

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
26th Day

Tuesday, March 11, 1969

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina South West): — It gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to this House 30 grade eight students from Athabasca school. They're sitting in the west gallery. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Culham. I would just like to say on behalf of the House how pleased we are to have you here today and we hope that your trip to the Assembly will be both interesting and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, to you and to this Assembly, I would like to introduce a group of 44 grade eight students from the Bruno public school. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery and with them today are their teachers, Mr. Marshack and Mr. Pentella, also their bus driver, Mr. Levschen. I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to introduce this group of students because with them today is my oldest daughter. I hope their trip to the Legislature and to Regina will be both informative and educational and may we all wish them a safe journey back to their homes.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, through you it is a pleasure to introduce to all Members 31 alert, young grade seven students from Rosemont school in Regina North West. They are in the east gallery with their teacher, Tom Laubman who is a former student of the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica). Their visit is a social studies project, I understand. All Members join me I am sure in welcoming them and expressing the wish that their stay with us will be both pleasant and educational.

Also, Mr. Speaker, from Regina North West in the Speaker's gallery two groups of special interest to all Members are seated with their teachers, Mrs. Katherine Bell of St. Patrick's annex vocational school and Mrs. Elaine Johnston of Saskatchewan House. The two groups of eleven and twelve adults are learning occupational English. They came to Canada from Czechoslovakia late last year. The teachers tell me they have decided to become Canadian citizens. At present they have above average educational standards in their own language. May I say to these people, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada have watched with consternation the political predicament that Czechoslovakia finds

itself in today. Our sympathy and admiration are extended to the gallant people of their nation.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The calibre of your countrymen is known to us. Their contribution to Canada and Saskatchewan speaks for itself. All Members of this House, I'm sure, welcome you to the Province, to this country and to this Assembly. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we could have these two groups stand so that the Members could have a look at them. They're seated at the front in the Speaker's gallery. Would you stand, please.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — With Members on this side of the House, I would like to join with the remarks expressed by the Hon. Member from Regina North West. The 25 students that we have in the gallery, as he pointed out, under the direction of Mrs. Bell and Mrs. Johnston, represent two classes out of about 18 such classes that this Province has provided in co-operation with the Department of Manpower, for the sum total, I believe, of about 350 Czech immigrants who came to Saskatchewan in the past few months. I think it's another excellent example of the co-operation of the two governments in providing services to immigrants such as the people we have today, the people from Czechoslovakia. They came to Saskatchewan, of course, as the Hon. Member pointed out, when they were forced to flee their home country due to the terrors of Socialism over there and we hope they never have to do that here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister of Education and the Member for Regina (Mr. Whelan), who first introduced the students from Czechoslovakia and assure them of the warmth of the welcome which they have here in Saskatchewan. May I say to the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) he should really get a bit of his history straightened out. What a lot of the students in Czechoslovakia were trying to do was to establish democratic Socialism not run away from it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — There is a very considerable difference.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Legislature to recognize and through you, Sir, to welcome a

March 11, 1969

group of students in the east gallery. They come from the McNabb Park school in Saskatoon. They have been attributed to the constituency of my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank). However, Saskatoon Mayfair doesn't take in all the people who seem to live in Saskatoon. There is an area just on the edge of Saskatoon housed and provided with services at what used to be the airport facilities and accommodation. A number of these visitors are from that area which is in my constituency. They're with their teacher, Mr. Thiel and, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we welcome them to the House today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — May I crave the indulgence of the House to also express a few words in connection with the people from Czechoslovakia who are in the Speaker's gallery. It is within the confines of the constituency of Saltcoats which I had the honor of representing. It contains one of the first groups of Czech settlers who came to Canada. Many of them are now in their third and fourth generations in this country. On behalf of the Czechoslovakian people in my constituency, I extend a very sincere and warm welcome to those who have recently arrived from that noble country.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

COMPULSORY AREA BARGAINING NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that most of the steps in his compulsory area bargaining negotiations have failed to date, what steps is the Minister taking to remedy the situation immediately.

Hon. J.C. Mr. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member we are still awaiting concurrence from at least two of the teacher area negotiating committees as to whether or not they wish to proceed with voluntary arbitration procedures. The answer to this we hope to have very shortly, this week later on.

COMMENT RE TRACK-TYPE SNOW VEHICLES IN HUNTING

Hon. J.R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to make a comment because of the numerous complaints being received by the Government respecting the use of track-type snow vehicles, particularly the motorized toboggans or skidoo, in hunting and destroying predatory wild animals especially coyotes and foxes. The tremendous upsurge and the use of this type of vehicle has and is causing great concern to the public as well as to the Government.

It is quite legal to use these conveyances to pursue predators until they are exhausted and then destroy them by using a firearm or other weapon, a club for instance. It is illegal, however, to carry a loaded firearm in or on any vehicle including this particular type or to kill or injure any wild animal with such vehicles by driving over or against them when exhausted. While the practice of driving over these animals is illegal, it is exceedingly difficult to enforce and obtain the necessary evidence with which to convict. However, I wish to assure the Members of this House and the general public that the RCMP and our officials are giving special attention to this particular problem in an attempt to put a stop to this inhumane and brutal practice of using these vehicles to kill or injure the exhausted animal by driving over it.

It is hoped that the combined efforts, Mr. Speaker, of the RCMP and DNR officers will result in the apprehension of offenders in such cases and the removal of the basis for the current complaints.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

GULF MINERALS AT WOLLASTON LAKE

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Before the Orders of the Day, Members will recall that last night there was a considerable discussion about Gulf Minerals and the so-called one hole discovery. I had said last night that I had every confidence that before long we would be receiving other interesting announcements from this particular company. I am sure Hon. Members didn't realize they'd be coming so quickly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Tell 'em the facts, tell 'em the facts.

Mr. Cameron: — Gulf Minerals this morning announced the completion of the second hole in the Wollaston Lake property.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cameron: — This is the first follow-up hole since the original uranium discovery last fall. The hole is some 400 feet removed from the former hole and the drilling encountered what appears to be further ore grade uranium mineralization. Tests will be immediately carried out to analyze the amount of uranium mineralization in the ore and further extensive drilling will be carried out commencing immediately to determine the size of the this ore body. If this drilling continues to follow-up in the same

March 11, 1969

manner and if the follow-up drilling confirms a substantial ore body, it could place Saskatchewan in a most favorable position as a supplier of uranium to the world markets.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — What it may mean to Saskatchewan is evident, when we realize that the world demand for uranium is such that estimates place the requirements of the non-Communist world by 1980 to be four times the 1967 production. Spring activities in Northern Saskatchewan could not have been ushered in, Mr. Speaker, on a more optimistic note than this announcement this morning.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

BATTEN COMMISSION REPORT

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I think Hon. Members would be interested in knowing that some time ago the Prairie Economic Council designated a Minister from each of the three Prairie Provinces to look into in detail and make recommendations in respect to the Batten Commission Report. It was decided at that time that a meeting would be held between the Ministers of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba with the Hon. Ron Basford, Federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to make recommendations to him with respect to possible implementation of portions of the Report.

I am pleased to tell the Legislature that this meeting between myself, representing Saskatchewan, Mr. Patrick representing Alberta, and Mr. Carroll representing Manitoba, will be held with Mr. Basford on Monday next in the city of Winnipeg.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, may I say that I welcome the announcement and I'm glad that the enquiries from this side of the House have spurred the Attorney General into action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to that, the enquiries and activity commenced a long time ago, long before the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw's motion in this House.

QUESTIONS

SALE OF ESTEVAN BRICK LIMITED SHARES

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Government. I wonder if the Premier or some other appropriate

Minister could advise us whether or not there are, in progress or completed, negotiations for the sale of the shares of Estevan Brick Limited to some person other than a Government agency?

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — I may say that negotiations are under way. We hope that we may be able to make an announcement shortly although the final negotiations are not yet completed.

Mr. Blakeney: — I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister can advise whether or not a Mr. Ron Thatcher is part of the group which is purchasing or negotiating for the purchase of the plant?

Hon. Mr. Thatcher: — No, no.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, the Attorney General tabled one Return. I wonder if he could say when he's going to table the two Returns ordered last year and still not brought down?

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — My recollection, Mr. Speaker, is that it's not two. It's one and we're in the process of chasing that down. I was told there was only one left, but if there are two, I'll undertake to see that they are tabled very shortly.

MOTION FOR RETURN

RETURN NO. 71

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 71 showing:

The number of new persons placed on the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan in 1968 (a) through new applications; and (b) through transfers from the categorical plans.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments and then move an amendment. First of all, I certainly have no objections to providing the information that the Member has requested, but in asking and requesting for all applications, I don't know if he appreciates the fact that this would include transient aid, people that stop for a meal at the Salvation Army. We have all kinds of agents located in various towns and communities across the province. I'm sure that what he is really interested in, at least I anticipate that what he is interested in, is those new applicants that have been long-term clients of the Department

March 11, 1969

over the past year and, therefore, I would like to move the following amendment.

That all the words after “applications” in line two be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(a) of over three months duration and (b) through transfers from the categorical programs.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND SAFETY

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino) moved, seconded by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government the immediate implementation of recommendations submitted by the Special Legislative Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety on December 31, 1966.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this motion what I really had in mind was the recommendation that we made in 1966 when we were on the Special Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety and it reads as follows:

That the Standing Committee of the Legislature be initiated to continue the study of traffic problems. It is the opinion of the Committee that a continuing review of traffic safety is necessary to ensure progress in this area.

Now, I want to congratulate the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) for the progress that he has made in highway safety, but there is a lot more distance to go if you put it this way and I don't think that we should stop there. I think the Committee should be re-instated or re-formed to continue the study. We have problems that change from day to day. We have better cars and worse highways and this is part of the problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Of course when we look at the records and go back to 1960, we had 164 deaths on our highways. Now, I can also say that in 1961 I also brought in a Resolution on highway safety. It's been close to me and I'm always very concerned about it. If people want to read Hansard you go back to 1957 when the former Minister from Humboldt made quite an issue about the breathalyzer and it didn't help the situation any.

At the present time you have co-operation from both sides of the House. When you have a Committee working on a problem of this kind, it takes the politics right out of it. This is one of the reasons why I say we should continue with the Committee. But going back to the question that was placed on the Order Paper on traffic deaths last year, it showed that in 1960 we had 164. When we got to 1963 we had 200 deaths on the highway, but then from 1964 to 1967, we had an upsurge of 287, 87 more from 1964 to 1967. Then in '68 we had a drop to 269. We can say we started to pull the traffic deaths down. Perhaps we hit the alcohol question a little hard, but I say traffic safety is a combination of factors and I think it's got to be attacked on all fronts. The only way we can get this attacked properly is with the public and get to the Legislators. There is no better place than the Legislative Committee to deal with a situation of this kind.

I think research should continue. I have sat in the court rooms and watched proceedings when people were coming in to pay their fines. I don't know if it's much of a lesson. When the people walk out of the court room grinning, laughing sometimes and if they're guilty or not guilty, so much money. I don't know whether it's the best place to train our drivers. It may improve some of them but I think we could do a little better than that. There is also talk of research in the safety of farm machinery. I think the Safety Committee could work in that area also. You have such complaints as made by the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) about an intersection in the city where he decided to put up his own signs. Maybe he could have come to the Committee and had a little quicker reaction than he had from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

Nevertheless I don't approve of breaking the law but once in a while you know, sometimes it's the only way you can get your point across. It's a bad way but with the Highway Safety Committee, the man would not have had to perhaps break the law as you've said to get his point across. We would have got after the Minister of Highways to wake up and say, "Look here, Buster, get to work there."

Now, I think that another area that can be worked on is to have the local government have a highway safety committee on their council to promote highway safety or road safety in their towns and in their municipalities. That's another area that perhaps could be worked on. In order to throw the matter open for discussion, I'm not going to take too much time, I'll just mention different things in passing.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Government would like to have a few comments on this Resolution, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 — POSTAL RATES ON PERIODICALS

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood) moved, seconded by Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):

March 11, 1969

That this Assembly urges the Provincial Government to protest the action of the Federal Government in raising postal rates, in some cases by several hundred per cent, on newspapers and magazines sponsored by farm, co-operative, consumer and church organizations and similar groups, whose publications are non-profit and non-commercial in nature.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion under my name I do so because I believe it's a vital issue not only to the agricultural economy, not only to the Province of Saskatchewan, but to the well-being of the democratic process in Canada.

I believe that all Members of this House will agree with me that newspaper media are still the best and the most effective way of our citizens getting all sides of the question and then being able to judge the pros and the cons of that question. Certainly I will admit that the instant coverage of radio and TV does get the headlines of the news, but for all the details of the story most of us turn to the newspaper or to magazines.

When the Hon. Mr. Kierans, Postmaster General, dropped the bomb shell of postal rate increases on the Canadian public, his reason for so doing he said was to the effect that the post office was losing \$130 million and that the Government of Canada could no longer subsidize it. Mr. Kierans then went on to announce increases which in effect hit harder, newspapers, magazines, especially those non-commercial in nature sponsored by farm co-operatives, consumers, church, professional and other associations, than any other type of news materials. I can well imagine that they also hit the larger newspapers as well. In the October 12, 1968 edition of The Leader Post, a Canadian Press news item dated Montreal quoted some comments of Claude Ryan, editor of Le Devoir. I would like to quote from that article:

Claude Ryan publisher of Le Devoir said in an open letter to Postmaster General Eric Kierans that proposed changes in postal services will have grave consequences for journalism. Mr. Ryan said in a letter published in Le Devoir today that some of the proposals are excessive, disproportionate, insufficiently thought out, and liable to cause irreparable harm to the free circulation of ideas and information in the country.

The letter goes on to say,

All points indicate that you have not gotten to the root of the matter by imposing increases that will satisfy your monetary needs, but will give way to certain prejudices and injustice in some very important sectors of the population. For Le Devoir, the proposed increases will reach as high as 275 per cent of habitual expenses. This increase becomes particularly odious when millions of American publications will be distributed at no extra charge.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan did not mention another type of mail that is getting off lightly. This is a great pile, what I call "junk mail". Every day my mailbox is full of circulars, flyers, and sheets, all of which I immediately transfer from my mailbox to the junk pile in the post office lobby. More important to me, Mr. Speaker, is the effect that these postal increases have had and are having on many of these publications mentioned in the Resolution. I would like to put on the records of this House some of the problems facing these publications. The editor of the Western Producer wrote three editorials on this subject, and I would like to quote from them. The first one is of November 7th, and I now quote in part:

The case of the Western Producer is typical of the rest. The cost of bulk mailing will rise by about 230 per cent, from \$55,000 per year to \$183,000, assuming the same number of subscriptions and the same number of pages per issue. Basically the increase is from one and one half to five cents per pound bulk rate, with a minimum of two cents per copy. Some publications with fewer pages than the Western Producer claim that the per issue rate will face increases of the order of 800 to 900 per cent over a normal year's mailing costs in the past.

Then further on it says,

It is hardly necessary to remind our readers that a very considerable amount of the space in each of the Western Producers is given to material emanating from various Federal Government Departments. For the record, during the year ending July 31, 1968, the Western Producer carried the equivalent of 88 pages of material from sources such as the Canada Department of Agriculture, the Department of Trade and Commerce, Canadian Wheat Board, Board of Commissioners, Dominion Bureau of Statistics and others.

In the next editorial which came the following week, on November 14th, they discussed the debate in the House of Commons. I now quote, Mr. Speaker:

All the way through the debate the most distressing thing of all was the Postmaster's stubborn insistence that the lower rates on newspaper mailings had been a subsidy to the publishers. As we have said before we certainly refuse to accept the formula he is using to come up with an utterly fantastic claim about the amounts of that subsidy to various publishers. If there has been a subsidy, large or small, publishers have received no part of it. The beneficiary of low postal rates has been the readers who purchased subscriptions at minimum rates. It has long been established that one of the basic requirements of a democracy is an informed public. The principle is recognized by all democratic countries where governments charge minimal rates for postal services on newspapers and periodicals. It was and is particularly

March 11, 1969

important to the rural population without access to newsstands and home delivery. The Post Office has never subsidized newspapers, it has subsidized subscribers and their rights to information. In this sense it has performed a vital public service as essential as any other services it will continue to subsidize.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Western Producer, one more quotation from the following week, November 21st, and I now quote:

The more one contemplates the new second-class postage rate, the more confusing they become. The provision for a minimum charge of two cents per copy is particularly baffling and obviously unfair, since it hits smaller periodicals in a most vicious blow; increases in some cases will be as high as 900 per cent.

Further on it says,

We've said the same thing before; Mr. Kierans' estimate of the cost of handling publications such as the Western Producer and the Co-operative Consumer and the scores of others affected in the same way is obviously ridiculous. He has not as yet revealed the formula by which he and his staff reached conclusions that make no sense at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand the March-April copy of the Homemaker's Digest. I want to just put on record their plea for help in this regard. On the second page, they say this:

We need your help, the Post Office has more than tripled the cost of mailing each issue of Homemaker's Digest to your house. A serious blow to our budget. We believe this is completely unjust where they have not applied as steep an increase to other publications, including US-owned Time and Reader's Digest, whose new rates are less than half of ours. We have asked the Post Office for equal postage rates as other magazines, but just because we send ours free to you, they say that we do not fit into their definition of a magazine. If you agree that this seems totally unfair, and that your magazine deserves at least the same treatment as other publications, we ask you to write the Cabinet Minister responsible for this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, the new postal rates have already closed the doors of some publications. I have here in my hand an ad in the Western Canada Livestock Industry, placed there by Bradley Publication, publishers of the Westerner. I now want to quote:

An unrealistic ruling which leaves the Westerner insufficient time to raise its subscription price in order to meet increased postage rates has prompted a decision to cease the publication following this issue. The new

postage rates represent for the Westerner an average increase of 1989.3 per cent per year. Most of our subscribers are members of one or more of eight livestock associations which have over the years appointed the Westerner to serve as their official publication. These association subscriptions date from January 1st and continue in force for 12 months. An increase in the cost of subscriptions to the association requires the attention of an annual meeting. The largest association we represent holds its annual meeting in June. Five others have theirs in December, and the remaining two in January. The new postal rates come into effect on April 1, 1969.

Then they go on to say that it is impossible for them to publish any further. Let us look at the percentage increase on several other periodicals. First of all, the Credit Union Way is up 2,000 per cent. The Union Farmer up 3,100 per cent. Free Press Prairie Weekly goes from \$2,700 a week to \$11,000. The Teachers' Federation Bulletin goes up by 900 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the Rural Municipal Councillor, the official publication of the SARM. I want to quote from a letter from the SARM, signed by Mr. Lorne Wilkinson, addressed to the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau and to all Saskatchewan MPs, I am not going to quote all of it, but I will read three pertinent paragraphs:

This Association is endeavoring to provide a service primarily to the rural municipal councillors of Saskatchewan, but in addition to the whole process of government in this country. Our publication carries timely and topical articles on matters of municipal and provincial and national concern to our readers. Because we want a first class publication that gives the impression of care and pride in our work, we use a good grade of paper and recently have taken deliberate steps to reduce advertising content to provide a better balanced magazine.

Our Association membership is made up of 294 rural municipalities each with an average of a reeve and six councillors and a secretary. Three years ago, when we commenced publication we doubled the membership fee on the understanding that \$16 would include a subscription of \$2 for each. Such subscriptions to be mailed to the subscribers home address. In this way we have a basic subscription list of about 2,330. In addition to this basic subscription list, we have about 500 subscribers at the rate of \$2 per subscription. All MLAs and Senators from Saskatchewan receive a complimentary copy of our publication as a public service.

Further on he says,

Until now our mailing costs for 3,000 copies have run about \$16-\$17 per month, which we will admit are low, and

March 11, 1969

some upward revision in rates would be reasonable. The shocking blow however contained in the recent advice from the postal board means that our mailing costs on our 36-page edition would be eight cents per copy or \$240 per issue. Our Christmas edition which ran 44 pages would have cost eleven cents per copy to a total of \$330 per issue. For our average 36-page edition, ten issues per year we previously paid \$170. Now we are required to pay \$2,400, or an increase of \$2,230 per year. This is a staggering increase for a small subscription such as ours. Postal rates for our type of publication have gone from the sublime to the ridiculous.

He goes on and asks for a re-consideration.

Let us consider the answer that SARM got from the postal authorities, from Mr. S. Pajot, Director of Postal Rates:

This refers to your application for registration of your publication, The Rural Councillor, voice of the SARM, as second-class mail matter. A review has been made of your application and of the copy of publication which indicates that Rural Councillor is being published by or under the auspices of the association. Under the terms of Section 11(1)(i) of The Post Office Act, as amended by Chapter 5 of the Statutes of Canada 1968, a publication which is published by or under the auspices of an association may not be transmitted by mail as a second-class rate of postage. Consequently, it is with regret that we inform you that second-class mailing privileges may not be granted for your publication.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of the Federal Government is callous, it is discriminatory and it's anti-Canadian. Now I ask why anti-Canadian? Let us look at Maclean's Magazine, really the only true national magazine in Canada. It is in trouble too. I want to quote from the Sheaf of February 11, 1969. The headline is, "Maclean's is dying." They point out here, although the magazine's recent change in size superficially looked like an idea that changes style and sparks up its image, but in actuality the size change is a sign of impending death. The change in size is supposed to reduce printing costs and it probably hides a decrease in content, but the real malaise that is affecting Maclean's is the lack of advertising revenue, the backbone of a national magazine. Maclean's is in competition with Reader's Digest, especially with Time Magazine for the advertising revenue in Canada. Time with 800,000 subscribers in Canada in the Canadian edition is only charging \$2,700 a page for advertising to cover printing costs and its minimal Canadian staff. Its subscription campaign is phenomenal as witnessed by the inserted card every time a book is bought at our book store. Maclean's is truly a Canadian operation with 700,000 subscribers. To stay in business it is necessary for them to charge \$4,600 a page. Later on it says:

A 1969 Royal Commission headed by Senator Gratten O'Leary recommended that Canadian corporations be prevented from deducting as business expenses the cost of advertising in non-Canadian publications where such advertising was directed at the Canadian market. But in 1966 when most of O'Leary's proposals were made law, Time and Reader's Digest were made exceptions. Observers at that time felt the decision came as a result of direct pressure from the American government. Senator O'Leary condemned the exceptions and warned that they would cause dire repercussion.

I might point out that Maclean's has had an increase of 136 per cent, but Time Magazine has had an increase of only 59 per cent. Here I detect either anti-Canadian or pro-American bias. The great lobby of 1966 by American interests won out again. Once again our Dominion Government bowed to the wishes of American interests, once again, Canadians get the dirty end of the stick.

But, Mr. Speaker, I detect something else in the actions of Mr. Kierans and the Liberal Government in Ottawa. The actions also smack at being anti-farm, anti-co-op, anti-labor. Here we have new postal rates from which organizations suffer most: farm papers, such as the Western Producer, the Free Press Prairie Farmer, the Stockmen, the Farm Union paper, labor publications, the Co-op Consumer and so on. All these publications supply people with necessary information. All are really non-commercial and feel the axe swing by a ruthless money-made government dominated by American corporate enterprises.

I submit that Claude Ryan is right when he states that the proposals are excessive, disproportionate, insufficiently thought out, and liable to cause irreparable harm to the free circulation of ideas and information in the country. I would like to quote from a resolution passed by the Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Credit Union League, and the Co-op Credit Society on January 24 last and sent to Prime Minister Trudeau and the Hon. Mr. Kierans. It said this and I quote:

Whereas Canadians and Canadian society value and constantly work for the ideal of democracy and whereas democracy employs many informed people, capable and willing to participate in decision-making of all levels, and whereas recent postal rate increases have killed some publications, which provide people with information and will stop more, and whereas these postal rates affect mainly publications of the credit unions, co-op, fraternal organizations, churches and trade unions, which do much to keep the fence of democracy mended, therefore, be it resolved that the Government of Canada should seriously re-consider the recent action in acutely increasing postal rates as it diversely affects publications mentioned above.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this Resolution spelled out the situation very clearly. I want to suggest that the situation is serious. I believe that it would be for the betterment of

March 11, 1969

Saskatchewan and Canada if this Resolution were passed unanimously and presented to the Government in Ottawa. I believe that injustice has been done. I ask all Members to support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, one of the really big boosts in the ever rising costs of living, be it business, social, religious, education, recreation, is this savage boost in postal rates in one fell swoop. Only a millionaire, I think, bent upon stamping his dollar sign upon a totally different area than that in which he had operated up to the present, namely, the Montreal Stock Exchange, could be so ruthless. My colleague from Touchwood has outlined the case for representation to the Federal Government on this matter very well. I am not going to deal at length with it, Mr. Speaker, but if you will bear with me, I want to quote extensively from the Co-op Consumer of November 12th, 1968, in its column, "It's your business." My first quote is merely covering first class mail.

On November 1st, the cost of posting a letter rose to six cents, whether the letter is going across the city or across the country. That is a 20 per cent increase for out of town mail and a 50 per cent boost for local letters.

I am sure that I don't have to remind anyone who sent out Christmas mail regarding this. As I said a moment ago, that covers first class mail. Some of it up 20 per cent, and some of it up a 50 per cent increase.

Now let us look at third class mail. Again let me quote from the Consumer.

On the same day rates for third class mail went up by equally large amounts. Third class mail includes circulars, bulletins and post cards and advertising material. The basic rate on addressed material of this type went up from two cents to three, and on addressed material from three cents to five. Clubs and churches and other such organizations are going to find the cost of mailing their bulletins and meeting notices and newsletters has gone up by five cents, more than first class letter rate has been. That will also be the rate for Christmas cards this year.

I am quoting from 1968 as I pointed out.

Let me continue with my quotation from the Co-op Consumer covering another class of mail. As I pointed out, clubs, churches and so on were going to find this very difficult. I want to turn now to the second-class mail. Again I wish to quote:

Starting April 1st next, second-class rates will begin an even greater rise. These are the rates that apply to newspapers and periodicals and any newsletter and bulletins published for members by clubs and trade unions, co-operatives and credit unions, now qualifying for second-class rates, but they will be excluded under the amended Post Office Act.

I wish to draw to the attention of the House that from now on they are excluded from the rates under which they were formerly mailed.

Between April 1st 1969 and April 1st 1970, they will rise to five cents a pound, but with a minimum charge of two cents to mail any newspaper or periodical.

This, Mr. Speaker, in total, amounts to a tremendous boost. What is it going to do rather to periodicals? Again, I am going to quote:

Almost without exception, the mailing costs of Canadian periodicals will increase by a minimum of 300 per cent. In many cases, the increase will be much more than that. For the Co-operative Consumer our total annual mailing cost will increase by more than nine times. Our cost for mailing papers delivered outside Saskatoon will increase 16 times.

Quoting further:

There is no doubt that many periodicals will be unable to stand such great cost increases and they will have to cease publication. It may also mean the end of some weekly newspapers. There is no doubt also that publications which stay in business will have to raise subscription rates and possibly advertising rates to get money for higher postage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us turn to what some of these periodicals have to say about their own position. I first want to quote the Co-op Consumer's own position in regard to these new rates.

The Co-operative Consumer is one of the many publications protesting the severe increase, but we did not object to an increase, because our postage is obviously too low for the service provided by the Post Office, but we did argue that a 900 per cent increase all at once is both unfair and unreasonable. Postmaster General Kierans was hardly sympathetic. He saw no great problem for us at all. He suggested that all we had to do was to increase our 35 cent group subscription to 83 cents to cover the two cents a copy postage.

The Postmaster General claims that the cost to the Post Office last year for handling the Co-op Consumer was more than \$280,000, while we actually paid less than

March 11, 1969

\$11,000. He seemed to think we would be embarrassed if this information was made public. We are not embarrassed for two reasons, first, because we have paid the rate charged by the Post Office and second, because we don't accept these figures.

Mr. Speaker, that is the position in which the Co-op Consumer finds itself.

I wish to turn now to a quotation from the United Church Observer. And I quote:

An important message to our readers.

This is December 15, 1968.

The new second-class postal rates imposed by Parliament this fall put a heavy burden on all Canadian magazines including The Observer. Under the new rates The Observer postage bill is going up 500 per cent, from \$30,000 per year to \$145,200 per year. Out of every \$2 the subscriber pays on a family plan, 44 cents. The Postmaster General Eric Kierans asked for the new rates and other postage increases on the grounds that the Post Office must pay its own way. Church periodicals and other magazines argued unsuccessfully but other forms of communication in Canada, such as televisions and films are subsidized for the common good and the part of the reason for the Post Office deficit is that it must deliver large numbers of American magazines which do not pay any Canadian postage. As a result of the large increase some small church magazines have already announced that they will stop publications. Most large magazines plan to increase subscriptions.

The United Church, Mr. Speaker, is not alone. I have here a quotation from the Canadian Churchmen which is an Anglican Church paper.

Tough postal rates faced with an estimated \$95 million deficit in the Post Office operations this year, Postmaster General Eric Kierans has announced plans to increase rates. Second-class mailing which accounts for nearly half the annual deficit will be raised. The Canadian Churchmen is one of the thousands of Canadian publications mailed under second-class privileges. If the rates are raised substantially, as Mr. Kierans has indicated, the paper and its diocese and companions along with many others will be affected. There are two aspects of this situation. First, the Canadian Government has always held the principle of subsidizing the mailing of the press in general because of its importance to our national life. Canadian newspapers and magazines are under heavy economic pressure called by competition from the United States publications which have a strong appeal to Canadians. Thus countless American publications are

handled by the Canadian Post Office which does not receive any revenue for this service since the postage has already been paid in the United States. Under a universal postal convention, all signatory governments are required to handle free whatever is passed to them by foreign post offices.

Second, the Government has long recognized the role of the church press as an important educational medium in Canada, operating for the common good, Religious publications have enjoyed a preferential rate of ¼ cent per pound below that of general magazines along with publications devoted to the sciences of agriculture. The church press represents . . . not an economic investment. All the publications belonging to the Canadian church press and ecumenical press association, to which Canadian churchmen belong, have stated that religious publications operate on the narrowest of financial margins.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I will just quote some figures from the Free Press which finds that increased rates are going to cost from around \$2,700 to \$11,000. The Western Producer finds that their postage is going to go up somewhere from \$90,000 to \$100,000 more than it has been. This, Mr. Speaker, is the picture that we find right across the country regarding publications of various kinds that they have been taken out of one postage rate and placed in another and drastic increases have been levied against them. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this House to your right are just as aware of this situation and just as concerned about it as many to your left, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that they will give this motion full support. I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of entering into any debate as to the value to Canada of the publications that have been spoken of by the mover and seconder of this Resolution. They certainly do make a great contribution to the life of the Canadian people. However, I also have a very definite feeling that things that are worthwhile are usually worthwhile paying for; the example of Time magazine, which I can well remember costing me less than 25 cents, now costs me 50 cents. I believe that that magazine is worthwhile buying otherwise I wouldn't buy it. I don't think that our Canadian postal rates are necessarily there to subsidize magazines and periodicals remaining at the same subscription price which they had many years ago. I really don't feel too happy about asking the Canadian public to subsidize the cost of my sending out Christmas cards. This is just one of the things that comes out of a discussion such as this and I think we have to look at all these in the light of changing times. For the past few months, I have been very interested in observing the actions of a man who I think is a very

March 11, 1969

intelligent and a very demanding Federal Minister of the Crown. He is attempting to solve the problems of providing modern postal services for our modern times. Many of our postal rates and the patterns of services which have grown up over the past few years have had really very little reference to a sound pattern, either in an administrative pattern or an economic procedure. Certainly there is good reason for the Postmaster General to examine the subsidies which have wittingly or unwittingly been provided to certain users of postal service. I certainly do not believe that this Legislature should attempt to stand in the way of a thorough overhaul of this Federal agency. I therefore propose the following amendment, seconded by the Hon. Member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell):

That all the words after the words "Provincial Government" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

to congratulate the Postmaster General of Canada for his efforts to put the operations of the Post Office on a sound financial basis, while at the same time, urging him to study the effect of postal rates and the service provided by rural post offices on newspapers and magazines sponsored by farm and church organizations and similar groups whose publications are non-profit and non-commercial in nature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding this amendment, but I would like to say a few words that I think are quite important to rural people in their mail deliveries. I think something that is much more important to rural dwellers than the cost of magazines is the right to be able to go to a post office and get mail. Now in this last year or so we've had, I think, throughout the province and certainly in my area some closures of small post offices, suggesting that these people can drive 10 to 12 miles to pick their mail up. I know, for instance, and I just cite an example, of one that was closed this fall on a paved highway. There was no extra expense for the post office to deliver the mail to it but it necessitated these people driving 10 and 12 miles further to pick up their mail. At the same time we boast for instance in the rural areas around Regina, and I assume they are the same in Saskatoon, we boast of rural mail and deliveries to the mail box. This is very fine and it's real handy for people to be able to just go out to the end of the lane and pick up their mail, but I think we certainly should give some consideration to our ratepayers and citizens who live in the rural areas. I would certainly urge this Government to bring pressure to bear on our Federal Government to give a lot more consideration to these post offices that they are considering closing and probably to re-open some that they already have closed. I think it is very important to our rural people to have the opportunity to drive for their mail, four, five or six miles and not have to go 15, when for

some people all they have to do is go out to the end of their lane to pick it up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I'm rather amused by the Resolution brought in by the Member for Touchwood . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I'm just wondering what is the motive of this Resolution? Here two Members from the Opposition speaking on the Resolution hid behind the smoke screen of this Co-op Consumer, for United Church Observer and many other publications. I say it is a smoke screen, but a smoke screen for what? Take note, Mr. Speaker, of The Commonwealth of March 5, 1969, that's what they are fighting for, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — That's what they are fighting for. They aren't concerned with the other publications.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: —

The Commonwealth is in a fight and you can help. The Trudeau Government's new postal charges are destroying many small publications, but The Commonwealth is going to carry on and fight back.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — I'm just wondering how inconsistent my Socialist friends can be. They talk with forked tongues as I have often said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — They cannot stand by their basic principles because they have no principles. I've heard of Resolutions in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and in Ottawa, and I'll quote from Hansard, February 17, 1966, and everybody will know this man's name, Max Saltsman, who is he? Everybody knows Stanley Knowles. Who is he? A Socialist. Everybody knows Mr. Regier, he's the unfortunate fellow who gave his place up to Tommy so that Tommy could get elected and get knocked out later on. But, however, what did these famous Socialists say? They say one thing in

March 11, 1969

this House today but they say another thing in Ottawa. And just for the records, Mr. Speaker. I could read the whole thing but if you don't mind I'll read out of context but if you want me to read all of what Max Saltsman said, I'll say it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Go ahead, read the whole thing.

Mr. Coderre: — All right, I think it is best because it is rather short and interesting.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Read the whole thing.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Saltsman, NDP MP for Waterloo South, that's the one . . . I don't know who speaks with a forked tongue, whether it's Saltsman or Meakes or the other fellow, I don't know. But Saltsman said:

Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the Postmaster General and the question resulted from a recommendation made in the report of the Auditor General to the House of Commons in which he said: 'That early consideration should be given to ways and means of covering the loss sustained by the Post Office Department in handling second-class mail. I think this is a matter of considerable urgency since it is not the first time that the Auditor General has made this request to the Postmaster General.'

Now Max Saltsman is really pushing for this now.

In his report last year on page 704 he pointed out the loss sustained of \$35 million as a result of handling a second-class mail by the Post Office Department. This sad history of losses in connection with second-class mail goes back for a long time. I think it is time to plug this leak of the taxpayer's dollar. I think it is time to raise second-class postage rates in the country to overcome the deficits of the Post Office.

Then he asked who benefits by these? Then he goes on to say:

I do not believe by any stretch of the imagination that we could consider these people really need the taxpayer's help.

An Hon. Member: — Who is that? The Commonwealth?

Mr. Coderre: — No, that's Max Saltsman carrying on.

I feel that the fellow who is working in this shop might have just cause to feel somewhat miffed when he knows that some of his hard-earned money is going in that particular direction.

There you are, our Socialist friend speaking with forked tongue as usual.

I just thought, Mr. Speaker, that this should be brought into the records and much more could be said about it. But there is so much inconsistency in the position that these Socialists have taken whether in Ottawa or elsewhere. They do not try to be honest to their own philosophy. If they are going to be honest, let's say so but not go contrary to the basic philosophy of their own party. They speak with forked tongues. It's evident, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the amendment but I won't support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want now to add just a very few words to the discussion which up until a few minutes ago was rather meaningful. I'm afraid I can't say that it continued to be meaningful during the course in which the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) was on his feet. But he did ask one question and that question was to the effect of why Members of the Opposition have raised this matter in the Legislature. There is a simple and very direct reason for that. Mr. Speaker, I had a letter from the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. To this letter he attached a copy of his protest, the protest of that organization to the Federal Minister. He attached also the copy of the reply which they got. The Secretary of the SARM in his letter to me said, "If there is any way in which you can help getting this matter reconsidered, please do so." And as a result this motion is on the Order Paper now, as a result of that letter. I feel reasonably certain, Mr. Speaker, that the Government got the same kind of a letter from the Secretary of the SARM, and I was reasonably convinced that the Government would do nothing about it. Consequently Members on this side of the House have taken the initiative in raising this matter before the House. They have taken the initiative in asking this House to request the Federal Government to do something about a problem that is of great importance to farm people and many other people throughout Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, there is no concern on the part of Members of this House for the commercial-type mail to which Mr. Saltsman was referring. Certainly nobody who spoke about it on this side of the House referred to that type of mail. As a matter of fact the Members who from over here spoke on it definitely excluded this from their consideration. The Member from

March 11, 1969

Touchwood in particular referred to the great mass of this commercial, unsolicited and unwanted stuff that comes through our mail boxes every day and said specifically, "This kind of material ought to be paying more." But this kind of material contributes nothing to the flow and the distribution of information and ideas. It is those periodicals which perform a service to their members and to the country at large that we are concerned with. Let's face the facts. Some of them have gone out of business, others are going to go out of business unless something is done about that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — That's the reason why, in spite of the meanderings of the Minister of Labour who took his seat, this Resolution is on the books before us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn very briefly to the amendment which has been offered. There is nothing particularly objectionable about the amendment I suppose. It says, "We congratulate the Postmaster General for his efforts to put the operations of the Post Office on a sound financial basis." Well and good. We all over here enjoy apple pie too and we respect motherhood also. And so we can certainly support a statement, already considered I'm sure by the MLAs in the House, to congratulate the Postmaster General for his efforts to put the operations of the Post Office on a sound financial basis. We do not congratulate him, let that be known very solidly, for his efforts which are going to put a lot of very valuable publications out of business, efforts which are going to result in a decrease of dialogue — to use a favorite term of the Prime Minister's, efforts which are going to result in a lessening in the amount of important information available to people all across the country on which to plan their operations and around which to develop their ideas.

The second part of the amendment urges him to study the effect of postal rates and the service provided by rural post offices on newspapers, magazines sponsored by farm and church organizations and similar groups whose publications are non-profit and non-commercial in nature. And in substance of course that is what the original Resolution offered. We did not include the reference to service of the rural post offices. The Member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) has done us a service by including that. The difference is of course that the original Resolution was much more direct, it was much more emphatic. The original Resolution would have reflected much better the mood of the people in Saskatchewan. It would have reflected much better the needs of farm publications and co-op publications and trade union publications and municipal publications than does this watered-down somewhat anemic version which has been offered in the amendment. However since the Government has offered the amendment it is undoubted that the Government Members are going to proceed to support it. There is no problem

about us in supporting it over on this side. I regret that the Liberals or the Government Members have seen fit to so water down this protest. As a result again they suggest to the Federal Government that the problem is less than it actually is. I would rather have had a Resolution with some guts and gusto to it, such as the original one had than this watered-down version.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to speak on this Resolution until I listened to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he said he had requests from the different organizations and a request from the Secretary of the SARM to bring this matter to the attention of the Federal authorities. Now I can indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that something has been done by the Government in this regard. Last week the Weekly Newspaper Association, especially those who print farm periodicals in this province, expressed their concern to me and indicated there was going to be a meeting between the Postmaster General, the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and asked if, even though the Resolution was on the Order Paper in this Legislature, asked if I would bring this matter to the attention of the Federal Minister of Agriculture, insofar as it referred to farm periodicals, because Departments of Agriculture all across Canada owe a great deal to these various weekly publications that carry the story of agricultural developments, agricultural plans, agricultural policies and the whole agricultural situation by means of extension to the farm readers not serviced by the daily newspapers in their respective provinces. So last week I sent a telegram on behalf of the farm periodicals in Saskatchewan drawing to the attention of the Federal Minister of Agriculture the service that had been rendered in the past and the hope that he would intervene with the Postmaster General and see if something could be done to alleviate the situation. Having received the telegram in Ottawa, I was very pleased last night to receive a telegram in return from the Federal Minister of Agriculture, saying that he had met with the Postmaster General, with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and that a higher degree of understanding had been reached by all groups concerned. So to say that you must wait until you bring a Resolution in front of the Legislature to take action on these different matters, I would want to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that on different occasions he says he takes credit for telegrams he has sent to Ottawa. But we haven't waited, because time was of the essence that something already has been done and I hope it will bear results. I will support the amendment and not the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a word or two because I think that some Members may not be fully aware of just the changes which are proposed or which are about to be implemented.

March 11, 1969

I heard the remarks of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and it seemed to me rather odd that he would seek to justify what changes had been made in the Act by the comments which were made in the House of Commons by Mr. Saltsman, Mr. Knowles or others. I think they were in fact calling for increases in the second-class mail rates. I am not aware of anyone who opposes increases in the second-class mail rates, fairly substantial increases, increases perhaps of 100 per cent. What I am objecting to is the rather remarkable pattern of application of the new rates. I wonder if Members opposite are aware of the fact that, let us say, the Co-operative Consumer — you may know that small publication — will now cost at least twice as much to mail through the mail as The Leader Post. I wonder if you are aware of the fact that, because of the application of these rates, Time Magazine will suffer an increase of less than 100 per cent whereas the Co-op Consumer's rates will go up at least 1,200 per cent, less than 100 per cent for Time and 1,200 per cent for the Co-op Consumer. And this is defended by the Minister of Co-ops. The same thing will happen with respect to a trade union paper. The cost of sending out a trade union paper will go up roughly from ½ cent or maybe 1/3 of a cent to roughly 4 cents. So this is defended by the Minister of Labour. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister of Labour believes that The Leader Post should be able to be circulated — I've got nothing against the Leader Post — at ½ the price of the Lakeview United Church bulletin or of the Sacred Heart Parish Church bulletin. This is defended by the Minister of Labour. It seems to me to be quite remarkable that a decision would be made to exclude from the second-class mailing privileges a whole series of publications put out by groups as diverse as the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, and the Canadian Congress of Labour. But whether it's put out by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce or the Canadian Congress of Labour, it strikes me that it is performing a useful public service. These publications ought not to go free, they ought not to go at below cost, but if the cost of sending The Leader Post is two cents, surely the cost of sending those periodicals is two cents. And if in fact the cost of sending those periodicals is four cents, let's charge The Leader Post or Time Magazine or similar publications four cents. I think there can be no justification for applying the sharp differential in rates which is applied by the new law. I find it absolutely remarkable that the Minister of Labour would stand in his place and defend them.

Mr. Coderre: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not defend. All I said is that the Opposition are speaking with forked tongues.

Mr. Blakeney: — I misinterpreted the Minister of Labour. I thought he was saying that he would vote against the Resolution as it was, I took that to be his meaning. I took that from his remarks from which I assumed that he is in favor of the changes made. The burden of his remarks was that I ought to be in favor of

them because Mr. Saltsman and Mr. Knowles were in favor of them, and this conclusion he drew from quoting Hansard. My comment on his argument is that his conclusion from the comments in Hansard is in error. Therefore, his conclusion as to what my position should be is in error. And I suggest to him that his position is in error. I suspect that some Members opposite may not have followed that explanation but it is perhaps not too important.

The particular point I wanted to make was that the new rules exclude from second-class mailing privileges a very wide range of publications put out by church groups, trade associations such as the Retail Merchants Association, Co-operatives, trade unions, stockmen's association. I am pleased to know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) has lodged a protest or at least a request for reconsideration on the part of the agricultural groups, but I would suggest that some of the other groups have the same right to consideration as the agricultural groups, not all of them, but some of them. I would suggest, therefore, that what has happened is that an effort has been made to balance the books, as you might say, out of the non-profit organizations. I regret this because it seems to me that all types of publications using the mails ought to bear their fair share of costs. I think that The Leader Post ought not to be overcharged, nor ought it to be undercharged, and I say the same with respect to the Sacred Heart Parish bulletin or the Wakaw Recorder or the Co-op Consumer, if I may select a few examples of different types of publications. I, therefore, think, Mr. Speaker, that the original Resolution was preferable to the amendment. I will oppose the amendment. If in fact the amendment passes I will support the motion as amended.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Also, Mr. Speaker, may I get a ruling, if I can speak to the things that the Hon. Member said while he moved the amendment and the speakers who have spoken since.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Touchwood is now speaking to the amendment and while speaking to the amendment he can answer the arguments of those who moved whatever they were.

Mr. Meakes: — I don't want to be on the outs with you, I don't mind being on the outs across there, but I like to keep in the good graces of Mr. Speaker.

I am only going to speak for a minute or two and mention a few of the things that were said by Members opposite. I first refer to the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth). He got up and completely ignored the points that I had mentioned about the special treatment that Time Magazine and Reader's Digest were getting. I think this was one of the important points that I was endeavoring to point out. I then

March 11, 1969

turn to the Hon. Member from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell), and I certainly want to agree with him. I am glad that he inserted those words about rural post offices. I know that it is going on in my own constituency, some of them being closed out and I don't think it is right. I think that it is a very good item that he brought into it. I then come to the Minister of Co-operatives and Labour (Mr. Coderre), I think he really showed that he really didn't know what he was talking about. He accused us of hiding behind the smoke screen. He accused us of the only thing we are worrying about was The Commonwealth. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote word for word what Mr. Wilkinson, Secretary-Manager of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities said in a letter to my Leader:

We cannot help but wonder what kind of consideration is given to such pieces of legislation before they are enacted. One cannot help but question the motives behind the legislation, such as this, that makes economically possible only the large publications with lucrative advertising revenues to operate. This is a very serious matter, one with which we believe everyone should be concerned. Please use every means at your disposal to have this matter raised again and to correct this obvious error in judgment.

So I want to point out to my hon. friends and the Minister of Labour that, even though we are politicians, over here we do think of other things besides our own political party paper. And certainly if you go about in recent months, picking up whatever magazine or publication that comes into your hand, you will read of the lamentations on the terrible increase in postage, the fact that subscribers are going to have to be paying much more, sometimes two or three times as much. This, Mr. Speaker, is the reason that I agreed to move this motion.

I also want to agree that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), I am glad that he moved in asking for reconsideration for agricultural publications. I think this is good, but I do also suggest that there are other magazines, other newspapers which should have the same consideration as the agricultural publications. Before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the amendment because I believe it weakens down our motion. I think that we should be protesting rather than asking consideration. If the amendment does carry I will be supporting the motion as amended.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to

RESOLUTION NO. 11 — ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION TO EXAMINE HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East) moved, seconded by Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government the establishment of a Commission to examine health programs in Saskatchewan and elsewhere, with a view to determining:

- (a) the cost of such programs and the various methods of financing them;
- (b) the number, ages and economic status of persons who are deterred by utilization fees from seeking health services;
- (c) methods of organizing health services which will control costs without placing obstacles in the way of obtaining needed services, and at the same time make possible an improvement in the quality of health services.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in opening debate on this Resolution may I say that we in the New Democratic party have a very sincere and genuine concern about the rising cost of public health services. At the same time, I want also to say that we are equally concerned about the rising cost of health services, which at the present time are not publicly financed and administered, such as the cost of drug care, the cost of dental care and all those other health services our citizens need and have to pay for directly. Mr. Speaker, Members of our caucus have considered these problems on many occasions. We admit there is no easy solution. We also differ very strongly with the Government's methods of controlling health costs. We abhor the introduction of deterrent fees as a means to control rising costs, simply because deterrent fees do exactly that. They deter low income earners from seeking health services when they need them. They are a barrier between the person needing the health care and the service itself. We object to deterrent fees for another reason. They are a regressive tax, they place the burden of health care costs unfairly on those using the service, rather than on the population as a whole, based on ability to pay. They eliminate the pooling of risk.

Our position is that health programs should be principally financed from Federal grants and from Provincial Consolidated Revenues.

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of the Hospital Services Plan was established in 1947, we had a flat premium when the plan was introduced. This principle was retained when the Medical Care Plan came into being. Premiums are relatively simple to collect; they provide a fairly large amount of revenue, and it is even argued by some that the payment of a direct premium has a psychological effect of making the contributor feel he is participating and that he has a direct stake in the program. This is a very debatable point. My argument is that a flat premium removes equity, it has no relationship to ability to pay. A premium of \$72 a year for example represents two per cent of income to a person earning \$3,600 a year; one per cent where the income is \$7,200 a year, and only ½ per cent

March 11, 1969

where the income is \$14,400 a year. Therefore, premiums have a built-in regressive aspect to them.

Combining flat premiums and deterrent fees results in a double-barrelled hardship on low-income earners. Hospital premiums and Medical Care premiums in Saskatchewan have never gone beyond \$72 a year for a family or \$36 a year for an individual. When this Administration took over the reigns of government, premiums were \$52 a year, or \$1 a week for a family and \$26 a year, or 50 cents a week for an individual. As a result of the introduction of deterrent fees last year, the direct charges to a majority of people were considerably increased. The Government has announced its intention to limit the deterrent fees to \$180 a year for a family. No limit has been mentioned so far as I can recall for an individual.

Let us take a family who pays over \$180 in hospital and medical care deterrents. They will be reimbursed as I understand for the amount over the \$180 figure. But the direct cost for the two services, medical and hospital care, will be the \$180 deterrent charge and the \$72 premium charge, for a total of \$252 for a family in that year, or almost \$5 a week. This is excluding other taxes that people have to pay to help finance the health services. Mr. Speaker, less than five years ago it was only \$1 a week and this was before the national medicare came into being. Mr. Speaker, I notice the budgetary estimate provides that Saskatchewan will receive close to \$19 million in the current fiscal year from Ottawa for the payment of medicare. This \$19 million does not come to Saskatchewan in the form of gratis. Saskatchewan citizens will pay that amount plus, in the form of the two per cent social development tax. As a result of a ceiling of \$180 a year, this tax again falls most heavily on the low-income group.

Mr. Speaker, during the last month the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has repeated several times that he feels hospitalization and medical care premiums in Saskatchewan are too low. The Minister argues that originally premiums represented 58 per cent of hospital care costs; now premiums represent 17 per cent of the hospital and medical care costs.

Taking this argument, Mr. Speaker, in isolation, this may be correct. However, he should not overlook the fact that other direct taxes were increased or imposed to specifically help finance hospital and medical care. These include deterrent fees, the Federal social development tax, increases in sales taxes and others, Mr. Speaker, perhaps one thing the Government and the Opposition Members can agree on. For every argument presented by the Government we can present equally as strong a counter argument and perhaps vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, last year we pressed the Government to produce evidence of alleged hospital and medical care abuses but no facts were revealed. We now ask again how much money the people of Saskatchewan paid in deterrent charges and who are the people

who are hurt economically by these charges, and because of this, how many do not seek needed health service. Mr. Speaker, I want to now refer to the report of the Medical Care Insurance Commission which was tabled with us yesterday. I ask the Members to refer firstly to page 40. If you analyze page 40, the number of services per 1,000 beneficiaries, if you make a calculation of the various services, office visits, complete examinations is 409 per 1,000; regional and minor examinations 1,554; the home and emergency services; the diagnostic services; the refractions by physicians and services by optometrists, it appears to me that the amount the people of Saskatchewan paid in deterrent fees is somewhere between \$3½ and \$4 million. Mr. Speaker, the Minister yesterday commenting in the news media said that the total payment was only increased, last year, by two per cent. The one thing that the Minister deliberately ignored mentioning is this \$3½ to \$4 million the people of Saskatchewan have paid directly in deterrent charges. This figure he excluded. Let us take that amount together with the total paid by the public purse of \$26.8 million, and we will find that last year the cost of health services, as provide under the Medical Care Insurance Commission or those benefits that are included under the plan, increased by about 14 per cent, not two per cent as the Minister quoted. Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to analyze why these costs increased so sharply. Someone has just mentioned this was the worst increase to the public and the individuals since the Medical Care Plan was introduced.

Well, Sir, in analyzing the report, I am sorry that time has not permitted to make as comprehensive a study as I would like to, because the report was only tabled yesterday afternoon. You are aware we sat last evening, and I had a Public Accounts Committee meeting this morning. But let us take a look at page 13, and what do we find? That effective July 1, 1968, war veterans, for whom premiums have been paid by the Federal Government have been added to the plan, effective July 1, 1968. Indians on whose behalf the Federal Government paid premiums have also been added to the plan. The number of beneficiaries has increased by .4 per cent. The administration costs increased by over \$207,000, this is reported on page 33, Mr. Speaker. You will note the tremendous increase of \$207,000 in administration costs. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this in the main was as a result of the introduction of deterrent fees. We warned the Government last year that this would be the consequence when the deterrent fees came into being, that the administration costs would rise sharply. The next item which helped to increase the cost of medicare was the adding of refractions by physicians as insured services as of July 1st and optometrist services being added to the plan effective July 1 of 1968. This is noted on page 21 under item 3. I direct you to page 34 of the report. Here we will note that payments to physicians for physician services were increased by six per cent for the first seven months of 1968 as compared to 1967 for the same period, and a further 14 per cent increase for physician services effective as of August 1st. Mr. Speaker, in other words physician's fee schedules were increased by 20 per cent for the last five months of 1968, compared to the first ten months of 1967. This

March 11, 1969

information as I said is recorded on page 34 of the report. The other cost, as I have already mentioned, which was enormous was the imposition of deterrent fees. They added to the total cost of health care between \$3½ to \$4 million.

I noticed that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) said that the savings to the MCIC last year were somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200,000 a month. Well, Sir, that may be true in as far as savings to MCIC, but the one thing we must remember that for every \$2 saved to MCIC, the public, the users of the service, paid \$3.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note what is mentioned on page 26 of the report. Take the regional and minor examinations of physicians. The MCIC in 1967 paid \$3.05 per service; in 1968 they only paid \$2.68 per service, and the individual had to pay an additional \$1.50 in deterrent charges, thus, Mr. Speaker, that particular service per visit cost \$4.18 in 1968 since the introduction of deterrent fees compared to \$3.05 in 1967 — a 37 per cent increase — and that increase had to be paid directly by the user.

The other important thing for us to note is what the Minister said, that deterrent fees had the effect of reducing the utilization by 4½ per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of figures that the Minister has quoted previously. I noticed when he spoke during a previous debate he gave us figures for certain periods saying it was 3½ per cent reductions, other periods 7.8 and then 8.9. I presume 4.5 per cent is an average for the 8½ months. Mr. Speaker, let us always keep in mind that, while he talks about a decrease in utilization, it should be recorded here the total increase and facts prove it in his own report that the users of the services were in no way guilty of increasing the cost or of overusing the service. The 14 per cent increase, as I noted earlier in the cost of medicare, is a direct result of other things, and in no way the fault of the individual, the receivers of the services, but as a result of the actions of this Government, Mr. Speaker, by the actions of this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I believe as Legislators, on this important issue, we may be well advised to pause and stop reacting from emotion and from bias, nor can we just look at the public purse, as the Minister has been doing and forget the individual's purse and vice versa. The big question confronting all of us as responsible elected representatives is: what are the best methods of financing health services and can our services be organized and re-organized where we can achieve economies and at the same time improve the quality of health services to the population?

I am satisfied that no one here including the Minister of Health, including his Department at this time, can answer that question conclusively. Each of us has an opinion, but no one has any full proof to go by, Mr. Speaker, this is the reason for my Resolution to establish a Commission to examine our health services in Saskatchewan and elsewhere. I want to know the effects of deterrent fees. I want to know who is deterred and what are the reasons and what are their incomes.

Mr. Speaker, for over 30 years studies and experiments have been conducted in many parts of this continent to develop better methods of delivering health care to the patients. The organization which has led the way in bringing together consumers of medical services and groups of doctors to promote these improvements is the Group Health Association of America. The 30 years of experiment and research has pointed very strongly to the conclusion that there are two factors which can contribute outstandingly to a form of health services which both reduces cost and improves the quality of service.

Mr. Speaker, the first is the complete prepayment of services so that no financial transaction takes place at the time of obtaining the service and so that no financial obstacle stands between the patient and his doctor. The second factor is the provision of a comprehensive, family-oriented health service by a group of general practitioners, medical specialists and other health personnel working as a team.

In the United States several million people are now obtaining their health services from comprehensive clinics based on this kind of group medical practice. The primary purpose of the consumer associations and the medical groups which launched these clinics was the improvement of the quality of care to be made available to the people. It was discovered over a period of years that as well as improving the quality of health services these group clinics were also able to substantially reduce health costs of the populations they were serving.

A major factor in cutting costs was found to be the much lower amount of health care required by the patients who are getting their services from group clinics.

Members will be interested that the Group Health Association of America approached the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and presented statistical evidence to show that many millions of dollars could be saved for the taxpayer if there was an extension of group-practice clinics. The result was that the United States Department of Health brought before the United States Congress legislation which would encourage the development of group-practice clinics, by offering Federal financial assistance to co-operatives or medical groups for the construction and the equipping of comprehensive group-practice, medical facilities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 11, 1969

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, a similar development has been taking place in Great Britain and in other European countries. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Legislature for a specific purpose. Government spokesmen have said a great deal about the costs rising out of proportion. They have made proposals and taken certain actions ostensibly to reduce health costs. These have all been negative steps, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House, have pointed out many times that Government actions are bound to be discriminatory and to prevent some sections of the population from obtaining services that they need; or steps such as withdrawing financial support from such services as minor surgery when performed in doctors' clinics; or steps such as those most recently proposed by the Minister of Health, the withdrawal of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan support for physiotherapy treatment and for diagnostic laboratory and x-ray procedures, when not performed in the hospital.

All of these steps will result not only in inconvenience to patients and doctors, but also will undermine those medical clinics in this province which are currently providing comprehensive service along the lines which the Group Health Association of America has found to be the most efficient and at the same time the most economical.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt at all, that the quality of service available to a number of families in Saskatchewan has suffered as a result of the steps taken by the present Government. The Minister now proposes a withdrawal of support from non-hospital out-patient services, a further retrograde step. Mr. Speaker, the most remarkable aspect of these policies is that, whereas the reason advanced to justify them is the saving of tax dollars, there is strong evidence that the result of these policies will be just the reverse . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — . . . that they will, over a period of years, result in higher health costs to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have referred to experience in the United States with regard to the saving in health costs made possible by an efficient and consumer-oriented organization of services. Experience translated into dollar statistics was sufficient to convince the Government and the Congress of the United States of America.

I want now to turn closer to home. There are in Saskatchewan community clinics, which are based on the philosophy of the Group Health Association of America, and which are organized along the lines of the clinics for which these statistics were presented, read and considered by the United States Government. These clinics, too, have been collecting statistical information. These statistics show that, in the case of the larger community clinics, hospital usage by the patients served is only a fraction

of hospital usage for the average patient of the city or area concerned and only a fraction of the usage for the province as whole — in fact, Mr. Speaker, less than one-half. This means a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the people of Saskatchewan. If projected to a larger segment of the population, this rate of saving per patient would run into many millions of dollars for the province as a whole.

The community clinics have made no secret of these facts. I understand they have made them known to the Minister of Health. In fact, it would be impossible for this information to be kept away from the Government as all of the relevant statistics are also compiled by the Government computers. And yet the Government has done nothing to encourage these new formations of organizations of health services, which have the potential of greatly improving the quality and greatly reducing the costs.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the Government to stop trying to reduce costs by hit-and-miss methods which are usually destructive in the short run and probably more expensive on the long-term basis. The time has come for a serious study of alternative methods of providing services and of arranging the financing. The information is available both in this province and elsewhere. The experts are available who could analyze the data objectively and impartially.

A report could be made to this Legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan which would provide a sound basis for both government action and voluntary initiative in developing a pattern of health care and a system of financing health services, which would raise the health standards of the people and ensure that the dollars spent in doing so would be spent to the best advantage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I know no better way than the appointment of an impartial Commission to be properly represented by those providing, and those receiving health services to undertake such a comprehensive study. Mr. Speaker, I might suggest to the Government, if it accepts the idea of appointing a Commission, that it consider inviting Mr. Justice E.M. Hall to chair such a Commission. Certainly he is eminently qualified. He has gained a great deal of knowledge on the health topic during his service as chairman of the Royal Commission on Health Services in Canada. He has gained a tremendous amount of experience and knowledge. I am sure he would be well received by all. Certainly the Commission would require a good secretariat and adequate staff. This proposal is submitted in all sincerity and good faith. It is not a political ploy.

We are mindful of the fact that Ottawa has already served notice to opt out of medicare within five years. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said that he has information that the Federal Government will also opt out of sharing costs of hospital care.

March 11, 1969

Now, if this is the case, what are the implications for us here in Saskatchewan? The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) tells us in his Budget Address that the Federal Hospital Construction Grants will come to an end early in 1970 and other Federal Health Grants are to be phased out.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me that we need to look at the total problem now. We can't wait for two or three years. It will be too late. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Government to give this Resolution their co-operation and their full support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this Resolution if it is accepted by the Government will represent one of the most important measures to receive the attention of the Government during this session of the Legislature. It provides the opportunity to determine a sense of direction for the Government, in place of the irrational and inconsistent approach to health matters that this Government has been displaying in recent years.

When I say that this Government has been inconsistent and irrational, Mr. Speaker, I think we need only recall a few of the piecemeal attempts by the Government opposite in dealing with matters which obviously need a well-organized and long-term approach, if the health needs of Saskatchewan people are to be taken care of effectively and as economically as possible. Members will remember well, I believe, how this Government rushed headlong into the implementation of the Saskatchewan Mental Health Plan in discharging and re-locating mental health patients in the community. The Provincial Treasurer, the former Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) refused to acknowledge that a problem existed, until public pressurers obliged him to appoint the so-called Ad Hoc Committee whose recommendations he proceeded to ignore almost completely.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with a new Minister of Health in the harness and with a multitude of problems materializing, and with a number of tragic events haunting the Liberal Administration, and with a Provincial general election just around the corner, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) established the Frazier Commission, whose report damned this Government's neglect, its incompetence and its cavalier attitude with respect to the method in which the Saskatchewan Plan was implemented by this Government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this sad and morbid story is a part of Saskatchewan's history at this stage, but I think that it points up sharply the need for a well-organized and a long-range approach to the health needs of Saskatchewan people and the need for vigilance in controlling health costs, as is suggested in the Resolution that is before us. The over-zealous discharge policy which the Government began in 1965 resulted in an almost complete break-up of our mental health program which Dr. Frazier described as operating on a sustained emergency basis.

This emergency situation has resulted in new demands upon both the 1968 and 1969 Budgets. Each of these Budgets has had to provide a half a million dollars in order to begin to set right the emergency situation that was allowed to develop during the 24 months following the flood of discharges from the Weyburn institution in 1965. This, Mr. Speaker, is one example of the Government's haphazard approach to the serious matter of providing health services to Saskatchewan people. Today, we are seeing the waste which results from short-term plans which fail to take into account long-term objectives. There are many more examples of the apparent lack of understanding which this Government has shown with respect to health services, Mr. Speaker.

The Government's recent decision to discontinue out-patient physiotherapy and radiology has some connotations about it which will, in the final sense we suggest, be costly in terms of both money and deteriorating services. I want to ask the Minister of Health what information he has available to him, which has led him to believe that hospital facilities would be adequate to fill the need under these new circumstances. The Minister of Health has indicated on other occasions that doctors are somewhat inclined to succumb to the wishes of the patient in allowing the patient to remain in the hospital for longer periods than are necessary, unless economic pressures are placed upon the patient. This was one of his arguments for the imposition of deterrent fees. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a speck of logic to that argument then the Minister is defeating his own case with the cancellation of out-patient payments for these two services. In effect, Mr. Speaker, I think that he is inviting excessive use of hospital beds for services which may very well be provided as out-patient services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the Commission which is mentioned in the Resolution might be properly charged with the responsibility of making a measured and learned judgment with respect to the number and location of the smaller community hospitals, which in the light of 1969 circumstances might determine if they are providing economic and valuable services. At the same time it might offer an indication also with respect to those hospitals which indeed must be phased out. It would appear that up until this moment, Mr. Speaker, the Government has proceeded on this eeny-meeny-miny-moe basis without any direction like a ship without a compass.

Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that prior to the introduction of deterrent charges, we on this side of the House were, interested in the information that might well have been revealed if a study had been conducted in the operation of the Swift Current Health Region. It was known, of course, that deterrent charges had been levied in that area for doctors' services for quite a number of years. However, it is well known, too, that no deterrent charges were applied to hospital services, and it is a matter of record also that utilization of hospital beds in

March 11, 1969

the Swift Current area is considerably higher than in most other areas of the province.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, these facts and this kind of evidence should arouse the interest of the Minister of Public Health, if he is interested in doing the kind of job that the public expects of a person, who is entrusted with what many people consider to be the most important portfolio in the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — A study into the circumstances in that area, prior to the introduction of deterrent charges, might very well have caused the Government to reach an entirely different conclusion with regard to the imposition of deterrent fees. The Government may yet discover, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that another costly mistake has been made. It is the opinion of many people that preventive medicine is being discouraged and that, in the long haul, a program that discourages early and frequent care is costly in terms of good health as well as dollars.

During the Throne Speech Debate, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that I had within my circle of acquaintances a number of old age pensioners who are deliberately postponing surgery and treatment for ailments ranging from hernia to hemorrhoids to thyroid conditions, all because of the difficult financial problems which they face. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that they are hoping for an early Provincial election in order that the existing situation in this respect may be corrected at an early date.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime no effort is being made to establish who is being deterred nor does the Government appear to be concerned about the relative age groups which are most seriously affected, nor does the Government seem to be concerned in discovering whether this charge has had a most severe effect on low-income groups or which groups are suffering from the imposition of deterrent charges more directly. Quit clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Government is satisfied to fly blind, blissfully ignorant, concerning the long-term possibilities of the action that it has taken and satisfied that some savings might have been achieved.

I think that I can say without question, Mr. Speaker, that there is no group of people in this province that is more concerned and more dedicated to containing the cost of health services than we who sit on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I think that there is every reason to express some concern over the rising cost of health services. But Saskatchewan

is certainly no island in this connection. One needs only to look to other areas of North America where there is no public plan in operation to realize that the cost of medical care and hospitalization elsewhere is completely out of reach of many people and that without protection financial ruin is an ever-present possibility.

It has been the practice for some people who in the past have opposed comprehensive, universal medical care and hospitalization to point to rising costs in an attempt to equate the increasing costs with the fact that this is a universal public plan. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that an examination of the facts will prove that it is just the very opposite. I believe that the only way that costs can be kept within reach of all the members of our society is through a public plan. Only the other day, the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) showed me a bill that an acquaintance of his had received after a brief confinement in a hospital in California. The cost for only a few days of care and treatment almost staggers the imagination. One of my own constituents brought a bill to me for a dependent child who was hospitalized in North Dakota for a period of six days. The comparison between Saskatchewan's cost per day as compared to the cost just across the 49th parallel leads one to believe that we may consider ourselves somewhat fortunate in relative terms.

It is to be expected, Mr. Speaker, during a period of inflation such as the one we are presently passing through, that costs will rise. Goods and services cost more. It is to be expected that doctors' services over a period of years will also cost more. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, have no quarrel with the decision of the Government in increasing the fee schedule for the general practitioner. I might have some other reservations with respect to specialist's fees. Certainly, the general practitioner who receives in the neighborhood of \$5 per office call is not over paid. And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I am acquainted with several doctors who are sacrificing the \$1.50 deterrent charge because in some particularly needy cases they haven't the heart to apply the charge. Accordingly, they are absorbing the cost themselves. I think that this is rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, when some good-hearted general practitioners find themselves in the position of running their own welfare agency.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House do not contend that we have all of the answers with respect to the organization of health services. I believe we can say though with a degree of confidence that, during that period when our group was the Government of this province, a pretty remarkable job was done of providing forward-looking programs, introducing new and imaginative concepts in health care and at the same time keeping costs of this care within reasonable limits. It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that since Members opposite formed this Government the Federal Government at Ottawa has come to the rescue with approximately \$15 million a year also.

March 11, 1969

Mr. Speaker, in light of recent financial assistance from Ottawa and increased revenue from other sources that were evident in the Budget that was just brought down a few weeks ago, including deterrent charges, it would not appear that the problem of the Government should be too desperate, and it is to be hoped that the Minister will restrain himself from initiating an increase in the personal premiums, as it appears he intends to do as soon as the 59th seat in this Legislature is filled at some future date. A study such as the one that is suggested in this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, should precede any such move by the Government.

It is to be hoped that the Government will see the wisdom in the kind of action that is recommended in this Resolution. A commission, along the lines suggested in the Resolution has the potential to provide a valuable service to the Government which could provide a new sense of direction, which I suggest has been badly lacking since this Government assumed the responsibility for the health care of Saskatchewan people. Too often in recent years, Mr. Speaker, this Government has plunged into situations which appear to be based on some pre-conceived prejudice rather than on any well-considered plan. In several of these cases it has been obliged to retreat because of the failure to arrive at a reasoned judgment before initiating programs or taking legislative action. Too often it appeared that the Government has had no real desire to arrive at the facts before applying its own solution. This, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, has been too much like a game of Russian roulette with the Government taking unnecessary and unwise privileges with long-established health services in our province.

I'm most happy, Mr. Speaker, to support this Resolution and I hope that Members opposite will also see wisdom in the suggestions that the Resolution contains.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would have been almost disappointed if we hadn't had a good dissertation on utilization fees and I presume that was the real reason for the introduction of this Resolution in order to give the Members opposite an opportunity to repeat many of the statements they made last year and obtain any political benefit therefrom. It was refreshing though to have both the speakers admit that there was no easy solution or they didn't know the answers. I have to agree with them on this statement at least. I think we must recognize that within the last two or three years there has been a tremendous amount of talk across this country about escalating health costs in general but very little action has been taken. I believe Saskatchewan was the only province that indicated a willingness to try something, even though it admitted that there may be features of it that weren't completely acceptable to the people, but at least we did something. Other provinces are looking at us now and thinking of doing the same thing. I predicted this a year ago

in this House. I can say at the present time that some other provinces are currently considering the same action as we took.

The Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) indicated that in his opinion the payment of a premium had no real good effect on the relationship of the patient to the doctor or to his health services, that there is no equity, that it had a built-in regressive tax feature and that in 1963 the premium was only \$52. I remind him also that the premium was reduced in anticipation of the election of 1964. We merely put it back to \$72.00 where they already had it in the earlier part of 1963. I'll use the expression that I used previously, when they were in power the premium for these services went up and down like a window shade.

I don't think I'll clutter up the discussion of the Resolution by arguing the figures that were quoted by the Hon. Member from Regina North East. He referred to the percentage of the premium in relationship to the cost of the hospital plan and referred to other costs, namely utilization fees, sales tax and the Federal tax of 2 per cent. I'd let him know that we did not introduce the so-called education and health tax and it doesn't go to the direct advantage of the health schemes anyway. It goes into the Consolidated Revenue Account. He wanted to know where the abuses were that we spoke of and who were paying the utilization fees. I think it was quite evident from information that we supplied a year ago that there were abuses. I went back 19 years for their own edification and quoted Dr. Mott, who referred to abuses at that time. The former Government must have anticipated abuses in The Medical Care Insurance Act because it provided for utilization fees in the Act when it was passed in 1962, and all that was required on our part was passing the necessary regulations by Order-in-Council. So back in 1962 they were heeding the words of Dr. Mott and were fearful themselves that something would have to be done; and so provided for utilization fees at that time. He seemed to try to leave the impression that the administrative cost increase in the Medicare Insurance Commission was brought about mainly by utilization fees. I deny this without reservation. Utilization fees certainly played a part in this increase in administrative cost, but the increase is quite minimal in line with other years and was brought about, if higher than other years, by the new fee schedule, the addition of the war vets, the Indians, the addition of refraction services. He mentioned that for every \$2 saved that the public must pay \$3. Actually the reduction in Federal cost-sharing is 16 per cent and this is a far cry from the 33 1/3 which is referred to in his figures. I think the public should get that straight. He made reference to the increase in costs as referred to on page 26 of the Medical Care Insurance Commission Report, but I would point out that, in my figures given in the Budget Debate, a group of citizens not affected by utilization fees, namely the welfare patients. Utilization went up about 20 per cent. We anticipate that the same thing would have happened to some degree with the other patients without the advent of utilization fees and the cost would also have gone up and that the increased administrative cost is certainly not

March 11, 1969

entirely due to utilization fees.

It gave the Members of the Opposition an opportunity to refer to their pet scheme of community clinics and their method of delivering medical services. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, to this House that I have never, in the two and one-half years I've had this portfolio, impeded or hindered these groups in any way but rather I have been very receptive to them. They have only brought one major request to me. Action is being taken on this and I'll explain later. I refer to an assessment of their method of delivery. Reference was made to the withdrawal of certain services and particularly physiotherapy. I would point out that they have not as yet been withdrawn. As a result of my earlier statements we are getting some action from Ottawa. I would like the Hon. Member to name any of the people that he made a sweeping reference to as suffering from the discontinuance of some of these services and that actually rather than saving money they are going to result in higher costs. I'm afraid he would have a hard time proving that.

One statement he made that I'll heartily agree with is that we can't live in isolation. Likewise the success or otherwise of a method of delivery of medical services by the clinics cannot be measured solely by the success of the clinics or at least the extent of the clinic use of hospital services, but we must measure the quality of the treatment and also the volume of use of Medical Care Insurance services. He indicated that the Government had done nothing. He says the Minister had data and should take some action. Well, let me explain, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member is slightly behind times. He apparently has not been communicating with his clinic friends, because, when I was approached last year to assess this method of delivery of service, I pointed out to the delegation that I thought this Government would be the wrong government to assess this service, because, if I proved they were right, my colleagues wouldn't accept the proof and if I proved they were wrong, they wouldn't accept it. Consequently I suggested that the logical body to assess it was a Federal group because, if it was good for Saskatchewan, it was good for other provinces in Canada.

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) indicated that we were inconsistent and operating in a piecemeal manner and left the impression that everything was a bed of roses prior to our Government assuming office. Well, let's look at the mental patient programs. I thought I had made my point clearly enough in an early statement in this House about the state of affairs with the mental patients, in this province prior to 1964, that they would hesitate to raise the subject again. But apparently they were satisfied to not move ahead with the Saskatchewan Plan. They speak of mass discharges. I think I explained to the House that there were more patients discharged in the three years prior to 1964 than in the three years subsequent to 1964, so I don't think that we were any more guilty of mass discharges than the previous Government, if such were the case. Reference was made as to where these physio services are going to be provided. Well, as pointed out, they have not as yet

been cancelled. I am aware of facilities in the hospitals. I would like to point out that in 1964 a private physiotherapist got no payment whatsoever for over three months and during that time I do not recall the hospital facilities being swamped with patients. The same Member also made reference to the experience in Swift Current, pointing out that with the advent of utilization fees on medical services the use of the hospital beds went up to the highest in the Province. Well, this was not entirely due, by any means, to the advent of utilization fees. It was due largely to the fact that more doctors came into that area at or about the same time as the advent of utilization fees. And where you have more doctors, I guarantee you will have more utilization of beds. He also made reference to some serious cases waiting for elective surgery and we are going to hold off for an early election. I suggest that they not do so. If they do they are not very serious, that they'd be better off to avail themselves of the services as quickly as they can.

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is certainly no island, cannot be treated as an island or looked at as an island as far as health services are concerned. The CCF have expressed their concern. They admit that they haven't got all the answers. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North said that while they were in office they kept costs within reason. Well, I don't exactly agree with them. When costs rose from \$7 million to \$70 million, I don't really feel that he is really sincere when he says he feels they kept costs within reason. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is not guilty of doing nothing, that early last year the Prairie Economic Conference was instrumental in setting up the Prairie Medical Services Committee, of which I am the chairman, and this Committee has had six meetings with some degree of success. The Saskatchewan Hospital Association last summer urged us to proceed with an enquiry along the lines suggested in this Resolution. As a result of a meeting last November in Ottawa of all Health Ministers with the Hon. Mr. Munroe, there were so many questions raised on the problems of health care across this country and the necessity of a co-ordinated approach or study on a Federal level, involving all provinces rather than any province doing it in isolation, that the Federal authorities in co-operation with the provinces have set up a committee on the cost of health services, consisting of about seven or eight different areas which cover all facets included in the Resolution. They have had 13 meetings to date and hopefully will be making their findings known to the Health Minister in midsummer. To give you some idea of the extent of their enquiry, I would just like to read a few off. First of all in the area of hospital care, they are looking at operational efficiency, beds and facilities, utilization, out-patient departments, laboratory X-ray utilization, wages and salaries, cost of public health services pertaining particularly to preventive services, methods of delivery of medical care, which takes in a study of the methods used by the community clinics and by other organizations in the United States. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we would be unwise to proceed with a Provincial study with the Federal authorities in co-operation with the Provincial bodies doing such a wide examination of the health

March 11, 1969

problems in Canada, involving hospital people, medical people, Federal and Provincial Government personnel and the public at large. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre):

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

commends the Government of Canada for establishing in 1968, a federal-provincial committee which is presently studying the costs of health services in Canada including:

- (a) the effectiveness of present delivery systems for health services;
- (b) the scope of community health services and preventive care programs;
- (c) the planning, organization and effectiveness of present health service programs; and
- (d) the responsibility of the patient in financing a portion of these costs;

and which will recommend to the Conference of Canadian Ministers of Health, positive action required to contain the cost of health services in a logical, definitive and practical way, but not impair the quality or the availability of necessary health services.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I may disappoint the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) by not burdening his deterrent fees, and I may in fact disappoint him further by referring him once again to some of the statistics that he has already been made aware of, I believe, and he has commented on in some respect. He referred to what he called our pet schemes of community clinics. I was happy to hear his comments about referring a community clinic delegation to the Federal officials and the result that it apparently has had up to this time in producing the amendment, which he has presented here to the Resolution. I am happy to report that this has been done. In order that this Legislature gets the benefits of the information which the Minister has, I would like to deal with these particular aspects of the method of practice that is provided for in a group medical practice that is now in operation in the Province. I want as well, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate my Hon. colleague from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) for moving the Resolution. It has provided the opportunity to impress upon the Government the growing urgency for it to act upon what the principle of the Resolution recommends.

There has been a continual flow of some alarming verbiage coming from the Government, suggesting that health and hospitalization costs are rising at unprecedented rates. It has indicated as a result of the costs rising at these staggering rates that threaten even the stability of the health and hospital plans themselves. It would seem therefore that it is both apropos to

the conditions and it is timely as well to accomplish what it, the Government, agrees requires attention. I am personally alarmed and this alarm is shared by many of my constituents that the Government is proposing to reduce the very important and necessary ancillary services of health care by reducing or by exempting from coverage, X-Ray, laboratory and physiotherapy services, other than from hospitals. I appreciate the comments that the Hon. Minister of Health made that these haven't been withdrawn as yet, but certainly every indication has been made that they will be. Seeing that Saskatchewan community clinics were highlighted both in the legislative and public comments, I want to deal with some of the evidence, which is coming from group medical practice in Saskatchewan, that indeed points out the urgency there is for the Government to examine the methods of organizing health services in order that the needed controls may be developed to arrest the rising cost. Mr. Speaker, there are areas of misuse in almost all segments of our private, corporate and social enterprise society. I would suppose that as long as man remains human that these will continue in a greater or in some lesser degree. But, because this is true, it makes no brief for any government to impose upon one segment and particularly upon the sick the added burdens of those who misuse those services. There are areas of major misuse in our medical and hospital plans which I know the Hon. Minister of Health is acquainted with. I'm also advised that his reaction to them was a simple pronouncement. Well so what? If you save \$1 million in health care, you save the Federal Government \$½ million in health care.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics I wish to refer to have previously been drawn to the attention of the Hon. Minister and I am informed that they will appear in the Group Health of America bulletin in the February issue. They are the records of a group medical practice now operating in the province, and the comparison of which to the Saskatchewan average of utilization figures both in health and hospital services shows an unbelievably striking contrast indeed. I am more than gratified, Sir, that after nearly seven years I am personally able to convey to this Legislature such strikingly advanced medical economics, which come from a group medical practice that officially opened its doors on July 1, 1962 and has maintained a continuous and growing service ever since. I am proud to say that I am a chartered member of that medical centre and that I served as its first board president during the formative years. Mr. Speaker, the relevancy of this group practice to the Saskatchewan health scene may be observed in the patient-bed per doctor. I use the two years of 1966 and 1967 throughout to indicate the reliability and the possible trend which may be in process here. I may say as well that this medical practice relates to some 30,000 individual patients in the area that it serves. In 1966 the Saskatchewan average was 814.7 patients per doctor and the group practice average was 1,618 patients per doctor. In 1967, the Saskatchewan average was 819.7 patients per doctor and the group practice average was 1,723 patients per doctor. I think this demonstrates without question that it certainly is one of the busiest health practices in the province. It therefore suggests

March 11, 1969

as well that the relevancy to the Provincial average is both adequate and meaningful. In the area of referrals for consultation per 1,000 beneficiaries it has this striking contrast. In 1966 the Saskatchewan average was 68 per 1,000 beneficiaries; that is, the referrals were 68 per 1,000 beneficiaries for the Saskatchewan average, and the group practice average was 20.4 per 1,000 beneficiaries. In 1967, the Saskatchewan average was 78 per 1,000 beneficiaries and the group practice average was 26.8 per 1,000 beneficiaries. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that, although the group practice has a doctor-patient load almost double the Saskatchewan average, they have at the same time almost two-thirds less referrals for consultation than the provincial average. This is a great saving in dollars as well a great saving in human effort. It is also interesting to note, Sir, that one of the possible measurements of misuse of medical care services is in the higher rate of surgical procedures on a Saskatchewan average as opposed to the single-group practice. I refer again to the years 1966 and 1967. And here T & A's for 1,000 beneficiaries. The Saskatchewan average in 1966 was 12 per 1,000 beneficiaries; the group practice average was 4.5 per 1,000 beneficiaries. In 1967 the Saskatchewan average was 4.4 per 1,000 beneficiaries and the group practice average in that year was 2.5. It is interesting to observe the surgical procedures of the medical group practice in 1967 were all substantially down from 1966, and this was not always the case in the Saskatchewan average. The outright cost of medical treatment per patient is indeed an interesting analysis. The Saskatchewan average cost per patient in 1966 was \$36.28, the group practice average was \$16.68. In 1967 the Saskatchewan average cost per patient was \$37.24 per patient, and the group practice average was \$15.70 per patient. I believe it is true that the Provincial Government receives \$14 per capita as the Federal Government's contribution toward health services. This means that health costs to the Saskatchewan taxpayer originating at this centre was \$1.70 per patient in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the picture would not be complete unless I drew your attention to the extremely sharp contrast in the utilization of Saskatchewan hospital services between the group method of health practice and the average Saskatchewan utilization rate. And here I refer to the case rate per 1,000 insured. In 1966 the Saskatchewan average was 235 patients hospitalized per 1,000 insured, and the group practice average in that same year was 93.2 patients hospitalized per 1,000 insured. In respect to the volume rate per 1,000 insured, the Saskatchewan average was 2,182.7 days in hospital per 1,000 insured, while the group practice average was 747.7 days in hospital per 1,000 insured. In 1967 the Saskatchewan average in the case rate average was 228 patients hospitalized and the group practice average was 70.9. For the volume rate per 1,000 insured in 1967, 2,119 in hospital per 1,000 insured for the Saskatchewan average as opposed to the group practice average of 623 days in hospital per 1,000 insured.

Mr. Speaker, the really salient factor in these statistics is that the group practice of hospital utilization rates is

much less than one-half of the provincial average in both years. If the average Saskatchewan rates of utilization were as low as the group practice rates of utilization, it would have saved the taxpayers of this province \$31.5 million on the basis of 1967 costs. In addition, the rates of medical service utilization by the single group practice did save an estimated \$1 million on the basis of the Saskatchewan average utilization rates of medical services. Surely when the citizens of this province acquaint themselves with these statistics, it won't be good enough for the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) to say, "So what? If you are saving \$1 million you are saving the Federal Government a ½ million dollars," and in the face of this to legislate a deterrent charge on the sick and reduce the ancillary services in the province, while at the same time saying it is the sick of the province that are the gross misusers of the facilities and of the care. Mr. Speaker, I have quoted you some statistical evidence which points out the urgency and the need for a Resolution of the kind that has been moved by my colleague from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). I would like to urge the Government to look with favor on this Resolution for the Commission study will dispel the speculating statements regarding the financial jeopardy of health and hospitalization programs. It will as well put programs and policy into effect to implement and to maintain the success of our health insurance in Saskatchewan. While I personally find favor in the amendment that the Minister moved, I would encourage all of those in this House to support both the amendment and the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister moved this amendment . . .

The House recessed at 5:30 until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't had time really to look at the amendment except to grasp the idea of it. The Minister (Mr. Grant) by amendment is trying to pass on the responsibility of making a study to the Federal Government. Now it is quite true that you agreed to the study there, but this is not the intention of the original motion. I think what the Minister has been trying — which I suggest was a very weak argument — was to evade the real issue of deterrent fees. The Minister could have told us in his speech why he didn't think it was necessary to have a study made as suggested by the motion. He could have told us that he had made studies which apparently he has not done. I know quite well that there is considerable material that is available to him, but from his speech it appears that he hadn't studied any of it. In other words what he suggested is — let George do it. Now because of the fact that there are some implications in this amendment that I would like to do some research on, and speak about at a later time, I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

March 11, 1969

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR HUMBLE ADDRESSES — HUMBLE ADDRESS NO. 1

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) that an Humble Address No. 1 be presented to his Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before the Assembly:

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan and agencies of the Government of Canada with respect to the processing of damp and tough grain in Saskatchewan and the transportation of grain during the period of October 1, 1968 and January 30, 1969 inclusive.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). The amendment would read:

That the motion be amended by deleting the words and figures 'January 30' where they appear in the last line, and the following substituted therefor: 'February 28'; and that the following be added to the motion: 'and the occasions on which the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Agriculture of Canada met during the period mentioned, at which the matter of processing damp and tough grain and transportation of grain was discussed.'

I move this seconded by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, if I may speak briefly on this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You will be speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Lloyd: — I have no objection to the extension which the Minister (Mr. McFarlane) is proposing although, as I look at it, for the life of me I can't see how it has meaning or why it makes any sense. If one tries to read copies of all correspondence and occasions, copies of all occasions, on which the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Agriculture of Canada met during the period mentioned, it really doesn't make very much sense. To draw attention to the fact that there were occasions on which the matter of processing damp and tough grain and transportation of grain was discussed really won't tell us very much, but I have objection to the amendment. It does give me the information I was hoping to get.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON THE SENATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University):

That the Government give early consideration to the approval of student representation on the Senate of the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it is now some weeks since the motion was first moved and since I was given leave to adjourn the debate. If you recall the Hon. Member from City Park-University moved it and seconded by the Hon. Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). At that time I think it was the Hon. Member from Regina South West who said this was “a great thing” that we were doing here. My comment was, if it was a great thing now, it really would have been a much greater thing, and I think with all deference a much more useful thing, had we done it last year.

I mention that, Mr. Speaker, because last year during a discussion of a Bill which changed The University Act, I proposed an amendment to the proposals of the Government at that time. Section 27 of The University Act describes the makeup of the University Senate. At that time I moved that Section 27 be amended by adding to the membership of the Senate “and two students who had been certified by the Registrar of the campus as full-time students from each campus now or hereafter established by the University, who shall be appointed annually by the Students’ Representative Council of the campus and whose term shall be from the first day of October to the next succeeding thirtieth day of September and who shall be eligible for reappointment for one further term.” That Resolution appears in the records of the Legislature for April 24th, 1968, and to it is attached the signature of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and the word ‘lost’. I could have hoped that the Members might have supported it last year with the same zeal with which they put it forth this year.

Regardless of that, Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the House this year do accept and do support the Resolution which has been moved. However, we submit that something more needs to be done. The Resolution or the change which the Resolution proposes is by itself, I submit, an inadequate change to meet today’s requirement for sensitive and responsible university administration. Later this evening I want to ask leave of the Assembly to introduce an amendment which would provide I think for a more adequate change.

I do this, Mr. Speaker, because in my opinion and the opinion of Members of this side of the House, more than just giving students representation on the Senate is needed at this

March 11, 1969

time, More is needed in order to accommodate the legitimate interest of faculty and students in sharing responsibility for decisions that count. I emphasize the legitimate interest of these groups. I emphasize responsibility, and I do suggest with all sincerity and with all emphasis, Mr. Speaker, that both of these groups are looking for an opportunity to exercise proper responsibility with respect to decisions that help to define the University.

The change that is needed is one not just to accommodate the interests of the university community. I think we need a change also in order that the University, which is our University, can draw on all possible strengths and resources available to it. It is only by using all resources that the University can do the various onerous jobs that we ask it to do. We ask it to do a job for the students. We ask it to do a job with respect to ideas generally. We ask it to do a job with regard to commenting on society generally. We ask it to do many jobs with respect to service to society generally.

So that we can have some guarantee of some changes now, I want to move an amendment later on. I want also to propose that we set up a representative group to study the possibility and the desirability of even more changes. May I say I have given to the mover of the Resolution a copy of the amendment which I intend to propose when he discussed the matter earlier.

Mr. Speaker, in a previous debate I did refer to progress which has been made on both campuses of the University. I made reference to progress in opening up avenues for students to share in decisions. More and more they are being given the opportunity and the responsibility to share in decisions about planning of courses, about the content of courses, about the development of courses. They are given more opportunity to take part in making decisions about how student achievement is best measured. Like some other Members in the House I have talked to both students and University teachers about the improvement which has resulted. Both students and teachers have benefited and certainly are willing to testify to the advantage to the University as well as to the students and the teachers as a result of this opening up of the decision-making process. As a result some courses have been made more relevant. One of the big criticisms of university today and other avenues of education as well is that they are not as relevant as they might be. Some frustrations and some boredom have decreased. Some interest and some satisfaction have increased. Some of the barriers which too frequently prevent contact between the learning of the teacher and the yearning of the student have been lowered.

I submit that it is our job as a Legislature, and it's the job of our Government to recognize and to applaud improvements of this kind. It is also our job as a Legislature and of the Government to encourage and facilitate more change of this kind which will release more of the total potential of the University. So I submit it is not good enough just to give students representation on the Senate. We need to make some

additional and some more positive specific proposals as well. We need for one thing, Mr. Speaker, to establish a procedure for some more broadly based and representative discussion about the University. I have reference to discussion which crosses the boundary between the University and the total Saskatchewan community. We need, I think, to have some kind of a timetable, so that the results of discussions of this kind can be brought before the public and before the Legislature within a certain given time. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we do need a timetable with respect to when these changes are going to take place. To do this, in my opinion, we need more than the Resolution proposes. So I ask the Legislature to consider some additional, or I will ask the Legislature to consider some addition to the proposal.

The amendment which I have in mind first of all will endorse the Resolution. In addition it will provide first that the faculty have an opportunity to select direct representation on the Senate. Now there are some who say that the faculty already has representation on the Senate. They have it only to the extent that the Deans have representation there. My point is that the faculty themselves should have the right to select some representative on the Senate. Secondly, it will suggest that both students and faculty will have representation on the Board of Governors of the University. Thirdly it will suggest the establishment of a Commission to discuss and to advise with respect to other desirable changes in some of the administrative structures and practices of the University. In other words the amendment will propose something to be done now and it will propose also a longer-term, more incisive kind of a study to decide other things which may be done later.

The Commission which I am proposing should include representatives of the public generally, should include representatives of the University administration, should include representatives of the students as well. This Commission, Mr. Speaker, should explore and report on the administrative structure and practices, which would contribute most to making our University responsible and responsive to the ideas and the hopes of the public, faculty and students. I am proposing obviously that not all the practices of university be studied — some of these are properly the prerogative of the university community itself. In particular I think that we need a body which can communicate with the people of Saskatchewan about this matter. May I suggest, Sir, that the University is a greatly misunderstood institution. It is at least an institution that is not understood. I submit that there are a lot of people in Saskatchewan who would like to understand it better. I submit that all of us would benefit if more people did understand better what the University is. So I propose this kind of a Commission. I would hope that the Commission would report back to this Legislature at the next session or that it might report at a special session, if the work is accomplished in time and the move appears to be urgent enough.

March 11, 1969

Mr. Speaker, before going further, may I ask the pardon of the House for some personal references with respect to the University. I do have as an individual, as many other Members of the House have, a very strong personal feeling and relationship with the University of Saskatchewan and this deepens my concern that our University be a good university. Like a number of my colleagues on both sides of the House I was a student there. It's an institution in which I enrolled at the age of 16 and 10 years later I got a degree. I have taken three classes from the present President of the University. Of my family my two daughters are both graduates of this University, one son is a student there now. I have another son who is still in high school, whom I should very much like some day to study at our University of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — In the early 1940s before becoming a Member of this House I was an elected member to the Senate of the University. As Minister of Education I sat on the Senate for some 16 years in that capacity. In addition to that during those years I was at various times chairman of the Saskatchewan Research Council, of the Saskatchewan Archives Board, and of the Saskatchewan Centre for Community Studies. And in all of these I was associated with representatives of the University on these boards. It was my privilege to represent the people of Saskatchewan in laying the cornerstone of the Regina campus and to speak on that occasion. I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, to underline and to emphasize my own deep and very real personal concern about the welfare of this institution of ours.

Mr. Speaker, a university is in the simplest of occasions a very complex institution. Under the best of conditions it faces a very difficult task. We give it a very onerous kind of job to do. It is I think true that these difficulties are magnified on a very broad spectrum by some new and many intensified tensions which exist in society generally today. As a result I think all of us have to work harder at the very essential job of understanding young people. We have to make a better job of understanding what it is that is motivating young people, understand what it is that's bothering them, understand what it is that they are hoping for. This is not simple and I hope we can work harder at it.

Part of the situation in society which makes this understanding difficult and which complicates the job of our universities was described in an article by the historian Toynbee which I read not very long ago. Toynbee referred to what he called "the accelerating pace of change in our man-made environment within the span of a single lifetime." We need hardly stop to think in order to appreciate how much that change has been. Sometimes we don't think, in addition, of what the change has meant in the lives of individuals. Toynbee went on to pinpoint this change in the lives of individuals by saying that, because of this fast and rapidly changing environment, "personal

relations have dwindled to insignificance and impersonal relations have become suffocating.” May I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a real problem for universities, a real part of the problem when a university grows and particularly when a university grows as quickly as has the campus here in Regina.

Toynbee goes on to point out that the technology which created this problem of impersonal relations can't even partially solve the problem which it created. He says this problem can be solved only by “changes in the management of our relations with each other and changes in the attitude of each individual.” I think this is something that those of us who have responsibility for defining in any way what happens to make other things happen at a university must work harder at, “the management of our relations with each other and the changes of the attitude of each individual.” I said a minute ago that we need to work harder at understanding young people. Toynbee who is now something over 80 years of age, I think, gives us a lead into this important job. I want to ask to read to this Legislature a further paragraph of his comments. He said, in this particular article:

Nobody can guarantee that genuine cures are going to be found but at least we can seek them in the right quarter. Let us start by reminding ourselves of the symptoms of our prevalent spiritual sickness. We know what these symptoms are: the abnormally bitter alienation of the young from their parents' generation, the resort to strikes and public demonstrations, the lapse from orderly demonstrations into physical violence, the resort to counter-violence by public authorities. These symptoms he says are all manifestations of one and the same complaint, namely, frustration. The individual feels that he is not the beneficiary but the victim of a social system into which he has been born.

Let's note these words carefully.

He tries to put his case and to obtain redress by approaching the traditional institutions, families, schools, university governments. He finds himself up against the wall. He cannot obtain a hearing. The establishment shows no intention of taking him seriously and no intention either of mending its ways on alternative lines of its own choosing.

And as a result of this, Mr. Speaker, there is abroad what somebody called a “hammering discontent”. Much of this discontent is consolidated and vigorously expressed and sometimes even ignited on university campuses. Much of this of course is nothing new in university history. In fact much of it is almost traditional in university life, particularly in a vigorous university. It's not confined to Saskatchewan. I think if one looks at what went on in Czechoslovakia, for example, not too many months ago, Mr. Speaker, we will find that the students there were a very real part and a very real spark in that

March 11, 1969

particular uprising. They were protesting and it was a part of their university life, part of their vigor. It's not evil that there should be strong dissent and criticism and clash of ideas, when vigorous and informed people examine the teachings of all time and explore the best hopes of humanity. But our job, our job as a Legislature is to guide and to develop a public structure so that out of this can come the greatest good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The hope of the amendment, which I want to move later, is to achieve this in part and to achieve part of it soon. It's to provide again a means to study further a more adequate way of achievement. Let's give the university people, may I ask, a chance to comment. Too frequently now in this as in many other things, I think, our discussion, our contact is with certain heads. There are a great many people in the University who have something to say whom perhaps we don't have a chance to talk to in the ordinary way.

While I have said that discontent and dissent is not new or confined to Saskatchewan, we must admit that discontent and dissent on university campuses all over the country is more intense than has been the case in the past. We need to recognize the particular dimension and the essential dialogue of 1969. May I urge here, Mr. Speaker, that it is not good enough to put blame on things and groups and individuals we don't like. May I submit that it is positively dangerous and foolhardy to suggest that, if a few students and a few professors and the few campus newspapers and a few TV programs would disappear, the problem would disappear with them. It won't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — And I suggest that such oversimplification, no matter how tempting it's made by oratorical embellishment, does the greatest possible disservice to all of us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I want to add to that that the use of emotionally charged labelling such as Communists, anarchists, kooks, or people without guts may sound brave and pure. In fact, it simply displays an inability for rational discussion of a deeply serious problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Use of this emotional appeal avoids the facts or tries to avoid the facts and sweep them under the table. The facts in this case, Mr. Speaker, are stubborn ones. They are real but

they're stubbornly stubborn ones. They are deeply imbedded not just in the university. They are imbedded in the very society which we have created. They aren't going to be chased away by name calling, and this Legislature should be competent of something more meaningful in facing up to the problems of our times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — In discussion of The University Act during the 1968 session, I noted a number of universities which already provide student and faculty representation on governing bodies. My statistics are from a 1967 report. There are indications that more universities have joined the groups since then. At the time ten Canadian universities had students on the Senate. Fifteen had faculty members on the Board of Governors. There were students on the Board of Governors of two, St. Michael's College at the University of Toronto and the University of Montreal. This hasn't solved all the problems of these institutions by any stretch of imagination, but it does, I think, support the idea I propose we study. There is further support for the ideas of the amendment, which I will propose, from the December 1967 bulletin of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. I read one comment:

Our universities are going to need all the strength they can muster to face these new challenges, continuing reform of internal university government, so as to provide effective participation by board, administration, faculty and students as one of the indispensable means to building this strength.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers has reference to all of the challenges that face universities, the strength we need to face those and says that representation on boards by faculty and students is, in their words, "an indispensable means of building this strength."

Support also comes from a paper by Drs. Armstrong and Rowat of Carleton University. Some Members will know that Dr. Rowat was in the city within recent days as a part of a Commission which is examining government-university relationships on a Canada-wide basis. Here's what they say in their paper in support of students on boards of governors:

What students would bring to the board is their topicality. They, better than anyone else, can present student opinion on a given issue. They can ensure that no board decision is arrived at without due consideration of the student perspective. Their most important contribution would be their understanding of student opinion.

I add one more reference from the Duff-Berdahl Report, a Commission a few years ago which has been called the "watershed", so far as changes in university structure are concerned. One comment was this:

March 11, 1969

The issue is not whether to welcome or stifle this new wave of student sentiment but rather how to develop channels into which it can flow constructively.

And as one further comment in support of my Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I have reference to the Star Phoenix, March 10th. There is an article there which says that the Saskatchewan Young Liberals have come out in support of an autonomous university in Regina. They gave unanimous support also to student representation on the University Board of Governors, and they said that representation on the Senate did not go far enough because the real power lay with the Board of Governors. I want to repeat as I did, in a former debate, Mr. Speaker, a comment made by former Prime Minister Pearson. He was speaking at Queen's University. He's reported in news items of January 31st and part of his words were these:

No dissenters but those who would diminish or deny the right to dissent are the really dangerous revolutionaries. By damming the avenues of peaceful and evolutionary change, they make violent change inevitable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the proposal which I have, as I said before, provides for some things that could happen in the very near future. It provides also a means of considering other methods over a longer period of time. It provides a means of getting opinion from people at the University and the administration at the University and the public of Saskatchewan as well.

The Resolution would add after the word "of" in the first line, the words "faculty and". The Resolution would add after the word "Senate" in the second line, the words "and the board of governors." In other words it would give representation on both the Senate and the Board of Governors to both students and faculty. And finally, it would add after "Saskatchewan" in the second line, the words "and that the Government also give consideration to appointing a Commission composed of public representatives together with representatives of the University administration, faculty and students to study and report on such changes in administrative structures and practices of the University which would provide adequate participation by the public, faculty and students."

For the guidance of Members, Mr. Speaker, may I read the Resolution as it would read if the amendment were accepted and passed and it would be this:

That the Government give early consideration to the approval of faculty and student representation on the Senate and the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan and that the Government also give consideration to appointing a Commission composed of public

representatives together with representatives of the University administration, faculty and students to study and report on such changes in administrative structure and practice of the University, which would provide adequate participation by the public, faculty and students.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, it was with mixed feelings that I first noticed the appearance of this Resolution on the Order Paper because, as I have said before in this House, I do not believe that the internal affairs of our University should be the subject for debate in this Legislature except insofar as financial support is concerned.

Absolute academic freedom, like any other absolute, is a concept rather than a definable goal. However, except for the duties inherent in our role as keepers of the public purse, we should do nothing to circumscribe the activities of our academic communities. During the last session of this Legislature I pointed out that under existing legislation, the Senate of our University has the authority to add representatives from student societies or from any other group which contributes to the social, economic or cultural life of the Province. Since the Senate has not chosen to exercise this power and, so far as I know student councils have not requested it to do so, I'm rather reluctant to pursue the matter any further.

My support for the Resolution itself is based on a desire to emphasize my agreement with the principle of student representation, though after the remarks which the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) is reported to have made on the Regina campus, there is some doubt as to whether students will welcome an invitation to be represented on the Senate.

The debate on this Resolution and its amendments make a very tempting launching pad for a journey into the land of student power. I would like to ask the indulgence of the House as I succumb to this temptation for a few minutes.

Let me begin by saying that I do not believe that student power exists as a phenomenon separated from the social unrest which characterizes our times. It is related to an ideological struggle which is by no means new but which is reaching a climax in the institution which we call the university. The struggle I refer to is the struggle to find living space for both the mystic and the mechanic, for the spiritual as well as the practical.

Peter Shrag writing in the Saturday Review, February 15th, 1969 puts it this way:

The universities haven't been standing in the way of the educational demands of most undergraduates.
The majority,

March 11, 1969

the business students, the education students, the engineers and agronomists and the dental technicians, have been using the system to get emoluments. The disaffected, most of them humanists and social scientists, have been engaging in a kind of status revolt to keep the university from being used that way.

As private citizens it may be impossible for us to keep out of this dispute, but, as Legislators, I hope that we can limit our involvement to a clear statement of our intent to provide a forum and a political atmosphere in which rational discussions can take place. In effect, this means that we must maintain the rule of law and we should not hesitate to make it clear that we intend to do so.

I will not be an apologist for or a supporter of any government which proffers the hemlock to a modern Socrates, if such there be amongst us, but let me make it very clear that I do not intend to be silent, while a small, well-disciplined and externally inspired group on our local campuses attempt to pervert the normal radicalism of youth into an ugly thing, a humorless thing, devoid of human decency.

Those who think as I do have no desire to stifle the voices of dissent, but we do warn the dissenters that we will fight and we will fight hard to assure for ourselves and for our children the right to achieve our goals by the exercise of reason and to the give-and-take of the democratic process.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — We do not intend to let our teenagers accept without challenge the belief that subversion is the “in” thing and that the underground high school newspaper has some special claims to justice and to truth.

A little over a year ago the distinguished American diplomat, George F. Kennan delivered an address to the students of Swarthmore College. It was reproduced in the New York Times magazine under the title, “Rebels Without a Program” and is the key-note section of a recently published book “Democracy and the Student Left.” I wish I could place all of Mr. Kennan’s remarks on the record of this Assembly for those of them are pertinent to the present situation. Let me read just one paragraph:

When we are confronted with attempts to frighten or intimidate an administration into doing things for which it can itself see neither the rationale nor the electoral mandate, when we are offered, as the only argument for change, the fact that a number of people are themselves very angry and very excited, and when we are presented with a violent objection to what exists, unaccompanied by any constructive concept of what ideally ought to exist in its place, then we of my generation can only

recognize that such behavior bears a disconcerting resemblance to phenomena which we have witnessed within our time in the origins of totalitarianism in other countries. Then we have no choice but to rally to the defence of a public authority, with which we may not be in agreement, but which is the only one we have got and with which in some form or another we cannot conceivably dispense. People should bear in mind that if this noise, violence and lawlessness is the way they are going to put their case, then many of us who are no happier than they are about some of the policies that arouse their indignation will have no choice but to place ourselves on the other side of the barricade.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not advocating that students be given more positive roles in the government of the University, because I feel that they have an inalienable right to such a role but rather because I feel they have a real contribution to make. Many of our institutions, including the University, need the freshness of thought and the untrammelled imagination which youthful minds can bring to their administration.

I hope that the recent action of a small politically inspired group on this and other campuses will not influence Members to react against the valid aspirations of thousands of less vocal but equally highly motivated students.

Speaking specifically to the amendment, I'm certainly not opposed to the underlying principles which it suggests. However, I will vote against it, because I feel it adds very little to the Resolution and in fact it could complicate the situation quite unnecessarily.

Dealing specifically with section (a) of the amendment, this would provide additional representation from some unspecified faculty group on the Senate and the Board of Governors. I would like to point out the responsibility which members of the faculty, including those of lecturers rank, have as members of campus councils. Each of these councils is represented by 18 members on the General University Council, and I'm sure that the opinions of these three councils are a major factor in decision-making by the Senate and the Board of Governors of the University.

I feel that the student representation on these councils may be a desirable thing. It has not been proposed. I feel that there is a good case to be made for student representation on these councils and on the councils or the student-faculty groups, which can meet informally in each of the colleges or departments of the University. Also, I would point out that the Senate does have some 32 members who are ex officio, because they are senior faculty members, deans, directors of academic programs and administrative officers, and if this is not adequate faculty representation, then we obviously have little faith in our senior, academic and administrative appointees.

March 11, 1969

Section (b) of the proposed amendment suggests further provision for a student representation on the Board of Governors. As for this section I will not argue the point whether or not that representation would contribute to more efficient government of the University. Since the Senate has the privilege of naming five of its members to the Board of Governors, I think it is sufficient to suggest that the student representatives proposed by the original Resolution will be available for such appointment. Surely such an appointment to the Board of Governors would be much more prestigious than one which is made purely on the basis of statutory requirements.

With respect to section (c) of the proposed amendment, the description of the Commission which it contains is also a perfect description of the Senate of the University. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) asks for a Commission composed of representatives of the public, the University administration, faculty and students. May I remind him that the Senate membership represents 21 province-wide organizations, including the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, the SARM, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association. The 14 members elected by convocation are selected from geographical areas which cover the province and the 34 ex officio members represent the Government, University administration and the senior faculty. When proposed, and we hope that this is done, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) will agree that there will be no body better constituted to study and to report on possible changes in the administrative structure than the University Senate or a Committee thereof.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this Resolution in anticipation of the benefits which it may produce for the students, for the administration and the general welfare of our University. I will not vote for the amendment because I feel that the clauses which it contains are largely redundant.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — I intend to have a few words to say about this Resolution and the amendment that has been proposed. I'm not completely ready to speak yet but one of the things that struck me, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking, is that I agree with him in many ways. Perhaps our University atmosphere, perhaps our University life does need a little bit of a shock, a little short-circuiting, as he suggests, by the appointment of a Commission, by the election or appointment of students and faculty to the University Board of Governors. Maybe it does need a little shock, but I think we ought to be careful that we don't electrocute it. These changes are sweeping. They are something that I want to consider after a few days, and I beg

leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

RETURN NO. 63

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. J. Kwasnica (Cutknife) for Return No. 63 showing:

With respect to students who applied for loans under the terms of the Canada Student Loan Plan in the fiscal year 1968-69 to January 31, 1969; (a) the number of loans granted; (b) the average amount granted; (c) the average amount applied for; (d) the number of applications for which the amount granted was less than the amount applied for; (e) the number rejected altogether; (f) the number of applicants qualifying for independent status under the regulations; (g) the number of applicants not qualifying for independent status under the regulations; and (h) the average amount of parental contribution required where the applicant was classed as dependent.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, on this Motion for Return I should like to propose an amendment, seconded by Mr. Heald as follows:

That part (e) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(e) the number of applicants not qualifying for a loan;

And the following words be added to the Motion:

(i) the number of applicants where the amount that could be granted was greater than the amount requested.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, that there are something like over 8,000 applications that were received. The motion, as it's presented with all its various subsections, will call for a great deal of work to review each and every one of these. It will be some time before we can give the Hon. Member the answer. We can give him the first part (a), (b) and (c) without any difficulty, without very much difficulty because these records we have, but the rest of the information will take a good deal of time to gather.

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife): — Could I ask the Minister to clarify what he intends to do with the last section? In simple English, what are you trying to tell me really?

March 11, 1969

Mr. Speaker: — I draw your attention to the fact that a person gets one speech. He's already made his speech, and you've already made yours. The debate continues.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) may wish to close the debate too, let me remind him of that, in case he thinks he is being hard done by.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — GUARANTEED WHEAT PRICE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):

That this Legislature recommend that the Provincial Government requests the Federal Government to adopt an agricultural policy that would provide for both an export and domestic guaranteed price for wheat, set through a study of production costs and world market trends and subject to periodic review, to insure an adequate standard of living for the farmer.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague the Member from Kelsey a few days ago produced an excellent review of the need for a two-price system for the farmer for the wheat that he grows. I do believe and feel that his presentation went far beyond the usual chatter in this Legislature by Members of the Government who have continued to say that farmers can take care of the problem themselves, and that farmers really don't need any assistance. I believe his presentation went again beyond the bogey-man policies of the Government which suggest that farmers can shift their present economic conditions by a simple combination of many enterprises which they call diversification. As the Member for Kelsey provided the broad basis to well establish the need for this Resolution, I do not intend to deal extensively with the subject at this time. I suggest that a two-price system is not the end-all solution to ills of agriculture. It will provide the additional income that is necessary at this point of time for survival of many of Saskatchewan's farmers who will otherwise, I suggest, disappear from the farming community. It will provide time for development of what may be a more reasonably based program related to guaranteed minimum income, which I suggest must inevitably come.

Secondly, I suggest it is a reasonable request to make of any government in order to sustain one of the principal industries

of both a national and provincial economy. It would also seem that any Resolution of this nature in Saskatchewan would certainly receive the support of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Our major resource is farm products. They contribute slightly less than one billion dollars to the Provincial economy. I suggest that, if you contrast these with the mineral revenues and with their subsequent tax grants and their grant incentive programs and other means of tax handouts, the proposal of a two-price wheat marketing program for agriculture becomes totally relevant. I suggested earlier that, unless there is financial stabilization of the farming economy, we will continue to see constant erosion at accelerated rates of our rural population in Saskatchewan.

For the years 1961 to 1966, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports Saskatchewan farm population has declined 25,000 or more. This means that there are 4,000 farmers per year that are leaving Saskatchewan farms. When we see how the farm revenues are structured in this province, there is little wonder why farmers are leaving the land. The 1966 census of Canadian agriculture shows classification of Saskatchewan farms on the basis of their agricultural product sold. It shows that there are 9,100 of these farms that have gross sales from \$1,200 to \$2,000 annually. Another 9,200 farms have sold \$2,500 to \$3,750 annually, another 8,600 sold \$3,750 to \$5,000 worth of products annually, and the largest group in this selection of farms is the next group, 15,500 farms that had gross sales from \$5,000 to \$7,500 worth of farm products in a year. This shows that 54,000 or 64 per cent of Saskatchewan farmers operate and live from gross farm sales of less than \$10,000 annually. To indicate what this means in terms of actual farm operation I have a 1966 income tax return from a person in my constituency that operates a seven quarter section farm, and that falls into this largest single farmer group with the gross sales that are in the area from \$5,000 to \$7,500 annually. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is necessary if I don't wish to table the document that I take full responsibility for the material that . . .

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — The Member . . .

Mr. Speaker: — . . . He can take his choice. He can table it and take full and complete responsibility for its content, the fact that it is a bona fide document.

Mr. Bowerman: — Very well, Mr. Speaker, I will take full responsibility for the signed document and that it is an income tax return for the year 1966.

I refer to the statement of income and expenses for the year 1966. It shows the income on this basis: wheat sold \$2,740.38; Wheat Board payment \$429; barley \$4.81; rye \$468; cattle \$2,139; pigs \$942; cream \$441; goods used \$100. I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture will appreciate that this

March 11, 1969

is a fully diversified farm that the income is coming not only from grain, but from cattle and hogs and cream and some of the other things that this person is producing. This is a gross income of \$7,265 from a seven quarter section farm. It falls into the largest category that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics says that Saskatchewan has in this particular area of farm production. The expenses on this farm show: interest \$340; miscellaneous \$42; phone \$44; power \$175; taxes \$257; tires and batteries \$99; mineral for livestock \$42; tractor and truck gas and oil \$891; repairs and maintenance \$1,186; family wages \$100; lumber \$169; depreciation \$2,125. For a total of \$6,174 of expenses.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — What was the cultivated acreage?

Mr. Bowerman: — I am not sure what the cultivated acreage was. This is in the poorer land area as you will recognize because of the fact that seven quarter sections of land certainly ought to be able to produce more than this.

An Hon. Member: — What was the gross income?

Mr. Bowerman: — The net income was \$1,081.

An Hon. Member: — What was the gross? . . .

Mr. Bowerman: — \$7,265. And the net income was \$1,081.55. Now this is less than \$100 a month. If he uses his depreciation as farmers are doing today, it in fact contributes to him \$320 a month.

What I am suggesting is that, as the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has said in this House, farming is not really on the high and glorious plane that it was demonstrated by him to be.

We have heard in this Legislature a good deal of talk about the high level of capitalization on Saskatchewan farms, and indeed this partly is true. But I am suggesting that the capital net income position of farmers is directly related and influenced by their net income position. Again, in the 1966 census of Canadian agriculture it shows that over 50,000 of the 70,000 commercial farms in Saskatchewan range in total capital value between \$25,000 and \$100,000. Only 3,400 of these commercial farms exceed \$150,000 of total capital value. This capital assessment includes land and buildings, machinery, equipment, automobiles, livestock and poultry, and it is estimated on a market value basis. This is a far cry from what has been said in this House about the relationship of the estates tax to the family farm in Saskatchewan. If this capital assessment is an impressive one, it certainly will appear much less impressive when we relate to it the current farm credit picture in Saskatchewan, or in Canada. The Farm Credit Corporation Annual Report of 1967-68 says that

one farm in every four has an average mortgage of \$15,000 and the average Farm Credit Loan last year was \$22,000. If we want to talk about nationalization of farm land, the largest land title holder in Canada today is the Prime Minister of Canada, who through farm credit legislation holds most of the titles in Canada at the present time. Maybe he should start selling wheat.

The number of farm credit mortgages and their amount have all but doubled in the last five-year period. In 1967-68 alone the number and amount of farm credit loans increased by 10 per cent and by 22.3 per cent respectively. At the same time the percentage of loans in good standing decreased by .8 per cent. In addition to the Farm Credit Corporation mortgages the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that Saskatchewan farmers are utilizing another \$60 or \$70 million annually under the Farm Improvement Loans Act. Both of these programs are Federal Government farm loan programs to which you can add the Canada Trust and Mortgage Company, industrial loans from John Deere and Massey Ferguson, Ford and other machine companies and lending agency accounts. Also it doesn't include the banks and the credit unions and the finance companies who are all servicing farm credit. I want to quote here from The Leader Post of January 29th, entitled, "Farmers' debts are growing."

Prairie farmers have been sliding deeper into debt and now owe more than \$2 billion, H.D. McRorie manager of the Royal Bank of Canada Prairie Agriculture Department said Monday night.

He told the Canadian Agro-marketing Association that financing farming operations has become more difficult and farmers may become more conscious about borrowing more money. It will have to be self-imposed rationing, said Mr. McRorie. Farmers will have to make their own decision on whether to extend their current debt position. Many may have to decide to cut back on capital expansion this year. In the period from 1961 to 1967, farmers' short-term debt climbed to \$1.3 billion from \$775 million. Intermediate debt rose to \$500 million from \$232 million, and long term debts climbed to \$375 million from \$137 million. This points to a rather gloomy picture insofar as agriculture is concerned. Again, it is not the gray train that it was said to be by the Hon. Minister of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, the net capital position of Saskatchewan in agriculture is one which is dead on the line. I suggest that, if it increases in any extent, it will mean bankruptcy for Saskatchewan farmers as we know them today. Farmers not only face a critical debt position, but added to this is the usual hazard of the weather such as we have had this year, the loss of their market, the continuing falling prices, and the continuing increased costs of farming operations and the continuing increased costs of farming operations and the interest which they must pay on their loans. From this vantage point all farm leaders, or at least most farm leaders, except Liberal Governments and Liberal Ministers of Agriculture, are aware of the impending consequences. I would like to quote again from The Leader Post of January 29, entitled, "Western grain farmers

March 11, 1969

face financial disaster.”

James Bentley, the president of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, said Tuesday that many Western grain farmers are on the brink of financial disaster.

And he goes on to talk about the drying of grain in the West.

Unless greater drying facilities are provided along with financial assistance to operate them, many farmers could be in serious financial predicament from which they might never recover.

I would hope that the Minister of Agriculture would listen to that.

Canadian grain exports in 1968 had dropped 35 per cent from the previous year and 26 per cent below the last five-year average.

Mr. Bentley said that the precarious position of wheat growers could result in serious disruption of other sectors of the agricultural community.

If large stocks of unsaleable grain continue to pile up on the farms there could be a shift to livestock production which could result in economic disaster if the increase is not tailored to the effective demand.

What we have been trying to say to this House before in this session is that this continual talk about the diversification of agriculture and the establishing of more cattle, without there being some tailoring to the effective demand, will only, I think, increase the problem and the predicament of the farmers which they are already in.

Mr. Bentley predicated that stock-piled wheat and flour will reach 685 million by the end of July.

Canada's share of the total world wheat trade had dropped to 17.2 per cent in 1968 from the traditional 25 per cent. Canadian wheat prices in 1968 had dropped 18 cents to \$1.94 a bushel compared with \$2.12 in 1967.

He goes on to say:

It is significant to note that while prices of wheat to farmers have declined bread prices this last fall increased to the consumer 2 cents per loaf.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there must be an interim stabilization program to assist farmers through this agricultural depression. My hon. colleague has moved a Resolution which, I believe, when put into effect, will serve to accomplish this requirement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members

to support the Resolution.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — INTRODUCING STUDENT GROUPS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):

That this House request Mr. Speaker, to introduce all student groups sitting in the Galleries before the Orders of the Day are entered into, and should the House be in a Committee of the Whole, request the Deputy Speaker to perform the same function.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Thibault:

That all the words after the word “House” where it appears in the first line be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

request the Special Committee on Procedures of the House to study the procedure of introducing students to this House.

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — I feel that this Resolution and this amendment are of much greater importance than many Members may take them to be. I would heartily endorse the stand that my hon. friend, Mr. Thibault from Kinistino, has taken. Again it is the youth and the students of our province that we have the privilege to show our concern for. If we defeat this amendment and support the Resolution, we, Mr. Speaker, are in fact saying to our young people that we as Members have no time to give you in our busy schedule. After all these young people are the citizens of tomorrow. What type of citizen they will make depends on what time, effort and opportunity that we as their Members offer to give them, so that they might have the opportunity to learn about many of today’s problems. Our concern for them has much greater effect than what I believe many Members seem to realize. So I urge, Mr. Speaker, all Members to support this amendment and to defeat this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I think I probably introduce as few students in this House as anyone, but I feel that I must speak on this matter because, while it might appear to some to be trivial, it probably involved more than appears at first glance.

It has been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that we have selected a Special Committee on House Procedures. I suggest that it is

March 11, 1969

a very poor way for us to start out by deciding by this motion one of the questions that should be within their purview. The Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has taken some time in pointing out what has been undisputed and that is that the very little time that is actually taken in introductions of students in this House by private Members. Surely, when students or visitors appear their own Member of the Legislature should have the right to introduce them, if this is done with discretion and responsibility. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is every evidence, certainly no evidence to the contrary, that Members have exercised responsibility and discretion in such introductions.

The real question is one of not diminishing the status of a Member of the Legislative Assembly and particularly the private MLA. I think the real question also is possibly associated with giving an MLA the right to speak to people that come from his own constituency or area. With deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I think that introductions through the Chair would constitute a stale and sterile procedure, whereas introductions from the Members of the House rising in their places on both sides of the House would enrich rather than injure the lifeblood and the vitality of this House.

Mr. Speaker, our House procedures are necessarily formal and the brief comments that Members can make on Orders of the Day provide a leeway and a flexibility, which I think are deliberately conceived as a counter to over-rigidity and to enervating forms within the House. It would be a great mistake to restrict Members in their right to introduce students from their own constituency areas.

I want to point this out, Mr. Speaker, - and I know that you are well aware of this — that Saskatchewan possibly is unique among the provinces in the number of students that visit this Assembly, that sit in the galleries and gain, I think, some knowledge, some understanding, some overall impressions and probably that which is most important, what this House is all about, what our kind of democracy is all about. I think that it is a great thing for our forms and our Legislature that these young people are visiting us. I point out again that I don't think anywhere in Canada is there the number of young people visiting a Legislature as is the case in this Province. I say, Mr. Speaker, to Members on both sides of the House why enforce a tongue-tied Member in the presence of his own constituents?

To sum up, and I am not going to labor the point, I think that it is obvious to everyone that the little time that is taken in the introductions gives no reason for the kind of action that is contemplated in the motion. I say, secondly, that action contemplated intrudes on the work of the Committee which this House has set up in good faith. In fact the action that is contemplated is premature and ill-advised at this time for these reasons. I say that the action intended by the motion robs this House of some of its vigor and some of its color. I say that it eliminates a common practice and an understood right of the private Member in this House. I would appeal to Members on both

sides of this House to vote the motion down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, very briefly and very quickly I want to add a few words of support for the amendment.

Presumably all during these years when students have come to this Legislature we have meant what we have said when we rose in our places and welcomed them here. I am sure that we did mean what we said, and the continuation of this practice is one way to convince them that we really do welcome them when they come to visit this institution. It is one way, Mr. Speaker, to make this institution look like a human sort of thing, a living thing. I submit the more we transfer the opportunity to welcome and introduce these students from the Members down here to the Speaker, Sir, the more formalized we make it and we take away some of the humanity of the whole action.

I don't want to take very much time, but we do want, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the students to remember what they have seen and what they have heard in the short time that they spend here. We don't want them just to feel they have come in and looked at something of awe and majesty and unmeaningful to them. We want them to really remember it. There is such a thing as learning more because of the association with those things that please and satisfy. When a Member gets up in his place and welcomes students from his constituency, then that develops a little bit of a bond between us down here and those students up there, and they are more likely to remember more of what they saw as a result of it. I want to add my plea that we do not accept the original motion but that we support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that this amendment deserves careful consideration from the Members of this Assembly. I would like to concur in the words which has just been echoed by my seatmate (Mr. Davies) and the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe that rules of any House should be to protect a minority in the House, not the majority. The majority can always protect themselves. I believe that this Legislature saw fit a while ago to set up a Special Committee to study and examine the rules to see if changes were necessary, I think this was a good move. I believe that the amendment by referring this subject matter to that Committee is a proper amendment. It is not trying to prejudge the decision of that Committee or prejudge what that Committee should do, but is just asking the Committee, which has been appointed by this Legislature on a motion by the Government, to study this main motion. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that, in our rules at the present time if we wanted to practise

March 11, 1969

strict ruling in the Legislature, there is no place for the introduction of students. Our Standing Orders or our Rules and Proceedings of Beauchesne's or soforth, do not make a place for introducing students. It has been done throughout the years as a matter of custom, a matter of courtesy, a matter of tolerance. I believe for that reason that it is a practice that has been long endured here. I would like to see the Members of this Assembly agree that for the balance of this session — and the large influx of students in the future as we have had in the first half of this session — I would like all the Members to consider this amendment to let this session continue as it has done so that this Committee would have a chance to study the question, receive representation from any Member who may care to give a brief to this Committee and to make a report accordingly at a later session. That way I think that we would have better harmony in the House. I would hate to see any group by a majority bring in a ruling at this time which has not properly been considered by a Special Committee or the Committee on Standing Orders, where it has had a chance to go through what we may call the proper channels for discussion first.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Government and the Members to support this amendment, so that we may take a look at this in Committee when we are not under the pressure of political or the heat of the debate of this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 20

Messieurs

Lloyd	Dewhurst	Michayluk
Wooff	Meakes	Brockelbank
Kramer	Berezowsky	Pepper
Willis	Romanow	Bowerman
Wood	Smishek	Kwasnica
Blakeney	Thibault	Kowalchuk
Davies	Whelan	

NAYS — 30

Messieurs

Thatcher	MacDougall	Leith
Howes	Grant	Radloff
McFarlane	Coderre	Mitchell
Boldt	Larochelle	Gardner
Cameron	MacDonald	Coupland
Steuart	Hooker	McPherson
Heald	Gallagher	Charlebois
McIsaac	MacLennan	Forsyth
Barrie	Heggie	McIvor
Loken	Breker	Schmeiser

The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): —Mr. Speaker, I think that I am one of the Members in this House that could argue that I have the right to vote for this motion, because I have only introduced one group of students in 17 years. Unfortunately my constituency is in the far North and I have not been honored by students coming often to this Legislature to be introduced and to watch us at work. There are some things that I think are a little more than just Government business. I think that there are some things which belong to us. I think that, if students did come from my constituency from time to time, I would like the House to allow me the small privilege of a minute or two, to introduce the students to the Assembly, to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this Assembly. It is something that I think is important as part of democracy. I think that it is something that is important to an MLA.

Introductions should be above politics. When I think of democracy and of freedoms, I think that this is one kind of personal freedom that I would like to have in this House. I do not wish to say very much about it. I thought that we had good enough judgment to be able to say to ourselves, if we believe in freedoms and democracy and certain human rights and certain rights of the Members of this Legislature, that we would have turned down this motion unanimously. I think that, with the amendment being lost, I would be out of order in discussing the proposal of the amendment, but I would like to say that I think that this might have saved the day. I do not know how the Government Members are going to vote on the motion, but I think that it will be a sad day for the Province of Saskatchewan if they would vote in favor of the motion. I think that it is most regrettable that the Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) should have brought this kind of a motion into this House. I should have said hon. gentleman, but I hesitated as you saw.

Mr. Speaker, where does this end? Today we had students who came to Canada to watch democracy in action. Today, Members of the Legislature including yourself, took the opportunity to introduce those students to our parliamentary system. I was very, very proud. I have relatives in Czechoslovakia. I did not know if any were here and I didn't ask. But were they here, I would have been proud for them to watch how we perform here. And, this again, is something that we as MLAs should be doing from time to time. It doesn't take too much time of the House. I think that introductions are very appropriate and I think that it is very democratic. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, there are times when we have other groups coming into this House which you have the honor of introducing, yet we feel that we have some part of them and so we take the opportunity to say a few words also to introduce them to the Members of this House.

What about a situation where you have a few hockey players? Is this the next step? They have come into this House, they have brought honor to the Province of Saskatchewan, so will I

March 11, 1969

be denied the right to introduce them to other Members and the gentlemen opposite? These are the questions that I must ask myself. I am very sad and disappointed to see that we haven't found some better means of protecting such Members' rights. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that it is 10 o'clock but I can go on if you like, Sir.

Debate adjourned.

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