

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Seventeenth Legislature
5th Day

Tuesday, August 3, 1971.

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

QUESTIONS

Bill to Facilitate Seating of Elected Members

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have asked now two or three days in a row about whether the Premier or the Government is prepared to bring in a Bill to facilitate the seating of the elected Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the elected Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross). Although I have given notice that I would introduce a Bill, I should, of course, be prepared to drop it if the Government would introduce a Bill and give it three readings today.

I notified the Government that we had consulted with our candidate in Gravelbourg and he is not going to appeal. I asked Mr. Blakeney if he would consult with his people and find out if they intend to appeal, and if they didn't this would make it more clear-cut. I noticed Mr. Taylor, the labor lawyer, was in the gallery last night. I don't know whether he was down here to make sure Bill 2 was repealed or not. He has a pretty good corporation but I don't think he really is a corporation lawyer. He was the lawyer, I understand, representing the NDP candidate from Athabasca. Could he now tell the House, if he is prepared to do the gracious thing and bring the Bill in and seat the two Members? They are both here, they are both very anxious to take part in this Session. Are they prepared to do that now?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't been able to get in touch with the people in Athabasca, but I have been in touch with our people, and my understanding is that there is a real possibility of an appeal. Under those circumstances, in our judgment, the normal rules should apply.

Firing of Civil Servants

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked the Premier a question on the firing of civil servants, in particular the firing of university students. At that time I indicated that I would provide him with names of the university students. I did provide him with one name out of four. I indicated that the other three had relatives and parents working in the Civil Service and did not want their names revealed because of fear of reprisal. I wonder if the Premier could give me a report on the one

university student in the Department of Natural Resources who was dismissed at the end of July?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't had any opportunity as yet to follow up whether or not anybody was dismissed in the Department of Natural Resources or otherwise. I acknowledge the receipt of one name from the Member opposite.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Last night or the night before on television the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) indicated in the press and over television that he was going to ask Husky Oil of Moose Jaw to pay severance pay to any employees that were released. I should like to know, is the Government prepared to treat civil servants that have been dismissed, like Jack Weymark and Bob Beeson, senior civil servants, in the same manner exactly as they are asking the private industry to do, instead of the 30-day notice, which is normal according to law, that they have given these two civil servants.

Mr. Steuart: — If you had anybody like Wilf Gardiner, you'd fire them and not give them any notice either.

Mr. Blakeney: — You answered the question.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We can't have any arguments on questions on Orders of the Day.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I should like a reply.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to payments in lieu of notice to civil servants, the policy being followed is the one which has been followed for some years in the Government.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh!

Mr. Blakeney: — I don't know who is answering the question.

Provincial Government's Building in Moosomin

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask question of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Wood) or perhaps the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow).

This spring construction was started on a new provincial government building in the town of Moosomin to house a Court House and Land Titles Office. I should like to know, first, is it the intention of the Government to complete the building as planned, and secondly, when completed is it still the

Government's intention to have the Land Titles Office housed in this building?

Mr. E.I. Wood (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, in reference to this question. It is our intention to complete the building as planned but it will not include the Land Titles Office. It may not, I understand that it would not, but possibly there is some chance it will be included.

Mr. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to add to the Minister of Public Work's reply. He used the word 'will not' and I think that was an error. The situation is that it may not. As the Hon. Member knows some several years ago, in a move to make more efficient the operation of Land Title's practice in the Province of Saskatchewan, agreed to by the Members of the Liberal Opposition at that time, by the way, and agreed to by the judiciary, there was a move to centralize Land Titles procedures.

There is some argument that the re-establishment of the Moosomin Land Registration District is in the sense a retrograde step. The Government has made no final decision on it. I have made no recommendation in Cabinet. We are looking at all aspects of it in that area.

RULING

Point of Personal Privilege by Mr. Kramer

Mr. Speaker: — Now, before I call for the special order, yesterday I had reserved a ruling on a certain matter which arose in this House.

I have spent some time reviewing the transcripts and checking the rule book, and so on. So at this time I should like to give to the House, the ruling which I am bringing down.

During the Address-in-Reply Debate of August 2, 1971, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) raised a point of personal privilege, that his personal character and conduct had been attacked in the speech made by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt).

The transcript of the speech given by the Member for Rosthern, on August 2, 1971, shows his words to be as follows:

We removed the drunks from our highways. They were charged and found guilty. This applies to everyone, including the Member for North Battleford. But I understand he has been at it again, and the Hon. Cabinet Minister will now be riding a bicycle for another 18 months.

I would draw to the attention of the Hon. Members the following rules and citations. Rule 26 of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, that is our Blue Book, states as follows:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor any of the Royal Family, nor of His Excellency, The Governor-General or a person administering the Government of Canada, nor of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, nor shall he use offensive words against the Assembly or against any Member thereof.

No member may reflect upon any vote of the Assembly except for the purpose of moving that such a vote be rescinded.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th edition, citation 149, page 127 states that:

A Member while speaking must not: . . . (f) make a personal charge against a Member.

Beauchesne further states in citation 128, page 115, that:

A personal attack, by one Member upon another, is an offence against the House.

During the remarks of the Minister of Natural Resources, in raising a point of personal privilege, he stated that the remarks on his character were not true. I wish further to quote from citation 145, page 126 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, which states:

It has been formally ruled by Speakers in the Canadian Commons that a statement by an honourable member respecting himself and peculiarly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary to temperately criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. A statement made by a member in his place, is considered as made upon honour and cannot be questioned in the House or out of it.

I wish to inform all Hon. Members that it is not the duty of the Chair to determine the correctness or validity of a statement but it is the duty of the Chair to ensure proper debate in the Assembly in accordance with the rules.

I would submit that the remarks of the Member for Rosthern pertained to the personal character and conduct of the Minister of Natural Resources and I would ask him to withdraw his remarks and apologize to the Assembly.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order you raise. I am not going to dispute your point of order or your ruling. It

is up to the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) what he does about it.

I should like to raise this point. If we are going to insist that ruling be followed — and I think we should — then I think it should be followed by all Members of this House regardless of where they happen to sit or what position they happen to hold. I am glad you agree. I want to quote from a speech made by the Premier on the 4th day of August in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — I am not going to interrupt, but I hope we don't get away from the ruling before the House because this was raised yesterday. Members had the right to rise to the point of order at that time before I took it under consideration.

Mr. Steuart: — I am raising this point, to find out, I should presume that we are going to have consistency in this House. I should presume that we are going to treat Members on both sides of the House the same way. The Hon. Premier . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I haven't finished. If you want to make a ruling . . . You don't even know what I have to say.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. C.P. Macdonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is a point of order. How can one point of order be interrupted by another?

Mr. Steuart: — I am asking you a question.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The point of order is this: the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) is obviously objecting to certain remarks made on or about August 4th, which is his right to do. The point that I wish to draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, is this, as I understand the rules, the proper time for an objection ought to have been at the time the remarks were made. This is the difference. In this particular case the Leader of the Opposition is referring to remarks now some days past. The matter that is before the House is the consideration of remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Boldt), relating to a Minister of this House, yesterday.

I say that the point here is not relevant. I ask the Member to make his point of order specifically to the issue at hand.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, the glib Attorney General, always quick on the trigger, always ready to get up and make a speech, always ready to get up and tell other people, whether from his back bench and inform the House of what somebody means to say before they have said it.

I am sure that the judges in this province are glad that you are out of circulation because I am sure you made the judgments long before they had a chance.

The point that I am raising, Mr. Speaker, is this: if you intend, as a fair Speaker, to raise this point, I don't disagree with you. But how alert were you yesterday? And how alert were the Members on the other side when the Premier got up and smeared myself and smeared the former Government, in a statement that he made? I wish to quote it, and I will raise, if I have to, a point of privilege. I want to know where you were yesterday when the Premier got up on August 4th and said, "What did they get from this deal from Parsons and Whittemore? What did they get? I leave it to the House" . . .

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Steuart: — I am going to finish what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, and those 45 Members won't talk me down.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Sit down and be quiet. You haven't anymore right to the floor, I have the floor. When the Speaker calls me to order, I'll sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! One Member has risen on a point of order, and I cannot accept two points of order at once. Whether a Member is raising a point of order or not, the Chair does not know until it is raised.

Mr. Steuart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say: "What did the Members opposite get. I could speculate, but any speculation that I make would be very quickly a breach of rules."

All I am raising, Mr. Speaker, if, as you have done, you have ruled that the Hon. Member from Rosthern is out of order and should retract his statement. I don't have any objections. What he does is up to him. But, I say — and I hope you will make a ruling — he even pointed out to this House that he might be breaking the rules. He went on to make that dirty little smear and he wasn't brought to order.

Now, if I have to rise to a point of privilege, I will. I should like to see you rule on that at the same time because it didn't just slip by, it wasn't just a slip of the tongue. He repeated it twice and he pointed out that this might be against the rules. So if you can call the Hon. Member from Rosthern to order, then I suggest you make the rules stick and ask him to withdraw at the same time — that snide, unfounded little remark, which is typical of the Premier. He hasn't got the guts to say what he thinks. He makes a snide little remark on the side.

Mr. Speaker: — On the point of order. I feel that the point of order that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, if any Member of this Legislature takes an offence to what another Member says, they have the right and the duty to raise it at that time. I shall try to be fair and impartial to see that if a remark is made by either side of the House, that shouldn't be made and a Member objects to it, that the Member who committed the offence shall be asked to withdraw.

So I do not, at this time, intend to be debating other debates on rules of procedure. We have before us a problem which arose yesterday and at which I asked Members at that time if they wished to state their points of order on it. Some Members have arisen on the item before us now. I asked the Member for Rosthern if he wished to withdraw and at that time he told me, "No," because he said the words were not improperly applied and they weren't what he said. I reserved the ruling until I got the transcript. I have read the words back to the Legislature this morning and I am asking the Hon. Member to kindly withdraw his remarks in this Assembly because I think it is to the good of all and the dignity of the Legislature that when offences are taken by others, that it's settled as soon as possible with the least inconvenience to all.

Mr. D. Boldt: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised yesterday when I made the statement, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) came over here and said to his knowledge he didn't go out of the House to check, but to my knowledge we have checked and there is no charge made against the Member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer). Why, was there any . . .

Mr. Romanow: — I'm sorry. On a point of order. What conversation is the Hon. Deputy Leader referring to because as I recall, I had no conversation with the Hon. Deputy Leader with respect to any charges in that nature.

Mr. Boldt: — No, I didn't say you talked to me.

Mr. Romanow: — All right, then.

Mr. Boldt: — Oh, I didn't say it in the

House. If a lawyer would be able to understand. I don't know — I'll give it to you in writing. You came to this side of the House and you told one of our Members that you had checked and there were no charges made. I want to ask the Attorney General were any charges dropped?

Mr. Speaker: — That is entirely beside the question that is before the House at this time.

Mr. Romanow: — No, no. Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked me a question. I want to make my position, if I can on this point . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That is another question and it's got nothing to do with the ruling the Chair is making. The words that were uttered yesterday, according to the transcript, to which offence was taken was as follows:

We removed the drunks from our highways, they were charged and found guilty. This applied to everyone including the Member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer). But I understand he has been at it again and the Hon. Cabinet Minister will now be riding a bicycle for another 18 months.

This is the statement I am asking the Hon. Member kindly to withdraw because it was raised at the time the aggrieved Member took offence and those are the words, according to the transcript, this is what I am asking to be withdrawn. And I don't wish to entertain other arguments at this stage.

Mr. Boldt: — The statement in the first place, when I read my notes, it said "when". Here you say it says, "they were charged and found guilty" and I read from my notes and my notes say, "when they were found charged and guilty," and if that report isn't correct, I have based my assumption from a statement in the North Battleford paper:

Refused the breathalyzer test. Failing to comply with the request by a police officer for a sample of breath . . .

Mr. Messer: — What is the date of the paper he is reading from so we know what he is referring to.

Mr. Boldt: — Oh, I'll give you the date. I think the North Battleford paper . . .

Mr. E. Kramer: — Oh a point of privilege and on a point of order, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Boldt: — I have the floor, Mr. Speaker. Who has the floor? If you don't want me to speak I'll go out of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Kramer: — I have a point of order right now!

Mr. Boldt: — January — Tuesday, January 12th.

Mr. Kramer: — This has nothing to do with . . .

Mr. Boldt: — The North Battleford News Optimist. Mr. Speaker, have I got the floor?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I am asking you to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Boldt: — Then keep that fellow down!

An Hon. Member: — Withdraw!

Mr. Boldt: — Then keep that fellow down! No, I'm going to read — it's the North Battleford paper, if they're not honest — newspaper reports are always read in the House regardless whether they are smearing or not smearing. And I want to read this report.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I am not asking you to read a report. I am asking you to withdraw the words which you uttered yesterday. The paper may or may not be correct and the Chair is not going to decide whether the paper is or is not correct. That is not before the Legislature at this time. What is before the Legislature is the words that were made yesterday which the transcript shows as I have read to this House on two occasions. And I am asking the Hon. Member to withdraw that statement. If he wishes to participate in a debate at a different time, that's his privilege.

Mr. Boldt: — Well, I did say, "But I understand has been at it again." I'll withdraw "at it again and the Hon. Cabinet Minister will now be riding a bicycle . . . ", instead of 18 months it will now be six months. And then I am informed, not being a drinker — I don't know how you sell liquor, you know. I said, "a 48-ouncer" and I am informed by those who do buy that it's a 40-ouncer, so I want to change that. So my statement will read . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The rules of the

House are plain and specific that a Member cannot withdraw a statement by trying to issue another statement. They must withdraw unqualifiedly. This is the statement to which offence was taken. I have not raised the last part of the statement which was in your speech of yesterday regarding a 40-ounce because I didn't feel that that was part of the offensive words. That may or may not be a different issue so I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw unequivocally.

Mr. Boldt: — I've got a question as to whether this report isn't true in the paper and I assume it is.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The paper has nothing whatsoever to do with what happened in this Legislature. What we are discussing are the words that were used in debate. We're not using the paper whatsoever, Mr. Member.

Mr. Boldt: — I'll only withdraw that one sentence:

But I understand he has been at it again and the Hon. Cabinet Minister will now be riding a bicycle for six months.

I withdraw only that sentence.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, that was the only statement that he was asked to withdraw. This was innuendo. There have been no charges. And let me say this — there has been innuendo, he's quoting from a paper which is a report from last January when, in fact, that was a statement when I refused to accept the breathalyzer test. He is trying to drag that paper in today as if it was a recent press statement. I'm simply saying he said that I had lost my licence again. I have my licence.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Kramer: — This is what he said and this is his innuendo, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We're not going to debate the issue. The Member is withdrawing the statement. He is withdrawing the statement:

But I understand he has been at it again and the Hon. Cabinet Minister will now be riding a bicycle for another 18 months.

That is the statement the Hon. Member is withdrawing. That is the sentence which caused the offence and the Hon. Member has withdrawn it without further qualifications. I thank the

Member and I think that settles the issue to the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would in the same vein then ask the Premier to withdraw the statement that he made on August 4th in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — The fourth day, I'm sorry! The fourth day.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — Aren't you back benchers proud of them, eh? Yak, yak, yak, yak, yak. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Where were the benefits of that agreement to the Minister, and the Government? Where were they? What did they get from it. He admits this morning that the mill didn't have to go ahead on June 14th. He has asked us to delay another month but he wouldn't delay it nine days. What did they get from it? What did Members opposite get from that? I could speculate, Mr. Speaker, but any speculation that I did would very quickly breach the rules of this House, while I am not supposed to impugn the motives of Members opposite

I ask that the Hon. Member (Mr. Blakeney) be asked to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the Premier wish to make any comment at this time before I take this under consideration because this raises a different type of an issue altogether when something is not raised at the time. As to whether it's an offensive statement or not I haven't the time right now to check the rules of Beauchesne and others to see how they would rule in similar circumstances, and the Premier may wish to say a word on it before I reserve any ruling on it.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, my desire is to assist the work of this Legislature. I don't want to get the Legislature off on the track of debates on whether or not the conscience of the ex-Minister, the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) is clear or not clear, I am sure that . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of

privilege. It's not a question of whether my conscience is clear. If that little man over there wants to apologize and withdraw, let him. If he doesn't, let him sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Premier has the floor.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the point that was so forcefully made a moment ago was that when people were speaking on a point of order, they were not to be interrupted, and I have now been rather summarily and I think rather rudely interrupted by the Member for Prince Albert West.

All I was trying to say in answer to his comments about his conscience being clear is that I don't want to get the business of the House into that area, shall we say, whether clear or unclear and I want simply to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, that if he takes offence at what I was saying — and I thought I was making it very clear — that I did not want to transgress the rules of the House and accordingly was not speculating. But if he thinks that not even to speculate is a transgression of his dignity, then I am happy to withdraw.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address-in-Reply

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. B. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park) and the amendment thereto by Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition).

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I asked for adjournment on this debate, I was pointing out that the Government opposite was the most promising Government in Canada, and I'm not kidding. They really are the most promising Government in Canada and one of the reasons why I didn't wish to continue and I wanted to adjourn was that the Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) was not present. I was so pleased to see him in his place this morning. I don't know just where the Member for Regina Wascana is now. He can't possibly be doing city work. The parade was yesterday — he can't be in the parade. The Exhibition doesn't open officially for business until after lunch, but there may be a funeral or wedding or a wake that he's at — something far more important than the business of this House. So, I don't think the business of the House can wait any longer for the Hon. Member from Regina Wascana and I'm glad he's got a stand-in and I hope that the Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) will convey my thoughts to him.

I was speaking of the promises, the irresponsible promises, the promises made by the left hand and the right hand and the Wafflers, but when one recalls the flamboyant promises made by the Member from Regina Wascana, I think he used to refer to it as his 'blue plate special'. Well, he'd have been better off to have called it his 'pie in the sky special' because it certainly was unearthly. There really wasn't anything special about it. It was very general in scope. It covered everything from price controls to the price of wheat to free bags of flour — you name it, Henry promised it.

In 1969 when we tried to total the cost of his promises, the adding machines broke down at \$40 million. But I'm interested in his latest brainchild. The latest one is the immediate removal of the power house. It's in his legislative report and he says, "I asked for the removal of the power house from our area to get rid of noise and air pollution."

Well, he knows perfectly well as a former mayor of this city that there is about 15 years useful life left in the power plant but this doesn't faze him — damn the cost — it's only \$15 million to replace it. Dismantle it. Get it out of there. He really isn't telling the truth, though. He doesn't want it removed because of air pollution or because it's an eyesore. I'll tell you why he wants it removed, because as a former mayor he promised to build a bridge across the Wascana at Winnipeg Street and this power plant is interfering with his civic promise of more spending, by building a bridge.

Now, there was another publication put out by the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana entitled, "Regina Wascana Advance" and it was like the one read yesterday by the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), Volume 1, Number 1, and I think it was the only issue that was put out. And the headline of this release said, "Henry Baker knows the problems of Regina," boy, he should! He's caused most of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I mentioned earlier that the NDP promises were numerous and costly. They are also confusing to the public. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they were intended to be so, misleading and subject to weaselling. Here are some of the examples.

On July 19th the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) was quoted as saying, "We did not say that we would introduce an insured drug program, etc." Well, I don't know whom he had in mind when he said "we". The NDP Member from Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk) campaigned on a drug-care program, evidence of it in his advertisement, I can show it here. He certainly wasn't one of the ones who didn't promise a drug-care program.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the NDP did campaign on a drug program.

It now appears that they are having some second thoughts or are trying to deny some of their candidates' promises. I ask the Member from Prince Albert East to tell us how he's going to explain his position on drugs when he returns home next week or the week after. Possibly the Health Minister can help him. It's amazing, Mr. Speaker, how those promises roll out during a campaign.

Well, let's look at another Member, an older Member, a Member of longer standing in this House, and I refer to the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). He's going to have to explain it too, because in the Commonwealth he says that, "he pledged the NDP to institute a prescription drug program," so there's another one.

The Member from Regina Wascana didn't miss this one either. He promised a prepaid drug plan. Here it is. Well, let me see, what did he say about this one. "We need a dental plan for those under 16." He wasn't satisfied up to 12 years of age. Leave it to good old Henry, raise it four years, make it 16. "And we need a prepaid drug plan for our people." Well, there's another one. I am sure the Minister of Health will emerge victorious again as far as the Member for Regina Wascana is concerned, as he did on a previous occasion. Even the mover of the Throne Speech, the Hon. Member from Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) said: "Some families have exceedingly high drug costs and these should be distributed through insurance."

I congratulate the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) for straightening out this garbled promise. There is to be no insured prescription drug program, possibly a bulk purchasing program.

Back in February or March of this year the now Premier said: "Elect us and we'll stop the wholesale closure of hospitals." Now the Health Minister says, "So Sorry. This is not what we really meant." He says the NDP had only said it would "re-examine proposals to close some rural hospitals." Whom are we to believe, the Premier, or the Minister?

I'd like at this point once again to touch on the remarks of the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Engel) yesterday, when he made reference to the efforts of myself and our Government to deny the Kincaid hospital a doctor, and he was unable to cite any case where we had done anything to interfere with acquisition of a doctor. I am surprised that this new Member would get off the track so badly in this regard. I'll tell you where the Kincaid hospital got their doctor, they got the doctor from Vanguard. Now Vanguard is without a doctor. What's the Hon. Member going to do about a doctor at Vanguard, he was so helpful at getting one at Kincaid? I can tell him that the doctor in question in Kincaid was lined up before the election. He had nothing whatever to do with getting a doctor at Kincaid. He knows it. The chairman, Mr. Anderson, of the Kincaid hospital board, knows it and so do the people down there.

The Hon. Health Minister (Mr. Smishek) also says his party has not said it would reopen those hospitals which the Liberals closed. Apparently his party didn't get the message to its candidate in the Cannington constituency because he campaigned on the reopening of the Maryfield hospital. I expect the same condition held for the Neudorf and Hodgeville hospitals. Everything is in such a garbled state now that the poor Minister of Health is working overtime, and I've every sympathy for him because I know the heavy burden he is carrying. He is working night and day. I am enjoying my fishing, Mr. Hon. Member, I hope you don't overwork yourself. But I should like to know what he is going to do and what the Government is going to do about the Lashburn hospital, the South Qu'Appelle hospital, the Frontier hospital, the Leroy hospital, the Willowbunch hospital, the Prelate hospital. If you are going to open the Cannington hospital, let's open those other ones too.

Let me remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that the hospital survey report, including the proposed closures, was initiated by the NDP Government in 1961, when the present Premier was Minister of Health. He didn't do anything about it. Do you know where he kept it, he kept it under his desk. He didn't want anybody to see it. But he knows perfectly well, the Hon. Minister of Labour knows perfectly well, and I am sure the Hon. Minister of Health knows — if he doesn't he is certainly going to find out — that this Province cannot continue to spread its hospital dollar over 133 hospitals, most of which are under 25 beds. Over half the hospitals in Canada under ten beds are in Saskatchewan. I believe there are 75 hospitals in Saskatchewan that are under 25 beds. No wonder Kincaid and Vanguard have trouble getting a doctor because there are just too many small hospitals. I should hope that the new Minister of Health — and I have every confidence in him — will face up to this problem and that he won't listen to these Wafflers who can't make up their minds.

An Hon. Member: — They've got their minds made up.

Mr. Grant: — Well, possibly the Wafflers are the most promising ones over there. They know what to do with the pulp mill and all these other things so I am sure that they have the answer for the hospitals too, and I'm sure that, if necessary, they would close them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot omit a reference to another promise, a dental care program. This was one that was made by a good many of the candidates, including the Member from Wascana (Mr. Baker). This, to me, is a promise that should get immediate attention. Our Government, through bursaries and establishment grants increased the number of dentists in this province. Also, in collaboration with Ottawa, a very promising pilot project is underway in the southeast part of the province. An ultra-modern, dental-equipped trailer is servicing school children up to Grade VIII, which is approximately age 12. This unit is an

experiment in the use of dental auxiliaries under the supervision of a dentist. The former NDP Government did not have the intestinal fortitude to go ahead with this type of a program. They did a lot of talking about dental auxiliaries but did nothing about them. We took the bull by the horns and started this program. It is not good enough for the Government of today to point out that there is a shortage of dentists. They made the promise, we didn't make the promise. The Oxbow pilot project shows them how to do it and I urge them to get on this with project immediately. Don't listen to the Health Minister, get busy and fill those cavities in those poor children's mouths.

Another election promise, "We'll help the small businessman, we'll promote secondary industry, we'll pay for our election goodies in corporate taxation and by resource development." Believe me, they have made a good start by cancelling the iron ore mine at Choiceland, cancelling the pulp mill at Athabasca. It is quite evident the mover of the Throne Speech (Mr. Dyck) is not a businessman. I believe he is a school teacher. I don't know whether there are any ambitious school teachers over there or not but I can tell them that if there are I would suggest that they communicate with the Hon. Clarence Fines. I can give you his address, he's at Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and Mr. Fines was a successful school teacher. When I first met him he was on the city council and he was principal of one of the public schools here in Regina. Boy, he has gone a long way and I can tell you he's still going a long way and he's still using the title, The Hon. Clarence Fines, which, Mr. Speaker, as you know, is not permissible but it certainly gives him the entree to all the upper echelons. When I was down there recently I saw where he was the guest of the Australian Government. Now there is no earthly reason why the Australian Government entertained Mr. Fines except that he was calling himself the Hon. Clarence Fines. I can tell you where you'll find Clarence Fines most frequently, at the race tracks at Fort Lauderdale. His picture appears at every race meet because he is among the bigger bettors. So I would suggest that you school teachers don't waste your time teaching school, get busy, get the message from Clarence and he'll tell you how to do it. I agree with the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) when Mr. Fines' name was mentioned by one of the Members of the Opposition, I don't think he's been back here, I don't think he's a taxpayer in Saskatchewan. I don't think he is a resident of Saskatchewan. He wouldn't dare come back, he'd be ridden out on a rail.

Well anyway, the same Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Dyck) said his Government would help small businessmen. If he had any business experience at all he would know that the best help any Government, his Government or our Government, can give the businessman is to keep its "cottonpicking" fingers off him and leave him alone. Let him run his business in a good economic atmosphere and not interfere to any degree. The Member and his Government can do all the studies, all the surveys that they wish but they will find that increases in corporation taxation is a poor way to help the businessman. I predict that they will

not develop resources without participation of private business. They are just whistling in the wind if they think that they can develop resources in this Province without the assistance and help and the know how of private business, the markets of private business. All they have to think back to is the Chip-Board plant at Hudson Bay. Did they sell much chip-board? They couldn't even make proper chip-board but if they had been able to make it, they couldn't retail it, they couldn't sell it, they couldn't market it. Since that mill has been operated by MacMillan Bloedel, the plant has been expanded twice and they are selling that chip-board right across Canada. The Government just can't do it.

I'll tell you the type of secondary industry that the Hon. Members across the way will get and I'll quote from the Debates and Proceedings of the 1964 Session. I'm sorry he is not in his place, I'm quoting the Hon. Russ Brown in 1964 and he was Minister of Industry at that time.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to apologize for just now entering the Chambers.

This is about eight pages from the start of the proceedings.

I couldn't get here any sooner. I had the privilege a short time ago of officiating at the opening of another one of these industries which my friends across the way continuously refer to as being non-existent. This was not one of those industries that my friends talk about, one of those with a large number of smoke stacks belching smoke and fumes over the landscape . . .

He was pollution conscious back in 1964.

Rather this is a small industry but a very interesting one. It is one that produces a new product for Saskatchewan, a new product for Regina and in fact is a first as far as Canada is concerned. It is an industry which is based on our agricultural industry. It is a little industry . . .

And it sure was a little one.

known as Golden Crest Foods. They produce a type of frozen bread dough.

Well the industry ran out of dough, they were out of business within a year in spite of the fact that the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation did their very best to bail them out. But this is the type of industry that the Members opposite are going to get, particularly if the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Brown) gives them any help.

Mr. Speaker, the Members to your right seem to get some pleasure from the fact that a heavy water plant didn't materialize during the Liberal regime. Mr. Speaker, as the Minister-in-

August 3, 1971

Charge of Industry and Commerce at that time, I am glad it didn't develop as it was proposed. Look at Nova Scotia, \$130 million and no heavy water. Another \$40 million required and still no assurance that the process is successful. I assume, since the NDP are critical of the outcome, if they had been the government in 1965 we would now have a non-producing heavy water plant, an over-sized, non-producing bread dough plant. I should like to read further from the 1964 record, the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan speaking on the heavy water plant. This is very interesting:

We will, Sir, providing we are not held back and frustrated, not only by my hon. friends opposite but by their colleagues who form the Government at Ottawa at the present time and this can happen, Sir. We already have some examples of how some of the policies recently introduced by the new Liberal Government in Ottawa can react against development here in the Province of Saskatchewan. Some of you may recall not too long ago I took exception to the fact that political interference had caused an industry, which Saskatchewan could reasonably have expected to obtain, to be placed elsewhere in this country. I am referring to a heavy water plant which only recently was announced would go to the Province of Nova Scotia. I want to tell you that we were making very good progress with respect to this particular industry, one which would have called for something like a \$30 million investment, one which would have used a tremendous amount of lignite coal of which we have in abundance in the Estevan area. At the last minute because of the policies of the Federal Liberal Government this plant went to Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan and the other Western provinces never had a chance in open competition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here he was, wailing to the heavens that Ottawa had double-crossed Saskatchewan and the Member had lost his heavy water. He didn't even recognize it was a bad deal at the time. Thank goodness the province lost the Glace Bay plant, no thanks to the then Minister nor his colleagues who did their level best to get it here. Sure, we worked hard to get the second plant, sure it was announced for Saskatchewan. The tenders were called by the Atomic Energy Commission, a bidder from Victoria was the successful bidder and it was a joint announcement that the plant would be built in Saskatchewan. I shall tell you why it didn't come here. We and the bidder found that there were some bugs in the proposed process. We realized that a second heavy water plant as accepted by the Atomic Energy Commission was fraught with problems. We saved the people of Saskatchewan another Glace Bay fiasco.

Mr. Speaker, the mover of the Throne Speech expounded on the great things the NDP were going to do on health care. I'll tell them one thing they will definitely do is escalate the costs to the very moon. He says community clinics are the answer because it has been proven they result in the lower incidence of

hospitalization. It hasn't been demonstrated to my knowledge that this type of clinic doesn't use medical services more extensively, nor has it been demonstrated that their case load is a typical patient load. I am pleased he was complimentary of the University Hospital hostel unit, a demonstration that the Liberals were taking steps other than utilization fees to slow down rising hospital costs. This was a first in Canada and I am pleased that he recognized it as a Liberal accomplishment.

He went on to say we have spent too much on roads, not enough on nursing home beds. I gather, if I read him correctly, that he is critical of the Idlewyld freeway in Saskatoon, the new highway north out of Saskatoon, the ring road. These, in his opinion, were unnecessary and he would gladly give them up for more nursing home beds. But does he realize that the number of nursing home beds in this province more than doubled to over 5,000 under our administration. One of the highest ratios in Canada. I predict the NDP will not raise this significantly in spite of what he says.

Prescription drugs, a favorite of the mover, he called the drug companies, "bandits on the sick." I think one of the other Members used the same expression. I am sure this outburst will appeal to prospective secondary industries and make them want to rush into this wonderful business atmosphere, where we are going to place a moratorium on farm debts and really create a wonderful atmosphere in order to attract secondary industry, increase corporate taxation to pay for all of these goodies, and also try to develop our resources. He says we will rescue the oppressed drug-user by central drug purchasing by the substitution of generic-named drugs. Mr. Speaker, we introduced a central drug buying for hospitals and institutions, all they can do is extend it. We introduced legislation this Spring to make possible the substitution of generic-type drugs. The Government can encourage this, I doubt they can force it. He went on to say that drug costs in Saskatchewan were higher than in any other province, state or country. I think he took in the entire universe. I don't know who did his research but mine disclosed this is not true.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to repeat what our leader said, "This Session was absolutely unnecessary," it is only a grandstand show and it is becoming more so every day by the Government trying to fool the public as to how efficient and how sincere they are. \$6,000 a day to prove what? In the light of this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion but will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate you on your election to this high office. I have not known you as long as many other Members of this House but I have quickly come to have a very high regard for your ability and your integrity.

You have already had to face some difficult moments in the House and I must say, as a new Member, that I have been somewhat surprised by the conduct of Members in this House, particularly in reference to their use of personal names which I must say the previous Speaker masterfully avoided. If I may use a biblical reference I would say that you must have the patience of Job to preside over this Assembly. I had naively believed when I came here that most Members would be more concerned with the passing of good legislation than with personal publicity or personal vendettas. I still have hopes that this may be the case.

I should like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne on the excellent job they did in presenting the position of this Government on a number of matters which will have a direct effect on the lives and welfare of our people. It seems abundantly clear that this Government intends to go forward to provide a new deal to the people of Saskatchewan. It is likewise clear that they intend to move with the maximum possible speed. The Throne Speech itself has indicated a number of matters to be dealt with immediately that are of importance to every person in our province. It is indeed rather amazing that so much has been accomplished in such a relatively short time. It is only about a month since this Government took office and already some major changes have been made to benefit the people of our province.

It is also becoming increasingly evident that this is not a party which reneges on its promises. It has committed itself to certain goals and objectives. From the Throne Speech it seems clear that we are moving steadily towards the attainment of these goals and objectives with the period ahead of us. Ours is not a government filled with tomorrow promises. Now is the time when help is needed. This Government recognizes this fact and is moving as quickly as possible to meet the immediate needs of our people. There are many concerns which face us. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I share with the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), his concern that religion in general and Christianity in particular are becoming increasingly scoffed at in our society today, although our reasons may be somewhat different. He made mention of a social or spiritual gospel. I can only say that I'm not sufficiently qualified to enter a theological debate with the Member for Rosthern. I leave this in his hands and I prefer not to mix politics and religion.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to look at agriculture. There can certainly be no doubt in anyone's mind that the state of agriculture in our province, to put it bluntly, is in a mess. The farmers already have their backs to the wall. They are facing a cost-price squeeze which if the tide is not quickly turned will place many of them on the unemployment rolls in our Province. The very future of the family farm is at stake.

Tied very closely to this, Mr. Speaker, is the problem being faced by our rural communities as a whole. One need only walk into almost any small town in our Province to see the

truth of this statement; see the number of small businesses that have closed down and are boarded up. This in turn creates tax loss for the town concerned, makes it more difficult for the town to provide the needed services and in most cases means a higher tax load for the fewer remaining citizens. It might also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that as farmers move away from the farms in the small communities, there is a corresponding loss in educational and health services and the services of other professionals as the communities become smaller. I am extremely pleased that this Government is going to take some immediate action in this field. I think it can be truly said that as agriculture goes, so goes the economy of Saskatchewan. I think the speed at which this Government intends to move is also demonstrated by the action recently in the field of education.

In the last few years education has suffered many setbacks including the arbitrary teacher-pupil ratio which has only created an additional obstacle in the learning process with overcrowded classrooms. I'm most happy to see that the Department of Education state that they have discontinued the use of the pupil-teacher ratio as a basis for planning school grants.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — It is indeed heartening to those of us who are involved in education to hear the Minister say that his department will take all feasible steps to assist any school board with problems that the pupil-teacher ratio may have caused.

Also in the field of education I was happy to see the new student-aid programs announced. I'm particularly pleased to see that the assistance will now be available to such students at technical institutes and business colleges in Saskatchewan. I should be the last person, Sir, to deny the usefulness of the university experience. Still, I believe that we have in the past tended to be rather lopsided in our approach to education. University is not the only kind of desirable education. There are many students who would benefit more from attendance at one of these other institutions and who indeed would prefer to attend other than a university. The program of assistance to university students only has tended to play down and de-emphasize the role of business colleges and technical institutes. The students who decide to attend the technical institutes has as much right to expect assistance from the Government as do those who choose to attend the university. It has always seemed to me that to refuse such assistance is littler other than penalizing those who prefer non-university continuing education. I compliment the Minister for this prompt action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I was very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to note the reference in the Speech from the Throne to the public works

program. It seems to me that not only will this provide needed jobs but it can also at the same time provide many needed services in the communities that receive this assistance. Not only will it supply employment, it will also assist in stopping the great exodus of people from our province that we have witnessed in recent years. I should hope, of course, as do most Members here, that my constituency would benefit from such a program. Mr. Speaker, the constituency I serve is blessed with many fine towns. It is indeed an oasis of the Prairies. I serve a constituency which is primarily agricultural in nature and one part mixed farming and in the other pure grain. It is also a constituency, for the benefit of our Members, that has the best goose hunting in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — The constituency, of course, is Kerrobert-Kindersley. Two of the larger towns in this area are Kerrobert and the town of Kindersley. The town of Kerrobert at the present time has a fine hospital and a good senior citizens' home. They are most anxious to round out their program and to do so by building a nursing home. I should also like to mention that this town has suffered a very severe setback in this past year by suffering from three fires, one of which was only about two months ago and which destroyed a good part of the business community of the town. As you know, this is a major catastrophe for any town. I should like to suggest that if a nursing home could be built there, I'm sure it would go a long way toward providing the stability and the incentive this town needs. Such a facility, of course, would also permit many people in need of such care to remain closer to their home communities and the people they love. I, for one, believe that we ought to take these facilities closer to the people themselves. The town of Kindersley was at one time one of the fastest growing towns in our province. In recent years, it, too, has suffered from the present economic condition. The population has not been growing nearly as fast as most of us would like to see it grow. There are, however, many who believe that the town is fast approaching a city status. At the present time, medically, it is served by a senior citizens' home, a nursing home and a hospital. The need at the present time is expansion of their senior citizens' facility. Even now they have a waiting list of around 30 per cent just waiting to get a room. This will indicate the need for providing additional services in this particular community. There are many other similar things that could be mentioned but I should like to go on.

I should like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to those parts of the Speech from the Throne which dealt with the medical care of our citizens. Most civilized people were shocked by the provisions added to the Mental Health Act by the previous government in 1968. To treat such patients differently from patients in any other hospital is nothing short of barbaric and the return to the Dark Ages. It seems to me that in a so-called enlightened society such as ours, there ought to be no

distinction between physical and mental illness.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Both are matters requiring medical care and both must be the responsibility of society. It seems to me inexcusable that the family of a mentally ill patient should be caused further suffering just because of the type of illness. Nor can this be excused on the grounds that the former provisions provided discretionary powers to the Minister whereby he could waive financial claims against the estate of a deceased mental patient. This still placed mental patients and their families in a different category from patients in general hospitals. It seems to me that it is high time that society recognized that mental illness is nothing more than another form of illness.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Concerning deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, a strong supporter of complete abolition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — If they do deter, they deter only those who cannot afford to pay them. They can be construed as an attempt to make medical care available on the ability to pay rather than the basis of need. In my work, Mr. Speaker, I have seen cases where fathers have refused to take their children to the doctor because they begrudge the \$1.50 that could otherwise have been spent at the local pub, at the race track or at some other place, although from what I've heard, it takes more than \$1.50 at a race track nowadays. What excuse can there be for such fees which restrict the accessibility of medical services to such children or for that matter to anyone else in society.

The Speech from the Throne also calls for the abolition of medical and hospital premiums for every resident at age 65 or over. It seems to me that this is the very least that we can do for our senior citizens. These are the people who pioneered and developed this great Province of which we are now citizens. They struggled through years of drought and difficulties, faced hardships in the pioneering tradition; they have given to us a great heritage. At the same time many of them are being forced to live on pensions that provide a bare existence if even that. Many indeed are in dire straits. Many of them earned their living at a time when pension plans had not been developed and had there been a pension plan, their age was such that they could afford to put very little aside. By abolishing these premiums for our senior citizens I believe we are showing them our respect and our gratitude for what they have done. We shall have the effect at the same time of providing additional income for it will mean a saving of \$3 a month for a single person and \$6 for a married couple.

Most people, Mr. Speaker, will be also pleased to see a return to free collective bargaining in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Every man surely must be free to withhold his labor. It seems to me the only way industrial peace can be returned to the Province of Saskatchewan and a climate of trust established in labor-management relationships. The role of government ought to be to assist both labor and management in reaching amicable settlements. Compulsion tends to cause strikes rather than settle them. Certainly this seems to have been the case in Australia and, I believe, the evidence in Saskatchewan is somewhat similar. The number of strikes since 1964 has more than doubled and what is even more fantastic the time loss is increased by some 750 per cent. Under the threat of compulsion, what reason is there for management or labor to bargain in good faith? They both know that eventually the case will go to compulsory arbitration so both at the start can take only an extreme position. It seems to me that even those who continuously scream of the values of their so-called Free Enterprise must surely recognize that freedom should not only be for those who sell the goods but also for those who sell their labor. It seems to me, too, Mr. Speaker, that once we take away the freedom from the worker to refuse to sell his labor at a certain price, it is not too long before we shall also take away the freedom of the farmer to refuse to sell his grain at a set price on the market. Our farmers have recognized this and they have realized that they and the laboring people of our province must stand together.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — For these and for many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must oppose the amendment and I am very pleased and happy to support the main motion on the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should first like to compliment the new Members on both sides of the House for the contribution they have made up to this point in the Debate. It appears that there are a number of competent speakers and we certainly look forward to their participation in the business of the House.

The previous speaker mentioned some of the loss suffered by small towns and I should like to refer to an instance that he may be interested in. I am concerned about the apparent decision of the Government not to proceed with the Land Titles Office in Moosomin. For 20 years under the NDP, rural Saskatchewan particularly the small towns, suffered from their policy of centralization. Small towns were allowed to dry up as the NDP Government took away various services. Moosomin

in my constituency is a good example. During the NDP's 20 years in office, Moosomin lost the Provincial jail, adequate court facilities and most import of all, the people of that area lost the services of a Land Titles Office which was closed up and moved to Regina. The Liberal Government had a policy of returning these services to the towns where this was feasible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — I'm interested in my own constituency. I know the situation there and I'm sure the same thing applies in many other areas. The Liberal Government decided in the last year or two to build a new building in Moosomin and to return the Land Titles Office to that town. And I might say that this was welcomed by everyone in the area, not only in the town of Moosomin but in the surrounding area and I should like to point out that the legal people in the area were certainly behind this move. But I wish to refer briefly to what the NDP candidate in my area said about this building and I should like to quote from the Moosomin paper. This is January 27, 1971 and the heading is: "Charges Pork Barrel Politics in Moosomin."

Port barrel politics was the description given to the Provincial Government decision to build a new government building in Moosomin by E.B. (Ned) Shillington last Wednesday night following his nomination as NDP candidate for Moosomin constituency in the next Provincial election.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, partially, as a result of this, the NDP candidate lost the town of Moosomin in the election and this is his home town. I don't live there but he does. He lost Moosomin by over 100 votes. I'm sure this is an indication that the people of Moosomin wanted the Land Titles Office back.

Mr. Romanow: — Has the NDP ever won Moosomin?

Mr. Gardner: — They would certainly have had a better chance if their candidate had supported the Land Titles Office.

Today we are told in this House that the Land Titles Office wasn't going to be established, it was corrected by the Attorney General — may not be established. Now I understand from people in that area, and this is the reason I asked the question, that plans have gone out from the Department of Public Works, changing the plans of the building so that there would be no provision made in the building for the Land Titles Office and this is the main part of the building. It was originally half a Court House, half Land Titles Office. I don't know what they are doing with the other space but this was my reason for asking the question. I should certainly hope that the Government does not plan on using this as a precedent for other services scattered around the province. We know there are various offices of Crown corporations, Power and so on, and it would be

disastrous to rural Saskatchewan if they continue with this policy of denying the people of rural Saskatchewan with services in their home areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech Debate that we listened to last Wednesday will certainly have to go on record as one of the most ineffective in the history of this Province. Major problems which are now facing the Saskatchewan people, were not even mentioned. We should like to know, for example, what the new Government is planning to do about the problem of pollution. The previous Liberal Government has introduced some of the most advanced pollution control legislation in Canada. They were in the process of mounting a massive attack on all aspects of pollution. The people of Saskatchewan want assurance that their soil, their water, and their air will remain as clean as possible. They want assurance, for example, that this new Government will not go back to their old program allowing major cities in the province to dump raw sewage into the Saskatchewan River which occurred when the NDP were the Government before. We want to know if they plan on using the legislation passed last session to prevent pollution from feed lots. I understand recently they may be going ahead with this. The people who are interested in recreation want to know what you are doing about the serious problem of sewage being dumped into the Qu'Appelle Lakes from government buildings near Fort Qu'Appelle. An act was passed by the previous Government setting up the Clean Environment Authority. Its purpose was to co-ordinate the battle against pollution of all types and to assure the regulations and laws in this regard were observed. Do you plan on actively proceeding and making use of the Clean Environment Authority? Do you plan on making adequate funds available so the municipalities may proceed with proper sewage treatment plants? These are some of the pollution questions being asked by the people of the province and I am sure by some of the new Members opposite. Certainly we were all disappointed the new Government saw fit to ignore completely this important question in the Throne Speech. Surely with all the talk that we have had during the campaign about pollution we should have expected that an emergency session would have done something concrete about these problems.

Much of the legislation discussed in the Throne Speech could have been postponed without adversely affecting the citizens of this Province. But the control of pollution requires constant vigilance, and constant action. I am surprised that the new Government appears to be starting its new term of office with a cavalier disregard for the evils of pollution.

Mr. Speaker, in the time that I have been in this Legislature, and there are many that have been here longer than I have, the NDP have spent perhaps as much time talking about agriculture as all other subjects combined. Most of the NDP Members in Opposition have spent long hours proposing solutions to some of the real problems facing Saskatchewan farmers.

I should like to comment at this time on statements made

by some of the speakers opposite in this debate, about the \$100 million stabilization payment to farmers. Surely they are joking in some of their remarks. Every farmer in the province knows that the Federal NDP Members purposely held this Bill in Committee until after the Provincial Election. It went to Committee, it could have been out of there in two or three days. The Federal NDP Members saw fit to hold this up, our farmers were deprived of \$100 million at a time when it was sorely needed, strictly for political reasons. I am sure that the farmers of the province will keep this in mind. Farmers now are surprised to see a Throne Speech which completely ignores their problems and I am sure that the new Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) is aware of this. We can visualize him coming to Cabinet rather belatedly and saying, 'Look we have to put something in the Throne Speech pertaining to agriculture'. So they hurriedly agreed to a small modification which will slightly improve the Hog Premium Bill, which was passed by the Liberal Government last winter. When they thought this over and realized after a few days that this was pretty inadequate, and it certainly wouldn't please many farmers or satisfy them, and probably pressed by some of their back benchers, they decided again to introduce at the last moment, a Bill which we have just seen and which could have long-term disastrous effects on rural Saskatchewan and we'll certainly have more to say about that in the next few days in this House.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . you people vote against that one!

Mr. Gardner: — Don't hold your breath! This Throne Speech is an insult to the farmers of Saskatchewan. If the Government couldn't come up with something more constructive, they should have ignored the problem completely until adequate legislation was made available.

Another urgent problem, Mr. Speaker, was ignored in the Throne Speech, the plight of our native people. NDP election talk was that the Indian and Metis Department might be abolished. This was the front page of the Leader-Post and has left our native people in a state of confusion. These people want to know if the Indian and Metis Department is going to continue to function in an effective manner. They want to know if the present Government is going to continue the policy of insisting that contractors provide them with a percentage of the available jobs. I haven't heard any statement to this effect from the Minister of Highways (Mr. Byers) or from other Ministers. The Indian people want jobs and they are interested in having these opportunities. I have a large number in my constituency and they were very pleased with this program which gave them an opportunity to learn some of these constructions trades.

The Indian people want to know if the policy of providing electricity, roads and telephones on reserves is going to be continued. They are anxious to know if the upgrading classes and such courses as heavy equipment training will be continued

by the present Government. On the reserves in my constituency a major park development is under way with the co-operation and support, certainly the financial support, of the Federal Government. Included in this development at Last Oak Park is the construction of a golf course, ski slopes and roads. This means, Mr. Speaker, opportunity is available for an on-the-job, on-the-reserve heavy equipment training course. I should hope that this Government would investigate this matter, take advantage of this rare opportunity. One of the problems in the past has been to get young Indian people to leave the reserve to take these courses in some remote area. Here is an opportunity where a great deal of construction is going on in the reserves, it is financed by the Federal Government and certainly the Indian and Metis Department could arrange some type of heavy equipment training course for the native people which would benefit them very greatly.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, also failed to consider the problem of providing jobs for unemployed people of Saskatchewan. In fact there is no doubt that some of the legislation proposed in the Throne Speech will contribute to the unemployment of a greater number of our citizens. Unemployment is certainly a greater priority than some of the phony reasons used for calling this Special Session. No mention was made of unemployment in the Throne Speech, no solution was proposed for this problem. Members opposite may not be concerned about the plight of the unemployed. The man who is out of work and with a family to support is going to be disappointed when he sees that the Throne Speech not only failed to provide any jobs, but may well be the cause of adding still further people to the ranks of the unemployed.

When the NDP election platform was first announced the NDP promised to consider the nationalization or government takeover of the potash mines. This again was published with their program in the Leader-Post. This has caused a great deal of concern in the Rocanville area of my constituency where the Sylvite Company has recently started the production of potash. Most of these potash producers have world-wide connections with parent or associate companies and because of these connections they are able to market and sell their production even though the world supply of potash at this time appears to exceed the demand. Government takeover of the potash industry in Saskatchewan at this time would bring immediate disaster. This fact is known by everyone in the potash industry from the newest worker in the mine to the company president. Potash is not difficult to produce, it is every efficiently produced by a number of companies in this Province. But it is difficult to sell. In fact without the present world-wide market organization, the connections that these companies have, it would simply not sell. Government takeover of the mines in Saskatchewan would simply result in immediate massive lay-offs and unemployment in the potash industry. Job security for our thousands of potash workers would disappear over night. This is a matter of great concern to the people in the potash industry. These people want immediate clarification of the Government's policy in this regard. It was part of the NDP election program publicly

announced and we should like to know whether you intend to carry out this part of your program or not. Immediate clarification is essential as the unsettled situation and threat of Government takeover is already damaging the industry.

Mr. Speaker, many of the new Members opposite are in for a rude awakening. I am sure they have enjoyed this Session, they have spent the taxpayers' money, they have done a few things that are popular, they think that the Hon. Premier simply has to go down in the sub-basement of this building, crank up the money machine and this is where the funds come from. You people and the people of Saskatchewan are going to find out that there is no money machine, certainly we weren't able to find it. There is no Santa Clause, the money comes from one place, it comes from increased taxes. The Liberal Government left this Province in excellent financial condition. They left \$90 million in the Treasury, Mr. Speaker. When you people whistle away this \$90 million and it won't take you long at the rate you are going, when you have borrowed all the money you can, ruined the good financial reputation of this Province — this may take a year or two — then some of you new Members and some of the taxpayers will find out there is no money machine. You can talk about taxing the rich and taxing the big corporations and I agree that this is popular at election time. You'll find out that there are very few rich in Saskatchewan and they are already taxed to the limit. You will find the corporations are already taxed to such an extent that they can't stand any more. Any further taxation would force our business people and corporations to move to other locations or go broke. You will find that massive taxes in the next few years will have to be loaded onto the working people. For these reasons I will support the amendment and not the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with those who preceded me in congratulating you on your elevation to the position of Speaker. I am sure you will exercise your responsibilities most capably. I should like to congratulate the Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) for moving the Address-in-Reply and the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson) for seconding.

In the last few days the Members opposite have been criticizing the Government's action regarding Choiceland iron mine. Choiceland is no longer in my constituency of Nipawin, although it used to be. In beginning to talk about Choiceland, I should like to re-echo the assurances that the Premier gave last Friday. 'If it is economically feasible, we'll go ahead with the Choiceland deal. But we are not going to conduct some sort of circus in regard to negotiating this deal. We are not going to have convenient pre-election announcements of a mine which can be dropped immediately after the election. We'll negotiate discreetly, we'll not grandstand, when the mine can become a reality, we'll announce it and we will build it.'

I should like to review the Liberal record in Nipawin constituency as far as industrial development goes, and especially as far as mining goes. If the Liberals had kept their promises in Nipawin we should have more mines in that constituency than any other comparable area in Canada probably. In 1964 they were going to develop an iron mine in Choiceland. Where is it? In 1967 they were going to develop the same mine. Still haven't seen it. In 1970 they moved Choiceland into Prince Albert East. They probably thought they would sell the mine to another constituency, they sold it to Nipawin twice and they would try somewhere else. Probably in a few more years they would have moved it into Melfort-Kinistino, and try that one. You have to wander pretty far and wide in northeastern Saskatchewan to find anyone who believes that the Liberals would have developed that mine.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Yesterday the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) made a statement concerning the economic situation in Nipawin because of the decision not to proceed with this mine at this time. He stated and I quote:

Two apartment blocks were in the process of being built at Nipawin, the property was bought. The day after the election the owners stopped the project. The people are moving out of Nipawin today and they will move out faster than in the past history.

A new motel was in progress, a dining room and additional units were planned. These have now been abandoned. The town of Nipawin is stunned and sick.

Now, I don't know about the apartment blocks, I knew about the motel, so I 'phoned up and asked about these. I 'phoned a number of people in Nipawin. The plans for those apartment blocks had been in the works for two years, and they are still in the works. They have not been stopped. As far as the motel being abandoned, it is the least abandoned motel I have seen in a long time. As far as people leaving Nipawin, it is just nonsense.

Choiceland wasn't the only mine that was a big one. There were others. They were going to develop a coal mine at Squaw Rapids. Haven't seen that one. They were going to develop oil shale deposits in the Pasquia Hills. Nothing happened! Last winter the former MLA from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) promised the development of the silver mine near Torch River. The former Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) was following it very closely, he was very interested. There was only one problem, there was no silver. This would really all be very humorous except for one thing as far as the silver mine is concerned. The publicity of that mine caused a large number of shares in the company called Kamad Exploration to be traded at 57 or 58 cents, about 100,000. Last Friday those shares were trading at

18 cents.

The Members opposite have talked a lot about getting capital. You don't encourage people to invest in your province when you get them investing in a company where they lose their shirts, when you start pushing promoters' dreams.

Yesterday, there was some reference to the attitude of the Indian and Metis population toward pulp mills. I have a fairly large Indian and Metis population in my constituency. I have a large population of Indian and Metis at Cumberland House along the Saskatchewan River. If you want to find out Indian and Metis attitudes toward pulp mills, the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) might have asked what the vote was at Cumberland House. There was a change, and it was a change our way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — And then, when the now Opposition, promised that they were going to develop another pulp mill in northeastern Saskatchewan, that pretty well sewed the issue up. They had one, they didn't want two, but the Liberals were promising three.

I should like to go and speak about some of the concerns of Nipawin constituency. These are certainly not all of them. First of all, I should like to talk about an industry related to agriculture.

My constituency has three Alfalfa Dehydrating Plants, one at Arborfield and two in Zenon Park. These plants are completely farmer-owned. They are not owned by anyone who doesn't deliver alfalfa to these plants. These plants have allowed a measure of agricultural diversification. They have created employment for many of our local young people. The alfalfa pellets produced are almost all exported to Japan. There is, many people feel, a real danger of overproduction in this industry. In the last two months three new plants have opened.

Last June, the magazine, 'Good Farming', carried an article about the possibility of overproduction. I think that it is fairly important that the Provincial Government take action in this regard. When this industry first started up, the former Government, which claimed to be so interested in industry, wouldn't touch it. They wouldn't touch Alfalfa Dehydrating Plants. The first one was started by local people. They bucked the Provincial Government every inch of the way, then when it proved to be successful, the Provincial Government got interested. In fact, you might say, that they went 'alfalfa wild' as well as 'hog wild'.

I think that it is extremely important that before any new loans are granted for Alfalfa Dehydrating Plants, the Government ascertain what the market potential is. The Department of Agriculture should also, I think, begin to promote alfalfa pellets for use domestically so that we can establish some kind

August 3, 1971

of a cushion for this industry in case of a fluctuation in the international price and market, because we are competing against California, and California's export market is only 30 per cent of its production and it is in a position to cut prices. This would hurt the Saskatchewan industry.

Another very important industry in Nipawin — an industry which has immense potential — is tourism. Yesterday I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) interjected something about tourism and laughed. In Nipawin we don't consider tourism to be a joke although it was fairly obvious the former Government did.

Fishing is attracting a large number of tourists to the area of Nipawin, the area from Nipawin along the Saskatchewan River and Tobin Lake and on to Cumberland Lake. In the last month a fish derby was held there and thousands of fishermen came to the area. The area also attracts a large number of moose hunters in the fall and early winter. As these industries continue to develop, there is danger of over-fishing and the depletion of the moose population. To date, tourist development has been of a haphazard nature. There has been no real planning.

In the northeast corner of Saskatchewan, there is the potential to develop the tourist industry on a magnitude which would make a pulp mill insignificant. Although if we have too many pulp mills they will make tourism insignificant. With proper planning, this industry could have all the income-producing benefits of any other industrial operation, without pollution, without the spoiling of the forests and with the potential to provide human enjoyment. I am emphasizing planning in this industry. Without it the tourist industry could be just sort of a flash in the pan.

The Provincial Government should look at tourist potential, determine the amount of hunting and fishing the area can bear, guarantee that only that amount takes place. It must determine how many resorts can be built and make sure that no more are built. Because in tourism we have a renewable resource but we also have a resource that can completely be destroyed. It is only by this type of thorough planning that tourism will realize its full potential if the proper conservation practices are followed.

I urge the Government and especially the Department of Natural Resources to proceed in this manner forthwith.

I have spoken on two industries important in Nipawin and I could go on to speak about the important legislation that we are dealing with here concerning health, concerning labor, concerning agriculture. It is only the beginning of a very ambitious program for our Government. I know the Opposition doesn't believe we can deliver it. They don't want us to deliver it, but at the same time they are afraid we will deliver it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — In closing, I should like to thank the people of Nipawin constituency for electing me here. I should like to thank the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) for getting on television every Sunday and winning me hundreds of votes. I hope you stay on, Dave.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I should like to thank the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Boldt) for coming into my constituency. He campaigned in four polls. We didn't win those polls in 1967. One of them we had never won in history. We won all four! I hope he comes to all 60 next time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, I should first of all like to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this Legislature and in the knowledge that you will be fair and just.

I also want to take this opportunity to say 'thank you' to the people of the Rosetown constituency for, again, giving me the honor of representing them in this Legislature for the third consecutive term. The Rosetown constituency is located in west central Saskatchewan and known as the heart of the wheat belt, with some of the highest assessed land in Saskatchewan.

The day after the election when we were defeated, I heard remarks by several of the Government supporters saying they were looking forward to a large reduction in the mill rate and that this would happen at this first Session. I know that the people are going to be very disappointed, because there was nothing in the Throne Speech in this regard, but this is what they were given to believe.

Another thing that I should like to mention is the fact that there has been considerable activity in oil and gas in the Rosetown constituency in the last few years. Many farmers in certain areas owned the mineral rights to their land but lost these through their inability to pay the unfair mineral tax imposed by the former CCF Government.

I have a few more remarks, Mr. Speaker, in regard to agriculture. There is nothing in the Throne Speech to help the farmer. How often have we heard the NDP describe the plight of the farmers today as far more desperate than in the dirty '30s?

The first move made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) upon assuming office, was to call a press conference. According to press reports, he repeated again that the

plight of the farmers has never been as grim in the history of farming. He then announced, what he called, a significant move to assist the farmer. He made the hog premium retroactive to January 1st, a paltry few thousand dollars, and there are very few farmers who raise hogs.

If the plight of the farmer is so desperate one would expect some measure of relief to be introduced in this Special Session. We now learned that the relief to the farmers is in the form of a measure along the lines of a Mediation Board, to protect farmers from seizure of land and machinery. If the Government has information of farmers having lost their farms with foreclosures, surely this House is entitled to have this information.

If farm machinery is being seized by banks or by finance companies, thus denying the farmer the right to till his land, this Legislature ought to know. If this is a serious pressing problem among farm people, something ought to be done. On the other hand if the problem is not of an emergency nature, this Legislature should give priority to those matters of urgent concern. The House was rushed into Session to remove Bill 2, to shorten the hours of work, to increase holidays to the employee. None of these measures by the far stretch of the imagination can be classified in the nature of an emergency, or a new deal for the small business operator, the small implement dealer, and so on.

How quick this Government is to reward the labor element of the party. Contrast this to its move on the farm front. There isn't a Member on the Government's side who hasn't portrayed a picture of gloom and doom and bankruptcy of the farm economy. They paint a picture of the farmer brought to his knees and driven from the land. With the farm economy in such desperate straits, this Government calls an emergency Session to initiate a study as to how to make more liquor available to more people. How quickly this Government attempts to sweep the farm problems under the rug in the hopes that they will disappear.

If they have any compassion for the farmer, then the greatest relief they could bring right now is for this Government to honor its commitments to reduce the mill rate to 25 mills. I say, do it now, make it effective on this fall's taxes. Bring this tangible relief and bring it now.

Surely this Session should not end until legislation is brought forth to give tangible relief. It is not enough now to sit and howl to Ottawa. The NDP is now the Government. Action can be taken on a provincial basis. In Opposition the NDP had all the answers to the farm problem. The present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) said he liked the Manitoba legislation of acreage payments.

The Manitoba Bill is well known to the Government. It is

a simple matter merely to copy the legislation. The excuse that the Government has not had time to draft legislation, cannot be accepted. Why did they rush into a Session before farm legislation was ready? It seems very evident this Session was called for only one reason. The reason, to pay off its debt to the labor bosses.

Before the election, the NDP's answer to farmers' problems was a Government Land Bank. They promised the electorate to set up a Land Commission which would purchase farm land for young farmers. The Commission would control the size of the big farmer in order to give the little farmer room to grow. The proposed farm legislation was designed to control the size of the farm. It was designed to control the price of land. This commitment was made to the electorate.

The House should not end until this commitment to the farm people is carried out. Let not the Government plead lack of time. Let them not rush in here and provide for shorter work hours, with no loss in pay for union men, and run away. I call on the Government to act now and begin to carry out the promises they so freely made to our farm people.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment but not the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for being appointed to this high office. Besides that, I also want to congratulate you for being the Member in this House who has been here for the longest time without a break. I also want to tell the new Members in this House, that the turnover of Members is generally a quick one.

I came into this House in 1959 and the Members who have stayed continuously since 1959 now number four. I want also to congratulate our Premier and our Deputy Premier for leading our Province into one of the greatest victories this Province has ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I, also, want to congratulate the new Members who are filling our back benches today. I want to tell them that they will find this kind of work very interesting, very exciting. And I want to say that their wives and families will certainly be a part of the job that they have to do, and that they should never be forgotten, the sacrifice that the family and the wife have to make.

I also want to thank the people of my constituency for having returned me for the fifth consecutive time. I say, in the

August 3, 1971

last election, the Liberal Party decided to give me two constituencies to look after and they told the people of Melfort and Kinistino that you can share one Member between the two of you. So I want to congratulate the people, who quietly crossed political boundaries to make this victory possible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — They rejected the gerrymander in no uncertain terms. To point out what the people have rejected, we have the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) who is sitting in the House who got 3500 votes; then you go to Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) who is sitting in the House with 9,000 votes; Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) between 4,000 and 4,500 votes.

Mr. Weatherald: — How many votes . . .

Mr. Thibault: — You will have a chance to speak, Mr. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and you can hardly wait so we shall be hearing from you later on. I'll make my speech and I'll try to abide by the rules of the House and if at any time, Mr. Speaker, I break the rules, I'll certainly bow to your decision.

Now, in Prince Albert East, now you call that P.A. East but we want to remember that it is not only a large part of the City of Prince Albert it is also the town of Creighton on the Manitoba border. I don't know how the man will ever serve that entire constituency, how he will ever be known throughout, but he is here with 6,229 votes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Then you get to Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and he is sitting in this House with 2,298 votes. You call that representation by population. I want to tell this House that the intelligence of the people of this Province was insulted and that is why.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — They'll never gerrymander again.

Mr. Thibault: — I hope it is a lesson to all the people who sit in this House to protect the very foundation of our democratic system and that is representation by population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And you ought to remember

that each and everyone of you — not the new ones who have come in, not the one who came in with 2,200 votes and a few plus, but the old Members who should have known better, who should have stood up and said, 'No, you are not going to do this.' And you take the former Member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald) who is now a judge, how do the people of this Province look upon a situation such as this?

Mr. C. MacDonald: — Like when you did it, the same way.

An Hon. Member: — I never did it.

Mr. Thibault: — We never did it and Mr. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) if you will sit quiet and get up on your feet when you speak and make your point, it would be much better. Now, I think I've made my point quite well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I'm looking forward to an independent electoral boundary commission and I want to quote the Prairie Messenger, an article by Rev. A.L. De Valk, C.S.B., St. Thomas Moore College, Saskatoon.

Gerrymandering of a riding is a long established practice in North American politics and today it is recognized as what is called 'dirty politics.'

Now the people made the mistake — the Liberal Party — of underestimating the intelligence of the voters, of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Anyway, I think it should be remembered for a long time because even an independent electoral boundary commission findings, unless it be written into the constitution, could still be tinkered with by politicians. But I hope that it is a lesson once and for all because I know very well that many Liberals who crossed political boundaries in my constituency did it on account of the gerrymander . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . because they love democracy and this was something that they could not stomach.

Now, I'm glad that in this Session we shall see some legislation to protect some of our farmers. Over the years as a Member of the Legislature I've had people come in and say,

"Well, the loan company is squeezing me out, could you advise me what to do?" And I would sit down and get their side of the question. Then I would grab the 'phone and I would 'phone the loan company or whoever was the creditor and I would say, "So and so is in my house and he would like to pay his bill but he is unable to." And somehow we were able to work out some compromise where the lender would grant a little time. And practically on every occasion the person who came to see me lived up to his end of the bargain because I would make it quite clear and I would say, "If we find time for you, you live up to your end of it."

But lately here is one person who came to my house, he had assets of \$60,000, a debt of \$14,000, was behind one year in his payments. He paid \$2,000 last year and he had \$1,200 with his lawyer in trust to pay them if they would only call their dogs off. They were moving in to take the property over, foreclosure they call it. I 'phoned the company who loaned the money and I said, "I've got so and so here in my house, could you give this man a little time, he's got so many hogs, so many acres in rape, he's got so many head of cattle, could you wait until after harvest." They said, 'No.' The answer was No. I said, "Why?" "Well" they said, "we are not satisfied with tidbits." I said, "Do you call \$2,000 last year tidbits on \$14,000?" Well," I said, "if that's the case you should go out and clean the hog barn and you'll find out different." I said, "Do you call \$1,200 at the lawyers tidbits?" And that man told me it is already costing him between \$200 and \$300 to hire a lawyer. That money should be going towards paying the debts. And the loan company had on the letter that there was an expense of \$310. Here's a man caught between two lawyers pleading for mercy. And they said, "We are going to foreclose." Corporation lawyers! Now I am glad that there is some legislation coming in to stop these fellows. I don't know what's got into them. They seem to be suffering from rabies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — They want their money now. Well, I'm glad that something is going to be done at this Session to slow these people down and to bring a little sense into their heads.

Now I don't want to speak too long because there are a lot of new Members who have a message to bring to this House and I would suggest to the older Members to listen to what these younger Members have to say because I say it is going to be their world. But, the reason that you have so few Members sitting over there . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And I say quit complaining because the way you treated democracy you didn't deserve to have a single seat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I would suggest that you get a leader that first of all is going to respect democracy and lose if you have to, but lose honourably.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Another reason why the Liberal Party was voted out of this Province, the people of this Province were sick and tired of watching their cities, their towns, their villages, their hamlets dying under bad administration from Ottawa and Regina. Saskatchewan people want a new deal.

In closing, I may say that I shall have a lot more to say but to give a chance to the young Members, I'll take only ten minutes of this House today. With that, you can see that I will support the main motion and I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, as this the first opportunity I have had to speak in the Throne Speech Debate I should like to congratulate you on your elevation to the high office as Speaker. We are all certain that you will dispatch your duties with the utmost dignity befitting the position. We are pleased to see that you have been elected Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I always take great pleasure in listening to the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault). I intend to say a few words about the gerrymander or redistribution or whatever you like to call it. I want to say a few words to some of the new Members on that side of the House. The Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley) yesterday spoke a great deal about principles and I hope he realizes as he looks down at those front benches that all of this great change of attitude has come over them very recently, Mr. Speaker, as you look back in the records of the Hansards in this particular Legislature. I want to suggest to them, for example, that when we come to talk about things like redistribution that they take a good look at some of the records that are in the Legislative Library because they will find that all of this sweetness that we have today about honesty in electoral distribution is a relatively new thing for the most of them, in the last three years or since they became the Opposition. If you take a look at the redistributions of 1952, Mr. Speaker, and the one shortly after, I think it was 1956, and you read what the Members of the Opposition who were Liberal Members at that time said about it and you see what actually the Members who were here at that time did, who now stand up and give very holy speeches about the great dedication to democracy, you will find there has been a

radical change in principle very rapidly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to point out to some of the newer Members here what did happen in 1960 in the City of Saskatoon. Well, the powers on the Government side sat down, they figured out that in the City of Saskatoon there were a few more NDP supporters than there were Liberals and they figured out . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I'll tell you how, I'm coming to how. They figured out if you let everybody in the City of Saskatoon vote five times, Mr. Speaker, that in all likelihood you would elect five NDP Members. Now, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that happened was, that went wrong, was the Liberal Party picked a very, very popular lady Member in the person of Mrs. Merchant who did manage to squeak in and displace one of their Members. But, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake that was as much a travesty on the democratic system when that situation prevailed in the City of Saskatoon as anything that has been alleged by the Member for Melfort-Kinistino.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — We know it, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan know it. Don't let them sell you that bill of goods from the front benches. They didn't get all that sweetness and light just the last couple of days. They have been working on it for three or four years.

An Hon. Member: — Every since they have been in the House . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Oh yeh, oh yeh! What about the Member for Touchwood, he was here in 1960, you were here in 1960, so was he. The two of you, the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) were here in 1960 and the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) was here when that Bill came in in 1960 and you let them vote five times because you thought in the City of Saskatoon — there were about 1,000 more NDP than there were Liberals — if you divide the city up five ways, then the Liberals would probably win two seats.

Mr. Messer: — How about in 1971?

Mr. Weatherald: — Oh, sure you did. That's fine. The point is that you let the people vote five times because you thought the majority of 500 NDPs would elect five candidates. That's why you did it and you know it. You know it. Everybody knows it, don't tell us that nonsense. Everybody knew in 1960 that you thought you would get 500 or 600 votes more than anybody else and you would elect five candidates, that's why you went for a

multiple constituency of five. You know it so don't tell us anything different, Mr. Minister from Kelsey (Mr. Messer).

So fellows, I just wanted to mention to the new Members that this new posture on redistribution is a relatively new thing for a lot of the fellows opposite and that particular party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as for the constituency of Cannington I should like to say a few words about it. I should like to thank the people of Cannington for giving me an opportunity once again to be their Member. The last time we had a redistribution in Cannington was when they tried to save the neck of Mr. Thorson from Estevan. In 1956 they plunked Lampman into Cannington so that they could try and save his neck which didn't work too well for them either. I want to express my appreciation to the people of Cannington who gave me about 3,900 votes, a considerable number more than a lot of the Members over there received and despite the fact the election was close I received more votes than any Liberal had in the history of Cannington. I am very pleased and I thank the people of Cannington for giving me that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal a little bit more with some of the other matters that have come to the attention of the House. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday was a pretty dismal day for any small businessman or anyone connected with business in Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, after we completed all of the labor legislation one of our Members remarked, "Is there surely not on that whole side anyone who has any sympathy for a small business whatsoever?" And, it would certainly be concluded that there wasn't. The last time, Mr. Speaker, that the small businessman received any attention from that side of the House — he didn't receive any in the four years previous but he did get a few words about two weeks before the election, none of which have been heard since.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about agriculture and in particular a problem which I think is becoming exceptionally important in the Province of Saskatchewan and one, I hope, the Government opposite will take some action upon. But I want to remind the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that he got elected on a policy of raising the income of Saskatchewan's farmers and it is also very obvious, far too obvious, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little policy coming forth or will likely be coming forth, except a loud and long holler to Ottawa for more money. That, Mr. Speaker, is the style and the substance of the agricultural policy from the NDP Government.

Mr. Messer: — There will be more coming forth in five weeks than did in seven years.

Mr. Weatherald: — From where, from you fellows?

Mr. Messer: — The Government in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, the Bill that he refers to will be coming up for second reading. I don't wish to speak on that particular item at this moment. But the truth of the matter is that the Minister has gone out and he has told the people of Canada that we have the worst agricultural crisis since 1935. And the Legislature was called in to deal with matters of emergency and the only thing outlined in the Throne Speech is retroactive hog premiums which is pretty thin soup for most people in Saskatchewan who are farmers because only about 10 per cent raise hogs of any type.

Mr. Messer: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — We'll come to the family farms, if you want me to be more competitive I could. Mr. Speaker, I want to review some of the policies he pressed for when he was in the Opposition.

Mr. Messer: — You didn't listen then.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, you're running the show now so you had better get started.

Mr. Messer: — You want it all in one month.

Mr. Weatherald: — No, no, we just want to remind you of what you are going to do, because I'm afraid Mr. Minister that most of it is going to be forgotten.

An Hon. Member: — They are all in the Bills.

Mr. Weatherald: — Okay, I'll just remind him of some of the things he is supposed to be coming forward with. 1968 — "It is time to update and refurbish the Agricultural Representative Branch to meet the needs of present day agriculture." At that time the Minister said a telephone service was just as good. That's the present Minister of Agriculture.

An Hon. Member: — Who . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, you've got a few nervous Ag. Reps. anyway. 2. Improvements in the development, leasing and selling of Crown lands. We'll be awaiting his actions in that regard which he says he is coming forth with. 3. A guaranteed and updated floor price on livestock, Mr. Speaker. We will await Government action on that. One of the great cries in the last session was the low price of hogs so we hope he has some action to come forward with other than just to cry to Ottawa. 4. More assistance to young farmers embarking on a career in farming. I can assure the Minister that this was one of the promises or implied promises that received a substantial number of votes for him in

the election and there will be a great disenchantment if nothing comes forth in that regard. A great disenchantment as far as you are concerned.

On February 26th, 1970, in Hansard the Minister said, "We should have a guaranteed floor price for feed grain." On July 23rd, 1971, he said, "The agricultural situation in Canada today is worse than it was at any time during the 1930s." This came from the Agricultural Ministers' Conference in Edmonton. Now anyone who would make a statement like that would deem a situation needing tremendous changes and very rapidly.

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, right away. You people . . . over five years.

Mr. Weatherald: — That's fine, we just want to remind you that you are supposed to be going to solve it. We'll wait, we'll wait.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to what was brought up by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) this morning regarding closure of small hospitals. In my constituency the Maryfield hospital was closed as all Members know. I held a meeting in Maryfield to explain why that particular situation did occur. Unfortunately the candidate for Cannington for the NDP probably wasn't impressed. One day he decided to go down to Maryfield and he took a look at the building from the outside and then he drove back all the way, 80 miles, to Lampman, and made a speech along with the Legislative Secretary, the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla). Now, Mr. Speaker, if I was the party opposite and I made a speech of this nature which puts them on record, I should certainly intend to reopen that building.

The closing of small hospitals such as the Lampman one, he was speaking in Lampman, I'll leave part of it out and table it and you can read it if you like. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, to come more to the point he said:

Despite the fact that the hospital in Maryfield had a favorable financial position, a very substantial bank account as well as a resident doctor and nurses, he had inspected the hospital recently and he was impressed with its excellent condition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he says that the new X ray equipment, the up-to-date equipped boards and the new four-bedroom nurses' residence adjacent to the hospital were a credit to the people of Maryfield and the community spirit and dedication that he could see, and this spirit had been crushed by the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite, despite the fact that the hospital survey report was initiated by their Government and had made the very recommendations on a number of small hospitals, which admittedly no local person would be happy with if it was closed, and I certainly would share that feeling if I lived in a community where one was closed. But, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite chose to make it very, very much a

political issue despite the fact that they knew there were valid reasons for the Government taking the action it did. Therefore, I think, Mr. Speaker, that many of the Members opposite in their haste to try and assume a seat in this Assembly made a great many promises which the local people will be asking them to respond to in the near future. I think it is important that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) review this situation very rapidly. I think the people in Maryfield in my constituency, have kept the building open for two years now. It is heated, it's looked after with janitorial service. I think that they deserve an answer from the Government opposite as to what its intentions are and in a very short time.

Mr. Romanow: — What did . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — I told them the truth as to why we closed it and I told 200 of them that too, and I don't mind saying so.

An Hon. Member: — Is that . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, I didn't get very many that's why you should open it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could deal with a substantial number of problems in the constituency of Cannington which the people of Cannington are familiar with, grid roads, for example. Here is one that will be easy to keep, the putting in of natural gas in all the towns on No. 16 highway which had already been done by a Liberal Government. That one will be fairly easy for the Government Members. But I don't intend to, I want to come to what I think is assuming a crisis of substantial proportions in Saskatchewan and I refer to the foreign ownership of agricultural lands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be very easy for the Members opposite to stand in their place and say, oh, you fellows were in the government for seven years, why didn't you do something. The truth of the matter is that in the past year this situation has grown steadily worse. While it could be easily said that it is a small proportion of land in Saskatchewan, it is a very significant amount of land if you draw a straight line through Regina from east to west and take the southern portion of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Romanow: — It is in your . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — No, it's not in mine, it's in the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley's (Mr. Hanson).

Now, Mr. Speaker, this particular problem, and I want to refer to it — I dislike referring to a particular instance but I think I am forced to because in this particular instance at Fillmore where 16 sections of land or a little bit over that

have been bought by one person, who is an American. I have always had great admiration for Americans, I think they are the greatest friends we have, but I think we must protect the interests of our own country first. Now in this particular area, Mr. Speaker, 16 sections have been bought in the past year simply because the person buying that was obviously very wealthy and he was able to outbid anyone else in that particular area. And the result of this, Mr. Speaker, has been that practically any person who had land who was reaching an older age is willing to sell to that individual.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the local residents, and rightly so, are disturbed by this matter. I need not give you the implications that such large transactions can have for the people of Saskatchewan. The long-term result, if it continues, means that we are headed back to the feudal system with the absentee landowners controlling large blocks of land and local people working it with wages being paid to them. This is the direction that we appear to be moving. We are a country close to 220 million people in the United States, a number of whom are very wealthy. It is reasonable to expect that more and more money from wealthy people will be invested in agricultural land, Mr. Speaker, and I want specifically to speak of agricultural land because I think other land deserves a different type of consideration. It is obvious that any wealthy person is able to write off any losses that occur in a farming operation against another business and this represents a considerable tax saving.

Agricultural land in Canada is cheap compared to the United States and presents a possible capital gain. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that in consideration of the land bank proposals that the Government opposite will give some consideration to bringing back and holding control of farm land in the Province of Saskatchewan in the hands of our own residents. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that by failing to do this I see little but a continued trend to large tracts of land being bought by foreign residents because it is obviously a good investment for them at present prices. I can see little but the enlargement of farms to the extent that there will be tremendous rural depopulation unless we enact laws to enforce resident ownership or tax laws which will remove the incentive which presently now exists.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of the Legislature because, as I said before, I think it is serious. It is serious because I understand in this particular individual case, that there is a possibility and willingness to purchase at least another 16 sections of land. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not anti-American in any sense but it is obvious that in order to compete, local farmers, Canadian residents, young farmers wishing to get into agriculture simply do not have the financial resources to compete with this type of person. Mr. Speaker, the matter which I have brought to the House's attention is a difficult one to solve in an equitable manner but I hope that the Government will give it careful consideration and support, because I am convinced in Southern Saskatchewan

August 3, 1971

we are on the edge of a tremendous possible increase in the buying of agricultural land, a trend which will be very hard to reverse once it is foreign owned.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned at the outset I intend to keep my remarks brief today. I shall make further remarks when I come to the Farm Protection Bill in that particular aspect. We could belabour all the promises made by the Government for a lengthy period of time.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words. I listened with a great deal of interest — there are a lot of new Members here, excellent speakers — and two or three of the younger speakers on that side of the House had carefully prepared a recitation. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that in these presentations I felt that there was a definite feeling for the destruction of the present system. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will give more careful consideration of the present system in this country, because it has a lot to offer. Despite our problems it is very doubtful whether some of the extreme solutions frequently offered present any viable alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I will be supporting the amendment and not the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — In rising to take part in this debate on the Speech from the Throne, I do want to add my congratulations to all those other Members either elected for the first time or re-elected. I, too, want to add my congratulations to all those Members who have congratulated you on your returning to the Chair that you sat in a few years ago. As one who has been in close friendship with you, Sir, I shall try not in any way to presume on that friendship and I promise to try to be a good boy. At least I'll be a good boy as long as the Hon. Member from Estevan (Mr. Brown) will keep his mouth shut. I know that in the past you had a record of impartiality and fair-play and as the Dean of the House we wish you the very best in that Chair.

I want also to congratulate all those Members who were elected to this Legislature especially the new ones. I am sure that they will find public life enjoyable. I have, and found it very worthwhile. After all, Mr. Speaker, it happens to a very small percentage of our society. I suppose that in percentage it would be .100 who ever have the opportunity to serve in this Legislature and I wouldn't miss it for anything. I want, in turn, to congratulate the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) for leading us in the New Democratic Party to a victory, a victory that has never been really equalled or surpassed in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I know that he will lead

the people of Saskatchewan to new heights. I am more than proud to serve under him.

I want to compliment the Cabinet Ministers who got their posts. I know that there is a lot of hard work involved in what they are doing. There is a lot of personal sacrifice. You know, I think one of the few consolations there is to being a Cabinet Minister — I was in it once — is that you are at the centre of getting things done.

I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder for the good job that they did. I know a maiden speech in the Legislature is never an easy job. I went through it a couple of times, one maiden speech in moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne. I think they did themselves proud and their constituencies have great reason to be proud of the ones that they chose and I know that we shall hear more of them.

I want to also congratulate all new Members who have taken part in the debate so far, in the debates of this House. As one of the older Members of the House it makes me feel good to know that there are young people coming in to take over the place of some of us older Members in the future. I know that we shall be able to retire when the time comes feeling that we have people replacing us who may be more able and more capable than we are.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to a few remarks that were made by different Members across the way. I'm sorry the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) is not in his seat, because what I am going to say is going to be very short and I should like to have said it while he was here. Really there was nothing in what he said that was worth answering. I have always had quite a respect for the Hon. Member from Rosthern but I must admit that in his first attempt back in the role of an Opposition Member, I was terribly disappointed.

Turning to the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), he first of all talked about redistribution, a very interesting subject. I should like to look at the redistribution of 1952 and 1956. There was a guide for population representation in both of those redistributions. No seat was to have more than 20 per cent less or 20 per cent more than another. This, of course, is necessary because of geographical boundaries, because of natural geographical boundaries that you can't have population equality. They could not go beyond that figure. But certainly the redistribution of 1970 went far beyond the 20 per cent difference that there could be between one constituency and another. You know they talked about the Saskatoon distribution. I suggest that in a way it was very fair. They were able to cross political lines in their choices and this, they did. I don't think it was that unfair.

I want to turn to the remarks that the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) gave in regard to foreign ownership of

farm land. I want to say that I heartily agree with him. I congratulate him on the stand that he is taking. I happen to know that he has thought this for quite a number of years. I think there is a big threat in this foreign ownership of land. We know that the size of the farms are getting bigger and bigger. Consider the example used by the Hon. Member this morning of one man buying 16 sections and ready to buy a lot more. I cannot help but wonder whether he is not just a front for some large corporate land company. We know that in the United States there is the Kern Land Company, there is the Gates Rubber Company which produces everything from avocados to peanuts, to cattle, who own their own terminals, who own their own ships, who grow their own grain. I am afraid that some of the land-buying now in Saskatchewan by wealthy people is really the undercover movement of large companies who are prepared to move in. Gates Rubber Company ship cattle not by the carloads but by the trainloads. Their ranches cover hundreds and hundreds of thousands of acres. I know that our Government is interested and I hope it will be doing something in this regard.

Maybe I have said this in the House before, but many of the Members may not have been here. When you look at the record of North Dakota back in 1932, they passed a law which made it illegal for corporation or corporate farms to operate in North Dakota. I want to make it clear that when they refer to corporate farms they don't refer to family corporate farms, they refer to corporate farms in terms of absentee ownership and the rest of it. That Act is still on the books of North Dakota and is still stopping large corporate farmers from moving into North Dakota. They have tried to get this changed at different times but they have never succeeded. The last time was in 1968 and finished up with a referendum by the people of North Dakota. The large corporate owner and companies lost that vote, four to one.

I really feel, along with the Member for Cannington that this is an extremely serious situation developing in Saskatchewan. I have been talking about this for a number of years. I am going to continue talking about it.

May I then turn, Mr. Speaker, just for a minute or two — and I am not going to speak very long — to the Speech from the Throne. This document to me spells out the dire urgency facing Saskatchewan in recent months and years. For seven long years, Saskatchewan has suffered under a Liberal Government in Ottawa and a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. For seven years the economy of this Province has slipped until it is now in a crisis.

The Speech from the Throne is the first step of a New Democratic Government's four year program for people, that we believe will help to remedy this economic disaster facing many of our citizens.

I know that deterrent fees have long been batted around in this Legislature and I am going to say just a very few words on it. But I remember saying in the debate in 1968, when the

deterrent fees came in, I remember sitting over in that seat — in fact I believe that it was the seat that my hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) is sitting in — and saying that a Liberal Government would be defeated because of deterrent fees.

We made that promise that it would be one of the first things that we would do. And now, just some five short weeks later, we are doing it. I believe that the Speech from the Throne is a good one. It is the first step, as I said, in the implementation of New Deal for the people, and so I will be voting for the motion and against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, before I begin my address, I should like on behalf of the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Engel) to assure the Hon. Member from Regina Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) that contrary to the fears expressed by him this morning, there is a doctor at Vanguard, and he has been practising there for the last three weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I join with others in formally congratulating you in your election to the office of Speaker. And less formally, I wish you well in your task in maintaining orderly and relevant debate in this Legislature, because, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to be relevant to peoples' problems, if we become enmeshed in form without content, if we indulge ourselves in the game of winning debating tricks one against the other, then we shall continue to add to the public cynicism about parliamentary institutions. And that cynicism, Mr. Speaker, is growing.

Fortunately, here in Canada, we have not arrived at the degree of cynicism that pervades American political life. But America presents us with a very unappealing vision of what awaits us if we cannot use parliamentary institutions for popular goals. There remains the cynicism and the apathy among a large part of the electorate. There is cynicism and corruption among the large part of their politicians. There is cynicism and contempt for parliamentary processes among the politically active youth, and other popular movements.

And let me cite two very simple examples, Mr. Speaker, from the State of Missouri where I lived from 1966 to 1970. In the spring of 1970 a prominent black Member of the House in Missouri was gunned down on the street in front of his committee room in Kansas City. When Pierre Laporte was murdered in Quebec, the whole country was quite legitimately shocked. When an analogous event occurred in Kansas City in Missouri it rated 1/32 spot on the national news on the following day.

Also in the spring of 1970, Mr. Speaker, the Mayor of

August 3, 1971

St. Louis was re-elected on a campaign platform, spearheaded by an anti-crime commission on the promise that he would fight crime. Shortly thereafter Life Magazine, circulation between six and seven million, ran a feature story in which they alleged that this crime commissioner was a Mafia lawyer. It was a very carefully documented article, which proceeded to discuss not only the alleged Mafia links of the crime commissioner to the Mayor of St. Louis, but it proceeded to document a great number of other scandals in the civic governments of St. Louis.

What, Mr. Speaker, you might ask was the reaction of the citizens of St. Louis towards this? To begin with it was very difficult for the citizens of St. Louis to find out a great deal about this event, because the henchmen of the Mayor proceeded to buy up all the copies of Life on the news stands. That is only the minor aspect. The most important political phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, was that nobody cared. The people shrugged their shoulders. They did not, maybe, know all the details of this particular political scandal. They knew that their civic life was fraud and corruption. They knew that the regular institutions of politics were fraud and corruption. The comfortable white suburbanites knew it and they remained comfortable. And the black ghetto knew it and it continued to seethe. Nobody, Mr. Speaker, can be particularly sanguine about American domestic politics.

Let us return to Canada, to Saskatchewan. There is poverty in Saskatchewan just as there is poverty in the black ghettos of St. Louis. And there is cynicism in Saskatchewan among people as to whether we, parliamentary politicians, are capable of any solutions. Again and again, as I campaigned in Saskatoon University people would express distrust of all political parties, including mine, Mr. Speaker. And they voted for us, not out of enthusiasm in many cases, but as the best of a bad bunch, because they were less cynical of us than they were of the Liberals.

We, in the NDP, have succeeded in channelling the cynicism that exists in the concern of the current economic depression into votes for the New Democratic Party. And, how, Mr. Speaker, did we do that? I don't presume to know all of the reasons that motivated these people in the way they voted in the last election. But I purport, Mr. Speaker, that one of the important reasons that the New Democratic Party was able to secure the support of the people that it did, is that for the first time since 1960 the New Democratic Party had a program which went beyond mere tinkering with some very fundamental social reform, that if successfully implemented, would just begin to move Saskatchewan towards a more Socialist society.

Legislation that we have had before us in the House, Mr. Speaker, are but small steps on the road towards which we must go. The announcement this Monday by the Premier of the cancellation of the agreement with respect to the building of the Meadow Lake mill, is another small step in the right

direction. Now it would be very flattering, Mr. Speaker, to believe, as the gibes of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) would suggest, that it was because of the Waffle element within the NDP that the Government took the decision that it did. That would be much too presumptuous for a group within a group, for all elements within the New Democratic Party supported that decision. Many other groups supported that decision outside of the New Democratic Party. And the people of Saskatchewan, the vast majority, supported that decision.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — I will return, Mr. Speaker, to a discussion about the significance of this decision that has been made. We should realize, however, that it is a momentous decision. This is one of the very first times that a government has voted against a resource development deal which has been purported to bring jobs to a province, and, therefore, it has got important ramifications for what is to be the future economic development of resource industries in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to what I consider to be some of the excellent aspects of the program of the New Democratic Party. If the House would indulge me, I should like very briefly, to list some of the very momentous and important kinds of reform which we, in the New Democratic Party, have committed ourselves to try to achieve in the next four years.

I don't take them in any particular order except that the order in which they were laid down in the program, Mr. Speaker, but I think it sufficient to do just that.

We have committed ourselves to restrict more corporate ownership to family farms, in groups of families farming co-operatively. We have committed ourselves to keep farm ownership in Canadian hands. We have committed ourselves to establish a Land Bank Commission which could purchase land offered voluntarily on the market at competitive prices and lease this land. We have committed ourselves to re-establish and expand the functions of agricultural machinery testing, to co-operate with other Prairie Provinces in setting up a positive program to encourage the manufacturing and importing of farm machinery. We have committed ourselves to enact a new Trade Union Act, guaranteed free collective bargaining, repeal Bill 2 — which is in the process of being done, Mr. Speaker. And to increase immediately the minimum wage to \$1.75; to reduce the legal work week; to end the present Government collaboration in a potash cartel that restricts Saskatchewan output and jobs; to establish the Department of Economic Development to plan and encourage orderly economic growth and to integrate and co-ordinate such programs of Northern Development and Urban Rural Planning. We have committed ourselves to provide bursaries for university students in conjunction with The Canada Student Loan Plan; to

establish a prescription drug program based on drug formula and central purchasing to provide drugs at greatly reduced costs; to establish an insured dental care service initially for those under the age of 12; we have committed ourselves to establish a government department to have overall responsibility for pollution control and maintenance of the quality of the environment, to establish a Provincial Housing Authority; to overhaul the Landlord and Tenant Act; to ensure that Indian and Metis organizations are effectively involved in planning and implementing programs which affect Indian and/or Metis people.

Mr. Speaker, that is a very ambitious program, that one might be forgiven if one thought that there is an element of rhetoric which might not be fulfilled. Agreed, there is a great element of promise in this and this program cannot be achieved solely by Caucus and Cabinet of this Government however well they are intentioned to achieve it unless there is a great deal of popular support throughout the province for all the measures involved. And in order to achieve this program, Mr. Speaker, it will be the responsibility of this Government, not only to sit here in the Legislature and present you with bills and legislation, or to administer their departments, it will be the responsibility of this Government to go to people and to organize them behind these very constructive kinds of reform.

It is at this stage that I want to return to the decision which our Premier made with respect to the Meadow Lake mill. We all realize that it is just the first step in an attempt to try and have a more constructive program of Northern development

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — But, nonetheless it is a constructive attempt to get away from the belief that it is only large and primarily foreign corporations who can lead us toward economic prosperity.

Now the Premier was in a position to make this decision, Mr. Speaker, in part because of the kind of political organization and activity that went on in this Province, both within and without, the New Democratic Party. It was because of the educational work of groups such as the Resource Studies Group in my constituency of Saskatoon; because of their educational work; because of the statements of the Indian and Metis Societies; because of the great amount of political organization that went on in opposition to that pulp mill. The Government found itself in a position where it was free to make such a constructive decision. We on this side of the House have the humility to realize that progress in society depends not only on the government in power, not only on the good intentions of the Cabinet, not only on the legislation that comes forth, but upon the political awareness, education and organization of the people of this Province.

Now let me, just as an economist, make a few summary remarks before I sit down. In the 1960s there was an air and a

theory about prosperity in our society, which assumed that it could be based — to use a very simple kind of summary — on Russian wheat sales, and sales to the Americans of the produce of our primary industries — oil, pulp, potash. Now in 1971 it is obvious that that kind of theory of economic development is a failure. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have to resurrect the radical and socialist traditions which go back to the attempts of farmers at Sintaluta in 1901 to beat down the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I shall not bore you with a long history of the attempts of Saskatchewan people to secure control of their economy. But when we come to deal with particular examples of the failure of the pulp industry to bring the kind of prosperity to the North which it was alleged to do and when we begin to study the details of who got the jobs at Prince Albert, then we see the extent of outside employment. When we analyse the potash industry, Mr. Speaker, and we realize the folly of capitalist unplanned development in that industry and the need for Socialist planning, and we realize the stagnation to which that industry has been brought because of American political power, we realize the need in Saskatchewan for independent political power, power more potent than can merely be brought by electing a government, power that comes from an organized population which is committed to achieve the kinds of reforms which are needed to have a prosperous and democratic society. I have no illusions, Mr. Speaker, about the ease of that job; I have no illusions about it arriving in the near future; I have no illusions about the amount of ridicule it will be exposed to because of the experiments which we shall have to undertake, but we will have to undertake these experiments, Mr. Speaker. But if we reject such deals as Parsons and Whittemore were willing to offer us, we are going to have to experiment with public ownership of resource development industries, and, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are capable of fulfilling that challenge. I would oppose the amendment and I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this debate, I should first like to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of the House. I'm sure you will rule with the utmost impartiality.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that I think this Session is unnecessary, an unnecessary expenditure of public funds because everything brought in could have been done without the Session. But then I can't really blame the Government for putting on a bit of a show because I can assure them, Mr. Speaker, they will only be on that side of the House for four years or less if they happen to call an election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — What I can't understand

August 3, 1971

about the Members opposite is they don't realize that 3,000 votes switched over would have changed the Government. They can't also realize that when the people realized in this Province what they had done, they could have gone back to the polls within ten days and that side would have all been gone.

Mr. Speaker, this was my fourth campaign and I want to say that there were more untruths and scare tactics used in the last campaign by my opposition than in any of the previous campaigns.

I should like to thank the people of Meadow Lake for placing their confidence in me for the third time.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how bad the NDP wanted the Meadow Lake constituency. I can't understand why. I didn't think that I had caused them so much trouble in the House. I realize I'm not a good speaker, like a lot of the teachers and so on, that you have on the other side but I do say that I try to represent the people of the Meadow Lake constituency as honestly as possible and I think being elected three times in a row has confirmed that they do show their appreciation. And I can assure the people of the Meadow Lake constituency I will see that the Government will fulfil the promises that they made to the people in Meadow Lake but I'm sure that there is no way that they can do it with the short time that they will be in office.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the people of the Meadow Lake constituency voted for was the pulp mill. When the Premier looks at the fact that I increased my majority by 400 per cent or over, it is a clear indication that the residents of the Meadow Lake constituency want the pulp mill. The Premier wouldn't be able to convince the people in Beauval or Ile-a-la-Crosse or Cole Bay or any of those centres up there that they shouldn't have had an opportunity to have the jobs that were available to them. Just an example, at Beauval which is only 10 miles from where the pulp mill site was started, I lost that poll in the last election, but I won it this time, 154 to 31. That's what those people thought about the pulp mill. They wanted the pulp mill. Mr. Speaker, I say that the native people of northwest Saskatchewan should not be forced to subsist on welfare when there are renewable resources for development that would provide them with a better way of life. Some of these people up there have had a taste of these new opportunities with good wages and will not be happy to lose them.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blakeney speaking during the campaign in Meadow Lake — incidentally I had all the big guns up there, the Deputy Leader, the Premier, the Leader of the NDP, I even had an organizer from Toronto and I understand he was the "guy" who helped get Lewis elected as Leader so I don't know why they zeroed in on me in the Meadow Lake constituency, but it was all to no avail. The people up there wanted the pulp mill. But Mr. Blakeney, speaking in Meadow Lake, he said, "We are going to make the northwest a wilderness, an unspoiled

wilderness for the people of Saskatchewan." Well I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people of the North have had their bellyful of being in the wilderness for so many years while the NDP were the Government. And now that they saw the change coming with industrial development of the area under the Liberals they will not be pushed back into the wilderness very easily. The people of the North could see where they would have the opportunities as people in other parts of Saskatchewan. They would be able to take advantage of the job opportunities offered by industrial expansion and be able to live their lives with satisfaction and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that over \$100,000 a month is paid out in that northwestern area in welfare and no one can convince me that this is necessary when you could supply job opportunities to the people of the area and those people have proved they want those opportunities to improve their lot in life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Government will continue with the post cutting operation for La Loche. This would have been in operation now if the Government hadn't changed and these people wanted this operation, they are going to run it themselves, and now to have this project in there is far more essential than ever since the Government opposite has cancelled the pulp mill.

The Government, Mr. Speaker, says they will use tourism as an alternative to job opportunities. What does tourism mean to the people of the North, Mr. Speaker? At best it can mean a few jobs for two or three months during the summer and then these people can go back on welfare for the other nine or ten months of the year. It also means, Mr. Speaker, that the commercial limits for the fishermen who have made a living on fishing for years in the North will be cut. It means the closing of some of the lakes entirely to the commercial fishermen. This is the New Deal for the fishermen that the Government opposite promises.

Mr. Speaker, June 23 was a very sad day for the people of Saskatchewan and especially for us in the Meadow Lake constituency and it was made a lot sadder on August 2. People in Meadow Lake were optimistic about the future. The town of Meadow Lake was a beehive of activity. Things really looked bright, and then, boom, the Government changed. Contractors moved out, construction on new homes stopped and this New Deal for People turned out to be a bust and the future looks really black. The Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) assured that the future will remain glum and black by pressuring the Premier into cancellation of the pulp mill. This outlook, Mr. Speaker, could have been changed if the Premier had gone ahead with the pulp mill and had not submitted to these pressure groups who do not really know what they are talking about. Ask how many of them have been in the North, have been in Meadow Lake and seen what this would do for the area or know what the situation or the problems are. I feel, Mr. Speaker,

that these groups are very selfish in that they are depriving these people of the area of an opportunity to live in dignity. Let's be the good Samaritan the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) spoke about and give these people this opportunity. We shall certainly be looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to the alternative job opportunities that this New Deal for People offered by these people across the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to see the power rates cut for the people of the North. You know they went up there and they say a bottle of liquor or a bottle of beer costs the same in Regina as it costs in Buffalo Narrows. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Government will take a serious look at the power rates these people are paying in the North and at least reduce them and I hope they will also provide the TV and telephones into the North which would have been part of the industrial expansion under the Liberal Government. Another thing I am looking forward to, Mr. Speaker, is an increase in pay.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Blakeney speaking in Buffalo Narrows on Saturday, June 12 told the gathering there that if he became the Premier of the Province he would see that the Member for the Meadow Lake constituency would get an increase in pay, would get more money. He said it was a very large riding and he realized it cost the Member a lot more to get out and look after the needs of his constituents. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm looking forward to this increase in pay and I can tell the Premier that what he said was the truth. It does cost a lot more to look after a seat the size of Meadow Lake. But what the people up in Buffalo Narrows don't realize is that what the NDP say and what they do are two different things and I'm certainly not going to hold my breath.

It was very interesting to note that the NDP Government has been in office for only a little over a month and already they are back at their old game of setting up commissions. The people elected them to run the Government, Mr. Speaker, and if they have to pay commissions to make their decisions for them, they should resign and let the people elect Members who will run the Government

Mr. Romanow: — We'll resign.

Mr. Coupland: — You resign and you'll see what will happen. We'll be sitting over on that side.

You know the Members opposite promised to help the farmers; they promised to help the small businessman and then right after that they call a Special Session and they bring in legislation that will help put the small businessman out of business and the small farmer off the farms. Mr. Speaker, they really have no sympathy for the farmers or the small businessman. Their promises are all so much window dressing because labor runs the show along with the Waffle group and they will have a real deal going with labor forcing the farmer off the land and

closing the small businesses and the Waffle group sitting there ready to force the Government to socialize them.

In view of the cancellation of the pulp mill, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the NDP will go ahead with the vocational training school that was to have started in Meadow Lake in July. This is every essential to Meadow Lake because of the high incidence of unemployment and people who need training. It would have worked well with the pulp mill but now these people will have to go elsewhere and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that these people across the way have been talking about people leaving the province, well there is already a path leading them west right now.

But because of some of the legislation which has been brought in, such as Bill 9, Mr. Speaker, which incidentally is similar to one the CCF brought in in 1944 — they were going to protect the farmer. But this sort of backfired on them and it stopped the small farmer from getting any credit and this is why there have been no young people able to stay on the farm.

Mr. Romanow: — Are you going to vote against it?

Mr. Coupland: — Yes, I'll vote against it, because you are doing exactly the same thing again and you are going to force the small farmer out of credit so that he has to get off the farm.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I do so with a great deal of reluctance. Several moments ago my Whip told me that I was scratched for this afternoon, but several moments ago he informed me, "Well, I think you will have to pick it up and go."

First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you on your appointment to the high office of this Assembly and I'm sure, as did other Speakers of his honored House, you will uphold the tradition that has been established over the years.

I, too, should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Dyck) and the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson). I know that to prepare an Address-in-Reply and to be a seconder in as short a notice as these two hon. gentlemen were given is a task in itself. I congratulate them on the effort that they put onto the speeches as their speeches, I think, rank with top speeches made in this Legislature.

August 3, 1971

I also want to congratulate all the New Members who have been elected to this Legislature for the first time. And when I turn around in this Legislature, and as I have had occasion to listen to these young Members who have been elected to represent the New Democratic Party, I think that these Members will ably and capably represent the philosophy of the New Democratic Party and their constituents who sent them here as their representatives.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Now I am sorry that my friend the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) is not in the House. We have developed over the years a sort of long-term friendship. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that only several months ago when the last Legislature prorogued at its spring Session, that as I was walking out of the building, I said to my friend, the then Minister of Highways, "Well, Mr. Boldt, I'll be seeing you." "Well, Dick", he said, "we won't see you here any more."

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Michayluk: — Well, Sir, the Hon. Member came close to not seeing this Chamber any more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Now, I want to make a few remarks of the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat and has walked out of the House, the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland), and a few other Members who have participated in this Throne Speech debate, who have said that the policies proposed could have been done without a Session. I do recall, Mr. Speaker, that when the Hon. Members opposite sat on this side of the House when they brought in the utilization fee which we call the deterrent fees, did they bring them in by Order-in-Council? Not by a long shot. I can recall debating the deterrent or utilization fees for three or four weeks. Why didn't the then Government do it by Order-in-Council? Is it that you gentlemen are afraid that we are partially implementing the pledges we made to the people of June 23rd?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — The Hon. Member from Meadow Lake says he was elected three times in a row. I did one better, I was elected four times in a row . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . in a constituency that

my hon. friends said was gerrymandered in 1951. And it was probably gerrymandered for the Liberals. You know, we gave the Liberals in Redberry in 1952 a 1,249 vote majority, and in spite of this, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the 1,249 vote majority based on the 1948 election, the people wouldn't have them in Redberry. We elected a CCFer by 24 votes. I'm glad that the Member says that somebody promised somebody an increase in pay. I wonder who did the promising. The Hon. Member from Meadow Lake receives a special allowance because he represents one of the northern constituencies! I don't know how much he's worth in terms of dollars and cents but I know that all northern Members are receiving a special allowance. The constituency of Athabasca, the constituency of Prince Albert East and the constituency of Meadow Lake are in this category.

Mention has been made about the Wafflers. I wonder what the Liberal Party think of their Waffle group — people in the Liberal Party like Walter Gordon, Eric Kierans, Paul Hellyer. These are people in the Liberal ranks who have the courage and the intestinal fortitude to think and speak for what they think is right. We have people on this side, and in the movement that you gentlemen wish to call "Wafflers." All the Liberals opposite want to do is befuddle the whole issue for the Saskatchewan people, by presenting the Wafflers as a monstrosity that's going to destroy everything everywhere in the Province and in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Now, the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake was talking about power rate reductions. Well, I wish he had discussed the matter with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and referred to the promise that they made in 1964. What did they say about rates? They promised to reduce hydro power and natural gas rates. Did you do that as the Government? You raised the rates and you added a five per cent health and education tax on every power bill that was not there prior to the election of 1964. What did you do with the telephones? You said you were going to lower the telephone rates. Instead the Liberals increased the long-distance rates by three or four times and to top it off put on a five per cent sales tax. Yes. That's right.

Do you know the reason why you're sitting on that side, gentlemen? It is because the promises that your party made in 1964 and 1967 were not meant to be implemented. Here's one from a statement in 1966. It's right on your program, Mr. Speaker: "Institute a drug program to care for major drug costs." This is not an NDP promise, this is a Liberal promise.

An Hon. Member: — A broken promise!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Steuart, speaking in North Battleford as reported in the News Optimist on April 29th, 1966, stated: "Steuart

predicts drug plan in two years." 1964 to 1971, and you hon. gentlemen in the Opposition expect us to implement our pledges at this first Session of the Legislature when the Ministers haven't been able to settle themselves into their executive positions.

I cannot overlook the blatant Liberal gerrymandering, Mr. Speaker, my opposition in the Redberry constituency and that's the constituency where bets have been made and lost and bets withdrawn. My Liberal opponent in the Redberry constituency published a pamphlet like this one in my hand. This pamphlet gave me more votes than any other piece of literature that my opponent or I sent out to the constituents. He had the Province of Saskatchewan with the constituencies in this little pamphlet. You know, some young children were asking me, "Mr. Michayluk, why couldn't these Liberals draw straight lines?" I didn't have to pay a cent for newspaper advertising, TV advertising or radio advertising. My opponent did it for me. I used this map, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency. "Look gentlemen, this is how the Liberals gerrymandered. This was Kelvington in the by-election in 1969. Do you know what happened, it looks like this in 1971 election." So that's all I had to do. They couldn't draw straight lines. So, if anything, it defeated you gentlemen, and I don't think that the prediction of the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat will come to fruition within a good many years. Yes, within the next four years they have the hopes and ambitions of being on this side. Well, Sir, we gave them one 20-year lesson and the Hon. Members didn't learn anything. This time we'll give you a longer period in which to learn.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Now, talking about utilization fees, I just want to use but one quotation and it's from a Member, from an hon. gentleman who sat in the Liberal Party, who was in Cabinet, and here's what this one, Mr. Wilf Gardiner, said in respect to utilization fees that you all voted for. He said this:

The first major confrontation came over deterrent fees for medicare. Sally Merchant, Jim Hooker, George Leith and myself held the battle in caucus against the wish of the Premier to establish fees in 1964.

And this, Mr. Speaker, was at the time when we left a \$9.8 million surplus in the medicare care and hospital fund.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — It's not the fact that you were short of money, as was so ably presented to this Legislature by the now Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), it wasn't the money issue, it was a philosophical issue that you people think when your stomachs are full you don't care for the less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy because of the content in the Speech from the Throne. It was intended to be a short Session. If, you gentlemen in the Opposition, want a longer Session we'll grant you that, but may I assure you that in the four years that will follow, we will implement our pledges to the people of Saskatchewan. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks this afternoon, I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, who, in the eyes of this newcomer to the Assembly, did a very creditable job.

I am a newcomer. I am a newcomer from a rural constituency of Last Mountain. I farm there. I'm proud to be a farmer. I love the farm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I'm a dirt farmer, yes, and I'm proud to be a dirt farmer. I love that farm and I'm prepared to fight for it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — And here's why I'm prepared to fight for it, Mr. Speaker. When the New Democratic Government, of which I am a Member, took office Saskatchewan faced a combination of crisis, more severe than any since the great depression. Virtually every department of government has its own thorny problem — resources, education, health, labor. But the most crucial and the most difficult problems seem to come to a focus in the crisis situation of our farms and of our farm communities.

Mr. Speaker, a drive down any highway or any grid road in this Province — and I've driven down them — reveals and endless succession of abandoned farmsteads. There often seems to be more abandoned farms than occupied farms. And in virtually every small community — and I've been in them — there can be found one or more boarded-up stores, grey and deadening to the eye. There is a sense of decay in much of rural Saskatchewan. And there are processes and these processes are causing depopulation of our rural areas, and they have been at work for some time. They have been working for more than just the last seven years. As a matter of fact, the present crisis of agriculture has its roots back in the days when the Prairies were settled, when my grandfather and my father settled at Semans. They date back to the history of land settlement, to the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the history of the National Policy of Sir John A. MacDonald and Wilfrid Laurier.

The farm crisis is not unique. The farmers are not a special case, but they are an exception. Our present situation is part and parcel of the workings of the corporate monopoly. I have been on the farm. I was raised on the farm, I've been farming 20 years and the bold fact of the matter, as I see it, is that Western farming must have been set up to be exploited, because Western agriculture is an integral part of the corporate economy, its problems cannot be resolved separately from those of the economy or of society as a whole.

Farmers in Saskatchewan, in Saskatchewan particularly, have instinctively realized this for we have initiated many social movements: the grain growers' associations, the wheat pools, the co-operatives, the Progressive Party — the CCF. And yes, at some times we even thought the Liberal Party, all arose in attempt to alleviate the farm situation.

A great deal has been done to assist farmers by these organizations. However, in the last few years it has become increasingly apparent that something more is required. The crushing depression, the crushing Liberal depression of the last three years, has ground away all illusions. Additionally, the Federal Government has brought out a set of specific policy proposals to accentuate the corrosive process of rural decline: the Task Force Report, the Lang farm proposals, the supposedly final solution to the whole farm problem. Mr. Speaker, I say to you and I say to the Members opposite, farmers and rural residents face the question squarely now and they don't like what they see.

Many farmers are coming to the realization that patch-work answers to their situation are not and never will be adequate. In the face of the Task Force Report, it has become obvious that a total overhaul of our farm policy will be required.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Rather than a government that speaks of adjustment, rather than a government that speaks of rationalization, rather than a government that speaks in weasel terms, farmers and rural people are looking for an alternative. They want leadership. They want leadership to provide decent incomes. They want leadership to provide dignified standards of living. They want leadership to provide a new commitment to the people who are the backbone of this country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, up to now the old party governments have been content merely to attempt to manage the ebb and flow of our corporate economy. There has been no serious attempt to channel resources in accordance with social priorities. Because no such attempt has been made, the old parties, in my opinion, are guilty of a massive fraud, a total betrayal to the people of

this country. For it is in the interests of all Canadians that a stable and economically sound rural population be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, our people have had enough of this fraud. This is why the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan took such a beating on June 23 and I was proud to be a part of the work of that campaign as President of the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, that is why they are sitting in Opposition and that is why they will continue to languish in Opposition. Mr. Speaker, while the most important lever in the farm problem — income guarantees — is in the hands of Ottawa, the provincial authority must act as well.

I can assure you that this New Democratic Party Government will act. The legislation now before this Assembly is good evidence of our intentions. At further sessions, other legislation to aid our rural residents will be introduced: the Land Bank Commission, a farmers' bill of rights, credit plans and laws to keep our farm land in Canadian hands. I believe that Saskatchewan people will welcome this action.

It would be possible to go on at length, Mr. Speaker, however, at this point I should like to turn to two matters related to education.

As I mentioned at the outset, Mr. Speaker, every department of government has its thorny problems. Education has them. I should like to zero in on just two of those problems in education today.

Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, may be interested to know that yesterday morning officials of the Department of Education and I met with a delegation from the Government of Alberta. We discussed a proposal for a community college campus at Lloydminster, a joint project between the two provinces. Another campus is planned for Vermilion, Alberta, about 40 miles from the Lloydminster site.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this college project is very interesting and I think it's very revealing, for it reveals the way in which the former Government operated. The project itself is not new. Discussions between the Alberta Cabinet and the Alberta College Board began three years ago, soon after legislation in that province set up the College Board. A community college was being negotiated for the northeast Alberta district to be located at Vermilion. About this time, a group of seven people in Lloydminster formed an ad hoc committee to look into the prospects of a college campus in their city. These people didn't represent any organization, they didn't represent any interests in particular, they were just citizens taking up the initiative on behalf of their community,

with the Alberta and Saskatchewan Governments. The ad hoc group met with the Alberta College's Board to ascertain the possibilities of a college campus under the new legislation. I am told the group was advised to do some further study on the matter, which they did, eventually presenting a brief.

That was three years ago. Then sometime in 1969 this citizens' committee met with the Saskatchewan Education Minister, now the Member for Wilkie (Mr. MacIsaac), apparently at Saskatoon. I've been told that they reported to him on their work and their progress to date. The Minister discussed the proposal sympathetically, indicating that it would probably be favorable and that consideration would be given to it subject to the future plans of the Saskatchewan Cabinet.

Discussion went on about the Lloydminster campus between the committee, the Alberta Board and with the Alberta Minister of Education and with the Hon. Member opposite. Then during the last session of the Legislature I am told that the committee came to Regina and met with the Premier. They discussed the proposal with him and then went to see the Member for Wilkie, then the Minister of Education. I am told he repeated his support for the idea, though he withheld any commitments. This was the third contact with him.

Now between the meeting of the Legislature last February and now, we have, of course, had a change of government, and, of course, we have had a change in the Department of Education in terms of the Minister. In such circumstances it is expected that the civil service will carry on the continuity of administration, working under both Governments. But, Mr. Speaker, this was not the case. Two weeks ago Alberta's Minister of Education, Robert Clark, announced publicly that a joint Saskatchewan-Alberta community college would be developed, with campuses at Lloydminster and Vermilion. The surprising thing about this, Mr. Speaker, was that no one in the Government of Saskatchewan had ever heard about the project. I repeat — no one. Not the Deputy Minister of Education, not the director in charge of the development of community colleges. Neither of the associate Deputy Ministers had heard of the project. Nowhere in the files was there any record of the discussion and nowhere in the files was there any record of negotiations. Not a trace of any scrap of information whatsoever.

This is a most unusual event. For three years negotiations and discussions had gone on and as far as the negotiators and those involved in the discussions were concerned, Saskatchewan was involved and the Saskatchewan Government was interested. But apparently the former Premier of Saskatchewan and his Minister of Education never bothered to tell their officials about this work. Apparently they never committed any part of the work to paper. This is a remarkable lack of concern and it comes as no surprise in the case of the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). I am told he rarely visited his department after he moved down to the Legislative Building. He didn't even have an office at Avord Towers. Some of his

staff had never seen him personally. So it is no surprise to find that no one knew of his discussions so far as the Lloydminster college is concerned.

However, it is not just surprising, Mr. Speaker, it is incredible, absolutely incredible that anyone, even a Liberal, would try to run a government in such a casual and haphazard manner. Did it ever occur to the Members opposite that they were dealing in the vital concerns of the Saskatchewan people? Did it ever occur to the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) opposite that he was concerned with the development of education, concerned with the young people of this Province. Did they have no sense of responsibility at all. Surely, surely men receiving over \$22,000 a year must have felt some twinge of conscience. But apparently no, Mr. Speaker. The record of the Liberal Government's management is a disgrace. I hope the catastrophe which befell them six weeks ago has been a learning experience for the Members opposite. People in Saskatchewan want sound and sensible and serious government. I can assure you the New Democrats will provide it.

Several days ago the Hon. Member for Wilkie enquired as to the status of the teacher-pupil ratio under the new Government. I replied to his question and in a further question at that time I told him I would deal with the matter during the debate on the Address-in-Reply which I should like now to do.

It is likely that sometime in early 1969 the former Government made the decision to introduce a teacher-pupil ratio as a basis for school grants. The ratio was set at 25 students to one teacher, including administrative staff and professional supporting staff. Grants were to be paid to school boards in proportion to the number of teachers determined by the ratio. Boards employing more teachers would have to cover the cost themselves from local property taxes. The ratio was to take effect in the fall of 1969.

The first official notification of this new policy came to school boards in a memo dated June 24, 1969. I refer to a clipping from the Leader-Post, dated November 4, 1969 where it refers to this:

Superintendents were told in March that there would be some changes in the teacher-pupil ratios for the calculation of grants.

But many school boards did not receive notification of the details until June 24th, the memorandum came from the Deputy Minister. The first notification of the new policy came to boards in a memo June 24th, 1969. The ratio was to apply to grants for the school term starting in September. They sent the notices at the end of June and demanded action by the first of September. They gave boards exactly two months' notice, I submit, Mr. Speaker, a totally inadequate period of time.

The reaction, Mr. Speaker, as you might expect, did not

take long to come. Both teachers and school boards made strong protests. The trustees' association presented a brief to the Government, protesting the short notice. They said the ratio couldn't be applied in the coming term without a massive overhaul of programs, without heavy firings of teachers, without substantial increases in property taxes, without a disastrous effect on Saskatchewan education and without a rapid decline in the quality of education in Saskatchewan. In the face of this opposition, the Government backed off. The Member for Wilkie announced that he would hold off the enforcing of the teacher-pupil ratio policy until the fall of 1970.

One year ago, in the fall of 1970, the Liberal Party lowered the boom on Saskatchewan's schools. We have just come through one year with the teacher-pupil ratio in force. We have seen program offerings hacked and slashed, wholesale firings of teaching staff, the closure of rural and small community schools, many of them just recently built, and we have seen a general decay in our whole school system.

Mr. Speaker, one man summed up the situation very well. I think the Members opposite may recognize this man, he once counted himself to be a proud member of their party. The man is Dr. John Egnatoff, Chairman of the Board of the Saskatoon Public School system, and he described what the Liberal Party did to education by stating the following: "The lights in education have never been lower in all the years I have been associated with it."

One of the major planks of the New Democratic Party platform for June 23 was a promise to do away with the arbitrary student-teacher ratio as a basis for paying school grants. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell this House that our Government has done away with the ratio policy for planning school grants.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I think that bears repeating, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to tell this House that our Government has done away with the rigid pupil-teacher ratio policy for planning school grants. Of course, Mr. Speaker, doing away with the ratio in July or even in June could not have had a direct effect on the school system since it opens this September. Too many of our school boards have finalized their programs, they have hired their teaching staff and they have drafted their schedules. It is unfortunate indeed that the Liberals didn't call the election in April as they thought they might. If they had we should have been in office two months earlier and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure the Members opposite, that Saskatchewan education would have been better for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Despite the accident of election timing, we face nevertheless the serious problems caused by the ratio policy. Many school boards are encountering some very real difficult situations. There is an over-supply of teachers. Programs have been cut back; rural schools have been threatened and are threatened with closure.

Our Government has not been content to rest on the excuse that we came to power after plans were set. Instead, we are acting to relieve the pressures put on schools in their planning for the upcoming year. I have written to every fiscal board in this Province to notify them that we are ready to look at their particular situation. We will review any and all such problems brought to our attention and they are bringing their problems to our attention. We are meeting with boards, we are meeting the requests of boards, we are providing grants to meet those requests. We are prepared to do everything possible to ensure that the after effects of the pupil-teacher ratio do not inflict further damage in our splendid school system in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment, but I will be pleased to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, my first comment this afternoon in this Debate would be to congratulate you, Sir, to your appointment as Speaker of this Assembly. May I say that in the few days that we have been sitting you certainly have demonstrated your capabilities for fairness in occupying that Chair.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — I want also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate both groups of new Members on the Government side and our side, for the comments and contributions that they have made so far in this Debate. Generally speaking they have been of a very high calibre and high nature and I congratulate them for it. I hope and I know that as they watch the performance of the House and are around here for a little while longer they will come to appreciate and get the sense and feel of this great Assembly and this great institution, Mr. Speaker. I hope that they don't pick up some of the poorer habits of some of the older Members. I suppose they could learn something from us and in other cases they would do well not to emulate some of the practices they see some of the older Members employ.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want also to congratulate the new Premier and the new Cabinet Members. I am glad to see a fellow farmer, and that's what I am today, Mr. Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacMurchy), occupying the position as Minister of Education.

August 3, 1971

I do believe that the new Minister today indicates that he is going to be able to take pretty strong part in debates in this House. Now, I didn't interrupt a number of the mis-statements that he made in the course of his remarks. His reference for example to short notice on pupil-teacher ratio is untrue. His statement that general complete decay in the whole school system is typical again of NDP negativism and harping back.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He says too many school boards had made up their plans for this year. Well now surely, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take much planning, or much time on his part to issue a two-line memo to the school boards of this Province saying go ahead and hire some of these other poor teachers. It's as simple as that. He doesn't need to meet with each and every board in the province as he implies now that he is doing. All he has to do is a two-line memo, and at the bottom of that memo he could add another couple of lines saying that we, hereby, also restore all of that lost autonomy that school boards have given up according to the Opposition over the past few years. Go ahead and hire your own and go back to the good old days in education, referred to I believe here yesterday by the Member from Elrose (Mr. Owens), when he sat as a board member. It's just that simple, Mr. Minister, that's all that there is to it. You needn't concern yourself with meeting every school board in the province to do that. And in the meantime you can get busy and try and meet some of those 700 staff members in the Department that I didn't get around to meeting. It will take a good deal of time, Mr. Speaker, for my hon. friend opposite to find time even to find out where all the various offices of that Department are and the various institutions to find out what they are doing. I wish him better luck than I had in that respect very sincerely. I really do.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more comments I should like to make on the Throne Speech and on other matters and I beg leave at this time to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Second Readings

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health) that Bill No. 4 — **An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I asked that this debate be adjourned I did so because of the lateness of the hour and as I

indicated this morning because certain Members were missing. I'm very happy indeed to welcome his former Worship (Mr. Baker) in his place today. I'm glad to have you here. I'm sorry you missed my remarks this morning, Hon. Member from Wascana (Mr. Baker) but I'm sure the occupant of your seat will be glad to convey them to you.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) was so far off the beam, I'm surprised. You know you could expect it from a newcomer to the Legislature but for the Hon. Member for Redberry to make the ridiculous statement he made a little while ago as to why we took a session to deal with utilization fees when we could have done it by Order-in-Council demonstrates that for one of the school teachers he probably has the worst memory of any of them over there. First of all, it was not done at a special session; secondly, there was no legislation in the Hospital Services Act to enable the imposition of utilization fees. So please note that in your records and not bring it up again because you are just talking utter nonsense.

As the Government in 1968, Mr. Speaker, my party felt that the alarming cost escalation rate of our health programs called for firm and responsible action. It was quite clear to us that there was no single cure for the problem. Hospital budgets were scrutinized closely and everything possible done to reduce the rate of cost escalation which had been running between 10 and 15 per cent per year. Fee adjustments to doctors, physiotherapists and other paramedical groups were restrained. You will recall that we toughened up on the picking up of hospital deficits and the Member for Wascana (Mr. Baker) will certainly remember this because there is now a law suit pending between the City of Regina and the Government of Saskatchewan for some \$173,000 of a deficit which was left with the Regina General Hospital. In spite of these actions, costs continued to rise out of all proportion to other costs and increase in productivity.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was not alone in this problem. Other provinces were going through the same pains and sufferings. Everyone seemed to agree that something should be done. But it seemed that any action that we took or might be considered was very difficult to determine in the first place and quite often was politically distasteful. Our Government of 1968 concluded that besides the controls we were exercising it was necessary to introduce utilization fees for both medical and hospital services, a patient fiscal payment at the time of delivery of service. The principle wasn't new, Mr. Speaker. It was used by some provinces on hospital services. The British Health Plan recognized it for drugs and some other services, the same principle that is followed in many types of insurance including health insurance and the compulsory automobile insurance in this Province. It is recognized in many private health schemes and, contrary to what the speakers on the other side said, it is still in force in Alberta and British Columbia. The 1968 records of this House will show that Members certainly didn't think alike and harsh words were used by Members opposite

to express their disagreement with utilization fees. However, experience demonstrated that utilization fees did slow down the high rate of use of medical services and hospital beds. It must be remembered that Saskatchewan people use hospital beds 25 per cent more than the average for Canada. In spite of a more or less constant population, and in recent years slipping, the number of medical services was growing annually. In 1968 with the introduction of utilization fees we saw a reduction of some five per cent of medical services as compared to the former three, four and five per cent escalation. The slowdown rate in 1969, granted, was less than 1968, and 1970 showed an escalation rather than a reduction. Not even the staff of the Medical Care Insurance Commission, however, and I think the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) touched on this the other day, have been able to pinpoint the reason for this increase. He says that possibly it is because the people were denied access to medical services for 1968 and 1969, now their ills have caught up with them and they are using the services more. I doubt this is true because I'm sure the staff at the Medical Care Insurance Commission would have caught this if it were.

In the hospital services field it was more difficult to measure the impact of utilization fees. Certainly it had an effect on one-doctor hospitals. The patient load in the smaller hospitals which are generally administered by one doctor dropped considerably. To give you some indication of the occasional abuse of our medical and hospital services, there was a case brought to my attention recently and I'm sure it is only one example of a couple who had an elderly parent living with them not requiring hospital care whatsoever but requiring tender loving care. The couple wanted to take a holiday and poor old dad was a bit of a burden to them. This occurred in a small community in this Province. The doctor put him in the hospital for three weeks. The average cost of a hospital bed in this Province is about \$38 a day so the taxpayers of Saskatchewan paid \$38 a day for three weeks so that couple would be relieved of the burden of looking after poor old dad for that period.

Another important effect on hospital load was right here in Regina where there was a marked reduction of some 800 in the waiting list of the two hospitals in Regina. I'm confident that the reduction was due entirely to the imposition of utilization fees. There had been no reduction in the population of the area served, the population had grown. There had been no increase in beds and the Department of Health officials confirmed this conclusion.

I said earlier that utilization fees were not original with our party. Actually I don't know just where they started. Perhaps they started with the Thompson Commission but I think we should give the NDP credit where credit is due because I really think they thought them up in 1961. At the Party's annual meeting in Saskatoon, the then Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Lloyd) urged the delegates to support the principles of utilization fees for medicare. He pointed out that this would bring about more prudent use of the services, discourage

over use or unnecessary use and, worst of all in the eyes of you gentlemen, he said that these utilization fees would help to pay for the plan. He apparently didn't feel that they would be a tax on the sick at that time. Well, the delegates really didn't see eye to eye with Mr. Lloyd — he was merely the Provincial Treasurer and why should they listen to him — but the Government of the day certainly listened to him because when introducing the Medical Care Insurance Act, what did they do, they included the principle of utilization fees. That, Mr. Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) was one reason that we could have done it by an Order-in-Council as far as the Medical Care Insurance Commission was concerned because the NDP had provided for it but not in the case of hospital services.

It is strange now that the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) today says that — see if I can find this — well, anyway what he said was that, "We recognize that we can remove these utilization fees by an Order-in-Council but we feel so strongly about it, it is such a principle with us and we are so dedicated to getting rid of utilization fees that we are not going to do it by Order-in-Council, no Siree, we are going to change the legislation." Well the principle of 1962 seems to have changed considerably as far as utilization fees are concerned. The Government of that day, the Minister of Health (Mr. Blakeney) is now the Premier. They thought utilization fees were a good thing to include in the Medical Care Insurance Act, in fact, the Thompson Commission had recommended it.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill that we are considering today reverses a former NDP action, NDP legislation, not Liberal legislation. We didn't introduce the principle at all. You people introduced it. You are the ones who foresaw the need for it, thank goodness you did, but now for some reason you have changed your minds but that's to be expected. You've changed your minds so frequently on promises that I'm not a bit surprised. More power to you. It takes a big man to admit that he has made a mistake.

While, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals took what we considered necessary and responsible action even though it was not universally popular — we recognize that — it meant a savings and a transfer of some \$7 million as far as the health plans are concerned. Speaking of rapidly learning money doesn't grow on trees, governments have no magical formula for getting it except from the people. The \$7 million must come from some other Government program or from taxation. The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) and others opposite have indicated that they are not just too sure yet where it is going to come from but in all likelihood it will come from increased income tax. Well here we go, a tax on the sick taxpayer now.

Mr. Speaker, 65 seems to be an age with some magic associated with it. In our country it brings up thoughts of retirement, although some of us retire earlier when political fortunes change, 65 does not necessarily mean retirement; it doesn't necessarily represent a drastic reduction in income, for some,

yes, others, no. I feel the Members to your right had their election radar set in the direction of vote getting rather than genuine concern when they promised the elimination of health plan premiums for those over 65. There were ways the needy and low-income families could have been provided for without including everyone regardless of their fiscal needs. No one can take serious objection to helping the needy but it is beyond me why we should ask the middle income group to pay more taxes to provide health care plans, gratis, to people well able, and not only able but willing, to pay those premiums. Let's, Mr. Speaker, not fool ourselves, there are thousands of persons in Saskatchewan with good incomes and good estates. People who live well and travel extensively, people who have worked hard, saved and are proud they have paid their way. Now we are going to ask the clerk, the steno, the bus driver, the mechanic to pick up the tab for this well off, over 65 group. This, to me, is a fine demonstration of Socialism at work. This is why Socialism in my eyes is bad. In its endeavor to help the needy everyone including the non-needy is pulled down to common level. However, apparently this is what the people want. I guess I'm the one who is out of step. It is only another \$3 million, just money.

Mr. Speaker, the Socialists are always promising something free. The Health Minister (Mr. Smishek) when giving second reading to this Bill said, "There are many poor, many small pensioners, they deserve free health care." Mr. Speaker, if he is so sincere why doesn't he give them free health care? He says he is going to give them free health care, he's cancelling the premiums. Big deal. It represents 16 per cent of the cost. The service will be far from free. It will still cost those over 65 plenty of money. The Minister of Health stated in a July 19 release that utilization fees had apparently stemmed rising costs and the utilization of health services during their first year but after the first year they are ineffective in controlling overservice or overutilization. He admits in this statement that there was a savings, yet in the press in one breath he says, "yes, they did, yes, they really did save some money." He was quoted in the Leader-Post that his officials can't find evidence of savings, yet he quoted figures showing net savings of only — and he emphasized only — \$2.5 million for which the patients paid \$4.5 million. Well, I think it was the late Mr. C.D. Howe who said. "What's a million, it is only money." That is now out of date. It is replaced by the Hon. Walter Smishek's statement, "What's \$2.5 million? Peanuts, it is only \$21 million while a Federal cost sharing of \$4.5 million was lost. Did he say this was peanuts? Oh, no, he changed his stand, \$2.5 million was peanuts, but \$4.5 million loss of Federal funds was a very serious matter. How on earth could the Liberals be so blind as to introduce legislation that was going to result in a tremendous loss of \$4.5 million?

We have a lot of teachers on the other side and I would solicit their support here because I should like them to tell

me what percentage 4.5 is of \$21 million. I make it roughly 20 per cent. I don't hear any denials of this so I guess 20 per cent is about right. But how come the people opposite did not tell the electors this? Did they say there would be a Federal recovery of 20 per cent? No. Did they say 30 per cent? No. Did they tell the people 40 per cent? No. Do you know what they did tell the people, Mr. Speaker, they told the people and they misled the public of Saskatchewan by saying that there is a loss of 50 per cent. For every \$1.50 you take there is 50 per cent of this that could have been collected from the Federal Government. They misled the public and the Hon. Minister of Health straightened them out here the other day by admitting that it was only 20 per cent. Now if you want to know where I got that from, the document is entitled, "Things will be better in Regina." I can get it for you if you wish. Actually that is the Member for Wascana (Mr. Baker) again. He slipped up here. He should have cleared with the Hon. Member for North East Regina because it takes the Minister of Health to straighten him out every once in a while. But he will learn, he'll learn.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) indicated there had been no decrease in the length of stay, patient days or discharges per thousand. He cited figures showing growth in these items but what he didn't say was what would have happened without utilization fees. I can tell him. Since June 23 there has been no problem getting a medical appointment. People are waiting until August 1st or the 4th or whenever it is, just to swarm in for doctors' appointments. I can speak with authority because I made two medical appointments myself. No problem getting in at all. Don't tell me that there is not going to be a change in the utilization of medical services and that's what the Minister of Health said on July 19th. He's got confidence in the people, he's got confidence in the doctors. They'll use the plan "to their fullest benefit." I can tell you they will sure use them to the fullest benefit. I don't care whether it's health plans or anything else when the Government is picking up the shot 100 per cent it's going to be utilized and overutilized. I don't care what it is.

I can show you the respect that people have for public property and public financing. You could see it around this building this morning. So many people say, oh, the young people are concerned about pollution, well, believe me they weren't concerned around here on Sunday. They polluted this area pretty freely. People weren't very concerned about the beautiful flags that were flying on Albert Street bridge. Where are they now. They are in the Creek, they threw them in the Creek. So don't tell me that people are responsible and will use the plan responsibly. They won't and the Minister of Health will soon find this out.

As the Waffler from Saskatoon said, the fluent one, (Mr. Richards) the one that speaks so freely. Actually you know at times I have some regrets that I was born 40 years too soon or something like that but, boy, when I listened to some

of the remarks he made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, thank goodness I was born in 1910. I think I've lived during the best part of the life of this country if these fellows are going to take over and run the country. I can tell the Premier is going to have a whale of a time with him, he's a bright young chap, more power to him. I like the way he delivers his speeches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — There is another good one over there from Nipawin (**Mr. Comer**). When he and Mr. Richards get together and they get a little support from outside the Legislature; I can tell you Mr. Blakeney is going to have lots of fun with you fellows in the Caucus. You know a Premier has a lot of tasks. First of all he has to keep his Cabinet happy and that's a strenuous job. I can tell you fellows in the front row, you'll have lots of fights with the Premier. I had mine, we all did. But then he has to keep his Caucus happy, that's a bigger job, it's going to be 45 times the problem. Then if he doesn't keep the Caucus happy or even if he does keep them happy, he's got all the constituencies, your provincial executives. Oh, boy, I can tell you are welcome to the job.

I had occasion to write him after the election, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I said, Mr. Blakeney, you know you and I haven't been able to agree on a political philosophy and I don't suppose we ever will. I said, there is one thing we can agree on — you've taken on a big job. I recognize this and I have every respect for anybody, I don't care what his political affiliations is, who takes on the job of Premier of any province.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Richards) said, the Government sincerely tried to stem health costs by introducing utilization fees. Their effect was questionable, it seems the people want unlimited use of these plans. More power to you, you Members on the other side. You said our efforts to cut costs failed. Okay, let's see what you can do.

Mr. Speaker, we will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, in rising may I first add my congratulations with those of many of the other Members of this Legislature to your being chosen as Speaker of this House. I know that you will carry out the duties of your office with sincerity and impartiality.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great privilege and an honor for me to speak on this Bill on behalf of the people of Humboldt constituency. I am proud to represent them in this Legislature as a Member of the team led by the Hon. Allan Blakeney.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — In speaking to this Bill may I say, Mr. Speaker, the true test of the democratic process is the way in which it works for the people who are affected by the legislation which is passed by the Government of the day. In 1968 when the former Liberal Government of this Province passed legislation that imposed deterrent fees, the democratic process was not working for many people of Saskatchewan.

There were those who even attempted completely to muzzle the rights of the people of Saskatchewan from expressing their opinion on measures such as deterrent fees. But the people of this Province united around the New Democratic Party and its platform and said that they would have their way. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud that this Government is acting on the wishes of the people, and is so rapidly taking action by eliminating the medicare premium for people 65 years and over and abolishing deterrent fees.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it has been said by some that \$180 a year paid in deterrent fees is not a hardship on the people of Saskatchewan. I want just to make mention of some cases which show how inaccurate this really is. In my constituency of Humboldt, large families are very common, many of whom live on very modest incomes. They all pay their medicare premiums, but yet every time a member of the family went to see a doctor they paid \$1.50. Every time a member of the family was hospitalized they paid \$2.50 a day in deterrent fees. They had to pay it even though in many cases they couldn't afford it. Somehow the democratic process wasn't working for them.

Mr. Speaker, in this Province there are many people who are old. Many of them have no other source of income besides their pension. Our senior citizens probably have greater need for medical care than any other members of our society. They also paid their medicare premiums out of their meagre pensions and they also had to pay \$1.50 when they saw a doctor, and they paid \$2.50 a day when the doctor decided they needed to be hospitalized. Now I have spoken to many of these people and I have a letter from one of them. In this letter which I received from one of our senior citizens this man writes that accommodation and drugs for his wife and himself cost nearly \$300 a month. The lady was a wheelchair case and they both were on medication. These people had to pay deterrent fees! Yet some Members on the other side of this House are able to say that \$180 a year was not a burden on the people of Saskatchewan. It was a burden for many people of Saskatchewan.

You know, it seems strange that the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) would say that in the villages and the towns of this Province there are many people who are very wealthy. Are these people that wealthy? Mr. Speaker, deterrent fees are a tax on the sick and the old. They are a tax on those who are least able to pay, a tax on those who because of their illness, which is no fault of their own, often are unable to pay or have to make great sacrifices in order to pay.

There are countless reasons why deterrent fees are wrong but I want to mention just one more, one more example. I shall mention this example of a case where a mother gave birth to three children, three infants, three tiny bundles of life that came into this world ready to grow up and make a contribution, ready to share in the great and wonderful experience of life on earth. Unfortunately two of these children died because they were premature. One of those infants had to be transferred to another hospital, from Humboldt to the University Hospital in Saskatoon in order to save his life and his life was saved. Now, Mr. Speaker, deterrent fees were not normally charged for babies born in hospitals, but because this child was transferred directly from the hospital where it was born to another hospital, his parents had to pay \$150 in deterrent fees. It was a burden to them. They have a large family and their income is very small and they live in one of those small towns and villages where some of the Members opposite say so many of our wealthy people are supposed to be living.

The legislation which we are considering in this debate will do away with the head tax on the old and it will do away with the tax on those who have barely entered this world. It will make health care available to all of those who need it.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the principle of this Bill, I want to mention that shortly after the election of June 23rd, I read an editorial comment in one of our weekly papers. The editor wrote and I quote:

The spirit of the new Government in this Province will be clearly seen in the care and concern it shows to the least privileged, the least protected, the poor from whom no patronage is won. The rest of Canada may well be waiting and hoping to find in our conduct during the next few months, the example of unity and harmony and common purpose so essential to maintaining any hope in a promising future for Canada or our world.

This Bill by eliminating the burden of medicare premiums from people 65 years of age and over and the abolition of deterrent fees is an indication of the spirit of this Government.

I want at this time, Mr. Speaker, to commend the Members opposite on their supporting this Bill, and I want to urge them in the light of this comment in this editorial to consider other legislation which has been presented in this House and which will be presented in this House in future sessions, and support that legislation when it is a good deal for people and New Deal for People.

Our society is one in which there are many problems. And too often we preoccupy ourselves with only the problems and neglect to recognize the good, the opportunities that we have. The opportunities that were made possible by those people who had dreams, who worked and who sacrificed, and many of whom have

today nothing more to live on than their pensions.

The former Government saw fit to reward these people by taxing them when they became ill. And, granted, the imposition of deterrent fees was no doubt brought about by the former Liberal Government in an attempt to control costs. I don't doubt it at all, but this cannot deny the fact that many people were often very hard pressed to find the money they needed to pay their deterrent fees. This cannot deny the fact that they were a great burden to many. This was no effort to help those who live in the most severe poverty — it only made their burden worse. I find it rather strange, in fact a little humorous, that the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) in his address just before I rose to speak, spoke of the escalation of costs and responsibility at the same time. How responsible is it to tax the sick and the old, Mr. Speaker, and the helpless. And why wasn't the Hon. Member just as responsible when he decided to give doctors an increase of 11 per cent, an increase of 11 per cent of \$20,000 to \$50,000 or more, at the same time that the Members of the previous Government were telling hospital workers in Saskatchewan who were earning \$1.35 an hour that they could only ask for six per cent.

Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about the rising cost of health care and I am sure every Member of this House is concerned. But it is a poor way to reduce the cost to the public by taxing the old, the sick and those who are least able to pay. I am very pleased that this Bill before us intends to do away with this situation.

The rising cost of health must be dealt with but this will only be done with some effect if the total health program is reassessed. Too often government has tended to employ stop gap measures which deal with isolated problems only. This, in effect, usually laid the foundation for other problems. Sooner or later we shall have to deal with the total package. I was very pleased the other day to hear the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) say that this Government will very soon study this whole system of public health to determine what is lacking and how improvements can be made and how we can get the most out of every dollar that is spent on health care.

This Bill will ease the burden on our senior citizens and our poor and our families with respect to medical care but it is only a beginning. Mr. Speaker, medical care should be a right and not a privilege determined by one's economic status. The removal of the medicare premium for people 65 years and over and the removal of deterrent fees is a step in making that right available to all people and therefore I'm proud to support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, we have just been subjected to another

August 3, 1971

typical Socialist sob story and we perhaps shouldn't knock success, it seemed to work in the election, but I hope I never come to the point where I have to speak like that to win my seat.

I suppose you realize now that we are not going to oppose this Bill, and I suppose that everyone in this House has parents or grandparents or other near relatives who will have their premium abolished by this legislation. Utilization fees have served a useful purpose. They have made people aware that service must be paid for by somebody. They have reminded people that medical service must be paid for by somebody. They have reminded people that medical service should be used when needed but not frivolously. It is difficult to assess just how valuable utilization fees have been in the past two or three years. Utilization fees have done their job but many people will be glad to see them go. However, Mr. Speaker, any responsible government or any responsible opposition, or indeed any responsible citizen of this Province must know that the several millions of dollars will simply have to be obtained from other taxpayers. The young working couple with a family are already having a difficult time and I am reluctant to support a Bill which will mean that these people will have to pay extra taxes to eliminate premiums for people over 65 years, who may or many not need this relief.

I would be completely in favor of a program which would provide help for those in need over 65 and also provide help for those in need under 65. What about people who are chronically ill or infirm under 65? Any universal application is the wrong approach and I am surprised the new Minister of Health didn't bring in legislation which would help all of these people who really need it. The Bill somehow makes the assumption that need is related to age and, of course, this is not necessarily so. We are not certain either that there will be a saving to these older people. I understand that the new Government has some proposal to destroy the Homeowner grant which at present is greatly assisting the older people who are retired in the small towns of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, what is so magic about the age 65? Many people are more in need at age 60 because they are not yet receiving pensions which are available to them in later years. I should hope that in committee the Government would bring in amendments which would improve this Bill and make it more acceptable to the people of the province.

The Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) for example said in this House March 4th, 1971 and I quote:

With the millions of dollars you receive from Ottawa you should also have taken off the \$72 per family medicare premiums. This is what our Government in Saskatchewan must work toward if we really want to call our medicare plan free.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is even getting more millions from Ottawa, this would be a good time to look at this.

The statement by the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), is also of interest at this time and I quote from the Leader-Post of August 10th, 1968, the heading, "Lower Premiums said Possible":

Walter Smishek, New Democratic Party MLA for Regina North East said Thursday, medical and hospital premiums should be kept to a minimum or eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the above statements we expect that the Hon. Member who is now Minister of Public Health would proceed toward the reduction and the elimination of medical premiums for all citizens. If the Minister of Public Health thought that hospital premiums should be eliminated in 1968 surely he believes there is even more urgency for this today. This Special Session would have been a good opportunity to reduce or to eliminate medical premiums for everyone. Your NDP colleagues in Alberta are advocating the abolishing of premiums. You have \$90 million left in the Provincial Treasury, this would be a good time to put it to good use. There is still time for the Minister to bring in amendments to reduce or eliminate the premiums. If he did this Bill would certainly be supported with greater enthusiasm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Government and the Minister on their prompt action in this matter that will relieve a good deal of needless suffering and anxiety. We, in Saskatchewan, can be proud of the fact that we have one of the best medical care programs in the world. Within our program, doctors are free to practice the best possible medicine. At the same time, patients are free to select the doctor of their choice.

We can also be proud of the former CCF Government which has led the way for Canada and, indeed, for all of North America in the field of medical care for our citizens. Without this kind of imaginative leadership, not only our citizens, but the citizens of every other part of Canada would be poorer off today.

The establishment, on the North American continent, first of a program for hospital care, then of a program for medical care took imagination and the courage to stand firm against well-organized opposition. Such a stand, such a step, was made possible only through the leadership of men of vision and compassion. I suggest that it was compassion for the needs of their fellowmen which provided the vision to see the possibilities in the way things could become. I believe that we can once again be proud when we pass this Bill which is now before

us. The imposition of deterrent fees was a retrograde step in the history of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that there is now fairly general agreement that deterrent fees for hospital care should be removed. It is true that there have been many different reasons expressed for this unanimity. There are those who are opposed to the basic idea and principle of such fees. Others have suggested, that while they still feel them to be right, it is clear that the will of the people is that they should be abolished.

Just a short time ago, the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) mentioned how they are abused. He spoke of a couple with an elderly parent who wanted to go on vacation and put their parent in hospital. May I respectfully suggest that no one puts his parents in hospital — a doctor does it. Where was the doctor when the parent was admitted? Who signed his admittance form? And who later, three weeks later, signed his release?

The Opposition has said, and I believe they mean this, that the people of this Province are not responsible. I suggest they were sufficiently responsible to elect the right government on June 23rd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — Let me say though that I am happy to see the change of heart in terms of the hospital deterrent fees. I never cease to be amazed, however, that some of the same people who support abolishing deterrent fees for hospital care are able to rationalize in their own minds, at least, the same kind of fees for medical and doctor visits. To my mind there is no more excuse for the one than there is for the other. If they have the effect, and I say, if they have the effect that they were intended to have of deterring people from attending doctors or going into hospital, then they are obstacles in the way of proper medical care. Some people argue that these fees reduce the number of nuisance calls to a doctor's office.

Mr. Speaker, I should like someone to explain to me just what a nuisance call is. Is the nuisance call the person who goes to the doctor every time he feels a cold coming on? Is it the person who goes with a slight case of the flu? Or is it the person who goes only after he has developed pneumonia? Or is a nuisance call the mother who goes to see the doctor if she is concerned that her child has trouble staying awake in school. And maybe, with apologies to some of our teachers, we probably all had that kind of trouble at one time or another. But also there are medical reasons for such things and they have to be examined.

One of the greatest arguments put forward against these

deterrent fees, against abolishing them, that is, has also been in the realm of nuisance calls. There are those who say that such fees keep neurotics out of the doctor's office, thereby saving, not only money, but his valuable time. Well, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, I just don't believe this argument. A neurotic is probably the one patient who will not hesitate to spend the \$1.50. Maybe there is some truth in the old saying that only the rich can afford to be neurotic. Besides this, however, no reputable doctor wants to keep neurotics out of his office. Any doctor who wants to bar such patients from his office is more like a body mechanic than he is a medical practitioner. A doctor's main concern is with helping those who are sick, no matter what that sickness may be. I believe that Saskatchewan is fortunate to be blessed with so many medical personnel who are well qualified, competent and truly concerned about the welfare of their patients. I am convinced that they are the kind of people who would like to help the neurotic overcome his problem, just as they would like to assist any other patient back to full health.

You say the neurotic is a nuisance case. What about the patient suffering from an incurable disease about which the doctor can do nothing anyway? Should he, too, be bared from continuing visits to his doctor's office? The doctor can provide him with a refillable prescription, a pain killer, to keep him going.

One Member on the other side of the House suggested that we on this side had made no complaint about the deductible clause in Government Auto Insurance, intimating that there is little difference between this and the deterrent fee for medical care. It seems to me that this is a classic example of the attitude of those people who place people and things in the same category. And this, this party will never do.

The greatest fear I have about such medical fees, however, is that they stand in the way of the practice of preventive medicine. What I have seen happening is that although fees may not appreciably cut down the number of patient's visits in the long run, they have delayed the seeking of medical aid. Instead of going to the doctor for the treatment of an apparently simple cut, the patient delays until it becomes clear that infection has set in and then discovers that a doctor's visit is not sufficient, but a hospital stay has become necessary. It is difficult for me to see how this makes any long-term savings in our medical care plan. Or, instead of parents taking their child to the doctor when he seems to have a fairly heavy cold, they postpone the visit, hoping for it to clear up. If it fails to do so and gets worse, then they take him to the doctor and discover that what could have been treated a few days ago in just a few days at the onset of his illness, will now take longer. It will involve a greater expense in prescription drugs and possibly a stay in hospital.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad fact in our society that all

parents are not equally concerned about the welfare of their children. It would be rather naive if we all believe that parents, every parent, truly loved their children. I have seen parents, who because of the deterrent fees have delayed taking their child to see a doctor, to see if maybe by tomorrow the condition might have cleared up. Maybe we don't like to think of such things, of parents who would play with young lives in this way. Maybe we should like to close our eyes to them, but the fact of the matter is that such situations do exist, even in our society.

It is true that the \$1.50 fee is not a financial disaster for very many people, but certainly it can become a medical disaster to some if treatment is delayed. For these people, hospital and medical fees may well be the last torpedo from the good ship economy, that finally sinks their self-sufficiency and places them on the rough seas of welfare.

I suggest, too, Mr. Speaker, that in the long run such fees have not saved money. They have cost money in more lengthy illness, more frequent return visits to the doctor's office, hospitalization and a loss to the economy of earning ability. Even more important, however, is the fact that such fees cause unnecessary suffering and hardship. We must recognize, once and for all, the basic principle that every citizen has the right to the best quality of medical care that is available. This care must be available strictly on the basis of need, and not on the ability to pay, or on the necessity of accepting charity.

I should like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, for just a few moments to our senior citizens. I, too, as many other Members have mentioned, have visited many of these people and have been shocked by the plight in which a good number find themselves. If this labels me, as some Opposition Members suggest, a bleeding heart, I can only say that I am rather proud of the company that I keep — at least 55 per cent of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I can have nothing but respect and admiration for the pioneers of this great Province. Theirs was not any easy task, but they gave themselves to it with a single-minded devotion which should serve as an example to each of us. They spent their lives building for the future and for future generations. It seems to me, Sir, that when we, who are that future generation, speak of assisting them at this time, we are speaking not of a charity we want to give, but of a debt we feel a responsibility to pay. It is a debt we cannot ever repay fully but we can certainly start and make an attempt.

As I spoke with many of these senior citizens, I, too, as some other Members have suggested, found them surprised and finding it almost hard to believe that we would abolish hospital and medical care premiums. They just couldn't conceive that

governments cared that much about them. I am, therefore, extremely happy that this is one of the first pieces of legislation to come before this Session of the House.

On the other hand, as I spoke with many of our young people, to whom the Opposition have referred, I found no hesitancy among them of accepting responsibility for our senior citizens. Many of them did ask where the money would come from, a normal question, and a number of them volunteered the suggestion that they would be more than willing to accept a larger share of responsibility to provide the help they knew was needed today.

We know, Mr. Speaker, as has already been mentioned, that there may well be a few inequities in any new and progressive legislation. 65 is not a magic age, but some age had to be decided upon. But this is always one of the dangers one faces when breaking new ground. I am convinced, that as this program is implemented and as these things come to light, as we find ways of resolving any difficulties, that this Government will move to do so. We do not pretend that we can solve every problem in one fell swoop. Mention has been made of the older man with the younger wife and family. I can't help but wonder if some Members are particularly concerned because of one rather famous Canadian that will be in this position in about nine or ten years.

Let me conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to be associated with this party and with the Leader who has placed this legislation high on the list of priorities for this new Government. Certainly it has my complete support.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I am forced to enter the debate on second reading of this bill. I want to tell my friends opposite I frankly had not intended to get into the debate, but I was prompted to do so after having heard some of the comments made by the Member who just took his seat (Mr. MacLeod) and the former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant).

I want to say, first of all, that the Hon. Member who just finished taking his seat indicated, or wondered out loud, whether or not the comments made by one or two of the Members on this side of the House, respecting doctors, was an attempt by the new Government in casting around, to put some blame, on a particular group or particular professional body with respect to rising costs.

I want to assure the House that it is certainly my understanding of Government policy not to put the blame on any particular professional group or professional body. I don't blame the doctors for the increasing or escalating costs in utilization of the Hospital Services Plan, or the Medicare Plan particularly, but by the same token I don't place the undue emphasis

or fault on the person who feels that he or she needs to use the doctor and go to the doctor for services, as the Liberal Party did when they introduced the legislation in 1968.

I am sure that the Hon. Member for Regina will agree with me, that very often professional people and the professions are right. They are quite often open to criticism by governments because they, themselves, fail to look at the problems in their own profession. They don't act until such time as public opinion forces governments to take action on their behalf. All I am hoping is that the medical profession wakes up to the problem that we have here, because if hospital beds are being overutilized, as I understand medical practice in the Province of Saskatchewan, the decision as to whether or not the patient goes to hospital or comes out of hospital, is primarily the decision of the doctor and not of the patient. Perhaps we ought to look at new concepts of health services. Perhaps we ought to try and promote a program of community clinic health, call it what you will, but something along that line. A program which has had terrific success thus far.

Mr. Steuart: — Where?

Mr. Romanow: — Everywhere, Saskatoon, Regina and Prince Albert, in terms of the total provision of health services.

Mr. Grant: — That's everywhere!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, everywhere where community clinics are set up. The former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) says, "that's everywhere!" Well, I agree that it isn't everywhere. Part of the reason why it isn't everywhere, former Minister of Public Health, is because your Government put the squeeze on community clinics when you ought to be giving them help to expand.

All I am saying to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and to the former Minister of Health, and the Member for Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) who just took his seat, is that there are a number of approaches that the Government, I am sure, and the Minister of Health are prepared to look at with respect to the question of costs.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) has assured this House and has assured the Province of Saskatchewan that there is a problem with increasing costs. We are going to move and try to control these costs. We think we can control them without the imposition of utilization fees or deterrent fees. We think we can stop the overuse of them, and if that requires an examination into the activities of certain professional bodies, then, I for one, would be prepared to sanction that type of an examination into the activities of professional bodies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Hon. Member from Regina also talked about premiums. He says, "Well, we are going to have no premiums now, in this Bill, for those 65 and over, but what about the forgotten age, from 50 to 64?" I agree with him. I think this is a problem. I think it was a very valuable comment. Frankly, I think there is some problems with premiums, or the concept of premiums. The placing of a flat fee on an individual, I think, has a drawback in the sense that it does not relate to ability to pay. That is to say, that a person who earns \$4,000 a year is going to pay \$72 for the medicare and hospitalization premiums as is the person who is making \$40,000 a year, or \$400,000 a year. There is no relationship to ability to pay. I think the premium, to that extent, like all taxes of that nature, is open to a legitimate form of criticism. And so we abolish it from 65 and over.

It is too early to say where the Government is going to go, but I should for one, urge the Minister of Health . . . Well, I can tell you where the Leader of the Opposition is going to go after the next election, right outside of this House after the election is finished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — All I am saying to the Leader of the Opposition is simply this: that I should hope that the Minister of Health would undertake studies to see whether or not it is possible eventually to do away with the premiums as a form of financing medicare and hospitalization, and to set up a taxation structure which is more directly related to ability to pay. That, I think, is of benefit to the Province of Saskatchewan. We can't do that in four or five weeks. There are a lot of things that we have done in the four or five weeks for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition. You would think that the Government opposite had stood still for seven years by the number of delegations that come to every Minister making requests of various departments. You would think that the sands of time in Saskatchewan had stopped absolutely still and there had been nothing done in the area in health, and nothing done in the area of welfare, and nothing done in the other areas of government. For the past four or five weeks we have been endeavoring to bring forward a positive form of relief to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now the Leader of the Opposition says this Session is a grandstand Session. The Leader of the Opposition says that this whole Session is unnecessary. He said, "You know, you really don't need to bring in this legislation." He argues that. He argues another item, he argues every sort of argument that he can possibly think of to support his point of view, that this Session and this legislation is not necessary. He tries to cover it up with all sort of legalities, when in truth, Mr. Speaker, the real reason why he didn't want this House to convene at this particular time, is that he didn't want to be

forced into the situation where he reversed a stand taken now for four years by the Liberal Government opposite on deterrent fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The real reason was that it would be a terrific loss of face to the Leader of the Opposition. A terrific loss of face to the Deputy Leader, the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) to get up now and have to find that the very crux of their policy to control health costs, this very paragon of virtue in controlling health costs, this policy now has to be reversed. That's why they say this Session is not necessary.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I have seen here, Mr. Speaker, and the reason why I was prompted to get into this debate, a terrific reversal by the Members opposite, a terrific political switch, an absolute reversal of direction. One of the all time great reversals that mankind in Saskatchewan has witnessed in modern history. I don't think there has been a reversal as great since Christine Jorgeson took a reversal of position and rank.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I must say that in Christine's case it was a little more beneficial to society than the Leader of the Opposition's. Yes, absolute and total reversal. The Liberal Party opposite says that they are now for the removal of deterrent fees. They say that, "We say deterrent fees are bad." But you wouldn't have thought that that would have been the case if you go back to some of the old Hansard debates. You wouldn't have to go back to too many of the old ones either. Every year since 1968, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) was instrumental in introducing a resolution advocating that the Government reverse its stand on deterrent fees. Every year we advanced arguments and every year the Liberal Government stood up and voted against the resolution on deterrent fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Why they even did it as late as three months ago. Three or four months ago when this session met in 1971, February, March and April, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) introduced the resolution again. And again those who are the remnants of the Liberal Party opposite stood up in their place and they laughed the present Minister of Health down. They used their majority to vote out the resolution on deterrent fees. Now, all of a sudden, now all of a sudden, three months later, they come before the Legislative Assembly, they come before the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, under the scrutiny of the eyes of the press and the people of this Province and they say, "What we did three months ago, what we fought on a matter of principle

in this election campaign was all wrong." That's what they are asking the people of this Province to accept under the new Leader of the Opposition.

I'll tell you how highly held this deterrent principle was by the Liberal Government opposite. They thought this was a great pioneering piece of legislation. Why the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was going to show all of Canada how it's done — I happen to have here a 1969 copy of the Debates and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly — that happened to be one of the last debates that the former Minister of Health got into on deterrent fees. Reading from page 1154, he says this about deterrent fees:

Other provinces are looking at us now and thinking of doing the same thing. I predicted this a year ago in this House. I can say at the present time that some other provinces are currently considering the same action that we took.

End of quote, Minister of Health in 1969. I could go on and table the speech for any of the new Members opposite in the Liberal Party to read for your own edification, the elaborate rationale, the elaborate argument advanced by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) in support of deterrent fees and now he has the audacity to get up in this House and vote against his own policy that he took three months ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Province of Saskatchewan is entitled to ask itself why it is that the Liberal Party now all of a sudden is for the removal deterrent fees. I think we are all entitled to ask ourselves why it is. I ask the Hon. Members is it really because they believe that deterrent fees are no good and should be removed? Is it really because they disagree with the principle of taxing the sick and taxing the poor? Is it because of that? Are they removing deterrent fees because they really believe in the principle of medicare and hospitalization? This Liberal Party opposite which was the chief organization and chief group behind the organization of the KOD (Keep Our Doctors) in 1962 fought medicare and fought hospitalization tooth and nail in 1962. Is that the reason? Is that the reason that they are now getting up and voting for the removal of deterrent fees? No, Mr. Speaker, none of those are the reasons why they are getting up and voting against deterrent fees now. I'll tell you why they are voting against deterrent fees.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm not sure whom he is pointing his finger at but when he is pointing his at somebody for organizing the KOD, it better not be me because I wasn't on that team. I was against that group right

from the start and I hope that his allegation is not in any way related to myself.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is not a point of order. He wasn't naming the Hon. Member for Regina Albert Park, he was just naming the Liberal Party of a previous day so he wasn't aiming at you.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I was about to answer the question of why it was and why it is that the Liberal Party now is standing up against deterrent fees? And I remain convinced that it isn't for any of the reasons that I have just quoted or any of the questions that I have asked. No, that's not the reason. The simple reason why the Liberal Party now is voting against deterrent fees is because they deem that it is to their political advantage in the short run to do so. Liberals have argued in this debate and other debates that I have read in the newspaper, Mr. Speaker, that they tried their best to control costs. They say it was an honest attempt to control costs. I say that those who acknowledge and recognize the Liberal Party's deterrent fees as an honest attempt to control costs simply don't know the facts of the case. The evidence was clearly before the people of Saskatchewan and everyone knows it and particularly the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), the Minister of Welfare (Mr. C. MacDonald) and those who sat in the Government knew it.

The facts were clear. In 1964 the increase in utilization was 5.75 per cent; in 1965 the increase dropped to only 2.4; then it rose again to 4.5; then it dropped again to 3.6; dropped, Mr. Speaker, the year that they introduced the deterrent fees; then deterrent fees stabilized for a period of about a year; and then in 1968-69 and 1970 they started going up again dramatically proving to everybody that deterrent fees did not accomplish the purpose of the Liberal Party's endeavor, namely, the controlling of costs. They knew that to be the case, Mr. Speaker. They didn't maintain deterrent fees because they controlled costs because the facts show that clearly they did not control costs. They maintained those deterrent fees because it is inherent and basic to the philosophy of the Liberal Party to put on this odious tax on the sick and the poor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Now the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. C. MacDonald) comes to this House, the Liberal colleagues come to the House and they say, "Well it was an honest attempt. We tried but we were chastised by the public vote. We know now that the people of Saskatchewan don't like deterrent fees, therefore we are going to vote for the removal of deterrent fees." Mr. Speaker, that argument is as contradictory and as false as any other argument advanced by the Liberal Party in support of these fees. That simply is not true because if it were really true than I should suspect that one of the first people opposite to get up

and to vote for a Government measure would be the Members opposite when we put in the Bill to repeal the Essential Services Act because just like deterrent fees the Liberal Party in 1971, and in 1967, got up and ran on the platform for the Essential Services Bill. I recall those fancy, elaborate advertising commercials on television, costing thousands of dollars to the Liberal Party, perhaps even millions of dollars, showing the CPR going down the railway line, showing how the CPR would be prevented from going out on strike, somehow, I don't know how, in the Province of Saskatchewan by the Essential Services Bill. They ran on that and they were defeated on that as they were defeated on deterrent fees. Yet they vote against our action to repeal Bill 2; they vote for our action to remove the deterrent fees. Where is the consistency in their argument?

The simple fact again is simply this. They know that deterrent fees are opposed by the churches, the United Church; they know that deterrent fees are opposed by the medical profession; they know that the deterrent fees are opposed by the Hospital Association; they know now, at least they ought to know now, that deterrent fees are opposed by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. When they were the Government these organizations petitioned the Government and yet they didn't listen. What's the point of my remarks? I will tell you in a brief word or two, Mr. Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson). The point is this: the Liberals support the removal of deterrent fees not because they believe that it is a good thing. They deep down really don't believe that deterrent fees are bad yet. Maybe the Member for Albert Park, the rookie Member (Mr. MacLeod) maybe he sincerely believes it but the people who control that party, they don't deep down believe that deterrent fees are bad. I'll tell you one other reason why, Mr. Speaker, there is a leadership contest about now in the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, the leaders opposite know that potentially they are going to have to perform for all of the back benchers and for all the party members. They think that politically it is good to support the removal of deterrent fees but for cheap political advantage it is good not to support the repeal of Bill 2, and the shallowness and inconsistency of their argument is revealed therein. I want to tell this House and tell the Province of Saskatchewan one thing and this is the real reason why I got into this debate. The Liberal Party will be choosing a new leader. If that new leader happens to be the Minister or former Minister of Welfare (Mr. C. MacDonald) . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, no! No, way!

Mr. Romanow: — I agree it is highly unlikely but if it does or if it happens to be his seatmate, the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, no!

Mr. Romanow: — I agree that is highly unlikely as well. Or if it

happens to be the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, no, no!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . or anybody in the Liberal Party there, I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan and the Members of this House that none of those future leaders really believes in eliminating deterrent fees, not one of them, and I warn the Province of Saskatchewan that if they should ever give the Liberal Party the powers of government again, which I don't think will happen for a long time, but if they ever do that is one of the first things the Liberal Government will do is re-establish deterrent fees on hospitalization and medicare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to say to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and to the Liberal Members opposite that they are not really true believers in the removal. If the people of Saskatchewan don't know it by now I'm going to take the liberty, if I may, to say it very bluntly, if there is any truism that our people in Saskatchewan should know it is this that no Liberal anywhere in the Province of Saskatchewan can ever again be entrusted to the care and control of medicare and hospitalization. So when they are asked to stand up and vote in their place as they will be asked to stand up and vote in their place on this Bill, I ask all Hon. Members to compare their action with their action of three months ago and their action of three years ago, to expose the fallacy, the contradictions and the unprincipled approach of the Members in the Liberal Party opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, you know we started off in this debate in this House suggesting that if there was one thing about this Session it was that it was unnecessary, that it was a grandstand approach and if ever we've had demonstrated just exactly what we mean, it has been by the performance of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). Here he stands up in this House with all the theatrics, with all these oratorical flourishes. You know it is too bad, it is too bad that he didn't have that oratorical approach a year ago for he might now be sitting a little further to the right rather than sitting to the left. You know he says, "It is just the biggest reversal of form he has ever seen," You know, he says, " Please you little fellows over there, repent and put on your sack cloth and ashes."

Well, let me tell him that the Liberal Government or the Liberal Party on this side of this House makes no apologies to the Attorney General or the NDP in this Province for trying to control health costs in this Province. We also make it very clear that we make no apologies for our stand at this time in

this House or in this piece of legislation. And let me tell him also that, yes, we said we would support this Bill but we said we did so with reservation. We did so because we felt that they were throwing out the shackles. We said that they proposed no alternative, that they were acting in an irresponsible manner, that they are turning around and leading Saskatchewan down the first step on the path to the welfare state, that they are turning around and they are driving out industry they are driving out employment, they are providing no opportunities to pay for this and develop the economic base of this Province. And I'm going to tell the Attorney General that we will be looking forward in the years ahead and when we say that deterrent fees are dead, we do not mean that we are not expecting them to put forth some counter-proposal or alternative to controlling the health costs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you again that if every time a piece of Government action that requires an Order-in-Council in the Cabinet room has to be brought into this Session of the Legislature to go with the theatrics that the Attorney General has put forth, what kind of Government will this be in the Province of Saskatchewan? This Bill on these deterrent fees could have been removed on the date that they took over the Government. Instead of that they come in here with their snide remarks, with their bragging, we have listened to more tears and more garbage and more nonsense in the last three days about the poor and the sick and so forth than I've ever heard in my life.

I'm going to tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker. He talks about people standing up and not supporting Bills in this House or speaking against Bills and speaking against the principle of them and then standing up and voting for one. You know I can remember a few occasions too and this isn't the first time that I have sat in this House like many of the new Members. I remember a debate on purple gas and the Attorney General didn't have enough guts to stand on his feet and vote against it even though every Member of his party stood up and spoke against it. Only Art Thibault, the Member for Kinistino and a couple more. And we give him full credit for it. But the Attorney General didn't have enough guts . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — He wasn't here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I meant the Premier. You know I have a little bit of trouble determining which is which. I didn't notice the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) standing up and voting against purple gas, he didn't have the guts.

And then we had homeowner grants. You know they stood up and said, this was a terrible thing. Why the Premier was actually signing a cheque and sending it out to every person in this Province. Political bribery, they said. Why, this

should be given directly to the municipalities. They should be able to remove the burden of taxation directly through the municipalities not this business of turning around and paying it directly to an individual. Yet, Mr. Speaker, how many of them had the guts to stand up on their feet and vote against it. They stood up and very quietly said, Yes, or Yea.

Let me make it very clear to this Province of Saskatchewan and to the NDP across the way, that we are willing at any time to abide by the decision of the people of Saskatchewan. We have lost an election. They have 45 Members and we have 14 and we will support this Bill not because of the actions of the NDP and their grandstand approach, we will support this action because of the decision of the people of Saskatchewan. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we will crawl and crawfish about the principle of acting responsibly in trying to protect our health plans. You know they just have to look around the world and they can find many, many Socialist countries and many, many Socialist states that turn around and offer to provide people from the cradle to the grave, including Great Britain, including Sweden, and look at the economy of those states today, look at the reversal. You know there is one thing about the welfare state, Mr. Speaker, it becomes very popular to initiate and very unpopular to remove; it becomes very politically unpalatable to reverse despite the bad economic effects or the economic realities that are there.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, this Session was supposed to be called to look after the plight of the farmer. They stood on every platform in this Province of Saskatchewan, everyone of those Members went across this Province saying, "The farm income situation is a real tragedy, it's an emergency." Mr. Speaker, at this Session of the Legislature this Government has not provided a five-cent piece to the farmers of this Province. We heard the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) stand on his feet and introduce a resolution calling on the Federal Government to give \$100 million cash injection immediately. Where is that five-cent piece by that Government over there on behalf of the farmers of this Province. What would old Toby say? Old Toby would say, "Oh, it's up to Ottawa." And yet they went the length and breadth of this Province and demanded that this Liberal Government be removed so that they could solve the plight of the farmer in this Province.

This Session, an emergency, a Special Session, has been called, Mr. Speaker, for one purpose and one reason only, to grandstand, to put on the theatrical performance of the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), not to help the farmer.

And the second thing, they went around the province saying, "Why the unemployment situation, it's a tragedy. Why those dirty Liberals in Ottawa and those Liberals in Saskatchewan in their fight against inflation have turned around and generated unemployment." It was rather interesting that in June the latest unemployment statistics showed the Province of Saskatchewan at

2.7; the Province of Manitoba, the Socialist Province, at 4 per cent; but what in this Session of this Legislature has that Government done to help the unemployed in this Province. They have insulted every businessman, every industrialist, every single businessman in the North American continent, and they have created an atmosphere of suspicion and hate and fear that the people of this Province are going to pay for, for the next 50 years. We watched for 20 years while that Government of the NDP and the Socialists were in power in this Province and what did they do? They drove out the businessmen, they created a real fear. Northern Saskatchewan was a desert, it was stagnant. They turned around and they did absolutely nothing. Oh, let's just go back to the records in mineral exploration, forest industries. And now, Mr. Speaker, in five short weeks, led by Premier Blakeney they have insulted every businessman in the Dominion of Canada.

You know, despite the pious platitudes of the Member for University (Mr. Richards), and the other Marxist gobbledegook that's been put forth by those young new Members over there, I want to tell you something. The future of this Province is going to depend upon industrial development, it's going to depend upon creating an atmosphere so people will come to this Province and invest and develop jobs. And don't suggest that your economic Socialism or your Marxism is going to provide that job and that answer. The Province of Saskatchewan watched you try it for 20 years and the failures that you had. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I have heard theatrics and grandstanding from the Attorney General, let's get back to the business of the House.

The House recessed from 5:30 until 7:00 p.m.

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in saying a few words on this Bill, I must say at the outset that I have been rather amused to some extent, amused by some of the statements that have been uttered during this debate. I have been amused by the complete turn about, attempted turn abouts of the Liberal Members sitting opposite. I have been amused by their attempts to try to justify what they now know they must do. I think if it has shown anything clearly and distinctly, it has shown the total and complete philosophical, if you like, difference between those who sit on that side and those who sit here. They talk just as loudly, and just as vehemently in defence of deterrent fees when they brought them in. They tried to tell everyone that it was the right thing to do. Now when they are put on the spot as they have been during this debate and in the presentation of this Bill, they recognize the realities, the total realities of what they have done and what modern society today actually stands for. They are completely and totally out of touch with modern society.

Free Enterprise doesn't ring a bell in anyone's mind any more. We have gone away beyond that stage, away beyond that stage in the development of human beings. Free Enterprise is nothing more than a slogan because in the Free Enterprise system

certainly it is not being practised, it is not being practised at all. We have seen in this debate and we have seen them trying to justify the stand that they took and the stand that they now know they must take if they are ever, ever in the political history of Saskatchewan, to achieve any political credibility. They recognize they must take this stand.

I'd feel rather sorry to be put into a position and a spot like that. I would hate to have to do it myself. If there is such a thing as any respect for principle, respect for what must be done, then certainly the position that these gentlemen have taken must be a difficult and almost impossible one. I have always felt, as most Members on this side have felt and do feel, that in presenting the kind of programs, and the kind of legislation that is in tune and that meets the needs of modern days, that you must have something worthwhile, that you have the ability to recognize this prior to being pushed, prior to being forced into it. This certainly indicates the kind of differences in these two philosophies and in the people who try to promote and represent each kind of philosophy. So if this debate has done nothing else it has served very clearly and very distinctly to separate the total and the basic difference that exists on that side of the House and this, Mr. Speaker.

Now I don't intend to say any more than to outline clearly and to state clearly again, that the people of Saskatchewan on June 23rd, and prior to this, began that recognition when this Bill was introduced. They said, then, oh, oh, let's wait, what is this all about? Liberals in Ottawa reluctantly, very reluctantly had to adopt the principle of a national medicare scheme without deterrent fees. And their colleagues in Saskatchewan said, oh, no, we're smarter, we're wise, we know better. Deterrent fees will do all kinds of things so we'll put it in. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the demonstration has been clear and the message has got through to the people of Saskatchewan and they spoke in a very decisive and in a very clear voice.

An Hon. Member: — The Liberals got the message too.

Mr. Larson: — They have the message today. Yes, after June 23rd, it took that long before it got through.

So I am very happy and very proud, Mr. Speaker, to support this Bill in its present form.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, the debate in the last hour and one-half or two became a much wider ranging debate than what is contained in the amendments to the Medical Are Insurance Act.

Mr. Speaker, in the last hour I have had the privilege of meeting with consultants in the health field who discussed with me and some officials of the Department of Health and tried to demonstrate to us some new concepts of delivery of health services. They seemed to be well informed. These people seem to know what they are talking about and told us that there are ways of reducing the delivery of health services by about 35 per cent. These are people who are building hospitals and health clinics all over the world and they tell us they have 70 different projects underway, Mr. Speaker. Certainly the explanations and the ideas they presented are indeed imaginative and worth considering. It is with this kind of an attitude, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the Department of Health are today looking at the delivery of health services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members opposite have been making accusations that the purpose of this Session was to have some kind of a circus or some kind of a competition for no reason other than a political motive. From the standpoint of the Department of Health and from the standpoint of our political party, this Session was called to do some things that need to be done; to do those things that we made commitments to the people of Saskatchewan. We promised the people of Saskatchewan that the New Democratic Party, if elected to form a government, would remove deterrent fees, both from medical and hospital care services. We promised the people of Saskatchewan that if we were elected those 65 years of age and over will be exempt from the payment of hospital and medical care premiums. This is precisely what we are doing.

You know it is interesting to see the change of heart and change of attitude that has really occurred in the last five weeks. But there are still those sitting on the opposite side of the House who are making the identical speeches that they made in 1968. They repeat the same arguments, repeat their old convictions which have proven to be unacceptable to the people of Saskatchewan. But there is one very significant change, after they finish speaking justifying deterrent fees, they all end up saying, "I will support the Bill."

I was interested in the remarks of the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) when he told us during his contributions to this debate that he had never supported the idea of deterrent fees, that he had hoped that there would never be reason or justification to introduce them again. He repeated on several occasions that he really never agreed with the Liberal Party when they introduced deterrent fees. Yet, it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that out of his own committee room this particular leaflet was being distributed. It was out of his committee rooms that this particular leaflet was picked up. It's a leaflet that was printed at the expense of the Government and it bears the name of the former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and among the things that this leaflet states, it says: "Have utilization fees been effective?" The answer is, "Yes," because of the fees, "demands on physicians' time had lessened." Mr. Speaker, we have asked time and time again

since 1968 whether this was a fact. There was no proof, no study to demonstrate that this was a fact. The other argument to, "Have utilization fees been effective?" says:

"This has given them the opportunity to care for more patients. The hospital utilization fees have assured each citizen better access to a hospital bed when needed."

Mr. Speaker, I have checked this carefully with my officials. There has been no reduction in the hospital stay since utilization fees have been introduced. The interesting last comment in this particular leaflet is, "The alarming increase in the demand for health services appears to have slowed down." I could read more excerpts from this leaflet. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that I have checked with my officials as to the facts that are contained in this leaflet and they tell me that the actual facts have never been checked with them. These statements were apparently prepared by McLarens Advertising Agency, dug up by themselves without checking the facts, because a number of things that appear in this leaflet do not square with the facts of the Department of Public Health. Yet the Hon. Member from Albert Park, who claims he opposes utilization fees, had these very leaflets in his committee rooms. I am glad that he is disassociating himself with this kind of literature. I hope that he would also rise sometime in his place and say that he would disassociate himself with the Government paying the cost of political literature that was being distributed by the Liberals at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, questions were also asked as to what we are doing for the farmers and the workers of the Province of Saskatchewan. And there was reference that very soon there would be rising tax increases.

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Member has made an allegation that certain material came out of my committee rooms. I should like to know what the material is. I notice that he has failed to file it. I think that surely I have the right to see what it is. I notice he has read some things from it but he hasn't read it all and he then set it back on his desk. I should like to have it tabled.

Mr. Smishek: — I shall be glad to table this particular document, this particular leaflet. It was published by Saskatchewan Government Information Services. It was used in every Liberal committee room, including the committee rooms of Albert Park because that's where this particular leaflet was picked up. I shall be glad to table this leaflet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, reference was also made that shortly hereafter

there will be tax increases as a result of us removing utilization fees and that they will fall most heavily on the low-income people. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me inform this House that this Session was called at this time to do something very concretely about removing the tax from the sick people of Saskatchewan. We are eliminating the deterrent fees which means a tax reduction to the people of Saskatchewan to the tune of \$7.5 million, at least . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — We are also eliminating the payment of premiums for those 65 years of age and over, which will mean a tax reduction of \$3 million. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in total this tax reduction to the people of Saskatchewan as of August 1st will be in excess of \$10.5 million a year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I ask, Mr. Speaker, did the Liberals during seven years of office ever introduce a tax reduction for the people of Saskatchewan to the extent of \$10.5 million?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, you know they told us that we should implement some further commitments during this Session., I can assure them that in the health field, the commitments that we made to the people of Saskatchewan will be fulfilled during our term of office. There may be some difficulties but I can tell the Members opposite and the people of Saskatchewan that since taking office, I have met with the officials of the Department of Health, they are indeed informed about the commitments the New Democratic Party made to the people of Saskatchewan. I can also tell them that the people in the Health Department are very excited, they are excited about some of our new ideas, about our new approaches, and many of them are very much excited and are working on proposals and ideas of how we can implement our program.

In the months ahead we shall be introducing more of our programs. There is perhaps even a more important thing. For the first time in seven years they feel that the lid has been lifted, and they wanted to apply their talents. For seven years the Liberals kept a lid on the employees and they weren't given the opportunity to use their talents and to explore new ideas and new methods in the delivery of health services to the people of Saskatchewan.

So when the Liberals talk about us introducing more of our programs now, I want to remind them of their 1966 promises. I have here a newspaper clipping, it's from the New Optimist. I believe it is the North Battleford newspaper of April 29, 1966.

At that time the Minister of Health, Mr. Steuart promised the people of Saskatchewan that within a period of 24 months following April 29, 1966, they would have a public drug care plan, Mr. Speaker. This is the story that appears. For five years thereafter the people of Saskatchewan waited and did they get an insured public drug plan? No, Mr. Speaker, we're still waiting.

During the 1967 election, the Liberals promised that there would be a plebiscite on a drug plan. We have waited for almost four years and there has been no plebiscite in the case of a drug plan. And they expect that within a period of five weeks we should be able to introduce a drug plan and that we would be able to introduce other new health services. We said as the first priority we would remove and abolish medical and hospital deterrent fees. We said as the next priority we would exempt those 65 years of age from payment of medical and hospital premiums.

This is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, at this Session. We're doing other things in the field of health. In the months ahead, the people of Saskatchewan will see the implementation of our program. We made a commitment to the people. We intend to keep the commitment to the people and despite what the former Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) said that the Medical Care Act which was legislated back in 1961 made provision for deterrent fees, the fact remains that the New Democratic Government, or at that time the CCF Government, never applied, never used that provision of the Act. It was included in the Act, based on the advice of the Thompson Committee. But based on the conviction of the CCF Government that deterrent fees were wrong they were not implemented. It was the Liberals who implemented and instituted deterrent fees. No other province in the Dominion of Canada imposed deterrent fees. As the former Minister of Health is fully aware, the Province of Alberta had deterrent fees for hospital care but they have now been removed. In the Province of Alberta . . .

Mr. Grant: — On a point of order. The Hon. Member is incorrect. The Province of Alberta charges an admission fee for admission to the hospital.

Mr. Smishek: — That, Mr. Speaker, is hardly a point of order. They do have a \$5 admission fee but that is not a deterrent fee, Mr. Speaker, that is not a deterrent fee in the way that a person has to pay for each day of his care for the first 90 days or every time he has to go and see the doctor he has to pay \$1.50 for each visit.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of removing this tax from the sick and I hope that from here on the people will use the services freely, despite the references that have been made that somehow people will become irresponsible and that somehow the doctors will start taking advantage of medicare. I have enough

confidence in the people of Saskatchewan, and enough confidence in the medical profession that this will not be the case, and I know they do welcome the removal of deterrent fees. I feel confident they will be responsible and that they will co-operate with the Government of Saskatchewan to ensure that our health services are used prudently and wisely by all concerned so that we can move ahead in extending public health services in the months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. K. Macleod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on that point of order now. I didn't want to interrupt the Minister when he was speaking but he has, in fact, I think, made an inaccurate statement. That brochure, that pamphlet did not come from one of our committee rooms. If it did it was done by stealth or something else but it certainly didn't come out of my committee rooms. As a matter of fact, we just did not distribute that pamphlet. And if that pamphlet — if it was left lying around anywhere — I can assure you it was totally accidental. Nobody was given any of those things freely and voluntarily because that particular pamphlet I had read and I had directed that it not be distributed.

Now, the Minister said that it came out of my committee room or that he picked it up there, or somebody from his group picked it up. No, we didn't distribute it.

An Hon. Member: — We don't allow Socialists in the committee rooms!

Mr. MacLeod: — Although they showed up!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Right! I say that he made a statement that is not accurate and I think he should withdraw it.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, that particular leaflet was given to me during the election campaign by people who tell me they were in the Hon. Member's committee rooms and that they picked it up and they delivered that leaflet, together with other leaflets that were being distributed from various committee rooms, and were printed at the expense of the Government. If the Member says they were not distributed from his committee rooms, then perhaps the people misused his name but this was what was told to me and I'm not trying to make any kind of aspersions against the Member except that they told me that's where the leaflet was picked up.

Mr. MacLeod: — I will accept his withdrawal, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 51

Messieurs

Blakeney	Brown	Hanson
Brockelbank	Kwasnica	Oliver
Byers	Carlson	Feschuk
Wood	Engel	Kaeding
Smishek	Tchorzewski	Flasch
Romanow	Richards	Gardner
Messer	Owens	Grant
Snyder	Larson	MacDonald
MacMurchy	Taylor	(Milestone)
Kowalchuk	Faris	McIsaac
Baker	Dyck	Loken
Thibault	Cowley	Weatherald
Matsalla	Cody	MacLeod
Robbins	Feduniak	McPherson
Pepper	Mostoway	Lane
Michayluk	Comer	MacDonald
Meakes	Rolfes	(Moose Jaw North)
Whelan	Lange	

NAYS — 00

Messieurs

SECOND READINGS

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 5 — **An Act to amend The Cancer Control Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I propose to be very, very brief in moving second reading of this Bill.

The amendments are related to the removal of the medical and hospital deterrent fees from this particular Act. Subsection (1) of Section 3 of the Act states that a cancer patient is entitled to care and treatment for his cancer condition at the expense of the province. In 1968 this Act was amended to provide that a cancer patient would be subject to the hospital deterrent fee authorized under The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. This provision is now being repealed.

The Act was also amended in 1968 to provide that a cancer patient would be subject to payment of deterrent fee charges by a physician in connection with his medical care and treatment. In fact, the medical care deterrent fees to be charged against the cancer patients were never authorized under the Act and I

commend the former Government for not implementing that provision.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will now remove from the Statutes the power of permitting medical care deterrent fees to be charged against the patients in respect of medical care, as well as in the case of hospital care and with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour) that Bill No. 6 — **An Act to Repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act**, 1966 be now read a second time.

Mr. K. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — I rise in connection with this Bill, Bill No. 6 — a proposal to eliminate what has commonly been known as Bill 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act.

It was with considerable interest, Mr. Speaker, that I listened to the comments of the Minister of Labour in presenting and supporting the legislation to eliminate this Act, and I cannot help but express some disappointment at his remarks, Mr. Speaker, because I think he directed them almost entirely to the political arena, and he has in no way attempted to give any assistance to this House in considering the problem in any depth.

For the purpose of discussing this particular problem, the labor problem related to Bill 2, for that's what I propose to refer to it as, I should like to deal with it under one or two or three categories and I think, Mr. Speaker, there has been a basic misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Bill 2 for what it is, for what it stands for and particularly its place in a growing and developing industrial society, the problem that it was intended to solve and the ways in which it does in fact fall short of dealing properly with one or two of our fundamental problems.

Without getting too technical, I propose to sort out some of our laboring people into the various categories and I have put them into three separate groups.

The first group deals primarily with that service or services provided by the state. In days gone by a man was his own policeman or his own fireman but in our society, of course, we ask that he lay aside his knife and his gun and we say that he and his children will be protected, we will provide him with firefighting services, we no longer live where a fire in his house or your house will travel down the street to destroy mine. Now these agencies of protection are very vital and necessary and fall into what I define as "essential service" and "an

emergency service". An emergency service being, in my view, (1) The temporary withdrawal of which creates an emergency.

Now these agencies — the police and the firefighters, the hospital workers — this group have made us very dependent upon them but they have not actually said, although they might well have said, as a general practice, "now that you're dependent upon us, we demand more than our fair share of the goods and products of our society, more than is fair compared to the amount of the training, and the energy and the responsibility that we, as individuals, assume." They might well have said that but they have not.

Now, our policemen have not been overpaid and our firemen are not overpaid and our hospital workers are not overpaid. These essential services, the employees of our civic government, have wages growing, in many cases, far too slowly having regard to the inflation and the growth of incomes around them and as I mentioned, the training, the energy and the responsibility required of them.

I want to say that I personally take the view and the position that The Essential Services Emergency Act has done more for them or can do more for them than the lack of it. The City of Regina policemen received last year — in fact this current year — a 14 per cent increase in wages. This was granted rather unwillingly by the city government and I am convinced far more was received by the city policemen as the result of the potential threat of The Essential Services Emergency Act than is going to be the case in future without the threat.

Now, in Saskatoon there was a friend of mine when I broke into the practice of law — that was in 1954. This gentleman was Deputy Police Chief Mackey. And Deputy Police Chief Mackey at that time had served some 47 years in the Saskatoon City police force. He had attained the age of 65 years. He arrived in Canada from Scotland — an excellent place from which to arrive. He had entered the City police force at the age 18 and had served faithfully and continuously ever since. He had paid regularly into the pension fund provided by the City of Saskatoon, yet he was unable, when he was 65 years, to take his retirement because the retirement fund was totally and absolutely inadequate to provide him for his retirement years. That, and the old age pension provided by the National Government were together inadequate. He was therefore obliged to apply to the City of Saskatoon and received an extension of his term of office, not for one year, not for two years, but after I left some two and one-half years later, he was still having his term of office extended by the City of Saskatoon.

I don't know what has happened to Deputy Police Chief Mackey in this interval, but I know that it is an evil, that after 49 years on the police force of Saskatoon, perhaps longer, in the service of one employer, the people of the City of Saskatoon, he was still unable to provide for his old age. Now that is a condition which existed entirely throughout the period

when we did not have an Essential Services Emergency Act. That was entirely during the period when we had the free bargaining power between these people and the City of Saskatoon. And in my submission, and in my personal view and I believe the view of our Caucus, the presence of The Essential Services Emergency Act can do a great deal for them.

Now it is true that over the years there has been a potential threat of strikes from these essential services, the police, the hospital workers and the firemen. And except for two notable exceptions, the Boston police strike and the Montreal police strike, by and large these people have continued to serve the population despite the fact that they had no adequate remedy, short of strike action, to demand and receive their fair share of the goods of society.

We had, in 1954 and 1956, the years I talked about, 12 years under the CCF. The essential point which I wish to make with respect to this particular kind of service is that under this advanced legislation there was nothing more than permission to live in accordance with the law of the jungle. But this group to which I refer were not in any way assisted by this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with what I regard as category (2). There is a condition peculiar to our economic and industrialized society. We have long recognized that there are certain conditions and certain people who have, what we have described, as a monopolistic position in our society. I can give you a few examples. In Canada, the right to run a railway is regarded as monopolistic. You have to get permission from the Federal Government before you can commence to construct a railway. Telephones and power, both electrical and natural gas, are regarded as monopolistic. The right to run an airline is regarded as monopolistic. The entire transportation system, by and large, is regarded as monopolistic and essential. And into this category, I should put the grainhandlers and the operators of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The essential character of this, to me, is that the state owns the right to grant these monopolies, but the grantee is normally one or other of either a Crown corporation or some private body. These monopolistic licenses are granted because there is just no other way reasonably to handle it. There is no other way to handle the telephone system. You cannot have competition regionally amongst telephone people. We cannot have two or three groups competing for a seaway. So there monopoly is defined for my purposes, and I think for society's purposes, as a group which has, by its unique position in society, an unusual economic power over other members of society to the extent that other members of society can be put to ransom. We have, therefore, installed special rules to deal with these monopolies. Having gained a license for a monopoly, a monopoly is not permitted — that is, the licensee is not permitted — to discontinue that service without the consent of the body which allowed the service in the first place. This service must be

provided to all who are willing to pay the price, controlled by the monopolistic controlling authority. It may not be discontinued and that is why we have the applications and the hearings and all the rest of it. These services must be, once provided, continuously provided at prices which are controlled. And this, I think is another essential part of it. It is the price that is controlled. There is no question about it, that with power and telephones and the use of the seaway, it must be open to those who are willing to pay for it and those who are willing to use it. And the cost is determined by some person other than the licensee of the monopoly.

How is it then, that in this industrialized society that we have taken the power of ransom out of the hands of the licensee of a monopoly and have placed it in the hands of a union? We say to the railway, "You cannot stop that train. You must, even at a loss, continue to run it until you get permission to discontinue it." But we do not say to the union that this is an essential service and you cannot have the right to discontinue it. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is it less essential when the union discontinues the service than when a monopolistic licensee discontinues the service? Does it make sense that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is required to service all who are willing to pay the controlled price, and yet give someone else the authority and the power to discontinue that service?

I think that the time has come when we must recognize that there are certain monopolistic rights in our society. And that these rights have been granted but are owned by the Government. That the prices paid by the consumers have been, and must always be controlled.

If in the depth of winter, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation came to me and said, "Ken, we are doubling the price of your natural gas," I should have no choice but to pay it. I should hate it and I shouldn't like it, but I would pay it. I would pay it because I have to pay it. I would be put to ransom.

But the power which has been denied to the licensee of this monopoly has now been transferred and granted to the union. It has the absolute power to do what we have long recognized in society we must not permit the licensee of these monopolies to do.

Now, the third point that I would like to categorize deals with the inadequacies of our labor laws in relation to the man who is not in the position of an essential service. That is a true service like the police, hospital, firemen, or the employees of licensees of monopolies, that are workers who fall in all other categories.

Now this is the condition which is most frequently described by the union. In recent political debates, it seems to me rather interesting, that on the Liberal side we heard a great deal of discussion over the loss of essential services. And on the other side we heard a great deal of discussion on the

right and the joys of free bargaining. It seems to me that we were not really talking about the same thing because nine times out of ten, I am quite sure, those who talked about the joys of free bargaining were talking about the old style group of people who did not fall into what I call category (1) or (2).

But the third group is all other groups of workers. Generally conflicts in this area are localized. They are localized as to the people involved, the laborers, the management involved, and usually to the local immediate geographical area surrounding the economic area affected. So a strike in the potash mine of International Minerals and Chemicals would undoubtedly have serious effects upon the company and upon the workers, on the very neighboring town, but by and large, it doesn't fall into the same category as a strike by Saskatchewan Power Corporation employees.

The same is true, Mr. Speaker, of a strike of the Prince Albert pulp mill. It would hurt the workers and it would hurt the company and it would probably hurt the City of Prince Albert, but it just isn't quite in the same category as a strike in the railways of Canada that haul the grains to markets.

Now the third kind of problem that I have mentioned is one involving a traditional labor-management form of dispute. And it isn't quite so critical except that it may drag on for days, weeks or months. It was this field that is most commonly discussed. It was in this field that the original growth of reform legislation that came following World War I and World War II. It was a part of our growing society.

Now, historically in Saskatchewan, what we did, of course, was adopt Federal legislation and Manitoba legislation to the point that by the time of the '40s we had the right to bargain collectively and we had the right to bargain individually, and we had the right to organize. And in 1944 the Government changed and the CCF Government then adopted the type of legislation that they had in the United States, the Wagner Act, which had been enacted in the United States in 1935. It was very closely patterned after this one and similar legislation, of course, has followed across Canada.

I am concerned, because, while this has given the worker the right to organize and the right to strike, it hasn't gone any further. During the election I was pleased to discuss this thing with a lot of people. I want to tell you about one man who I think is typical. This fellow is a laboring man. He has a new house, and he has a new car, and he has a new wife, and I think in due course he will have a brand new baby. Now he tells me that as a union man he supports Bill No. 2. He tells me that he is not getting a bad wage at the present time, but he would like some more. Now he is no different from anybody else in that regard. What he cannot afford is a lengthy strike. Now his employment is covered by Bill No. 2 — this particular individual. But what if it were not. Well he could very easily be called to go on strike against his wishes, strike for a long

August 3, 1971

period of time and lose all sorts of money. Lose his house and his home. He is, Mr. Speaker, left to the law of the jungle. And in my submission, neither we nor the Government across the way, nor the last Government have done anything for this person, except — I shouldn't say the last Government — the CCF Government. As I recognize Bill 2 it is a growth in labor legislation. A proper administration of Bill 2, it seems to me, would require that it be equally available to management and to labor, to the employer, the employee as an individual and to the union.

Now Bill 2 potentially is a tremendous benefit to each and every working man. Under this type of an arrangement the policeman in the City of Regina doesn't have to worry about having to go on strike and can go to whatever tribunal deals with the organization under Bill 2, whatever is set up under that type of structure and he can get just treatment. Bill 2 means that you can continue to draw every nickel of your regular salary, and having drawn every nickel of your salary, you can still be heard to ask for more. And if I were still a union man, in any industry or situation which was not covered by Bill 2, I should want it to be covered by Bill 2.

If I were in the monopolistic condition, that is, if I were an employee of Saskatchewan Power Corporation or the Telephone Corporation, or the seaway workers, or somebody in that condition, perhaps I should oppose Bill 2. I should oppose it because in my hands as a union man I have the power of ransom which is denied to other organizations. But if I were any other worker, Mr. Speaker, I would insist that Bill 2 remain. If I were a policeman, fireman, hospital worker, anybody else in this Province, except perhaps those who have the power of a monopoly, I would demand that Bill 2 would remain in effect.

So it seems clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the elimination of Bill 2 is simply and totally an instrument of a limited group of union people. Unions which are internationally connected. Unions which are heavily and totally politically connected. I should like to repeat that — I think that this has been brought in for their benefit and for their benefit alone. The offerings of this Government on this Bill are not in the best interests of the working man. I say that more harm and damage is going to be done to him by this legislation than anything brought into this House in the last 20 years.

Now nobody ever believed that Bill 2 was the final step. I think that Bill 2 was born of necessity. It was just a step along the way. It solved a permanent and nagging continuous problem in a temporary way, but it was part of our growth. It is like a gravelled road, I suppose, it was better than what came before but not as good as what should come after.

This is one thing about the last Liberal Government that I did support very strongly. And that is the proposal to go another step. It promised labor-management courts. I don't care whether we call them labor-management courts or we do something

different. But some kind of a tribunal is necessary. As a candidate I didn't run so much in support of Bill 2 as I ran in support of the development that will go along, and should go along, following Bill 2. So I am pretty disappointed in the Government. I am disappointed because it ignores the problems which have existed and which still exist. And above all because this proposal ignores the working man.

So we have freed the working man over the years from the domination of management and we have handed him over to the domination of the union. If there was something else, I should be pleased. Is there a plan of study or research into this entire question to consider the rights of all the parties? Well, there is not. I would gladly support a Bill for real reform, that is a Bill which really tackles the problem, a Bill which offers something to the workmen.

I believe that people want this kind of a tribunal, the kind of a tribunal for which everyone, including an employer, the union and the individual himself, can go and get justice and fair treatment. In my view the present Labour Relations Board and the Labour Relations Act is so constructed that only one party has any real hearing, and that is the union. In my view unions do . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Under the present board?

Mr. MacLeod: — Under any board constructed under the present Labour Relations Act. I'm not talking about the quality or the character or the bias or lack of bias of any member on that board. I am talking about the form and structure of our Labour Relations Act.

Let me give you a quick example. I was consulted not too long ago by some people from Chrysler Canada. What happened there was that Chrysler Canada was about to transfer its operations to Winnipeg — some of them. It had a distribution depot in Regina and it opened one in Winnipeg. The Regina one was unionized and they asked some people if they wanted to move to Winnipeg because they were reducing staff here. They did. Now the older fellows here, those who had reached senior positions and seniority rights and were well established and had gone along way up the ladder. They were well established in Regina, they had homes and they had friends, cottages at the beach and they didn't want to go, but they were the receivers and the shippers and the fellows who had the higher categories, the higher paid jobs so they stayed. The junior men all moved to Winnipeg because they had nothing to lose. Some three years later Chrysler Canada decided to close its office here and made an offer to the workmen here to move to Winnipeg. In the meantime, of course, this Winnipeg office had been totally unionized with a new union local still under the United Auto Workers of America, under the same union. But when the people went from here to Winnipeg they had to apply for union membership in the new union and they were put at the bottom of the seniority list. So people who had

August 3, 1971

worked 10, 20 and 30 years for Chrysler Canada found themselves starting in all over at the bottom again. They went to the union and the union did nothing for them.

Mr. Romanow: — Change the union officers.

Mr. MacLeod: — Well that's just great — change the officers. Wouldn't it be nice for these people to have some place to go to get some fair treatment. My suggestion is that the unions do not protect anything but the unions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Now I'm not blaming anybody in this Local in Regina. They did their level best but the system as it was constructed did not protect them.

Mr. Romanow: — Who are the unions supposed to protect?

Mr. MacLeod: — Well at that time I was trying to protect these people.

The point I make, Mr. Speaker, is this: that big unionism all too frequently is more concerned with its own size and in its own big unionism than it is with the worker. For my part, Mr. Speaker, this Opposition and the Liberal Caucus is determined to support the rights of the worker, the actual man who does the packing and the actual man who does the work. I'm not on the side of huge organized monopolistic labor unless that organized labor is on the side and can actually be proven to be of assistance to the worker. That's the position that we adopt.

Now the Bill that we have here is nothing more than a publicity stunt. I just can't go along with it. Now my vote isn't so much a vote for the retention of Bill 2 and I intend to oppose its repeal, this Bill that is presented is a vote against the failure of this Government to go ahead. The time has come to take another step and I think the last Government more than anything clearly understood that Bill 2 was inadequate but it was far superior to anything that had been presented before it. My position is for the improvement and the development of the labor laws and the lot of the working man. Those who say otherwise misrepresent what I stand for. I am voting for the union man himself and for the workman. I vote against this law of the jungle.

If I may turn for a moment to explain a little more clearly what I have in mind, let me return to the remarks of the Hon. Minister. He talked about employee morale. Well I have in my hands a clipping from the Leader-Post of July 24, 1971. The headline is: "Hospital strike in tenth month." It is rather a lengthy one so I won't read it, but it describes the strike that has occurred in the Victoria Geriatric Hospital after a

ten-month strike by the Canadian Union of Public Employees. Their demands were for more money and simply for better working conditions. There were 28 employees. The position of the company was that they couldn't afford to pay any more because, quite frankly, they were losing money and the operator of the hospital had to discontinue operation and the owner of the hospital took the thing back over under his direct supervision. The strike co-ordinator said that, "The union is now going to mount another offensive in an effort to settle the thing to get a negotiated settlement within a month," so they hope to settle before the end of August. Now there had been a proposal. The company had said that it was going broke so the unions had said, "Fine, let us send in an accountant to determine what your profits and losses are." The owners wouldn't let them do that so they describe this as a fight for justice on the one hand and a fight for justice on the other hand — both parties seeking justice. But the administrator of the hospital said that those people who walked out on the elderly just didn't deserve to work there, they aren't socially responsible. The owners of the hospital said they just could never hire back the same workers who had walked off the job ten months earlier. "They are not the kind of people who should be allowed near sick people." Well now it "slays" me too and I'll tell you why. This, the employee morale that was discussed . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — It would be very interesting to know and I'm not buying any of the arguments that are put in this paper at all. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that on the one hand they say they are going broke and they will never hire back these other people; the other side, the union says: "Look if you say you are going broke just show us, we'll send in an accountant and we will look at your books and we will decide whether you are going broke." But, no, the owners wouldn't do that. So there's the situation and the two of them have been fighting for ten months. And the owners say they will never hire back the kind of people who walked off the job at that time. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of employee morale that results from the law of the jungle that is described by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) across the way when he is supporting this Bill. That's the kind of employee morale we are talking about.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, he says if a genuine emergency arises it can still be handled by the legislative action to deal with that one problem. Quite obviously the Bill isn't disappearing at all. They are erasing the writing when it is still on the books for all practical purposes. Because if anybody strikes, while we don't have it in legislative form, but we have taken one step back from that. We can easily come back into this House and put it back into legislative form and that's the threat he gives them. For all practical purposes that is the threat that existed before Bill 2, that is the threat that existed during Bill 2 and it will exist after Bill 2, but the one thing it won't do, Mr. Speaker, is solve the

problem.

Now there is one thing that was stated by the Hon. Minister of Labour when he was speaking and that is this: he said, and I have his remarks in front of me -

There can be no more damning evidence of the extent to which Bill 2 has no place in our democratic society than its relationship to International Labor Organization Convention 87 dealing with the freedom of association. This Convention which has been ratified by 77 countries provides that workers and employees shall have the right to establish organizations and join organizations without interference from public authorities.

Then he goes on to say:

Unbelievable as it may seem, Mr. Speaker, it has not been possible for a progressive country like Canada to ratify this Convention because assurance cannot be given that the terms of the Convention will be carried out throughout this country. The sole reason for the inability of the Canadian Government to ratify the Convention is the existence of the Essential Services Emergency Act with its clauses involving compulsory arbitration, the decertification of the unions and other heavy penalties.

Well I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is absolutely and totally incorrect. Mr. Speaker, the ILO Convention 87 is the Convention which deals with the freedom of association and protection of the rights to organize. It's part of the constitution of ILO and it is one of their conventions. Quite frankly the Canadian Labour Congress took a complaint to the ILO dealing with this particular legislation and the ILO committee on freedom of association dismissed this complaint as it related to Saskatchewan. It upheld the complaint as it related to Newfoundland and it so happens that Canada could not ratify Convention 87 until each and every one of the 10 provinces agreed to it. Now he holds up Saskatchewan for reasons which are immaterial because Newfoundland itself was the one that caused the trouble and it was not Saskatchewan.

The complaint was dismissed as far as Saskatchewan was concerned. In the particular commentary about it, the committee of the ILO considered the provisions of The Essential Services Emergency Act of Saskatchewan dealing with the prohibition of strikes and it did not find that Saskatchewan contravened Convention 87 and the reasons it gave were as follows: firstly, that the Act does not come into operation automatically; secondly, that to have this Act come into force a proclamation had to be made prescribing certain conditions and stating that those conditions existed; thirdly, that provision was made, in fact, for arbitration; fourthly, the arbitration procedures were acceptable to the ILO because the interested parties, all of them, are involved and have representatives on the board

and have a fair hearing; and lastly, because the award is binding, not only on the workers but upon the management.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the statements made on the fourth day of debate, August 2, were that Saskatchewan was such a terrible place because the ILO was so upset over this particular thing. The fact is that the Canadian Labour Congress's complaint was dismissed as it related to Saskatchewan for the reasons I have given.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I may summarize. We've got a variety of people and a variety of conditions in our society who deserve protection. The best protection offered by this Government is that they be put back in the law of the jungle; that they be allowed to fight like this Victoria Hospital strike. Well my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is quite frankly that Bill 2 should be left as it is until we can come to grips with the real problem. I think we should give a lot more research into this, Mr. Speaker. I think we should have hearings into the problem; we should listen to everybody who is interested — the union, management, the public and the workmen and the consumer. I think the time has come when there has got to be a better way to solve the problems of labor-management disputes. I think that we have failed to do that. We have talked for votes but we haven't talked for people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope I have not too tediously tried to set out the fact that we are for the workman, we are not necessarily for the union, we are for the people. We intend to vote against the elimination of Bill 2. I would sooner see us going the other way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the proud moments of my life. As you know, Sir, when this Bill was brought in and later when further amendments to Bill 2 were brought in, the New Democratic MLAs, including myself, opposed this Bill. At that time I stated my reasons and I do not intend to spend much time tonight repeating them but I want to say this, that I spent my whole life — grown up life — fighting for minority rights and for the democratic process. As has been quoted so many times in this Legislature, Abraham Lincoln's saying that, "The only difference between a free man and a slave is that a free man can withhold his service", is as true as it was the day he said it.

At my father's knee I was taught that other people's rights must be protected. At his knee I heard the stories of the struggle of the miners of Wales and the struggles of the miner in the United States and the struggles of these people to become masters of their own destiny. I spent practically all my life on the farm except for a few short months when I worked in Sudbury for International Nickel. And it was here for the first time that I realized that the laboring man has really the same problems and the same enemies as we farmers. In a sense I

really hadn't intended to speak in this debate until I listened to the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) the other day and I could not help but wonder if that speech had been written by the Manufacturers' Association of Canada. It was certainly the same speech that we have listened to through the years.

For 11 years the Liberal Party in this Province has expounded their philosophy and for those same years the New Democrats expounded the opposite. When the election was called on May 25 the then Premier said the issue would be labor courts and the doing away of strikes. Accepting the issue, I and all the other New Democratic candidates, went out and faced our electorate. I, for one, raised it at every opportunity. It is practically a completely rural constituency. I was elected as were 44 other New Democratic MLAs.

Let us look particularly at the rural ridings. I think back to the last few years in this House to those Liberal MLAs of the last Legislature who peddled the anti-labor line and especially those from the rural constituencies who peddled it. I looked around this House and looked and tried to find where the ex-Minister of Labour, the then Hon. Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), a rural constituency, where his philosophy of labor was rejected. Look at the other ex-Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) from Last Mountain, again a completely rural constituency, who brought in vicious legislation last winter and the people of that rural constituency, the farmers of Last Mountain, rejected the labor philosophy of the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — And then I think of that anti-labor resolution and the resolution on labor courts that was brought in by the then Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willow Bunch (Mr. Hooker) and I looked around and I tried to find him and I find that, too, that rural constituency of Notukeu-Willow Bunch, the farming people of that riding, rejected the philosophy of the Hon. Member. They rejected that retrograde philosophy. Then I look around and I think of the Member, then from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell), he too got up and spoke on all those different resolutions. This too is again a rural riding full of farmers. My friends across the way when they were here were saying labor was the enemy of farmers. But these farmers rejected this anti-labor philosophy of the Liberal Party. I think of the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), and again I can't find him in this House. Again he was one who got up and spoke on the Bill on anti-labor legislation and he too was rejected. The farmers of Elrose rejected him.

I think of the ex-Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) another man who voted for that anti-labor philosophy legislation enacted by the then Liberal Government. Where is he? Also the farmers of Humboldt rejected the philosophy of the Liberal Party in regard to labor.

I think of the ex-Minister of Agriculture, the Member from Qu'Appelle Wolseley, the Hon. Doug McFarlane, and he forever was getting up and speaking on those resolutions. And his philosophy too was rejected when he went to the people. The people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley would not accept that philosophy of the Liberal Party.

I think of the ex-Member for Pelly, Hon. Ross Barrie. He, too, his electors rejected him and I believe one of the main reasons was because of the philosophy of anti-labor expounded by the Liberal Government of the day.

And then we come to that Hon. Member from Estevan. I'll admit that Estevan is a small city but there's a large rural area and I think if I look at my hon. friend, he will agree that it was the rural areas voted against the Hon. Member for Estevan, who was then Mr. MacDougall. Again the farming people rejected this anti-labor philosophy expounded by the Liberal Government and the Liberal Party.

I think of the Hon. Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, Bill Howes, a personal friend of mine, but he, too, voted for all this anti-labor legislation and he, too, didn't come back to this House. The farmers, the grain farmers, of that area rejected the philosophy expounded by the Liberal Party.

And I think of the Hon. Member from Arm River, Mr. McIvor. He, too, voted for this legislation and he, too, was rejected by the farming people of that constituency.

And I look — I'm sorry he has left his seat, he was here but I guess I drove him out — but I think of what happened to that great majority of the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). You know, the Hon. Member from Rosthern was able to pile up a very impressive majority, and my hon. friend, the Member for Rosthern, lost the election in terms of what he usually got. I think in this last election, if I'm not mistaken, he got around 2,500 votes, this time somewhere around in the 300 group.

An Hon. Member: — 224!

Mr. Meakes: — 224. Again this rural constituency — and it certainly is a rural constituency — the farming people of that community rejected the philosophy of the Liberal Party in terms of labor. And again he's not in his seat but I looked at the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) — I'm coming to you Tom!

Mr. Weatherald: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I looked at the Member for Milestone and his majority, too, was cut. Certainly another very rural constituency and if the people of Milestone had thought that this anti-labor legislation expounded by the Liberal Party was so good, they would have elected him with a much larger majority.

And now I come to my friend from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and he, too, you know had quite a large majority and he, too, stood up — I believe it was right here where he stood — and he stood up in his place and he voted for this anti-labor legislation brought in by the Liberal Government. He, too, got cut down to a pretty thin majority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out, and I stand to be corrected, only six farming communities over there sent any of their Liberal representatives back to this House. I want to suggest that it's mainly because of the anti-labor philosophy of the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — And I'll tell you why, because no longer can they fool farm people. Our farming people know, they've either got a son or a daughter or a brother or a sister or an uncle or an aunt who are in the labor force, and they know that these terrible labor people are often their relations and they know that they're not getting a good square deal, any more than the farmers. This is the reason why they were rejected.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we've heard enough from the other side and I give them all a right so speak but certainly the record of what happened to them with their anti-labor legislation should be enough for them to realize that the people of Saskatchewan, the farming people, the city people, don't want the type of legislation that was brought in by the previous Government.

And I say as I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I will say again, as I said at the beginning — it's a proud moment for me that I stand here as one who is doing away with some of the worst legislation that was ever enacted in the Dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in speaking to Bill 6 which, when enacted, will repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act.

I should like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by paraphrasing something that Abraham Lincoln said and he said something like this: "The only difference between a free man and a slave was that a free man could withhold his labor." Any standing law, Mr. Speaker, I believe which forces men to work is automatically pro-management. The removal of the right to withhold labor — in other words, to strike — will not, I repeat again, will not stop strikes but merely interfere with democratic bargaining.

It is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that between 1945 and 1966, a period in which Saskatchewan had the fairest

restrictions on work stoppages in Canada, the number of man days lost in Saskatchewan was .15 per cent of the total. At the same time the national average was .30 per cent. One very important fact about strikes in this Province that we must all bear in mind is that we have relatively very few strikes. However, the number has risen rapidly since 1964. One of the reasons for this increase has been, in my opinion, the Liberal Party's attitude towards labor.

The Liberal Party used strikes and other labor-management disputes to generate animosity between working people and farmers. Despite this massive increase in lost time during the Liberal reign, the fact remains that industrial accidents, sickness and unemployment caused infinitely greater losses than strikes. Accidents on the job cost 13 times as much work lost, sickness 117 times and unemployment 190 times. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that strikes are not really a very costly thing.

I want to point out to the Party opposite that at every session in the Legislature, the Liberals introduced anti-labor legislation. I'll only mention a few. One was, of course, Bill 2. The other one under the disguise of fighting inflation in a very depressed economy in Saskatchewan was the six per cent guidelines. In education they introduced area bargaining against the wishes of almost everyone in that particular field. Bill 57 was another and, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on.

In addition to this, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), who is now not present in this House — and won't be for a long time, I hope — toured the province attacking unions and workers' rights. Every opportunity was used to aggravate the problems of workers and employers for political purposes. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals' sledgehammer approach to industrial relations directly caused an upswing in the number of strikes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, did not have the desired effect of easing the tension between labor and management. It did not reduce the number of strikes. In plain words, it just didn't work and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that it must be repealed.

The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) claimed in the House yesterday that the Liberals have always been fair and impartial in disputes between labor and management. What a laugh, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who were in the field. What a laugh to the hospital workers in Estevan. What a laugh to the people in the pulp mill in Prince Albert where they were told beforehand, either you accept this or you will not get a penny more. And the ironical part of it was, Mr. Speaker, that they did not get a penny more. What a laugh it was in the field of education and I should like to refer this to the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and I should like to ask

him, how many formulas he had to review before he finally okayed the settlement in Area six. And I should like to know what the tension was between you and Mr. Purdy before you got that settlement? Maybe he will have an opportunity to report later on this.

Even the Hon. Member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) has difficulty in accepting Bill 2 and compulsory arbitration. On March 26th, 1969, he stated in this Legislature and I quote:

The right to strike, the right of employers and employees to disagree is a guarantee of the freedom which we cherish. Governments should stick to conciliation and not stop there and permit labor and management to practise free collective bargaining. Neither side can ever hope to bargain freely when they are hampered by laws binding one side or the other to certain predetermined procedures and conditions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to refer to the former Member from Elrose, George Leith, who didn't seem to agree with the Hon. Minister of Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) about the impartiality of the Government. At a convention on December 1st, 1970, he reportedly said to the reporters of the Leader-Post: "I wonder if our Party isn't beginning to have an unfortunate anti-labor stance."

It is preposterous, Mr. Speaker, to claim that bargaining between two parties is free when a third party is sitting on the shoulders of the bargaining team. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it has not worked and I think that there are many people in this society today who feel that it has not worked and that Bill 2 must be repealed.

I have a clipping here from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and it says, "United Church blasts Bill 2," and I should like to quote from that. It says:

It is a dangerous piece of legislation and tends to move us away from the democratic ideal, the Church said in a brief to the Provincial Cabinet.

A little further on they say:

The same threat to the process of negotiation applies here too . . .

Referring to the so-called impartial labor courts that they had proposed. Later on it says:

Labor and management must have the right to challenge each other and each has the right to a just share of the economy of this country. We are moved to say that the

differing opinions between power groups is not always a bad thing and we are hopeful that when such does exist, it may bring about effective progress.

Let me again quote from the Star-Phoenix, which of course we know is not very pro-labor or pro-NDP, in an editorial entitled, "Shun Compulsion," and I should like just to read a little part from it. It says:

. . . worst of all about compulsory arbitration is that compulsion as a feature of the teachers' contract is far from the ideal of a free society in which members of the profession work enthusiastically. Without dedicated teachers a deterioration in professional attitudes and performance may well result.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Well, I didn't expect him to, really.

They end up by saying:

Any compulsion involving teachers will be tolerated only in the short run. In the long run the electorate will reject such involvement of education in the political arena in a way that is disturbing to the whole school system.

Mr. Speaker, we do not stand alone in wanting Bill 2 repealed and I find it sometimes very difficult to follow the Hon. Member of Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I thought for awhile that he was going to be in favor of the repeal but during his talk he must have had a change of mind. Now he says that he wants more research. He wants to involve more unions. He wants more consultation. Where was all this research and consultation between 1966 and 1971 on the part of your party? I know you weren't in there but I would bet my last dollar, Mr. Member, that you are not a labor lawyer and I don't know what you are but I am sure that you are not a labor lawyer.

He also said that this was a growth in labor legislation. Well, I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan — not only labor people, not only professional people, not only farmers — did not agree with the Liberal Party and rejected them on June 23rd.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased and proud to stand here and support Bill 6.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel rather neglected that the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) left me out of his discussion. He probably failed to notice that I was here at all but I

August 3, 1971

should like him to know that I will not be supporting the repeal of Bill 2 and I'll take my chances on that decision when the next election rolls around.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that when the election was announced, we immediately heard the same evening on TV and on radio that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour stated that they were contributing \$70,000 to the NDP campaign funds.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — The fact that they contributing, Mr. Speaker, was no surprise but many citizens didn't expect a public announcement. Under-the-table contributions of course from unions to the NDP has been a common occurrence for years. This time they took a more public stand.

I should like to refer to an article in the Leader-Post of May 13, 1971, headed, "Union Head urges defeat of Liberals." It states:

Estevan. Ross Hale, president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour called on all union members to work for the defeat of the Thatcher Government in Saskatchewan and the election of the New Democratic Party.

Some of the Members opposite speaking in this debate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seem a bit surprised and amazed that we are not enthusiastic about some of these union leaders. I think some of the reasons are obvious. Strangely enough we heard very little about this \$70,000 after the initial news on the radio. We can only assume of course that the NDP quickly got in touch with the union bosses, and said, look we are happy to have the money but could you be a little quieter about it. Huge donations from other unions to the NDP were handled in a more discreet manner. Union bosses from all over Canada flocked into Saskatchewan during the election campaign and I am sure that every Member in the House saw these people in his constituency while the campaign was in progress. As soon as the election was over, the union bosses demanded their pay-off. That of course is the reason why we are here now at this Special Session, the repeal of Bill 2.

In spite of the close connection, the union bosses really don't trust the NDP. They were not convinced by the argument that the Bill could only be invoked by the Government. In other words, the unions had nothing to fear from Bill 2 unless it was invoked by the present NDP Government. They were not reassured by this arrangement. They had paid their money and wanted their demands met now, not at the next regular session, but now.

Most Canadians believe that innocent third parties should not be made to suffer from strikes. Bill 2 was established to prevent the general public from unnecessary suffering caused by prolonged strikes. Consider for example a strike by members of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the dispute would be between the workers and the Crown Corporation. But what about the third parties involved. What about the farmer's wife who has worked all summer to fill her deep freeze with produce from her garden. An electrical strike of only a few days could leave her with a deep freeze full of rotten meat and vegetables. Socialists and unionists express great concern for rights of workers to strike and rightly so, this is a basic right and they are entitled to it. But what about the other people, doesn't the innocent farmer's wife who is not a party to this dispute, does she not have any rights? A strike of policemen, for example, could result in innocent people being the victims of assault, theft, and other crimes. In considering the rights of various special interest groups the rights of the innocent private citizen must not be ignored and that was the purpose of Bill 2. Any government had the responsibility to only invoke Bill 2 under the conditions of emergency. It is up to the government of the time to define what an emergency would be.

The union bosses apparently didn't trust the Government to use Bill 2 in a responsible manner. They insisted on a Special Session to repeal immediately this Bill and give them a free hand to prey on the innocent people of this Province. The citizens of Saskatchewan will now be at the mercy of the unions in the matter of essential services. Of course, many of us know that the heads of these unions, are from outside the province, in many cases from outside Canada. If things get quiet the union leaders in Detroit or Cincinnati can decide to call a strike of some essential service in the Province of Saskatchewan. If Bill 2 is repealed representatives of our local citizens, and those are the Members of this Legislature, will be powerless to do anything about it. Bill 2 will be gone. I should hope that some of these union pressure groups are not successful in quickly getting some of their other demands. Business people in this Province could well be concerned about some other demands of labor. A recent report in the Leader-Post could be of interest to us all, and I should like to refer to it briefly. This is from the Leader-Post, "Workers control of business urged."

Members of an NDP constituency organization meeting Tuesday approved a resolution calling for workers control of business enterprises.

This is the Nutana South Constituency Organization in Saskatoon and I am sure we have representation from that constituency here. It goes on to say:

The resolution was drafted by party member Lorne Teed. It said Socialism must include social ownership of major production apparatus of a society and control of workers over the direction and operation of enterprises.

It lists several things that they were asking, I'll read a few of them, you may be interested.

Legislation granting unions access to all company information and policy on matters of manpower, profits, investment, product research and corporate structure.

Guarantee of workers' rights to complete control over discipline at their place of work.

And another point:

The establishment of a 30-hour work week at 40 hours pay.

And another one still:

Workers control over the deployment of personnel, the organization of work, hiring, firing, shift schedules, allocations of profits and the election of supervisors. The operation of all Crown corporations under workers' control.

Mr. Speaker, these are examples of some of the demands made at NDP meetings by some of the union people. We should like to know if we can expect legislation from this Government which will make some of these recommendations the law of the land. Implementation of some of these demands could result in economic disaster in the province, including mass unemployment. If the present Government was presenting us with a constructive alternative, I should be the first to be in favor of repeal of the Essential Services Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a labor crisis usually seems to fall into a familiar pattern. Wage negotiations occur, the public takes little notice, as they drag on, labor may be right, management may be right, more likely both of them are partly right and partly wrong. Labor suddenly becomes discouraged with negotiations and often with good reason and calls a strike. Negotiations then continue, often for days, or months, and with high tension and great publicity. It is at this stage that the innocent party suffers. If it is the rail workers, dock workers, or seaway workers, the farmer who cannot deliver his grain is the main loser. If it is the postal workers, business and general public suffers and so on. Finally, after long negotiation a breakthrough is made and the strike is over. The employees go back to work, everyone tries to forget the whole thing as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think in this day and age this procedure is certainly not good enough. The general public has a right to expect something better. They are fed up with being the innocent pawns in a battle between the giant unions and giant industries or government. Surely as a civilized developed nation we can devise some better way of settling strikes.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to consider the repeal of The Essential Services Act. We should be here to consider a logical alternative to the disastrous strikes which damage our economy and cause hardships to our citizens. For these reasons I cannot support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in dealing with Bill No. 6 an Act to repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act, I personally feel that the basic issue here is that of individual freedom and protection of human rights. It is mainly on this principle that I want to discuss this legislation and Government's action to remove it from the statutes of the Province.

With the passing of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, the right of the individual was infringed upon, the right of the worker to negotiate with his employer was lost, if not completely lost, then certainly always under strain. The Act completely ignored individual rights through the compulsory element incorporated in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, under the existing legislation free collective bargaining between employer-employee, one might say, went out of the window. Labor and management no longer find themselves in a position to sit around a table to seriously iron out their differences and arrive at a mutual agreement. It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that if and when management knows that workers could be forced back to work, negotiations will not take place seriously nor in a reasonable manner to settle differences.

For the information of this House and particularly for the information of the Hon. Members opposite, I want to make reference to the Report of the Labour Management Committee on the construction industry. The report which was the result of work by a Committee established in 1968, states and I quote:

It is our conviction, after nearly two years of review, that there is no substitute for free collective bargaining. There should be no government compulsion in this process in the construction industry. Government has a role to play, but that role, during contract negotiations is to provide the parties with effective mediation machinery.

The Committee's conviction in this report applied to the construction industry, but it could very well apply to all industrial disputes.

Mr. Speaker, since the passing of the legislation in 1966, records will prove that Saskatchewan had more strikes than ever before. It is evident that The Essential Services Emergency Act is not doing the job. It has failed, at the same time it

August 3, 1971

has widened the gap in relations between management and labor.

I want to say that since the Liberals took office in 1964 they continually attempted to drive a wedge between labor and the general public. They used various tactics to divide labor and farmer, teacher and trustee, worker and management. The Liberal Government of that day adopted the rule of 'divide and conquer'. It reminds me of the rule that was practised under Nazism in Germany and under Fascism in Italy. And it worked effectively, but let me tell you it was short-lived. You know what happened to Nazi Germany. You know what happened to Fascist Italy, and, of course, you know very well what happened to Saskatchewan Liberals June 23rd. They were all short-lived!

Mr. Speaker, to further their tactics of keeping people apart, class against class, the Liberals passed The Essential Services Act. They passed it to use it as a vehicle of suppression. Rather than making an attempt to assist labor and management in cases of negotiation breakdown and rather than encourage collective bargaining, the former Liberal Government interfered with the intent to divide people and create a breakdown in relations. Then they applied the right Act, you must accept it or else!

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that when people are pushed around and treated in a high-handed dictatorial fashion, people will rebel, and there is bound to be rejection. And there was rejection. That is why we have been having so many strikes that were difficult to settle. There was too much compulsion and not enough diplomacy and conciliation!

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Government for standing firm on its election commitment and acting to repeal the so-called Bill 2, The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — We on this side of the House are looking forward to the repeal of this Act bringing back to Saskatchewan free collective bargaining and harmony in industrial relations.

This Legislature ought to take a lesson from the Federal Minister of Labour, Hon. Bryce Mackasey, whose approach to settle labor disputes makes good sense and we must agree it has proved very successful. Mr. Mackasey believes and I quote:

The touchstones are communications, anticipation, initiation, and leadership in a plan of action that need not end in legislation.

A plan that, with the co-operation and good will of both sides, will make the collective bargaining process far more responsive to the actual issues and thus, hopefully, drastically reducing the incidence of strikes and lockouts.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the Hon. Minister's approach. The New Democratic Party believes in this approach and I commend this Government for acting with this approach in mind by introducing Bill No. 6 to repeal The Essential Services Emergency Act.

Let us ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, who is labor? Labor is you and I, your children and mine, the farmer, the businessman, and their sons and daughters. We are all laborers in one way or another. Why can't we understand each other, and why do we need to discriminate and pit one class of labor against the other? If we are interested in building a society for our benefit and the benefit of our children, then we must be prepared to understand each other and work together for our sake and for the sake of our children.

The existing legislation, Mr. Speaker, has every feature of the police state. Individual rights have been eroded, and individuals no longer democratically participated in the process of free collective bargaining. And it has created bitter feeling between labor and management groups. I believe, Sir, that in every industrial dispute, there should be every opportunity to negotiate and settle differences. All avenues of conciliation and mediation should be explored and tried. Compulsory arbitration should certainly be the last resort, and then only when all other reasonable ways and means and efforts have failed.

By repealing the Emergency Act we, as legislators, will be restoring free collective bargaining at the best and possibly the only way of maintaining good sound industrial relations in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — From my remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I will be fully supporting the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Liberal stance on labor and their attitude toward the Trade Union Movement and the working people of this Province would have changed. I regret to hear the same kind of speeches, the same kind of name calling prevails here tonight as it did during previous sessions and during the period of Liberal administration. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the working people together with the farm people, and the professionals as well as business people so soundly decided to defeat the Liberal administration on June 23rd. Liberals seem to have a hard time in learning lessons.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when the election writs were issued, in fact prior to that, the Liberals said that the

number one plank in their election program was to impose and to legislate more oppressive and more restrictive labor legislation. They said that the number one plank in their platform was the establishment of labor courts. They did not explain what they meant by the labor courts but I believe the message was left clear with the people of Saskatchewan, particularly the workers in the province, that they were going to impose more restrictive and more oppressive legislation.

Labor courts have been tried in other countries throughout the world. In fact a number of years ago they were tried in the United States of America. They proved to be a bad thing, they proved that they created more industrial strife than industrial harmony.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak tonight in support of the Government's action to repeal this notorious, anti-labor Act known as The Essential Services Emergency Act. This is an occasion of great significance for the people of Saskatchewan. It is an occasion of very great importance to the Trade Union Movement. The repeal of The Essential Services Act is a great victory for the people of Saskatchewan, it marks a defeat for the anti-labor forces and their spokesmen, the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Seldom in our history, in the history of provincial governments, has there been a government so arrogant as the Liberal Government was during those seven years in their attitude towards the rights of working people. Seldom has a provincial government defied the united opposition of workers and thousands of other citizens concerned with human rights, by enacting legislation so opposed to the basic principles of human rights and the rights of wage earners. Mr. Speaker, my former leader, Woodrow Lloyd, spoke for all of us when this law was introduced in 1966. Mr. Lloyd denounced The Essential Services Emergency Act as a vicious and evil piece of legislation. And he was right. It is a vicious and evil piece of legislation and it is just one of the many reasons for the Liberals being thrown out of office on June 23rd.

Mr. Speaker, I want to underline a few important points that we should do well to remember. I want to emphasize that compulsory arbitration is never a good answer to the resolution of labor-management problems. Studies and experience over many years in other countries have clearly shown that compulsory arbitration will not work. References have been made from time to time to the labor courts and compulsory arbitration in Australia. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we examine the records of that country, what do we find? Let me give you a few comparative statistics and facts. In 1945 in Canada there were 197 labor disputes, in Australia with compulsory arbitration, with labor courts they had 945 labor disputes.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — How many . . .

Mr. Smishek: — Those are the work stoppages, those are the strikes. In 1960 in Canada 274 strikes, in Australia 1145.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Would you mind now that you are giving all these facts and figures about the number of strikes in Australia and Canada, you must also, you have done this kind of research, be able to give us the length of time lost in work stoppages in both Canada and Australia during that same period.

Mr. Smishek: — Well, if the Hon. Member will permit me to complete my statement, he will probably learn. He shouldn't get that anxious, I'll give him the answer, just be patient.

In 1965, as I was saying 501 strikes in Canada, in Australia 1346. In 1967, Australia had 1340 strikes, in Canada 522. The latest statistics available, in Canada in 1969, 595 strikes, in Australia 2014. Now let us clarify one point and I want the Hon. Member from Milestone to listen to this. Canada's figures exclude disputes where time lost is less than ten man-days. I want him to take note of that. Australia's figures exclude disputes where time lost is less than ten working days. There is a very great difference between ten man-days and ten working days. We must also take note, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's population and therefore Canada's labor force is about three times as large as that of Australia. So when the Liberals argue that labor courts and compulsory arbitration works, I think they would do well to examine the record of a country that has for a number of years had labor courts and compulsory arbitration.

I also want to point out that reports were prepared by the former Government's own two committees, established for the purpose of studying industrial relations. These reports argued strongly against compulsory arbitration but the Liberals chose to ignore the advice of the very committees that they established. They went ahead blindly and made this regressive law applicable to all workers and managements throughout the province at the last session of the Legislature. Why did they bring in this bad legislation in the first place, Mr. Speaker? Well, the Liberals said first, their intent was to protect the innocent public in emergency cases. While Saskatchewan has had very few strikes the Liberals were always raving about strikes. Time lost in strikes in the Province of Saskatchewan is negligible compared to time lost through illness, or accidents or unemployment. So this great need to stop strikes simply does not exist, Mr. Speaker.

There was never a need to bring this vicious law into being, but I shall tell you why they brought it in. They brought this misnamed Essential Services Act in to help them in their continued vendetta against the labor movement. They

wanted another powerful weapon in their arsenals so that they could do a more effective job in their vindictive attack on the Trade Union Movement. But this Bill was a very serious blunder on the part of the Liberal Party. It was a stupid and reckless political act and the Liberals had to pay a pretty stiff price for this attack on the labor movement on June 23rd. Bill 2 was just part of the old Liberal game of trying to get the farmers 'uptight' against the Trade Union Movement but the Liberals always underestimate the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan. They tried to tell the farmers that Bill 2 type of legislation and their proposed labor courts would stop any strikes by the grainhandlers or railroad workers or the longshoremens. This was another big lie and an insult to the intelligence of every farmer. The farmers knew these kinds of strikes come under the Federal jurisdiction and the farmers and the workers in this Province joined hands on election day. They were more united than ever before in their determination to keep the Liberals out of office. One thing the Liberals did not learn in the seven years of their office is that the vast majority of Saskatchewan wage earners are the sons and daughters and relatives of our Saskatchewan farmers.

The big fact is that nobody wants strikes, working people do not like strikes. We all want to keep strikes to a minimum, but we can never do that by trying to hammer labor into the ground. There are many things we can do to avoid strikes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, we can start off by treating working people with respect. The Liberals have never shown much respect for the worth and dignity of the working man and woman. Secondly, we can work to remove the conditions that cause strikes. We can provide decent wages and working conditions. We can improve the economic conditions. We can bring in better social legislation. We are making a start, Mr. Speaker, at this Session by legislating a 40-hour work week, removing deterrent fees and providing free hospital and medical care for those 65 years of age and over.

Mr. Speaker, this Government accepts its share of responsibilities to make this Province a better place to live and to work. We make no apologies but we are strongly on the side of working men and women in their struggle to exercise their democratic rights to free themselves from harsh economic exploitation and to win an increased share of the fruits of their labor.

Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies for the fact that this Government is vitally concerned about the needs and priorities of our working people. Our program is clear, we were elected to support the interests of our wage earners. Mr. Speaker, farmers also know that they have nothing to fear from this Government. Our working people, our farmers, our teachers, our fair-minded businessmen and professions, and our Government employees, they all know that we are here to give them a fair deal and to give them a New Deal.

The Liberals tried to tell us that they were acting in the public interest when they introduced The Essential Services Act but, Mr. Speaker, whose public and whose interest. The American owned Potash companies, Parsons and Whitemore, Mr. Landegger, are these the interests that they were trying to protect. Mr. Speaker, we are particularly interested in the rights of Saskatchewan people in the first instance, that collective bargaining be conducted in a fair and proper manner. But we also feel that this Government should do everything possible to promote the process of proper and fair collective bargaining. When we are called upon to do so we shall provide every possible assistance to help resolve industrial disputes, to bring people together, to bring the parties of disputes around the bargaining table and help them in the resolution of their problems as quickly as possible. The Government is also going to take action to ensure that we are going to have more well-trained people and make them available through the Department of Labour, who will merit the trust and confidence of those engaged in collective bargaining — management and labor. Mr. Speaker, this Government will take steps by a force of law and by power of example to improve the social and economic conditions of the province and to develop a more harmonious and more productive society. We are making a good beginning at this Session by cleaning up some of the mess left behind by the Liberal Government. We are throwing out some of the worst Liberal legislation and we have set the wheels in motion once again to make the Government of Saskatchewan responsive to the needs of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say how proud I am to be able to play a part in helping to remove this sinister piece of legislation from the statute books of the Province of Saskatchewan. I am proud to have been so closely associated with thousands of workers over the years who have battled not only against Bill 2 but all other anti-labor legislation of the Liberal Party in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted on this occasion to play a part and to support the Bill that was introduced by the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) to repeal The Essential Services Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, when Bill 2 was first introduced to the Legislature in 1966 there was a very unpleasant strike taking place in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The main purpose of introducing the Bill was to guarantee the people of Saskatchewan this very needed service. The former Government, Mr. Speaker, was concerned about the 100,000 families who used natural gas in their homes. The Government of the day was concerned about the operation of our schools, our homes for the aged and for our hospitals. Many of these institutions used natural gas for heating or cooking or both and would not be able to function if their supply of natural gas were cut off. The

former Government was concerned, too, Mr. Speaker, about our vital industries such as mines and factories that depend on natural gas for energy. If these were to be closed because of a gas shut-off, thousands of our workers would be laid off with a resulting loss of millions of dollars in income. Dozens of companies not involved in the strike would have lost thousands upon thousands of dollars in lost production. They would have lost many important markets to out-of-province competitors. In short the Liberal Government, under the late Premier, reflected by its legislation its concern over the serious and continued effects of strikes on our economy. The Liberals, Mr. Speaker, showed concern for: (1) the striking employees whose income was cut off during the length of the strike; (2) concern for the employer involved; (3) concern for other employees and employers who were not involved in the strike but were effected by it; (4) concern for the general economy; (5) concern for the general public who to a growing extent are forced to accept hardships and inconvenience in the face of work stoppages which they are helpless to prevent and are not responsible for.

The general purpose of this Act, that the Government is asking us to repeal today, was to facilitate a reasonable settlement of labor disputes. It provided for the resolving of problems caused by the collapse of negotiations in services affecting the public welfare without interrupting the service itself. That Act did not, Mr. Speaker, take away the right of collective bargaining. The NDP Government opposite is, by repealing Bill 2, acting in a manner not in the best interest of the general public. They are responding to the demands of a few labor bosses. The Government opposite now argues that Bill 2 must be abolished because it infringes on the right of collective bargaining and that compulsory arbitration is bad. To answer the first argument The Essential Services Act was only used when all forms of collective bargaining failed and the public interest was in jeopardy.

Their arguments on compulsory arbitration, Mr. Speaker, are hard to understand, to believe, when one looks at statements made by some of the Members opposite in previous debates of this Legislature. The public as well as many Members of this House remember well when the NDP supported the principle of compulsory arbitration to solve the railroad dispute. And only tonight, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) makes a statement that compulsory arbitration will never work.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of the House vividly recall other instances when NDP spokesmen accepted the principle of compulsory arbitration. Let me quote, first, the present Premier. He said, in this House, as reported on page 38 of the Debates and Proceedings September 7, 1966, and I quote Mr. Blakeney:

But as other Members have pointed out, basic civil rights of employees are not the only rights around. Citizens have rights too, and citizens have a right to more or less continued service in essential public services. They have no right to ask management to spend huge sums

of money so there won't be a momentary interruption. They have no right to ask labor to give up all sorts of rights so there won't be a momentary interruption. But basically they have the right to continue services of an essential nature.

Mr. Speaker, the same Hon. gentleman says in the same speech, as reported on page 43, and I again quote Mr. Blakeney:

I invite Members to study this motion with some care, because this is precisely what it does and it provides that when negotiations fail there shall be compulsory arbitration. Our proposal would fully protect the public. It would provide that all the responsibilities of direct negotiation, mediation and conciliation be exhausted. It would provide that there would be voluntary arbitration and it would provide that if all else failed there would be compulsory arbitration. We are taking away a basic human right, as Paul Martin calls it. If this must be done, so be it, but it ought to be done after all the alternatives are explored.

Mr. Speaker, there you have it. The present Premier has told us what ought to be done. What he said is exactly the policy implemented in The Essential Services Bill — compulsory arbitration when all else fails. That was before an election when the NDP was afraid to alienate farm, business and work support.

Mr. Speaker, after the election, the Premier by repealing The Essential Services Bill is ignoring the opinion of the farm community, the business community and the ordinary worker. He does dance to the tune of the labor bosses. May I quote from the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). He said in this House, as reported on page 72 of the Debates and Proceedings, the second Session 1966, and I quote:

Compulsory arbitration, Mr. Speaker, I believe is regarded by most people as a very distasteful business. And it is generally accepted that it should be used as a final measure only when all other methods of settling disputes have failed and a situation results where peril, extreme hardship or danger to the economy of the country materializes.

Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with these quotes of Mr. Snyder and Mr. Blakeney, and for this reason I would ask him to reconsider the repeal of Bill 2. Both of these gentlemen realize and have stated the need for such a Bill. Even after the election, Mr. Blakeney told a news conference on June 24, 1971, that he had changed his mind about rushing to repeal Bill 2. He said that his reason for the change of mind is that the legislation is not a threat to labor until it is used.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the point. It is not a threat to labor until it is used. Both the Premier and the Minister of Labour agree that there could be a need for such a Bill. I suggest that we leave it in. Surely we can trust these

August 3, 1971

gentlemen not to invoke the Bill unless there truly is a need. Surely the labor movement can trust our new Minister of Labour not to abuse the use of Bill 2.

I have seen only one shred of reason to suggest why even the labor union officials would want this Bill repealed. It might be feared that an employer, in a difficult spot, might try to embarrass the Government by requesting the legislation be acted upon. This could tend to rally the so-called anti-labor forces. This is a very petty reason to repeal such an important Bill. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that Bill 2 is not the ultimate, but at the same time by no means is collective bargaining a very perfect method. So until such times that this Government finds some better method, I suggest they leave Bill 2 alone.

Mr. Blakeney admitted in this House that there will be a need in the future for this type of legislation.

Mr. Blakeney: — May be, not will.

Mr. MacDonald: — Will. May I quote from the debate on an amendment to The Essential Services Emergency Act in this House on April 5, 1971. I quote from the Leader-Post of April 6, 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Blakeney said, and I quote:

But if a serious crisis ever arises, compulsory arbitration should only apply as a last method after all other methods have failed, and only to the one situation. Very rarely will it be needed in the future.

I agree, Mr. Blakeney, it will rarely be needed and I hope never needed. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is not anti-labor legislation. It is people legislation. Until we have an alternative, it must remain. It is about time that the Government opposite showed a little more responsibility to the welfare and security of Saskatchewan people and workers. It is time to stop saying one thing and doing another. We all realize the NDP have a big debt to pay to the large union leaders, but surely the repealing of Bill 2, is far too big a price for Saskatchewan people to pay.

I should much rather see the NDP Government get on with the job of finding alternatives, or at least to get on with the job of improving conciliation services. The first job should be to give the priority to the Department of Labour that it deserves and which they promised. They might start, by at least getting a full time Minister to the Department of Labour.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I have lots of time. As soon as you have order in the House I'll start.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) just a few minutes ago mentioned that the Liberal Government never learned from elections, that we were defeated on the issues of Bill 2, on the issues of deterrent fees. And, yet, you know, during the election campaign every NDP candidate went around and said, "You vote against the Liberal Government here in Saskatchewan and that will be a protest vote against the Trudeau Government." That was the issue that they had at that time! And there is no Member in this House who has criticized the Federal Government more than I have.

That was the election issue that many farmers took into consideration when they voted against their Liberal candidate and this was told to them by the NDP, time and time again, "Vote against the Liberal candidate and you will vote against Otto Lang, the Wheat Board and Trudeau."

Now in 1964, when we formed the Government, the then Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, before the final votes were counted, Mr. Gilbey issued a statement that the labor movement in Saskatchewan should not rest until they had defeated the Liberal Government. There was no Bill 2 at that time. And when he retired this fall — I think it was this fall or this spring — in Moose Jaw, Mr. Gilbey said that every labor union man should wear a black band until the Liberal Government was defeated.

That was the position of labor and always has been. And you have put that wedge between the Liberal Party, the farmer, industry and labor. What concerns me most about this Bill, if the Premier has given the assurance to the labor unions, that the present Government will not use the Essential Services Act, then why repeal it? I can tell you, across the way, that there will be many, many times in the next couple of years where you are going to call special sessions and this is the reason why we amended the Bill. This is the reason why we gave the Cabinet the power to say 'this is an essential service and we can put the union or management back to work.' We didn't want to call special sessions of this kind where we are spending public funds, which are not needed, like today's Session. Hundreds and hundreds of dollars, thousands of dollars being spent on taxpayers' money that is absolutely useless. If I were a junior Member, I would be all for it. There are some Members on this side that every time you call a session, when they will retire at age 55, you know it just ups their pension plan. Oh, I am sure you will. It doesn't matter to me. It certainly doesn't matter to me but I am sure that you are certainly going to be fooled if you think that you fellows in the back are going to sit here for nothing.

All these special sessions cost money and you are here to spend the taxpayers' money and you are certainly going to do it.

August 3, 1971

I don't know how long the people can stand to pay the price that labor wants. When I see, in the press, that in the United States there are labor unions that have settled for about one per cent every month, 36 per cent increase in three years, 40 per cent in three years. We are just pricing ourselves out of existence and some day there must be a day of reckoning. And the day of reckoning is coming very, very fast.

I was uptown during the noon hour and I am amazed at the number of people who came to me and said how tragic it is that this Government has cancelled the pulp mill at Meadow Lake. You know it won't be too long — Bill 2 wouldn't have been used even if it were on the Statutes because there will be no labor unions in Saskatchewan that have any jobs. No! If you took over the potash industry, you know they will all be Civil Servants. You don't need any union.

I got up here this evening to express my opposition to the repeal of this Bill. I was for it 100 per cent and I want to tell the people across the way, that under no circumstances do I think the farmers voted against the Liberal Government because we decided to bring in Bill 2.

I shall oppose this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to remarks from both sides of the House, including those just concluded, following my presentation last evening, it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little left to be said on the principle of this Bill, and I don't intend to prolong the debate unnecessarily.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, how very gratified I am to have had the support and the understanding and the articulate contribution by new Members on this side of the House. Their arguments have been logically expressed and sincerely presented and I want to indicate my personal gratification in being surrounded by such a capable group of new Members, in addition to the older Members, who have been in this House previous to this Session.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to contrast the positive appraisal which has been shown by Members on this side of the House with the presentations of Members opposite, especially the one just rendered and the one of the former Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) to which we listened last evening.

Mr. Speaker, I can, perhaps, forgive the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald). I can, perhaps, forgive the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) on a rather naive and a rather compromising presentation.

The Member for Moosomin spoke with a degree of sincerity

on a matter upon which he had very little understanding or concern. He claimed that we should not be here, repealing Bill 2, but instead we should be developing alternative solutions. In part, I have to agree that he is on firm ground. We have to be in a position, I believe, Mr. Speaker, to be looking at all times for the development of more complete, and more sophisticated mediation and conciliation services.

But let me point this out, Mr. Speaker, if his colleagues had believed, or acknowledged, that point of view then they should have been moving in that direction over the last number of years. But instead the entire Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal Government has developed an extreme case of malnutrition over the last seven years. Just for an example, the Labour Standards Branch has been starved. The Chief Industrial Relations Officer's position has remained vacant since the death of that person last spring. The Labour Department has been starved, Mr. Speaker, and is in desperate need of a rebuilding job which will be my responsibility in the months directly ahead.

In my initial remarks, last evening, Mr. Speaker, I indicated the extent to which the former Liberal Government has employed scare tactics in an effort to convince the public that without Bill 2 to protect them that they would run the risk of freezing when some irresponsible labor boss decided to cut off gas and electrical services in mid-winter. And we heard that same kind of nonsense repeated again tonight.

For years, Mr. Speaker, Liberals, both inside and outside the House, have attempted to create an illusory emergency as they forecast, a possible withdrawal of services by hospital workers, by firefighters and by policemen. The former Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) again repeated last night the same arguments and suggested, Mr. Speaker, that for good measure that this legislation, somehow, had some relationship to the longshoremen, grainhandlers and to rail workers, knowing full well that Bill 2 has no application, whatsoever, to those workers who are under federal jurisdiction. But this is a repeat of the same kind of blatant nonsense that was perpetrated during the election campaign which saw the majority of Members opposite, resoundingly defeated.

This had to be, I believe, a deliberate attempt to mislead the uninformed public. Will the Liberals ever learn, Mr. Speaker? Since I arrived in this Legislature, a matter of about 11 years ago, the Liberal Party has attempted to wage a vendetta against working men and women in Saskatchewan, and it is a continuous vendetta that has been with us since the Liberals attempted to gain political advantage in this way. It was, and continues to be, an organized program intended to impress rural voters, with the old-age theory of divide and conquer.

There is an old German saying, Mr. Speaker, 'we get too soon old and too late smart.' Liberals opposite, I suggest,

August 3, 1971

should take note and recognize that their scare tactics and their vendetta against Saskatchewan workers cost them very dearly on the 23rd of June. Even the former Liberal Member, George Leith found that the anti-labor tactics of the former Government were an embarrassment to him and were an embarrassment to many of their other candidates.

The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) before he took his seat, suggested that we New Democrats had the support of the trade union movement in the June 23rd election and you can bet your sweet life, we did, Mr. Speaker.

For seven years, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have been systematically driving organized and unorganized laborers into our arms and I welcome them sincerely along with teachers, along with farmers and along with other Saskatchewan citizens who joined together to deal a Liberal Government a well-deserved defeat on the 23rd of June. Bill 2, Mr. Speaker, played a very significant role in that decision.

Let me suggest to Members opposite that to continue their present anti-labor stance is to court disaster in an electoral way and I ask Members opposite, as did the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) to glance about them and to reflect upon the fate of those who showed, in this House and outside of this House an outstanding labor bias. The man who introduced Bill 2 and guided it through this House, the former Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) and the former Minister of Labour now has ample opportunity to reflect upon the wisdom of his judgment and speculate about the degree to which his anti-labor bias contributed to his own defeat last June. Members of this House who have a desire to return to this House in 1975 or thereafter should, I suggest, consider the whereabouts of another Labour Minister, Mr. MacLennan, the former Member for Last Mountain or the perennial mover of anti-labor resolutions, Mr. Jim Hooker from Notukeu-Willow Bunch. I wonder where Jim Hooker is these days or Mr. Larochelle, the former Member from Shaunavon, who used to indicate in no uncertain terms his attitude towards labor, or I ask Members to consider the whereabouts of the former Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) who used to use some of the most colorful and most remarkable descriptions of working people when he referred to them as cunning, sinister, slimy, Mafia-controlled labor thugs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Those Members, Mr. Speaker, all from predominantly rural constituencies were soundly rejected by their constituents and I suggest that Members of this House should take account of that fact.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that it is our objective in the Department of Labour to usher in a new era in labor-management relations in this period following 1971. We intend to provide to the principals, to labor and management

groups, conciliation and mediation services which will identify problems before either side has assumed a hardened and unrelenting position. We believe that new life must be injected into industrial relations in the Department of Labour and that the vast majority of disputes in the Province of Saskatchewan can be avoided.

It is within the realm of possibility, Mr. Speaker, that some real emergency could rise in the future and if this were to happen it would not result, I suggest, from a conscious destructive streak within Saskatchewan people as the Opposition would tend to suggest but from some irreversible force which I couldn't even attempt to predict since the precedent does not presently exist. The laws of this Province, Mr. Speaker, as delineated under Section 92 of the BNA Act are the sole responsibility of this Legislature. Under a Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, the all fearsome Bill 2 could be utilized by the Cabinet without public discussion and without parliamentary debate. The New Democratic Party, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, bases its history upon free speech, upon open discussion and upon public communication.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Any emergency can be discussed freely in this House at any time, Mr. Speaker. The present Government intends to give to the Opposition their legal right to debate and to discuss any potential emergency. In this manner, Mr. Speaker, the public would be legitimately exposed to the various opinions vis-a-vis the emergency situation. It will also give the Opposition the opportunity to oppose or to support the Government in its position. I should hope that the Opposition would value this right if they intend to fulfil their function as an official Opposition in Saskatchewan. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, when the NDP was seated in the Opposition across this House that we would have heartily grasped the opportunity to debate in the Legislature when matters of vital public interest of Saskatchewan were at stake rather than being informed that the Cabinet alone would make such an important and such a controversial decision.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are prepared to assume our legitimate responsibility and we propose to assume that responsibility in a democratic way. The repeal of Bill 2 is a blow for freedom, Mr. Speaker; it is a blow for the freedom of association, a blow for freedom of speech; it is a blow for the general freedom of Saskatchewan's working men and women and I take a great deal of pleasure in moving that this Bill, Bill No. 6, a Bill to repeal the Essential Services Emergency Act be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.