled to this safeguarding protection in the event of a possible discrimination which under any circumstances is always a possibility. If the minister's line of reasons were valid, we would also repeal our Civil Rights legislation, and all the protective legislation that has been designed to see that citizens get a fair trial.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it is almost like doing away with our courts of law. The matter of protecting basic human rights is the undisputed responsibility of senior governments, and any senior government which deliberately evades this responsibility is derelict in its duty to protect its citizens and taxpayers. I say, Mr. Speaker, I, myself, as a citizen and taxpayer, have a right to go to the doctor of my choice and I have a fundamental right to know that that doctor is going to treat me in a hospital if he is a duly qualified physician.

I do not want any small group, or any special powerful group to interfere with this fundamental right of mine, and it is time hon. members opposite have some concern for the majority rights of people and not for the privilege-seeking few who would arbitrarily set aside these fundamental rights.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, it has been conclusively proven to the knowledge of the general public that by the findings of the Royal Commission, that discrimination of the rankest kind has occurred at the behest of a powerful organized group who talked a great deal about doctor-patient relationship and the right of the patient to his choice of doctor, and the doctor's right to practice his profession. The biased opinions engendered by the medicare issue have not as yet subsided, Mr. Speaker. Attempts to foist prejudicial viewpoints on others will continue for some time and will probably continue forever. The right to appeal is something that must be maintained forever too.

It is vital that legislation be made to protect freedom of choice of doctors by patients and taxpayers, as well as the professional freedom of doctors too. It is the duty of government, under the rule of law, to provide this protection otherwise it is a threat and the beginning of the end to justice under law and good government. Protection of local autonomy is needed against undue and powerful pressure groups. These are the protections that were brought about in the legislation and to which hon. members opposite, many of them in the house now, agree to unanimously without dissent. Why this sudden change of heart, Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: — Bribery.

Mr. Nollet: — No matter what happens, the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) and the members of the government will have to answer to the public of Saskatchewan for the repeal of this protective legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Eiling Kramer (The Battlefords): — Paying off their election debts.

An Hon. Member: — They should answer now.

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with respect to this particular bill.

It is my contention that legislation is required to protect doctors and especially the less powerful and less vocal groups within the medical profession. I think it was the hon. lady member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) who made some comment about the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) patting himself on the back. I think when legislation of this type is introduced, he should be patted on the back, rather low down, and with a great deal of vigor.

This legislation is needed, not only to protect the public, but to insure their right to be cared for by doctors of their own choice. It is also needed in order to protect those doctors themselves. Within any group of persons in any organization, with economic aspects attached thereto, there is a tendency for power to gather in the hands of those more favored by circumstances. Control within the medical profession can have a profound effect on the opportunity of an individual doctor to carryon his practice and to make his living. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is emphasized tonight, in terms of the press report with respect to Dr. Raymon and the problem that has arisen at Biggar.

This tendency to conflicting interests between groups within the profession has been well illustrated by developments in other lands. This has been true in Great Britain. The general practitioners in Great Britain have become convinced that their interests were not being properly safeguarded and that a large number of them have now actually formed a separate organization for general practitioners. This, Mr. Speaker, was not because of the National Health Service but because the way in which medicine was organized placed advantages in the hands of the specialists as compared with general practitioners.

I am sure hon. members, probably some of them at least, saw the television program the other night when Dr. Bannister was interviewed by Pierre Berton, when he intimated that the National Health Service was in large measure, very successful in that country. Yet there are severe problems there, particularly with respect to general practitioners.

The split between the specialists working in the hospitals and the general practitioners working outside of hospitals, has become rather extreme in that country. This tendency could very well take place in this country. Indeed, I think there is some indication that general practitioners feel that this trend is already threatening in Canada. In some parts of Canada, already, general practitioners are finding it difficult to obtain the privilege of caring for their patients in hospitals. Without the protection of an appeals procedure such as is provided in the amendments we are now discussing, the general practitioners could in large measure, lose control of their practice and indeed this may very well develop.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Mervin Woods in the Royal Commission Report on hospital privileges, calls attention to the rights and privileges of doctors. I am quoting him directly, page 102 of the report.

> Physicians are citizens and are entitled to full rights and privileges as such. They have, as citizens, the same freedom of thought, word and deed, as other members of the community. When acting as physicians, however, they are in a position of trust. Those doctors who are not associated with community clinics are in the majority. They have control of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. They also control the medical staff committees of the four hospitals involved in these hearings and, no doubt, of many others. They, therefore, in many instances, have the heavy responsibility of sitting in judgement on those with whom they are in 'basic disagreement on certain aspects of the practice of medicine.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, this is a direct quotation from page 102 of the Woods Royal Commission with respect to hospital privileges. This Royal Commission report refers to community clinic doctors being in the minority and this, of course, is self evident in this province. This reference is natural since the complaints which did come before the Royal Commission, were those of community clinic doctors.

However, the legislation setting up the appeal procedure was not designed to protect a particular minority, and I can not stress this too strongly, but any minority. A minority requiring this protection in future, could conceivably be general practitioners as opposed to specialists. It might be the doctors in any particular private clinic in the same community where a larger clinic was in operation, where the larger clinic was able to control and dominate in that particular situation, or to dominate the medical staff in the particular hospital involved. It might be a minority holding a different view on some other issue concerned with the organization of medical practice.

Without the protection of an appeal procedure, whichever group is more powerful within the profession, tends to gain increasing power. This is quite evident. Without the benefit of the appeal board the group which is smaller or weaker, tends to become smaller and weaker and eventually to be squeezed out entirely.

The Royal Commission on Hospital Privileges report makes it, I think, abundantly clear that the division of opinion amongst physicians is the basic reason for requiring an appeal procedure. On page 99 of the Commission report it states as follows:

> Seven complaints by five community clinic doctors were heard. None had been granted hospital privileges. This commission is satisfied that the problem

> in each case is attributable to the marked division of opinion among Saskatchewan physicians as to how medicine should be practiced. This difference lead to a lack of communication which in effect prevented the parties from appreciating clearly the problems to be solved.

The point I am trying to make here is that the division of opinion among physicians, as to how medicine should be practiced does not, and I repeat, does not, apply' only to a community clinic but also to a non-community clinic doctors. It also applies in many other areas. Decisions on hospital privileges are so crucial in determining the doctors professional career, that unless there is an appeal procedure, in disputed hospital privileges applications, the possibility of the majority suppressing a minority viewpoint is very great and very real indeed.

This legislation should therefore remain, not only in the interests of community clinic doctors but in the interests of all doctors who may at any time be members of a minority group, and indeed in the interests of the entire medical profession.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer again to the latest instance we have of a real need for the appeals procedure. It has been referred to by other hon. members in this debate but it appears as late as in tonight's press where a doctor is forced out of this province because of his inability to secure hospital privileges, which in effect, not only removes from him the right to practice medicine for which he is duly qualified, but also removed the right of patients in his area who wish to use those services and also removes the right of those patients to make utilization or use of the hospital which they are supporting in terms of taxation payments. This provides a completely illogical approach, not only from the standpoint of the doctor practicing medicine, but the patient requiring the services and the facilities which have been made available in the community by the individual concerned, in concert with other people living in that particular community.

I suggest that there is no rationality whatsoever in a situation such as this, where we find people unable to use the facilities which they themselves have to support in terms of taxation payments and which they themselves have been instrumental, along with other people in their community, in building up within their community.

Surely, members on the government side can realize that when rationality goes out the window, you are bound to have extreme difficulties, not only for doctors, but for patients, also for taxpayers. I cannot emphasize too strongly my very sincere opposition to a procedure which I think removes completely the democratic right of people to practice their own profession, the democratic right of people to utilize the services of the doctor of their choice and the democratic right of citizens to have use of the facilities which they, along with other members in their community, support through their taxes.

To argue that legislation cannot enforce good public relations, I think, is not a valid argument in this respect and in this particular instance I think it is a completely fallacious argument and I think government members, along with members on this side, should take cognizance of the fact that obviously grave difficulties will arise in the future as they have in the past, and as we have clear examples very recently to indicate that this is so, we should, I think, make certain that we very strongly oppose this bill.

I would like to ask members on the government side, who were in this house last year and who supported this bill at that time, why they voted for the bill at that time? If, as it is argued, a person has the right to change his mind, I suppose there is some argument in this respect. But nevertheless, I find it very difficult to understand why members on the opposite side would support this legislation and unanimously support it and then find themselves in a position this year when they wish to withdraw the appeal board legislation. It clearly indicates that somewhere along the line some very strong pressure has been applied and we can't think of any other reason for this, other than the fact that pressure has been applied. Are these people paying off a political debt?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is 10 o'clock and I would like to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.
The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.