

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
7th Day

March 3, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Legislature, a group of 38 students situated in the East Gallery. They are from Assiniboine School, Grade five. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Thompson, I know that you would join with myself and the Members to wish them an exciting day and an interesting day in the House. It is good to see students taking an interest in the Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of students from St. Francis School in Saskatoon. St. Francis School is physically located in Riversdale constituency but the boundaries run right on the east side of the school building and many of the children are in my constituency. I am sure that the House will join with me in extending a welcome to these students and extending to them a favourable day and hope that they will have an exciting and an education day here in the House. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Gartland.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in welcoming here today a class of Grade eight students from the town of Willow Bunch. There are 35 of them here and they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Gerald Hays. I hope that their stay here today is an informative one and that they will take back with them a happy experience of visiting the Legislature and the city of Regina.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce two groups of students this afternoon. Both are from the Maple Creek constituency. In the Speaker's Gallery are my own Grade 11 class from the Mendham High School under the direction of Mr. Allan Stewart. The other group in the East Gallery, Grade 9, 10, and 11 students are from Prelate and they are under the direction of Mr. Larry Zemlak. All of us, of course, hope that they will enjoy witnessing the democratic process in action and that they will have a safe return journey.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I introduce to you and to the Member of this House the Grade Six class from Southey with their teacher, Mrs. Ruth Weisbrot seated in the speaker's Gallery. We welcome them. We hope that they have a very enjoyable and worthwhile visit.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

ELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATELY OWNED HOSPITALS FOR THE FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS FOR 1971-72

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Municipal affairs (Mr. Wood). Can he tell this Assembly if privately owned hospitals are eligible for the Federal-Provincial employment programs for 1971-1972?

Mr. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal affairs): — Would the Member repeat the last part of the question please?

Mr. Grant: — If privately owned hospitals are eligible to participate in the Federal-Provincial employment programs?

Mr. Wood: — It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that these hospitals are organizations. The program is set up in regard to municipalities which includes general hospitals, school districts and municipalities as we know them and also in regard to organizations. The Local Initiative Program by the Federal Government has dealt with organizations as such. They had originally \$50 million to be spent in regard to Local Initiative Programs put forward by organizations. They also had \$50 million which they were going to use for municipalities, the same program but in regard to municipalities which has taken, after some tussling back and forth, to include schools and hospitals, that is, the tax supported hospitals. We said that we would extend the money. We assumed that there was going to be two million dollars in the Federal portion of the Local Initiatives Program for municipalities and we said that we would extend that by \$1 million.

We have had a good deal of difficulty with this program because the Manpower people took a good deal of time to make up their minds what they were going to do in regard to accepting and rejecting and we are just now going forward with putting out not only our million, but we've said that we will now go to \$1.5 million in extending this program. What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, to answer his question, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, under organizations, this would include private hospitals. In regard to our program it is only in regard to municipalities which include tax supported hospitals. We are, however, considering looking at the matter of private hospitals because they do perform much the same function, although I find that there are very few applications along this

line. Most of them have been picked up already by the Federal Government.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, it's a long answer but I summarize it this way by saying that the answer is No, that private hospitals are not included in this program. Is that right?

Mr. Wood: — The answer is Yes, under the Federal portion of it.

Mr. Grant: — Private hospitals are not included. Thank you every so much.

EXPLANATION OF BILLS

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, we have been threatened by over 100 Bills by the Government. I should say the public has been threatened with them. One of the complaints — and we instituted this program — of the Government when they were the Opposition was that we didn't give them the explanations fast enough. Now, may I ask the premier, are you going to continue the practice that our Government started of giving the Opposition explanations of the Bills and if so, when can we expect them?

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I can only say what the former Attorney General used to say when he replied to the very same question when I was standing where the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West now is — that every attempt will be made to provide the explanatory notes. There are pressures of staff particularly because of the large number of Bills. We hope the explanatory notes will be coming along.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobart-Kindersley) for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. E.F. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this Throne speech debate. At the outset, however, I should like to make reference to those groups of students from the Prelate High School and from my own school at Mendham who are in the galleries this afternoon. I suppose I'll have to watch my behaviour here.

I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. At the risk of being dubbed a hypocrite by the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), I am going to congratulate the Member from Morse for being elected to the opposition. I should also like to congratulate the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) who is now the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Member for Saskatoon-Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) who is, of course, Minister of Public Works. Mr. Speaker, I just can't overlook the Leader of the Opposition. I must

congratulate him too on being elected leader of his party.

In our area, we don't get coverage from Saskatchewan television stations, so I couldn't watch the entire proceedings. But we did get the odd excerpt on the National News and at one point I saw the Leader of the Opposition doing a little dance. I don't know whether this was meant to convey the impression that we have a swinger leading the Liberal Party in this province as well as on the Federal scene or what it was designed to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I always enjoyed listening to the Leader of the Opposition, but I didn't appreciate him quite so much yesterday when he cut into our airtime and took up the time even of his own Members. I understand that the Opposition group has used up all the time allocated to them for the Throne speech Debate. They will have to borrow time from the Budget Debate. The Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) took it all. Well, I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, that certain other Members would have liked to have spoken. I think particularly of the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I am sure he would like to have addressed his people on the air. I know that most of them would fit into the galleries quite comfortably.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Nevertheless, the overflow would like to be able to switch on the radio and listen to the Member from Albert Park. I think of the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), Mr. Speaker, I understand he lives in North Battleford now. It's farther back there. I am sure his people would have liked to have listened to him on radio. Did he get an opportunity, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no!

Mr. Flasch: — The Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Athabasca took the whole time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — I don't know why he accorded so much time to the Member from Athabasca. I think it's because he might not be here too long and he wanted to hear him speak one more time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — It's one these cases, Mr. Speaker, of now you see him and now you don't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — He missed the first Session, Mr. Speaker, but came around

for this one. He has a rather tenuous claim to the seat that he occupies. It reminds me a little bit of the cuckoo. I stand to be corrected there but I think it's the cuckoo, Mr. Speaker, that lays its eggs in other birds' nests.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — Mr. Speaker, I'll turn now to my own constituency of Maple Creek. And I can honestly say that regardless of political ideology, nowhere in Saskatchewan will you find people more generous and more outgoing than those in the southwest part of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — At this time, I should like to thank the people of that constituency for electing me as their representative of this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — In doing so they broke a 23-year-old tradition of Liberal representation for that area. Now, the populated part of our constituency takes the form of a giant horseshoe which encompasses a major portion of the Great Sand Hills. Maple Creek and Leader are the largest towns in the area. We have a number of smaller towns and villages. The people of the region fall into diverse occupational groups. We have some labourers and of course professional people. But mainly, we are a farming area—mixed farming, grain farming and ranching.

One could perhaps say that for the most part, the people of our area did not feel the economic squeeze, particularly of 1969 and 1970, as acutely as did the people of some of the other areas of this province. Those engaged in mixed farming were able to make a go of it because beef prices remained relatively stable although hog prices have made some recovery only recently. But the farmer who hadn't diversified, Mr. Speaker, and who depended solely on grain was in a difficult position during these years because he was caught in the cost-price squeeze and because his grain sales were severely limited at that time. While grain sales have improved (and I welcome the recent sale made to Russia) the other factor I mentioned, the cost-price squeeze, still exists.

I welcome too, as does everyone in Western Canada, the recently announced two-price system for wheat. I hope that when, and if, the Federal Government ever decides to unveil a new Grain Income Stabilization Plan, it will indeed be a new plan and not simply the old one dragged out and dusted off — one which most of the farmers of Western Canada rejected and the Liberals across the way supported.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, too, about the sheep industry. Since the Federal Government has withdrawn its subsidy on wool this industry has found itself in great difficulty. I hope that the Government of this province will continue to urge the Federal Government to have this subsidy reintroduced. I believe that we can ill afford to lose that industry in this province.

We on this side of the House, believe that the Land Bank Commission, while it is certainly not the answer to all the economic ills of agriculture in Saskatchewan, will help more young people to enter farming. I feel that there will be occasions when large estates are sold to the commission. These estates could in turn be divided and increase the total number of viable farm units. This should have the result of helping to sustain certain of the small rural communities which could otherwise disappear, as so many have already done.

The Family Farm Protection Act passed by this Government during the Special Session of the Legislature no doubt gave a measure of relief to certain farmers who were hard-pressed. How many farmers took advantage of it, I don't know. On the other hand, however, it certainly didn't have the disastrous effects that some of the Members opposite predicted that it would have. I remember the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) rising in his place and saying that if this Act were every passed all the credit facilities available to the farmer would be dried up – there would be no more money from banks – none from credit unions. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was sheer baloney; he knew it then and he knows it now. The Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) came into the House with a list of something like 17 implement dealers whom he had apparently contacted and encouraged to say exactly what he wanted to hear. I ask him how many dealers he can say face financial ruin today because of The Family Farm Protection Act?

I think, Mr. Speaker, what this Government has done in the field of health is widely known. The removal of deterrent fees, the abolition of hospitalization and Medicare premiums for those 65 and over, these were measures widely appreciated by the people throughout this province.

Since June 23 last, several items of note have taken place in the Maple Creek constituency itself. A new special care home, Cypress Lodge, will soon be under construction in Maple Creek.

Mr. MacDonald: — Is that yours too?

Mr. Flasch: — You want to take credit for it, Mr. Member from Milestone? You've done a whole lot more since June 23rd than you've done before, I'll tell you that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch: — It's true, Mr. Speaker, that some of the preliminary work was done by the previous Liberal administration. The size of this home, however, has recently been increased from 48 to 60 beds. Out of the total cost of \$580,000, \$116,000 will be contributed by the Provincial Government. Such a project has long been needed in Maple Creek and I am happy to say that it will soon be a reality.

Highway No. 371 has been oiled from the junction of No. 21 at Fox Valley to two miles north of Horsham, a distance of 18 miles. I hope that in the not too distant future, this Government will take the remaining 7-½ miles of this road into the provincial highway system and have it oiled to the Alberta border. The same I might add is the case of 321 from its

junction with No. 21 to the Alberta border. This has been oiled since last June. I suppose the Members opposite will want to take credit for that too.

A very interesting and imaginative scheme, which is of particular interest to the people of my constituency, was advanced jointly by the Chamber of Commerce of Maple Creek and Medicine Hat. They chose to call it a Regional Concept for Recreation and Environment. It involves pumping water from the south Saskatchewan River some 15 miles east of Medicine Hat, into a natural channel created during the glacial period which connects several lakes in southeastern Alberta and southwestern Saskatchewan; namely, lakes such as Chappice, Sam, Many Island, Bitter, Bigstick, and Ingebright. The water would eventually be returned to the South Saskatchewan River west of the town of Prelate. Such a project, of course, involves inter-provincial waters. We realize that there are certain related problems. This project has the potential to create facilities for stock watering, camping, boating, fishing, swimming and even a wildlife sanctuary.

We hope to bring this proposal before the Prairie Provinces Water Board this month and we hope that this will result in the setting up of a feasibility study and eventually, through the co-operation between the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the Federal Government, the development of this very worth while project.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Speech from the Throne brought down in this Legislature compares more than favourably with that brought down in Ottawa. That speech very vaguely mentioned "the goal of a total income security program for all Canadians." Mr. Speaker, I predict that this will sink into the same abyss which swallowed up the "Just society."

In unemployment, well, the Federal Government is going to "re-double its efforts." They haven't done anything up to this point and they are going to do twice as much now.

All of us, Mr. Speaker, know people who will be happy to learn that through the efforts of this New Democratic Government, they will be able to save a few hundred dollars on the purchase of hearing aids, or that they will soon have chiropractic services insured under Medicare, or that their civil rights will be protected by a Human Rights Commission and an Ombudsman, to mention only a few.

This province, Mr. Speaker, under this Government, will once again lead the rest of Canada in the field of humanitarianism and in the fight for social justice.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure as the Member for Moose Jaw North to speak in this Debate. I wish first of all to congratulate my new seatmate...

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I think I was standing prior to the

Member for Moose Jaw North and therefore would like to be recognized if you will please.

Mr. Speaker: — The matter is in the hands of the House. The Member for Moose Jaw North was speaking, it is a matter which is in the hands of the House as to what order the Members shall speak in.

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — The Member from Moose Jaw was obviously on his feet speaking. The orders are very clear that the first Member on his feet has the right to speak. Our Member was on his feet and I suggest he be allowed to carry on.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — If my eyes were right the Member for Watrous was on his feet first.

Mr. Stuart: — You must have eyes in the back of your head because you were looking...

Hon. Blakeney: — No, I was not, Sir, I was not. I was looking at the Member for Watrous. I suggest we leave it to the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Under Standing Rule No. 23, it says:

When two or more Members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls on the Member who first rose in his place, but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen be now heard which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

I would say that both Members rose at the same time. The Member for Moose Jaw I believe started speaking before the Member for Watrous, but as far as timing you need a time clock to say which one rose first. So it is entirely in the hands of the House. If a motion is made that any Member shall now speak that motion shall have to be put without debate under Standing Rule 23.

Mr. Stuart: — I move, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Moose Jaw North be now heard.

Mr. Speaker: — Call in the Members. The Motion before the House is on a motion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stuart), two Members having risen at the same time and under Rule 23, when two Members rise at the same time a motion can be made as to which Member shall now speak. The motion was made by the Leader of the Opposition:

That the Member for Moose Jaw North be now heard.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 14
Messieurs

Steuart

Boldt

MacLeod

Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Loken	McIsaac	Macdonald (M. Jaw N.)
Guy	Gardner	
Grant	Weatherald	Wiebe

NAYS — 42
Messieurs

Blakeney	Brockelbank	Cowley
Dyck	MacMurchy	Taylor
Meakes	Pepper	Faris
Wood	Michayluk	Cody
Smishek	Byers	Gross
Romanow	Whelan	Feduniak
Messer	Kwasnica	Mostoway
Snyder	Carlson	Comer
Bowerman	Engel	Rolfes
Kramer	Tchorzewski	Lange
Thibault	Richards	Hanson
Larson	Owens	Feschuk
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Kaeding
Baker	Matsalla	Flasch

Mr. Speaker: — I declare the motion lost and I call on the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) to speak.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I want to apologize to the constituents of Watrous for this kind of attitude, the kind of arrogance shown by the Opposition on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) took 15 minutes of my time, he took 15 minutes of the Opposition's time and he took more than 15 minutes of the time of the other Members of our side. I'll tell you that the people of Saskatchewan ...

Mr. Steuart: — Point of Privilege! My point of privilege is that he made a statement attributed to me and I should like him to explain what time I took of anybody's. Where is any rule in this House that gives anybody the right to speak...

Mr. Speaker: — This is a matter where an arrangement has been made by what we call the usual channels and the Speaker has no knowledge of it.

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, when I was scheduled to speak yesterday, and I want to reiterate this to the people of Watrous and to the people of Saskatchewan. We have what we call a gentlemen's agreement in this Assembly and I am afraid that the gentlemen have faded from the scene.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — I should have thought that

we were in a place where people could be gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, I want again to tell the people of the Watrous constituency that they are just as important as the people from Prince Albert West. As far as I am concerned the move that was just made by this vote was another arrogant move by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, radio time costs the taxpayers of this province a lot of money. The taxpayers of this province want to hear what is to be said in this House and they want to hear it from us as well as the Leader of the Opposition in 75 minutes of blasting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — And, Mr. Speaker, when the bell rang where were they? They were out hiding in the lounge, that's where they were. Mr. Speaker, let me say that this afternoon I am not going to be as long nor as vociferous as that of the ...

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Point of Privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! What is your Point of Privilege?

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite made a blanket accusation that we were hiding in the lounge. I was sitting right here in my seat for the whole duration and was never out of this Assembly once.

Some Hon. Members: — Apologize!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, to carry on, as I was saying before I am not going to make as long or as vociferous a speech as the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) or Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), as I am sure two blatant outbursts as they gave are certainly enough for one session.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to join with Hon. Members in congratulating the mover and the seconder in their ability to point out the highlights of the Throne Speech. I should also like to congratulate the Members who have taken their seats since we last met, Hon. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan) and the Hon. Members from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and Morse (Mr. Wiebe). I am not so sure how long the Member from Athabasca will be with us, however, we do welcome him at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want for a moment, to turn to my own constituency, that of Watrous. We are basically a mixed farming community with a heavy concentration of livestock to the North. We have three distinct ethnic groups which are situated at Prudhomme, Bruno area and Cudworth. Mr. Speaker, all of the people in my constituency are hard working, honest and extremely easy to deal with. I must say that I am proud to have been given the opportunity to represent these people and I wish at this time to thank the electorate for this opportunity.

The constituency of Watrous is, of course, not without industry. We have a potash mine at Noranda, near the towns of Colonsay, Young and Viscount, which are greatly aided by employment and it aids the areas of Watrous, Meacham and Bruno, as well. However, if this mine were at full production a considerable amount of extra employment could have been generated

March 3, 1972

and we would, of course, not have the layoffs that we have experienced in the past three months.

I also want to congratulate the town of Colonsay for winning first prize in the category of villages in the Homecoming '71 competition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — I want to thank the Government for grants given to the town of Colonsay for a water project, to the hospital at Watrous for fire protection, and above all, a grant through the Youth Agency for a sandlot baseball club to make their way to New Westminster to the Western Canadian championships last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to belong to a Government with such an imaginative, forward-looking Throne Speech. Briefly, what are some of the programs? Mr. Speaker, in agriculture under the Federal and Provincial Liberal governments of the past few years, agriculture has been virtually a depressed industry. Under the Liberals all farm commodities have decreased in price except the cost of production. Gross farm income as we know, has decreased. Net farm income decreased. Number of family farms decreased.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked, what did the Liberal Government do about this situation? Absolutely nothing. They merely said — if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen. With their typical, arrogant, devil-may-care attitude, they said the disappearance of the family farm was in the best interests of efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, this Government will not sit idly by and allow the depopulation of rural Saskatchewan to take place and further congest already overcrowded cities, which are plagued with unemployment, smog and slums.

The people of the Watrous constituency will be pleased to see the establishment of a Land Bank commission, which was mentioned in the Throne Speech, once again fulfilling a promise to the people of Saskatchewan. That promise was to stop the alarming decline in the number of family farms and the ever-increasing rate of large integrated corporate farms which virtually do nothing for our rural way of life in Saskatchewan.

I'm also pleased to see that legislation will be introduced to provide for veterinary inspection of all feeder cattle and hogs sold at auction markets. This will prove to be a very popular piece of legislation in my constituency, as a lot of cattle and particularly hogs are purchased and sold through auction markets.

In some instances, Mr. Speaker, animal disease has literally crippled some of our farmers to near bankruptcy. Mr. Speaker, I should also like to see the Government go even further in the area of disease prevention and cure. I urge the Government to explore a plan of 'Veticare' which would give veterinarians an opportunity to work with farmers, to set up proper programs of feeding and medication. This would greatly reduce emergency calls for veterinarians to farmers. This

program would literally save thousands of dollars in veterinarian fees for the livestock industry in this province. I am not so sure how well this will go over with the Member from Wilkie (Mr. J.C. McIsaac), but nevertheless we'll take our chances on him.

An Hon. Member: — No, he's not here just like as usual.

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased; oh, I thought I was going to be pleased, but I'm not so pleased, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has finally vacated his seat. However, I'm not pleased at all to see that he is out of the House this afternoon as I have a few remarks which I should like to direct particularly to this Member. Some of the Government's Insurance Office and about the firing of civil servants, have led me to believe that he was practising to become a comedian. It's not what he says that is so funny, but it's the way he says it, with a straight face. I think that should qualify him for a guest spot on the Flip Wilson show. I was particularly amused when Mr. Steuart said the Liberals had fired only ten or twelve SGIO agents in the time they were in office. Mr. Speaker, I have a clipping which says this. A clipping of January 21 in the Leader Post says, and I quote:

There were those who quit and went out of business under the Liberal regime, but not more than ten or twelve were cancelled outright during the eight years the Liberals were in office.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the Hon. Attorney General, compiled a list of agents fired by the Liberals, and he offered to make it public if Mr. Steuart was to continue his debate. However, you will note today there is some unusual but absolute silence on this issue. What would the reason be for that?

Mr. Steuart, I can assure you and Mr. Speaker that the fact is that there were literally dozens and dozens and dozens of agents fired in this province by that Liberal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a new twist to things. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and, of course, now the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) have both put in their two-bits' worth. They're on the rate kick these days. I would suggest to these gentlemen to look back at their dismal record concerning The automobile Accident Insurance Act. Look at your increase in rates before making rash judgements of a Government which has barely taken office. What is your record? In 1964 a compulsory insurance program received \$12 million, approximately \$26 per vehicle. At the end of 1969 premiums totalled \$24.9 million, or an average of \$53 per vehicle. One hundred per cent increase in insurance premiums in a matter of seven years. Mr. Speaker, I note the Opposition aren't taking up this rate kick on their own. They have a few friends in the business of the media. I noticed the other night on a television program that there was something about insurance rates. Funny to note, but it was only after this that the Leader of the Opposition started to wield the big stick about insurance rates. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Member from Rosthern that if they wish to criticize they should use specific information and not some

of the unfounded information they get from the news media.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this type of criticism is the same kind of derogation this Corporation has been getting during the past seven years from the Liberal Government. I am pleased to see this Government's meaningful and helpful approach concerning The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, instead of the destructive treatment handed out by the Liberals during the past seven years.

The mention, in the Throne Speech, of greatly increased benefits to the motoring public in the province, while holding these in line on premiums, will be welcomed. Weekly indemnity payments are to increase by 140 per cent. This will make the insurance plan in Saskatchewan, under the compulsory section, the best insurance corporation, private or public, anywhere in Canada excluding Manitoba and there they have Auto pack, thanks to a Socialist Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on co-operatives. Let me turn for a moment to the co-operatives and co-operative developments. I am pleased to see that the Department of Co-operatives have a valuable place in our society, as we can see every day with the multi-national corporations grabbing up more control of the market and more control of the wholesaling of our basic food stuffs. Pick one area out of wholesaling, out of purchasing. You have insurance companies and in the insurance area I can say that Co-op Insurance is one of the most forward looking progressive and efficient companies in the Maritimes, in Alberta and in British Columbia. Which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, are all capitalistically dominated provinces, with private insurance vendors.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Co-operation was nearly nonexistent under the past Liberal Government. This Department was operating on a skeleton staff, with virtually no budget, thanks to the Liberals opposite.

Credit Unions, today, are becoming one of the social institutions which cannot be matched by any bank or lending house. Let us not allow this system to falter by governments who will not have an interest in the co-operative way of life. Mr. Speaker, the Credit Union movement has shown its largest vote in history in 1971. Assets increased by \$80.5 millions, an increase of 18.9 per cent, an increase to a record of \$471.8 millions in assets. The physical growth was 14,921 members this year. They now have 334, 577 people in Saskatchewan sharing in the Credit Union movement. Mr. Speaker, that represents one-third of the people of this province and certainly worthy of recognition. With this kind of membership there is a need for legislation with teeth in it to protect that membership. In the past, we have seen a starved Department of Co-operation. Inspections were made of Credit Unions, there was no follow-up done and there were no corrections made. The result was the general membership suffered. There were no dividends. The loss exposure was high, and soon the Credit Union was out of business. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we need legislation which will allow an agency to give direction

to Credit Unions, which are in trouble and if we can but only save one of these Credit Unions we will have done a worthwhile job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce the students in the West gallery who have come in. There are 45 of them from Grade Eight at Cudworth, in the north end of my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers, Peter Yuzik and Sister Miriam. Their bus driver is John Yackiw. We welcome them here today and hope that the Legislature is an education to them and that they enjoy their stay in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, with that brief comment, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I t. . .

RULING

Mr. Speaker: — We are getting into a very bad predicament here in this Assembly. It's one that the Speaker hates to be put in but I can see that what is usually referred to as the usual channels for arranging debates, is not, does not seem to be working or appear to be working.

The duty of the Speaker is not to know what side of a debate a Member may or may not be taking, but I have to judge from where the members in the Legislature are sitting. I have 15 Members sitting to the left of me and six from the right of me. If the usual channels of communication for arranging debates cannot be arranged to relieve the Speaker from the position you are putting the Speaker in, then I have no alternative than to say that for every speaker I recognize to the left of me, I must recognize three speakers on the right of me. I have no alternative because the usual channels of communication seem to have broken down. So I call on the member for Nipawin.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): —Mr. Speaker, with deference to traditional parliamentary procedure, the practice is to recognize a speaker on one side and a speaker on the other. They have had two speakers on that side, and I think that in fairness and I don't know which speaker got up first, but with deference, I must appeal your ruling.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I should also like to point out that there are now two days left of the Throne Speech, other than today. As you know, the debate will be through, or today's proceedings will be through at 5:30, there will be Monday and Tuesday left, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you give three speakers on that side the opportunity to speak, for every one on this side of the House, that in

all probability many of our Members will not have the opportunity to speak. It is the usual custom where there is a large percentage on one side of the House that many of them do not speak on the Throne Speech and many of them speak in the Budget Debate as a result, because there just isn't time to hear everybody in the House. I should also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that, as you know, the channel, the usual channel of communication, when any time the usual procedure in the House is diverged from, or digressed from, there is usually an agreement that is reached between the two Members, the Whip on the Government side and the Whip on the Opposition side. The usual procedure of allocating radio time has been the policy that first of all the committee that is in charge of this would allocate the separation of the time between the two sides of the House, and then the Opposition side have the opportunity of allocating their time as they see fit. As you know, the other day the Leader of the Opposition was about to speak, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: — Gentlemen, I should like to make my point if I might...

Mr. Speaker: — But stay to the point that is before us, we should not be back in the allocation of radio time, that is not the point before us. What is before us, I had called on the Member for Nipawin to speak. I have explained my reasons why. The Leader of the Opposition has challenged my ruling. Now, a debate cannot be prolonged on the challenging of the Chair's ruling but I am prepared to hear one or two short comments, but it's not going to be a lengthy citation on challenging the Chair's ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: — All right, Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker, I will just finish by saying that that is not the rule and normal practice in parliamentary procedure of the Speaker of this House to make a designation as to who will speak and who will not speak. The rules of the House in any parliamentary system under the British Commonwealth or under the British Parliamentary System, is that the rules of the House are there to protect the minority, to see that the Opposition gets an opportunity to speak and in order to present their views on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. To allocate the time, three to one, will stifle the Opposition in this House.

Mr. Romanow: — To the point of order, very briefly, as Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, I will not presume to lecture you, Mr. Speaker, a man of some 20 years or more experience in this House, as to what the rules of this House ought to be as the Member of Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has just sought to do. May I say that I concur with his observations that Parliament is here to protect the rights of the minority; by the same token, I'm sure that the Member for Milestone will agree with me that the minority ought not to muzzle the majority and this is, after all, a form of debate. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, I see by the Whites of February 28, 1972, it was moved by Mr. Pepper (Weyburn) from our side, seconded by Mr. MacPherson from the Liberal, the Opposition side, that there be an allocation of radio time — 844 minutes to Government 281 minutes to the official

Opposition. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to abide by Your Honour's ruling and to abide by Your Honour's ruling that you saw the Member for Nipawin and that he should now have the floor to speak.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I can't permit debate, the ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Those in favour...

Mr. Steuart: — May I make just one brief comment? We are not debating the radio time, we've never objected to that, although...

An Hon. Member: — We are debating...

Mr. Steuart: — We are objecting to being muzzled by 45 Government supporters...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! What we have before the House is the challenge of the Chair. The Chair has ruled that the Member for Nipawin shall now speak. That ruling was challenged. Those in favour of sustaining the ruling of the Chair will say 'aye'; those opposed will say 'no'.

Mr. Romanow: — ...on by the Opposition here today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, if we haven't got the right to summon our Members, then these people, the NDP are trampling on the very rights of Parliament in this House as they have been doing ever since this Session started.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I can recall when they were in the Opposition they rang the bell and they rang the bell for 26 minutes one night when they hid out in the back. We are out trying to find our Members. Don't you think with their 45 Members, with their 45 Members, Mr. Speaker, that they can steam roller this Opposition, because they can't.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Order! We cannot permit this type of debate. Order! Order! Order! There was a comment and I permitted a reply from the Leader of the Opposition but we cannot continue a debate on it.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, then will you call them to order when they get up and to speak with this bell ringing and have not right to speak.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Speaker will decide when I shall have to call them to order which I have already done before you came in.

Order! The vote before the House is on the challenging of the Speaker's ruling. My ruling was that while there are some 60 Members in this House, 44 to the right of me, 15 to the left of me and if the usual channels of making arrangements have broken down or cannot be arranged that while it is the duty of the Speaker to protect the minority groups in the House, it is also the duty of the Speaker to protect Members of a constituency, so if the decision had to fall to me, I rule, that I would have to recognize three from one side, one from the other unless other communications are working. My ruling was challenged. I had recognized the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Comer) because two Members had risen at the same time. My ruling being challenged those in favour of sustaining the Ruling of the Chair will please rise.

The ruling of the Chair was sustained on the following recorded division.

YEAS – 40
Messieurs

Dyck	MacMurchy	Taylor
Meakes	Pepper	Cody
Wood	Byers	Cross
Smishek	Michayluk	Feduniak
Romanow	Whelan	Mostoway
Messer	Kwasnica	Comer
Snyder	Carlson	Rolfes
Bowerman	Engel	Lange
Kramer	Tchorzewski	Hanson
Thibault	Richards	Feschuk
Kowalchuk	Robbins	Kaeding
Brockelbank	Owens	Flasch
Baker	Matsalla	Larson
Cowley		

NAYS – 12
Messieurs

Steuart	Grant	MacLeod
Coupland	MacDonald (Milestone)	McPherson
Loken	Gardner	MacDonald (Moose Jaw N)
Guy	Weatherald	Wiebe

Mr. MacLeod: — Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — What's the point of order?

Mr. MacLeod: — The point of order is this. I don't understand the net effect of this because I read the rules of debate No. 22, it says every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his place uncovered and address himself to Mr. Speaker. No. 23, when two or more Members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in this place but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen be now heard which motion shall be forthwith put without debate. It is my understanding that these rules are now abrogated.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member has read the rules and I hope he

sees what is there. The rules are not abrogated, the two Members had risen and I called on the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Comer) because I saw him first, and my ruling was challenged. These rules are here and I hope that Members will try to co-operate with the Chair rather than to try to embarrass the Chair because that will not facilitate the work of the House. I call on the Member from Nipawin.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order then are you saying that the next time, as I understand the point of order you have now made, that you are informing the House that you intend automatically to allow three Members from the Government side to speak before you allow one Member from this side to speak under any conditions. The rules of the House say that when a Member rises first, one of our Members can be up clearly first, no question about it but if your ruling that you just made is followed then it doesn't matter when they get up. They can get up two or three minutes later and under your ruling, if only two of them have spoken then they can speak and ensure the debates of the House as three to one. This is a Legislative Assembly to hear both sides of the question. For the Opposition I think this would be totally unfair.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer).

Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, in many respects what we have seen here today is a pretty sad commentary.

Mr. Steuart: — It sure is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — All right, the trained seals can stop now. Mr. Speaker, we are here in a Legislature that follows the traditions of the British Parliamentary system.

Mr. Steuart: — False, three to one or six to one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor. The Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is lucky to have his seat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, this parliamentary system has been established not in my lifetime, not in the lifetime of any man here, it has been established over hundreds of years of tradition.

Mr. Steuart: — You killed it.

Mr. Comer: — Much of the tradition is not written down. Much of it is what we call common law. There is no rule to turn to. It is written in the hearts of men who will make gentlemen's agreements and who will keep those agreements.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Three to one.

Mr. Comer: — We have in this House established a principle whereby we divide up radio time. It has been in effect 27 years, it's as old as I am, and it's older than some Members here. Yesterday the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) rose in his place and said that there were no rules, that he was going to break all of those rules. Mr. Speaker, I submit...

Mr. Steuart: — On a point of personal privilege, I never said that the Hon. Member (Mr. Comer) should withdraw it.

Mr. Comer: — I withdraw that. Mr. Mr. Speaker, when this sort of behaviour occurs it is not just radio time that suffers. It is not just this Government that suffers or the Opposition that suffers, it is the parliamentary institutions of this country that suffer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — By carrying on irresponsibly you do not just bring disrepute on this Legislature, you bring disrepute on democracy.

Mr. Steuart: — That's exactly what I'm trying to tell you.

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker,...

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, when we look through the history of parliaments in many countries when either the Government or the Opposition has acted irresponsibly that the parliamentary system has fallen and I submit that by the action of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) yesterday, he is acting irresponsibly and he is bringing in disrepute this Legislature and as a consequence of his action he brings in disrepute the whole democratic system.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, this action on his part is a cheap political trick. He likes those words, we'll give them back to him.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Free speech.

Mr. Comer: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on, and deal with what I had planned earlier to speak about. I should like to join with those speakers who have preceded me in congratulating the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mt. Thorson) on his election to this House and his appointment to the Cabinet. I am sure he will carry out his new duties with vigour and to the satisfaction of the people of this province. I should like also to congratulate the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) on his election.

In his maiden speech I believe he showed that he will be a capable debater in this House. I should like also to congratulate the Hon. Member from Saskatoon-Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) for his appointment to the Cabinet. I have known this man and respected this man for some years and I feel confident that he will serve his Government well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I should like to congratulate the Member for City Park (Mr. Dyck) on his selection to the office of Deputy Speaker. He has a very responsible and, at times I am sure, a very trying position. I wish him well. I should like also to congratulate the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on his election to the position of Leader of the Opposition. I should like to commend the mover and the seconder for their reasoned and carefully prepared speeches. Their abilities will be valuable in this House. Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on to give my heartfelt thanks to the voters of Nipawin constituency by extending their confidence to me by electing me to this Legislature as their representative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Although I have lived in Nipawin itself for about two and one half years, in Nipawin constituency, I've come to know these people, their problems and their aspirations well and it's an area that I am very pleased to be able to call home.

Before getting on to the main text of my address, I would like to mention two honours which I'm sure Members here will be very interested in that have been bestowed on my constituency during the past year. The village of Codette has been awarded third prize in the Community Improvement Contest of Homecoming '71 in the Village Category. The Rural Municipality of Willow Creek No. 456 which is partially in my constituency, partially in the constituency of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and partially in the constituency of Melfort-Kinistino, has been awarded second prize. I think these awards indicate to the people of this province the pride with which the people of my constituency care for their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to realize that the election of the New Democratic Government has given hope to the people of this province. It has given hope to the farmers. When before has there been much interest in a government program concerning agriculture as there has been concerning the Land Bank?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — The farmers accept this program, they appreciate the Minister's action in going to them and asking them for their ideas. There is renewed hope for the small businessmen. Many businessmen that I know, some of them Liberals, some of them New Democrats have reacted with a great deal of interest to the announcement in the Speech from the Throne that this Government is planning to aid small businessmen. It has given hope to young people. They recognize in this Government a government which understands and listens to young people. They look with interest to the proposed Department of Culture and Youth. They

are reacting positively to a summer employment program. They are happy with the long awaited bursary program.

It has given hope to the working man, hope that this Government respects the working man and will not treat him as a second class citizen. He has seen the removal of Bill 2, the proclamation of the forty-hour week and the increased minimum wage. It has given hope to the educators of this province. A hope that teachers will be treated justly and that education once again has a priority, a hope that education will no longer be apolitical football as it has been in the past. There has been mention in this House of school closing and pupil-teacher ratios. I should like to relay for a moment an experience in my constituency due to the pupil-teacher ratio. The Nipawin School Unit was forced to close the school at Love Siding due to the pupil-teacher ratio. The people of Love on a number of occasions had attempted to get an audience with the Minister of Education. They got nowhere with the former Minister of Education. Within one month of this Government's coming to office, the school at Love Siding was reopened. When Members opposite say that the discriminatory pupil-teacher ratio is still in effect, I ask you go to places like Love Siding and try to tell the people there that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — This Government has given hope to our Indian and Métis people. This Government has shown a willingness to listen to our native people as no other government has. This Government is establishing a Department of the North, a department which will give the people of the North an effective voice. We will stop treating our natives as a political issue. We will start treating them as humans.

Hope has sprung from the realization that we have a government that has acted to curtail unemployment (although the Trudeau government created it) — a government which is making plans even now to deal with any future unemployment problems. It is a government which has done more than make announcements and announce plans, a government which has done more than hold press conferences and erect green billboards. It is the hope that comes from a government that has made millions of dollars available to put our people to work, and a government which has taken action against unemployment.

I am not trying to pretend, as our Prime Minister is, that unemployment is no longer a serious problem. It is a serious problem, very unfortunately. This Government is making commendable efforts to deal with that problem and those efforts are appreciated in the country. But as long as there is even one man or one woman who wants a job and can't get one, the people of this province know that this Government will not be satisfied.

I'd like to spend a few moments illustrating the benefits that are being realized in my constituency from employment creating activities of this Government as well, of course, as employing people. In Nipawin, this program is building a needed library, museum and an art gallery. It is also building an artificial ice plant. These projects greatly enhance the quality of life in the town of Nipawin, in towns around Nipawin such as the Codette area, and Lost River and other areas. In White Fox this program is building a Municipal Office for the

R.M. of Torch River adding to the town of White Fox, benefitting Torch River, Love, Garrich, communities such as Choiceland, Snowden, Smeaton, Shipman which are in my good neighbour, Mike Feschuk's riding of Prince Albert East. At the Pasquia Regional Park south of Carrot River, a swimming pool is being built, benefiting not only the community of Carrot River but also the communities of Aylsham, Arborfield and Zenon Park. Under the program to speed up the projects for which the former Government had erected green signs but hadn't turned the spade, our Government has built an addition to the school at the Shoal Lake Indian Reserve. It built an auditorium on the school of Cumberland House, and built a senior citizens' home in the same community.

Both these communities appreciate our speedy action.

The Department of Natural Resources in a joint Federal-Provincial program is spending \$100,000 to begin the cleanup of Tobin Lake. Although this is only a beginning it is a welcome beginning all over my constituency as well as all over northeastern Saskatchewan. Since the announcement of log cleanup I have had many people come to me and express their appreciation. Many have contrasted our action with the present the Leader of the Opposition's promise of quarter of a million dollars which never materialized.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition the other day quipped while the Premier was speaking, a promise made is a debt unpaid. I should like to read a few lines of the Debates and Proceedings of February 6, 1968. The speaker at this time was my predecessor from Nipawin, Frank Radloff. I am not trying to belittle Mr. Radloff. He was a man who did all that he could within his ability to aid our area of the country. I am sure that Mr. Radloff accepted that promise of a quarter million as a debt which the Deputy Premier would pay. I shall quote what he said:

This year our constituency was fortunate to have a visit from the Deputy Premier of the Province to assess one of the constituency's most serious problems, that is the log and debris in Tobin Lake. I am pleased with the Hon. Dave Steuart's visit to Tobin Lake. He did give a promise that his Department would try and budget some \$250,000 for a start to clear the mess of logs from the shores of Tobin Lake.

A promise made, is a debt unpaid and the bill collector was around on June 23rd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I should like to go on and deal with one of the industries which are of considerable importance in my constituency and that is the timber industry.

In my constituency are located a number of independent small mills hauling timber to the Timer Board at Carrot River. There is also a small mill at Redearth Indian Reserve cutting timber for local needs and another mill at Cumberland House which is at present sawing lumber for an indoor rink. The mill at Redearth is sawing lumber for a recreation centre. These mills are providing employment for natives in my constituency

as well as supplying material for needed local public works. The independent mills and the Timber Board give employment to people throughout my constituency. These mills make good use of the timber and they return every cent they make to the economy of Saskatchewan and they deserve our support.

Let's look for a minute at the Liberal plans for this industry. The Liberals promoted Simpson Timber Company at Hudson Bay. The Liberals brought in this company that sawed two-by-fours, using small trees. Once the company got into operation they came running back to the former Deputy Premier, the now the Leader of the Opposition and the former Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie), and said they couldn't make a go of it, so the Government of the day allowed them to cut bigger timber. They didn't cut it into dimension lumber. They cut it all into two-by-fours. It is a wasteful process, cutting it into two-by-fours. This method is a highly automated process. It didn't employ and isn't employing very many men and the company doesn't return its profits to Saskatchewan, it all goes to the United States. And this is what they called industrial development. And what is to be the fate today of the mills at Cumberland House and Redearth according to the former Government's plan? What is to be the plan for the Carrot River Timber Board and its feeder mills? They were left with small tracts of timber with about 60 million feet, enough timber for five years at best.

Recently when I was talking to one of the men in the bush — these are small businessmen who sure don't support the Liberals — he said: "The Liberals gave us five more years. Had they won that election this would have been the fifth year." From their former actions I think that would probably be correct. The Liberals planned to shut down the Carrot River mill. They planned to shut down the Redearth mill, while they talk about helping the natives. They planned to shut down the Cumberland House Mill, while they talked about helping the natives. This plan would have thrown hundreds of men out of work, men with small farms who need that employment, men who made substantial investments in equipment to work in the bush. And instead of these hundreds of men working, a few large contractors would haul out the trees employing very few people. That is what they call industrial development, at the same time returning its profits to the United States.

These deals have been made by the former Government. The timber will soon be used up that is left for these independent mills. Once this occurs, Simpson along with MacMillan Bloedel will be the only timber company in northeastern Saskatchewan. It is important that this Government take action to spring some of that timber from Simpson go re-establish as a viable operation the Timber Board, to keep the profits of the timber industry in Saskatchewan, not in the United States. The lumbermen of the northeast want the Timber Board. The ordinary people want it and I think once the story is known everyone in the province, except possibly 15 of them, will want it.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at some length on this topic but at some other time I think I will deal further with the deal with Simpson Timber. I will close now and I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I gather it is my privilege to speak at this time, under the rules that we are following whereby one Member of the Opposition will speak and three Members of the Government...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The rules that I said I would have to follow if Members were rising simultaneously at the same time. In the case of the Hon. Member who has just risen, there was no other Member rising at that time, but as I tried to point out before the Speaker hates to be put in this position, but I have to recognize, not just parties, but Members if the onus has to be left on me. I hope that I shall get the co-operation of this House so that I am not put in that position.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that you will certainly get my co-operation and I should hope that the Leader of the House, the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) will do a better job from here on in, than he has done. He is the new Leader, on your right and his leadership has broken down in the first week.

Let's just review what has taken place in the last few days. I, for one, am not really concerned whether I have radio time or not. There are some of us on this side of the House who feel that way and I imagine there are some on the other side of the House. I have never been that "up tight" about radio time. I think it means more to the rural Members than it does to the city Members. I have always been prepared to step aside either to make room for the other Members to have a little more radio time or for the Premier, in years gone by.

Once again, this year, I was quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to do so and indicated to Mr. Steuart that he could certainly have my 15 minutes. It seems to me that any arrangement that we can make of this sort should be acceptable to the House providing that we don't overindulge and go over our allotted time. I am not happy about the allocation of radio time but that was a minor detail compared to the fact that the Party Leader to your right, and the Cabinet — and I understand it went right to Cabinet — decided that the Leader of the Opposition would have 15 minutes and 15 minutes only and that was all. Now this is really the reason that we have got ourselves into this position. It wasn't our fault and I don't think you can point the finger at us. I think it was dictatorship, steamroller ship, on the part of the Government in not recognizing the role of the Opposition and the Opposition Leader, in giving him a fair break on the time that was allotted to him.

Just touching for a minute on what took place earlier this afternoon. If this procedure is followed, and I agree with you it must not continue because we are not getting anywhere, of looking to your right for three members and looking to your left for one Member in the case of a tie. Supposing that you only had one Member in the Opposition, I can tell you he wouldn't have very much of an opportunity to expose the weaknesses or the mistakes of the Government or represent the 43 per cent of the people of the province who voted against the Government, and I am sure that you don't agree with this either, because we can honestly say on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we are

very impressed with your fairness. You have treated us well and we will do our level best to treat you in a like manner, but we don't necessarily have to treat the Government Members the same.

As Mr. Steuart indicated, the rules of the House are really set forth to protect the Opposition, to give the Opposition an opportunity to speak on behalf of the people and criticize. The Government really doesn't need that protection with 45 Members over there. They have control of the House, and they can do pretty well as they please within the rules of order. I should hope that the older Members over there — maybe it should be the newer Members that I should be looking to for help in this regard — will recognize fair play and give the Opposition a break as we did in the past on allocation of radio time and speakers and all such things.

One thing about last June, there were a lot of promises made and I kept a file of them here and I have some pretty good ones. One type that really came to my attention forcibly during the election were promises by several of the NDP candidates that if their party was elected on June 23rd, small hospitals would be reopened. I think we have expressed this previously in this House. I believe one came from the Willowbunch area and one up in the east central part of the province. They made no bones about it. It wasn't put into language that allowed for any weaselling at all. They came right out and said that they would see that the small hospitals would be opened. But things seem to be a little different now, now that the NDP is in control of things. The Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) indicated the other day that they haven't opened any of these hospitals but he has met with most of them and they understand his feelings and he understands their feelings, and they are doing their level best to find an alternate use for the buildings.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been in every one of those 11 hospitals that were closed and I should like to know what earthly alternate use he is going to find for the Hodgeville hospital, for the Quill Lake hospital, for the Lashburn hospital — and that is a dandy. I think it was built in 1902, a complete firetrap and Mr. Hon. Minister you have a real job on your hands to find an alternate use for that building.

Now, why did he do this? Well, there is no doubt about it, closure of the small hospitals wasn't really a vote-winning procedure and we knew that. The one thing about the last Mr. Thatcher and his Cabinet is that we did what we felt was right regardless of the repercussions. We felt very sincerely about utilization fees and we went ahead and did it. But, this new Government on your right, they seem to feel that they have to have some little goody for everybody and they are either going to open this little hospital, they are going to help this age group, take the premium off those over 65, take those dirty utilization fees off, because they are a tax on the poor. One would think that the poor wouldn't have any other taxes. I am under the impression that the sales tax is a hardship on poor people, property tax is a hardship on poor people, and even income tax — people with very low income have to pay it — and some very poor people drive automobiles and they have to pay 16 or 17 cents on gas tax. They leave the impression that only the poor people got ill, therefore this was a tax on the poor. Well, I want them to know that a lot of wealthy people get ill too and a lot of wealthy people paid those utilization fees.

The whole approach seems to be to try and hoodwink various sectors of our population, whether it is the old people, the sick, the young or the farmers, and consequently win support and form the Government. Well, maybe this is the way that democracy should work. I don't know. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, socialism is inevitable because you are appealing to the weaknesses of us all for things for nothing. One thing about the Members to your right they are not really very realistic. They somehow think that they can keep on chipping away at the golden goose, or the goose that lays the golden egg, the haves, the producers and businesses and pay for all these programs that they plan on implementing.

Let's just look at some of these promises. It will take a little time to sort them out as there are so many, you know. Well here is one that appeared in — you know it is like a broken record almost when they get hold of something — the Health Care program and I am reading now from a pamphlet put out by Art Lloyd. He was my opposition and I haven't heard of Art since the election and I am not sure whether he lost his deposit or not. "The New Democratic Government will establish a new dental care program and provide prescription drugs at low cost through Central Purchasing and they are going to extend nursing care. Level IV cases will be brought under Medicare."

Well let me explain, Mr. Speaker, Level IV cases are cases such as are housed over in the Wascana Hospital. They are a geriatric type case, they are the next level down or up whichever way you want go from nursing homes. Nursing homes are Level III care and none of these Level IV cases come under Medicare. They come under Hospitalization, but someone made a mistake in the NDP hierarchy and this was one of their planks — and repeated all over this province. There are several pamphlets here, and here is one from the Hon. Member for Regina Northwest (Mr. Whelan) and he said:

We will include Level IV nursing care as in insured service under Medicare.

Well, of all people who should know better, the Hon. Member for Regina Northwest, because he spends a great deal of his time visiting people in nursing homes, and I commend him for it. More of us should do it. I'm convinced that more and more people should spend more time such as Mr. Whelan is doing and not to discuss politics necessarily, but even political discussion is welcome by some of those people.

Here is one in the Commonwealth, page 7, February 17th issue:

Give better care to our senior and chronically sick citizens through including extended nursing Level IV as an insured service.

There is a promise that was misworded and picked up throughout the province like so many parrots repeating it.

Now, what other one is there here, just be patient, Mr. Speaker, I'll find it. It is just an indication that not only were the older Members careless in the preparation of their platform but the new Members really didn't know what the heck they were campaigning on. They weren't sure whether they were going to open hospitals or close hospitals because some

candidates were saying they were going to open them. The Premier got into the show on the opening of small hospitals at one stage.

Also on the drug program, there is another one that several of the candidates were saying, "Elect the NDP and we'll introduce a drug program." But the Hon. Minister of Health said: "Oh, I am so sorry you misunderstood me, we didn't really say that. We said we would introduce a plan that would bring drugs more cheaply to the people." I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, if you want me to take time I can dig out the advertisements which stated definitely there was going to be a drug program. A pre-paid drug program. I'm in no hurry, I'm not on radio, no rush.

Here's a kind of an interesting one too. Here's a pamphlet put out by the political wing of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. They are going to include Level IV nursing care too. There's all kinds of things in here. Just a minute until I find one about the drug program. It's okay, Mr. Steuart, I've got quite a bit if I can lay my finger on it. They are going to lower the Medicare premiums to \$54 a year. I missed that.

Oh yes, Cannington: "Protect our rural way of life by supporting and encouraging government programs to assist the small businessman, " — well, I have something to say about the small businessman — "by halting the closure of hospitals and schools." Cannington is one area where I am sure that an opinion was voiced that they were going to re-open that hospital.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Oh, that was down in that good old Liberal seat. You know, -ms I believe that area was represented in the march on this building. They carried a banner and it said, "How low can you get." There was a picture of a snake and my name was painted right in the lower part of the snake. I think that came from Cannington, I am not sure but I thought surely that the Member might be in a little trouble over the closure of that hospital at Maryfield because they had voted Liberal since 1897 or something like that. But they faced up to the facts of life in spite of the clamouring of one of your school teacher friends down there who did so much to rouse the ire of the people and they re-elected Mr. Weatherald and I am very happy to have him here.

I wish this thing was dated but I note they are going to give Regina a greater share of the gasoline tax revenues, my son will be very glad to hear that, he's one of the hard-pressed aldermen now trying to make things a little better after the Hon. Member from Wascana got things in such a mess down at City Hall. They were going to introduce some flood protection along Boggy Creek. There is just no end of goodies, that's the point I am trying to make. They are going to build a power dam at Nipawin and there is going to be no purge of the Civil Service, rather an increase in job security. Well there are 31 people who I just wonder how sure they feel about that. They are going to end the depopulation of the province, create new jobs in Moose Jaw. The message I wish to convey to you, Mr. Speaker, is that the Members opposite were guilty of making many, many irresponsible statements during the election and have made gestures of carrying out some of the more serious ones and have made almost a joke of some of the others.

The chiropractors! There is a lot of talk about the inclusion of chiropractors. I for one am in favour of the inclusion of chiropractic services. I voiced my opinion in government on this score, but I haven't heard as yet any indication of the date when the chiropractors are going to be included. I should like to hear that. I believe enabling legislation is going to be brought in, but that's about all. I haven't missed any real goodies.

I am sorry the Premier isn't here because speaking of security for Civil Servants...

Mr. Romanow: — Take notes...

Mr. Grant: — No, I want him here, I want to save this one because it refers to something he said about one of my staff members. I just wouldn't want to miss him. I am afraid you might convey it back to him a little big garbled and not quite so clearly.

Where's that document I was looking for here. I'll find it, I'll find it. Here it is. One of the points that has been stressed, and I'll touch on this further at a later time, by the Government to your right seems to be giving the impression that they are going to do a lot for business. There is one document that came to my hand just last night that I think is worthy of note because it is drawn from the Journal of Commerce, February 2, 9, 14th, 16th, 21st and 23rd. This paper is a reputable journal on construction trends and trades in the Prairie Provinces. There are three categories to it, the tenders called, which is pretty important, a pretty good yardstick or indices of activity; contract awarded, that's maybe even a better one because sometimes tenders are called and not awarded; a third category which is very important I think is projects planned. Let's take a look, this is February, this is an indication of what is taking place during the month of February in this great NDP province of ours. Let's take tenders called. For instance in Alberta under the private sector there was six tenders called, in Saskatchewan three, in Manitoba 12. How many awarded? In Alberta they called six, they awarded six; in Saskatchewan they called three, awarded none; in Manitoba they called 12 and awarded two, not very good for the NDP government really. In Alberta 25 tenders called and they awarded 23, pretty good batting averages; but in Saskatchewan better still, they called 14 and awarded 14; Manitoba called 12 and awarded six. Now let's look at the provincial trend. In Alberta they called 11. I don't know how they awarded 13, they must have had a carryover from last month. Saskatchewan called 11 and awarded nine. Manitoba caught up on some old ones too, for they called five and awarded seven. Now there are Federal projects. In Alberta they really got busy and awarded a lot of contracts, 24 contract for Federal works awarded in the Province of Alberta in the month of February. Now let's look at Saskatchewan, there were four called and four awarded. In Manitoba six called and 13 awarded, so Saskatchewan looks pretty sick compared to the other two provinces. Let's take a look at this third category which probably is of more significance than the figures that I have been reading. These are projects planned, under these four headings, private, municipal, provincial and federal. To me this indicates that these four groups are planning programs and getting

March 3, 1972

on with the job of developing their provinces. Well let's look at Alberta, private 53; Manitoba four; Saskatchewan, four? No! Three? No! Two? No! One? No! Not a single private project planned in Saskatchewan.

Let's look at the municipal ones because you would think in this haven of state government at least the municipalities would be planning something with all the help that the Government to your right is offering. In Alberta 43. They have 43 projects planned. In Manitoba they have four private ones, municipal, none! In Saskatchewan four, three, two, one, zero!

Mr. Romanow: — Still working under the Liberal budget!

Mr. Grant: — I don't know, maybe the Hon. Members on the other side will say, this Journal of Commerce, that's a capitalistic publication, they're picking on us, they are just not recognizing us, but they haven't even recognized the private sector either.

Let's look at the provincial projects planned. Alberta eight, that's pretty good, eight projects. Manitoba, one, not so hot. Saskatchewan none. Federal, last but not least. Two planned in Alberta, none planned in Manitoba, none planned in Saskatchewan. A pretty dismal record. Granted this is only one month, but it certainly whetted my curiosity and I am going to be watching the Journal of Commerce for March to see what job generating projects this Government has been able to get off the planning board. But nothing for February. This is the great government that is going to do much for the businessman.

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Grant: — Yes, I'll take a question.

Mr. Wood: — What was the date of that report?

Mr. Grant: — I gave you that.

Mr. Wood: — I am sorry I just didn't hear it.

Mr. Grant: — I'll table this, I don't need it, I'm finished with it. It is the Journal of Commerce, February 2, 9, 14, 16, 21, 23, it is compiled from that.

Mr. Romanow: — 1971.

Mr. Grant: — This month, 1972, February 1972!

This is the answer to a question I directed to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) the other day. I thought I would glance at it. If I read it correctly, we have one hospital less than we had a year ago. The question, Mr. Speaker, was, how many acute care hospitals were in operation in Saskatchewan on February 28, 1971, and February 29, 1972? The answer to the

first part was 131, and the answer to the second part was 130. I guess the Hon. Minister caught up with one and closed it.

Now this brings to mind an answer that was given to me by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Wood). I think I understood him correctly, I hope I have my information correct. The Premier confirmed what he said. My question, Mr. Speaker, was do private hospitals qualify under the Federal-Provincial employment programs? I think the answer was Yes, they do. I know that the municipally owned or union hospitals qualify because I notice the Swift Current Hospital just recently has had a program involving \$32,000, so it appears the program is rolling along all right. Under date of December 8th over the signature of the Hon. E.I. Wood there was a letter addressed to all municipal councils, school boards and hospitals. It is headed up, "The Federal-Provincial Employment Loans Program 1971." I won't bother reading the letter because it is available to you and you probably all received it. It points out the forgiveness features etc., and clarifies some other points. It ends up by saying?

I sincerely hope that your organization will be able to take advantage of the extra assistance being made available by the Province.

Then there is another letter dated December 31st, and this was directed to the hospitals as well with the same heading. It says:

You are reminded of the deadline for receiving applications under this program.

They wanted the applications in by January 24th, and pointed out that there had been general publicity given:

If you have a submission to make under either program please make sure it reaches the Department on or before Monday the 24th.

There was a third letter, and I guess I have misplaced it. I am given to understand that several of the privately owned hospitals under the religious orders particularly are being denied assistance under this program. I believe it was the hospital in Humboldt, if I am correct. That is only an example though, but it recently got a letter saying that they were very sorry they didn't qualify and thus their project of \$25,000 for some work they thought was needed wouldn't qualify and wouldn't be accepted. Humboldt isn't the only one. I understand the Sisters' hospital at Gravelbourg, St. Pauls and Estevan are all in the same category. I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would either clarify his statement today or advise those hospitals that they do qualify so that they could go ahead with those programs, because these are pretty vital to the hospital affected.

Mr. Wood: — I clarified that...

Mr. Grant: — Well, I am very glad to have the record set straight. I was very pleased, Mr. Speaker, yesterday to have the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) set the record straight on insurance rates. It took a long time. I am amazed that he was so stubborn about it really. I thought he was a big enough man to stand up and say, "I made a mistake, I'm sorry." We all make

mistakes, we're only human, and he's human, believe it or not, but it took several days to get him to admit and get the record straight that there had been an increase.

Mr. Wood: — I realize this is out order but could I give the Hon. Member an answer on that?

Mr. Speaker: — Not at this time. The Member has the floor.

Mr. Grant: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice the Hon. Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) started off on a very high plane the other day by urging the Members to be honest and sincere and "let's not have any bickering," and I really felt enthused about this coming from a member of the cloth because the other member of the cloth over there didn't excite me that much last year. He excited me a little bit but in the wrong way. But I thought here is a man who is really speaking my own mind. He is going to be sincere, forthright, and he's urging his fellow Members to follow this line. But it didn't take very long for me to become disillusioned because he immediately got into world problems but worse still, as pointed out in last night's Leader-Post, he immediately failed to heed his own admonition and proceeded to make irresponsible statements. I should hope that the other Members opposite, particularly the newer Members would heed his suggestion and not his example. The Opposition has a role to fill and a serious role, namely, criticizing the Government, acting as a watchdog. I can assure you that our caucus some weeks ago decided that we would be a responsible Opposition and act accordingly. But it didn't take long, Mr. Speaker, for the steamroller opposite to force us to change our minds. I'm beginning to feel more sympathetic to those Christians who used to go into the Coliseum in Rome, you know. We're like the Christians, we know we're right but eventually we are going to be overwhelmed by numbers and defeated by those gladiators. Mr. Speaker, we've certainly seen a demonstration of that today. The Opposition is voted down right, left and centre, and to me this isn't carrying out the suggestion made by the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley.

I should like to dwell for a minute on the whole question of economic atmosphere for business. I am sorry he is not in his place. I was hoping the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) would be in his place. I'll make this statement with some qualifications. I'll say this, that to me he represents one of the few businessmen on the other side of the House. I won't say the only one but one of a few. I haven't seen his worldly possessions, but I understand he is a very successful farmer, a successful operator in a business way and has done very well. So, other than the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, there are very, very few on the other side, if my information is correct, who have run their own business. There are 14 schoolteachers, I believe, a couple of lawyers. I'm not sure which is the worst category as far as business is concerned. If there was a doctor over there I think the doctor would be probably the poorest, then the lawyer and then the schoolteacher. Here you have 45 Members with one businessman, question mark, maybe two, telling the 900,000 people in this province, "Elect us and we are going to do a wonderful job of increasing your opportunities and making things better for you."

I can't help but recall the Regina Manifesto. You know, quite a few of your Members sitting over there were not even born back in those days, but I was in that same age group, 1933, I believe it was. I graduated from the University of Saskatchewan in 1933. and if they think they have things tough now, after four years in University, the only job I could get was licking stamps at \$30 a month, and those were tough times, I can tell you that. I don't doubt that it gave birth to some pretty radical thinking to Mr. Coldwell, S.P. East, and who were some of the others? I remember one in particular — a railroader, what was his name? And another one who came along about that time was the Hon. Clarence Fines. He was a teacher, one of your people. As they say in that program, "He was one of you." He was a public school teacher. I don't suppose public school teachers in 1933 were making very much money. I can remember the rural teachers weren't They go two or three hundred dollars and in some cases they had to take it out in board and room or farm produce or something of that sort. So things were really rough.

By the way, I'm going to digress for a moment. I mentioned the Hon. Mr. Fines' name. When I say the Hon. Mr. Fines I am only quoting Mr. Fines. Now, it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, correct me if I'm wrong, that once a Cabinet Minister ceases to be a Cabinet Minister that he no longer has the privilege of using that title, "The Honourable". And if such is the case, I don't know what the procedure is, maybe the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) is the one to follow up on it. I think someone from that side of the House should communicate with the "Hon." C.M. Fines, Fort Lauderdale, I can give you his address if you like, and admonish him for using this title. He's been riding on it now for "x" number of years. About two years ago, I received a clipping from Fort Lauderdale. It was of a Symphony Ball and Mr. Fines is a patron of the Arts down there, and he wasn't in Fort Lauderdale and the news item stated that they regretted very much that the Hon. C.M. and Mrs. Fines (number two) were not present, they were holidaying as guests of the Australian Government. Now, this puzzled me a bit as to why the Hon. Clarence Fines would be hosted by the Australian Government. I tried my best to find out. The only advice I could get or the suggestion was that he was still riding on the title the "Honourable". That was two years ago but I can give you a more recent one. He was pictured once again at a charity ball. He is always a man of distinction, standing with a glass in his hand. They very seldom get him with a glass. I guess this is a hangover from his chairmanship of the Liquor Commission back in those days. Once again, he was patronizing these arts. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Attorney General to take that under consideration. I am not sure whether it is his responsibility or this Legislature's responsibility or your responsibility, but surely it's somebody's responsibility with authority to bring it to his attention that he should not use his title any longer.

Mr. Romanow: — I'll do my job.

Mr. Grant: — If he doesn't, by golly, I think I'll start using it again because I find it helps quite a bit. It certainly gives you an entrée to a lot of places that you wouldn't get otherwise. You get trips over to London, you know, you're wined and dined over there. You got to Vancouver on a wheat deal and I'm sure you get wined and dined there. I'd just love to be able to use

that title again. It's about the only thing, Mr. Speaker, that I miss about being a Cabinet Minister. I must admit I'm enjoying my leisure over here. It's not exactly the way I planned it but I can tell you I'm sure enjoying it. I've got more time now and I'd surely like to have the Honourable title. If you can arrange that, Mr. Attorney General, I am sure I would be indebted to you.

Mr. Thibault: — You'd better get a Senate job.

Mr. Grant: — No, I don't want a Senate job. That opens up a good subject now. I wouldn't take a Senate job if Mr. Trudeau offered it to me. You can quote me on that because I have no intention of every accepting that job. I don't expect I'll be offered one.

I want to comment about the research and planning that seems to be taking place in so many branches of Government these days. Just to keep the record straight so that the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) will not think that it was one of my deputies who told me this because I appreciate the fact that he is working well with the deputies I had. They are good men and I wouldn't for the world do anything to jeopardize their position. One of the deputies in the Government (that clouds it enough so you won't know who it is) said, "We're so busy making studies and having them scrapped that we just don't have time to do our regular work." Apparently, there are more studies going on and more probes and more thrusts. I am sorry the Minister of Health is not here because...

Mr. Romanow: — I'm taking notes for him.

Mr. Grant: — Oh, you're taking notes for him. Good. I notice he is making a lot of hay, political hay, out of his great PROBE committee. I think its PROBE. I don't know what it stands for, but I believe that's close to it. I think he's got another one called THRUST. So I inquired as to who made up this PROBE Committee and I find it's made up of the identical people that I met with every Monday morning and every Tuesday morning to discuss programs of the Department of Health and ways and means that we could improve them. I just thought it was part and parcel of being the Minister of Health. I didn't realize that you had to make political capital by announcing that you had a wonder new group set up called PROBE. If you would mention that to him, that it's really nothing new, he just put a title on it. I would hope that the Government would be bringing forth some of these studies and examinations that they are making because apparently it is going on in great volume in every department. Your personnel are so busy it's hard for them to keep up with their normal duties.

I'm going to have to turn up my hearing aid, Mr. Speaker, because I'm missing some words of wisdom from the other side. I just couldn't wait — I'm sorry that the Minister of Health isn't here because I want to tell him how sorry I am that I couldn't wait for that \$35 hearing aid that he's going to make available, but I'm sure that he will get me a \$35 credit note on this one that I did buy. And believe me, if people have as many problems getting used to the \$35 hearing aid as I've had getting used to this one, I just hope that too many people don't have to avail themselves of that \$35 hearing aid. In fact I

have one. If any Member on the other side would like to borrow it, in fact, I'll give it to him. When I came back from Japan there was a lot of noise about these \$35 hearing aids so I wrote over there and I got one. It's available, and I'll make it available to the Minister of Health so he can try it out first hand. If there are any of you that would like to use it, you are quite welcome to it. I'd say that for \$35 you are getting exactly what you are paying for. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister sees fit to issue me that credit note for \$35 because I couldn't wait.

If there are worthwhile remarks going to be made from the other side of the House, I'll turn my hearing aid on and I'll pick it up. Right now, I'm not tuned in to that side of the House. I'm on a different wavelength.

Speaking of studies, let's revert for a minute to these small hospitals. I well remember — I'm sorry again, the Premier is not here, maybe the Attorney General will convey this to him too — discussing with the Premier this question of hospital closure when it was at its height in this House. He left no doubt in my mind that practically, he agreed that there were too many hospitals in this province and that somehow, someday, someone had to reduce the number. And I also well recall, with the possible exception of one Member of the NDP when in Opposition, saying that we shouldn't close all hospitals. What they said was, "You're not going about it in the right way." In other words, they got the message, I'm sure, from the former Minister of Health, Mr. Blakeney, that it was inevitable that the number of hospitals in this province had to be reduced, so pick out the tender part, namely, the way we were doing it, and give the Government heck, which they proceeded to do. I am under the impression that the present Minister of Health, Mr. Smishek, is of the same opinion. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that any member on the other side of the House could sit in the office of the Minister of Health for very long without recognizing the fact that Saskatchewan has too many hospitals, too many buildings, too many beds. And one of the ways of trying to bring some sense into this per capita number of hospital beds is by reducing or eliminating the less efficient, older type buildings, hospitals, where the community cannot support a doctor and, for various reasons, are travelling far beyond their boundaries to get medical services. Take Quill Lake for an example. Now, if you think closing hospitals is a nice pastime I wish you had been with me in Quill Lake the night I went up to meet with what I thought would be a few people. I think there are only 500 people in Quill Lake. There were 502 people in the high school auditorium that night. When I was introduced they applauded me and I said that was probably the last applause I would get that night but before the evening was over I did get a good hearing and a good reception and I even had a little bit of applause at the end. Mr. Speaker, those people right in that audience (all 500 didn't come from Quill Lake, they came from the surrounding area), those people right in that audience were responsible for the closure of that hospital not me. This is the approach I took. I said, "Don't blame me for the closure of your hospital. You and you and you are responsible. We are caught in the cost-price squeeze, the same as the farmers, the same as you have been caught in the cost price squeeze." I doubt if there was any farmer in that room who hadn't over the last 20 years, if he had farmed that long, added to his holdings, increased the size of his operation,

to try to make it more efficient. Thus this had an effect on the rural population in the area. But we are still in this quandary and this is common to us all and it's just as common to you fellows over there as it was to me.

We all want to travel to the best places, we all want to go to the shopping centres and we drive right by our little corner drug stores and go to the large department stores. The rural people are exactly the same. God bless them, they deserve shopping facilities the same as I have but they are not going to get them in the rural areas so they drive by Quill Lake to go to Saskatoon. So the small merchant is suffering. Now where do they go when it comes times for hospitalisation? Well, about 40 per cent of the people who were expected to support the Quill Lake Union Hospital never went to the Quill Lake Union Hospital. They only time they thought of it was when they were well. When they will ill, zip, right by the door. They went to Saskatoon, they went to Humboldt. You name it, all kinds of places. We can tell you exactly where they went because SHSP have a record of where they went. I don't blame them. I can tell you that when I have to have medical services I want the very best possible. I won't be like the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) who went to Saskatoon for peace and quiet. He wouldn't admit that he went up there to patronize certain people. He said that his doctor told him that because he was a Minister of the Crown that he would be harassed and interrupted and everything else so the best thing for him to do was fly off to Saskatoon.

Well, the late Ross Thatcher, unfortunately because of his diabetic condition and the speed at which he went had to be hospitalised occasionally. He never went to Saskatoon. The hospitals can very easily hand a 'no visitors sign on your door. I don't know whether even that would have kept visitors away from Mr. Thatcher though because he seemed to think that while he was in hospital he had to carry on at the same pace as he did here. But I don't blame the people of Quill Lake and all these places for wanting the very best of medical services. But, believe me, if they are not going to patronize their local hospitals, they are not going to patronize their local doctors and it is inevitable that the utilization of those hospitals is going to drop to the point where the cost is out of all proportion to the number of patients in the facility. When the Hon. Minister of Health talks about using these buildings for alternate uses there are problems. There is a lot of talk about making nursing homes out of them. He knows as well as I do and you know it, that if they are not suitable for acute patient care, they are certainly not suitable for elderly bed-ridden patients. So the utilization of these facilities for other uses is quite limited and all I can do is wish them good luck in providing other services. We tried it with some success in Willow Bunch, Qu'Appelle, and I believe there was one other one, providing outpatient services. The presence of a doctor on certain days of the week, the availability of a nurse to help patients with arrangements with doctors, with the dressings and what not. The Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, are just as concerned about the health care of the people in southwestern Saskatchewan as you Government Members are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Let me tell you what happens. As you know the Val Marie Hospital was closed by the Sister, we didn't close it, the

Sisters closed it. They said they could just no longer carry on, it wasn't a viable project so they closed it down. Well, there was great pressure to reopen that building and all indications pointed to the fact that the community wasn't prepared to support a hospital in the standard that we thought it should be. So where did those people go for their hospital services? Well, Climax is not too far away. There is another place just north there about 40 or 50 miles, I can't think of the name of it, a good little hospital, a new one. But did the people from Val Marie stop at Climax? No, they never went to Climax, they didn't like the doctor over there. And did they stop at the other place, Ponteix, I think the place was? No, they didn't like it because that was a Sisters operated hospital and the Sisters hadn't been very good to them down in Val Marie, they closed the hospital, so no they weren't going to stop there. Where did they go? 75 miles to Swift Current. For good reason, far better medical personnel there, specialists. While mother was having her ailment looked after, dad was doing a little shopping at the implement shop or some place like that. So this is the problem. You talk about having all these small hospitals available within driving distance doesn't necessarily mean the people are going to patronize them.

I'll tell you another dandy, too. I remember the former Leader, the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, who asked in this House what the criteria was for the closure of small hospitals. I said, well, Mr. Speaker, I guess the first criterion is that they have to be in a Liberal seat. There was such an uproar of laughter and that was the end of the question.

I am thinking now of Climax and Frontier. Here was a shining example. You see Frontier was in existence from about 1912 I guess. They built their own hospital, a very successful operation and a very proud community. Wonderful people down there. But when the CCF came in 1944, or there about, I am not sure when they did it but sometime after than, Frontier hadn't been very good to the CCF in that constituency but Climax had been pretty good. So there was great pressure, "We need a hospital in Climax". Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how far it is from Climax to Frontier? Does anybody know how far it is — eight miles, but they needed a hospital at Climax. So the NDP or the CCF, got an old Air Force building and fixed it up in Climax and brought a doctor in there, so they had two hospitals. But immediately they got fighting with each other. Nobody who supported the Climax hospital would have anything to do with Frontier and vice versa. Sooner or later one of them had to fall on the ropes. Well, I suppose, I don't know whether it was political influence or what, but Frontier was the one that fell on the ropes, and Frontier was one of the ones we closed. A good Liberal seat, you can't say we were playing politics. We should have picked Climax and closed it, Frontier would have just loved us to do it. But we said no, it is operating and it has a better utilization right now that you people have. You've been closed for a year or so, so we closed Frontier. No, I don't think Frontier is that disgruntled today, even though we didn't win that seat. There were realistic, they realized it.

I can tell you another one, Lashburn, Saskatchewan. The Chairman of the Board up there, I believe it was Mr. Anderson and naturally he had to kick up a hue and cry about the closure of that small hospital. But privately he told me it was inevitable, that it had to go and they would have to abide by it. They are getting far better hospitalization up there now than

they had before.

Mr. Speaker, when the Members opposite try to mislead the public or the province into believing that they are not going to reduce the number of hospitals beds, they are not being honest, in the words of the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor). Because only last month hospitals in this province were advised that because of the high utilization of beds, because of the fact that Saskatchewan had more beds per thousand than any place in the world, we are very sorry but we're going to have to do something about it. You know why they have more beds than any place in the world, because you fellows built too many and you encouraged people to go to hospitals and utilize these beds. So now you've got the highest utilization in the country and the highest number of beds. So what did they do? They are not going to close small hospitals because politically that's not so good. So this letter went out to all the hospitals and it said that the formula in the past has been seven beds per thousand and hospitals should be about 80 per cent occupied. So 80 per cent of seven is 5.6, so we are going to recognize 5.6 beds per thousand of population in your area. Now there were some adjustments for the distribution of male and female and Indians and native population and like that, but basically it was 80 per cent of seven or 5.6. They said this new formula would be 5.3. I don't know what this is, that's 78 per cent or something like this. They didn't stick to any particular percentage they just said 5.3. So every hospital in this province is squeezed to that extent of the reduction of hospital beds from 5.6 to 5.3.

Now, I'm not arguing against this. I'm not saying that this isn't a necessary move, but is this a logical move rather than the reduction of the units that are less efficient where there are very, very inadequate services being provided? You are going to take the Humboldt hospital and the Swift Current hospitals, both excellent hospitals, the Weyburn hospital, that's a good one, put the little squeeze on them and reduce the number of beds. I would suggest that the MLAs from those or from any constituency for that matter check with their hospital and see just how happy they are with this reduction in approved beds. Now this may be the right way to do it, we'll wait and see. This may be better than being honest and frank and eliminating some of the very inefficient hospitals.

I can tell you one hospital, I don't want to name it because it would put somebody on the spot, where there was a death, solely and simply because the medical practitioner took too much on to himself. A one-doctor hospital of this province. Now this is a pretty sad situation, and you'll say, well, that's up to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, they shouldn't licence a fellow who does that. Well, that's not exactly the case either, you know. This chap may have been a fairly reliable physician but he is 20 or 25 miles from another physician and can't get him for one reason or another. He has the choice of driving the patient to another hospital where there is adequate staff but decides, well, it's somewhat routine so I'll go ahead with it. So one must bear this in mind that these smaller hospitals and inadequate medical staff and back-up staff, which is pretty important, really are not providing the most adequate service possible for the people of this province. Well, as one chap said, "Don't tell me that I get better service in the Regina General Hospital than I get in the Hodgeville Hospital. You know in the Hodgeville Hospital the nurses were always within sight and no matter when I wanted them I could always get

them.” In fact they were in sight so much that they were practically sitting on the patients’ beds, so they did have a pretty chummy relationship.

“When I was in the Regina General the other day I tell you the service there is terrible.” This is when the Member from Wascana (Mr. Baker) was the Mayor too. Well, having been a Chairman of the General Hospital Board I was interested in this statement. So I said, “What’s the trouble.” He said, “Well I had the light on ringing for help and I needs a bed pan and those nurses were too busy talking out in the hall to come in and give me a bed pan.” Well, I know that’s a pretty serious matter, when you need one, you really need it, but it is really not a reflection on the quality of medical and hospital care that you get in the Regina General Hospital. I think it’s a misconception, that chap didn’t realize that while that was very important to him at that instant, if he had been in the Hodgeville Hospital where he thought the service was better, he would have probably died of something else rather than the lack of a bed pan. So I would urge the present Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) and the present Government to be realistic about the distribution of hospital beds. God bless them if they can reduce the number, it is a very, very difficult job because as soon as you reduce 200 or 300 you are going to be opening another 300 in the Base Hospital here. So there goes your seven per thousand to seven point something or other. So it is not just a case of taking that static figure of seven and reducing it, there is a building up on top of the seven continuously. It is a very, very difficult job.

I am firmly convinced there are many, many ways that savings can be made. I am not convinced, and I know the Members opposite won’t agree with me here, that the wide-open-door policy of admission or access to medical services or hospital services is the answer. I maintain and I have said this before in this House and I’ll keep repeating it, I know you won’t agree with me and you’ll trample me down, but I still believe it, that anything, I don’t care what it is, that’s provided at the cost of the Government or somebody else’s cost is going to be abused. I don’t care whether it is stationery from the Clerk’s office, radio time, medical care, hospital services. If General Motors supplied it and they don’t put a limit on it, we’re going to abuse it. Anything, we abuse food when we have free access to it. Some of my own Members do, some of your Members do. If you have to pay for it, it’s a little bit different. Hospital services, recreation facilities, everything that is provided, look at all the abuse that is perpetrated by people on services and facilities that are provided for them. It is regrettable, I feel badly to think that human beings are not responsible enough in so many cases to take care of our parks and our public buildings. You can see it right in this building and it’s a shame. We pay a staff good wages to clean this building up, it’s really a joy to walk in here but the next thing you know one of our own Members, one of our civil servants are clomping up those front steps with snow and mud. They don’t even have the courtesy to stay off the red carpet for instance. You know these kinds of things happen. You can’t expect people to be any more responsible with the utilization of health services. I would just like to see the commissioner tell everybody to leave their rubbers at the front door or do as I do, carry them up in their hands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 3, 1972

Mr. Grant: —Mr. Speaker, the Members are going to have to speak up or I'm going to have to tune in on another wavelength. I'm on the wrong wavelength for those comments. You know sometimes it's a blessing that you can't hear things. I must admit I wasn't in tune with what was said there. I missed the entire point and I hope somebody will tell me what it was.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to convey my good wishes to the new Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson). I always felt that this young fellow would pop up again. I was sure that when he was — I don't know whether he was imitating or whether it was a coincidence — but he did sound a lot like Tommy Douglas. His platform appearance was good, his ability to speak was good and I said that sooner or later we are going to hear from that young fellow. He is an exceptionally able fellow.

I thought that maybe he would succeed Tommy but I guess he was too young then. But I recognize Mr. Thorson as a high calibre young fellow with good ideas. I don't agree with them all, but I will tell you about some that I do agree with him on. I wish him well in his new position. I tell you, having filled that post — and I am speaking of Industry and Commerce — I am not sure whether it was on two occasions or three as I was in and out of it several times. I was there long enough to find out that it was probably one of the most frustrating posts that you could have. I was very pleased, indeed, when the Premier took it over and gave me the Department of Telephones. I was more content over at Telephones. When I took on the Industry and commerce Department first of all, I must admit that I was just thrilled to death. This was one that I thought was right up my alley. I had many business associates across the country because I could contact my good friends and urge them to establish in Saskatchewan.

Well I can tell you it is a tough road and I just wish Mr. Thorson every good luck. There are times when he is going to wonder what the heck he is doing with his time because the results will be very, very difficult to show. Just when he thinks that he has something it is going to slip out of his hands and go to Manitoba or Alberta. Just when he thinks it looks good, you fellows are going to say, "Oh, subsidization is too high and we can't afford that." Or it may even be like the Heavy Water Plant. That is one you people are happy to criticize us for. I can tell you that I worked harder on that Heavy Water plan than I did on any other project. But when I got into it more deeply and was told about some of the problems that the plant might run into, and which proved to be correct, I could tell you that I was pretty happy when the chap from Victoria backed out of it. He knew what he was doing. He was a very able man and he recognized that the Glace Bay Plan was in trouble.

Well I can tell you that after spending all those hours trying to get that plan for Saskatchewan, it was pretty frustrating and really lets you down and you feel that you are more or less wasting your time.

I want also to congratulate the new Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe). Mr. Wiebe has had a lot of experience around the perimeter of politics. He is something like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). I kind of admire these fellows

because they have made successes of their own business. I think that is what we need more of in Government, and I am not picking on this House in particular, but I think we have to look more and more to people who have demonstrated to the people of this province that they can at least run their own business before they move into responsibility in school boards, municipal councils, city councils and provincial or federal politics.

In the case of Mr. Wiebe we certainly have that type of individual, a young fellow who has proven his ability to manage an operation, make a success of it and also proven his ability to appeal to the people of Morse. My good wishes to him.

As I said earlier, looking across the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, at the 45 faces, I can't help but be reminded of my feeling when I was in the Coliseum a couple of years ago. Those Christians just must have been scared stiff when they faced all those gladiators and all those jeering Romans looking down on them. You know we are really not afraid of the Government. We know that we are going to be steamrollered like we were today. We know we are going to be dictated to and sooner or later it will be zip off will come our heads and we will lose a motion or a resolution. But deep down in our hearts we know we are right and we will keep raising our voices, expounding our cause, defending our principles and looking after the interests of the people of this province, because as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said, you know you people represent the people of this province but don't forget we also represent the people of Saskatchewan and we are going to make sure that their voices are heard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Now as each Member knows, Mr. Speaker, the role of the Opposition is to criticize and to act as a watchdog of the Government. I feel that all too often each side is guilty of feeling that the voters expect us to stand up and criticize, harangue and disagree at all times and on all subjects. I really don't think that my example in this House in the last seven years would indicate that I have had too much guilt in this regard, but no doubt I have been guilty.

Well, we can't do too much about the other fellow because there is freedom of speech here and he can say what he wishes, but we can each follow our own conscience in this regard. I'll certainly try, Mr. Speaker, to do my part in offering constructive criticism where necessary and directing questions where warranted. While we probably will not disagree on some pieces of legislation or policy introduced or expounded by the Government, we cannot lose sight that our basic philosophy is different and this gives rise to many differences.

We believe in private initiative, the least government possible, letting people do things under proper conditions, economically and politically, setting the rules for them. I agree management is wrong and abusive at times, labour is wrong and so it is only natural that as Government people we must set the rules for business and labour. But at that point let's quit. Once we set the rules let's not get in and play the game too. And that is where our philosophies differ.

You fellows believe in getting into business, Crown

corporations, state ownership and all that. I am going to be perfectly honest, I disagree with you. You may be right but I am entitled to my own opinion. So with these basic differences, it is going to be very, very difficult to reconcile.

I congratulate the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) for the honour bestowed upon him to move the Speech from the Throne. This is indeed an honour and while I have had quite a few that is one that I haven't had. So you are one up on me now.

But I felt, Mr. Speaker, that his words were more worldly than provincial. A lot of his remarks had to do with conditions around the world and in other countries. I don't agree with everything Prime Minister Trudeau says by any means but I do agree with him that we might all be better off if we didn't watch so many 11:00 pm. News items. I think that is what he is guilty of. He is more concerned with all the problems of the world than he is with the problems of this province. But the thing that really bothered me was the fact, as I pointed out, that after this warning to us he turned right around and violated his own suggestions.

I mentioned, I believe, about his reference to a tax on the poor in reference to utilization fees and I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, just what impost put on by government is not a tax on the poor. I think we all recognize there are many, many people in our civilization that are not getting their fair break. Let us not kid ourselves that one particular tax is a tax on the sick or a tax on the poor any more than any other tax. I can tell you that when we get that tax bill from the city of Regina to pay those taxes, believe me, I think that is a tax on the poor as well considering some of the services that we get.

When I have to pay that abominable income tax, I am sure that some of the poor people must feel that is a real burden. Let's remove them all and help out the poor people. Let's take all the taxes off. Maybe this is the thing to do. Let's go in for complete socialism and let the government give us back our little pittance to live and let them have the rest.

I felt sure that the Premier would be back with us again, but, Mr. Speaker, he is the first one that I should like to appeal to and I would ask you, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), to convey to him in particular, because he violated the suggestion of the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley. He wasn't honest as he didn't set a high standard. We were successful in getting you, Mr. Attorney General, to be a big man, as you should be in your post. You hold a very responsible post in the Government, probably next to the Premier. The Attorney General has always been a man of repute and beyond question. So we were successful and I commend you for it and I am sure that you feel good now that you did stand up and admit that you had made a mistake.

But, in talking about dismissals, the Premier said, "Well, we only dismissed 31. You fellows dismissed all kinds of them and you chased some of them out of the province. For instance you chased good men like Dr. Clarkson, Art Wakabyashi", aid I don't know who else he named, but believe me when he mentioned Graham Clarkson it struck me. This is a downright untruth. I don't know whether that is unparliamentary language but if it

is I will change it to some other expression. But it is not a fact.

I was Dr. Clarkson's Minister when he left of his own free will and accord, no harassment, no chasing, nothing whatsoever. Do you know where he went? He went with the Liberals in New Brunswick, an appointment with those dirty old Liberals in New Brunswick. Yes, that is where he went. I can honestly say that I was sorry to see Dr. Clarkson go. I don't think the medical profession was heartbroken, but I can honestly say that I found Dr. Clarkson to be an efficient civil servant, one of the few doctors who has good administrative abilities. He had that rare combination of being a medical man and of being a good administrator, and there aren't too many of those around. In fact, I should like to tell you what the Late Ross Thatcher said when I told him that Dr. Clarkson was leaving. He said, "I like him. I am sorry to see him go."

Another thing, I personally put on and paid for at my own expense — not at Government expense — a farewell dinner for Dr. Clarkson and some of his associates in the Department. I wonder if this is what you do when you chase a person out of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — On Wednesday I phoned Dr. Clarkson and asked him if I or my Government or any Member of the Liberal Government chased him out. He said, "Mr. Grant, the answer is absolutely no and you can quote me in the House."

Dr. Clarkson is a man of integrity. He knows what he wants. He knows where he is going. He is a good civil servant. He gave the Hon. Premier good faithful support when the Premier was Minister of Health. He gave Mr. Steuart good support and loyalty and he gave me loyalty. If any of the Members or the Premier would like to 'phone Dr. Clarkson, I have his 'phone number and I will make it available to you.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, will the Government urge the Premier and other Members to be factual and straightforward with the truth.

Mr. Speaker,...

Mr. Speaker: — It now being 5:30 and we must adjourn at 5:30 on Friday evening, so I am afraid that I will have to interrupt the Hon. Member.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:33 o'clock pm.