

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**6th Day**

**Thursday, February 6, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I am pleased, indeed, to introduce to you and through you to all Members of the House 100, keen, sparkling and alert grade eight students from three classes from Empire school in my constituency. They are located in the east gallery. This large group of students is accompanied by Principal Garry Olafson, Vice Principal Benton Searcy and Mrs. E. Gardner their social studies teacher. They have had a busy time while they have been in Regina. I sincerely hope that they will find much that is interesting, educational and instructive from their stay and visit in the House this afternoon. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you and all the Members will join with me in extending our good wishes this afternoon to this group.

**Hon. Members (Touchwood):** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes:** — Mr. Speaker, I would, too, like to draw to the attention of the House a group of high school pupils from Dysart school under their teacher Mr. Parmar. I am sure that all Members will go along with me in wishing that their stay may be educational, informative and hopefully entertaining and wish them a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of you, Sir, and the Hon. Members of the Assembly this afternoon the presence in the Speaker's gallery in the third and fourth rows, 18 grade seven and eight students from the Pense Consolidated school in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Laventure and by the fine ladies who have transported them here today: Mrs. Wood, Mrs. Jensen and Mrs. Campbell. Pense, as most of you know, is situated halfway between Regina and Moose Jaw. Due to the very enlightened policies of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) with his Urban Assistance Program and through the co-operation of the rural municipality of Pense and the village of Pense we now have a very fine all-weather road from the Trans-Canada Highway into the village of Pense. There is no problem for the people of Pense getting here no matter what the weather may be.

These are a very fine group of students. They have visited the Legislature today and they have also visited the Museum of Natural History. I know that they await with a great deal of anticipation the contribution that all Hon. Members are going to make in the debate this afternoon. I am sure that you would wish me to extend to them on your behalf, Sir, the best wishes of everybody here and to wish them a safe trip home on the very fine highway and road.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you a group of students from the Fiske and Darcy schools which are in the Rosetown constituency. These students are seated in the west gallery and are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Stonehouse and Mrs. Wallace. I am sure the Assembly will join with me in extending a hearty welcome to these students and an enjoyable visit and a safe return home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina South West):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to this Assembly a group of students from Davin public school. This school is situated in the Regina South West constituency. They are here today visiting the Legislature and are accompanied by Mr. Needham. Davin school is named after Nicholas Davin and it is one of the older schools in the city of Regina, but it is a fine school. We are very pleased to have them here today and I hope that their stay with us will be interesting and educational.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome a number of students from three schools from the city of Regina. The first being Strathcona school – some 36 students – accompanied by Mr. Falkowsky, the principal. Amongst the 36 students we have three new Czechoslovakian residents that have come here recently and we are pleased to have them in our midst. Also the Arcola school, the grade eight class some 55 in number, and brought here by Mr. Olson. May I also greet the Davin school students because some of them are in my constituency too. The ways that these areas are cut up you never know what constituency they are in. We are pleased to greet these three schools here and I hope that their stay will be fruitful. May I also welcome the Dysart students because I am sure that I know most of their parents and of course they come from a very fine area too, next to Lipton where I was born and raised. We do want to welcome all outside students as well. We wish them a pleasant stay and a fruitful afternoon and may those from out-of-town visit the fine sights in their capital city.

February 6, 1969

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce four visitors that I have in the Speaker's gallery today in the persons of Dr. Donavon Ross, the Minister of Health from Alberta; his Deputy, Dr. Rose; Dr. Paul, also associated with him; and Dr. Morrison representing Dr. Johnson from Manitoba, the Minister of Health in that Province. They are in the back corner with the school children.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### QUESTION

#### ON HIGHWAYS

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to ask a question of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) regarding the icy conditions which have been prevailing on the highways in southern Saskatchewan over the past month. I would ask the question of the Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, because of the concern that we all have regarding the probability of accidents happening to students who are here and others who are using our highways. I would ask the minister, what steps are being taken by the Department of Highways to overcome the driving hazards which have prevailed over the last month. Second, what degree of success the efforts of the Department are having in returning our highways to normal winter driving conditions?

**Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year we had quite a bit of rainfall south of No. 5 Highway in the southern part of the province. We immediately cleared off all the ice from the highways in the Swift Current area and shortly afterwards all the ice was cleared in the Moose Jaw area, but due to the extreme cold weather we had very little benefit from the use of chemicals in the Regina area. However, today we are only talking about patches of ice on our roads. I am pleased to report that all the roads are open since the last snow storm. In reference to the accidents I like to inform the Hon. Member that only 10 per cent of the accidents in the province occur on our highways. Fifty-seven per cent of our accidents and claims to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office have come from urban centre of which Mayor Baker is responsible for one of them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### CONTRACT FOR HIGH-RISE APARTMENTS AT SASKATOON CAMPUS

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — I would like to announce that a contract has been awarded for the construction of two high-rise apartments at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon campus, marking the beginning of a large student housing complex known as the Cumberland Housing project.

The contract has been awarded to the low bidder, Poole Construction Ltd. for a combined price of \$1,673,640 for the two buildings. This was the low tender. Eight tenders were received and the low bid was well below the estimate which we had. The largest apartment has 13 floors with a gross floor area of 83,400 square feet. It will contain 84 one-bedroom suites and 23 two-bedroom suites. The second apartment will feature 67 two-bedroom suites and parking facilities will be provided for all units.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

**Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Saskatoon Nutana South I continue to find it a thrilling experience to represent a part of one of the fastest growing cities in Canada. During the past year the face of our city has continued to change, with new office buildings and high-rise apartment complexes reaching up to provide an interesting vertical dimension to our skyline. Despite difficulties experienced in the money market, Saskatoon's year-end total for authorized construction was over \$45 million, the second highest in the history of the city. The record number of housing starts in 1968, 2,278 to be exact, I hope Mayor Baker is taking note of that, is ample proof that my faith in our city is shared by a great many people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Since approximately one out of every eight citizens of Saskatchewan makes his home in Saskatoon, and a much larger proportion makes use of the facilities which our city has to offer, the various departments of our Government have been both

**February 6, 1969**

ready and willing to acknowledge their responsibilities for increased facilities and services.

The Department of Municipal Affairs in co-operation with Federal authorities has ensured room for the orderly growth of Saskatoon by giving major assistance to the establishment of a land bank for future expansion. The same Department has also worked with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to make possible the construction of 78 units of economic rental housing in the Eastview area of the city which is in my constituency. It is expected that these will be ready for occupancy in May of this year.

Major additions to the facilities for secondary and post-secondary education have taken place with the opening of a comprehensive school wing at both Mount Royal and Walter Murray collegiates at a total cost of about \$7 million. Further additional facilities have been provided at the Saskatchewan Institute for Arts and Science where we have greatly expanded classroom space. There has been continued expansion on the Saskatoon campus of the University, one evidence of which has just been indicated by the Minister who made the announcement of the new high-rise student apartments. During the past year at this institution we have seen the opening of the new college of Commerce, the near completion of quarters for the College of Veterinary Medicine and progress towards the completion of the long awaited building for the College of Education. We are also looking forward with keen anticipation to the completion of improved facilities for the Provincial School for the Deaf.

The Department of Social Welfare, in attempting to keep pace with the demand for housing for our senior citizens, has authorized construction of a number of units for married couples and 101 bachelor suites as an addition to the Cosmopolitan Court. In this regard I would like to pay tribute to the Cosmopolitan clubs of Saskatoon for the initiative and hard work which they have shown in raising \$50,000 for this project.

In a society which is sometimes accused of being overly dependent on government we Members of the Legislature may be a bit remiss in failing to acknowledge the tremendous contribution made by hundreds of citizens who serve in organizations and on boards which are dedicated to the betterment of the human condition. In this category I would certainly place members of service clubs, fraternal organizations and the wide variety of voluntary health and welfare groups which exist in our province.

The board of directors of Jubilee Residences in Saskatoon is a good example of the type of devoted service to which I refer and the leadership of the Associated Commercial Travellers in financing the fight against tuberculosis, which has gone on for many years, is still another example. Further examples of such selfless and gratuitous service to the people of Saskatchewan are the dozens of citizens who are working on the Premier's Task Force for Indian and Métis. Money could not buy

the interest and the enthusiasm which these people display. Perhaps I should not give examples, because for every one that I single out there are scores who are equally deserving of recognition. These grass roots giants are the epitome of human brotherhood. They build our skating rinks, swimming pools, coach our youngsters' sports teams, organize our drama clubs, staff our blood donor clinics and dream of bigger and better Camp Easter Seals. They are the private sector and as an elected representative of the people I am humbled by their accomplishments, and I am proud to be here in support of a government which is a partner in many of their enterprises.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) paid tribute to this private sector in his reply to the Speech from the Throne at the last session of this Legislature. I sincerely hope that the Members opposite who attempted to ridicule his words have had some second thoughts on this matter.

Now because of the up-in-the-clouds dreaming and the down-to-earth planning of still another group of dedicated people, we will soon have in Saskatoon a facility for handicapped young adults, known as Elmwood Residence. This will provide a home for those who are capable of participating in a limited program of self-help. Major financing is being provided by our Department of Social Welfare with significant help from efforts of the board of directors and the Kinsmen Club of Saskatoon. This will be a pilot project in the rehabilitation of the retarded and, if successful, it could point the way to future province-wide developments. It was most gratifying to hear the eloquent plea which the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) made yesterday for increased attention in this area of concern.

Standing as we do at the threshold of an era which promises increased leisure for our citizens, it is perhaps timely to note the interest of our Government in providing better recreational facilities through the work of the Department of Natural Resources and the Water Resources Board. While higher priority demands on our financial resources do not permit as rapid completion of these developments as we might wish, I am happy to say that the long-term planning for improvements at Black Strap Reservoir and Lake Diefenbaker will provide residents of the Saskatoon area with rapidly accessible opportunities for summertime relaxation. Pike Lake Provincial Park continues to attract more patrons than all but two other parks in the province. I would like to commend the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) for the interest which his Department is taking in the maintenance and the improvement of this facility.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**February 6, 1969**

**Mr. Forsyth:** — I am particularly pleased to note the co-operation which officers of his Department are offering to the Saskatoon schools in building up an outstanding program of outdoor education.

No review of the services rendered by this Government would be complete without mention of the improvements carried out by our Department of Highways. Whenever any of us wants a few dollars for a pet project, we have a tendency to cast our eyes longingly at the Highways budget. Indeed some of the Members opposite purport to give such a low priority to this item that they seem willing to accept a prairie trail standard of roads in any part of the province outside of the constituencies which they represent.

I suppose that it is only natural for a party whose ideology is centered in the great depression of the 1930s to think in terms of transportation by Bennett buggies and horse-drawn sleighs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Perhaps it is unkind to disturb their dreams of the past by letting them know that, as of November, 1968, we had 468,119 vehicles registered in this province which works out to approximately .5 per capita — one of the highest ratios in Canada. The name of the game in modern Saskatchewan is communication. I am sure that the people of Saskatoon are grateful for the major improvements to Highways Nos. 5, 7, 11 and 14, which enable them to visit and do business with the rest of the province on safe all-weather roads.

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Insofar as health facilities are concerned, Saskatoon is a centre for the provision of services to a wide area of the province. The use made of the three hospitals located there is a case in point. Statistics received from their officials show that for 1967, 69 per cent of University Hospital admissions, 45 per cent of St. Paul's Hospital admissions and 40 per cent of City Hospital admissions were for patients from outside the city. The Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) should certainly be commended for the consideration which his Department is giving to the expansion of the University Hospital. Such an expansion will mean improved services either directly or indirectly for all the people in the province.

Our city is most happy to see included in the Throne Speech a proposal for assistance to urban municipalities for control of water pollution. Faced as it is with a major problem in this area, such legislation will be most welcome to all Saskatonians.

For the past few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I have attempted

To outline a few of the many ways in which the citizens of Saskatoon and central Saskatchewan have benefited from the co-operative interest of a government which is not unmindful of the problems created by the continuing trend to urbanization. I could mention other examples such as the participation of the Province in the Western Development Museum and the Centennial Auditorium, but I think that I have made my point. This Government is interested in people and within the framework of financial responsibility it is prepared to help them meet their needs.

I would like to say a few words about the responsibility of this Legislature to offer bold and courageous leadership at a time when social change is occurring with frightening speed. At times I am critical of my own party in this respect, but after listening to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), I am convinced that by comparison we Saskatchewan Liberal are truly crusading spirits.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — He spoke most feelingly in his address of the terrible generation gap and well he should, for nowhere is it more evident that in his own party, Mr. Speaker, unless the performance of the Opposition achieves a much, much higher level than has been demonstrated to date, I shall vote against the amendment and for the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take my place in the Throne Speech Debate, I wish first of all to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne Debate. They took pride and pleasure in their task and both gave a good account of themselves in so doing. Naturally, it is the Opposition's duty to pick holes in the Throne Speech. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) did a great job of grunting and groaning through about an hour and a half the other day. Sometimes he appeared confused as to whether or not he was in Ottawa and the balance of the time he seemed to be trying to confuse the people of Saskatchewan as to what must be done provincially; but these I submit are typical NDP tactics. If they themselves are not confused they attempt to confuse the people in general.

I saw a TV broadcast on Sunday last whereby three of the young NDP Members across the way aired their feelings about some of the Throne Speech. The Junior Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) for example talked about the Health Program and what this Government had done to mental health.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that what has taken place in



**February 6, 1969**

regard to the closing or phasing out of the Weyburn Hospital was started before we became the Government. New methods of treatment and new drugs make the old institutions obsolete and units such as the facilities at Yorkton are replacing hospitals like the Weyburn and North Battleford institutions.

Maybe in the process of phasing out Weyburn we made some mistakes by moving too rapidly. However, this Government did attempt to assess the direction we were pursuing by engaging Dr. S.H. Frazier from Texas to come to Saskatchewan and submit a report on our program. Some of Dr. Frazier's findings pointed out the shortcomings of the Mental Health Program here. These I am informed will be rectified and improved as time goes on. He recommended a greater formalization of admission and discharge criteria, better communications throughout the service, an increased number of community supervisory workers, considerable salary increases for professional staff to enable us to retain our trained personnel, increased emphasis on the evaluation of the results of treatment, more emphasis on public relations, a review of procedures in regard to the release of patients detained under Orders-in-Council, the development of long-range plans and setting up of a research and training institute – just to name a few.

It is now recognized that most forms chronic mental illness represent a long continuing battle in which hospital care becomes but a partial approach to effective treatment. Over the past few years a system of follow-up care has been developed in this province on a scale probably unparalleled elsewhere on the continent.

The original drive to develop this program came in part from the decline in our mental hospital populations from 3,100 in 1963 to about 1,200 at the end of 1967. Many of these discharged patients required follow-up care and in addition it was found that such care was applicable to many who might have never been admitted to one of the institutional facilities. Many of the former mental hospital patients have been placed in approved homes. By February 1968, there were 198 of these homes which were approved for three patients and 56 others which could take from four to six persons. The total number of persons so cared for is at present about 600. In addition many patients are being followed up in their own homes, while some others are being looked after in nursing homes throughout the provinces.

Good follow-up programs are necessary and are based on eight of the following principles: 1. There are more patients in the community with psychiatric problems than was formerly the case. 2. Good follow-up is essential to see that patients are properly cared for and they get the proper drugs. 3. More trained personnel are needed. 4. The community workers must understand the social stresses which result from placing mental patients in a community. 5. A proper environment to aid these patients must be created. These homes must not become merely small, inferior institutions. 6. The psychiatric facilities

must be prepared to readmit patients to hospital if circumstances so dictate. 7. Good public education is necessary in order to render the best possible environment for mental patients in our communities. 8. Research projects are a must to measure the effectiveness of our province.

In 1967, Mr. Speaker, 17,798 home visits were made to psychiatric patients and their families. These services are to be expanded and further developed in 1969. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, while the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) criticizes our handling of the Mental Health Program, the Department and the Government are trying to use new and improved methods to rehabilitate and care for the mentally ill.

Our Mental Retardation Program came under review during 1968 as well. The number of beds for the mentally retarded is very high in Saskatchewan compared to most other places. Yet there is a considerable waiting list for admission. It is known that admission of the mentally retarded to institutions is undesirable whenever it can be avoided, because these poor unfortunate people require the love and care of a home much more so than the average person does. If, however, more of these patients are to be kept in the community, a great deal of effort will have to be made in co-ordinating the services of the Health, Education, Welfare and Manpower Departments and the private agencies. In Saskatchewan these problems are greater because of our widely scattered population.

Other aspects of the Health Program such as hospital utilization fees are going to have improvements made to them. This Government is going to place a family ceiling on the amount of these fees payable in any one year. This to my mind is a great improvement and probably should have been done in the first place. In the past, persons who entered hospital for two or three weeks and then returned home for a week or two and re-entered hospital again, could conceivably have paid utilization in excess of what was originally intended. Now, after a certain limit has been attained, no further fees will be payable in any particular year. This is like any other deductible insurance plan, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the people of Saskatchewan realize that money for hospitalization does not grow on trees. It must be found either on a direct or indirect basis. One thing I do know is that it works. It is necessary and most people have realized the necessity of it.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) stood in his place and spoke for 1½ hours, give or take a few minutes, and he spent about ¾ of an hour telling us about damp grain. He told us about what Ottawa should be doing to move damp grain, about grain drying equipment and so forth. He shed pails of tears, Mr. Speaker, for the plight of the farmer with damp grain. Why, Mr. Speaker, he even went to North Dakota – a free enterprise state – to see what the capitalists were doing down in the United States. I doubt very much if the North Dakota farmers have much of a damp grain problem

**February 6, 1969**

because even the farmers in the southern part of Saskatchewan are not in the same boat as the farmers in the northern areas. However, it was a great show, great propaganda for his own supporters, but I submit that it was all for the good of the party and a phone call would have saved him a lot of time for all the good he did going down to North Dakota. I don't know if they burned any flags down there or not. However, I recall a couple of years ago when the grain handlers went on strike, when the longshoremen went of strike or when the railroaders were on strike, all at crucial times insofar as farmers movement of grain was concerned, maybe the Leader of the Opposition could have done something in these cases since the union leaders control the NDP. But where was his voice in those days, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, it does seem strange doesn't it, that in that case the farmer didn't really count because almost all NDP Members were forced to be silent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Tears shed for the farmers by so many of the Opposition Members are almost laughable. In the Moose Jaw Times Herald of Monday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 1969, the following article appears, "Saskatchewan Young NDP Sunday voted to press for the nationalization of all the farm lands in Canada, etc., etc.". The resolution also called for the Young NDP to press for government action to improve the farmers' position as controllers of his input and output. Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, they're not going to fool the farmers. These are the very same people who are the Smiskeks and Snyders of tomorrow. These are the youth who are going to take over the NDP in the years to come. These are the very people who terrify industrial people about the future of coming to Saskatchewan should the NDP ever return to power. These are the young radicals who also terrify the farmer, making all the statements made by the NDP Members in this House look and sound so hollow. These are the very same people who stand by and burn American flags and who, like their Provincial Leader (Mr. Lloyd), condemn the Chicago Police for trying to maintain law and order, who holler 'foul' about Vietnam, who try to grab publicity as the great humanitarians with their fact-finding trips to Biafra. Ye they're so strangely silent when Russia invades Czechoslovakia.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Mr. Speaker, these people are either closely aligned with the Communists who seek to destroy our way of life or they are maladjusted.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Hypocrisy and the NDP go hand in hand on many other counts, Mr. Speaker. I got a real charge out of the closing

hours of the last session when the subject of Members' indemnities came up for discussion. A change in Members' indemnities was indicated before the 1967 election, no matter which party won. The increase was moved by the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Now, three Opposition members spoke against it, including the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder), the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), and the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), and two others didn't speak at all but voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, at that time the Premier suggested that, if such Members in their conscience could not accept the pay raise, then they really shouldn't put out their grubby little hands to take it. He said, "I don't think this House should oblige them to take it." Fourteen of the Opposition Members voted in favour of the pay increases. These included people like the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker), Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), just to name a few. The few others, like the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), likely were not around or more likely went into hiding, and the Member for Prince Albert East Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), who probably felt it was bad propaganda, was not around for the vote either. But, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to your imagination, to judge the sincerity of both Members for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder, Mr. Davies), the Members for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and Swift Current (Mr. Wood), when you look into the public accounts to find all, yes, Mr. Speaker, all of them, whether they were against the Bill or not, were there grabbing their pay cheques before the ink was hardly dry.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, indicated that this Government will introduce some legislation to permit the making of cash grants to industry where such incentives are needed to meet competition from other provinces.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — We're not going to nationalize the farmers. No, you know full well that other provinces provided cash grants to industries to get them to locate in their province, to provide jobs for the young people and that's exactly what we're trying to do, to provide jobs for our young people in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Again I remind the Department of Industry and Commerce that Estevan is in need of a few industries in our city. Oil activity, particularly in the service and drilling end of it,

**February 6, 1969**

has slowed down considerably. Many supply offices have moved or reduced staff in the past two years and I submit that Estevan needs an economic shot in the arm.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — Of course they do. We admit it. We want this economic shot in the arm. I asked the Department of Industry and Commerce to promote some companies to locate in the Estevan area to make use of the many resources and facilities available to them.

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — How about a heavy water plant?

**Mr. MacDougall:** — We will soon have a new comprehensive high school. You fellow complain when we get industry into this province and a heavy water plant! You'd be shouting to high heaven today because we brought one in so maybe it's just as well we didn't. We'll soon have a new comprehensive high school completed. We have some very fine recreational facilities. We have an abundance of natural resources including a water supply. We have a huge power plant. All we need is the industry and I'm certain that the City Fathers and the Chamber of Commerce in Estevan will be more that co-operative in trying to locate some new industry for Estevan. I will continue to press the Department of Industry and Commerce to put Estevan high on the list of desirable places to locate new industries.

Mr. Speaker, my radio time has run out. I will oppose the amendment and I will support the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, while there is unlimited time and freedom of discussion in the Throne Speech debate, I do not plan to abuse the privilege, but on the contrary I will confine my remarks to two reference in the Throne Speech and I refer particularly to the question of utilization fees and the psychiatric program.

First of all, I want to bring to the attention of this House the effects and results of the very difficult decision that this Government made some 10 months ago when it faced up to a difficult problem and made a very difficult decision. Everyone had been complaining of the escalating health costs, particularly in the field of hospitalization. In case anyone in this House feels that this was of recent origin, I would like to straighten them out and quote from the Leader Post, October 14<sup>th</sup>, 1950, under the heading, "Hospital abuses forces new plan of payment."

Dr. F.B. Mott,

I'm sure the Members of the Opposition remember Dr. Mott,

the Chairman of the Saskatchewan Health Services Planning Commission, said today while speaking to the Saskatchewan Hospital Association that it is common knowledge that there have been widespread abuses of benefits available under the Province's Hospitalization Plan. He said, 'We all know the plan is being abused and very widely. While better hospital care is being experienced in Saskatchewan, quite a portion of this hospital service could be described as unessential.'

At the same meeting, Dr. H.E. Baird, the Hospital Association President and at that time the administrator of the Regina General Hospital agreed that abuses had been occurring. He didn't want the hospitals blamed entirely for them. Miss Lola Wilson, well known to us all, Registrar of the Saskatchewan Nurses' Association at the same meeting said:

People are occupying beds that shouldn't be and people are being treated in hospitals who could be treated better elsewhere.

About the same date . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You put them there!

**Mr. Grant:** — About the same date an editorial in the Leader Post praising Dr. Mott and headed up, "Dr. Mott speaks frankly" says:

Undoubtedly all those involved either directly or indirectly have had a hand in the plan's imperfections. Perhaps a major role has been played by the people themselves in their clamor for services to which they felt they were entitled through the payment of their hospitalization tax.

All such service which involve the 'pooled-risk' principle appear to pass through the same abuse stage. It was somewhat the same with the medical schemes in New Zealand and Great Britain. The frank admission at the Saskatoon convention will serve a useful purpose of warning people that a service which they have come to appreciate may be placed in jeopardy if abuses are continued.

Now they point out that abuses add to the cost, that originally this scheme was visualized to cost \$5 million but before it was ever launched, the cost in 1947, the first year, was \$7½ million. 1948, \$9.2 million; 1949, \$10 million and the editorial goes on to say, that the total may come close to the staggering figure of \$12 million this year.

**February 6, 1969**

Let me tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that this staggering amount of \$12 million has now grown to \$66½ million for 1969. Apparently, neither the people nor the previous Government heeded the warning that Dr. Mott gave. It's interesting also that the editorial goes on to point out that the original individual hospitalization tax was \$5. It was doubled to \$10 but revenues failed to catch up with expenditures:

This spring (that would be the spring of 1950), the provincial sales tax was increased from two to three per cent to produce more money for hospitalization, but Provincial treasurer Fines declared at Yorkton on Friday that the income for 1950 still will be short of the outgo by approximately \$2 million. Other plans for raising revenues have been considered, including \$20 hospitalization admission payment by patient.

So here was the great NDP-CCF Government talking about utilization fees for hospital patients. They later provided for utilization fees in the Medicate Plan and now we, the Government of 1968, was faced with doing something about these escalating costs.

While all provinces were uttering howls of fiscal pain, Saskatchewan seemed to have reached the epic in that we were using hospital beds to such an extent that we exceeded the average in Canada by a third. This has occurred because of hospitalization schemes providing first dollar coverage with no built-in controls or incentives to limit overutilization. Our relatively high number of hospital beds per thousand also aided and abetted the situation.

At the same time medical offices quite frequently were overloaded in some cases by trivialities to the extent that some of the more seriously ill were denied proper attention. As I indicated, many people were complaining but few offered suggestions for improvement. Your Government felt that action could not be delayed, that something had to be done to keep these costs in line in order to give proper recognition to program priorities within the fiscal limitations of the taxpayers.

It was realized that utilization fees did not fit into the thinking of the Socialists. Their solution would be to tax more and make no effort to slow down the escalation of costs. History has proven that this was the approach they took. However, after 10 months in effect, I can say that utilization fees are doing the job that was deemed necessary to be done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — I appreciate that there may be some Members of the Opposition who may not readily agree with me. I maintain, however, their disappointment is more politically orientated than economically. Opposition Members claim utilization fees will defeat the Government. This should please them. They should be urging us to

continue them if they honestly believe that they will be our downfall. No, Mr. Speaker, they know as well as we do that the public expects us to reduce unnecessary use. Utilization fees are a responsible, sincere effort in this direction. The Opposition only harp on it because they feel they can make some political lineage – in the same category as damp grain.

As promised last session, the application of utilization has been continuously under review and assessment. Although we have figures for only the last three quarters of 1968, it is quite evident that recent experience of over-utilization of hospital beds and medical services has been slowed down. In my opinion, we are still using hospital beds far in excess of what I consider necessary and realistic. I realize that this trend cannot be stopped solely by utilization fees. They will help but other efforts such as reduction of the total number of beds and studies of more economic methods of delivering services must be continued.

Now let's look at comparison today with that of 1967. In 1967 MCIC services exceeded those of 1966 by 5.37 per cent. This was the normal increase prior to utilization fees. The first quarter of 1968 MCIC services exceeded the first quarter of 1967 by 7.35 per cent. The trend was ever upward. The second quarter of 1968 showed the effects of utilization fees compared to the second quarter of 1967, not an increase but a 3.5 per cent decline, the first in the history of medicare in Saskatchewan.

Now let's look at the patients who were not affected by utilization fees, namely those on welfare. The per capita cost of MCIC services, April 15<sup>th</sup> to June 30<sup>th</sup>, 1968, for welfare patients with no utilization fees, were up 20.2 per cent over the same period of 1967. I have every reason to believe that other service would have trended in the same direction without utilization fees, but with these fees the utilization by non-welfare patients declined 1.1 per cent in the same period.

While some specific specialty services showed an increase during the third and fourth quarters of 1968, the overall decreases for these periods were 7.8 and 8.9 per cent respectively. As anticipated, the largest decline was for office visits. These decreases must be viewed in light of the previous trend of increasing volumes of services.

The hospitalization data shows that during the April to December period of 1968, patient days were 4.5 per cent less than during the corresponding period of 1967, admissions 3.4 per cent less and outpatient visits 3.8 per cent less. There are no utilization fees for outpatient visits, however, there is a \$2 physician utilization fee for hospital outpatient services rendered by a physician. Therefore decrease in outpatient visits indicates that the decrease mentioned in physician's office calls is not resulting in a significant transfer of services to outpatient facilities.



**February 6, 1969**

The long-term trend in Saskatchewan and other parts of North America has been for increasing volume of services in outpatient facilities. This trend in Saskatchewan would appear to have been arrested. Hospital utilization by bed size group indicates that the changes have been least pronounced in the larger hospitals. This can be partly explained by the fact that, generally, the population of these centres is increasing more rapidly than the province as a whole and also that a significant portion of these hospital patients are serious cases referred for treatment from other areas of the province. The large declines in the under 10-bed size group reflects that some hospitals that were providing inpatient care in 1967 were not operating in 1968. The large percentage changes in this group do not affect the provincial totals significantly due to the relatively small amount of care provided in these hospitals.

What are the fiscal implications to date? Under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, it appears that payments by the Government are \$197,000 per month less. This is the net figure. Under MCIC, the net reduction in Government payments – \$306,500 per month. I recognize that a large portion of this is a transfer from public cost to private cost, but we must bear in mind that there has been a marked dollar saving in MCIC due to lower utilization. It is anticipated that hospital costs will shortly reflect reduced utilization of beds.

From the outset we have indicated our willingness to consider a family limit for utilization fees. For the Leader of the Opposition (MR. Lloyd) to say the suggestion in the Throne Speech of a family limit is an admission of the failure of utilization fees, is utterly ridiculous. In reality it is an indication of our willingness to review any undue fiscal hardships created by utilization fees as promised a year ago.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) says in connection with the Throne Speech:

If things are so good why can we not cease to tax the sick? Why can we not give more to education so university fees won't be increased?

It seems that all he can see is a need to take more and more taxpayer dollars so the "great white father" can do more and more for the taxpayer. I recognize him as a man of some ability. I know that only a dedicated Socialist could be so oblivious to the need, the necessity, or encouraging the individual to realize that governments cannot look after his total needs in any area.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — He seems to be dedicated to the principle that whatever the individual can do, government can do better, more government dollars can solve all our problems.

I'll comment no further on his arguments except to say that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and I will just have to agree to disagree and I hope he reads these comments because I see he's absent from the House.

I recognized that utilization fees were not as bad as the Opposition made out, that it was the responsible tins to do and that we must proceed with them and take steps to offset undue effects where necessary. I've stated on several occasions that we do not have a health insurance scheme in Saskatchewan when the premiums present only 18 per cent of the cost. Rather we have a tax-supported scheme. When one looks across Canada, premiums for hospital and medicare range from \$72 in our case to over \$300 in Ontario.

This Government has concluded that considering costs elsewhere, and in order to give some fiscal limitation to those families who incur extra heavy costs because of unfortunate circumstances, we are acting responsibly and realistically to announce a family limit of \$180.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — Details will be released shortly. I anticipate that this limit or any limit will benefit quite a number of people who are not on welfare. This limit is in line with the maximum of \$165 for 90 days continuous hospitalization plus a modest amount for medical utilization fees. The limit, plus the premium, bears close relationship to premium charges alone in some provinces.

I don't expect the Opposition to be enthused about any limit. The only solution they would suggest would be more tax dollars so that the Government could take over more of what I consider personal responsibility. Some say the limit should be less. Nay limit would encounter this reaction. Let me say that I consider this a reasonable limit, a limit that will not unduly detract from the reasons for utilization fees but will considerably remove fears of those faced with prolonged or repeated hospital stays and very frequent medical consultations.

The next health area touched on the Throne Speech I would like to deal with is the psychiatric program. The Junior Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) seems ever willing, and at times somewhat overanxious, to comment on any change or condition in our Provincial psychiatric program. Since he is apparently the official critic in this area I cannot deny him this privilege. I welcome constructive criticism but harping criticism helps no one or, as I would particularly point out in this case, no cause. The Hon. Member's (Mr. Snyder) latest exploit into space was directed at our announcement of the further implementation of the Saskatchewan plan. I'm pretty well convinced that I can't win in the eyes of the Opposition, no matter what I do. Last year I was castigated for what was termed "lack of consultation" with small hospitals slated for closure.

**February 6, 1969**

In 1969, it seems that my approach to the future use of the mental hospital buildings at Weyburn will be the whipping boy. Now, let's look at the facts in a rational way.

I've given credit, and I do it again, to the previous Government and Health Department employees for an enlightened approach to the treatment of our mentally ill. I readily admit it was not my idea, but on the other hand it is my responsibility to further implement and develop a community-based psychiatric rather than an institutional-based program. The so-called Saskatchewan plan is in essence exactly this. It's a program endorsed by the NDP, it's a program endorsed by the Canadian Mental Health Association, it's a program endorsed by leading authorities.

It is only to be expected that a major program change of this nature will encounter many problems and involve many changes. Generally speaking, humans do not respond either quickly or favourably to change. All studies by professionals and lay personnel have endorsed the principle of a community-based program. With their endorsements we launched the Frazier enquiry to deal with certain problem areas. Dr. Frazier's recommendations have either been implemented or are being implemented. We have kept faith with the people of Saskatchewan by demonstrating we do mean business . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — We do mean to do what we say we will. Last year's budget for the Psychiatric Branch was by far the largest in history. It represented the largest increase in any year both in dollars and percentage and it is one of the highest per capita of psychiatric budgets in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Grant:** — You people had high budgets too but apparently you didn't know how to spend them or you didn't have the intestinal fortitude to do the things necessary.

As indicated in the Throne Speech, we propose to continue emphasis of this program in 1969. Dr. Frazier indicated in his report a changing role for one or both of our large institutions. This is only logical. You can't disperse a program of this sort into eight regions and still have need for large institutions. There are just not as many people being institutionalized today. Thirty years ago a person committed to a mental institution had only one chance out of three of ever getting out. Today, there is only one out of 200 mental patients who will spend more than two years in confinement.

The Yorkton Psychiatric Centre has demonstrated that almost all mental patients can be dealt with in the community and with better results. This "test area", by the way, involves about 1/8 of our population.

During 1958 a major recommendation of Dr. Frazier was carried out. Namely, a study of the administration of the branch. This involved all aspects of the program, particularly central office, community work, and the two large institutions. The study was made by M.D. Associates of Winnipeg and is known as The Prefontaine Report. From the start, working committees of psychiatric personnel were involved as it was realized that a report was worthless unless it was to be implemented by the people working with the plan.

The communities of North Battleford and Weyburn, institutional personnel, union representatives and news media were included in meetings and announcements and releases. This seemed to me to be the logical approach to a difficult transition involving so many people and particularly as it involved the people of Weyburn.

It is inevitable that new uses be found for some of the Weyburn buildings and this is being done. A joint committee of Health, Welfare and Public Works is currently studying detailed possible uses and I expect their report by April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of comments from Opposition Members, our psychiatric program is progressively moving ahead. We have increased our staff positions and have recruited qualified people to help us further implement the Saskatchewan Plan. The Government is serious in its intention to improve and upgrade the care of our mentally ill. We are conscious of the necessity of using the Weyburn buildings as fully as possible and we will do everything humanly possible to use the service of the present staff members in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that it is evident that I will support the motion and vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.G Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention this afternoon to dwell too long on the remarks of the previous three speakers on this debate. I am tempted to range very deeply into what the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has had to say. I think his speech is an embodiment of the old saying that the best defence is the (Moose Jaw South) offensive and I'll give him full marks for trying here this afternoon. But when someone has to range back 19 years for arguments, he is ranging back very far indeed.

May I say first of all with respect to deterrent fees about which he has made so much in his speech this afternoon that what he said is going to convince very few people who have suffered need because of his Government's policy during his last year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**February 6, 1969**

**Mr. Davies:** — He says, Mr. Speaker, that overutilization of hospital and medical services have been slowed down. I ask him for whom have they been slowed down? Have they been slowed down for the well-to-do or have they been slowed down for the poor? He speaks of a saving of a \$503,000 a month in hospitalization and in medical care services. Where is this saving? Who has paid for this saving? He has admitted that a large part of this saving has been borne at the expense of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan in outright cash payments. He has said that this is not all of the \$500,000, that part comes from other directions. I think that I would agree with that. The point is that there are no figures in the Minister's possession and he well knows it, that thousands of people during this last year have not taken services, hospital services and have not gone to the doctor, because they simply could not afford to pay the imposts of this Government. And the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) says "nothing!" I want to tell the Deputy Premier this, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Go out on the street, talk to the people, they will give you the answers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — The Minister says, Mr. Speaker, that money has been saved. I would like to know where money has been saved. During the course of the next half dozen years we may very well find that money that was saved as he says will not have been saved at all. But we will have long-stay patients in hospitals, people will have to go to a doctor for a longer period, simply because of the omissions of his Government.

Mr. Speaker, I said that the Minister ranged back 19 years in an endeavor to associate the Members on this side of the House, the previous CCF Government with the inequities of his Government. He talked about widespread abuses that were referred to by Dr. Mott in 1950. Well, I want the Minister to know this, Mr. Speaker, that the CCF Government did something in a constructive way not to hurt people that were in hospital, or to hurt people that needed medical services, but to improve the efficiency of hospitals and reduce costs that patients would be bearing were it not for the action of that Government.

The encouragement of the creation of doctors' committees, the start of home-care plans, the construction of alternative institutions for the sick and the ill, like geriatric centres are examples. Of course, finally the assistance to all hospitals in the improvement of their administration and in the bulk-buying of drugs and in 100 other methods, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that much was done by the previous Government to keep hospital costs at the minimum. When he talks about the rise in costs and uses figures between 1944 and 1966–1968, he well knows that costs have increased everywhere in this ratio. I want him to know that the increase in costs per patient days and per bed has been less in Saskatchewan than it has been in any other province in the last eight or nine years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are others who will be entering this debate, who will be able to deal more extensively with the speech of the Minister of public Health (Mr. Grant). I can say here and now that I found his explanation very weak and very doubtful. I am sure other Members will be pointing out some of the omissions.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was not in my seat when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) spoke. I was ill. I am sure I would have been even sicker if I had had the doubtful opportunity of listening to his tirade.

I wonder if the Member for Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) could have been listening to the Minister of Public Works when he was talking today about, “We are crusading spirits, we need social change, there is a generation gap . . .” and all the rest of it. He couldn’t have been listening if he heard what I read in the newspaper this morning.

The other day when the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) – it was reported in the press by the way as the speech that the Premier was unable to give – he dealt in his final remarks with the need to upgrade and uplift the conduct and proceedings of our legislative institutions. He said, and I agree, that we should not make this Legislature a kind of “bear-pit.” The Minister for Athabasca, the Minister of Public Works, must have turned a deaf ear. The Deputy Premier and his Leader would render a signal service and example to his Minister, this House and the public, if they were to reprimand the Minister of Public Works for a contribution which in the opinion of a great many people lowers the dignity and prestige of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we in the House can to some extent defend ourselves perhaps from attacks such as the Minister made yesterday under the immunity of this House and our institutions. However, I say his attack on people outside this Legislature was cowardly in nature and regrettable in the extreme.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — I do not want to take the time of this House to dwell on what I think was an unsavoury interlude in this debate. I do want to tell the Members opposite that name calling and personal attacks on people don’t change the fact that there is student unrest, that there are legitimate student grievances which cannot be obscured by mean and ridiculous charges against either student leaders or New Democrats. The next people to be called Communists and gangsters may turn out to be respected members of the Liberal party in this province, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — I have on my desk a clipping from the Regina

**February 6, 1969**

Leader Post, today's issue (February 6, 1969). Let me read a few paragraphs. It is headed, "CULF Leaders criticize Government." I want to read these few paragraphs into the records:

National leaders of the Canadian University Liberal Federation lashed the provincial government Wednesday for its stand on the compulsory student fees issue at Regina Campus and its political ideology. Saskatchewan has a Conservative government, not a Liberal one, said Dave Hawkes . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** —

. . . president of the Regina Campus Liberal group. Yves Tardif of Montreal, national president of the University Liberals, and Tom Bernes of Winnipeg, leader of the federation's western arm, said they agreed with Mr. Hawkes' statement.

He went on to say . . . A few left-wingers the Minister says.

Campus Liberals . . .

the article goes on to say,

. . . and the provincial government are so far apart in ideology that they can't see our point and we can't see theirs, Mr. Hawkes said at a press conference in Regina.

Mr. Tardiff and Mr. Bernes were investigating the compulsory student fee issue in Saskatoon Tuesday and Regina Wednesday. They met with administrators and student leaders at both campuses.

A motion supporting compulsory student fee issue is before the federation's annual convention in Montreal in two weeks, Mr. Bernes said.

The last three paragraphs of the news item, Mr. Speaker, and this is a quotation from Mr. Bernes:

The provincial government has served to undermine the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan in the university . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Bernes went on to say,

They have persistently criticized university spending and labelled student leaders with derogatory terms.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** —

He said the government has played a bad role. Obviously they're politically motivated. Mr. Bernes said the Saskatchewan Liberals get little support from students or union people and are using these groups as political scapegoats.

and finally,

Mr. Bernes said the provincial government has supported persons of questionable ability to the board of governors of the university.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, and you fellows can make all the noise you want, because you are going to hear all of this. Mr. Speaker, this item is a clear and forthright condemnation of the Liberal Government's position on the University and on student treatment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Prominent Liberal spokesman abundantly, indignantly, confirm what has previously been stated by numerous people. They say the whole posture of this so-called Liberal Government is to make university autonomy, student unrest, and unions, a political scapegoat to distract attention from the dismal failures and arbitrary actions of this Government. They suggest that this Government has striven to exercise political control by appointments to the University Board of Governors.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that the narrow and contemptible approach and tactics used by the Liberal party with respect to university problems and students should cease once and for all. Let the Government adopt a constructive stance. Stop maligning well-meaning and sincere people. They may be wrong on some things, but they may well be rights on important matters. The claim that student unrest is the work of agitators insults the intelligence. Countries all over the world – 21 countries according to Dr. Robert M. Huchins, in an article in the Los Angeles Times Syndicate of November 3, 1968. And I might say in answer to the Minister of Public Works about, "they are all Communists, agitators" that demonstrations took place in Moscow, Peking, Warsaw, Italy, Spain, Montreal, everywhere, and he knows as well as I do that there is this feeling in the minds of students throughout this world. At times, Mr. Speaker, the character of student demonstrations and utterances may be criticized, but overall, we would be obtuse and remiss in our duties as Legislators if we did not recognize a deep and sincere concern on the part of, I think, the majority of students, over the life and substance of students and society. In Saskatchewan



**February 6, 1969**

we should be engaging not in provocative acts, statement making and abuse, which further alienate the students as a group. We should be working to devise changes that will provide a decisive and understanding answer to students' proposals and problems.

As a final word on this subject, we should be glad, Mr. Speaker, that there is concern about society among students. A few years ago the same society was blaming the youth for selfishness, unconcern and crass materialism about everything.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage in the debate it is hard not to repeat what has already been said at least in parts before. More than once, the Members on this side of the House have suggested that the Speech from the Throne was dull, tepid, plodding and pedestrian in approach and tempo. I think it also has other doubtful characteristics. One of these is that it provides information which is pure padding and superfluity, while failing where information is due to the House to do more than either refer to, or simply omit to provide, any facts at all. On all counts the Speech will make history as one of the least inspiring ever to be recorded.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — There are, of course, occasional bright spots which we will hope to examine in more detail when it pleases the Cabinet to reveal what has only been barely alluded to at this time. However, we look forward to examining the more positive indications touched on in the speech. I will be very interested myself in the proposals for industrial incentives, especially because of the economic blows that have been dealt my own constituency through the technological changes that have come about in the last 25 years. At the moment, for example, the future of the B.A. (or Gulf Oil) oil refinery in Moose Jaw is a matter for serious concern and speculation. Several years ago the Robin Hood Flour Mills closed in our city which had seen thousands of jobs lost because of diesel-ization on the railroads. The flour milling industry, like the oil industry, has enormously increased its efficiency and productivity through advanced equipment. Now, no one disputes the need to use such knowledge and techniques. But Moose Jaw is an example of many like communities that have found the on-rushing applications of technology virtually ignore the stake the community and individual have in this process.

I have consistently said all the time that I have been an MLA that truly adequate Federal-Provincial programs should be devised to help communities like Moose Jaw. The Depressed Area Aid Program of the Federal Government is completely barren for centres which are in a state of static or very low growth. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the pleas of Moose Jaw leaders and I am glad to note some efforts of the Government, will result in favourable changes in the shape of Federal assistance that may help Moose Jaw constituencies.

Meantime, I am eager to learn more about the proposal for industrial incentives. May I say that in the effecting of any plans that may arise out of proposed incentives, Moose Jaw should be given a first, or foremost place in Government consideration. While I am on the subject of Moose Jaw economic diversification, Mr. Speaker, may I also suggest to the Premier and his Ministers that they should immediately consider all other ways and means by which Moose Jaw's situation can be improved. Moose Jaw is a bare three quarters of an hour's automobile trip from Regina. There is no reason why consideration should not be given to location of a number of government operations in my constituency. More and more, it is being recognized that concentration of effort in one centre is not a healthy development. Certainly, in a situation like Moose Jaw, there is every good and fair reason why some government work or functions should be located or re-located in that city.

It is now five years since the previous Government, of which I was a member, purchased a large and well-placed block of land for a provincial office building in Moose Jaw. In the 1964 budget, that Government proposed, and the House approved, \$455,000 for the commencement of construction of the building. It was one of the first projects to be shorn away by the heavy hand of the then Minister of Public Works, Mr. Gardiner. He said that he thought Moose Jaw had already received too much in the way of Government buildings and the people in my constituency haven't forgotten it. There are many construction workers who would be happy indeed to return to work on a Moose Jaw provincial office building. Construction is declining badly. While the new building is being erected, I suggest that your Government could make plans for a more significant location of government operations in Moose Jaw City.

While I am dealing with government buildings in Moose Jaw, I want again to request that everything possible be done to expand and enlarge the functions of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute. I hope the Government will see the importance of the institute to our community both in the light of the training function and that of helping the city to emerge from its temporary economic twilight and forge ahead.

Many of my fellow citizens have asked me to raise the question of a community college in Moose Jaw. I am sure that this sort of institution is bound to become a larger part of our educational endeavours in Saskatchewan. I would hope that the Government might proceed in this direction in my city.

The crowded situation on the university campuses, both in Saskatoon and Regina, points to the need to consider the community college in a more serious fashion. The experience in Ontario, where these institutions have developed quite rapidly, are valuable for Saskatchewan. The Government should make an early appointment of its positive intentions with respect to this matter.

**February 6, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, I note that the Speech from the Throne calls for the creation of a House Committee to study the desirability and most appropriate methods of electoral reform. I join with other MLAs in supporting any constructive steps that can be taken towards this general objective. I hope that such discussions will result in fair and reasonable revisions that are made without partisan consideration.

I say again, as I have many times before, here and outside the House, that the citizens of Moose Jaw overwhelmingly see no reason to be divided into two constituencies and they would like to be returned to the two-member seat we had formerly. I remind my friends in the Government that long ago, when a Liberal Government presided in Regina, cities like Saskatoon and Regina, then with a population of 40,000 – 50,000 had two-member seats. The practical justification for dividing Moose Jaw politically simply does not exist. It was done by the present Liberal Government for one reason and one reason alone, to attempt to defeat the wishes of the people of Moose Jaw. They failed, even in the one constituency where they used every wandering boundary and questionable population divisions, to get a Liberal in the Legislature. This Government should now renounce a position which smacks of an act of malice and permit the people of Moose Jaw to select their two MLAs in one city-wide area.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, if Moose Jaw cannot be returned to a two-member seat, the least that can be done is to divide the city by a boundary, say down Manitoba Street, so that there are an equal number of electors in each of the two seats. Now of course, there is almost a third more voters in Moose Jaw South than in Moose Jaw North.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I said that the Speech from the Throne was a plodding document. I want, however, to express my admiration to the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply for really valiant efforts to summon up an artificial sense of enthusiasm and excitement over its contents. They tried hard indeed. It isn't to be surprised that in their striving they fell into grave errors, because, for the most part they were taking statements of their Leaders and other Ministers at face value. Perhaps at this point in the debate they may have learned that this doesn't pay.

The Member for Saskatoon City Park, for example, repeated what the Premier and the Labour Minister have been saying too frequently that Saskatchewan has the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about the percentage of unemployment in the whole labor force, I can scarcely think of a year in the past several decades when Saskatchewan hasn't had the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada.

But, let's be frank enough to admit what this Liberal Government never does, that in Saskatchewan we are talking about a province which has over 85,000 farm operators in its labor force, the largest proportion of any province in Canada. If you deduct the number of farm operators from the labor force in each province, you get a somewhat different picture than that suggested by the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) or the Premier or the Minister of Labour. Surely the degree of unemployment measurement should be based on the number of wage and salary earners. Who after all ever heard of an employed employer?

DBS Special Table on the Labor Force for the week ended December 14, 1968, show a Saskatchewan labor force of 337,000 and an unemployed total of 11,000. If you deduct the number of farmers from the labor force, you get 251,314. This figure of course includes people like doctors, lawyers and other self-employed. But using even this figure, which is truer, more realistic, you come up with a Saskatchewan unemployed figure of 4.4 per cent. This is considerably in excess of the figure that the Economic Council of Canada considers to be the outside or grave unemployment figure – that figure being 3 per cent.

Using the same basis of calculation for Manitoba and Alberta, you will find that the unemployment figure for mid-December 1968, was respectively 4.7 per cent for Manitoba, 3.4 per cent for Alberta. The figure for Ontario, our largest industrial province in Canada, was 3.1 per cent – 3.1 per cent, almost 1½ per cent less than the figure in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is going to claim that the labor force figure used by the DBS is wrong. He apparently relies, and I don't think he should, on the very generous and far-out estimates of labor force from his own department and the Government's Economic Advisory body . . . All I can say is that where you have a choice of relying on DBS or the Government's figures (and where they do use them, they use DBS anyway), I would far sooner trust the DBS figures.

The significance of the Government's boastfulness about allegedly low unemployment is just not justified and it is unjustified partisan political behaviour. But it is far worse than that. It reveals a dangerous complacency in the midst of a growing unemployment problem in our province. This situation is getting serious and it will be worse by early summer, when thousands of students in this province try to find jobs. If there was ever a time when the economy needed stimulation, not only from Regina, but from its Liberal counterpart, the Government at Ottawa, it is now! But we are not getting it. The Speech from the Throne simply ignores the existence of any employment problem. Its only recognition of wage and salary earners is an ominous hint that collective bargaining rights may be again eroded. At Ottawa, the Hellyer Report on Housing seems hardly likely to engender large-scale employment through

**February 6, 1969**

the creation of new homes for the average family. Neither here, nor at Ottawa, does there seem to be any real concern or awareness of the growing jobless conditions.

Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I quoted unemployment figures for mid-December of last year. As the winter goes on, jobless numbers are growing very rapidly. Saskatchewan figures for January of 1969 will probably show very heavy increases.

The Star Phoenix of January 23, 1969, has a lead story on unemployment in that city which could be paralleled in almost any Saskatchewan centre. It comments that two jobs of newspaper mail-room apprentices drew a response from 61 applicants in less than 1½ days. The paper's circulation manager said that in 1968 the same advertisement for help would have drawn only a handful. The story comments, and I am quoting:

The response is typical. A generally tight economic situation on the farm and a corresponding, but less serious business decline in the city have been added to usual seasonal layoff problems.

The newspaper story went on to note a marked drop in building permits in Saskatoon and that the Construction Workers' Union is now hard hit by unemployment. It comments significantly on the situation caused by the Trudeau Government's abrupt termination of municipal winter works programs. Sixty people have been cut from the city work force in Saskatoon alone because of the Ottawa Liberal Government's action. Whatever the reasons for the sudden decision of the Federal Government, it caught many of our local governments by complete surprise. And without question, hundreds of families are unemployed because of this very hasty ill-timed Liberal move. This Saskatoon story, as I have said, represents a typical trend in Saskatchewan centres.

Nor do unemployment figures show the whole extent of a serious problem. There are thousands of people who are not eligible for unemployment insurance and who do not register for work because they know there is nothing for them or that they can do nothing if the work is there for them. The Task Force on employment for Indian-Métis people said, in a news story in the Star Phoenix again, last September 14, that 10,000 jobs were needed for Indian Métis people. Only a fraction of these people would be included of course in the official unemployment figures. The fact is that the Government figures fall very far short of showing the actual extent of unemployment in this province. As I have pointed out frequently, the actual extent of unemployment is not reflected in Government figures here, or elsewhere, and Government figures fail in general on all economic matters to provide a host of facts that should be known by ourselves and by people that are in charge of offices that relieve unemployment to aid wage earners and combat unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, another grave indictment of this Government lies in the field of inflation and consumer protection. The Speech from the Throne in its opening paragraphs observed and I quote again, "Inflation continues to pose a serious threat to our economy and we will continue to do all in our power to combat the danger." Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems in practice that this Government has done all in its power to ignore and resist the terms of the Batten Commission Report that was brought down early last year. It refused to agree to set up a Consumers' Agency or to proceed with other concrete recommend actions in that report. It has belittled and derided the report itself. Even the seconder of the motion to the Address-in-Reply, the Member for Cannington, questioned the findings of the Batten Report. His only suggestion was that co-operatives should do more to lower prices if they are too high. He also said that he supports his Government because it has attempted to control inflation. Where, Mr. Speaker? How? The Saskatchewan public would very much like to know.

The Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), I should also mention in passing, defended the profits of the meat packers and repeated the hoary old arguments about profits being only a fraction of a cent of a pound. What the Member for Cannington should do, I'm sure he knows it, is to tell this House the facts that the profits of the meat packers can only be related to the money they invested in their concerns. The big meat packing companies in Canada over the last 20 years, have had some very healthy annual profits indeed – with huge capital investments out of profits besides all of that. Mr. Weatherald said with respect to the Batten Report that the Opposition has often and particularly since the Batten Report came out alleged that the chain stores are making fantastic profits. Mr. Speaker, if the Member doesn't believe the Batten Report, he should examine some earlier reports, like the report of the Royal Commission on Price Spreads, which said that supermarket chains in Canada had a much higher profit experience than their counterparts in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, right in the heart of one of the world's great food-processing areas, we pay more for food than in large industrial communities. The Regina Leader Post for January 28, 1969, headlined a story from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics showing that of eight principal Canadian cities, Regina had the highest prices for family groceries. The big supermarket chains who were criticized by the Batten Report for a situation which costs the average Saskatchewan family \$61 a year in food costs than elsewhere, appear to feel that they have got no cause to fear any Liberal Government action in Saskatchewan to change it. Food prices are higher here than ever and they are higher here than the other checked areas. This Government's actions tend towards a policy of wage containment and threats of legislative or legal action to organized wage earners who seek to overcome higher prices by collective bargaining solutions. Yet, it tolerates and permits the highest food prices to be charged by the big grocery chains and refuses to take action that

**February 6, 1969**

would curb these corporate excesses. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is one-sided and inexcusable behaviour.

If the Government has done next to nothing to control inflation in any real way, it has failed equally to increase incomes of thousands of low-paid workers who are unorganized and who depend on legislative protection through minimum wage regulations. This Government and its Labour Minister, say they have increased the minimum wage. So they have, so they have, in meagre doles, during the mounting inflation of the past few years. The fact remains that where Saskatchewan once had the highest minimum wage in Canada, it now stands far behind most Canadian provinces. We presently have in Saskatchewan the lowest minimum wage of any province in Western Canada; in fact we have the lowest minimum wage west of the Maritimes. The wage earners in these minimum categories desperately need and deserve genuine consideration in coping with high price levels. They need buying power. If the Government is sincere in claiming to do all in its power to help and to continue high levels of employment and wages as some of the speakers opposite have said, why doesn't it raise minimum wage? There is not the slightest excuse for not doing so in the face of not only comparative evidence, but plain common sense. The wheels off industry don't turn fast and the tills in the shops won't ring where thousands are on low incomes.

The United States Secretary of Labour, Mr. Willard Wirtz, reported in 1968 on the effects of an increase to the 1966 institution of \$1.40 per hour in the Federal Minimum Wage law. (The rate today, by the way, in the U.S. is \$1.60.) Some employers in the United States, Mr. Wirtz said, had made doomful forecasts of plants closing down and unemployment resulting because of the minimum wage hikes. Although over 9 million new workers were included at that time under minimum wage protection, the economy continued to prosper and to grow. Total employment in the United States rose from 72.2 million employees in January of 1967 to 74.6 million employees in September of 1968. Retail and service industries in which low-paid employees predominant, had more employees at the end of the period referred to also. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the United States Federal Labour Department looks on minimum wages as a major device in fighting poverty and their goal, they say, is partially being achieved.

Now it isn't only in the United States that people are beginning to realize that minimum levels of wages have to be substantially increased. The Toronto Globe and Mail of September 30, 1968, editorialized on this theme in strongly criticizing Ontario's minimum wage rates (and incidentally, of course, they are higher than those in Saskatchewan.) The Editorial said in part this:

Many special causes of poverty exist, but very important among them are unrealistically low minimum wages. Using the Economic Council's standard as a measure, Ontario's

minimum wage rates are indefensible. They should be \$1.50 per hour.

The editorial in its concluding paragraph said this:

The war on poverty will bog down if it is viewed only as a matter of increasing government handouts. A greater part of it relates to ensuring that all workers are paid at least a decent minimum for their labor. Here is one battle that a government can win beyond question without increasing budgets or taxes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, we talk a great deal about poverty but often action falls short of meeting it. I call upon this Government to immediately increase its minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour and to consider progressive increases as soon as possible thereafter. We've heard a good deal of sometimes unfair criticism from the Government Front and Back Benchers about students and student unrest. Part of this at least has to be in the finding of jobs. Last year the employment picture for students was so grim that a Canadian Press story in the July 7, 1968 issue of the Leader Post led off with this paragraph:

Sorry spring has merged into sad summer for thousands of unemployed Canadian students.

The article later went on to say that the job slump was the worst in five or ten years. Words like "bleak", "bad", "grim" were used everywhere to describe the student job position. They said that the student placement services for Regina had found jobs for only about half as many as it had in 1967. Now, Mr. Labour Minister, (Mr. Coderre) and Mr. Deputy Premier, (Mr. Steuart) — Mr. Deputy Premier, I see he is not in his seat — may I suggest that the Government of Saskatchewan should at once consider every avenue to improve upon last year's grave situation in student employment. If, Mr. Speaker, this is not done, 1969 will prove to be a really disastrous year and we will find hundreds of worthy young people having to desert their studies next year. One of the reasons why employment for students was drastically down in 1968 was because provincial governments and municipalities followed the austerity lead of the Federal Government in the words of this article, "cutting hiring to the bone."

In considering a special program to help students to remunerative and useful jobs, I suggest that the Saskatchewan Government should give a clear lead and example. If a program is planned now, jobs can be found for students who must work longer and harder to meet rising costs, including the higher fees that have been imposed by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, it may be useful to say finally, and referring again to minimum wages, that there is no industrial competitive element or argument in the minimum wages in Saskatchewan



**February 6, 1969**

that could be used in the remotest fashion to justify the continuance of the present low rates. Mines, potash plants, refineries, manufacturing industry, in general all pay rates far in excess of minimum wages.

Speaking of potash plants, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) during his speech lauded private enterprise as a symbol of his party. He defied the known history that major potash development originated and was pioneered under the former CCF Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, he'll fool no one. It was with a CCF Government in power that the great problems of potash development were solved and production got under way. With our immense pure and extensive potash deposits and other factors such as the dwindling and deteriorating deposits in the USA, it was inevitable that the rate of potash mine development would quickly expand. For the Saskatoon City Park Member (Mr. Charlebois), to relate this to the blandishments of Saskatchewan Liberals, is just utter and complete moonshine in its super, triple-distilled quintessence.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, after referring to this, he went on to talk about the Prince Albert Pulp Mill as another glowing example of the triumph of his Liberal party's private enterprise theories. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see the pulp mill constructed. But to suggest that it came about because of fine, old, private, risk-taking enterprise, is a bit of unintentional humor on his part.

**Mr. Charlebois:** — What's your record on pulp mill?

**Mr. Davies:** — With \$50 million worth of investment guaranteed by the citizens of Saskatchewan and millions more spent by the public in implementing the operation of this mill, it can hardly be spoken of as a triumph of initiative for the private entrepreneur or the winning ways and declamation of the Premier.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, getting down to cases, it was public, not private risk-taking, that determined the emergence of the pulp mill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the question of labor relations in Saskatchewan. As a preliminary, let me say what the general picture is.

First, for many years this Province and its organized workers have, by and large, had a relationship which was highly responsible. The record I think is undisputed even by the most rightward-looking in their opinions. Saskatchewan's rate of strike time lost per 100 workmen has been in almost all years during the past two decades half, or less than half, that of the Canada-wide rate. The figure speaks for itself. But it is strange that the Liberals rarely, if ever, refer to it. The Premier's references are almost always calculated to excite the hostility, not the co-operation of organized labor.

Secondly, the wage increases secured by organized labor in Saskatchewan in recent years have not come up to Canadian averages. Rather, Saskatchewan workers have fallen behind the overall movement of income gains. In October of 1964, Saskatchewan weekly wages were \$5.58 below the Canadian average. In October of 1968, the disparity had increased to \$7.29 per year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the conclusion here is that there is not the slightest reason for anyone in the Cabinet to speak as despairingly of unionists as has often been the case. In fact, a few words of praise are obviously in order. This may be very difficult for the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) and other people in his party to utter, as one who has more than once said, as the Premier said that he believes that collective bargaining in major areas should be ended as we know it and arbitration established as a way of enforcing settlements in labor disputes.

Now, the words of advice that I give the Government are not simply my own. They are echoed by most conciliators and mediators in labor relations today in North America. They are these: change your direction from a rigid, arbitrary, restrictive course; turn to means that will increase management-labor contact for the development of new, and advanced forms of collective bargaining; rescind changes that have been made in our labor laws that interfere and obstruct the worker in his right to organize and his right to bargain.

I want to say as sincerely as I can that there is discontent at every major wage-earner level over the extent of employer interference in the right to organize. This right is written into our statute. But in practice, many workers fear employer pressure or retaliation. Where labor law provides only paper protection or where labor law administration is not zealous in interrupting its duties in this respect, the situation becomes aggravated as it has in recent years in this Province. With less than 30 per cent of the wage and salary work force in unions in Saskatchewan — and many would benefit much from collective bargaining through unions — it is absolutely essential, Mr. Speaker, that the law regarding unions is observed in a way

**February 6, 1969**

that encourages the formation of unions. This can't be done if the law and its administration fail to supply real protection for the right to organize and real deterrents for those who use manifold and subtle forms of intimidation, interference and pressure that prevents employee organization.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour occasionally has some good things to say in speeches that he gives. One of them was a statement to the effect that one of the worst things that can happen in a labor dispute is where bargaining parties rush to make news releases. Mr. Speaker, he should pass on this warning to his Leader and to others who are prominent in his party, because they rush to print and microphone on almost any labor issue, seldom in a manner to cast a favourable light on the wage earners concerned. It is hard, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the conclusion that the Saskatchewan Liberal party is using labor as the whipping boy in attempting to convince farmers that their many troubles can be settled by restricting and confining and abusing wage earners and their organization. It is, Mr. Speaker, a device by which the Liberal party hopes that it can get farmers' attention away from low farm prices and high farm costs and damp grain and focused on strikes and labor bosses.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne was typically deficient in making only the briefest reference to Government intentions on amendments to The Trade Union Act. The House deserved to know, at least in a general way, what changes were to be proposed. That this is not done is cause for, I think, great regret and concern.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, again that the inflexible and hardnosed approach of the Government be changed. Sometimes Government Members express themselves in favour of the Swedish labor methods. I wish they would take a good look at them. They will find that collective bargaining is the root of the whole system, that arbitration in Sweden takes place only on voluntary agreement in contract situations, and that labor is treated as a meaningful partner in economic and social affairs, by both Government and industry and that by so doing many potential economic conflicts have been eliminated.

We can't import the Swedish system and we shouldn't try to intimidate it in any slavish way because of the major differences in Canada in which governmental and employer-employee jurisdictions have grown up and operated. But we could learn much from the atmosphere and the methods that are used in Sweden. I hope that the present Saskatchewan Government will study them because the atmosphere and the methods concerned are wholly contrary to the manner and the philosophy of labor relations they express and practise in this Province.

The actions and the statements of the Saskatchewan Liberal party leaders are completely out of step on the other hand with the remarks of people, like say, the Federal Minister of Labour, Mr. Mackasey. In recent speeches he has made it very plain that he has no patience with the kind of philosophy and provocation

shown by many of the Members on your right, Mr. Speaker. He said when he was speaking in the House of Commons on September 19, 1968, that compulsory arbitration was not the type of action that as Minister of Labour he would prescribe for the Federal Cabinet. He expressed his faith in collective bargaining as, to quote him, "most compatible with the aims and aspirations of a free society." And while he acknowledged that Government action might in exceptional cases be necessary to find a conclusion to labor disputes, he emphasized that this would really have to be on truly exceptional lines.

I was interested the other day to hear the Liberal Leader – and he was joined by other leading Members from his side of the House – again castigate the grain-handler employees at the Lakehead. Well, perhaps they might be interested to know what Mr. Mackasey had to say in a recent speech in the House of Commons and I am quoting him directly. He said:

I am quite willing to substantiate now or any other time, Mr. Speaker, that my justification for not intervening sooner in the grain handling dispute was based on facts and figures supplied to my Department by people who know the industry. I have been able to establish to my satisfaction, if not necessarily to the Opposition, that not one single grain sale was lost as a result of the strike . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** —

. . . not one market was jeopardized, or one commitment not honoured. Our commitments to existing customers were filled.

That was the end of the quotation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, labor disputes, I think, do affect our economy on occasion and I think that much more effort and thought and imagination must be applied to expand our present concepts of collective bargaining and management labor consultation. Mr. Speaker, these desirable developments will be much injured, and certainly not assisted in any way, by the customary loose charges and blame that are constantly being cast upon working people by Members to your right.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken critically of various parts of the Throne Speech. There are some that I hope I shall be able to support as the ideas are finally expressed in bills before this House.

Respecting rules of the Legislature, I have consistently felt that we should look to improving our House rules, both for

**February 6, 1969**

ourselves and for the benefit of the public who put us here. I hope that we will all be able to approach the subjects involved in this study in a manner that will protect the rights of the Members and democratic parliamentary practice, while at the same time updating our processes.

The Throne Speech doesn't comment upon what is clearly as important as any modernizing procedures and that is, to my mind, to provide better opportunities for all MLAs to participate as Legislators in the fullest and the most meaningful manner. The day is long past, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion when private MLAs, either on the Government or in the Opposition, should wither on the vine and fail to perform and develop to the greatest degree possible.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter. Assistance in preventing pollution of waters is clearly a principle we can also agree to in this House. However, I will personally want to see how the Government intends to operate in this connection. I hope for example that city governments will be given really major assistance in this area. Nothing short of substantial help will succeed because of the very formidable financial difficulties and obstacles that municipalities, especially urban ones, face at this time. I think, too, that the municipal loan program announced and the increase in Civil Service pensions may also be worthy of support. I am sure that we have a genuine obligation to raise pension benefits of our public employees where these have been greatly reduced in value over recent years. Mr. Speaker, having paid some due regard to what looks like improvements at this point, the overall nature of the Throne Speech does not merit support because it fails to meet the greatest problems of the day in our province. In a time when outstanding leadership and action are needed to cope with the grave problems of both the rural farmer and the urban worker, it takes a bits-and-pieces approach to governmental responsibilities. It completely ignores consumer problems while it prates about concern for the consumer. Mr. Speaker, in sum it is a flaccid offering with little muscular response. As legislation unfolds to interpret it further, I feel it will be found to be even more wanting in substance. I must, therefore, Sir, support the amendment and reject the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, rising to participate in this debate, I want to first congratulate the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) on his appointment as House Leader. When he acted in his capacity before, he facilitated the business of the House by being co-operatively and positive. Since I expect that he will be appointed to the bench prior to the next election, I think this will be a good experience for a future member of the judiciary.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I want to congratulate my hon. friend, the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Laroche), on his appointment as party Whip. The increase in salary he receives for this onerous task will be, I am sure, offset by the co-operation he will receive from hon. friends on both sides of the House. It is a job that has been done and I feel sure the Hon. Member for Shaunavon will handle it well.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I want to congratulate, as is customary, the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. The Hon. Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) said he thought the Government was doing a sound job. In reference to his Throne Speech I will say without hesitation that in outlining the job he thought the Government was doing, there was certainly lots of sound.

The Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), who is quite a nice fellow, had to follow his conscience, and as a farmer, he had to criticize the Federal Government. It seems strange that he would still remain a supporter of the Liberal party after enunciating in so many ways his dissatisfaction with the agricultural policies of the Government at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, about two months ago, the Leader Post dated November 30<sup>th</sup>, 1968, carried a column by Mel Hinds that caught the attention of all the people of Saskatchewan, "Discontent reached the point." He is talking about the Government Members on that side of the House:

. . . during the late part of the session and the early summer that at least two Liberal Members of the Legislature threatened to cross the floor and sit as independent Members. One went so far as to ask Speaker J.E. Snedker to have his Legislature chair and desk moved.

It goes on, I am quoting directly from the Leader Post:

While much of the discontent of last spring and early summer was blamed on static from the constituencies over such things as utilization fees, the tax on purple gas and other tax increases imposed at the last session, it now appears that at least some of the restlessness goes deeper.

There is a group within the caucus – and it claims to speak for many rank-and-file supporters – that is as concerned with hoe decisions are made, as is with the decisions themselves.

And I continue to quote:

**February 6, 1969**

They claim the head of the party has lost touch with its feet, that the Premier and the Cabinet too often fail to take into account the opinions of party grass roots.

What they want is more say in the decisions, some sort of re-alignment that would make the party itself heard in the Cabinet chamber.

One MLA recently explained it as follows, 'If we don't put more power back in the hands of the party itself, we are going to be in trouble' . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** —

. . . My campaign supporters and workers in my constituency come to me and say, 'You want us when there is an election but you don't pay any attention to us the rest of the time. We may vote for you next time but don't ask us to work.'

They want to take part in politics, to be involved all the time, not just during election campaigns.

Another MLA commented, "The Cabinet Members don't listen enough to the people who put them there. Some of those guys think they were elected to Cabinet. They forgot that without the rest of the Liberal MLAs and their supporters, they would not be there.'

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, this story . . .

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University):** — What happened on your side?

**Mr. Whelan:** — Perhaps Government Members are seated on their conscience and no wonder they are howling with pain. Their conscience is bothering them right at the moment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — This story, Mr. Speaker, proves that there are Liberals in the group opposite who have judgement. There are some over there that have some judgment and they have a conscience, even if they lack the initiative required to move their desks. Judgment without action to follow it up, amounts to judgment without conviction and courage. For a while I thought it was the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) who had asked to move his desk. I thought it was him, but when I heard him talking in such glowing terms

about free enterprise, it was obvious that the Hon. Member lacked the judgment required to take this step.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — Him, I didn't suspect!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, you know I still have some doubts about the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). Then there is the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes) who has been telling his constituents that he is against the tax on the sick. Then there is the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) who continually tells people that he is going to quit, that he is dissatisfied with some of the Government policies. What about him? Then there is the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) who is dissatisfied with the sick tax, and the charge against the estates of those who are mentally ill. You know, the Hon. Member for Elrose on November 29<sup>th</sup>, 1968, attended a meeting at Yorkton, where I am sure these two Hon. Members got together and compared notes, for when he spoke the Hon. Member for Elrose said and I quote him from the Leader Post.

People want to have more active participation in the decisions made by the governments of the province and the country.

And then he goes on:

It is the role of the political party to find out the opinion of the public and the party members and advise the Government through resolutions and general meetings as to what is desirable in the way of legislation . . . the party is failing to do its duty . . .

Anyone could have told them that, not just the Member from Elrose. But he goes on and he says:

We have seen a transformation of our province convention from an enthusiastic policy-making meeting with active participation from most of the delegates, to a cautious, behind the doors meeting, which more resembles a board of directors meeting than a political convention.

Now there is a candidate for moving a desk, I think that sounds like one there. I am sure going to watch what he does.

Others have been convinced, after talking to the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie), and the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) who were faced with such close margins, that they were the ones who wanted to move their desks. But on second thoughts people came to the conclusion that these Hon. Members are not the type of people that could make this type of a decision easily. Then there is the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. McIvor) who has a 30-vote lead, he is in a pretty precarious



**February 6, 1969**

position. You know, he might understand what is going to happen, he might want to become an independent. And the Hon. Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser), who has a magnificent majority of about 65, and the Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) whose lead is razor thin, a lead of about 26½ votes or something like that. They might think that a switch to the other side of the House could save them too, you know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I'm sorry, I realize now that they wouldn't let you sit over here. But then it takes some courage, it takes initiative, and I question whether they would go as far as to visit the Speaker. In all fairness, since there are a number of Back Benchers, and even some members of the Cabinet, we just don't know who it is. This is a very difficult thing to figure out. You know, there are so many of the people over there that say they are not in favour of the sick tax, the tax on the dying and the tax, retroactive, on the mentally ill, I think the two courageous ones should stand up and identify themselves. Tell us who they are so we won't be suspicious of all of them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — He's half way over here now . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — He's going to get you . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — if all of those who are constantly harping about the decisions that are made in the Legislature really meant what they said, there wouldn't be enough room for all of them on this side of the House. The fact that the Leader Post story suggested that there are only two and they didn't give their names, makes them some of the people in about 20 ridings figure that it is their Member. Yes, Sir, and that he is fighting against this outrageous tax on the sick and dying people, fighting against the charge per day retroactive on the mentally ill. I say this to them. Let those who claim they are opposed to the tax on the sick and the dying, who were going to move their desks, stand up and be counted, and let the people in their respective constituencies know who the other 18 or 20 are who are kidding. As a matter of fact, until these outrageous taxes are withdrawn – and remember all the Government Members who voted for them – let them put their action where their mouth is. Let them quit kidding the people back in the riding. Let them stand up in the House and say they are against taxing someone who is dying.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — The Leader Post story says there are two. The people of the province want to know which two, because about 22 will

deny any association with these nefarious acts against unfortunate people in our society.

There will be a desk moved to this side of the House alright. It is the one out in the washroom, I think, and I am not sure when but the move will take place. The desk will be moved by the people of Kelvington when the Government opposite gets up enough courage to call a by-election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I predict, Mr. Speaker, that that is the only desk that will be moved to this side of the House before a general election is called, unless there are other by-elections. The Premier (Mr. Thatcher) says that he is going to get the ball back in this session. All I say to him is that if the Leader Post article is right, and I believe its right, he has a job on his hands and he has a task that he must perform, and his Cabinet must help him with this job. He must get his own members back first and make sure that their desks are on that side of the House before he starts worrying about who is carrying the ball. I say to them that their policies and their administration with the kind of program they initiate, that leading their party, regardless of who it is, is a pretty hopeless task. The facts remain, and the Speech from the Throne does nothing to cover it up. Whether it is charging the estates of the mentally ill retroactive to 1945, or charging a dying cancer patient, the policies of this Government are not going to be changed by the Throne Speech. They have the full backing of every last Member on that side of the House because they voted for these unconscionable, unreasonable, undemocratic and onerous pieces of legislation. Those who would defend this Government opposite may say they are doing a sound job. Let me ask you, how sound and what kind of a job?

Mr. Speaker, in the field of Crown corporations, there is a Crown corporation, Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd., fully financed by Saskatchewan citizens' money in the amount of \$4,750,000. We really don't know the amount, it could be \$10 million, I don't know, the Government has never reported to the House. This Crown Corporation supplies the Prince Albert Pulp Mill with wood. Its president is the Provincial Treasurer. In spite of the fact that it has millions, millions of dollars of the people's money, and in spite of the fact that the Premier said they may spend a few million dollars to get an industry, in spite of the fact that another Crown corporation of a similar make-up owned by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation reports in detail, in spite of the fact that rumors are rife as to who is benefiting by this fantastic loss that we are told, in general terms, is being suffered by the people of the province, in spite of all of these things, in spite of the fact that the previous Government reported any loss on its Crown corporations when they lost money, and in spite of the fact that the leaders of the Government opposite go galloping off to all corners of the earth, saying that when the CCF were in government, they lost money in Crown

**February 6, 1969**

corporations, in spite of the fact that it is rumoured that relatives of Members of the Government are involved with the operation of the pulpwood company, in spite of these facts, the Government opposite, and that means all of the Members opposite, the Government has stubbornly refused to report on the operations of this Crown corporation to the Crown Corporations Committee, to the people who have put up the money, to the people who are suffering the loss, to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Let me say this, if this company isn't losing \$3, \$4, \$5 or \$6 or \$7 million a year, and if it isn't making fancy deals with friends and relatives of the Members of the Government opposite, and if it isn't hooked on a financial contract that will mean many more millions lost before too long, then I suggest that they prove these rumors are not correct and prove it by filing a financial statement of this Crown corporation, in the Crown Corporations Committee, by producing a financial statement for the people who are putting up the millions of dollars that are being lost, we are told. I challenge the Government either to file a financial statement for Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd., and take the shadow off Members of the Government, and admit to the loss, or suffer the gossip and criticism that are justifiably pointed at them, because of their failure to divulge the details of the operations of this Crown corporation. Oh yes, the CCF lost \$100,000 on a shoe factory, and a few thousand dollars on a woollen mill and a tannery, and up and down the country Liberal spokesmen go, screaming at the top of their lungs. The further away they are the louder they talk. Meanwhile by the Premier's own admission, this Crown corporation is losing millions of dollars. This is what he told the Crown Corporations Committee last year. But they are silent. A government that keeps quiet while it is mismanaging millions of dollars or more, \$5, \$6, \$7, \$8 — I don't know how many millions of the people's money — has neither the right, the administrative know-how, the sense of responsibility required to handle the affairs of the people of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

What could we expect from a government that doesn't have the administrative know-how to provide, after several attempts, automobile license plates that will last for at least 12 months. At the same time it manages to supply it with an airplane to go to tea parties and political meetings.

Nowhere is there a more significant example of bad administration than in the whole field of medical care and hospitals. Communications to me by telephone and letter tell the story of bad Government administration and bad handling of medicare. There is the widow with five children who had a broken arm, four bones in her elbow, who was held at the front

desk in a local hospital while they insisted that she pay \$25 in advance. Is this a deterrent? Is this a tax on the sick? To say that this is a deterrent is a ridiculous and cruel joke.

There is the case of the baby who was choking with pneumonia, waiting in the waiting room of the hospital until they 'phoned the father on the job to make sure he would guarantee the \$25 payment. Deterrent? The child was choking. It didn't deter the father from anything, it didn't deter the mother from going to the hospital with the child. It did enrage them to think that they would be called upon to pay first, in such an emergency. A humanitarian policy!

There is the case of a baby who became sick while the family were visiting in the United States. They paid a bill for \$19 which they submitted to the Medical Care Insurance Commission. The letter in reply stated that they would receive \$3.10, less \$1.50 utilization fee – payment in full – a cheque for \$1.60 is enclosed.

**An Hon. Member:** — Saving money . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — There is the young patient who went to hospital, and while in hospital was charged \$1.50 for a visit to the doctor's office which he couldn't possibly have made because he was sick in hospital, in a bed for which he had already paid \$2.50 on that day.

There is a relative of a cancer patient, a supporter of the Government opposite down through the years, 1943 to 1964, who told everyone he met that the Liberal party introduced free cancer treatment. "When you are sick with cancer, the treatment is free; we introduced it," he bragged. He carried the torch for the party opposite. Since last April when a member of his family became ill with cancer, altogether in three different periods in the hospital, they have spent approximately \$200 paying a tax for a sick and dying cancer patient. The limit will be \$180 from now on. With tears in his eyes the relative told me it took this mistreatment of one of their family by a callous Liberal Government to convince him that there is no humanitarian instinct in the liberal party. "From now on," he says, "I will support any other party, any party other than the Liberals, but it must be a party that can defeat them, we must get rid of them."

Let us not make any mistake about it. Members opposite pretend that they are worried about the deterrent fee for cancer patients. You know we have heard about this thing, even when they had the Liberal convention it was raised there and they were in touch with Ottawa, they were negotiating something. How worried are they? I will tell you how worried they are. When the Member of Parliament for Regina East (Mr. Burton), rose in his seat in the House of Commons and asked for all the correspondence between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Federal Government regarding utilization fees on cancer patients the answer came back, "There has been no correspondence." This

**February 6, 1969**

Government – let me read it. I don't think that some of the Liberal Members that were at that convention would believe this unless they heard it. They were convinced that they were really working on it. Here it is on page 4612, January 22<sup>nd</sup>, Motion number 53, Mr. Burton:

That a humble address be presented to his Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all documents and correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan with respect to the application of deterrent fees on cancer patients under the Hospital Insurance Plan.

Hon. John C. Munro, Minister of National Health and Welfare:

Mr. Speaker, I have talked to the Hon. Member about this matter. We do not have any correspondence or documents relating to that aspect of the problem with which this motion deals and he is aware of that now.

Well, I don't think the Members of the Liberal party who went to that convention were aware of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — This Government hasn't even bothered, Mr. Speaker, to raise the matter by writing a single letter to the Federal Government and yet it pretends that it is bothering their conscience.

What do words mean, Mr. Speaker? "Patient participation" they call it. What a pleasant way of coating an outrageous charge when the patient can least afford it, when the patient is sick, when there is no income if the patient is the breadwinner, when the family have to spend extra money to go to see them in the hospital, and when, if the patient is dying, they are faced with the additional expenses such as funeral costs. Only a Liberal Member of a callous Government could in any way interpret this as beneficial. It is no wonder that some Hon. Members opposite consider moving their seats from that side of the House. It is no wonder they don't want to be associated with those who would introduce such legislation. It is said that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has a thankless task. Those who are ill and have received the benefits of his patient participation have another adjective that they use – they call it 'merciless', and that, Mr. Speaker, is the way I interpret it. It is a merciless, inhuman, unrepresentative aggression against the security of the sick, and the family of the sick.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.A. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Nonsense!

**Mr. Whelan:** — You'll make the same speech in Estevan come the next election. I know that you are sitting on your conscience and your conscience is bothering you and that is why you are making so much noise. Let me finish my speech.

**Mr. MacDougall:** — But you have to have your wife with you, or else you wouldn't be able to write that speech.

**Mr. Whelan:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate enough to marry a clever person . . .

**Mr. MacDougall:** — But she was so unfortunate, the poor soul.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Your wife was not as fortunate.

When a Member of the House can predict that a base hospital will be built under the Liberals, he should get a crystal ball and dress in fortune teller's garb, and begin telling fairy stories predicting the future. In my opinion people are more likely to believe him if he is wearing a fortune teller's garb. The only thing it has done during the last year is postpone the beginning of the construction of the base hospital. In my neighbourhood there are a number of people waiting for hospital beds, and the bed utilization in Regina is lower than any place in the province. Since 1964 they have been drawing the plans, this is now 1969. The city is growing larger, the need for a base hospital gets greater. Those waiting in line for treatment increase in number, and all we get from the hospital board is a ridiculous extension of the time when they will begin building. Let me say to the Hon. Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) it takes a lot of nerve and very little judgement for a Liberal to even mention base hospital as a possibility to those who are waiting for a bed in the city of Regina.

The Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) regrets that Ottawa hasn't lived up to expectations and yet he says there should be and I quote him, "no handouts to farmers." Farmers are a basic part of the economy. Farmers are people who put the foundation under our communities, and the citizens who buy consumer goods in the greatest quantity. Refusal to assist them because it is a handout is naïve, mini-minded and unrealistic. He quoted the figure \$30 million. This is a trivial amount compared to some of the handouts that are being allowed. Special tax programs for insurance, mining and oil industries cost the Canadian taxpayer \$300 million a year. \$300 million, not \$30 million. Handouts to banks and mortgage companies who are making fantastic profits and charging the highest interest rates in their history are in order. No protest from the Hon. Members opposite. Handouts to the companies who are already charging too much for insurance and are already threatening the very existence of Government Insurance. But

**February 6, 1969**

no handouts to the farmers says the Hon. Member for Cannington. \$523 million in tax concessions for the corporations who take huge profits, but no help for the man who has damp grain and a low income. What kind of a Christian attitude, how representative, what kind of reasoning, what kind of logic does the Hon. Member for Cannington use? He doesn't deserve and he shouldn't get and maybe he won't receive the vote from the people of Cannington when the next election rolls around. If the Hon. Member is going to be consistent then he should be opposed to all handouts as he calls them. They are not entitled to them, not just opposed to handouts to farmers.

There is a need to give an exemption on the estates tax to farmers, but it is the height of hypocrisy and it is cheap political chicanery to talk in one breath of an exemption on the estates tax and in the next breath take up the case of a mentally ill person and allow his widow an exemption of only \$10,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what Members opposite by the amendments to the Mental Health Act did last year. They have charged against the estate the care of a mental patient in an institution, a figure that could run to \$33,000 or more and allow his estate an exemption of \$10,000. Those opposite, asking for complete exemption of the estates tax, while they allow an unfortunate widow to be plucked for mental care retroactive to 1945 in a mental institution of this province, leaving her with nothing more than \$10,000, transgress the rules of reason and the measure of decency that should be applied by a government.

Imagine an estate worth \$50,000 being presented with a bill for \$33,000 to cover care in a mental hospital. Picture, if you can, a family that has struggled down through the years with the breadwinner in a mental institution. From 1945 there was no charge – the CCF government saw to that. Now, even though it is questionable in legal terms and should be tried in the courts, a retroactive charge has been made against the estate of the mentally ill patient: \$2.50 per day from January 1, 1945, to March 31, 1959; \$5 per day from April 1 1959, until January 1, 1969, and it continues, for a total amount of \$33,000 for the entire period January 1, 1945, to January 31, 1969. But there is a \$10,000 exemption which would probably buy the widow a used combine. A widow with someone mentally ill receiving care in an institution, when she recovers from the shock still refuses to believe this retroactive policy, this inhuman, Scrooge-like aggression on behalf of the people of this province by the Government opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — These are the facts and I have advised any of the unfortunate victims, the widows of the mentally ill, in addition

to imposing this charge the Members opposite refused to vote for an amendment to set the exemption at \$30,000 or even \$20,000. I have made sure that the record has been put straight in this respect.

Members on the Government benches opposite tell their constituents they are opposed to this legislation, that they don't like it, they think it is unfair. If this is the case let them get on their feet and say so. Otherwise the adjective that the Hon. Judy LaMarsh used describes Liberal politicians very well.

A farm estate of \$50,000 with a bill for \$33,000 and a \$10,000 exemption would be out of business, but the Government fights for exemptions for estates. What heroes they are! What red-faced heroes they are when you think of their treatment of the widow of someone mentally ill!

The cost of drugs in Canada has risen to astronomical and unbelievable levels. Committees in both this country and the country to the south have examined the reason for this and have concluded that there are profits as high as 5,000 per cent made in the sale of some drugs. The Liberals promised the people of Saskatchewan a drug plan. They are now weaselling and going back on their own promise. A drug plan would begin immediately bargaining for decent prices, if it were government – controlled and properly motivated. In addition, if the cost of administration of a government plan is similar to the percentage cost of administering Government Insurance, or the Medial Care Plan, then a government-sponsored drug plan would automatically be less costly than any privately sponsored drug plan.

In the case of medicare, the administration cost is just over 5 per cent. In the case of Government Insurance approximately 13 cents of the insurance dollar goes for administration. Private medical and automobile insurance coverage pays as much as 35 per cent for administration. To argue for private administration of a drug plan is to accept little or no control over the cost of drugs. The experience in our automobile insurance plan and the experience in our Medial Care Plan clinch the value and the validity of a government-controlled and administrated drug plan. To argue against it is to argue for a private plan and 20 per cent more for administration and leave us without protection from the drug companies. To refuse to introduce the plan is to allow those who must but lifesaving drugs to be exploited, to be robbed, to be plucked by the drug companies and cartels. To remain quiet or inactive is to allow unbridled exploitation. To endorse a private plan is to add 20 per cent to our drug bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — In the Speech from the Throne, under the heading of Education, there is a vague mention of priorities. But unless there is a definite clear-cut policy to remove the cost of



**February 6, 1969**

education from the homes of Regina and Saskatoon citizens, to give these cities as well as the farm people some assistance so that they can hold the line on the education mill rate on the farms and homes of Saskatchewan, then it would have been better not to have included this heading in the Speech from the Throne.

While the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) will talk about the introduction of legislation for the orderly payment of debts, unless he is prepared to back it up with staff, he can write legislation that has little or no value. Time and time again I have referred people to his Department for assistance, but there are neither lawyers nor staff to administer nor give assistance to the general public for some of the legislation he already has because his Department is understaffed. If he is proposing to introduce this legislation and even write little booklets about it, unless he has adequate staff to back it up, it is just so many words on so many pieces of paper.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — On what case are you . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — I know that your conscience is bothering you. I know that you are sitting on your conscience. It's all right.

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Hon. Member has made a statement that he has referred people to my office with respect to problems and that they were not able to handle them. Now I think in fairness he should name the cases.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't say the office, I said the Department and I don't propose to throw names into the House, but it is a fact and that is all that is to it. And I know the Department as well as he does. Remember I worked in the Department for ten years.

**Mr. Heald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, he did say my Department and I am responsible for the Department of the Attorney General and the Department of the Provincial Secretary. If he has referred people to my Department or to myself and they haven't been looked after I would like to know their names.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister has his estimates before the House I will raise the matter on the proper estimate and he will have an opportunity to explain. If you want to ruin my speech, okay keep on getting on your feet and . . .

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, on the question of privilege he made a statement and now he is not prepared to back it up with names and I think that he should withdraw it.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I think the time comes when we have to ask ourselves whether we are running this House by rules or not. If the Attorney General doesn't know he ought to know that a Member can say in this House that he has sent people to a department of the Government and they haven't got service. There is no requirement to name names. None whatever. And when we start naming names of mental patients then Members opposite say, "Oh you shouldn't have dragged that one into public." And here is the Attorney General saying . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! . . . Now there isn't anything in the world to prevent the Attorney General asking for the names. And there is nothing that demands or makes the Member produce. The House will be the judge as to the correct procedure and the public in the final analysis. The charge was made, the names were asked for, the names weren't given, so let the House and the public decide the issue.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I think it is wrong to use people's names in the House and I don't intend to do that.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to highways. The city of Regina is being asked to pay for provincial highways that are within its boundaries. Millions of dollars are collected from the citizens of that city by the gasoline tax and only a miserable pittance is returned to them to help build the streets that form part of the provincial highway system.

There are some items this Speech from the Throne omits which should have been included, for instance, a complete report to this Assembly after the expenditure of tens of thousands of the province's money on the progress that is being made with the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Government Administration of 1965. I suggest that we have waited long enough. This was a political gimmick to get elected. Look at it. The report can be used as a paper weight or doorstop, unless this Assembly receives a report each year on the implementation of its recommendations step by step.

The people of this province are in need of housing. The low-income groups are fighting desperately to find the money to pay for rental accommodation that is inadequate and high priced. I looked in vain for a section in the Throne Speech that would have told us that a housing authority, a separate department of urban development, would be set up to study and develop programs to provide shelter for the citizens of Saskatchewan.

If, as the Hon. Paul Hellyer says, a good home is the basic right of every Canadian, then all I can say to him is that, looking at this Throne Speech, that basic right is not recognized in this province.

**February 6, 1969**

Omitted is any mention of plans to seek markets for potash to assist the companies who have spent millions of dollars developing mines within our boundaries. Either the Government doesn't want to help them or it doesn't care.

Let me say in conclusion the Government of this Province is not doing a good job. It has omitted in the Throne Speech and failed to include programs that would improve the lot of most of our citizens. Some people say that is the worst government in Canada. Others say that it is the worst government Saskatchewan has ever had.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — I will just say that after reading the Throne Speech that the Government is ineffective, inefficient, does not deserve a vote of confidence. I will vote for the amendment. I am opposed to the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this traditional debate in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to congratulate my Leader who I believe made one of the most powerful addresses that has ever been made in this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I think the proof of it is the fact that it fetched blood so badly that the Government Members were just a dancing and squirming and squealing all the way through it. You know I learned early when I came into this House that when a person delivered a good speech in this House he would generally be heckled. Just as my hon. friend the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) who just sat down was heckled. This is one of the early lessons that I learned in this House.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for their hard work. I know that it takes a lot of hard work to move or second. There is a lot of research and especially it must have been a lot of hard work in trying to defend this document.

I would like to spend just a couple of minutes reviewing it. There isn't too much to review in it. I want to review it in the light of my own constituency and its own problems. Certainly the greatest problem facing Touchwood constituency this year is the agricultural condition, the weather and all the rest of it. The whole Speech from the Throne, I suggest, is really apologetic and plays down the seriousness of that problem. I would like to quote from it:

Although weather conditions resulted in substantial damage to our wheat crop, general income in Saskatchewan equalled an all-time record.

Reduced income to our farmers was more than compensated for, by greatly increased earnings by our citizens outside agriculture.

I want to say right here and now that is a small solace to the people of my constituency, the biggest part of whom haven't sold a bushel. I will be dealing with more of that tomorrow. One or two other things that I want to say at this time that I note in the Speech from the Throne is that there is going to be more sales on Crown lands. I for one object to the sale by tender. I can remember when land was sold in this province, when I was a young man, it was the people with the most money who got it. It wasn't the people who needed it the most who got it and certainly this is what is going to happen again when this land is sold. The person with the biggest bank account and can bid the highest is going to get this land and it is just going to one further step, in driving out the small farmer.

There are many other things that I might say but the time is getting on. I would like to refer to a few works of the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) in which he said that the utilization fees were doing the job. They are doing the job of reducing expense to the Government I presume. They are assisting and keeping people away from the doctors' offices. They are reducing the number of people receiving hospital care. At least by the figures that he quoted it sounded this way. It seems to me that he didn't seem interested in whether some of those people needed care or not. I sometimes wish that my hon. friend would take the dollar signs out of his eyes. I think the whole basis of this argument is whether we all pay whether we are sick or not, or whether those who are sick are going to have to pay more. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know there is other business to do in the House. I would now ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## STATEMENT

### RADIO BROADCASTS

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement to the House with respect to a matter which was raised in connection with radio broadcasting. I would like to advise the House that the Government is endeavouring to make arrangements to extend the radio coverage in the Saskatoon area. Inquiries and arrangements will be discussed tomorrow toward the end that either CKOM or CFQC be added to the list of stations carrying the broadcasts from the Legislative Chamber. I will report to the House, hopefully tomorrow before we adjourn, on what arrangements have been made.

**February 6, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, I would now move that this House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:22 o'clock p.m.