

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**27th Day**

**Tuesday, March 24, 1970.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries. From Eyebrow high school, in the constituency of Morse, represented by the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher), 29 students under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Agnes Wilson; 72 students from the Clavet school in the constituency of Saskatoon in Nutana Centre, represented by the Member, Dr. Forsyth, under the direction of their school teachers, Mr. Adrian and Mr. Derdall; 28 students from St. Paul school in the constituency of Regina North East, represented by their Member, Mr. Smishek, under the direction of Mr. Hartnell; 45 students from the Bruno Central School in the constituency of Watrous, represented by Mr. Schmeiser, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Marshak and Mr. M. Pantella; 62 students from Gravelbourg high school, from the constituency of Gravelbourg, represented by the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Mr. Coderre; and 50 students from the Rosthern School Unit from the constituency of Rosthern, represented by the Minister of Highways, the Hon. Mr. Boldt.

I am sure all Members in the Legislature would wish to extend to each and everyone of these students and other visitors in the gallery a very cordial, warm welcome to the Legislature and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here interesting and educational. We wish them a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Heggie** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to draw to your attention that the Clavet school which you just so warmly welcomed a moment ago is in the constituency of Hanley and not in the constituency of Nutana South which was indicated wrongly on the bulletin board. I know that that was the way you received the message. I thought you might want the correction in for the information of the students who would want to be recognized.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to thank you for bringing this to my attention. On my notice it appeared as being from the

constituency of Nutana. Now that school is from the constituency of Hanley.

## **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

### **RETURN NO. 95**

**Mr. E. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 95 showing:

The amount of money that has been spent to date on a subdivision or subdivisions on Blackstrap Lake on all phases of development each year since its inception.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — I have an amendment here that I think will provide the information that the Hon. Member requires in a little better manner than it is worded here. Therefore, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) that Return No. 95 be amended by:

Deleting all the words after showing and substituting the following therefore:

The revenues and expenditures to date on the subdivisions on Blackstrap Lake on all phases of development each year since its inception.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **RETURN NO. 96**

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney** (Regina Centre): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 96 showing:

Copies of all agreements and subsequent amendments thereto, entered into since January 1, 1968, by the Government or any Crown Corporations with Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company, respecting the purchase, sale or transfer of insurance business of any kind, including the transfer of reserves, securities or other similar assets related to such purchase, sale or transfer.

He said: I note, Mr. Speaker, that the word 'Limited' has been left out after the word 'Company' and I would ask that the typographical error be dealt with.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now the Member says that there is a word that has been left out and I presume that this is after the words

Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity Company we should have the word 'Limited', between the word 'Company' and the word 'respecting'. Am I correct in this? I think we can consider this as a typographical error and amend it as we go along.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer).

### RETURN NO. 100

**Mr. W.G. Davies** (Moose Jaw South): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 100 showing:

1. The estimated number of wage and salary earners in Saskatchewan:
  - (a) as of December 31, 1968; (b) as of December 31, 1969 (or nearest date for which information is available, in each case).
2. The source of this information.

**Hon. L.P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — I would like to draw to your attention that on several occasions the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw has asked a similar question and that goes back for a number of years. They have been quoted from DBS when they were available. He wouldn't accept it, he would quote Manpower. Next time Manpower figures were shown and he wouldn't accept that; on another occasion the estimates from the Research Branch of the Department of Labour, and he wouldn't accept that. These are three reliable authorities but the Hon. Member feels that he would rather use a Davies' statistical service rather than any of the others. So that just to be sure we will provide you with the estimated number but I do hope, and I would like to register to this House, that the Hon. Member does not use a Davies' statistical service to refute the figures in the future.

**Mr. Davies:** — I can't understand the outburst of the Minister of Labour. There is nothing here to indicate that I asked for anything except the official figures. The difficulty is that the Minister is so often not anxious to provide the official figures or any other for that matter. Here what we are asking for, of course, are the figures as given by the DBS and they are estimates, I suppose. In times past the Minister has not been able to give us any answers at all, and this is why I have not said here that they specifically have to be DBS figures. I would hope, however, that if the Minister would go to his Statistical Department that they would give him the right answers. I am sure they can.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN NO. 101

**Mr. W.E. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 101 showing:

Of physicians receiving \$10,000 or more in payments from the MCIC in 1969, the average annual payment to (a) general practitioners, and (b) specialists.

**Hon. G.B. Grant** (Minister of Public Health): — I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) that Return No. 101 be amended by:

Substituting the word 'median' for the word 'average' in the second line.

**Mr. Smishek**: — Mr. Speaker, I am just not quite sure what the Minister really means by the 'medium' payment, perhaps he might explain which might be acceptable to myself. I'm just not sure what the amendment is intended to do.

**Mr. Speaker**: — The mover of the amendment has already spoken to the amendment and he can't close the debate because he can't close the debate on an amendment. I don't know how we are going to resolve this argument.

**Hon. D.V. Heald** (Attorney General): — I think he was being asked a question by the Member for Regina North East, and on the basis that he was asking a question, wouldn't he have the right to reply?

**Mr. Grant**: — Mr. Speaker, the word was 'median' not 'medium' and I am told by the Department that it would facilitate getting this information if that expression was used rather than 'average'. It just makes it a little easier for us to supply the information and it's a mid-point of a doctor's earnings during a year.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky** (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — It seems to me that what the Minister has said is that the information which he is going to submit is going to be different than it would have been if he used the word 'average'. It could be much lower under the word 'median', it could be any kind of thing. I think that is not the intent of the mover of the motion.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## RESOLUTIONS

### RESOLUTION NO. 4 — SYSTEM OF PAYMENTS TO PRAIRIE FARMERS FOR FARM STORED GRAIN.

**Mr. D.G. MacLennan** (Last Mountain): — Moved, seconded by Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):

That the Saskatchewan Legislature urge the Government of Canada to immediately institute a system of payments to Prairie farmers for farm-stored grain.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this motion I have a few comments to make. Over the years a Resolution similar to this in meaning has been introduced into several Legislatures and into the House of Commons. This year, like the years when similar motions or resolutions or amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act were introduced, is a year with an agricultural crisis on hand. Wheat is a vital factor to Canadian world trade. Wheat producers were the key people involved in a world balance of payment situation just a few years ago. These people today, Mr. Speaker, are facing their worst crisis in 35 years. The grain producers, Mr. Speaker, still have a vital role to play in Canada's future. The talk of the last few weeks does not seem to indicate that. The pessimism that prevails in this industry is unfortunate, dangerous and could be ruinous to the economies of the three Prairie Provinces as in turn to the economy of Canada. The glut of wheat on the farms, in the elevators and in the terminals is well known to all. The Federal Government is aware of this and has proposed a wheat or grain reduction program for this year. This program is a drastic measure that will, because of the shortage of cash in the farmers' pockets, reduce the number of acres that will go into production and consequently prohibit the further pile up of grain on the Prairies. The purpose of the program is to do just that and I do not condemn the program. It is a program that asks the farmers to mark time for one year. Many farmers that I have talked to cannot afford to mark time for a year. They appreciate, Mr. Speaker, whatever assistance they will get under this program. They well understand the problem of oversupply but they simply need more help. Many farmers, Mr. Speaker, were shocked and sceptical when they first heard of this program. They were so for good reasons. It is not too many years ago when the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, a former Minister of Agriculture in the Canadian Government, told them, "You grow all the wheat you can and I will sell it." Then, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Mitchell Sharp indicated to the farmers that the Wheat Board had everything under control and that they would sell it all. The Prairie farmers, Mr. Speaker, were ill advised not only by these two men but by many so-called experts. They followed this advice, expanded their holdings and equipment by borrowing huge sums of money from every source and produced the mountains of grain that we have in surplus today. Many people in Canada have benefited over the years by farmers investing in new, bigger and better equipment. The Premier of Ontario in the last few weeks expressed his concern

over the slow-down of Western farm spending. The Premier of British Columbia expressed similar views. I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, only to indicate that the Prairie grain farmer is vital to the Canadian economy, not only as a producer but as a major consumer. My remarks so far, Mr. Speaker, have pointed out the following well-known facts: 1. There is a crisis in the grain industry caused by the lack of grain sales. 2. Farmers were encouraged to reduce their grain inventory by the Federal Government. 3. The grain farmer and his product are vital to the Canadian economy. It then follows, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian grain producer and his product must be considered as valuable Canadian assets. The problem of a large inventory or surplus is, as I am told by many farmers, a much more pleasant problem than a lack or a shortage of grain.

The grain industry over the years has had many ups and downs. Mr. Speaker, almost every industry known to mankind goes through cycles of overproduction, then underproduction with corresponding high and low prices. The grain producer, Mr. Speaker, must be told that he is a valuable asset to our country. Many of these people, Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks after the new Federal policy on acreage reduction, are beginning to doubt this and to lose confidence in themselves and in their product. He must be told he is valuable to his country in a tangible way that will help him continue to be a grain producer in the future. He must be helped financially to survive the cycle he is going through now. The present or new grain acreage reduction policy gives him some relief. It is not and is not intended to be a long-term policy.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is designed to give further assistance to the farmer. It will only need apply to years like this when farmers are storing hundreds of millions of bushels of grain. This Resolution calls for the Wheat Board and the Government of Canada to amend The Canadian Wheat Board Act so that farmers could be paid a reasonable amount of money for protecting a very valuable Canadian asset. In the past, Mr. Speaker, as all Members know, payments were made for off-site storage. It was a reasonable plan and a beneficial plan for all concerned. Many skating rinks and curling rinks in the province were built because of this plan but the Wheat Board solved their storage problem. The principle of this Resolution is only different from the former policy in that it is extended to the individual farmer. This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, should cause no controversy in this House. It seems that if you are from Saskatchewan you can advocate this policy regardless of what political party you may belong to or what side of the Speaker you may sit on.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to read excerpts from the House of Commons Hansard, dated February 17th, 1953, on pages 2019 and 2021. The address is given, Mr. Speaker, by the then Member of Parliament for Assiniboia, Hazen Argue. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that he was a CCF member at that time and I will, however, quote him speaking as a Liberal member later on in the Senate. He, Mr. Speaker, in the debate that I am referring to is moving an amendment to The Canadian Wheat Board Act to provide payments

for farm-stored grain. A few of his comments are:

I believe such a storage payment is desirable because it would enable farmers who through no fault of their own must keep grain on their farms to obtain some compensation for the added expense involved.

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say:

We have already, of course, payment of storage now but that payment is made by the Wheat Board to the elevator companies and there is no complaint about that. It is a legitimate charge on the cost of handling grain and the elevator companies are paid what it seems to me a reasonable storage rate. Even with an increase in the country elevators' storage facilities, as there has been over the last few years, nevertheless for a given period of time most farmers must store on their own farms almost all of their grain. So a farmer has to provide his own storage and then the elevator companies provide storage at the elevator marketing point. In any year, except perhaps when there is a bumper crop, the farmers will have sufficient storage on their own farms to store their own grains and the elevator companies have a certain amount of storage at the elevator marketing points. So farmers are forced now to provide their own storage facilities and the Wheat Board of course pays them no storage. The elevator companies are in a preferred position in that respect. They are paid by the Canadian Wheat Board a storage rate for all the grain they have on hand.

I would further like to comment from the Senate debate November 5th, 1969, quoting Senator Argue again:

I have a suggestion to make. It is perhaps an emergency suggestion for something that might be used to bring about a great measure of stability in the grain prices on the prairies.

And he goes on, Mr. Speaker, to outline several reasons why this policy should be adopted. In the Senate debate on December 16th he goes on in his address, and I quote from page 344 in the Senate Hansard:

As Hon. Senators know the wheat situation can change very drastically from time to time. A few years ago it was the conventional wisdom of all the experts that what producers had to do was produce more grain and there would be a market for everything that could be produced. Now the conventional wisdom seems to be changing in the other direction and all those experts whose salaries the Federal Government pays are now saying that it is a black pitch, that there really is no hope and what we must do is reduce the acreage, reduce the production of one agricultural commodity after the other. The experts were proven wrong a few years ago and I expect that in a

few years time what they are now saying will be proven wrong once again. I, therefore, hope that the Government and others who are considering the facts of this situation will bring a little optimism to bear on prevailing conditions and try to solve the problem by positive measures rather than by giving up by adopting desperate measures of capitulation and saying that all we can do is pass around the money within Canada to pay farmers at a subsistence level not to produce and go out of production.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that the Hon. Senator made as a Member of Parliament in 1953 in the House of Commons and the remarks that he has made in November and December of 1969, are true today. It is regrettable that the government of the day in 1953, and I am aware of who that government was, did not heed his advice and have such payments introduced at that time.

It is most interesting to note that many of those people that voted against his amendment were not re-elected in subsequent elections. That's possibly one of the reasons why the political party which I represent has not established a great deal of public support federally in the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan in the grain-producing areas.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher** (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) I do so not because the dollars involved in payment on farm-stored grain would cure the farm problem, nor because I believe it to be any long-range solution to the ills that face the wheat farmer. In fact I think it is a very wrong approach. However, since the elevator companies are presently receiving storage and have been receiving storage for quite a number of years, there is no incentive for them to move grain as long as they can receive payment for piling the grain in annexes, elevators and terminals. By now I am sure the elevator system has paid for their excess storage over and above what they would normally require for the handling of grain, if that grain were moved into the market place where it should be moving. When the grain growers and the pools were originally set up they were organized to help the farmer get more for what they produced. Nobody need tell the grain grower he is getting more for what he produces because the Federal Government is paying his grain company one thirty-fifth of a cent of a bushel per day for storing his grain. If there is anyone who should be involved in selling grain it is the companies who are handling that grain. When Henry Ford started building cars in quantity the first thing he did was set up a sales organization. The same thing applies to every industry that is successful. If the Government paid the manufacturers of cotton dresses to store the dresses because there were too many produced, then it would follow that the incentive to sell the dresses would be killed. In the grain business, Mr. Speaker, I suggest nobody is in a better position to sell than the grain companies who buy the farmers' grain. An organization as large as the Wheat Pool



should have access to enough credit that it should be looking at spending millions of dollars in the countries that are wheat deficient. There should be nothing to stop the large grain-handling companies, including both the Line elevators and the Pools from building flourmills, and bakeries in countries where they need wheat. If the people there do not know the value of eating bread, there should be diet kitchens built to show them that value. The three Prairie Pools have had a considerable influence on the Federal Government respecting the storage, movement and the selling of grain. I believe that is how it should be because in the main these organizations represent a majority of farmers. I believe they have become so involved in the successful operation of their own plants that they are forgetting what they were set up to do. As long as the Government pays them to store grain, there is not too much incentive to sell that grain. I say, if the Government of Canada is going to spend money on storage, then it is time the farmer started getting the money to pay for building his farm storage. The grain companies should have their storage paid for by now, as it is some number of years since the Federal Government started paying them for the storage of whatever was in excess of 178 million bushels. Why not have this money go to the farmer to pay for part of the cost of his storage which he has had to pay for himself? If such a policy were adopted, Mr. Speaker, I know there would be many problems encountered. Maximum payments would have to be established. They would have to be based on the amount of cultivated acreage in the farmer's permit book. It would also have to be established through statistical data available in the different soil zones on what percentage of production storage should be paid. There would be far too many complications to make this program efficient and foolproof and this is certainly not the answer to the farm problem. But if Ottawa is to spend money on storage, then let the farmer who is storing the grain get the benefit of the tax dollar instead of the grain company, and maybe then the grain companies would be more concerned with moving what they buy.

I note in the last Annual Report of The Canadian Wheat Board in the year 1967-68 and the supplement, some \$46,765 was paid to the grain companies in excess storage charges under The Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. Now this isn't a lot of money. The report is not available for last year but there would be something like \$50 million paid out of the Treasury of Canada to help to pay the cost of storage in our country elevators and in our terminals in 1969. I think that the farmers themselves could use this \$50 million. It is a long, long way short from solving the farm problem. But I think the only way you are going to solve the farm problem is to get at least a half a billion dollars into the economy by grain sales. If the companies that are getting this \$46 million or \$50 million were not getting this money for storing grain they would be more concerned with selling our wheat instead of storing it.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in seconding the Member's motion.

**Mr. J. Messer** (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about the Resolution that the Member for Last Mountain has just now introduced. I first want to bring to his attention that it has been a long-term policy of the former CCF Government and the New Democratic party in Saskatchewan. Therefore we will be supporting his Resolution.

I would, however, like to make several comments in regard to some of the statements made by the Members opposite. I can certainly agree with the Member from Last Mountain, I think that grain producers, especially in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in all three Prairie Provinces, are facing the worst crisis they have had in some 35 years. I however do not agree with his references in regard to Operation LIFT. He seems to assume that some relief is going to be received by most farmers in the three Prairie Provinces from this program. I think my colleague from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) is right. If any assistance is going to be received at all, it is going to be very, very little. It is not a long-term policy, as the Member has pointed out, due to the fact that there is no other program that is going to be or at least suggested to be following after this policy terminates in one year's time. It leaves a number of problems confronting the farmers of the Prairie Provinces, especially in regard to what is going to be done with the increased summer fallow that has been accepted, if a large volume of acreage has been accepted for 1970. I think because farmers have always been and I think always will be production geared rather than non-production geared that their tendencies always are toward maximum production. Because of the conditions that he has to operate under, he cannot very well accept other production methods.

I notice that the Member for Last Mountain made reference that the farmer of Saskatchewan be told that he is a valuable asset to the Dominion or to the country. I can only hope that he takes the opportunity to extend that suggestion to the present Prime Minister of Canada in regard to his position on Western Canadian farmers.

I notice the Member from Yorkton, Mr. Gallagher, made a point of comparing a dress manufacturer in regard to his position and that of a grain farmer. He tried to make some comparison, I think he is well aware as all Members in this Assembly are that no comparison can be made with a situation like that. It is like comparing day to night or night to day. He knows full well that the dress manufacturer can control his production, where a farmer cannot because he never knows whether he is going to have a crop failure or a bumper crop due to climatic conditions. A dress manufacturer is protected to a great extent by tariffs in this country where a farmer has no such protection. A dress manufacturer is able to assess his own prices on his product after it is manufactured; a farmer has no way or means of assessing the price of the produce that he grows. Taking this into consideration and also the sales policies of such countries as Australia, Argentina, France and particularly the United States,

where we find them offering low interest rates of two per cent on the unpaid balance of wheat with terms of credit for some 40 years in length of time, and also 10-year grace periods before any monies have to be paid on the grain after sales are negotiated. This means that regardless of who tries to sell our grain in Canada, until the Federal Government accepts some responsibility in regard to the terms of sales we cannot compete with other countries who are now exporting wheat.

Just briefly I have mentioned that the policy has been a long-term policy of the New Democratic party. It is the grain that is in store, whether it is in excess in the eyes of some people or not that is an asset to the people of Canada. I think that the person that should be receiving the benefit from that asset is the producer himself, whereby the reasoning for the Resolution that the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) introduced. It is not a major money earner for the grain companies, consequently I think the farmer is entitled to participate in that one cent per bushel per month which could supply him with some sort of a base or some sort of a steady income when levels or at least the fluctuations of grain trade in Canada are erratic. As the Member pointed out, it could well mean \$50 million in some years, I think with a crop of 500 millions bushels in storage for a whole year it could well mean \$50 million to the Western Canadian farm economy. In modern day agriculture we are expecting changes in the grain-handling system, expecting changes in the grain-sales situation, expecting changes and indeed are confronted with changes in regard to grain movement in the present day block system which is a very good example. We are expecting changes in the grading of grain, the suggestion in The Canada Grains Act that protein grading will soon be the means of grading grain in Western Canada. We are expecting changes in the quota system which will in all probability lead to a regional quota system which will be a block system in itself, opening up an A, B or a C, D, E sort of quota demand from the farmers. The general feeling of inefficiency by a great many people in maintaining or retaining the type of grain-purchasing system that we have now, meaning the elevators spread throughout all of the province, whether it is now practical to maintain these smaller points or whether it is more feasible to have larger handling centres. I think taking all of these into consideration it almost means that the farmer has to have some sort of grain storage payment for his grain, so that he will be able to be the person that can construct and establish proper storage and handling systems on his farm. Having done that, it will mean that he will then be able to coordinate himself with the changes that we see in regard to all the grain-handling and purchasing systems that are going to be taking place in the agricultural system.

With these few brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will be supporting the Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Kowalchuk** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the number of remarks made and I just want to comment on a few points. It is a policy that we have on this side of the House repeatedly reiterated and asked for many years of the Federal and the Provincial Government, and also other much repeatedly asked for policies such as the two-price wheat system and so on. The United States has had this policy of grain storage for quite a number of years, along with others. Although it hasn't helped to do away with all the grain problems in the United States, it has helped in a small way to stabilize and hold firm the agricultural economy. I am not sure whether I heard correctly, but I think I heard the Member for Last Mountain say that this will be a one-year policy and not in times of plenty. I am sure I must have heard him wrong, because this must be one of our long-range plans, Mr. Speaker.

We, the farmers, believe in and want good storage provisions made for the storage of grain and this cost money, to build bins, etc. Therefore farmers are prepared to finance this kind of storage, provided it can be written off in a number of years and the only way they can do it is by having it continuously year from year. Many of our farmers have already provided that kind of storage. I believe that they should have been provided payment for this a long time ago. There will be drought, Mr. Speaker, and there will be frost, and there will be other vagaries of nature which will affect the growth of crops in this province. Therefore I say there should be grain storage facilities. It is important that we have them. It is time that the grain companies be stopped from holding over grain in elevators and getting paid for it, and according to Mr. Bentley of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture we lost some 200 million bushels of grain sales last year because the railroads hadn't got it to the proper destination in time. A coordinator with the power to see to it that all these things are done in time would have made it possible for the railroad to get that grain in there and so on. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House agree that it is the farmer that should be getting paid for the storage of the grain stored on the farms. Not only that, but we should be getting paid a basic amount — about 75 or 80 per cent value of that grain stored on the farm. We certainly approve of this Resolution, but it should be long-term, not on a yearly basis in order that it be of financial benefit to the farmer.

**Hon. D. Boldt** (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the Wheat Board and the wheat policy, but I might be out of order if I speak about it, I am surprised that the Members opposite now support the Resolution. When I made a speech some time ago, if you will allow me to refer to some of the press statements and some of the statements made opposite, how critical they were of me, for even suggesting that the Wheat Pool was storing grain for the benefit of the Pool and not for the benefit of the farmer. I was criticized. I would like to tell the Members opposite that — they don't have to tell the Provincial Government what

we are here for — but I would like them to go to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to convince them that they should be supporting this kind of policy. I want to read from a clipping that I took from the Western Producer of February 12, 1970. This I believe was after the Provincial Government met with the Federal Government on the Constitution and on agricultural policy. It reads something like this:

A storage resolution introduced by the Saskatchewan delegate Don Lockwood asked for modification of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act to establish a permanent grain storage policy.

This resolution at the Federation was turned down. The statement goes on to say:

A resolution asking that farmers receive one cent per bushel per month for grain stored on farms was defeated, with the observation that sealed storage would be necessary to make such a policy workable.

I have said in the past and I say again, this statement borders on the line of being senile. Here the farmers have received \$6,000 on storage that they are supposed to have in the bin. They have received a payment on 6,000 bushels and I have seen no bins sealed where the Government has invested this amount. But the farm organization says that it is impossible to pay a farmer one cent a bushel. If they do this, they will have to go and inspect the bin, see what kind of a bind it is in. They would have to put the lock on it and they would have to seal it and they would keep the key. Then another very important question came up at the same meeting. I would like Hon. Members to take note of this. The very same thing that Mr. McFarlane and the Premier brought to the attention of the Federal Government only a month ago about doing away with the barriers in the three provinces, or in Canada as a matter of fact. This article goes on to say:

During a feed-grain policy discussion, one section asking that the barrier restriction movement between the Western Provinces be removed was defeated Saskatchewan Wheat Pool President, E.K. Turner, led opposition to the clause.

It follows right after the resolution where they were opposed to the policy on farm-stored grain. I would just like to know what position the Wheat Pool is taking in regard to this resolution, whether they too are opposed to having the farmer receive one cent a bushel. It was stated in the press, "Over \$500 million has been paid out to the grain companies for storage." I have said it in the past and I say it again, this has been the root of some of the problems facing the farmer: why doesn't the wheat, why doesn't the barley and why doesn't the oats move? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have only a fraction of the

**March 24, 1970**

letters with me that I received since I made the speech on wheat some time ago, and they bear out that a good number of the farmers believe in what I have said. I would just like to quote one letter, I take full responsibility of this letter, they may come and see it, I don't want to table it. It is written by a University student, in Saskatoon, the date is not on it, but I received it after the Throne Speech Debate. It says:

Congratulations on your article which made headlines in Tuesday's Star. It takes courage for an elected representative to come out and state the truth on what is happening to the farmer in Western Canada. The toes you stepped on needed it. You have laid the blame for many of our problems where it belongs.

This is the important part of it:

As a grain farmer, a pool member, Farmer Union member and a university student, you have my support and my thanks.

I want to say that I have only received two letters that have criticized the attitude I have taken in regard to the wheat situation. Now that we are in real trouble the Western farmer today, particularly the wheat farmer, doesn't know which way to go. I received a letter from a farmer from Cupar whom I have never met. He says, "I don't know how to farm, I have worked out seven different ways, now Otto Lang wants me to put on a cover crop of oats. I haven't got oats, so I can't put a cover crop on." This program that we are supposed to be adhering to, I have never in all my life seen any group, in labour, teachers, students, farmers, industry people, put into such a strait jacket as the farmer is today. He is being told that, if you want to market one bushel of wheat, you have got to summer fallow one acre of land. He has absolutely nothing to say. The Government is doing it all for him. If I want to sell wheat, I am going to summer fallow. If I don't summer fallow I won't sell wheat. This is what is said to the farmer today. Here we are going to have a string of civil servants checking the farmer that will make the Gardiner machine look like it is totally insignificant.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Boldt:** — The farmer today if he is going to seed — by July 15th he is going to have somebody check who is not going to ask you for your permit book. No, Sir, the regulations say that he has to make a field inspection. The farmers are not believed whether they can affirm or swear an affidavit that this is the truth. By the 15th of July if they are not going to be out soon enough, you are not going to have a permit book by August 1st. You are not going to have one ready, I doubt if they are going to have one ready by October 1. The \$100 million that the Hon. Minister

Lang claims he is going to spend in Saskatchewan, I don't think he is going to spend \$20 million of it. I don't think that the farmers are going to summer fallow, they just can't. The university people, our scientists, our agricultural people have advised the farmer that they must strip farm, which has been very substantial. By one stroke of the pen, we are supposed to do away with that, and let the land blow over to Tokyo. We are told not to seed. Most of the farmers, when they do seed put fertilizer into summer fallow. So the fertilizer dealer is out. In my particular case, I bought a brand new combine and a brand new swather. If I am supposed to do what the Federal Government says, I am not going to turn a key on that new combine, so all the inventory that the machine company agent has on harvest equipment is going to lie dormant. He is not going to sell it. The farmer was hit before, so now I think every farm implement dealer, every segment of the farm industry is hit by this policy. It is so shortsighted that if there isn't a drastic program brought in 1971, we are going to have the greatest surplus that ever existed in Saskatchewan. We are going to have a minimum of 30 million, maybe 40 million acres of summer fallow. If they are all going to go all out for this program which Otto Lang hopes that they will, we are going to have 53 million acres of summer fallow in Western Canada. You multiply that by 30 bushels an acre and you are going to have one billion five hundred million bushels of wheat raised in 1971, if it goes into wheat. It is that simple. that is more wheat than we have on hand today. I just don't know — as a farmer I have always been able to decide well ahead, and most farmers have — what I am going to do next spring, and what I am going to do a year from now. Today I think the farmers are so confused, they don't know whether they are going to seed barley or rape or flax or what they are going to seed. They don't know what they are going to sell. If you are going to designate your summer fallow to wheat, it is not sure whether there is going to be any barley sale, it is not sure whether there is going to be any oats sale. We are not guaranteed that there is going to be any rape sale and not guaranteed that you are going to get a quota on flax. If you want to sell wheat, you have to put your land into summer fallow and that is the only way, the only way a farmer is going to have any income guaranteed. I would hope that the farm organization — if you people have friends in the farm organizations — I would hope that you will go to the farm organizations and tell the Wheat Pool and tell the United Grain Growers and tell McCabe Company that they should abdicate from the storage on grain and give it to the farmer. There is no doubt in my mind that what the Federal Minister has in mind is that the \$50 million is going to come from the storage. The farmers in Saskatchewan this year on July 31st will see that there is going to be at least 100 million bushels of space available in the elevators. We are not going to deliver more than four bushels — we might be able to deliver five — but we have criticized this program, so I think automatically the Federal Minister is going to take the storage away from the elevator companies and he is going to pay it out in summer fallow payments.

In closing I want to say that I appreciate the fact that

one of my colleagues and the mover have brought in this motion. I also appreciate the fact that the members opposite are going to support this motion. I hope that you people on the other side will get to work with the farm organizations so that they too will support this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky** (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I think I can begin by saying that never in my life have I heard such a repudiation of one's policies. Here we have had three Members, Liberal Members, repudiating the private enterprise policies of the Liberals and the Conservatives in Ottawa. We have not only heard the policies of their party repudiated, we also heard from other Members today repudiating the co-op marketing services that we built up and other farm programs.

I agree with many things that have been said. I agree with the Resolution. As a matter of fact, I could have told the Hon. Member who introduced that Resolution that my constituency had passed on that resolution two years ago to the Federal Government. We had no action. I hope now that you are supporting it we might get some action, but it makes me feel that this is just a little too late, just a little too late. When we talked about farm problems five or six years ago you were the people opposite that didn't do anything about it. We had to force you to support our resolutions which we were going to send to Ottawa.

The only thing I can say now is that I am glad that you realized what the truth is and that you are now prepared to go ahead and speak up for the people of this province and of the West. And I think the only reason, I can't help but suspect that the only reason you are doing it is because you are in difficulties and failing in collecting tax monies. You are just like a wolf. When he is hungry that is the time you can tame him. And that is what is happening today to you.

Now I do want to mention a few things, some things that haven't been mentioned. I for one do not agree with the present fiscal policies of the Federal Government when it tells us not to grow wheat, to put land into summer fallow. I agree that we should do, as the Minister who sat down has proposed, farm in a proper and husband like manner, just as we have done in the past, with reason and understanding the situation and not do anything to the agricultural situation that would make it tougher for farmers, because, if we —put our land into summer fallow now, then two years from now, as has been said, Sir, we are going to have twice the usual crop and we are going to have twice the difficulties that we have today with surpluses. I can't help but agree with what Alvin Hamilton said and Sharp said a few years ago, "Grow all the wheat you can. Grow all the grain you can. Produce all the cattle you can." There is nothing wrong in producing wealth. Alvin Hamilton repeated himself yesterday. I have it in today's paper where he says, "Produce



wheat.” I don’t disagree with him and I don’t disagree with the Minister who just sat down.

Let me quote something here. Alvin says:

The world needs two billion bushels of wheat annually. We have a moral obligation to keep on producing.

I agree with that but I don’t agree and I never have agreed with Liberal and Conservative policies in the past and the present time in Ottawa. They sit in their offices, they bring in regulations and these regulations don’t fit our situation. Now I can’t agree with some things that the Member who seconded the Motion said, because we must remember, when we are considering our own position, that it isn’t just the West that we’ve got to think of. We’ve got to think of Canada as a whole. We must remember that we must not produce in such a way that it is going to hurt the farmers in eastern Canada. We must think of this. And when we read farm periodicals we hear the people at the other end of this great country of ours talking from their point of view. Therefore, if we are going to have agricultural policies of any kind, they surely must meet the needs and the demands not only of the people of the West but also of the people of the East.

One of the things that you could have in an agricultural policy is that when you have an oversupply of grain, farmers be paid for storage. In that way the farmer would at least get some money to carry on with. Such cash payments wouldn’t be too bad and would help.

I can’t help but agree with the Minister (Mr. Boldt) because I think that some of the farm organizations, and private organizations who handle our grain through elevators, are falling down on the job. I do agree that, as a farmer, who hasn’t been able to sell one bushel of grain because of filled up elevators while seeing private enterprises getting cars, and my organization unable to get cars, then I must say that to that extent my organization, whether it is the UG or the Pool, is failing. I think it is right that we say so in this Legislature. It certainly won’t hurt to perk them up a little bit.

But this isn’t the whole story. I don’t want to say too much but I don’t think that anybody is going to prove to me that we have overproduced. I think what is essentially happening in our country and in the world is that there are lagging sales. I think Alvin Hamilton is right when he says there is a world need of two billion bushels on the world market. Certainly we should not be cutting down on the production of wheat and putting in more summer fallow. So we must do something to see that we can carry our stocks, that we can continue producing and finding markets for our product. But I don’t believe, Mr. Speaker, that you can do it by getting rid of the Wheat Board as suggested by the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). He may not have said that directly...

**An Hon. Member:** — Minister of Highways.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — ...and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). Marketing Boards are the only way. We have proven it and the farmers themselves have learned that lesson. Farmers have tried everything. They have tried selling their grain through private agencies. We know what the Grain Exchange had done to the farmers. I recall as a young man when my father and I sold wheat for 20-cents a bushel on an open market to companies that took my dad's grain. The farmers don't want this kind of marketing. What the farmers essentially want is the continuation of marketing through a board that is going to be effective and I cannot agree with the Hon. Members who spoke and were trying to suggest that marketing through a board is the wrong way. I think that they would find that in the long run farmers would suffer from that kind of a policy. I think that we should join together and not talk nonsense, but joint together to support our grain marketing organizations such as the Wheat Board. In that way we would benefit much more than we would ever benefit through the Grain Exchange or through the sale of our grain through the elevator companies. Let's not forget that elevator companies today are not buying grain, as the Hon. Member from Yorkton has suggested. The elevator companies today only take grain, they only move it. that's all. And you would have to have special legislation in Ottawa, or another resolution here asking Ottawa to change the system. But I think the system is good as far as marketing is concerned. The only thing is that we have not gone out into the world and found the markets for the grain that we have in store.

I am surprised — in conclusion I would like to say — that every time there is a problem the Liberals opposite run to Ottawa. Here is another example where they find themselves in difficulty and so they run to Ottawa to ask for help to pay storage to farmers. And I hope we succeed. But I will ask this Government what has it done. What is your record in the past few years?

**An Hon. Member:** — Nothing!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What have you done to help the farmers? When last year in my part of the country, Mr. Speaker, we had damp grain that cost 50 cents a bushel to dry what did you do? These farmers aren't farmers that have 20,000 or 30,000 or 40,000 bushels on hand. They are lucky if they have 2,000 bushels. But when they needed aid, to survive, this Government sat back and didn't extend one cent of assistance to farmers in my part of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — This year once again when grain is lying in the fields

in the North while 60 per cent of the grain is still under the snow, Mr. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), what have you done to help the farmer?

**An Hon. Member:** — Nothing!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And if you haven't done anything in the past, then there is one thing you could do now. If Ottawa refuses to help farmers with some storage payments, then you could say to the Government at Ottawa, "If you will only pay half we will find the money to pay the other half." Then you will be doing something and you will be proving that you really mean what you often say, that you are friends of the farmers. In the past all you have done is prove that you are not friends of the farmer, Mr. Speaker.

These are some of the things that I thought I should say after hearing the three Members who just sat down. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly will support this motion because it is a motion that we have recommended for a long time. I am glad that once at least in this Session we have been able to get together on something worthwhile.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to take up the time of the House this afternoon to speak on this motion because on many occasions during the year and during the course of the fall and winter months, I have continuously brought the problems of the farmers to the attention of the Wheat Board and the Federal g. I am not one of those that believe that you should sit silently in your seat and never mention the fact that the Wheat Board may not be doing its job, as you people have on the other side of the House been inclined to do for years. These sanctimonious Socialists.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — You say you set up the idea that the Wheat Board is the key marketing agency in Saskatchewan, but over the years you will cut out the feet from under the Wheat Board, undermine it, but afraid to get out in public and even suggest things that the Wheat Board should be doing or should not be doing. We are not afraid to do this. We are not afraid to get after the Federal Government and indicate to the Federal Government that it should assume the responsibility. I don't care whether there is a Conservative Federal Government or a Liberal Federal Government, we will get after it and indicate to it the things that it should be doing for the people of Saskatchewan.

Then for the member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland

**March 24, 1970**

(Mr. Berezowsky) to get up in this House and try to castigate the Wheat Board or rather try and castigate the line elevator companies, he as one of the Members of this House along with the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) who signed a petition on behalf of an organization who would get after the Wheat Board. I think it ill becomes them to get up in the House and make statements like that.

**Mr. G.R. Bowerman** (Shellbrook): — Point of order. The Hon. Member has suggested that I was responsible for signing my name to a petition against the Wheat Board. That is not true. I want you to withdraw the statement or produce the evidence.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I said he signed a petition on behalf of a firm who were actively engaged against some of the practices of the Wheat Board. I will stick to that and I say the Member...

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Mr. Speaker, ...

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — One at a time, please!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — On a point of privilege, the Hon. Minister...oh, I am sorry.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — He made a statement that I signed a petition on behalf of some company against the Wheat Board. This is not true and the Minister either produces the evidence or withdraws his statement.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Well, all I can say is that it appeared to me at least that your name was on that petition that I saw.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Withdraw, withdraw!

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Either he saw my name on that petition or he didn't.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I saw the signature, all right. Then for the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland...

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — I don't think that the Chair can adjudicate this. I mean the Hon. Member from Shellbrook says that his name wasn't on it and the Hon. Minister of Agriculture says he saw his name. I haven't seen it, I can't judge.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, ...

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, ...

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Well, I also have to take the Hon. Minister of Agriculture's word that he saw it, so how...

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Well, maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker...

**Mr. Bowerman:** — I ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he either produce the evidence with my name on that petition or he withdraw. Now he'll either produce it...

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Well, maybe to get around it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it may have been some other person with a similar name and so that being case, if it will help the Hon. Member...

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Are you on a point of order?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I wish to speak on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Okay.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The Minister has not produced the petition. He suggested the petition that I signed, if I did sign one — any kind of a petition — was against orderly marketing, against the Wheat Board. If he can produce that, let him bring it into the House. If not, I want him to withdraw that insinuation.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — If it will make the Hon. Members happy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw this afternoon, but it still won't...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — ...it still won't alter the fact that I am under the impression that the names were there. Now then, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland...

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Is this a qualifying statement that...

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Order, order! The Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we establish what the procedure is and the Minister has said, "If it will make the Members happy." That I suggest misses the point entirely. He either withdraws or he doesn't withdraw on the basis of the statements made that their names were not there.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it will make them happy this afternoon I will withdraw the statement and we will get on with the drying of grain up in the Prince Albert East-Cumberland area.

Now, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would try to have this House believe that it was only last year and this year that they have had problems up in that area with tough and damp grain. Well, this isn't the case, because I can remember year after year after year sitting in this House and the former Member for Kelsey, J.H. Brockelbank, used to present a resolution asking the Government intervene on behalf of the people in that area and see that the tough and damp grain was taken care of by virtue of having extra box cars spotted in that area. Now as for last year, I want to put our record on the records of this House as compared to the record of that Government when it came to handling tough and damp grain in this province. Only one year in the history of the NDP Government did it ever do anything for the farmers in Northern Saskatchewan — when there was crop out under the snow. And what did you do? To those farmers that went ahead on their own initiative and got over half their crop off, they got not one red cent but to the other farmers who never went out and got half their crop harvested, what happened to them? You gave them a payment shared by the Federal g. So they got a windfall in the fall and they took their crop off again in the spring. So here were the farmers who went ahead on their own and got nothing from this program at all. So then we had the situation last fall where there was a great deal of tough and damp grain in the province. Once again when you people had this situation in those years you did absolutely nothing. You had 11 grain dryers in Saskatchewan in those days. We ended up this spring with practically all the grain in the northern part of the province saved and I won't take the full credit for that on behalf of the Government, or on behalf of my own Department, but I will congratulate all those grain organizations, the Ag Rep services, all the farmers throughout the province who got in and helped and utilized not 11 grain dryers in the province but about 2,000 grain dryers that were brought into this province and set up at elevator points. Everybody got together and dried the grain. So the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland says the Minister didn't do a thing again this year. Sixty per cent of the crop out under the snow. We know there was crop out under the snow but what did we do? We wired to Ottawa and asked Ottawa if it would extend cash advances to those farmers who didn't have their grain off and could utilize the cash by the virtue of the fact that the crop was out under the snow.

And so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say it ill-behooves these sanctimonious Socialists to sit in their place here this afternoon and to criticize because the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and because other Members on this side of the House have

continually taken issue with some of the suggestions of our farm organizations in regard to what they thought the agricultural policies that should be adapted in this province and yes, even on the LIFT program. We were informed by the Federal Minister — I am not going to protect him on his acreage reduction program — all I am going to do is, if the farmers contact me to indicate to them how it may apply to their operations. I am not going to protect this program because as the Minister of Agriculture I can see the disastrous effects it may have on the soil erosion in the province and realize in two years from now you may have as big a surplus if this summer fallow land comes into production as you do now.

Let's look at his statement. He said that he had contacted farm organizations prior to announcing the statement. If he did this, then it is up to the farm organizations, whom he is supposedly to have contacted, to accept some responsibility for this type of program. I will give the President of the Wheat Pool credit because if he was contacted then he has come out in support of the program not only in his own company organ but in the weekly newspapers of the province.

In regard to Alvin Hamilton's statements about selling grain — he was speaking in Grenfell last night and I just happened to see the Press this morning — I believe it was only two years ago when he was advocating that the farmers in Saskatchewan grow a billion bushels of wheat each year. He said when he was the Federal Minister of Agriculture that he moved the wheat. What years did he refer to? He refers to 1959 and 1960 and then these were followed by 1961 with probably the greatest drought in the history of this province. But because of improved farming methods they did manage to get a yield of about eight or nine bushels to the acre. So it wasn't any of his policies that moved the wheat in this province or in Western Canada. It was a combination of drought and many other factors.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I want to indicate to the Opposition side of the House that we aren't afraid to take the initiative when we think that the Wheat Board should be changing its policies. We aren't afraid to take the initiative and to criticize the Federal Government regardless of its political stripes, when we think that changes must be made in the interests of the farmer. Then to sit here and listen to the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) say that nothing was done by this Government on behalf of the farmers, tell me one year when you were the Member of your Provincial Government that you ever refunded the five per cent sales tax on granaries in a critical year like last year to help the farmers. Tell me one program that you ever developed to help the great livestock industry in this province to get back on its feet and to go ahead. Tell me one cent that you ever gave to the farmers as long as you were a Member of that Government in regard to payments for crop under the snow or drying of crop or these other types of things for farmers in general. Tell me one cent that you gave to all the farmers of Saskatchewan by way of cash injections.

**March 24, 1970**

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) introducing this Resolution here this afternoon.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Before he sits down could I ask the Member...

**An Hon. Member:** — He has already spoken, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — ...whether he agrees with the mover and seconder of the motion that we should get rid of the Wheat Board marketing and let marketing agencies sell the grain?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I'll answer the question and say that at no time has any Member on this side of the House ever suggested we get rid of the Wheat Board. In fact the Members on this side of the House say that, as long as we have state marketing throughout the different countries of the world, Canada can only have a state marketing board in the name of the Wheat Board to meet this type of competition. But Members on this side of the House will continue to suggest to the Wheat Board what they must be doing to stay up-to-date to meet world competition as far as the sale and movement of grain is concerned.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald** (Cannington): — Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one very brief word about some of the comments that have been made here this afternoon, because again we have seen some of the emotional pitches raised when we talk about reducing wheat to a respectable inventory. For example, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) brings up the old standard cliché that we must grow all the food that we can to provide food for the hungry people of the world. His National Leader is one of the favourites in this country to trot that one out and I just want to say something about that item. It is the only one that I want to comment on. All my life, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to this statement that farmers should grow all they can to feed the hungry people of the world. There is nobody that disagrees with it. But the only thing is we are running out of patience waiting for the politicians of this world to find out how they are going to get it to these hungry people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — It isn't Liberals, Mr. Speaker, it's the United Nations, all the poor countries of the world, the United States, just about everybody thrown in together. Canada along in this year is giving about \$70 million worth of wheat away for a food-aid program



and we have been waiting for a long time and I want to say this to sum up the situation.

We now have about 1½ or 1¼ billion bushels of wheat in storage and, if the politicians of this world find a way to get it to the hungry people, that will last for a little while, and then we'll grow them some more. But until we find a way that they are going to get it there, then it is time that we have brought our inventories in line with what we can sell. We are getting tired of waiting for the politicians of this country to get the food to those hungry people. We aren't just going to keep growing food that we can't do anything with forever, Mr. Speaker. And it is about time that somebody got around to either getting it to them or else we will start growing less.

To go off on this emotional binge that we have the Leader of the National NDP go on every time that anything is talked about production control, to go on this emotional binge that we should feed the hungry people of the world with no plan, we've been waiting for a hundred years and we'll likely wait another hundred years, so we had better get at the job of tackling our inventory control and producing what we are able to give away, to sell and so forth.

I want to compliment the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), the agricultural critic, for never having brought out this time-honoured cliché that appeals to the do-gooders, because not one has he mentioned it. At least he is somewhat realistic, far more than their National Leader and a few more of the do-gooders that say we should produce all we can but nobody knows how we are going to get rid of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Romanow** (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, is the microphone working? I want everybody over there to hear me. Mr. Speaker, it might surprise some of my friends opposite that I am entering into this debate. All I can say to the Minister, the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), that I certainly could do no worse than the participants on the Liberal side when it comes to debating agricultural policy and trying to defend the lack of agricultural policy that the Members opposite have tried to do.

I think the best example of that, Mr. Treasurer — and you don't have to be working on a farm to evidence this, just sitting in the House being an MLA brings it home very vividly — is the debate that we have heard today and the observations by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and the observations by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). You contrast them with the statement made by the Hon. Premier about Operation LIFT. Hon. Members might be interested in having brought to their attention again what the position of this Government was with respect to Operation LIFT, and Hon. Members may want to contrast that statement made by the Hon. Premier on behalf of the

**March 24, 1970**

Government of Saskatchewan for the farmers of Saskatchewan with the position that is enunciated today by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Highways. I happen to have a copy of that statement here, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to put it on the record here before the Members of this House. The Hon. Premier said this:

Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) asked me if I would care to make a statement on the Provincial Government's stand on Ottawa's acreage reduction plan and I would like to do that today briefly.

Then he said this:

After preliminary evaluation the Government of Saskatchewan generally welcomes the Federal wheat acreage reduction plan as a sincere effort to help the Western farm economy.

Now you contrast those words with what the Minister of Highways said today. The Minister of Highways said the plan wasn't worth a hoot. The Minister of Agriculture debunked the plan. He said that the thing wasn't going to work and that he had reservations about that. Yet his Leader, the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, speaking on March 3rd, 1970 got up and he stated the position of the Provincial Government to be "welcoming the plan." Let's continue on with the statement made by the Premier. He said:

In the short term the cash injection will help the farmer financially over a difficult period.

Well, isn't that an interesting statement? The Hon. Premier says that the acreage reduction plan is going to be a help because it's going to mean a cash injection to the farmers. What did the Minister of Highways say this afternoon about a cash injection? Did the Minister of Highways say there was going to be a \$100 million cash injection or an \$80 million cash injection or a \$60 million cash injection? No! He said we would be lucky if we got a \$20 million cash injection and then he told the Members of this House that the wheat acreage reduction plan wouldn't mean one cent of help with respect to cash injection in the agricultural community. That's the position of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Highways in the debate today as contrasted with the position taken by the Hon. Premier.

Then I think this statement also is very interesting. We talk about confusion about the boys opposite and their agricultural position. Here's another statement, continuing on, by the Premier. He said this, in talking about the plan, Mr. Speaker:

It should contribute to reducing the glut of wheat at the same time discouraging the seeding of wheat on marginal farm land.

He says it's going to discourage the glut of wheat. The Hon. Minister of Highways said that we are going to find ourselves with a larger than ever glut of wheat after this plan is over. So there you have three statements that have been made by the Premier, three important statements and three vital areas that have been contradicted today by a Member of the Crown, two Members of the Premier's Cabinet. I don't know what this says about the Minister of Agriculture. He wasn't even brought in on the negotiations when the wheat acreage plan was introduced. The Federal Government didn't think enough of the Provincial Government to even have this Government consulted before the introduction of this plan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — This plan was introduced and foisted on to the people, the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan, without the knowledge and the consent of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), without the knowledge and the consent of the Hon. Premier, without the knowledge and the consent of the Treasury Benches. In fact they were absolutely ill-informed and not consulted about a plan that affects the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now you talk about confusion. I can hardly blame the farmers of Saskatchewan for being confused when it comes to the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Liberals enunciating a policy with respect to the farmers. If you take this Operation LIFT and you contrast the statements in those three areas: the Premier welcomes it, the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) debunks it. The Premier says it is going to be a cash injection but the Minister of Highways says it is only going to mean \$20 million of that. The Premier says it's going to reduce the current glut of wheat, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of highways say it is going to increase the glut of wheat. Now where do they stand? Where do you stand, Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron)? I would like you to get up and tell where you stand in this area.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — I'll tell you in just a minute where I am going to stand. I've already said where the Minister of Mineral Resources stands and this Government when it comes to agricultural policies stands on quicksand, and the next election is going to show that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I could read the balance of this statement. It doesn't affect the position of the point that I want to make. The Government goes on to say, according to the Premier, it is not an overall solution to the wheat crisis. And that is

**March 24, 1970**

correct. But if you contrast that statement made with the statement by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer), the agricultural critic, then it makes you wonder about the comments and the observations by the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Agriculture. Maybe it is about time that they started coming over to our side when it comes to the question of position on these very important issues.

I happen to have a copy of the statement of the Member from Kelsey. He said this, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. Speaker, I can agree with the Premier on some of the statement he has made in regard to the Federal Government's announcement. It has, after several days, left a large number of farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan in a state of confusion.

And then he goes on to say more. That's what the Member from Kelsey said on the day that the statement was made to the House and he replied to it on March 3rd. A state of confusion. Not the Premier. Not the Minister of Highways. Not the Minister of Agriculture. They weren't confused about the plan on March 3rd. But now they come before us on this day late in March and say now the confusion is rampant. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the confusion that exists in the minds of the farmers is partially and to a large extent attributable to the confusion that the Treasury Benches opposite have exhibited with respect to this plan. If there is anybody to be condemned, as equally as the Federal Government for the implementation of the program, it is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), the Hon. Premier and the entire Liberal group opposite for being confused about this program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one or two additional words in conclusion with respect to the comments made by Hon. Members. I want to say, and it has been stated by our agricultural spokesman in this area, that we will support the motion. We put the resolution forward on a number of years and have argued for it. I think we are all in unanimity in this area. But there is one area on which I would like to make just a few comments.

As a Member who was born, raised and bred in Saskatchewan, you can't help but be affected by agriculture if you live in the Province of Saskatchewan — all aspects of agriculture. With respect to Operation LIFT, I want to say that I agree with the Minister of Highways. I agree with the Minister of Agriculture today when he has reservations about the program of Operation LIFT, essentially for four reasons. I don't know, but I am told by people far more informed about this than I am that \$20 million is probably a very generous estimate about the amount of cash that is going to be injected into the economy of Saskatchewan with respect to this program. Even if it is \$20 million or higher, even if it is \$100 million — and I doubt if it will be that, Mr. Speaker - the effect is going to be a further shortage

of purchasing power with respect to farmers. There is going to be a further contracting of business activities in the small communities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if we think that we've got a recession in the Province of Saskatchewan now respecting the question of the agricultural problem, the \$20 million or less is only going to compound the situation with respect to the small communities and the small businessmen in these communities. Second, I agree with the Minister and the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer). I don't know, speaking to the experienced farmers on this side, what real benefit the program will have to farmers. I think they have very serious reservations about the long-range benefits. Thirdly, this whole question of whether or not this province is going to turn into a bit of a dust bowl must be raised. The Premier raised his statement, the one that I referred to, and he said:

Our Government particularly points out the danger from wind erosion under the new acreage reduction plan if too much land is permitted to lie fallow.

I think that this is a very natural concern of all of us. Fourthly, from what I can see of the farming community there is a psychology, and I think a right psychology, that has been prevalent for years now. If you produce all the wheat, the best wheat in the world, if you have this wheat we will be able to sell it because, as the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) said, there is an obligation with respect to the starving peoples of the world.

What Operation LIFT does is that it is asking the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan to change their entire attitude about their traditional means or ways of approaching farming. You are asking them to change the psychology from one of production and selling the production to one of non-production. I think people, farmers, like all people, are essentially conservative in these areas. You are not going to sell it to them if you introduce the program in early March with seeding time just around the corner.

I want to say furthermore that I don't think we should sell the program to them, because, if you sell this program, in effect what you are doing, on the other side of the coin, is accepting the fact that the sales policies of the Dominion of Canada have totally failed the farmers of Saskatchewan and Canada. You are, if you accept this program, turning your back on the area where the real salvation of the farmers is going to be, namely, in aggressive sales and all the other questions of Wheat Board regulations and grading, like we have talked about. I disagree with the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). I don't think I am a do-gooder. I hope I don't sound that way but we do have a concern for the millions of hungry people in the world.

We have in the New Democratic party proposed a World Food

**March 24, 1970**

Bank and storage of grains and foods on an international basis have been proposed as a small means of solution to getting the food to the millions of hungry people of the world.

I think we have a concern. We must be concerned if we are going to be responsible citizens in this world that is now a small world as a result of technology and automation. You can't turn your back on the needy people because we are caught in a temporary crisis. I have a feeling that the reason for the Resolution put forward by the Member is in many ways a panic Resolution. Farmers are hard up, they are pinched tight. So now the Liberals introduce a Resolution that there be some assistance by way of payments on farm-stored grain. We agree with this. But I don't agree with the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) if he says it is only going to come about with respect to the crisis. It has to be done on a continual and reasonable, long-range program. It has to be part of an overall program nationally and internationally. And this is what worries me about the Resolution. I will vote for it in principle. The thing that worries me is that it is a panic Resolution. Operation LIFT is a panic reaction. It is panic reaction from a Government that is devoid of and bankrupt in agricultural ideas. It hasn't planned at all. It has a crisis and it foists onto us a plan that is going to be a great deal of more misery for the people in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is never going to solve the problems.

I can only simply say this — and it is not my own thinking by any means but again by those who are farming, and they have communicated to me — the moment we decide to put our land in moth balls, we may as well look at ourselves next, because we are going to go into moth balls right after that.

Small farmers, large farmers, the entire country, the entire provinces, face a real critical problem when it comes to Operation LIFT. We have to deal with it as Members of the Legislative Assembly. To this extent, I conclude, Mr. Speaker, that this debate has been worthwhile because the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) — and we disagree with him on many occasions — at least has the courage to raise the issue and bring it onto the floor of the House and get the true feelings of the farmers and Members of this House on the floor and before the Province of Saskatchewan.

All I am saying is simply this: that the confusion as it exists is to a large extent attributable to my friends opposite. We will be supporting this Resolution. I suspect that the Resolution is, as I said, a panic Resolution. But we will be support the Resolution with the reservations put forward by my colleagues from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk), from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith** (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word about the Resolution and also about the debate that has ranged pretty widely, I think, from the original Resolution. We have been talking about farm policies, farm programs. Of course they are important. They are important to the problem of farm-stored grain.

I want to say a word also about Operation LIFT. I want to come squarely in favour of the proposition that was put forward by the Hon. Otto Lang. We may not know until a year from now and we may not know for five years whether this is the way to solve our present problem. I, for one, am not afraid to stand up and say that I think it is the best possible solution that anybody could have arrived at. Perhaps some of the City Members from Saskatoon sitting opposite — one of them anyway — may have a better one, but I haven't heard it. In fact from people who have complained, like the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), I haven't heard any solution from him that would solve what seems to be the basic problem, the one of over-production and lack of wheat sales of our most viable commodity.

Again, I say to you — and I don't make any bones about it and I will say it anywhere in Western Canada — that I do support this program. I will not benefit from it myself because I happened to reduce my wheat acreage last year. It has unfortunate connotations in that people who have contributed to the surplus by having all their land in wheat last year, perhaps, are the ones that are going to be able to get the \$2,000 or the \$4,000 or the \$6,000. For these reasons there are loopholes in it. No plan in the face of the surplus that we have now would not benefit someone who doesn't deserve it. And no plan is going to adequately reward people who have already begun their diversification program.

The billion and a half bushels that we are supposed to be carrying now, I think, is greatly exaggerated. I think that the very announcement of the program cut our wheat surplus by 500 million bushels. I think that farmers have been exaggerating for reasons of their own, the amount of grain they have stored. You will know in about three or four months just how much grain is in the farmer's bin.

I want to say one more thing about Operation LIFT and that is that it doesn't harm any person that I know of. Nobody is going to be worse off because of having to sell wheat on summer fallow acreage. This is the first time, in my opinion, that a reasonable and rational look at our whole marketing concept, our whole marketing programs, has been taken. I want to publicly congratulate Hon. Otto Lang and the people who worked with him to bring this program forward.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — I may be proven wrong. I

**March 24, 1970**

don't think I will be proven wrong. It may turn out in the end that Otto Lang has been wrong in his estimate of the situation. I don't think that he will be proven wrong. At that time I want people, on this side of the House as well as opposite, who are criticizing this program now to drop him a letter and say, "I am sorry, Otto, you were right all along." I wonder how many of you will have the guts to do that if it does work out.

Our problem has been over-production, coupled with a lack of wheat sales. We are faced with a grain explosion across the world, people who were formerly importers of our wheat are now exporting wheat — bread wheat and feed wheat and feed barley. We have to make the adjustment and the sooner we do this, even though it hurts, the better off we are going to be.

And for this reason I think that Otto Lang's proposal is the best of any number that might have been advanced. A revolutionary proposal, perhaps, to ask people to cut back on their production of grain. A revolution in psychology; a revolution in the way we have been thinking about ourselves as farmers for all these years. But we must come to believe that we have to be businessmen as well as producers. We must understand our marketing problems and our marketing potential. And the very fact that people have two months — or six weeks anyway — to sit down at a table with a pencil and paper and figure out what their alternatives — their best alternatives — will be for next year's crop and this is a valuable exercise. For too long we have been sitting here throwing wheat in the ground, throwing barley in the ground, throwing flax in the ground, and hoping that someone would sell it. We have been also hoping that we would get a good price for it.

We have to face the reality of the world situation. We have to face the market facts and I think that the first step has been taken. I don't want any mistake about this. I endorsed the program and I intend to double summer fallow some of my land. I intend to use a cover crop of oats and I am going to try it out. I urge every farm Member in this House and every person in Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba to give this plan a change and to actually try to see if this isn't the way towards a solution of our long-range problem.

As far as the Resolution at hand is concerned, I have grave doubts about it. I am going to support it, but I want to remind Members that already the Federal Government pays the storage on wheat in store, over 178 million bushels. If the Resolution is passed and if it is implemented, I would want to know whether the one cent a bushel per month was going to be taken off my final payment for the wheat that I am storing or if it is going to be a gift to wheat producers, grain producers from the rest of the people in Canada. Personally I say now that I would endorse it if it were going to be taken off my final payment, that is if it was going to come off the total price that I would receive. I don't think that I would want to endorse this



Resolution if it meant some kind of subsidy that would lead us, or encourage us to, keep massive stocks of wheat on our farms; if it would lead to a whole new bureaucratic structure of inspection and control and sealing of bins and the necessity to use steel bins instead of wood bins. So I say that I would like to know a little more about it, but on the face of it now I endorse the Resolution.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.C. Cameron** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I just have one or two comments, if I may. I was interested in the discussions and particularly of the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) who had a great to-do about the Government Members and their views.

I was interest, too, in the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) when he rose in wrath to deny that anyone on that side of the House would ever dream of opposing orderly marketing, that it was something that was to be sunned, that anyone who would dare accuse any Member of the Socialist party as being against orderly marketing ought to have their heads examined. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I had recalled something and I asked the boys if they would go out and find it for me. It took a little searching but I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am able to make small contributions toward setting the record straight.

I have here in my hand a petition, a petition that was presented to the Saskatchewan Government together with the Federal Government, to Mr. Olson, Mr. Peppin, Mr. McFarlane and Mr. D.G. Steuart. From the Directors of the Rape Seed Association of Saskatchewan, August 7, 1969, I want to read this just to get the record straight:

We, as Directors of the Rape Seed Growers association of Saskatchewan, request that any private cleaning plant which sells rape seed for export, which rape seed is scheduled to be loaded into a board, that such rape seed be allowed to be purchased by the cleaning plan at the point of origin, free of any quota to the growers.

The right of buying rape seed free of quota for export is the same rights that oil crushing plants have for buying domestic use.

We, the undersigned growers, hereby respectively petition the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada as follows:

The Canadian Wheat Board has chosen to interpret the Canadian Wheat Board Act as given the jurisdiction over the marketing of rape seed and has in the past included

rape seed in the delivery quotas imposed on deliveries of grain by Canadian farmers. The inclusion of rape seed in delivery quotas is denied Canadian farmers of the ready cash market for produce which requires immediate export. The delivery quotas work a hardship on the grower. We, therefore, request a declaration by the Government of Canada that the Canadian Wheat Board does not have jurisdiction over the marketing of the rape seed for 1969 and subsequent crops, and that producers of rape seed be free to dispose of the rape seed where, when and how they choose.

If it is difficult or impossible for the Government to grant the said request at this time, then we ask that rape seed be taken direct from the producer, cleaned at the point of origin and sold for exports, that such rape seed be allowed to be purchased by the cleaning plant at point of origin, free of quota from here on in.

It lists the petitioners who support this petition to the Saskatchewan Government and to the Canadian Government, as a direct threat on orderly marketing in this country. On page 10 I don't find the name of Mr. Bowerman, but I was interested in this one, Mr. W.J. Berezowsky, Meath Park, farming 960 acres. There are a great many other names on here, many of the NDPs. I haven't had a chance to look at them all and some of the writing is pretty hard to decipher. Here is an official document, a petition to the Saskatchewan Government and to the Canadian Government, that they put their weight, their influence to destroy orderly marketing in the Dominion of Canada, supported by at least one Member of the Opposition. And the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) asks where the Government stands on this orderly marketing business.

I was very interested in what his stand was. I thought that this young, bright chap would at least have the courage to stand up and declare to the chamber where he stood on this matter of orderly marketing, where he stood on this program of Operation LIFT. Where did he stand? I will tell you. He stood on one foot and then he stood on the other. Then he stood on this foot and then he stood on the other, you know like a hen in the snow, when one foot gets tired it raises it up; when the other gets cold it raises it up.

I listened intently and while he did this foot work, never once did he even come close to declaring his stand either for or against orderly marketing or for or against Operation LIFT. I am still waiting for him to tell us where he stands.

I was interested in the so-called new critic of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). He came out and was very anxious to support Operation LIFT and give it a lift of his own. The next day he had reservations about it. That's his first statement, oh, that is his second statement. Well, I am going to refer to his third statement. He has a first statement, a second statement

and then a third statement and the result was he stands on one foot and then on the other foot, and he doesn't know whether he supports Operation LIFT or doesn't support Operation LIFT. He doesn't know, as a rape seed grower, whether he is in support of orderly marketing or against orderly marketing. He doesn't know where he stands on these issues either. I wouldn't be surprised if I had sufficient time that I might find a few more surprising names on this list.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Minister permit a question?

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, I'll permit a question when I sit down. I didn't get any answers from you so why should I permit you any questions. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to prolong the debate. I do want to say this, that it is very easy for one to be critical, very easy for one to side-step an issue. But on behalf of myself let me say this: I think in the crisis we are facing that the Government at Ottawa has taken the most practical approach available. I was happy when I read that the leaders of some of the note-worthy and respectable farm organizations came out in support of it. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) as he always does, speaks for the Minister of Highways as a person and I respect him for his forthrightness. And one thing is that you don't find him standing on one foot and then on the other foot and end up telling us nothing. I am surprised that some of the other Members haven't stood up and declared themselves either in support of the petition or against the petition, whether they support orderly marketing or would destroy orderly marketing; whether they are in support of Operation LIFT or against Operation LIFT. We are still waiting for some declaration on some other vital problems that the people of Saskatchewan are interested in. Where do they stand on other so-called reforms that have a direct bearing on the very earnings of the farmer in Saskatchewan? Where do they stand on those issues? I was amazed that the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) hasn't enlightened me yet on where he stands on those issues. Where does he stand on the taxation issue? Where does he stand on the Watkins Manifesto? Where does he stand on Operation LIFT? Where does he stand on this petition against orderly marketing?

I am only asking, Mr. Speaker, that somewhere, in this debate I hope that someone who is a spokesman for the Socialists would tell us where they stand and that when he speaks that he is standing on both feet and they are firmly committed to what they say.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.R. Bowerman** (Shellbrook): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this afternoon there were accusations made with respect to the document that the Minister now has at his desk, that my name was on

**March 24, 1970**

the list of signatures. Accusations were made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and he said he wouldn't withdraw the charges. I suggested that he either bring the document in and prove that my name was there or withdraw the charges. He suggested that if it made me feel better, he would then withdraw the charges. I suggest that the document is now here and I would like him either to prove it or withdraw same.

**Hon. D.V. Heald** (Attorney General): — Well now, Mr. Speaker, just a minute. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) made no accusations against you. He has a document and you are drawing a conclusion that it is the same document. He made no reference to you at all. Your point of order is not well taken.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources said that he wasn't able to see my name on that list. He did!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Don't put words in my mouth. I said that I hadn't had a chance to look at them all and some I can't even decipher. I didn't say it wasn't there.

**Mr. Bowerman:** — You said that you were not able to find it on the list.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! It seems to me that this is a point of debate. One Member makes a statement about another and you can't expect the Chair to adjudicate all the statements that were made by all the Members of the House in all of the debates, or any of them for that matter. As far as this being a question of privilege, I couldn't see it as being a question of privilege. Presumably somebody made a statement and the other Member denies it. This is what debates are all about. And, indeed and in fact, I doubt very much if this is the proper time to debate it, because I understand this whole matter took place some half or one hour ago.

**Mr. T.M. Breker** (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, seeing that Operation LIFT has come under heavy fire in this debate I would like to refresh the memories of the Members present.

The program was designed only partly to put cash into the farmers' pockets. The prime objective was to achieve a major reduction in the wheat surpluses by taking land out of production.

In my constituency, the big beef for this program is that the farmer that was responsible for creating the glut of wheat, the farmer that is quilt of continuous cropping would get the benefit of the acreage reduction plan. I have a report here from Ottawa. It is a report from the Minister (Otto Lang)

responsible for the Wheat Board — and the statement goes like this:

Provision has been made to allow the farmer who seeds no wheat in 1970, to choose either his 1968 or 1969 wheat summer fallow and perennial forage acreage for comparison with 1970 acreages in determining the wheat reduction payments which he is entitled.

This will give some consideration to the farmer that either diversified or cut back his wheat production in 1969.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal on many things. I just want to take a moment in this debate to review some of the things that were said, and there were some interesting things said by many people. I am surprised and somewhat pleased that someone from the other side of the House, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), suggests that the main benefit, or one of the main benefits at least, of Operation LIFT is going to be the re-establishment of a machine more active and more political and better oiled than the Gardiner machine ever was in this province.

It is certain by the time that this program gets under way we will have politic appointments snooping into every granary and through everyone's back quarter throughout this province by the end of operation dust-bowl, then we are going to have seen it all. It's amusing, Mr. Speaker, to see these people now running for cover after the happy announcements by the Premier, speaking on behalf of the Government when Operation LIFT was first announced. It is true, as the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) says and I agree with him that this was not designed to be a panaceas for the total farm picture, this is true, and I respect the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) in his statement that he will go along with it. But put me down with the do-gooders, list me with them if that's the penalty for saying that in this world today — that is a hungry world for the most part — we don't have the God-given sense to be able to devise methods whereby we can get this surplus grain into the hungry bellies of the starving millions of this world. We have the scientific ability to put a man on the moon; we have the scientific ability to do many things; we spend, Mr. Speaker, a billion dollars a year now on national defence defending ourselves against God knows what. Yet we haven't got the sense to take care of what isn't a large surplus, not nearly as large as some people believe, to take care of this plenty we have on hand to see to it that it gets into the proper place or is at least properly stored. That is what this Resolution is all about; to see to it that grain is properly stored somewhere. I really don't care too much where it is stored, but I certainly believe that we ought to have at least the sense of the early pharaohs when we store up in the good years for the bad ones that are bound to

come sooner or later. Anyone who ever went through the dust-bowl years will know that we can't depend on these surpluses forever.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks on some things by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), who was so cavalier with the facts and some challenges he laid down. First of all he talked about the wonderful job they did on grain dryers last year, but the time when damp grain was our problem there was hardly a grain dryer available anywhere in the North American continent; they were just something new at that time and they were not available. I congratulate them for whatever efforts they made but still this is certainly no point of argument when it comes to bragging about Liberal accomplishments. He said, "What did you do?" Well, I'll tell him some things we didn't do when the farmers were in some of the worst positions that they have been in these last few years of Liberal Government in Ottawa and the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. We didn't take \$8 million from them in extra gasoline tax; we didn't double and triple farm truck licences; we didn't increase the taxes or allow the increases in taxes of about 35 to 40 per cent in all the municipalities, while you fiddle around wasting money in the various departments, other various departments of government, rather than taking care of the people who really need help, or spending money trying to encourage others to come in to take care of some of the Premier's pseudo pipe-dream programs. This problem, Mr. Speaker, is not over-production. The problem is under-organization, under-utilization of the resources we have and certainly an underdevelopment of the markets that are available. Let no one make any mistake about that. Certainly the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) said, "No one was worse off." I would like to point out to him and this isn't entirely to do with Operation LIFT but it is in conjunction with Operation LIFT: what about the small farmer right across this province who is going to lose this initial quota? What are you going to do about him? And to say he is no worse off is ridiculous. This program, Mr. Speaker, simply rewards those people who were the greatest contributors to the problem in the first place and does nothing for the hundreds and hundreds of farmers who have been trying to do their best to diversify to some extent; it is actually going to rob them of some of the opportunities that they have and put them in a worse position than they were before. If you want to know where I stand, I stand flatly against this without something else to go with it. This Government has operated a crash program — the Government at Ottawa — with no advice whatever and acquiescence at least in the beginning, before they learned they were in trouble, from this g. They have done nothing and for a government, a Department of Agriculture at Ottawa and the Minister without portfolio to come along and offer a farmer a one-year crash program is wrong. No farmer can operate on a one-year basis. He needs three and I would be much happier and so would the farmers of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba be much happier if this Government at Ottawa had had the sense to devise a three-year program so that farmers knew where they were at. Tell me, any of you farm Members over

there, can any of you plan an operation on a one-year basis, not knowing whether you are going to get another crash program which is going to completely contradict the program that you had this year. Judging by what they have done this year, God knows what they will devise next year. And it is the uncertainty that is causing farmers now to be completely apathetic in their approach to this year's crop. This program is changing and seems to be devised, I'm sure it wasn't done intentionally but what they are actually doing, if it is successful, is changing the break basket of the world into a dust bowl.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.G. MacLennan:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few remarks in closing the debate. First of all, the first speaker from the Opposition, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) had several comments and a lecture to give us on some of the remarks made by the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) who seconded the motion. He, I'm sure, misunderstood the Member for Yorkton's remarks, or if he didn't innocently misunderstand then he attempted to deliberately mislead the House. He compared or he said that the Member for Yorkton compared the farmer to a dressmaker and went on with a great lecture on the differences between a farmer and a dressmaker. Well, the Member for Yorkton never did compare the farmer to the dressmaker. He compared the dressmaker receiving payments for storage on his dresses to the agencies that are receiving storage at the present time. Mr. Speaker, we heard remarks from the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), most interesting remarks. The most objectionable one he made as far as I was concerned is his statement that we brought in a resolution similar to his, simply to try to prove that we are friends of the farmers. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that this side of the House does not have to prove and it is a fact that we are a true friend of the farmer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacLennan:** — The election campaigns in 1964 and 1967 have borne us out and the next election will bear us out as the true friend once again. A great speech could be made on pointing out the various benefits the farmers have received from a Liberal Administration since 1964. Such addresses have been given before in the House. We have heard the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) get up with the same criticism that he has made of this Government time and time again without paying any heed to the Resolution. The only difference in his remarks this afternoon to any of the remarks that he made in the past few days in this Legislature is he just didn't work in his funny road. So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I have heard Members on both sides of the House support this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

**RESOLUTION NO. 12 — STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FROM SASKATCHEWAN  
NURSING HOMES**

**Mr. G.T. Snyder** (Moose Jaw North: — Moved, seconded by Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):

That this Assembly views with alarm the rapid escalation in the rates charged to guests in some Saskatchewan nursing homes and recommends to the government that all those private institutions licensed under The Housing and Nursing Homes Act and accommodating 10 or more guests be required to provide to the government an annual statement of income, operating expenses and net profit.

He said: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution is one which I hope and expect will raise a number of questions which relate to the care of the aged. It will, I hope, inspire some dialogue which will make somewhat clearer the direction in which we are travelling in the care of the aged and the infirm. I believe it is well known, Mr. Speaker, that in 1945 the home for the infirm in Wolseley was placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Welfare. This, Mr. Speaker, in effect was the first formal recognition of the responsibility of the Government in the care of the aged, the needy and the disabled. During the next few decades the Provincial Geriatric Centres at Melfort, Regina and Swift Current came into existence with numerous municipal and charitable institutions supplementing the accommodations that had been provided by the g. I believe at this point, Mr. Speaker, that statistics which relate to the composition of our population today as compared to previous years are relevant to the discussion of this Resolution.

It's a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, that in 1961, 9.40 per cent of Saskatchewan's population was over 65 years of age; by 1969 this had increased slightly to 9.53 per cent. I believe what is more significant, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that those over 75 years of age as a percentage of Saskatchewan's population increased from 3.4 per cent to 4.15 per cent during that 8-year period. These figures at least on the surface would seem to indicate that medical science is becoming increasingly successful in prolonging the life of our senior citizens. In addition I believe these figures may serve to indicate that our senior citizens tend to live out their life here in the province, while the movement of young people out of the province has increased rather sharply in recent years.

A number of factors have contributed to the increasing need for special-care accommodation in our province. Not the least of these was the discharge of approximately 1,000 patients from Saskatchewan's mental institutions around 1965 and in the early months thereafter. Sudden pressures were placed upon existing facilities and the need for new accommodation to provide for these and for other aged and infirmed groups had become extremely evident at that time. It will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the 1961 Survey committee which dealt with the problems of the



aging and long-term ill established general classifications for the care of the senior citizen groups in special-care homes in terms of level I, II, III, and IV care. The informed estimate of Saskatchewan's need for the first three levels of care, level I to level III seemed to be based on a formula of five beds per thousand of total population or a total of about 5,000 beds. Informed sources indicate that, while there are presently over 2,700 beds for level III care in use or under construction, there is still a shortage of beds for this level of care which appears to involve the greatest proportionate number of Saskatchewan's aged and infirm.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have seen a new phenomenon emerge in Saskatchewan in the care of the elderly with the private commercial nursing homes springing up across the country. One of these commercial enterprises involved in providing care for the aged gave notice of their success — success of their operation — in the February 10th issue of *The Leader Post* in which this organization lays claim to an investment of some \$40 million in the chain of 20 nursing homes across Canada. The article claims that the success of this scheme has been so rapid that a year ago the principals who backed the plan originally had to decide whether to mark time while collecting more expansion capital or to combine with the larger organizations seeking investment opportunities. The article concludes by saying that they eventually combined with “Trizec”, one of Canada's largest real estate and development firms and that there is now no limit to their future development.

It seems clear, Mr. Speaker, that the care of the aged has become increasingly fragmented in recent years. Sometime ago this care was the principal responsibility of the Government with municipal and charitable organizations filling an important role also in this vital work. I've had the opportunity over the past number of months and years to visit a large number of these institutions which fall generally into one of those three categories. Administrative personnel have indicated that in the private and charitable institutions there is a general component of residents or guests about 60 per cent of whom are Saskatchewan Assistance Plan cases who are receiving financial help through this agency of government. One of the private institutions provided figures to indicate that their rates for level III care had increased from \$9 per day in 1966 to \$11 per day in 1969, to \$13 per day only a few weeks ago; and since I had my script typed up, Mr. Speaker, I discover that the rate has now gone from \$13 per day to \$15 per day, amounting to a monthly cost to a guest in this private nursing home of some \$450 per month. Charitable and religious non-profit organizations, Mr. Speaker, have been plagued as have others, I suppose, with increasing costs as the inflationary trend has influenced their cost of operations with rising interest rates adding to the burden in a very significant way. As of April 1965, level III care in St. Anthony's Home in the city of Moose Jaw, which I am pleased to represent, cost \$170 a month. By 1966 it had risen to \$180 a month and in 1967 it had increased to \$190. By April

of 1968 it had increased to \$260 and \$270 by April of 1969 and as of December 31, 1969, it had risen to \$287 and I understand that the figure is now \$310 a month for level III care. I think it is worthy of comment too, Mr. Speaker, that the Government's decision to discontinue the maintenance grant last April contributed another \$4 per month of an increase to the cost of care of these homes at that time.

The Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) is aware, I'm sure, that one of the factors which have compounded the financial problems of these institutions is the fact that his Department provides for payment only up to and including level III care at a maximum rate which I understand is now \$310 a month. There are, I am told, approximately 20 guests in the St. Anthony's Old Folks Home in Moose Jaw who should be classified as level IV guests because they must be fed and require much more intensive care than is generally accepted in the case of level III guests. The superintendent of the institution indicates that they have been told that the alternative available to them is to discharge the guest to the Wascana Hospital, if they require level IV care or to another general hospital where they would occupy a bed at a cost of something in excess of \$30 per day. I understand that these possibilities to transfer are extremely remote because of limited space, so as a result a large number of level IV cases continue to be classified as level III. I think that this indicates, Mr. Speaker, what a genuine need there is for level IV accommodation with an estimate that between 400 to 500 special-care guests are requiring level IV care. In turn, Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the demand for level III facilities would be at least partially solved with the development of level IV accommodation to provide for those level IV patients who are presently occupying level III beds.

I believe it is generally accepted, Mr. Speaker, that with the exception of the few independently wealthy cases that it is only a matter of a few weeks or a few months before the majority of elderly people who are institutionalised at existing rates charged by private nursing homes become financially dependent upon public programs. The question which I directed to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) earlier this Session was answered on February 24, which indicates that a total of 2,101 guests in nursing homes registered by the Department are receiving financial assistance through the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that with the expanded role that is being played by the private nursing homes in our province over the past number of years that the Government owes it to the tax-paying public to have an accounting of the manner in which those taxpayers' dollars are being spent. The charitable and religious organizations with whom I've been in touch would welcome the opportunity to make their operations public knowledge and they felt that a very useful purpose would be served if this was done. With approximately half of the income of the private homes being derived from the public purse, it would appear to be only good business to provide an annual financial statement to the g. I think with this initial step, Mr. Speaker, the Government might then be in a better position to make the

necessary adjustments in order to iron out some of the inequities which presently exist. It seems almost incredible to me, Mr. Speaker, that if two patients with identical disabilities were discharged from hospital, one to the Parkside Nursing Home in Regina and one to the Swift Current Geriatric Centre, the patient at the Parkside Nursing Home would have paid \$5,400 for level III at \$15 a day in the first 12 months that he was a guest at that institution, while the patient who are fortunate enough to get into the Government Geriatric Centre in Swift Current would have paid his \$180 deterrent charge and would have then been cared for without charge except for the extended services that are provided for a few dollars a month. This would mean that the Swift Current Geriatric Centre patient would be able to save somewhere between \$600 and \$700 a year out of his or her old age pension, while the Parkside Nursing Home patient would be depleting his or her resources at a rate of over \$5,000 a year. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, this is an inequity which cries for remedial measures to be taken and to be taken shortly. All Members, I think, will appreciate the fact that a patient in a Government geriatric centre is regarded substantially the same as a hospital case and as such is charged for care in the same way as a patient in a general hospital. There is, however, I believe, a very fundamental difference to me, Mr. Speaker, arises because of the fact that a hospital patient is usually discharged after a relatively short stay in the vast majority of cases, while an elderly geriatric or nursing-home patient is usually expected to live out their final years in that institution. The private nursing homes assert that they are not making excessive profits in conducting their operation and some actually suggest that they are losing money, Mr. Speaker, Quite frankly I find it a little difficult to convince myself that insurance companies, investment companies, real estate and development firms are in the nursing home business for charitable or benevolent purposes. This simply isn't the general motivation of these captains of industry who must account for their operation to an annual meeting of their shareholders. I just suggest that an annual statement of income, operating expenses and net profit to be provided to the Government would clear up the matter once and for all. Rightly or wrongly, Mr. Speaker, private nursing homes are being accused of gouging the public for all the traffic will bear. Now if this charge is unfounded it can be laid to rest, and if excessive profits are being rung out of the aged and the unfortunate, then it seems clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has a solemn obligation to see to it that our senior citizens are not used as a commercial commodity to be exploited for private profit.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution need not be one which is voted on with a demarcation line drawn down the floor of this Assembly. There are a large number of people of all political faiths who are deeply concerned with the problems that I related today and I hope that Members opposite can see their way clear to offer their support for this re.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this motion which was placed on the Order Paper by the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder), I do so because I wholeheartedly approve of the reference to the rapid escalation in the price, particularly of nursing care in private nursing homes. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me some latitude I would like to bring to the attention of this House and to the attention particularly of the Ministers involved, some of the discrepancies and some of the problems nursing home administrators and directors are attempting to solve. Mr. Speaker, correspondence I have on their behalf from sons and daughters of patients in nursing homes indicates clearly to me that there is a lack of coordination and communication between the Civil Service and the Health Department and the Civil Service and the Department of Welfare. In one particular case a constituent of mine who are suffering from terminal cancer was, under pressure, asked to leave the Grey Nuns' Hospital. This decision was brought about and enforced by the hospital. The patient was taken to a private home that is not licensed; although he was suffering severe pain, he did not receive adequate care. Second, the nursing home is located in the extreme southeast portion of the city while the relatives of the patient, including the wife of the patient, who was also quite elderly, live in the extreme northwest. Mr. Speaker, apparently no attempt had been made to locate a nursing home near at hand. The elderly wife of the patient had to take a taxi cab several times a day across the city of attempt to give some comfort to her husband who lived a very short period of time after being discharged from the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Welfare administers homes which look after patients of this type. When I approached the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) he referred the standard of the private nursing home to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). Since this home was less than ten beds he dissociated himself from any responsibility and wrote me accordingly. In another case, Mr. Speaker, where the need for closer coordination between the Department of Welfare and the Department of Health is evident, another elderly senior citizen suffering from cancer was advised by a staff member of the Grey Nuns' that he would have to leave the hospital. The sons and daughters were introduced to a lady who was to look after him for a fixed figure of \$185 per month. He went to the home on September 8th last year and was there over night. The receipt the relatives received was dated from August 25th although they had not met the lady who was operating the nursing home prior to September 8th. Mr. Speaker, this patient stayed in the private home overnight, a haemorrhage developed, the doctor was called, the patient was rushed back to the hospital and did not live for very long afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, a difficult problem arose when the relatives asked for a return of a portion of the \$185 because their father had stayed in the nursing home one night. When I approached the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) advising him that they had received a refund of half of the amount for one night's care,

that is \$92.50, he maintained that the lady who ran the private home was entitled to notice. Mr. Speaker, she had been paid \$92.50 for one night's care, which incidentally the relatives felt was inadequate and indicated that she was not giving their father the proper attention. One might attribute this entire situation to the fact that we are desperately short of hospital beds, but added to that there is definitely evidence, in my estimation, that the Department of Welfare has no supervision over some homes caring for patients from hospital who need nursing care every day, that is homes, private homes, of less than ten beds. Perhaps those with ten beds or more have some supervision. The rank and file citizen is not being protected when he has to pay \$92.50 for an overnight stay.

Mr. Speaker, it is also pertinent and it has been drawn to my attention in a strong and definite manner, that those with terminal cancer for instance, and patients with a short time to live, when they are discharged from hospital, should be the responsibility of the hospital. The relatives insist on this, or, if not the hospital, then the Department of Public Health. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the coordination that we should have doesn't exist and the guarantee of good care has, in a number of occasions in my constituency, perhaps too many occasions, alarmed the relatives of the patients.

May I turn now to the rates charged in level I and level II accommodation in three of the nursing homes in this city. The first nursing home is publicly owned and charged \$169 for hostel-type accommodation. I understand that this is going to be raised and probably has been in the last while. The Department, I understand, has approved some sort of an increase. A private institution providing the same care charges \$207 per patient, and a third private institution regardless of whether it is a I or II or III or IV level care charges \$465 per month. And this is the latest figure I understand. Someone came to me the other day with a charge of \$15 a day for 31 days. The patient was in a two-bed ward. It is \$527 per month if the patient is in a private room. Level III care at the publicly owned institution in my constituency charges \$287, I understand that figure is to be raised. One of the private nursing homes charges a similar amount. The third private nursing home for level III care charges the rate I just quoted, \$465 and \$527 per month, the most recent one, of \$15 per day and the patient is in a two-bed ward. Of this, Mr. Speaker, the Government as I understand it, puts up \$194 in some cases where the relatives are unable to do so; the patient \$111.40 and the relatives are asked to pay the balance per month if finances permit.

Mr. Speaker, often when these patients requiring level III care are being discharged from the hospital, the relatives sign for the full responsibility and the only payment that is made for their care other than the payment received by the relative is \$111.40. It seems inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that two

homes, one privately owned and the other publicly owned, should charge \$287 and maybe it's \$301 or \$310 now — I am not sure, it could have gone up in the last few days — for level III care while a third home would charge \$15 per day or \$465 for a 31-day month and the patient would be located in a ward.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to solve the problem and seeks to answer the question that is being asked: why? And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is the responsibility of the Government to answer this question to the satisfaction of the relatives who are forced to pay this rate, a very high rate, an outrageous rate, because in many instances there is no other place for them to go. Mr. Speaker, at one time it was automatic that welfare recipients would be covered by the Government after they became nursing-home patients in level I or II or level III range. This is not the case anymore. On occasions, on more occasions that we would like to see, the patient is admitted, the application isn't filed and the Department of Welfare doesn't pay from the day the patient is admitted but from the day the application is approved and the nursing home is asked to put up the difference. I have several sets of correspondence on this and I would be glad to give them to the Minister, showing the gap that they are asked to pay for — the time between the day that they entered and the day the application was approved.

This, Mr. Speaker, has been happening and has been happening to constituents of mine, and I see no reason for it. I would suggest that the Department of Welfare, through its proper channels, make certain that, when the welfare recipient is entitled to level I, or II or level III care, and from the day they begin to receive this care, pay the nursing home, whether it is a private or publicly owned home from the time the patient is in the home, and stop quibbling and squabbling over 20 or 30 days care in the nursing home for level I and II and level III patients.

I want to turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the fourth level of geriatric patient. This area is not receiving adequate or proper attention and there is desperate need for geriatric beds in Regina city. I am sure that the Minister is well aware of this. Fourth level care is the care that is received at Wascana hospital and is paid for at hospital rates. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, one nursing home in Regina at least — and probably others — is looking after level IV geriatric patients and is being paid for it at the level III rate, at this rate, \$287, or maybe it is \$301 or \$310 by now, certainly much below the hospital rate, and this particular nursing home, Mr. Speaker, has more than 40 level-four patients at the present time. We are talking about building new level I and level II bachelor units in Regina — I understand that 70 are planned and may be constructed — one nursing home has 102 applications for this type of accommodation. This should tell all of us how inadequate 70 bachelor suites will be to meet the present need. We plan to build 350 other nursing and hospital type units. One nursing home alone has 336 applications for hospital and nursing-type accommodations — yes, one nursing home along in the

city has these many applications. Nursing homes are experiencing difficulty training staff and I would like to turn to this for a moment. Orderlies and aides have to be trained on the job. There isn't the proper training program, the proper facilities, or the proper instruction for orderlies and aides at the moment. As a result there is a shortage, a very severe shortage of this type of personnel for nursing homes. Male guests are often without male orderlies because of the lack of pay and the need for training.

Let me conclude my remarks by saying, first, I think the rates for private nursing homes at \$15 per bed per day are too high and the operation of these homes should be thoroughly checked. In my estimation the publicly owned homes charge much less, do a better job and provide better food and more adequate care. Second, I think there should be a committee established between the Department of Welfare and the Department of Health to decide on a procedure when a patient is discharged to a nursing home at the instigation of the Department of Health or a hospital, without an application, payment should be given immediately to the nursing home upon arrival of the patient at that time. I think this committee should coordinate the date of discharge with those operate nursing homes to see that the patient is properly looked after the minute he or she leaves the hospital. When there is a dispute over payment to a private individual home which is not licensed, there should be someone within either the Department of Public Health or the Department of Welfare who will take the responsibility for deciding what should be paid to the operator of a private home with a bed capacity of less than 10 since he operates without a licence. Fourth, there should be worked out between the nursing homes in conjunction with the Department of Public Health, training programs for orderlies and aides. In addition, Mr. Speaker, some financial recognition of this training should be provided to the employees of nursing homes who take the time and the effort to develop this proper type of training.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to pursue the development of the nursing home field, particularly the rates and the administration and the discharge procedure from hospitals to nursing homes. Also the training of personnel will receive my attention.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) by placing this Resolution on the Order Paper has done the senior citizens and the patients in the nursing home a real service for he has provided the opportunity for each Member of the Legislature to raise points, to make suggestions and to criticize some of the techniques we are using at the present time. Mr. Speaker, no more dedicated group of people operate in our Civil Service than those who care for nursing home patients. But, Mr. Speaker, unless we attempt to improve from day to day the whole area of care for senior citizens in nursing homes, we will find that problems will develop. It is my observation that the Minister of both Public Health and Welfare will merit by the discussions this Resolution will provide and develop.

**March 24, 1970**

Senior citizens of this province are entitled to and deserve the best possible care. Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to see that they get it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. L. P. Coderre** (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, I've heard intently what both Members for Moose Jaw and Regina North West (Mr. Snyder and Mr. Whelan) have stated in their remarks. It seems to me that some of them are a little far fetched, a little exaggerated, trying to create again the usual type of confusion to the public, indicating that many of the senior citizens are not being looked after. I would certainly like to study their remarks a little more and make my comments later on, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **RESOLUTION NO. 15 — DISAPPROVAL OF MODIFICATIONS OF THE SASKATCHEWAN HOSPITAL SERVICES PLAN**

**Mr. W.E. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Moved, seconded by Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):

That this Assembly strongly disapproves of the successive modifications to the Saskatchewan Hospital Services plan which have changed it from a plan which paid all hospital operating costs, leaving the balance to be paid partly by those requiring hospital care and partly by municipalities or religious orders; and further that this Assembly calls on the government to consider restoring the Plan to its original intent by abandoning deterrent fees and by abandoning its attempts to shift part of hospital operating costs onto local ratepayers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Government has led this province into successive sets of crisis; farm depression, unprecedented high rate of unemployment, education turmoil and confusion, hospital crisis. In the case of farm problems and unemployment, the Government has tried to brush off its responsibility on to outside economic pressures and forces. In health care programs, the hospital crisis, Mr. Speaker, it is this Government that has created the problem. I must assume the total blame and responsibility and it must be called upon to account for its sins. Liberals in this province and for that matter throughout Canada have held an over-hostile attitude towards public health care programs, despite their promises when out of office or during election years to maintain and extend public health services. When in office and off-election years they openly attack and undermine health programs initiated by other governments and forced upon by the citizens. Mr. Speaker, this attitude of hostility never ceases. As last as last fall the Minister of



Public Health (Mr. Grant) let the Liberal cat out of the bag when he described our hospital and medical plan as, let me quote: "A two-headed monster." I am sure the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada take strong exception to this kind of description of the two most humane public programs established for and by the people.

Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic party are very sensitive when these plans become attacked, not just because we take pride for having the wisdom and courage of pioneering them and deserving some credit for their introduction and acceptance throughout Canada. It is more. The fact is that public hospital and medical care is often a matter of life and death. We feel very strongly that all citizens, regardless of age, or condition, or ability to pay ought to have health services and facilities they need without hindrance of any kind. The Hospital and Medical Care Plans are not monsters. Where the real problems lie is in the inhuman, hard and cold-blooded attitude of the present Government toward health programs generally.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back to 1964, the year the Liberal Government was elected to office. During the campaign they said, and let me quote: "Costs for health services were rising out of all proportion." when the people asked what a Liberal Government would do, would it dismantle the plans, will it reduce benefits and services, they answered, "Oh, no." In fact they promised to increase public health services and benefits. Remember the promise of a public drug plan? Their answer was that they would apply 'business management techniques' and by doing this they would save enough money to be able to make their promise good.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at what has happened since the Liberals took office. Let us look at the effectiveness and the efficiency of these cool and sharp businessmen, how they have controlled costs and what they have done in their promise to improve health services. Look at the Hospital Services Plan in 1964. Hospital premiums were \$40 for a family and \$20 for a single person. This yielded \$10.4 million. Out of Provincial Consolidated Funds \$15.8 million was put into SHSP. The Federal Government provided or reimbursed the Plan with 44.5 per cent of the cost, totalling \$21.4 million. The total cost of the Plan was \$48 million. No deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker, no special hospital revenue tax, all hospital operating costs were paid for ensured services provided by SHSP. Municipalities and religious orders were not required to pay deficits for ensured services. There were no strikes by hospital workers in the 17 years of the existence of the Plan administered by a CCF government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Then let us look at MCIC. In 1964 the medical care premiums were \$12 for a family, \$6 for a single person — this yielded \$3.4 million. Out of consolidated revenues the Province

**March 24, 1970**

contributed \$19.7 million for a total of \$23.1 million. No Federal cost-sharing, no deterrent fees. All ensured services were paid by the Medical Care Insurance Plan. And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Medical care Insurance Plan had an investment or a surplus at the beginning of the year amounting to \$9.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, let us contrast this with 1969, the Liberal year, the year of Liberal business management of the Hospital and Medical Care Plan. SHSP cost, 1969; hospital premiums went up by 20 per cent - \$48 for a family, \$24 for a single person — this yielded \$12.6 million. Out of consolidated revenues the Province contributed \$23.6 million; third party liabilities and other sources \$1.1 million. The Federal Government provided 50.5 per cent of the provincial total for an amount of \$37.3 million. This makes up a figure of \$74.6 million. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not the total cost. We have to add to this amount some \$5 million or \$6 million that the sick people had to pay in deterrent fees and the Government has refused and is continuing to refuse to pay costs for insurance services incurred by hospital boards beyond last year's approved budget.

Take MCIC. The cost in 1964 — medical care premiums for a family \$24, and \$12 for a single person — a 100 per cent increase, Mr. Speaker. This yielded \$5.9 million. Out of consolidated revenue the Government only contributed \$6.8 million and the Federal Government provided \$17.2 million, for a total of \$29.9 million. But again, Mr. Speaker, in deterrent fees that the people have to pay. And let me underline the fact that in 1964 the Plan had a surplus of some \$10 million. In 1968, Mr. Speaker, at year end, the Plan had a book overdraft amounting to \$218,000.

So let us analyse what has really happened to the financing of Hospital and Medical Care Plans. In 1964 hospital and medical care premiums amounted to \$13.8 million. In 1969 they totalled \$18.5 million, a \$4.7 million increase or 34 per cent. This is a direct charge or shift to the individual. In 1964 the Federal Government paid or reimbursed the Province with \$21.4 million toward the cost of hospital care. Ottawa paid nothing toward the cost of Medicare. In 1969, however, the Federal Government contributed \$54.4 million toward the cost of hospital and Medicare, \$33.1 million more, Mr. Speaker, an increase of over 150 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be deluded into a belief that Ottawa is being a rich uncle — it is not. The Saskatchewan citizens are paying for this money we are receiving in the form of a 2 per cent social development tax. The trouble with this tax is the \$120 yearly ceiling, which means that the burden falls most heavily on the low-income people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Provincial share of responsibility. In 1964, out of the general revenues, the Province contributed \$34.5 million toward the cost and maintenance of the Hospital and Medical Care Plans - \$15.8 toward

hospital, \$19.7 toward Medicare. In 1969, Mr. Speaker, the Government only \$30.4 million out of consolidated revenue toward the cost and maintenance of these two plans - \$5.1 million less than what was contributed in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, it is here where we find the two-headed monster and the piker and chiseller. The picture in fact is much worse. In this five-year period, 1964 to 1969, according to DBS, the cost of living has risen by 21 per cent for the reduced value of the dollar, which is \$7.4 million, then it should have contributed \$43 million. But it only contributed \$30.4 million out of consolidated revenues. It short-changed these Plans by \$12.5 million, Mr. Speaker. Let us also not forget that if there were no deterrent fees, Saskatchewan would receive some \$3 million more from Ottawa. Adding this amount it means \$15.5 million. Mr. Speaker, this would be enough money to remove the deterrent fees, enough money to have prevented hospital deficits, enough money have given the hospital workers a decent increase and prevented the occurrence of strikes and serious conflicts. And, if you check, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Health estimates for this year, you will find the Government is not proposing to correct the situation in 1970. So the hospital crisis will continue and there is reason to believe that the crisis may even get worse.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is reported to have said that the actual total hospital salaries projected for 1969 will amount to \$53.4 million. That is about 67 per cent of the total hospital operating costs when deterrent fees are added. He also told us that for the immediate past five years, 1965 to 1969 inclusive, salaries for hospital employees have increased by 34.5 per cent. The hospital costs on the other hand have increased from \$48 million to over \$80 million, deterrent fees included, but excluding deficits. In other words the total wage cost increased only about one-half as much as the increase of the total cost of the Plan. Yet Government spokesmen last fall were trying to lay all the blame for rising hospital costs on the employees. Fortunately some hospital administrators came to the defence of the employees. Mr. William Conway, financial director the Saskatoon St. Paul Hospital, is reported in the October 31 Press as saying this:

Operating costs, not salaries, pushed St. Paul's Hospital into a deficit position this year. Chief actors were increases in medical and drug expenses.

I note with interest some of the figures the Minister has quoted. In 1963, the last full year the CCF Government administered the Hospital Plan. There was a total average staff compliment of 9,290 for the year. In 1969 this rose to 11,111 according to the Minister, an increase of 1,821 or 20 per cent. This must be contrasted with the number of hospital beds and patient days of care and stay. At the end of 1963, the number

of hospital beds in Saskatchewan stood at 7,705. The number of beds dropped to 7,410, a decline of 295 beds. In 1964 the total number of days of hospital care provided was 1,986,000; in 1969 it dropped to 1,916,000 — a drop of 70,000 — days of care. The average days of stay has also declined from 9.6 in 1964 to 9.4 in 1969. Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is entitled to know why the number of hospital employees in a period of six years has increased by 20 per cent when the number of hospital beds has dropped by almost 4 per cent. The number of days of hospital care has dropped by 3.6 per cent, the average days of stay declined by 2 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I am not imputing any bad management, nor am I suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there has not been some improvement in the quality of hospital care. The question I would like answered is: how much of the improvement and the quality of care is attributable to medical science and how much to larger staff; also how much has the quality of hospital care really improved? Now the Minister boastfully told us that during the period of Liberal administration average wages increased by 34.5 per cent and that this was a larger increase than granted by a CCF Government in the immediate preceding five years. This may be true, Mr. Speaker, except he did not tell us the whole story. This average figure he quotes includes wage increases granted to the non-professional staff, nursing and other professional staff, interns, management, and administrative staff. It does not mean that wages for the lay staff have increased by that amount. Far from it, Mr. Speaker, wages for the unionised employees have increased by 20 per cent to 26 per cent only, depending on the hospital and in some cases even less. On the other hand, wages for nursing staff have increased much more. In 1964 the starting salary for the general staff nurse was \$315 a month. It is 4470 now. The top rate for a general staff nurse in 1964 was \$375 per month and is \$520 now. A further 6 per cent increase is due to nurses as of September 1, 1970, to bring the starting rate up to \$500 and the top rate to \$550 a month, with a bargaining agreement to expire on December 31, 1970. In other words, nursing staff wages will have increased by about 50 per cent whereas wages for unionised employees have increased by only half the amount, in many cases less. Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear, I am not suggesting that nurses are getting large wages, far from it. However, it may not be unfair to say that their wages are beginning to look more reasonable. There is no question that they earn their pay.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I can call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 to 7:30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, when I called it 5:30 I made comparisons to the kind of increases that were granted to non-professional hospital employees and professional groups, particularly nurses. I noted that since 1964 and including 1970, nurses will have received a wage increase of about 50 per cent, whereas the lay staff received only about half that amount. I also said that nurses' wages were finally getting to a reasonable rate for the kind of work they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 4,800 nurses working in the general hospitals in the province out of a total staff of what the Minister reported, 11,100. The Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association bargains for about 3,000 nurses, the balance are in administrative, managerial and supervisory positions. Wages for other professional and administrative staff have increased equal to that or about the same area as those of nurses. This is why the percentage is higher. The non-professional staff did not receive a 34 per cent increase as I have stated. The only thing that they have received, Mr. Speaker, is abuse and discrimination.

When it comes to wage increases, Mr. Speaker, this Government has a double standard. When the Minister compared wage increases, he had a responsibility to also point out that the cost of living in the years 1960 to 1964 inclusive, rose 7.3 points only. During that period, hospital workers received a 17.6 per cent increase according to the Minister's statement, whereas the cost of living in the period 1965-69 inclusive, went up by an unbelievable 21 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The total hospital group according to the Minister had a wage increase of 34.5 per cent, about one-third of the amount granted by the CCF Government in relation to the rise in the cost of living. As I said before the non-professional employees did not receive that amount. Wages for non-professional hospital employees have been pathetically low and still are. Certain employees would get more money as welfare recipients than as wage earners. For example at the Estevan St. Joseph's Hospital, where the employees took action, the average wage was only \$1.58 per hour, that's less than \$275 a month. At the Prince Albert Victoria Hospital where the employees also went out on strike and stayed out until ordered to work by the Government invoking the union-crippling Bill 2, average wages there were only \$1.75 per hour, that's less than \$300 per month. Saskatchewan's average wage in July last, stood at \$470.50 a month. While average wages in Saskatchewan increased by \$27 a week since 1964, average wages for hospital employees increased only by slightly more than this amount. The Minister told us that hospital wages in 1969 averaged \$4,800 a year, or \$400 a month. I understand that two-thirds of the non-professional hospital employees are in the classifications of maids, nurses' aids and certified nursing assistants, often referred to as CNAs. I have checked dozens of union contracts and nowhere can I find a \$400 rate for these categories. Wages for maids range from \$235 to \$290 a month. Nurses' aids from \$235 to \$335 per month, CNAs from \$270 to \$385 a month and this is depending on the size of the hospital and length of service. I have said that this Government has a double standard. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is a double, double standard. Last May the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association entered into a first province-wide bargaining agreement with the Hospital Association. These were their first bargaining negotiations. Government representatives sit in during these negotiations. I know that the Canadian Union of Public Employees and the Service Employees International Union have asked for province-wide bargaining and for government representatives to take part in negotiations, since it is the Government that in the final analysis determines

the results of the monetary items.

With respect to trade unions, the Government has continued to refuse to take part in negotiations, but they did participate in bargaining negotiations between the Hospital Association and the Nurses Association. Again, Mr. Speaker, may I ask why the discrimination.

Last year, the Government dictated a 6 per cent maximum increase for the lowest paid hospital workers, thus making it impossible to hospital boards to bargain with their employees in good faith. Having created an impasse the Government imposed its will by invoking compulsory arbitration. The settlement was all a Liberal Government could wish for, with increases as low as 2 per cent among the lowest paid non-professional hospital workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is false economy. Consider these facts: 1. Saskatchewan which stood fourth among the provinces in hospital wages paid per patient day in 1961 had slipped to ninth place in 1967. Only Prince Edward Island pays less. 2. Low wages induce rapid staff turnover. Even in 1967 DBS figures showed that the turnover rates for all non-professional nursing staff in Saskatchewan except orderlies exceeded 50 per cent per year, 10 per cent higher than the Canadian average. 3. The Government-imposed wage settlement inevitably will increase this rate of turnover. 4. High turnover rates lower the quality of service to the patient and increase hospital efficiency. Furthermore, employee terminations are costly. The Federal-Provincial Task Force on the costs of health care reports that each termination of employment costs the hospital \$525. The prospects clearly are that the Government's chosen role will increase costs, not reduce them, and will lower the quality of care. Recruitment of new hospital employees will be even more restricted to non-skilled workers. Experienced personnel will flee the province for higher paying jobs in Manitoba, Alberta and other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, it is instructive to note the difference in the Government's approach to help workers at the top of the income scale. Faced with a turnover rate of about 7 per cent among physicians, compared to 53 per cent for nursing assistants, the Health Minister announced on January 21st, and the Provincial Treasurer restated it in his Budget, that doctors will be granted a fee schedule increase. Annual earnings of average physicians in Saskatchewan under the present fee schedule are well over \$25,000. The Government has said doctors will get a \$1 million increase, 692 doctors will get \$1 million. This is on top of a 20 per cent increase in the fee schedule since November, 1967. I want to refer you to page 34 of the MCIC Report of 1968. It says this:

Average increases in payments for insured services of approximately 6 per cent effective November 1, 1967, and a further 14 per cent effective August 1, 1968.

And a further \$1,500 increase per doctor on the average will be granted in 1970. The Minister of Health may argue that that is only 6 per cent of the \$25,000 doctors average in Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, a 6 per cent increase for the average Estevan hospital worker who has not had an increase in two years is less than \$200 a year. To an average doctor, 6 per cent means a \$1,500 increase a year. Does it cost the hospital worker less to buy his groceries, or clothes for his children, or to get a roof over his head? The doctors on the average will get 7 ½ times the increase compared to that which the non-professional hospital employees received or may receive.

In the eyes of this Government, the cost of living for the doctors has increased 7 ½ per cent as much as the hospital workers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say nonsense to that. You will not convince me, nor will you convince the hospital workers that this Government has not treated them fairly; you will not convince them that this Government is not anti-labour.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons has asked the Government for an increase in the fee schedule. I know this that the Canadian Medical Association told the Young Commission that they will cooperate with the Federal Government in their effort to check inflation and will ask the doctors across Canada not to increase their fee schedule. Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that doctors really don't want this increase and the \$1 million ought to be paid to those who need it most — the non-professional hospital employees. They need this money to help feed their families.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, let me now briefly recap the successive cost shifts and undermining of the Hospital Plan since this Government took office, and more particularly what this has meant to the people of the province. The election of a Liberal Government in 1964 resulted in Saskatchewan losing a large number of most qualified public servants, knowledgeable in financing, economic planning and in administration of public health plans. Some were fired, some were forced to quit, others resigned voluntarily because their advice and skills were not welcome by the Government of the day. No one can count in dollars and cents how much this loss has meant to the Plan and to the people of Saskatchewan. Within a few weeks of taking office, the Government increased the hospital premium tax by 20 per cent or close to a \$2 million new tax imposition on the individual. The Minister of Health has been threatening to increase the premiums again. He has been saying that he personally feels hospital and medical care premiums in Saskatchewan are too low. During the 1965 session, the Government's first, the Hospital Appeal Board provisions under the Hospital Standards Act were repealed, resulting in patients being denied the right of hospital care and treatment by doctors of their own choice. Payments for minor surgery and non-hospital facilities were discontinued, thus

loading the cost on to the SHSP, resulting often in unnecessary use of hospital beds. Payments for physiotherapy services under MCIC were stopped as of July 1, 1965, again loading additional costs on to the Hospital Plan. In 1966 the Government introduced a hospital revenue tax law, taxing properties for maintenance of hospitals previously exempt. This gives the Government some \$500,000 a year. Since 1964, ten hospitals have been closed in small communities and others are slated for closure. The cost of providing hospital and medical care for Saskatchewan Assistance Plan recipients, those in receipt of old age supplementary allowances, blind persons and others up to April 1, 1966, came from the Medical Services Division, and money was especially voted for that purpose. Since that date, the Government has shifted the cost of providing Medicare and hospital care directly on to SHSP and MCIC. It is admitted that the cost of providing service for this group of citizens is greater than for the average population, because many senior citizens are included. In 1966 there were some 28,000 beneficiaries in this group. It cost the Medical Services Division some \$2 million. Their numbers have grown to over 52,000, therefore the cost of SHSP and MCIC is perhaps over \$4 million. Statistical figures are not available in the Health Department's report. This is another example of the Government loading the cost onto the plans without providing the needed additional funds, Mr. Speaker.

In 1968, came the major attack. Deterrent fees were introduced in respect of hospital and medical care. A hidden tax of some \$9 million was imposed on the sick people. Reports show that medical care deterrent fees last year exceeded \$3 million. It therefore means that the people who required hospital care and were referred to hospitals by doctors, not by their own admission, paid between \$5 million and \$6 million. When the Provincial Treasurer announced the introduction of deterrent fees in 1968, he told the Legislature that for every \$3 paid in deterrent fees by the sick, the Province would save \$2. This therefore means that Saskatchewan is losing some \$2 million in Federal grants in respect of SHSP and over \$1 million in Federal grants for Medicare. Deterrent fees have shifted the costs from the plan to the patient.

In 1969 there was a further shift of financial responsibility. The Government proposed to shift the costs of insured services from the plan to the ratepayer. Mr. Speaker, let me give you a few examples of the problem. Take the Regina Grey Nuns' Hospital. It estimated in August a possible deficit of \$310,000. The Government said it would not provide the money. The Hospital was forced to close between 50 and 60 beds. The figure varied as emergency cases were admitted. Despite the closure of these beds, they still had a deficit of some 50,000 at year's end, and to this day do not know how this will be met. Take the Regina General Hospital; they had a deficit at the year's end of \$561,000. The Government said it is not its problem. The city of Regina has engaged legal counsel and is considering to take the matter to court to determine whether the Government



can refuse to pay the deficit under SHSP. The Minister has reported that the Government will pick up part of this deficit, but not the full amount. Part of this deficit is attributed to the non-collection of deterrent fees — over \$11,000 of this amount is as a result of non-collection of deterrent fees.

The Minister has said that there were hospital deficits under a CCF g. I will deal with this allegation in some detail a little later. All I want to do now is make note that in the five years he referred to, the average for all hospitals in the province was \$512,000 deficit in one year and the Government refused to pick up the amount. Take the Saskatoon City Hospital. It estimated a deficit of \$90,000 and considered closing some 85 beds, finally the city agreed to pay the deficit out of municipal taxes. The decision was made after months of negotiation with the Government, including a meeting between the City Council and the Cabinet. The Government said, “No, a thousand times No.” Finally at year-end it contributed some money. Take the Saskatoon St. Paul’s Hospital, as of October 31, according to press reports, they face a deficit of \$49,000. These are but a few examples. Other hospitals in the province are faced with exactly the same situation.

The annual Saskatchewan Hospital Services Report for the year 1968 on page 32 states, I quote:

The Plan pays what it considers to be the reasonable net cost of operating the hospitals, that is, the total cost less revenue from sources other than the Plan. In this way the hospitals supply the services insured by the Plan without charge to beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, that was the plan. By the time that description was published, the Government had already changed it by instituting deterrent fees, charges to the beneficiaries. But also, you, Mr. Minister, and your colleagues had begun your second attack on the Plan. Let me quote from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of February 15, 1968. The speaker is W.B. Stefaniuk of the North Battleford Union Hospital who was incensed at the SHSP decision on rates of payment prescribed by the Plan for his hospital back in 1968. This is what he said:

We have our backs to the wall. We are faced with a cutback in some services or else we must face the wrath of the community if we reduce services. SHSP is placing the emphasis on minimum instead of maximum in its rate decisions. This follows an apparent aim of providing a minimal level of care under the plan with community to pay for a high standard of care.

So the squeeze got tighter “with the community to pay,” So the squeeze grew tighter and out the window went the commitment to meet the total cost less revenue from other sources, Mr. Speaker.

The other day the Minister of Health said this is nothing new; he said that hospital deficits were nothing new. The CCF Government started it all. And he recited amounts unpaid to hospitals in the years 1960 through 1964. Well, Mr. Speaker, what he failed to say was that under the Plan, as it was designed to operate, there were always retroactive adjustments in payments to hospitals to cover legitimate over-expenditures. Mr. Speaker, the Minister quoted for 1960 the figure of \$653,000. Well in 1961, there was a retroactive adjustment of \$941,000. He said in 1961 the deficit was \$162,000. Well in 1962 there was a retroactive adjustment of \$310,000. He said in 1962 there was a deficit of \$386,000. Well in 1963 there was a retroactive adjustment of \$493,000. He said in 1963 there was deficit of \$626,000. Well, Sir, in 1964, there was an adjustment of \$555,000; in 1964 he said there was a deficit of \$733,000. Well Sir, in 1965, there was a retroactive adjustment of \$27,000. Mr. Speaker, you know in 1966 the Liberals changed the reporting of Hospital Plan expenditure to a cash basis of reporting. What retroactive payment adjustments had been made since then, if any, cannot be determined by the Plan. But we know that in 1969, the Liberals threw this procedure out the window. Many a threat came from the Premier at the Local Government Conference. In August of this year, through the mouth of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) the word went out. Retroactive budget adjustments for hospitals for 1969, no payments to be made to meet extra costs if they exceed the Premier's magical formula of six per cent. Mr. Speaker, what did Mayor Buckwold of Saskatoon have to say about this when the Saskatoon City Hospital found itself in a position where it had to reduce services to survive? In the Star Phoenix of September 25, 1969, the Mayor is quoted to have said this:

This very regrettable and shameful action was forced by the action of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan in refusing to honour a practice which has been in effect since the Plan was started.

More confirmation that the Plan was being changed from a Plan that paid for insured services to a Plan which paid grants towards operation of hospitals is here. The Minister put the clincher on this question in early October last year. He is reported in the Star Phoenix in a story bearing Mr. McConachie's by-line of October 8, saying this, and let me quote:

Municipalities may find themselves having to finance a portion of hospital costs possibly as much as two mills yearly if they plan on operating hospitals on a local basis.

This is the statement of the Minister of Public Health. Well, Mr. Speaker, two mills this year, four mills the next, eight the following, I suppose. This is the wedge that will spell doom for a hospital plan if this Government has its way, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Hospital Services Association saw the handwriting on the wall. At its meeting in Saskatoon last November the Association passed a resolution reported in

the Star Phoenix on November 14, which called on the Provincial Government and let me quote:

to institute without delay a rearranged or new financing policy for hospitals which would avoid financing their further burden of operating costs on the local governments.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any doubt of the direction this Government is heading. It's heading down the discredited path of the Alberta Government and its approach to hospital financing. Alberta for years has had a four-mill property tax across the board devoted to hospital finance. Alberta for years has collected deterrent fees for hospital users. Alberta for years has told hospitals they will only receive X per cent increase over last year's budget, take it or leave it, with the result that major hospitals in Edmonton and Calgary, particularly, have had mammoth deficits year after year to be made up by the local taxpayers. Now even Alberta is making some changes, Mr. Speaker. It is doing away with the property levy. Albertans are hoping that it will do away with some of the arbitrary methods. But here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thatcher and Company are following in their ancient footsteps.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that step by step this Government has moved further and further away from the original concept of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. They reduced the amount of funds made available from consolidated revenues to SHSP and MCIC. They slapped on deterrent fees thus shifting costs from the Plan to the patient. They got tough on rates saying in effect, "Lower your quality of care or get the money from your ratepayers." They imposed an arbitrary and unrealistic ceiling on cost increases at a time when inflation was running rampant and said, "There will be no money for retroactive adjustments; get it from the property owner." The Minister told municipalities they had better be prepared to accept the permanent property levy for hospitals if they want to operate on a local basis.

Mr. Speaker, we say it is time to call a halt. We say that this is not the way to get at the problem of health costs. We say it is time to restore the Plan to its original intent and let me remind you that in the words of the Plan as reported that the Plan pays what is considered to be the reasonable net costs of operating the hospitals, that is, the total cost, less revenue from sources other than the Plan. In this way the hospitals supply the services insured by the Plan without charge to beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, last year we on this side of the House proposed that the Government establish a commission to examine the health progress, the cost and methods of financing them, and the effects of deterrent fees. We propose that such a commission be empowered to make recommendations on methods of organizing health services which will control costs without placing obstacles in the way of obtaining needed services and at the same time

**March 24, 1970**

make it possible to improve the quality of health care. I said last year and I say again that we in the New Democratic party have a serious and genuine concern about rising health costs, the cost of hospital care, Medicare, dental and optical care and constantly rising drug costs. The Minister and the Government Members chose to reject our proposals. They said that the Federal Government established a Task Force on Health Services and they would wait and see what that body would recommend. Well, Sir, the Task Force has reported on the problems of rising costs and organization of health services and the problems are still with us. Nothing has changed. I understand the Department of Public Health is studying the report and has invited various organizations to comment on the report. Saskatchewan has peculiar problems of its own. Deterrent fees and shifting of insurance services from the public plans to individuals and ratepayers are the creation of this Government and should be and could be corrected forthwith. The total problem of cost control, reorganization, extension of public programs and improving the quality of care needs special attention and study. Had this Government established a commission, as we proposed last year, we may now have been on the road to fully understanding the problems and knowing the solutions. A special commission may still be the appropriate approach.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre).

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