

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**28th Day**

**Thursday, March 13, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you a group of 40 grade ten students from Kelliher high school who are situated in the east gallery. They came here today under the leadership of their teacher Mr. Ehman, and I am sure that all Members will join with me in wishing them a pleasant, instructive and educational afternoon and a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislative Assembly this afternoon, a group of students from the Indian Residential school at Lebret. They are accompanied by The Rev. Father Gerard and by their teachers Miss Stewardson and Mrs. Greyeyes. I point out to Members of this Assembly that the Indian Residential school at Lebret is one of the oldest established schools in Saskatchewan, having first begun operations in 1884. As a matter of history, the original principal of that school was The Rev. Hugonard. The school is conducted under the auspices of The Order of The Oblates of Mary Immaculate. I am sure that the students will enjoy themselves here this afternoon and we hope that they have a very safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you I too want to offer a word of welcome to the school from Lebret. They are within the Melville constituency. I know that they are going to enjoy their visit here this afternoon and on behalf of all of us here I wish to extend a word of welcome.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University):** — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today to introduce through you to the Members of this Assembly a group of 51 students that are here from the constituency of City Park-University in Saskatoon. Twenty-one of these students are

attending Richmond high school and they are here with their teachers, Mr. Hill. And then we have 30 students who are here from College Park school and they are accompanied by Mrs. Wallace. These are two of the newer schools in Saskatoon. It is certainly a pleasure to see them here and see the interests their teachers are taking in seeing that they enjoy this day in Regina. We wish them a very happy and safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the House through you a group of students from the Lorne Hazelton school located in Nutana South constituency. This is a very distinguished name in educational circles in Saskatoon. Dr. Lorne Hazelton after whom the school is named was for over 30 years very closely connected with the public school board in the city of Saskatoon. We are very proud of this school and we are very proud of the man after whom it was named. We certainly hope that the students from that school will enjoy their visit in Regina and enjoy their stay in the Legislature with us.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### SALE OF ESTEVAN BRICK PLANT

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — Hon. Members know that the Government has been endeavoring for some time to sell the Estevan Brick Plant. In the past six months several concrete offers have been received. Today I am pleased to announce that a sale has been completed to the Peben Contractors Limited of Edmonton.

I might say that the President of this company is a man called Mr. Peter Shipka. The takeover by the purchaser has been made effective January 1st last, or at the beginning of the fiscal current year. The purchase price will be \$610,000 with a cash payment of \$110,000 and the balance over ten years.

Peben Contractors Limited have given assurances for continued operation of the plant, and they have indicated that modest expansions will take place. All present employees will be kept on the job. Prior to the date when the present Government took office, the Estevan Brick Plant had experienced a long series of financial difficulties. In the period 1961-64 inclusive, the company incurred losses which totalled \$337,000. These of course had to be absorbed by the Saskatchewan taxpayer.

Sometime ago the Government reorganized management at the plant. As a result it began to show some very modest profits. In spite of a loss in 1967, due to a prolonged strike, the plant had total profits of about \$75,000 in the period 1965-68

**March 13, 1969**

inclusive. The Government has for some time been endeavoring to sell this enterprise, provided that it could be disposed of without serious loss to the people whose money is invested in it. It is not the kind of business, such as power and telephone, which are by nature somewhat monopolistic in the areas where they operate.

The brick plant is engaged in the production of building materials in a competitive market. It is the kind of industry likely to operate more efficiently and economically under private ownership and management. Peben Contractors Limited will bring to the operation of this plant their very considerable amount of relevant experience. We welcome them and wish them well in this venture.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in the past six months we, the Government, have had four concrete offers on this plant. We have accepted the highest of the four.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **GRAIN DRYERS**

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Hon. Members will be glad to know of the significant progress being made in the Province of Saskatchewan as far as grain drying is concerned. I am sure that they will be interested to hear the results of the Wheat Board report that was compiled as of February 28th and issued March 11th. It shows the increase in the number of grain dryers in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta, the drying capacities of each province and the amount of grain that is being dried by each province. The figures for the end of February show that, as of January there were 1,330 grain dryers in Saskatchewan; as of March 1st this figure had increased to 1,569 as compared to 721 in Manitoba and 1,016 in Alberta. The number of grain dryers in operation, even in spite of the inclement weather in February, showed 1,049 in Saskatchewan as against 456 the month before, compared to 375 in Manitoba and 501 in Alberta. More significant still is the total capacity of all dryers. In Saskatchewan as of March 1st the total capacity per day was 2½ million bushels up from 1½ million the month before. This compares with 908,000 bushels in Manitoba and 1½ million in Alberta. The quantity being dried in February as up to March 1st shows that there are 1½ million bushels being dried in Saskatchewan as against 570,000 in Manitoba and some 635,000 in Alberta. The number of bushels dried showed a total of 28,156,000 in our Province. The number of bushels left to be delivered on three-bushel quota in Saskatchewan was cut down quite substantially to 17,175,000. So we started the month of March with a total of 83 million bushels left in the province to be dried or to be fed to livestock or to be turned over to prevent spoilage.

So even with the adverse weather in January and February, I suggest a tremendous record has been established by the farmers, the elevator companies and all those who have devoted their time and interest to the solving of this major problem.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). My question is whether the Government will undertake a program similar to the one announced in Ontario that will encourage and assist the employment of students in both the Public Service and the private industry this summer in view of the serious difficulties that have been forecast for student employment this year?

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what program the Hon. Member is referring to that has been announced in Ontario. I have not heard of it. I can tell him that we are making every effort through the Public Service Commission and the Crown corporations to secure employment for our students and to make every possible job opportunity available that we have to the students who will be seeking summer employment.

**Mr. Davies** — May I just ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister if he will study the program that was announced this morning and see if this will assist him and assist student employment?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I will be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

### LETTER RE MOOSE JAW WATER SUPPLY

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and with your permission I would like to share a communication with other Members of this House. I have with me a letter which was addressed to me but one that I think other Members will be interested in. And it says:

Dear Mr. Snyder:

I was sincerely concerned on reading of the plight of the Members of this Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan on Monday, in that they were unable to obtain drinking water fit to drink from the taps of the Capital City.

**March 13, 1969**

Moose Jaw has an abundant supply of clear, cool water and has had for some 17 years. I wish to supply you with a gallon of this pure, chlorinated, fluorinated, crystal-clear drinking water for you and your colleagues, both Government and Opposition Members.

We would be prepared to assure you of a supply for the duration of your debates but would also suggest that a permanent solution would be to move the Capital of the Province to our city where we can assure you we have water of the highest quality and quantity.

Signed: Yours sincerely, L.H. Lewry, Mayor

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, and without attempting to sound like a toothpaste commercial, I would like to suggest to you that the additives which the Friendly City has been placing in our drinking water supply for many years has resulted in a marked decrease in cavities in our children's teeth. You only have to ask any dentist in either of the two cities, either Moose Jaw or Regina and they will tell you that Moose Jaw youngsters have by far the superior record in this respect. While we lay claim to a solution to the problem of holes in our children's teeth, we don't maintain, however, that the superior grade of water will do anything for holes in other parts of the head, and I address this remark especially to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy).

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to table this sample of another superior Moose Jaw product.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, since my name was brought into this debate, I would only like to say that, as Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, the city of Moose Jaw wouldn't be having such fine water if it wasn't for the efforts of the Government of Saskatchewan today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I can't be outdone by the Minister of Public Works for fear that the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) might rise to his feet and take credit for Moose Jaw's water. The letter from His Worship Mayor Lewry indicated that this event took place 17 years ago. I was Mayor of Regina at that time. Therefore it was through the foresight of the Mayor and city council of Regina 17 years ago that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw is able to present this water today, and it is not solely through the efforts of the Mayor of Moose Jaw.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is a wonderful-looking bottle of water, but I draw your attention to the fact that water is awfully good stuff to wash in but not so good for carrying on a conversation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — Mr. Speaker, could I just comment. We appreciate this water and of course the former Mayor the Hon. Minister of Public Health was in office at that time, but I can assure him that we had an awful lot of trouble with that water when I got into office and we had to do something about it. I had one gentleman say to me that when you turned on the tap everything came through except the hoofs and the horns. We do appreciate having this from the Member from Moose Jaw South, but I hope that it has been filtered of the sewage that goes down Moose Jaw Creek. I hope that that isn't in it, Mr. Snyder, because we would accept it and with our well water here, we have the best in the West. We do appreciate that Moose Jaw is getting this good water through the efforts of Regina as well.

## RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION NO. 12 — LONG DISTANCE TOLLS

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford) moved, seconded by Mr. Messer (Kelsey):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that Saskatchewan Government Telephones assume responsibility for collection of long distance tolls on calls originating with Rural Telephone Companies, or alternatively pay to the said companies full collection costs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for some time and for several years there has been growing concern on the part of rural telephone companies regarding the increasing costs of collecting toll fees for Saskatchewan Government Telephones, I believe now known as Saskatchewan Telecommunications. Along with this concern there has arisen a vociferous criticism of Saskatchewan Telecommunication's commission allowing rural telephone companies the collection of these long distance tolls. This concern, Mr. Speaker, and this criticism reached what you might speak of as a crescendo, at the last annual Rural Telephone Companies' convention held in Saskatoon on November 8th.

In order to give some credence to what I have just said, I would like to quote two resolutions, one from the 1967 Rural Telephone convention held in Regina and the other from the 1968

**March 13, 1969**

Rural Telephone convention which was held in Saskatoon last November. The one from the 1967 convention reads as follows:

Whereas the cost to rural telephone companies in connection with collection of toll charges is continually rising and, whereas the present reimbursement by Saskatchewan Government Telephones of \$1.25 per subscriber to rural telephone companies to defray the costs of such collections is totally inadequate. And, whereas the cost of this company in the process of making these collections which includes postage and maintenance of records, plus uncollectable accounts, has risen to \$3 per subscriber.

Therefore, be it resolved that the grant to rural telephone companies for collection of toll charges be increased from \$1.25 to \$3 per subscriber.

That was at the 1967 convention held here in Regina. The resolution from Turtleford presented to last year's convention on the very same subject reads as follows:

Whereas the cost of rural telephone companies with collection of toll charges is continually rising and, whereas the present reimbursement by Saskatchewan Government Telephones of \$1.25 per subscriber to the rural telephone companies to defray the cost of such collections is totally inadequate.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Saskatchewan Government Telephones be responsible for the collection of long distance tolls or give a grant to the rural telephone companies of 10 per cent of long distance tolls.

May I just remark, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution that finally passed the 1968 convention read essentially the same as the one that I have just read except that it requested a commission of 20 per cent instead of 10 per cent. May I point out that this resolution that passed last year's convention was substantially the same as the one that I have just read with the change that I already noted that the reimbursement be raised from 10 to 20 per cent.

Here, Mr. Speaker, are some figures from my own company in Turtleford. The allowance made to the rural company for the collection of long distance fees as has already been noted, is still \$1.25 per subscriber. The Turtleford company consists of something like 251 rural subscribers, which means that there is a monthly bill for postage alone of about \$15. The yearly cost for mailing comes to \$180.72. The large number of these subscribers take more than one billing as anyone who has anything to do with rural telephone companies is aware. The real crunch comes that any bills that are not collected are the responsibility of the rural telephone company. That is that any subscriber who has left the area by one way or another selling

out and leaving the area, the company must pick up the bill on their behalf. Any disputed bill of any subscriber, which for one reason or another is not sent in within a given term, again becomes the telephone company's responsibility.

I think that most of you are well aware, if you have had anything to do with some of the larger companies, that farmers living 25 miles away from the local company's office and trading in some other town or centre, do not always pay their bills strictly on a monthly basis especially in the busy seasons of spring and harvest. Again, our local secretary receives the magnificent sum of \$600 per annum for services as a secretary to the local board. He estimates that \$400 of the \$600, or two-thirds of his time is spent purely on collections. This means that \$400 out of his salary is chargeable to the collection of long distance toll fees.

The board's estimate of last year is that it costs them \$450 per year more than the \$1.25 subscriber, allowed by Saskatchewan Telecommunications, to collect and remit the \$12,569 sent in to Saskatchewan Telecommunications for the year.

Mr. Speaker, just in case someone should jump up with the old bogey of inefficiency, I would like to point out that the Turtleford company's costs are considerably below that of many other even larger companies within the province. Corporation officials at the convention did throw out a suggestion that they would look at the possibility of mailing bills from Regina. However, may I say, Mr. Speaker, this was not received with any enthusiasm by the convention. They didn't consider that that was an answer to the problem that the local companies face at the present time. Just in case this whole matter is treated too lightly, may I emphatically state that some of the rural telephone companies are seriously considering a flat refusal to collect long distance telephone fees in the coming year or in the years that lie ahead.

Before taking my seat may I urge the Government to look seriously at a change of policy in the commission now allowed rural telephone companies for the service of collecting long distance toll fees. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the 1968 profits of SaskTel, I see no reason why rural telephone boards should carry on at a yearly loss to their local company.

**Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways):** — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**RESOLUTION NO. 14 — TRAINING AND EDUCATION FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED**

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife) moved, seconded by Mr. Matsalla:

**March 13, 1969**

That this Assembly reaffirms its belief that every child has the right to develop his potentials to the maximum and recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan that appropriate training and education be provided for mentally handicapped by:

- (1) further extending modern training and educational facilities at Moose Jaw or other centres elsewhere in the province.
- (2) passing legislation making it mandatory that educational and training facilities be provided for all students; and
- (3) co-ordinating and assisting all governmental programs and voluntary organizations working for the cause of mental retardation in Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House by now will have seen the Resolution which I am presenting. Fellow Members, have you ever considered what it would be like to be the father of a mentally handicapped child? The happiness at first of hearing the good news when the newborn arrives; the happy hours spent playing with the baby in its first year; the hours spent discussing the child's future educational plans with your wife; and then after a year when the child does not walk or talk as you expected he should, the creeping suspicion that your baby is not quite normal — but you brush that silly notion aside — and then one day it strikes you dumbfoundedly that you are the father of a retarded child. And now the anguish stabs you, the fear, the guilt and you feel that you must cover up to save face in front of your friends and neighbors. You must now give up going out for entertainment because your child needs constant affection and watching and anyway, what young girl wants the responsibility of looking after a retarded six-year old? You make many trips into town Monday mornings to take your child to the folks in town who have agreed to board him, while he attends a special school if he is lucky enough to have one in his area. Then one day you hear a vicious rumor that the nice people who agreed to board your child had a party one night, and as a highlight to their evening of fun, woke up your child at 2 a.m. to bring him into the living room to tease and badger him to see how he reacts, getting a big charge of it all. Then, in desperation you as the parent of this child try to get accommodation for your child at the Moose Jaw Training Centre. You are told the waiting list is 558 and that you would have to wait your turn.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is what it could be like to be parents of a retarded child. Having a retarded child does something to parents. What is this something? First, it seems to be an air of constantly being on the defensive; secondly it seems to be a never-ending search to find out why and where to put the blame, his family, her family, the doctor, the teacher, the psychologist, the social worker, digging, digging always digging for an answer. Having a retarded child in the

family almost inevitably creates confusion, perplexity, horror and fear. All of these often disrupt the family unit and the parent's physical and mental health, not to mention their finances. Many parents of handicapped children feel like colossal failures. They are scolded directly or indirectly by members of their family, by neighbors, by physicians, by teachers, by psychologists and by politicians. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that it is terrible enough to be burdened with the emotional and the psychological side-effects of having a retarded child, let alone not having the necessary facilities to help them develop to their fullest potential. We as politicians owe it to our fellowman to provide the means and finances to alleviate the suffering and humiliation of thousands in our province and in our country.

In 1966, Dr. S.A. Perkins of the University of Lethbridge estimated that there were some 9,000 people in Canada with profound retardation, that is, an I.Q. of 20 or less; some 21,000 people with severe retardation, an I.Q. of 20-35; another 36,000 with moderate retardation, an I.Q. of 36—52 approximately; and another 534,000 mild retardates, an I.Q. of 53—68, making a total of some 600,000 retarded in our country, 240,000 of whom are below the age of 20. Dr. Perkins also estimated that two in every 1,000 children born will be of profound or severe retardation, that three in every 1,000 will be of moderate retardation and that 26 out of every 1,000 born will be of mild retardation.

In Saskatchewan, in a recent survey conducted by the Saskatchewan Commission for Emotional and Learning Disorders in Children, it was estimated that some 25,000 children need special help to offset their handicaps. This figure has since been criticized as being too conservative, perhaps a more accurate number would be 28,000. Only about 1,600 of them or 5.7 per cent of them are actually in institutions. As I understand it, less than 20 per cent of the total number in the province are receiving the type of education that they would benefit from.

Mr. Speaker, when talking about the handicapped in our province we must congratulate the many voluntary organizations who have worked and presently are working for the cause of mental retardation. Also, some excellent ground work has been done by past Provincial Governments in setting up five training and experimental centres such as the ones at Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, and the Alvin Buchwald Unit in Saskatoon, plus several sheltered workshops throughout the province and many classrooms as well. The work-training project at Prince Albert and the unit in Saskatoon were the direct results of a \$20 million national crusade launched in 1967, Centennial Year. The Federal Government is providing annual grants for work and research in the field, but it too must do more. Grants to aid classrooms in Saskatchewan were started by the Provincial Government as early as 1930. These grants were increased in 1952, in 1959 and 1965, when grants to special classes ranged anywhere

**March 13, 1969**

from \$2,500 to \$4,000 a year. All of this, Mr. Speaker, shows a rather slow pace of increased assistance for mental retardation in our province.

However, as my Resolution states it, a greater co-ordinated effort is needed across the province to get the most out of all the existing organizations. I am not asking for preferential treatment for the retarded. At present the rights of the retarded are practically ignored and care is proving costly. Everybody knows that to keep a trainable child untrained costs money, but train him and he can become at least partially self-sufficient. The retarded child should be given a service equal to others, the right to family life, to remain at home, the right to parents, to remain in the community if he wishes, and the right to training and employment.

There are so many things that need to be done and can be done, Mr. Speaker. Now that we are fully aware of the magnitude of the problem, 28,000 people who need help in Saskatchewan, we must immediately find out who they are and where they are and get in touch with their families. An all-out program of diagnosis is needed now to find out specifically the degree of retardation in order to assess fully the needs of each individual. It is hoped that in some cases simple physical deficiencies will be found to be the cause of retardation and these will be cleared up quickly and easily. To this end, Mr. Speaker, I suggest a mobile diagnostic clinic, a sort of mobile health clinic should be set up to travel around the province.

We must next work out our aims and objectives of our programs. If our general aim is to ensure that every child get an opportunity to receive the type of education and training that he can benefit from, then our next job is to set priorities. Perhaps we would gain the most by tackling the problem of preschool retardates and we could follow the Quebec plan of using volunteer Home Care Workers. A committee could be set up composed of a cross-section of those involved to establish aims and objectives of our whole program. I am sure that one of the aims would be to integrate as many handicapped into society as possible. Therefore, I would recommend that all trainable handicapped should be taught in regular school buildings, sharing possible activities and facilities with others and having whatever benefits there are from family and community association. We should invite these children to join us in ordinary living. There is legislation governing the education of children, there are school facilities designated for children, there are school boards who have responsibilities for the education of children. Retarded children are children.

I believe also that the Provincial Government should pass legislation, taking the initiative in urging mandatory educational and training services for all mentally handicapped in the province. The State of Connecticut saw little real action until a mandatory law was passed in 1959. In that state the number of classrooms for the retarded jumped from 70 to around

400 in about four years' time. This caused a tremendous demand for teachers. This in turn put greater pressure on the university to train people and the universities in turn came to the training schools to get some help.

The legislation, if passed here, should be helpful, not restrictive. It should not lay down explicit admission criteria for special classes; it should not state minimum or maximum enrolment requirements. It should keep in mind that regulations suitable for urban centres may not be appropriate in rural areas. At present, school districts are not obliged by law to provide for the education of retarded children. However, most districts pay the tuition when children are able to attend special classes outside their own school system. Some may also pay for transportation costs. Legislation placing more responsibility on local school districts would have to be accompanied by a considerable increase in grants for this specific purpose. I feel that Section 122 of The School Act should simply be amended by changing the word "may" to "must" in two places so that the Section would read, "A board must establish special classes of instruction for children who are from any physical or mental cause unable to take proper advantage of the regular public school courses of study or must provide financial assistance to any person or organization conducting such special classes."

However, if mandatory legislation is not passed in the near future, the Government should then give direct aid to parents keeping handicapped children under 18 years at home. This would make it possible to keep these children in the community where they are less expensive to care for and are happier and likely to be more useful citizens. At the same time, special provision in school grants should be made for bussing to schools for urban handicapped children.

Another pressing need is that of greater co-ordination of the many rehabilitation and voluntary agencies working in the field of mental retardation in the province. We must get them to work together to avoid duplication and overlapping of services — a mammoth task, I admit. The office of the Provincial Co-ordinator of Rehabilitation must reassess its progress to date. If it feels it is unable to do the necessary job, perhaps the Department of Public Health could act as the co-ordinating agency. Since the Department of Public Health already shows a good deal of interest in the problem, and since it is better for one agency to assume continuity of responsibility for the retarded from birth to old age, this Department is the most logical co-ordinator. The problem here lies with the job of co-ordinating all the volunteer organizations, all the various departments of government such as Labor, Manpower, Welfare, and Health and the various facilities provided for the handicapped by the different government departments. The whole picture needs to be assessed, and following that, co-ordination, delineation of tasks and suggested modes of action to the various agencies must be given. We have the basis for easy co-ordinated action in the 11 Health Regions of the province which

**March 13, 1969**

are already set up.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, that must be looked at is the question of guardianship. Guardianship should be arranged for persons whose parents are unable to assume this responsibility. Parents worry a great deal about the future of their children when they are gone, but at the same time they do not wish to lose control during their lifetime. Legislation could be passed to enable the province to assume guardianship in such cases. There is no reason why retarded persons could not become wards of the Minister of Public Health, just as children can at present become wards of the Minister of Welfare. Guardianship could be assumed after a court hearing. It would not mean that the person would be institutionalized, but simply that he was in need of protective services and that there would be some person in the community holding legal responsibility to supervise the care, management, education and general well-being of the mentally retarded. Child Welfare Officers exercise this responsibility without too much trouble and I feel the retarded have a right to similar services. The guardianship plan would have to be very carefully worked out so that individual rights or rights of parents and legal guardians are not infringed upon.

There is also a need for some person to oversee the actual classroom instruction given to the handicapped. For lack of a better name, he could be called a superintendent or a chief consultant to parents and teachers within a health region. This advisor could help set up a flexible curriculum to be used as a guide of instruction and training for the different levels of achievers. This consultant could be the chief idea man for teachers and the main advisor to parents. He could also carry out a public education and information campaign through the press, radio, television and films. This same consultant might also help to plan a unit of study on the mentally handicapped and their problems to be taught at the various grade levels in the public school system.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, much more support must be given for research. There are at least 70 known and suspected causes of retardation. Some occur before birth, others during birth and still others in early infancy. Much more research is needed into the causes of retardation, into the methods of diagnosing, into the methods of teaching and training, and into levels of achievement. Much more stress must be placed on research that stresses prevention. Existing research is seriously lacking in long-term financial support and many research projects are funded on a very short-term project basis. It is an established fact that money spent on prevention is really the most effective technique against retardation or any other deficiency for that matter.

In the debate following this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I hope I don't hear long-winded speeches from the Government side of the House with long lists of comparative figures from year

to year covering the past program of 30 years of various governments. I have all the past history of government action in my files, and I am sure all Members will agree with me that a rehash of the past will serve no constructive purpose in discussing this Resolution. The people of Saskatchewan are aware that a start has been made, that progress is being made at a slow pace, and that hundreds of handicapped children in Saskatchewan and their families are not getting the advice, training and help they require to lift them out of the despairs of mental anguish and suffering. Therefore, I am asking this Government to take a forward step to cope with this demanding problem and to plan for the future.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, let me just review the problem for a moment. There are some 28,000 handicapped in our province today with extreme varying mental capacities. Only about 1,600 of them or 5.7 per cent of the severe cases are actually in institutions. As I understand it, less than 20 per cent of the total number in the province are receiving the type of education and training that they would benefit from. This means 80 per cent receiving no training. This in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is the number one problem. The severely handicapped must be the number one priority for this Government, and the Moose Jaw Centre — bless the people and the superintendent who work there — is doing a tremendous job within its capabilities. The Moose Jaw school deals with mentally handicapped at all ages and levels, the children's ward for the chronically multiple handicapped. It has wards and cottages for active children of varying ages, and an infirm unit for the multiple handicapped adults. It has wards for children of school age and for adults with varying degrees of retardation and handicaps. The school programs offered there must be geared to the different levels of capacity; walking, training, and self-feeding have to be taught to the very young. School programs have to be organized for the school children and work training with return to the community in mind for the adults. One could go on and on about the programs, the problems and the needs of this institution. The waiting list as of February 24th this year 1969 was 558, 558 helpless children or adults with their parents waiting in despair, humiliation and frustration. Can we as Legislators sit back and continue this man's inhumanity to man? Certainly not, if we want to be proud of our Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, parents and relatives of handicapped, school boards, teachers and others that are interested in this problem, have only one main avenue of approach for help, and that is the Government. Therefore, I appeal to all Members in this Assembly to support my Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — As the late Governor General

**March 13, 1969**

George P. Vanier once pleaded and I quote:

I throw out this challenge to all those who believe in the value of the human being. There are hundreds of thousands of inadequately cared-for persons who need your scientific knowledge, who have need for your heart, your affection and your love . . . They have already been waiting too long.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say first that the speech from the Hon. Member who just took his seat, has struck a responsive chord in every Member of this House. I think that no one can . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — . . . find fault with the statistics he quoted, no one can find fault with the sentiments he expressed. For my part, I agree almost completely with what he said, I agree certainly that we ought to look at extending modern training and educational facilities at Moose Jaw or other centres. I think that the Hon. Member knows that the Government has this under consideration now. I agree that not enough co-ordination exists between the three branches of Government that are concerned with mentally retarded people. I think the Hon. Member does know, however, there is now an inter-departmental committee, which was set up two or three years ago and the deputy from each of the three departments, Health, Education and Welfare, with other people sit on that committee and they do try to co-ordinate the work of Government branches and voluntary organizations. I am not prepared yet to say that they are doing all that can be done. For this reason I must congratulate the Hon. Member for what he has said.

The second part of the Resolution, however, does not get my approval, and will not get my support. To pass legislation making it mandatory that educational and training facilities be provided for all students may be ideal, may be something that we should work toward, but at this time I think it would be extremely bad business to tell every unit board that somewhere in the school unit they have to provide an opportunity classroom. I have mentioned it before in this House, but I want to point to the experience in the west central part of the province where I come from. There is no opportunity classroom in the Eston-Elrose school unit. I don't know how many mentally retarded children there are in there, but I would guess, well, less than 50, more than 20. Some of them are trainable, some of them are not, some of them are in the Moose Jaw Training School, some of them are at home. I do know that Rosetown School Unit does operate a very fine opportunity classroom. I do know that the Eston-Elrose School Unit pays the tuition fee for children from the Eston-Elrose unit to attend

that classroom. I do know that they make it possible for the parents of these students to either move into Rosetown in the winter time, or to board their children there, or to convey them to that school. This is the way it has to be in rural areas. It would be wildly impractical to have a second opportunity classroom somewhere in the Eston-Elrose unit. I agree that we must in all conscience provide the training facilities that are needed. But to make it mandatory at this stage in our development, I think is wrong. Mr. Speaker, I intend to have more to say about this, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### RESOLUTION NO. 4 — SPECIAL TASK FORCE ON EDUCATIONAL AIMS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the Proposed Resolution by Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the constitution of a Special Task Force on Educational Aims for the 1970s, to be composed of citizens representative of our province, to examine into all aspects of education and its present relevancy to the future needs of our society, the organization and administration of our education system, the method of financing thereof, the Provincial Department of Education and its organization, and to make recommendations thereon to the Government for immediate action.

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, this motion moved by the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Riversdale is one that urges the Government to establish a Special Task Force on education aims. As I listened to his remarks in proposing this motion I couldn't help but think that, with a little more time on researching some of the questions he raised, he would not need to propose a Royal Commission. Now I shall deal later on with some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Riversdale and try to demonstrate more clearly what I mean by that. I certainly don't wish to deny the usefulness of a Royal Commission, I do disagree however with the assumption that he seemed to make, the mere establishment of a Royal Commission as such is all that will be needed to solve our problems in the field of education. I would agree that there are areas of concern in this whole broad field of education, as I have said before in this House and in previous debates, that I believe our aims, our objectives, our methods, curricular content, structure of the schools, and many other aspects of education should be and must be subjected to continual scrutiny and examination and be prepared to stand up to that scrutiny at any time. Now I agree also that the views of the public and of interested and knowledgeable groups must be consulted and I want to suggest that his has already been

**March 13, 1969**

done more expeditiously by different techniques than he has suggested.

In recent years this Government has employed a wide variety of committees, some with province-wide representation, others with specialized capabilities depending upon the problem of the study or the issue to be looked at. To cite a few of them I could refer to the General Steering Committee and other committees relating to the general reorganization of the curriculum as it relates to the implementation of the division programs; the School Facilities Council, several meetings of which have resulted in some changes that will be implemented very shortly into the Department with respect to the handling of school building requests, locations and so on; the Nicks-Gathercole Committee, the Joint Committee on Higher Education, the Committee on Nursing Education, the Library Inquiry Report, and, as I said, a host of other advisory committees and boards pertaining to technical and vocational education in the more specific areas. It is true that the terms of reference of such committees are narrower than those of a Royal Commission. They are more precise I suggest and more to the point in dealing with and in arriving at specific conclusions and decisions on the real problems as they present themselves. Moreover, I think they function within the basic philosophy of the province regarding overall educational objectives which can best at a given point of time, I think, be stated only in general and broad terms. For in changing times certainly I think there can be no rigidity of objectives as such. Now I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, to have received sometime ago the final report of the Nicks-Gathercole Committee. This was a committee established over a year ago, Members may recall, briefly to look into curricular, financial and other aspects of the division three and four programs. However, within the last few days I have received a letter from this Committee and I should like to take the time to read a few excerpts from that letter at this time and I am quoting from a letter from Doctor Gathercole and Mr. Stewart Nicks. And I quote:

Your Advisory Committee in division three and four is now writing the final report for study. Unfortunately this report will not likely be ready for you before the present session of the Legislature is prorogued. However, we are submitting this memorandum to indicate some of the things you may expect from the final report.

Recently we have heard that what Saskatchewan needs is a Royal Commission on aims and objectives of education, a study which will get down to the bedrock on which our educational program is based. Your Advisory Committee does not believe that a Royal Commission as such is necessary. It should not be forgotten that in 1958 and in 1963 Canadian conferences on education were held and at both of these the aims of education were given quite thorough study. In 1958 Manitoba got a Royal Commission, 1959 Alberta had a Royal Commission, in 1960 British

Columbia followed suit with a Royal Commission, and all of these reports dealt with the aims of education among other things. In 1963 the Province of Quebec established a Royal Commission to make a very thorough study of education in that province, and more recently the British Columbia Teachers' Federation has conducted a very comprehensive study of education and has published its report in a volume entitled "Involvement."

I think the biggest study of course, Mr. Speaker, in recent years has been the so-called Hall-Dennis Inquiry in the Province of Ontario, carried on by the Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the schools of Ontario. So certainly there is no dearth of material available on the question of the philosophy of education and the purposes of our schools. In its interim report the Advisory Committee the Nicks-Gathercole Committee recommended as follows:

That the Department of Education set up a Committee to develop a statement of aims and objectives on education that will reflect the expectations of the people of Saskatchewan for their schools and it will set guidelines for developing an educational program appropriate for our age.

This letter goes on to state that the Committee will reaffirm this recommendation in the final report. They will go further, however, and include in the final report a number of statements concerning aims and objectives of education drawn from these various reports that I have referred to above.

This letter goes on, Mr. Speaker:

It would seem a waste of time to have any Royal Commission in Saskatchewan to go over the same ground that other commissions and committees have worked upon in very recent years, especially in view of the fact the Nicks-Gathercole Committee itself is giving a good deal of thought to this question.

However, they go on to state:

We think there is a place for a Committee to be established that will assume some responsibility for channelling back to trustees' meetings, Teachers' Federation meetings and meetings of a variety of community groups a proposed statement of educational aims for this province with a view to getting reaction from these various groups.

And with these reactions the Committee suggests they could then put together a statement of aims which would be directed to the Department of Education for its adoption.

And with these reactions the Committee suggests they could

**March 13, 1969**

then put together a statement of aims which would be directed to the Department of Education for its adoption.

Further, reading from the letter from Dr. Gathercole and Mr. Nicks, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the division system:

In its final report your Advisory Committee will reaffirm its support of the division system. Actually it is not the term division system itself that is important. The name could well be changed without any loss in education practice. What is important is the concept of non-gradedness that underlies the division system and the idea of flexibility that is part and parcel of the division system.

The purpose of those who conceived the division system was to make the child more central in educational planning, organization and practice. For too long have grade standards, external examinations, June promotions, mastering of one specific textbook in a given course, the lecture method of teaching and so on determined what went on in our schools. Each may have been good in its place and time, but in this age of universal education, with all that we know about how children learn and what is best for them to learn, these things are not necessarily good today. We believe that subjects like reading, the formal aspects of language and mathematics which depend upon a sequential presentation of material to ensure mastery must continue to be presented in a formal manner. However, there is an abundance of evidence that all children of a given age are not ready for these skills at the same time. Now if we accept this idea of differential treatment, if we accept the idea of continuous progress and the only way to make continuous progress work more effectively is to have a flexible school organization which is in effect the non-graded program.

This was one of the points raised by my hon. friend opposite from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) when he was referring to the rigidity and the fact that there has been no change. There has been change in this and many other aspects of today's school system. Now there are other remarks in this letter that I think would be pertinent to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker. They go on to state that:

It follows that a new high school curriculum was needed and it must be one which on the one hand is challenging to the bright student, yet in the other hand is within the capabilities of the average or less than average young person. Obviously one high school program as such is not sufficient. The academic courses of yesteryear with their abstractness and their stress on verbalization are not enough in themselves. The comprehensive school program with its wide range of electives and its variety of courses has emerged as the educator's answer to

society's demands that high schools should be open to all young people. One of its strengths is that it makes more central in the education program.

Now they go on to state, Mr. Speaker, that it would be utter lunacy to assume that all communities in this province can have a comprehensive high school. A comprehensive high school demands a relatively large enrolment to permit the efficient and economical offering of the broad program, many items of which are electives. Education tax dollars are still too scarce whether they are obtained locally, provincially or federally, to warrant the heavy expenditures required to provide the costly shops in equipment that go to make up this program in, as I say, many of the smaller communities of this province.

They go on to state:

The purpose of the high school is to retain students, to reduce dropouts and not to force young people out into the streets or into uncertain employment before they are equipped for it. They represent, if you want to talk about dropouts, a failure of the school and of society to meet their needs. The concern of the high school must be the adaption of the program to save the students, not rigid conformity which will in effect, as it has in the past quite often, force that student out of school.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment also on some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). He went on to state, and I have just selected a few of his remarks to comment on, he believes that Saskatchewan's education system is adrift. And I can only take from these remarks, Mr. Speaker, that he doesn't know what changes have taken place in the last four or five years. I could remind him that the qualifications of the teaching force in this province today have never been higher. This year about 30 per cent of the teachers employed in the province hold professional certificates, 48 per cent hold standard certificates. Compare this with 1963, only six years ago, when you had 18.8 per cent with professional certificates and only 38 per cent with standard certificates. So certainly the qualifications of our teaching force in this province today are at an all-time high. Secondly, does he realize how many comprehensive schools there were in this province when this Government took office. There were none, one underway. Today six have been built and are in operation and a number of others are in various stages of building and planning. In 1964 there were 4,700 adult students enrolled in technical and vocational programs in Saskatchewan. Today the figure is something in the neighborhood of 12,000. During the past year as well, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the matter of more concern to the curriculum content, there has been a very comprehensive province-wide evaluation of our school system, the school program, the curriculum in divisions one and two, with feedback, Mr. Speaker, from teachers, from trustees and above all from the parents and the children themselves.

Nursing

**March 13, 1969**

education has been put on a completely different status since this Government has taken office. Under the regime of the Opposition nursing education was still in the Florence Nightingale tradition. It has been completely revamped and made a good deal more relevant to the needs of the day, I suggest. We have also done a good deal of work in experimental programs in teacher accreditation and in the semester type of school organization which have been initiated by the Department in the last two or three years. Today the opportunities for adults to obtain grade 12 standing have certainly been enhanced by more night school offerings, by more adult upgrading courses being offered, and also as well this program has been helped by holding grade 12 examinations in January as well as in June. Legislation has been enacted just last year which makes possible the establishment of French language schools in this province. I am sure the Hon. Member will be interested to know that a program of Ukrainian has been developed and offered this year for the first time in grade seven and eight with a very excellent acceptance from many schools throughout the province. The entire high school program, the entire high school curriculum, Mr. Speaker, has been subjected to very careful scrutiny by the Division Four Steering Committee, and I suggest that this scrutiny will continue. On that committee we have representatives of the SSTA, the School Trustees' Association, the Teachers' Federation and the University.

A general reorganization of our entire high school program is pretty well nearing completion at this point in time. There will be fewer compulsory subjects, my hon. friend will be interested to know. I think we only have three compulsory subjects at the high school level today and it will result in the virtual elimination of a strict grading system in the high schools. Rather we will be going through a credit system and subject promotion.

We have given in the last few years financial support to demonstration school libraries in Yorkton and in Watrous. We have provided incentive grants for library books and science equipment to make these programs and these courses in science particularly more meaningful. The fine arts have been encouraged. I suggest more emphasis has been placed on this aspect of the curriculum.

I refer again to our band program which has been mentioned many times before.

A comprehensive program of driver education has been introduced and has been very, very well accepted.

Special attention has been given to the development of appropriate curricular materials for pupils of Indian ancestry. And this is a field, I can assure Hon. Members on both sides of the House, that we are going to continue to emphasize and to promote to the best of our ability.

A co-operative school work training program has been developed and is operating now in 54 centres in the province. More and more of the blind children are being integrated into our regular school system, Mr. Speaker. A total of 57 registered blind students are now studying in local schools in this province made possible by the special assistance from the Department of Education.

A Teacher Classification Board has been set up. It's only one phase of education I realize, it's still in its early growing pains, but I suggest that it will reduce some of the many variations that have existed in the past in the matter of salary classification practices by the various boards of the province.

Considerable progress was made last year in 1968, Mr. Speaker, toward the more complete integration of our pupils in the northern part of Saskatchewan. Last year I am sure Hon. Members will be interested to know that 39 teachers and 900 and some pupils from eight federally operated schools were transferred to the jurisdiction of the Northern School Board of this province.

I mentioned the Nicks-Gathercole Committee. I mentioned the Joint Committee on Higher Education and other committees that have been going on. Now the very function and the organization of the Department of Education itself have been examined during a two-year study by people in our own Department, by the Budget Bureau officials and by a group that were retained for this purpose, a group of management consultants. They have just recently submitted a full report. I can tell the House that reorganization of the Department will be taking place in an effort to line up more effectively the activities and the objectives of the Department with today's scene in education in this province.

Now the Member for Riversdale stated again in the course of his remarks — I believe these are roughly his words — that our education system really exists solely and purely for job training. Now here again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is quite obvious that the Member has not examined the courses of study on their objectives for the course content when he makes a statement like this. There is the emphasis on fine arts related to job training, there is driver education, there is the new teaching in Ukrainian or French language instruction, or Christian ethics. Are these courses vocational or job-oriented? I don't think so. He goes on to state that it is his personal conviction that our system is antiquated and obsolete. In other words we are in the horse and buggy age, and he thinks we should be in the rocket age. Well, I can only point out some of the changes that I have already listed, Mr. Speaker, and I think they clearly demonstrate that the educational system of this province has been progressing and adapting to meet the needs as we see them. I suggest, if he knew more about the objectives and the procedures and the courses of study as they are now available, he wouldn't make the charges

**March 13, 1969**

and the suggestions that he has made. For example, the Hall-Dennis Report, the Ontario Government report recommends the elimination of grades. Well, for several years we have had an authorized non-graded continuous program for divisions one and two or formerly grades one to six. In this program, as such, grade failure has largely been eliminated, and this was one of the points that he raised. Students are permitted to progress at different rates. It could be pointed out that different schools, and the teaching force in different schools have not all implemented this concept to the fullest degree as yet, but it is there for them and it is coming in this regard.

“In my view,” he stated also in the course of his remarks, “the autonomy of the teachers should be established as a principle.” He went on also to state, “all the matter that I have referred to briefly should in any view be removed from the hands of the Department and put in the hands of local school boards.” In the course of his remarks he made it quite clear that he could see no place whatever in education in this province for local trustees or local government or local school boards of any kind. He went on to compare the teaching profession with the legal profession and the medical profession. I suggest his comparisons here are not very valid. The cliental of the legal profession in his case, or the medical profession have a good deal of freedom of choice. Certainly this isn’t so with pupils and teachers. By law children are asked to go to school and to designated school as such, and, therefore, certainly the public must have some avenue of appeal. So I suggest that it is not a valid comparison to compare the teaching profession with the legal or the medical profession. I mention again that from his remarks it is obvious that he has no faith whatever in the system of local government for the administration of public schools. He would prefer to have, as I understand him, the professional educator call the tune in all cases. Certainly I am not opposed to reasonable autonomy for teachers in many areas of decision-making, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree that we must have to abrogate the public responsibility for policy development in education.

I mentioned also that our concerns in the whole field have not ignored the role of the Department of Education itself and that over two years ago we did initiate study on its present and its future role. I suggest that this project has resulted in an updating and redefining of the role of the functions of the Department. Within a year or two we will have many changes in the new structure that is now in the process of implementation. The results, I think, will be evident in the operation of the Department at that time.

I don’t wish to imply, Mr. Speaker, that there are no problems ahead or that we don’t have problems today, or that all of the current problems we have are solved by any means. But I do say though that we have gone a long way to face up to the hard facts of the present and the future and to prepare ourselves for the task of meeting the challenges which do lie ahead. Now the

Department itself, local governments, the trustees, the teaching profession and their organization, and the public at large certainly must together be prepared to search out better ways of doing things, be willing to abandon some of the older practices that, time-honored in themselves, are obsolete in today's world, and I think be prepared to subordinate selfish motives from any side in the interest of the common good of the young people, who must live out most of their lives from here on, certainly in an environment very different from the one we have known, and very different perhaps to today's environment itself. There can be no doubt that the educational processes must always be under question and analysis and not the subject I suggest of a Royal Commission every ten years or so. The matter of Educational objectives is one of everyday concern. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is safe to predict for example that changes will be needed soon, I suggest, in certain administrative systems to provide a better rationalization of material and management resources. I think the need for regional organization, in the provision of some educational services particularly, is becoming more and more urgent. As a matter of fact we have already initiated some preliminary studies in this regard: the utilization of mechanical aids to learning, the use of teaching assistants, the whole question of locally employed superintendents and the structure of our rural unions today. Accreditation of high schools are some things we must give consideration to, access to special education for all classes of the handicapped, the subject of a previous motion in this House this afternoon. These are all questions that are on our doorstep right now. I suggest that we must deal with these and continue to deal with these and other problems as they present themselves. But I suggest that they could be better dealt with by handling them one at a time than by the establishment of a Task Force as such. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment, seconded by Mr. Heald, to the Resolution that is before us to read as follows:

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

commends the Government for the measures taken to provide a program of educational services relevant to the present and future needs of the province, for its extensive consultation with representative groups in studying proposals for improvements; and further, commends the Government in particular for the implementation of curricular reforms for the expansion of educational programs for youth and adults, for the encouragement of the fine arts, for provision of expanded educational services for the handicapped and disadvantaged, and for the reorganization of the Department of Education in keeping with the modern role of government in providing leadership in educational development.

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, some of the remarks made by the Minister

**March 13, 1969**

of Education (Mr. McIsaac) will need answering and I am sure will be replied to by my hon. friend from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) in closing the debate on this Resolution and amendment.

Briefly, the gist of the remarks showed that the Minister of Education relies on the answers of some reports and some commissions. Some of these of course being incomplete, in themselves are inconclusive, such as the Nicks-Gathercole Report. Mr. Speaker, for this day and age all I can say is that somehow I feel, and many other people in Saskatchewan do too, that some of this is just a little bit too little and too late, to have most of our education programs based on these reports. I think there should be a quick updating. They have their place, these reports, and they are extremely useful, as indicated by the Minister, but a new search of our own problems, Sir, must be initiated immediately for our own educational good.

Now, our educational system in Saskatchewan is different than in many of the other provinces and somewhat similar in many respects as well. And certainly all bodies having anything to do with education; trustees, teachers and so on — and there are many of them who are very interested of course in our province, where a third of the Budget is being spent for education, this shows that education is an important part of our life — are searching for guidance as never before. Even the Department of Education, the people within the Department of Education, I know, are also searching for guidance. Sometimes I know as well that they are in a real dilemma for answers as the rest of us are. Now, I believe a study of this at this time would be very appropriate and very much needed.

I want to make one remark in replying to the Minister, stating what I think he said was that grade seven and eight had French for the first time last year and that they had brought in a French course which is all right, which is very good, Sir. Also that Ukrainian was introduced in Saskatchewan public schools last year for the first time too. Now I am not sure — and if I am wrong, I stand to be corrected — but I think Ukrainian in grade seven and eight has been in many of our schools for a good number of years. I can't tell exactly how many but I know it has been offered. So have German and Russian and Latin and some of the other languages. I say this is very good, Sir, and certainly along with French, this is going to be very useful in a province like ours.

Now, this Resolution, Sir, recommending the constitution of a Special Task Force to examine into all aspects of education and its present relevancy to the future needs of our society, is a Resolution which in my mind and in my opinion is so all-encompassing, Sir, in the field of future education in our province and which, in our times, I consider the most vital, Sir, and I think a desperate and urgent challenge to our times.

I am very proud to take part in this Resolution. Mr.

Speaker, I think that the key wording of this is “to examine into all aspects of education and its present relevancy to the future needs of our society.” From that standpoint, Sir, that knowledge in the last 10 years has doubled when compared to the total sum of all knowledge from the beginning of time is really frightening. But that statement in itself is not so alarming except when one realizes that old, unwieldy and many outdated mechanics of transporting that knowledge are still being used, when new methods and new ideas supplemented by technological and mechanical machinery of conveyances should be used and must be used, if the schools are to successfully give our youth the kind of education that the immediate future calls for. But if there is no relevancy to the education program that is being imparted to the needs of a very sophisticatedly educated society, in the evolutionary leap into the fathomless questions of the new educational area, Sir, I believe it will falter and eventually die on the vine.

But there are those of us who are afraid of the future. There are those of us who are afraid to ask questions, Sir. Now, the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) reminded me of one of these, Sir, seemingly desperately trying to hold back the tide and progress that comes along with the future, and in reality saying that what was good enough for my father is good enough for me. Well, Sir, this is just not acceptable in our modern day education.

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):** — Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that isn't at all what I said. Mr. Speaker, what I said was that all of the things that we have had in the past we shouldn't just throw out. It has nothing to do with my father, my grandfather, or any of the rest of my relatives.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, you can try to dam and hold back the ever-pressing, ever-searching lava of knowledge, but in a free and democratic question-searching society like ours, you can hold it back no more than you can hold back the rays of the coming of dawn.

Our dedicated purpose in the field of education to the youth in the future should not be to try to hold back but to push on, exploring and fulfilling man's capabilities to the utmost. A lot has been said about the great advances in the field of learning that have come about in the last decade. I am going to suggest that some teachers and some trustees have not really seriously grasped and accepted the significance of the revolutionary trends in our contemporary world of education. We, as teachers and trustees, particularly those of us who relate back to the Dirty Thirties, are sometimes so strait-jacketed and steeped in the traditional economic and educational set-up that I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that for many of us there is little hope for a different outlook. To wean us off our educational prejudice sometimes is next to impossible. Worse than

**March 13, 1969**

that many of us have been able to impart, to slough off our blinker-like narrow prejudices onto our children who although young in years are old in tradition and in ideas. I know, Mr. Speaker, that this outlook is sometimes not acceptable. We hate to really take a look at ourselves. Sir, I have been perceptibly watching for the last number of years the blossoming forth of the division system in our schools. Now, it isn't blossoming, Mr. Speaker, it's slowly dying on the stem. And what are the reasons for this unacceptability, Sir? Certainly one reason is the general public's apathy and traditional resistance to change. But, Sir, more so is the resistance of some teachers who refuse to come out of their shell, yes, and even some superintendents who talk about these progressive education ideas but show little enthusiasm for them.

Now, I am not saying that this is so with everyone or everywhere or with every teacher, or every superintendent. Certainly not. We've got some of the best progressive teachers and superintendents. But I say this is obviously evident every once in a while. From my own personal observation, it is far more prevalent than you would surmise. And trustees are no exception in this respect. I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that I am not condemning anyone. I, as a trustee, like the next one am often jolted into the reality that this is the 20th century. The trouble seems to be, Mr. Speaker, that some trustees never get that holt. In comparison with the slow, ox-like moving world of 20 years ago, (and I'd like to suggest, Sir, what a comfortable age that was then and I think many of us would like to live back in that age) we are hurdling forward at a tremendously accelerated pace and our educational ideas and concepts must move along with it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is one reason why so many of us are so critical of the impatient youth of today. I realize that many of us feel that we must protect them from themselves, but really, Sir, how often it is, if we really soul-searched our conscience, that it is really we who are often out of step. I was exceedingly gratified to hear one gentleman tell us, at the dinner meeting of the Trustees' Association Executive, that he was just as sceptical about those so-called young people at the Regina campus as ever. But after a number of meetings with them, and talking with them, he came to the realization that these young people really had a message to communicate, that the problems of university education were real problems, that these students' demands should be heard and considered. This is what he said. Now, I want to say that I agree, not totally, but with most of the principles enunciated by my colleague from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), that to prepare solely for becoming the breadwinner is not enough. The old adage that man does not live by bread alone is even more so important today than every before. Technology, automation and cybernation shall make it possible for man shortly to devote much of his time to do things other than working from sun-up to sun-down for his daily bread. To be educated solely to become a cog in an industrial machine is the kind of a practice

relegating human beings back into history to the days of the galley slaves, Sir. By no means, Mr. Speaker, am I suggesting that man shouldn't work. I agree with the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). Man should work, should strive, should produce but not to the point that he can feel and see nothing and do nothing but work, be so brainwashed by his loyalty to the system and the master that he has no feeling for the human spiritual things of life.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, as a board member it would be assumed that I would be very vociferous in defending the existence of local school boards, who normally carry out the wishes of the ratepayers and thus provide the kind of education program needed. And so I do, Mr. Speaker. A local board with a strong sense of dedication to education and knowledge of local conditions, with the necessary powers to conduct the full program of a school district, can often be classed the best situation for administration of local schools. However, Sir, a local board emasculated of its most important powers is of no value. The local school district boards of a school unit, we all remember them, legal entities with powers of election of their own local board and certain other limited powers, have disintegrated almost in total in these school units. And, Mr. Speaker, I predict the same demise of unit boards and other board, whose powers are being whittled away by this Government. Nearly every education Bill being presented in this House takes away some of the power of the board. It won't be a question of existence, Mr. Speaker. They will exist, these boards, but this emasculation of certain important powers, leaving only minor and mediocre decisions to be made, will result in less participation of capable candidates running for trustees, and finally, leading to eventual takeover by senior government bodies, probably the formation of area boards and leading to a total operation of these schools by the Provincial Government.

As a unit board member I defend their existence, the unit boards, and I do so by virtue of the fact that in our experience as the board we think we have done a good job, administering and negotiating and the other essentials of good local government, as well. Mr. Speaker, I was very disturbed by the remarks of the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). Someone said that he was expounding educational philosophy of the 18th century, I recall hearing that said. Probably going back farther than that, to the 14th century would have been more accurate. He suggested that the ideas expounded by my colleague from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) were purely idealistic. Well, wake up man, you are so far behind in your thinking. You are a piker in comparison to Rip Van Winkle when it comes to being asleep.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**March 13, 1969**

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — These ideas are already in existence in many states of the United States, in certain European countries and many of them are being tried out in Canada. You know, Mr. Speaker, he suggested that human nature is such that to get ahead it's imperative that a student be pushed to study. Cramming is necessary, he said. Pressure must be applied, that the human being is such that he won't move ahead unless he is driven,

**An Hon. Member:** — It's not true.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — that without this goading the student would just slacken off. Now, Mr. Speaker, after hearing that psychological analysis of student-study-situation behavior and the remedial solution, I wonder if he had ever heard of such encouraging student study incentives as involvement, stimulation, challenge, encouragement and many others. The suggestion by the Hon. Member that universal accessibility is now impossible is the usual Liberal philosophy. Tomorrow, not today, tomorrow. We can't afford it today. With the population increase at the rate it is expanding in Canada and in Saskatchewan, that's if it stays here, Sir, tomorrow will never come with men in power such as he. You can't afford not to have universal accessibility today. Mr. Speaker, you can't afford to wait until tomorrow.

“University students should consider themselves fortunate to be able to get a university education,” he said. And certainly they should be, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Hon. Member (Mr. Weatherald), but all students who have the mental capacity to get that education should be able to qualify irrespective of financial availability, Mr. Speaker. If we can pay for 80 per cent of student cost of a university education for those who can possibly afford to pay that 20 per cent, who have had a free ride on us at the university for many years, many of these who warmed a seat at the university for six or seven years getting a B.A., and for every year he was there, we, the public, paid for 80 per cent of the seven-year seat-warming safari, then surely to God we can put up the extra 20 per cent for the student who is intelligent enough and is capable enough and is certainly willing enough but only lacks that 20 per cent or an extra few hundred dollars, Sir. It's time that the university became a learning institution for all people, not just a haven for the rich boys and the marriageable girls, or even for the poor fellow who grinds himself half to death trying to get university education. That is no way to have an education obtained, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) has taken a hard line on matters relating to education. He has made it obvious that the meat axe shall fall wherever cost can be pared regardless of the total effect on education. The harm that such a stringent financial policy will do, Sir, will be irreparable. I believe that, as the months go by and as the years go by, the Minister will see the folly of running the Department of Education like a big business enterprise. The

ledger may balance, Sir, it may even show a profit, but the loss incurred by the youth of our province will be incalculable. I ask the Minister to raise the question of priorities with his Government and attempt a much more flexible policy towards expenditures in education, Sir.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, we've spent millions on many commissions and many reports, many of them pigeon-holed and collecting dust for years. I ask the Members of this House to vote unanimously for this Resolution to establish a Task Force on the aims of education. It will cost money, granted, but I think it will be an investment that will be more profitable than an investment in any oilfield, in any potash mine, or any pulp mill, a thousandfold.

I want to finish by quoting the remarks of the Hall and Dennis Report as my closing statement.

The underlying aim of education is to further man's unending search for truth. Once he possesses the means to truth all else is within his grasp, wisdom and understanding, sensitivity, compassion and responsibility, as well as intellectual honesty and companions and maturity. The truth shall make you free.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know if personally I have any strong reservations to the Resolution as it is. It seems innocent enough on the surface that we should review education in the province and re-define the aims for the seventies. That seems a wholesome enough exercise. I listened with interest to the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) who introduced this Resolution. What alerted me and interested me was not the wordage of the Resolution itself but rather the philosophy of the Member who introduced the Resolution. He spoke, for instance, of his belief that school grades should be done away with. I think he is entitled to that, that all restrictions on limiting the choices should be held to a minimum. There is something to be said for that. But I breathed a bit uneasy when he began to talk about the role that the school boards may play. I was somewhat astounded to hear him say that he thought we should question the relevancy of school boards and that we should probably look towards one provincial school board that would have control of education matters in the province. Then I hear the Member from Melville (Mr. Kowachuk) who just sat down decrying the fact, as he put it, that the Liberal Government was eroding the powers of the local school board and as determined to do away with them. I can recall reading in the press some time back, although I couldn't quote the exact

**March 13, 1969**

quotation, where the same Member who introduced the Resolution, was a bit more forthright and I believe he advocated outright disbanding of local school boards. This is the philosophy which to me is frightening. I can recall last year another gentleman who came to Saskatchewan. He spoke on education and created quite a stir addressing a group of teachers in the city of Regina, he too, referred to Saskatchewan educational system and he, too, referred to the role of school trustee in this system. He told this group of teachers that the day of the school board is finished and that it was time the school teachers rose up and overthrew the school boards because they were a parasite on the backs of the people. I wondered when I heard the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) speaking if he subscribed to this philosophy of this gentleman who came to this province and called our trustees parasites and that the teachers should eradicate them. This gentleman was the Vice-President of the NDP National Association, Mr. Lapierre.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, that . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — And I would ask that when he speaks to the motion again in windup, he answer whether he subscribes to this philosophy. Is it his intention to do away with school boards in Saskatchewan? Is it his intention to make one provincial school board? Is it his intention to make all matters of curriculum and education out of the hands of the school boards and turn them over to an organization which he terms professionals in the field, professionals in the university and professional teachers? He would make a professional college of teachers and professors of university and they would determine the curriculum and what is best for the students of Saskatchewan. Then he said — and I was surprised to hear this — that after all teaching is very elemental, it's very simple. All you have to have is a teacher in a classroom and a good feeling of co-operation between the pupil and the teacher. And if there are days and occasions when the teacher has doubts as to where he's leading his children, just ask the children. They will tell her. Why, he said, these children, these little tots should participate in a decision-making as to what they think is in their interest to be taught.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Six years old.

**Mr. Cameron:** — He says this is his philosophy of education. He says in other words we will progress together and these children will grow to maturity by having mature things to deal with. So he's trying to place in the hands of the children the decision making as to what subjects will be taught in the classroom and how they will be taught.

**Mr. Heald:** — Six years old.

**Hon. Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, and he speaks of

himself as my generation. He calls it. I was thinking that my generation, as he calls it, would come out with some propositions in tune with the times in which we live. Do you know what he did? He took us back to the generation of the former Minister, the former Premier. I can recall in this House when the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was the Minister of Education, way back in 1958. I spoke in this House about education and I spoke in reply.

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Alex, I can't hear you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well then be quiet and you will.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I spoke about the need of a review of financing education. I spoke about the need of some system of foundation program of financing education. I pointed out that it was my belief that education was the responsibility of all the citizens of Saskatchewan, not just the obligation of a few. These students' parents through local taxes were educating and putting them through high school, but they did not return to the local community. They went on to the broader field because there were no opportunities for them to come back to. Therefore we were educating these children to make their contribution on the national and on the international scene and for that reason the state as such should carry the major burden of educating the children of the state. And this in our terms, the Province of Saskatchewan should be making a greater contribution financially than has been the policy in the past.

I said to the Minister of Education at that time that we should look to curriculum revision, that we should look to some of the disciplines in the classroom which would train and develop the child. You know what his reaction was? He said, why you would turn back the clock. You would turn back the clock. He said this policy which we are following today has been established and has been in use for the past 20 years. He said it is a good policy of education. Recalling his approach, I was startled that the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) should be following the footsteps of the former Minister of Education (Mr. Lloyd). He was a great disciple of Dewey, who said the whole child comes to school. You know he said, since the whole child comes to school, we must bring in those subjects which will involve the child. He clothed them in slogans of what an educational program should be. It should be conscious of the fact that the whole child comes to school not just a portion of him. It should be conscious of the fact that education should be geared for social living. Education should be geared for democracy . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . Thus he said there should be a wide range of

**March 13, 1969**

subjects in the classroom. This is the philosophy which they've had in this province ever since before he was Minister of Education. This Member comes back repeating the same worn-out statement, and says my generation asks for this new approach to education, student participation, education for democracy, education for social living. I can recall in those days too, every pressure group that was possible was trying to get their pet subject on to the curriculum. We have the Voice of Women asking us to deal with, what do you call it, goes in and examines the Metis people . . . well, it doesn't matter, others were advocating that we teach psychiatry in schools. All of these subjects have crept into the curriculum, . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Anthropology.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Anthropology, correct, thank you, Mr. Minister. A conglomeration of all of these subjects have been introduced into the curriculum. Then, he says, my generation would ask that we do away with classes, with grades, that we do away with compulsory subjects, that we teach the child to participate, that all we need in the interest of the developing child is a good spirit of harmony and co-operation, so the child will be free to tell the teacher what is best for him. This is what I was alarmed at when I heard the Member move the Resolution. Hearing the Minister of Education speak this afternoon, I was most impressed with his outline of the progress that he has made and that this Government has made in the field of education and in the field of a constant and continuing review of education and the curriculum, and the steps that should be taken to meet the conditions of the new technological age. I was surprised, and I might say too a little disturbed, to learn that we have even gone so far that there are only three compulsory subjects left in the high school. Yet the Member has advocated that we even eradicate those, move those subjects from the high schools. I am amazed to think my generation has nothing more to offer in the whole serious and complex field of education than to say we should carry on with the same system as we have the past 20 years. Therefore, let us participate with the students. Let them tell us what they want and in the meantime they will mature. We will grow wiser and together we will lift the province with us and we will be able to relax in our old age, having worked together, become enlightened together and lie down as lambs together to enjoy our last days peacefully, relaxing in the warmth of the sunshine of the new society we have created together. I will not support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry)** — Mr. Speaker, I'm having some difficulty with my throat, but I couldn't resist rising to participate in this debate and probably when I conclude I will ask for adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, no one amazes me more than the Minister of Mineral Resources. He has shown us how he goes off on a tangent from hard rock mining into education. He further amazes me, as the Hon. Member was a member of the teaching profession. He undoubtedly still dwells and thinks of the era when he was participating and trying to instill all the goodies which he spoke about, in the minds of the young people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the amendment moved by the Hon. Minister of Education sheds a different light on the original Resolution moved by the Hon. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). It is abundantly evident to all that this amendment heaps adulation unrestrained upon the Government and the Minister for all past educational achievements, which could not justifiably be attributed to the Minister and the Government opposite. I do agree that they have in some measure contributed to the betterment of education in Saskatchewan, but the amendment as moved by the Minister definitely heaps, as I have mentioned, adulation unrestrained as this Government is trying to take all the credit for all the educational progress that has been made. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is entitled to all this.

I feel, Sir, too that many of the remarks made by the Minister require closer scrutiny. Therefore in order to do this, and because of the condition of my vocal chords, due to a cold, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 7 — HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND SAFETY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):

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.

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse this Resolution, and in rising to participate in this debate, I must first congratulate the mover, who, as a member of our Highway Traffic and Safety Committee, conscientiously pressed for improvements in the traffic situation that confronts us in the Province of Saskatchewan. True, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) said on television lately and, true, there was a story in the January paper that there had been a 50 per cent decrease in traffic deaths. For what period, where he got his figures, for when and what figures he is applying, I am not sure, but, certainly, if he looks in the House Journals he will find, on Friday, March 15th, 1968, a question was asked as to how many traffic deaths there were in the year 1967 and the figure shown there is 287. As of March 1st, this year, 1969, if he will check, he will find that the traffic deaths are 269 deaths for 1968. I want to commend the Government for even this reduction in the number of

**March 13, 1969**

traffic deaths. By March 15th, which was the date given to us in the Journals last year, the traffic figure could be a bit higher than it is at the present time. But to quote figures for 1968 after all the totals are in, and compare them with the figures of January 1st, 1969, is certainly trying to get the best of both worlds with your percentages. There is an old saying a well known politician used to quote time and time again, "When someone quotes you only percentages be suspicious. Percentages without figures and dates mean absolutely nothing." The cold facts of the matter are during this past year, 1969, there were 269 people killed in the Province of Saskatchewan because of highway traffic accidents, 17 or 18 less than one year ago. More than five people per week died on Saskatchewan's highways. Yes, nine more than if five people died every week in this province and 18 people less than died during the year 1967 comparing the same date one year ago.

Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney General quotes the effectiveness of his legislation and quotes the limited experience with this legislation, I think it is presumptuous on his part to give it credit for the decrease of traffic deaths. Without either the impairment legislation or without the baby-sitting over night suspension of a licence because of the breathalyser test, there was a reduction of six deaths in Saskatchewan from 1965 over the 1964 figures. That's what the record shows. In 1965 there were 223 deaths and in 1964 there were 229 traffic fatalities in this province.

Quoting evidence that there were 1,400 24-hour suspension, as a result of the new legislation from October 1st, and quoting their value based on such flimsy evidence is hardly acceptable. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General knows too that he could go to British Columbia and get their experience with a one-day temporary suspension for impairment. He could get their experience quite easily and he could quote it for a longer period of time. Police officers in British Columbia will tell you that there are many repeaters in this temporary arrangement and that the only answer, the only answer to prove impairment is to have a compulsory breathalyser test, in British Columbia or any other province. The breathalyser was introduced in this province in 1956. It is a matter of record on the Hansard of this House and anyone that wants to can read it. The problem then was to ascertain whether or not the person was impaired. There was no method of measurement, no reliable method of measurement. There is still no method of measurement today unless you have the compulsory test, unless perhaps if you are fortunate enough to get an individual who has been unfortunate enough to get into an accident to get him to admit to drinking to excess, or perhaps have him admit to plead guilty to a charge.

When I discuss the matter of the reduction of highway traffic deaths I would like to say, well, this reduction will be of a permanent nature, that there will be fifty less deaths in Saskatchewan next year. I attempted recently to convince

a traffic officer who has a great deal to do with traffic in this province that the reduction was noteworthy and should be considered as evidence. He discounted my contention and insisted on a longer-term piece of evidence. Mr. Speaker, I think evidence to maintain an argument, evidence to maintain a policy, evidence to convince others, must be on a long-term basis, must be as a result of specific and careful consideration by groups of people after examination of the facts.

The Committee that examined highway and traffic safety, made up of six members of the Government, one Conservative and three members of this group, spent hours listening to briefs considering the problems and it made certain recommendations. The majority of those members didn't come from our side of the House, the majority came from the side, Mr. Speaker, where the Attorney General sits. I would have thought, in all sincerity, because of the traffic situation, the increase in traffic deaths over the years, the situation that we are faced with in this province, that the implementation of the Traffic Safety Committee's recommendations would have been number one on the list of priorities. Before money was taken from vehicle operators who pay compulsory insurance, a program should be organized, the staff should be hired, to do something concrete to reduce traffic deaths, not by 10, not by 20, but by 100. Recommendations of the Highway Traffic Safety Committee have in the main been ignored. Oh, I know that the Attorney General goes on television. You hear him on radio. He is always talking about the improvement in the situation. But whether it is 265 or 269, you take the figure. These people have died. These people have died in the Province of Saskatchewan, young people, old people, babies, mothers, fathers. As I said, five people every seven days in this province and nine more than five people every seven days, nine more than if five people died every week, because of traffic. We have nothing to brag about, nothing to boast about, and I contend the real reason we have nothing to boast about is because we have ignored the recommendations of the Highway Safety Committee. If the Government had implemented all of them — and we still have this situation on our hands — then we could say, well they've tried their best. But anything less than implementation of the recommendations of this committee is just not good enough. Just not good enough. Even the death of one person, because we did not implement some of these recommendations is unexplainable. It is a life that cannot be brought back, one that is lost to this province, one that is lost to a neighborhood, lost to a family. Sure some of the recommendations of the committee have been implemented. Sure, some of the lesser ones, some of the less important ones, some of the less costly ones, some of the recommendations that don't really cost a great deal, don't require staff, don't require a great deal of organization. They have been implemented. And maybe they have saved lives. This is probably true. The main recommendations have not been implemented.

Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at first, the recommendation that we should have a permanent Committee of this

**March 13, 1969**

Legislature to study, to constantly study highway traffic problems. It hasn't met, it hasn't been organized, no resolution has been introduced by the Government opposite. We talk about 1,400 or so temporary suspensions. Why don't we interview some of those who have been suspended? Why don't we interview some of those who have been suspended more than once on a 24-hour basis? We talk about impairment, and charges laid because of impairment, licences revoked. Why don't we interview the judges? We talk about liquor and driving. Why don't we interview the victims? Why don't we interview the families? Why don't we interview the people that have suffered as a result of liquor and driving? This Committee could ask people to appear before it who are interested in driver training and who have seen concrete results. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when we are talking about percentages, it is not 45 per cent, it is not 50 per cent, it is not 75 per cent. This recommendation of the Highway Traffic Safety Committee has been ignored 100 per cent.

One of the most important recommendations of the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee called for immediate action on the .08 per cent regarding the breathalyser test. I want to ask the Members of this House how many lives could have been saved if it was implemented? How many lives could have been saved? Well, look at the British statistics. They proved that the compulsory use of the breathalyser saved hundreds of lives. Emergency sections of hospitals that looked after traffic injuries and traffic victims late in the evening and in the early morning practically closed their doors when the compulsory breathalyser was introduced in that country. In this province, we are introducing the breathalyser as a baby-sitting proposition, a baby-sitter's proposition which hasn't worked out in British Columbia. Now if a person is impaired or is suspected of being impaired his licence is suspended for 24 hours. His licence is taken from him. True, he cannot drive home, someone drives the vehicle home for him. People in British Columbia laugh about it, call it the baby-sitter's arrangement. They think it is a nuisance, and they will tell you, those who enforce the law, that it is ineffective.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee called for driver training for all young drivers as soon as possible. We still have the same situation. Conscientious drivers take driver training. Those who need it, those who should take it, those who do the fish tails and those who run the hot-rods around with their tires screaming, don't take driver training, and they need it. There is a need to look at the whole driver training program and its place in the curriculum, the need to give it constant study. The whole field of driver training, its implementation on a compulsory basis was recommended to convince the student driver that he has taken on an extremely important responsibility when he gets behind the wheel of a car. This recommendation has to a large degree been ignored. Sure, there was driver training before the Committee sat, on a voluntary basis. There is still driver training on a voluntary basis. The money that we need to spend in this whole program has not been made available.

Too often the present driver training is on a hit-and-miss basis and is not training people who should be trained.

What causes accidents? Do we know whether it was the car, the highway, or the driver? Until we have proper traffic research, until we have a bureau that checks out every accident, looks at the brakes, looks at the road, examines the driver, we will not know. Mr. Speaker, I recall interviewing someone who was involved in a serious traffic accident. He told me, in all sincerity the brakes on his car, although it was a late model car, and had been driven only a few miles after it came off the factory assembly line, he told me the brakes quit completely. I wasn't convinced. He caught the look in my eye and said, "I am telling you the cold truth." A week later, I read a story in the newspaper. The automobile factory that manufactured his car was calling back that particular model to fix the brakes. Mr. Speaker, what we don't know, is how many times an accident has been caused because the brakes were defective, because they didn't work properly. This bureau would tell us. This recommendation by the Committee should have been implemented. In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, this recommendation by the Committee was 95 per cent ignored.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee called for a university grant and bursary to be provided for the study of highway traffic problems, of traffic engineering. Where are the bursaries? When will they be provided and how? This, Mr. Speaker, this recommendation has been a 100 per cent flop. We haven't enough students working and being paid to work on the problems of traffic. We haven't nearly enough of them. We go on guessing when we should be really studying the problem. The Committee recommended there should be periodic checks for vehicles. It got a mention in the Throne Speech two years and two months after the report was submitted.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned. This recommendation has been about 85 per cent ignored and certainly there has been 100 per cent delay up until now. How many of us in this House can say that, because we didn't have the periodic tests for vehicles, no one has been killed?

I think statistics can prove, if we study the facts that we get from British Columbia, that some people have died in this province because we did not implement a periodic test for vehicles in the Province of Saskatchewan; a 100 per cent delay on this recommendation, 85 per cent ineffective, as far as the recommendation itself is concerned; 85 per cent ineffective implementation of this recommendation of the Committee's report.

Mr. Speaker, the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee recommended driver examination every five years. What action has been taken? Lives are at stake, lives of the people who are not capable of driving, lives of all those that they meet on the highway. Other jurisdictions have implemented this type of program. This performance of indifference on our part, after

**March 13, 1969**

the recommendation of the Committee, defies logic. This is about a 90 per cent refusal on behalf of the Government to implement the Committee's recommendations. The Committee's recommendations called for improvement and study of highway designs. If the highways have been improved, because of better design, let a Committee decide. Let a Standing Committee of the Legislature decide. Let them call neutral engineers. Let engineers give the Committee information on research. Let research be widespread so that we will know what is being done. Until we set up a Committee where research on highways, where submissions on improvements for highways can be presented, who knows whether the performance of our Highway Department is good or bad? We can spend millions on the roads, how much are we spending to train people, to drive on them and to design these roads for safety? What proportion of it is for safety design? Who can say?

Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, in my constituency, helped to take the bodies of two dead people out of a car. It was badly smashed on an icy road in this province during the month of February. The Committee recommended research to find out how we should take ice off the roads in the winter. If this research program has been undertaken, no information is available, and no one seems to know anything about it. In my estimation the Government is ignoring this recommendation of the Highway Traffic Safety Committee.

When the Committee met, Mr. Speaker, we were convinced that driver improvement clinics could improve bad drivers. In some areas in the United States and in some areas in Canada, people are requested to take courses in driver improvement before they can pick up their licences. They surrender them and then take the course. Where are these clinics that we were going to try on an experimental basis? When will they be organized? How will they be tried on an experimental basis? This recommendation in my estimation was a necessary one. It has been ignored completely. Knowing how much publicity has been given to so little activity I cannot imagine the Attorney General undertaking any activity in this area without telling the newspaper, and I haven't seen a line anywhere about a driver improvement clinic. I must come to the conclusion, therefore, that this recommendation has been 100 per cent ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I could point out that some of the recommendations have been accepted, but the main recommendations were ignored. Were they the important ones? I suggest that they are the main recommendations of the Committee. They are the recommendations that cost money, that require staff, that require organization, that demand attention.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, we have new policies regarding motor scooters, new policies regarding pictures on drivers' licences. Mr. Speaker, we can paint school buses, we can have new traffic speed regulations, but, Mr. Speaker, vehicle testing, compulsory use of the breathalyser, a research bureau to find out what

causes accidents, driver examinations on a periodic basis, improvement clinics for traffic violators, bursaries for traffic studies, these are the most valuable and carefully considered, the most necessary recommendations. And these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, the Committee felt would help solve our problem, and I repeat, these recommendations were in most instances 100 per cent ignored. They didn't have the money for the program. I contend that, if you take money from motorists, and if you get taxes from motorists, that you should put some of the money back in the form of assistance to the motorist as tangible evidence that you are going to help him with traffic safety. Certainly if you are going to save his life you couldn't do anything that is more evident and of a more tangible nature.

Mr. Speaker, the taxes that are placed on the extension policy for automobile insurance and the taxes that were placed on the compulsory section of the automobile insurance add up to many hundreds of thousands of dollars, estimated between \$650,000 and \$700,000. Mr. Speaker, that money has been taken from the motorists and I suggest that it is being penny-wise and pound-foolish not to use money like this to save people's lives.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Let me give the House a rundown on some of the funds that have been taken from the motorists just recently. Let's look at the new taxes that have been collected from motorists and were given to us in Crown Corporation Committee the other morning. One per cent driver education tax collected last year, \$236,000; two per cent tax on compulsory insurance - \$480,000; \$2 surcharge on 25-year olds and under - \$272,000; \$25 surcharge on accidents - \$610,000, for a total of \$1,600,000, plus a one and two per cent levy on auto policies written by private insurance companies that could run to about \$200,000. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the Government should be prepared to spend \$1 million of this money plus some of the liquor profits to implement the Committee's recommendations.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we must spend money on traffic safety education. Yes, we must spend money on traffic engineering and we must spend money on enforcement of traffic laws. Mr. Speaker, enforcement alone, or engineering alone, or education alone, will not solve the problem. There must be an overall safety program organized by this Government that will take in research, driver training, periodic testing of the vehicle and the driver. There must be bursaries to study constantly the traffic problem and above all an opportunity for the public to tell the Members of the Legislature what they think the traffic problems are and what they think the solutions to these problems might be.

**March 13, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, money spent here in these areas would save millions in damages, would save injuries, would save time lost on the job. But above all, Mr. Speaker, money spent here would save lives. Mr. Speaker, to use the motorists' money for anything else is to defy the Committee. To defy the Committee is to make a mockery of its effort. Let's not argue about over whether it is 287 or 292 lives lost in traffic accidents in 1967 against 265 or 270 that were lost in 1968. I would like to see the Government decide here and now that it is going to save 100 lives this year. Let it set a goal. Let us aim at a target. Let us really and truly go after it and go after it by first implementing the recommendations of the Legislative Committee. If there is any possibility that the Government will have any trouble getting the money, put the Legislative Committee to work and let them interview those relatives of people who have lost their lives in traffic. Let us hear their story and let us say that there is no money to solve this problem. The reduction in death is not satisfactory. Is there any improvement? Who can say. Have the Committee's recommendations been met? No, they haven't. Could the implementation of a Committee recommendation have saved lives? Mr. Speaker, the Committee in all its honesty and in all its sincerity thinks that the recommendations would have saved lives. But, Mr. Speaker, no one will prove that they are right and no one will prove that they are wrong as long as the Committee is not going to meet, as long as the recommendations — important recommendations — are not going to be implemented. They thought that the recommendations could have saved lives, many lives. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) knows that, as he was on the Committee. He was there when the recommendations were made. They are his recommendations as well as mine. Let us use the money that we collect on insurance and taxes and let us use some of the liquor profits that we made to stop the killing of people on the highways and roads of the province, not just slow it down, not just check it, but let's really stop it.

Mr. Speaker, if the recommendations of the Committee are no good, then let us say so. Don't say it in a round-about way by ignoring the main recommendations as they have been submitted by a sincere and a hard-working Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Member for submitting the Resolution and I urge all Members of the House to support it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):

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.

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Grant:

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. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, when I joined the debate the other day I said at that time that the purpose of the amendment appeared to be essentially similar to the original motion. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that Members on this side of the House have been fully aware of the launching of cost-probe from Ottawa just a short time ago. This House and the Minister should know how this came about. This came about as a result of a health care symposium of community clinic associations held at Prince Albert, to which the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was invited but who conveniently didn't show up. But the Federal Minister was advised as to the findings of the symposium, and I am sure that the challenging figures and statistics of cost in comparison with Provincial costs paved the way for the Federal-Provincial cost-probe. However, the purpose of our Resolution

**March 13, 1969**

is to impress upon this Government to discontinue its discriminatory program of penalizing the sick and the poor for no valid reasons whatsoever.

It is known that sufficient proof is available at our doorstep to the Minister and the Government to prove to them and to the Department of Public Health that there is no justification in this war against the poor and the sick. Now in his reply to the mover of the motion, Mr. Speaker, the Minister made a very feeble effort in replying to the Hon. Members from Regina East and from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman), who together presented irrefutable facts. The Minister in presenting his amendment had only one thing to say and it was that a probe was underway and then he brought in the amendment. Well, of course, this we knew. One thing that he made clear to the House is that he seems to be very little concerned about the reasons for the probe or the terms of reference of the Task Force. Indeed this House was thoroughly disappointed in his total presentation. At least I was. Only one statement that he made held out a bit of promise to the people of Saskatchewan. He said that certain services which he had previously threatened to remove may be staved off for a while. I don't know how long, maybe staved off until spring or maybe late fall.

I would like to agree with the Minister when he says that he is concerned about cost. Of course, there is much concern about costs both here in Saskatchewan, in Canada, and if you go across the border to the United States you find the same kind of concern about costs. In going through and doing a little bit of research I came across some reports in the library which the Minister could have found and I find that they have tremendous cause for concern there. Now this United States report was for 1966. It is a report to the President of the United States on medical care prices by the secretary William Gormans, assistant secretary for Program Co-ordination. Right on the first page, the first paragraph says:

“Cause for concern”

Let me point out and I will quote what some of these concerns are. I quote:

The price of medical care rose rapidly in 1966. The Bureau of Labor statistics index of medical care prices rose 6.6 per cent. The index of hospital daily room rates went up 16.5 per cent. Increases of this magnitude cause severe hardship to individuals in need of medical care whether they pay the prices directly or indirectly through higher insurance premiums. Medical price increases make government financed medical care programs more expensive for the taxpayer. And there is nothing new about rising medical prices. Since World War II medical prices have been rising considerably faster than consumer prices generally, but in 1966 increases were the largest in many years.

And then it goes on to identify the purposes of this report. So what the Minister said is nothing new, he is concerned, we are concerned, everybody is concerned. The question is: what is he doing about this concern? Now these people — and I will quote again a little later on — are doing quite a bit more than we are doing here in Saskatchewan. They have already, according to this report, done what the Task Force that has been appointed or the seven Task Forces that have been appointed are going to do in Canada. Information is now available. My purpose is to reiterate to this House that we are asking not for a Federal-Provincial Task Force but a Saskatchewan cost-probe or investigation. The report from our Prince Albert Community Clinic should be carefully evaluated as this is close to us. The cost of services of other clinics should be assessed and compared to Provincial costs forthwith. I would as well suggest to the Minister to obtain some statistics from the Flin Flon private plan, which is in existence between the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company and its employees at Creighton and Flin Flon. This is a broad universal health plan which has been very successful and economical. It is a company contribution as the Minister should know and requires employee deductions. This is a health service which is economical and gives thorough coverage.

I would like to point out that the Federal-Provincial cost inquiry, which he has in his amendment, may take one, two or three years to investigate and then possibly another two or three years of consideration by Provincial and Federal Governments. It may then take another five or six years or ten years for a Liberal Government to get off its fanny and produce some legislation and regulations along the lines recommended by the Task Force or health team. This will take too long to satisfy the needs of the times for the people of our province and for the edification of this Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan. That is why we brought in the Resolution asking that something be done now. There are certain very important aspects of our health program that should be looked at now.

We all know, the Liberals in Ottawa made a Pearson election promise. Now they hold a tiger by the tail so they are going to have a study to evade the promise. We all know that Mr. Trudeau, Robert Winters, Edgar Benson, Mitchell Sharp and others have qualms about medicare. That is why they propose opting out of the Federal Government health plan in due course. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislature, that once Canadians have judged and experienced the benefits of universal medicine they will defeat any government that would reverse the process of human progress.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And don't forget that, Mr. Premier and Mr. Minister. Think of the political losses you have sustained already among your own supporters for daring to impose deterrent fees in this province. And it is not too late to back down and this is why

**March 13, 1969**

we are trying to get his Resolution through. I doubt if you will ever regain your Liberal votes as a result of this unjustified and uncalled for Act of last year.

I am going to prognosticate, Mr. Speaker, that that is just what is going to happen. You will be defeated unless you reverse that trend. You may still have some Liberals but they are not going to be Liberal unless you do something about these deterrent fees.

You may ask why do I prognosticate. Well it is very simple, Mr. Speaker. Let me use the words of Health Minister John Munro, I admit that he has been a consistent supporter of the Federal Medicare Plan and has argued and rightly so that a universal program of medical care is a step forward in the fight against poverty. He has said in speaking to the Canadian Mental Health Association meeting and I quote:

There is much Governments can do, especially in relieving some of the basic economic and social threats with programs such as medicare. It stands to reason that a person's mental well-being is menaced if he has a crippling medical bill. Such a person cannot achieve peace of mind as long as the prospect of such disaster exists and without medical insurance this threat remains over him and his family until death. Medicare is one means the Government can use to relieve the emotional insecurity which is inherent in poverty environment and such a cause of major illness.

Now this is what Mr. Munro said, but this isn't what the Minister and the Government opposite said. The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) fails to grasp and fails to understand Mr. Munro's statement. He has compelled our ratepayers to pay deterrent fees because he does not understand the facts of life. Yet, surprisingly enough, this Minister and this Government can understand the words of the medical profession and of the medical associations. This Minister repeats the phrases and sentences and he has repeated them now for some years, which are relayed to him by high-priced executives, high-priced specialists in the medical field. Let me illustrate. I am going to quote from the Canadian Medical Association News and Views, Mr. Speaker, March 8, number 195 and I am sure that the Minister gets this report. He has probably read it. Here is the quote:

The Governments of Ontario and British Columbia have demonstrated a realistic workable approach to the provision of Medical Care Insurance. They have recognized that there are many who require some financial help and others who need total assistance, but that the majority of the population are capable of providing for their own needs. These programs have resulted in close to 100 per cent of the population having adequate medical care insurance on a voluntary basis.

Nonsense, Mr. Speaker. But this is the kind of stuff that is published by these people. This is what the Minister reads, this is what the Minister believes and this is how he behaves. This kind of statement is not true and I will quote again some other statements that we read in these periodicals. And I quote again from the same paper:

There are many reasons for the rising costs of medical care, the chief one of which is the increasing utilization of medical services generated largely by the public, but to some extent by the medical profession. This has been well demonstrated in the United Kingdom and in Saskatchewan. On the other hand the increases in medical fees have not been greater than increases in the wages and salaries of other Canadians.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this is not true and I will prove it before I sit down. But, I ask this: where did we hear these words, Mr. Speaker? When I heard the Minister speaking on different occasions I thought that he was original, yet these are exactly the kind of words, the kind of language that he has used in the past. And I quote again from the same periodical and the same paper.

It would be much less costly and more to the point to assist those people who are not now covered with Medical Care Insurance because of lack of funds or other reasons.

There you have some kind of medical philosophy, believe me. This is another phrase often heard from gentlemen opposite. But let us remember these are statements from the top echelons of the medical profession. These are the statements that the Minister produces here in this House. These are the kind of statements that are very often untrue and they are the kind of statements that we cannot accept. Such are only statements and not facts. If these words were true then a Task Force would not have been required to get the facts for the forthcoming conference of Ministers, Mr. Speaker.

Let me look at another paper. On checking I find the Canadian Health Association believes that health legislation in Canada requires a complete overhaul. It has enunciated that there should be long-term planning and evaluation of health arrangements and that there should be more attention paid to health in the future. I agree with this. So let us have our own Task Force to study, evaluate and prepare some plans for this Government and this Administration. And eventually we may be able to agree on all points. In the meantime I would suggest that this Government do not jump to conclusions which it has jumped to, conclusions which are false. Let not this Government begin penalizing sick and poor people on the say-so of prejudiced special groups who fail to produce worthwhile evidence for their arguments.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, there are many

**March 13, 1969**

sources which can produce evidence and facts for the Minister and the Government, disproving some of the opinions that I have quoted, which are false medical philosophy. They can get real facts and I intend, before I sit down, to mention a few which it should know.

The Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) the other day very ably presented a summary of findings at the Prince Albert Symposium concerning costs at community clinics. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the same story pertains when you study other group practice plans in Canada and the United States. Group practices at Sault Ste. Marie and in the Maritimes and in the United States as well as here in the West have proven themselves. I am sure that the Minister will find that group practice costs are below the Provincial average cost, in some cases only 50 per cent of Provincial costs and in no case exceeding Provincial costs. This is the experience in the United States and right here in Saskatchewan.

I received the other day a periodical Group Health and Welfare News and in it is the story of the Prince Albert Community Clinic. I would just like to quote a few paragraphs, and I want to lay on the table for identification of all Members opposite. I suggest that every Member read this and you will get the true facts of some medical costs in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — On the second page of this periodical it says here in the second paragraph:

This means that in 1966 our doctors saw an average of 1,618 patients each versus a Provincial average of 817. In 1967 our average was 1,600 patients per doctor versus a Provincial average of 809.

In other words the story here is that these doctors . . .

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member could tell me where that figure of 816 came from.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I am getting it out of the Health Care Economic Saskatchewan report. These are the figures here which indicate that we have doctors who are working twice as heavily as the average doctor in Saskatchewan. Then you see other cost figures. You find this: in 1966 T and A costs Provincial total, the rate was 12.

**Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — Who wrote the article, Bill?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It was written by a group of doctors at the Community Clinic at Prince Albert. They had a Symposium and the facts are there. I am sorry if you don't believe facts. If I wrote down that two and two make four, and you wouldn't believe that it is four, well then I could only feel sorry for you. We have other figures here and I am not going to take up these figures. I will leave it on the desk for Hon. Members to see. Do you want me to read them? Alright, and then you can ask questions on it.

Provincial total appendectomies in 1966 — 2,094, the Provincial rate is three out of a thousand; community clinic did 50 and the rate per thousand is 1.9. Hysterectomies in 1967, Provincial total is 2,057, the Provincial rate is 4.4 per thousand people; they did 40 at the Community Clinic and the number of patients that they had works out to 2.5. Looking at our hospitalization utilization figures and I am quoting now:

Comparing the Provincial averages per thousand beneficiaries we find that something, probably the combination of general practitioners and specialists, plus diagnostic and therapeutic facilities under the one roof has resulted in hospital utilization of considerably less than half the Provincial average.

They give you a summary of these averages. This is worth looking at, Mr. Minister, and this is something that you haven't looked at. I am glad that you have seen it.

**Mr. Grant:** — Mr. Speaker, I hope the Hon. Member will table that document plus the other one that he was quoting from.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, I will pass them both on to you. One belongs to the library and I hope that you will give it back to them. Don't keep it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, this is what it says. "Each year our hospital use was considerably less than one-half of the Provincial average," and this is a fact. Mr. Speaker, I am on the board and I know that this is a fact. If you don't want to believe me that's just fine, you don't have to. Without going back, because the Hon. Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) I think indicated some of the figures, I am going to pass this on. I will lay this on the table later in the day.

I would like to say at this time that there are some 582 such plans in the United States like the one in Prince Albert, and the membership, as you will find out if you read this little book, is increasing every day. It is the same, I suppose, all

**March 13, 1969**

over the world, these are the times. Organized services are apparently less costly than those which are not organized and there is no argument on that score. It is obvious that the Minister doesn't understand, but he will learn. It is obvious also that when you have group practice, which is a combination of specialists and general practitioners, which means diagnostic and therapeutic services in one building, not only do patients get better attention — that is the important thing — but hospitalization costs are very definitely and substantially reduced. You know that! If any clinic here in Regina or anywhere else, if they can do that kind of a job you would get less people going to hospital. That is plain language.

I will read for edification of the Hon. Members a part of the letter that was written to the United States President which points out some very enlightening facts. I will take the third paragraph and it says:

The report attributes these price rises to the pressure of the rising demand for medical services, the relatively slow growth in supply of physicians, the rising wage cost in hospitals without commensurate increase in productivity and the increasing complexity of medical care provided to the patients.

The report holds out a little hope for an early end to medical price increases. Growing population and rising incomes as well as the public commitment to assure adequate medical care for all citizens will continue to put upward pressure on medical prices.

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why prices have been going up, not because of utilization fees. And the report further says:

Nevertheless steps can be taken to moderate the rise of medical prices by using medical resources more efficiently.

To this end the report recommends and makes a few recommendations. They recommend in the United States, to the President this:

The establishment of a national centre for health services, research and development to discover new ways of delivering health care efficiently.

They are going to study some more. That is what we want you to do in this Resolution. Do more studying. They put this as number two. That is how important this was.

“The encouragement of the group practice of medicine,” which my hon. friends are belittling, which the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) is belittling. The secretary is writing to the President of the United States and puts this as number two, the encouragement of the group practice of medicine to save on costs. They ask for strong federal support for state-area planning for

the efficient use of health resources and so on. You can read it. It is too bad that you haven't read it. The only reason that I am speaking, as I am, is because I want to save the people of Saskatchewan tax money, and in order to save millions of dollars I think that this Government would be wise in having a study made to direct the department on the road to efficiency and the saving of dollars for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — If that is the purpose of the amendment as is the purpose of the motion, then of course every Member in this House should support both the amendment and the motion.

Now I am going to refer also to some other people who have spoken on this matter. The Globe and Mail for example, in their book, "Medicare Hodgepodge", page 2 has this. Do you know what the heading says, Mr. Speaker? "The medicare answer? Extend non-profit plans!" There's your answer in just one sentence. Mr. Speaker, no decision can ever be made wisely by government or unwisely, unless it approaches the problem properly by investigation, by research and getting the necessary information. I regret that this Government did not bother to get full information before it put on deterrent fees. I regret that it did not enlighten the public when the Minister decided to increase these health costs last year. I regret that he threatens removal of essential services and I regret that he makes unfounded statements in this House that the health cost isn't high enough to the public and threatens to raise the prices, and suggesting that the taxpayer should pay more medical taxes. I submit he was short on information and that his behavior and his statements were neither proper nor wise.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### PROPOSED TRIP TO WESTMINSTER

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Before I leave the Chair, I draw the attention of all Hon. Members that they have a circular in connection with a proposed trip to Westminster and after I leave the Chair, I shall remain in the Chamber for a few moments to answer any questions that anybody may have in their minds in order to facilitate the filling out of their questionnaires.

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

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, before I sat down before 5:30 I had pointed out to this Legislature a number of pertinent facts.

I had indicated that the Resolution did not conflict with the Minister's amendment, but that the amendment was a smoke screen to evade certain issues, such as the imposition of

**March 13, 1969**

deterrent and utilization fees, and the removal of minor surgery from clinics and threats of removal of physiotherapy, X-rays and lab services from the community clinics.

I had made reference to the report of the Prince Albert Community Clinic, proving that health costs compared very well with Provincial costs. I had referred to the report on health to President Johnson which report suggested that one of the first answers in reducing health costs was the establishment of community health services.

I also had argued that the Minister and the Government had failed the people of Saskatchewan by bringing in taxes without prior study of health facts. I said that the Minister had misled this Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan by imputing that overuse and abuse of health services by the public justified deterrent fees.

Just before you called it 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with an article from the Globe and Mail, indicating that a survey had been made in Saskatchewan and that the Government had not been telling the people of Saskatchewan the true facts about medicare costs.

The Minister has used overuse and abuse as his reasons for penalties he imposed, but the same report in the Globe and Mail study says:

As for overuse by patients, some doctors contend that this can be largely controlled by doctors who are fully co-operating, by others that it cannot. But the doctors are beginning to offer some leadership in this area.

Now here is the interesting thing. And again I quote:

A commission study of 550,000 patients indicated that overuse in any case was not a highly significant problem.

But the Minister has said otherwise. He has been telling us for the past two years the only reason we had deterrent fees, utilization fees was, because of abuse and overuse. Yet his own Commission says that it is not a significant factor. And is it not strange that the Government's own Commission reported in this study and on this point to the Minister? Did the Minister not know when he talked in this House about this survey? He says he did know! So I challenge the Minister and I say that he failed to tell this Legislature the truth as to why costs of medicare had gone up. It was not because of over-utilization, Mr. Speaker. His own Commission admits this. I say and I can prove that the increase of medical care costs was mainly due to the increase of the fee schedule to Saskatchewan surgeons and physicians. I'm not complaining about that, but that's the truth. You will note from your own statement, Mr. Minister, that this schedule increased costs by six per cent by November, 1967 and 14 per cent by 1968. Why didn't the Minister tell this

to the House and what was he trying to hide? Why did he blame the people for over-utilization? Why did he begin cutting services at community and other clinics? Only to cover up the facts of the increased costs, Mr. Speaker, and only to fool the public, Sir, and it, the Government, knows it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Now let me make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan know why the increases are there and we are not complaining too much about the reason for the increases. Here they are:

There has been a 20 per cent increase in fee schedule for doctors. There have been increases in wages in hospitals, and in the administration of the plan. There have been increased costs of drugs that are used in hospitals, and we are providing them now to a greater extent. That's another reason for the increase. And there has been an increase because of inefficiencies, and there has been an increase because of inefficient programming by the Government, such as, forcing minor surgery, physiotherapy, laboratory and X-rays to hospitals from clinics.

**An Hon. Member:** — Haven't done it yet?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well you said you are doing it. You did remove minor surgery, Sir, you know that, two years ago. Once you did that and you promised you would do it, I'll have to believe you are going to do it once again. I hope you don't do it. I hope you don't do it and I'll shake your hand if you don't. There have been hit-and-miss policies of this Government. This brings on waste and has brought increases in costs. Now, if a Commission makes a study as suggested by the Resolution, then I am sure that other important areas of waste and unnecessary costs would be uncovered. At the same time we would find some means of finding efficiencies and saving money for the people of Saskatchewan. I am sure that the seven Task Forces that have been appointed to enquire into every major aspect of health of Canadians will do a fine job. I am sure that Canadians generally agree that health should be the first or one of the first priorities in this technological age. I am sure the Government agrees with that. But the behavior in the past of this Government, the threats that have been made by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) in this House and outside indicate that some firsthand information must be presented to the Government and to this Legislature for the edification of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, I could go on and on, but I promised I'd be through in a few minutes so I just want to refer again to this report. Mr. Minister, I am going to lay it on the table. I hope you return it to the Library and you will see the different recommendations therein. It was a comprehensive survey made and you will find the same results when we get our survey in Canada and

**March 13, 1969**

you will find out that there are things here that probably your deputies and your civil staff haven't told you about. You will learn from this report I am sure.

Now, I'll conclude because I think I have said what I had to say. If the Minister wants some more information, I have some more here that he can read and he will find out what I said was true. But in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is this: We must know what we must do to further improve our medical health services. They can only be evaluated after a full investigation has been made by a Commission for Saskatchewan. The Commission reports should be studied by responsible people and until such time the Government must not threaten anyone but must hold the line. If you hold the line, Mr. Minister, as I have said, I'll come over and shake your hand.

I will vote for both the motion and the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:59 o'clock p.m.