

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
25th Day

Wednesday, February 28, 1973

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce to you and to the Assembly 65 Grade Eight students attending Division III School at Rosetown. They are located in the east gallery and accompanied by their principal, Mr. Jim MacIntosh, and teachers, Mr. Jake Wiebe and Mrs. Beth Robertson. The bus driver is Mrs. Betts. I know the Assembly will join with me in wishing them an informative and pleasant stay here this afternoon and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Premier Blakeney the Member for Regina Centre, I should like to introduce to you and to all Member of this Assembly, 20 Grade Eight boys from Regent Park School in Regina Centre. Their teacher Robert Grocholski is with them in the Speaker's Gallery. Since this school is close to my home many of these boys are my neighbors. On behalf of all Members, a warm welcome to these young citizens and their teacher. We hope their visit here will be an informative and educational experience.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my words of welcome to the Rosetown students and those other students who are here from other parts as well, but especially the Rosetown students. I had the privilege of meeting and speaking to them at noon today. I certainly was very pleased and surprised at the intensive questioning. I wish them a safe journey home and I hope they will be coming back again before too long. They are, of course, from the western part of Saskatchewan, the better side of the province and I hope the whole House will welcome them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Dr. Faris, MLA for Arm River, I should like to welcome the group from the Hawarden district. Dr. Faris is apparently tied up but will be here very shortly. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to welcome the students, teachers and bus drivers of Hawarden School and wish to introduce them to you and to this Assembly. I do so because some of them reside in Hanley constituency. I wish them a pleasant afternoon and hope that the time spent here will be of value to them in learning something about representative government at the provincial level. I also wish them a safe and happy trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. John Brockelbank who is the MLA for Mayfair constituency, Minister of Government Services, who is not here today, I would like to welcome the Estey School. Members of that school are in the galleries today to attend the proceedings of the House. I believe they are accompanied by two teachers, Mr. Demars and Mr. Kyle. I hope I have those names correct. There are 42 students. I am sorry that the Minister is not in the House with them today. I know he would have wanted to have been here to have said a few words to them outside. I hope they have a pleasant and informative stay in the legislature today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Intercontinental Packers purchased by Government of Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to make an announcement, a very important announcement to this House on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Premier Allan Blakeney, Mr. Fred Mendel, Chairman of the Board of Intercontinental Packers, Mr. Kim Thorson, Minister-in-Charge of SEDCO, Mr. John Messer, Minister of Agriculture, have today entered into an agreement for the sale and purchase of 45 per cent interest in Intercontinental Packers Limited by the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I might say that they were accompanied at the announcement today by MLAs John Brockelbank (that is the reason why he can't be here today) and Herman Rolfes, MLA for Saskatoon Nutana. If I might just beg the indulgence of the House because this is a very important matter, I am sure all will agree.

The Premier's statement in part reads as follows:

We are most pleased to become associated with Mr. Mendel in his company. The Government recognizes the great importance of Intercontinental Packers to the beef and hog producers of this province. And the very significant contribution which Mr. Mendel has made to the growth of our livestock industry and to the economic growth of the city of Saskatoon.

Our association with Mr. Mendel and his family in this company assures the province that the fruits of further developments in the livestock industry assisted by the Government's programs for agriculture will mean more jobs in the processing industry for Saskatchewan workers.

Premier Blakeney also noted in the statement just made at 2:00 o'clock in Saskatoon that the company commenced operations in Saskatoon when Mr. Mendel purchased the closed plant in the city in 1940. Since that time major expansions have taken place at Saskatoon and branch plants have been acquired at Regina, Red Deer, Alberta and Vancouver, British Columbia.

The company also has a large modern feed mill in Saskatoon.

Fresh meats and processed meat products have been marketed primarily under the Olympic brand name and sold from these plants to markets throughout Canada as well as the United States and Japan.

Commenting on the sale, Mr. Mendel in his 85th year, his 70th in the meat industry, says:

I feel that I have an obligation to my family and the people who have worked with me to make arrangements for their secure future.

This was not one man's accomplishment. All those who worked with me over the years made important contributions to what we are today. I feel that their best security is in this company.

Mr. Mendel confirmed that he will continue to manage the company as chairman of the board assisted by his daughter, Mrs. Joanna Mitchell, the company president and by Mr. Fred Mitchell, a senior executive of the company. Mr. Mendel senior further states:

This is a willing marriage and it is my hope and wish that both parties will benefit from it. I feel that it is in the interest of both the producer and the consumer that a major meat packing plant should have a Saskatchewan head office and be Canadian owned. Mr. Mendel says, we are the only company that can make that claim.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — As all Members know the continued existence of independent packing companies such as Intercontinental is important to the livestock producers of Western Canada. This new association between the Government and Intercontinental assures the continued independence of this company and consequently insures that this company will continue to maintain keen competition in the packing industry and will serve to assure producers of maximum returns.

The Government is also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that a business man of the stature of Mr. Mendel shares our view that we can work together to strengthen Saskatchewan industry to serve the world markets.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — This company is recognized as a major Saskatchewan industry which has made and will continue to make a significant contribution to the economic growth of our province, both in the Agricultural sector and in support industries. We have indicated our willingness to enter into joint venture arrangements with businessmen and we are pleased when Mr. Mendel willingly announced his engagement to discussion and an arrangement of this nature.

The Premier sums up:

Mr. Mendel is a young man of 84 who continues to look confidently into the future and his past record of success clearly demonstrates that he does so with considerable skill. We share his confidence in the future

of the company and of Saskatchewan and we are pleased to join with him.

Mr. Speaker, Members will know that Intercontinental is located in my home constituency and I regret not being able to be present with the Premier in today's announcement because of the House duties. However, I am sure that this announcement made to the people of Saskatchewan today will receive the approval of the workers in Intercontinental, their families and all the citizens of Saskatoon, who I am sure, will see today's announcement as the potential for even better and greater growth for the city of Saskatoon.

I want to congratulate Mr. Mendel and his family for a job well done in Saskatoon and voice my optimism for the continued success in the future of Intercontinental.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — I would like to first congratulate Mr. Mendel.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You know Mr. Mendel escaped from Germany and he came over to this country and he is a fierce free enterpriser. He was, up until a little while ago. I presume he still is. He is a great entrepreneur. And at no time in his very interesting career do I suggest has Mr. Mendel shown greater ingenuity and greater bargaining power than he did in unloading 45 per cent, I presume for cash, of his operation onto the Government of Saskatchewan.

The Attorney General announces this a great major break through. Well, I should like to know how much money this cost the people of Saskatchewan. We should like to see the agreement tabled. We would like to know how many new jobs this has created for the people of Saskatchewan. We would like to know whether this agreement will be tabled, and if so, when. We would also like to know if the Government knows if Mr. Mendel is going to take his new found liquid cash wealth he received from the people of this province and move to Alberta to escape the succession duties and the death duties imposed here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Mendel was selling his 45 per cent interest more to protect his family from the rapacious hands of the NDP Government after he goes to his reward than he was in any idea to increase the viability of his concern in the Province of Saskatchewan. I have every respect for Mr. Mendel as he is a good free enterpriser who did bring to this province a very viable industry. But I so far can't see any gain that has accrued to the people of Saskatchewan. When they table the agreement; when we see exactly how many people we have on the board of directors; when we see what assurance we have on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan that some of the profits that are made by this packing industry will be paid into the coffers of Saskatchewan then we may know. Because after all if you have got 45 per cent interest that means that Mr. Mendel still has 55 per cent interest and he can decide whether in fact he will pay any dividends; whether in fact he will defer those dividends

We may find that we signed an agreement, if it is ever tabled, that gives us the opportunity, the people of Saskatchewan, of giving Mr. Mendel a great deal of money for 45 per cent. It allows Mr. Romanow to stand up and announce as if he announced some great breakthrough for the Government of Saskatchewan. I would also wonder if the Attorney General would inform the House — Mr. Mendel or someone said this was a voluntary marriage. Was Mr. Mendel in the process of obtaining a loan or a grant from SEDCO and was part of the price for this grant or this loan and equity position by the Government of Saskatchewan? Because if this is true, then, I would suggest that there may be a shade of doubt about the validity of the statement that this was a voluntary marriage. There may have been a white shot gun somewhere in the background waved by the Premier for the arrangement of SEDCO.

Anyway I just say, Mr. Speaker, that we greet this announcement with some amusement, some skepticism and I hope again that the Government will be as quick to table all this information for the interest of the public. How much did it cost? What kind of an agreement have they got? How many people will it put on the board of directors? What guarantee have we got that of any profits that are made the dividends will accrue immediately to the people of Saskatchewan? How many new jobs will it create? And table this so we can look and see how good this deal announced with such fanfare today really is. We know it is a good deal for Mr. Mendel. I can see that immediately. Mr. Speaker, 45 per cent, I hope that satisfies the Wafflers. I would hope that Mr. Richards will rise in his place and strike a blow for pure socialism. Because this sounds like a pretty watered down version.

I find another interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the socialists, the NDP, are finally going to find out how profitable this meat packing industry really is. So we will look forward in the short time they have left in office to receiving the official statement of Intercontinental. What's the new name going to be, I wonder? Intercontinental NDP Packers of Saskatoon and Canada Unlimited. To see just how wonderful the intrusion of our money will be on the viability and the economic outlook for this particular company, I wonder if the Minister would say if they are prepared to table this information.

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in response I should like to say that I will certainly consider the request by the Leader of the Opposition, to table the agreement and the details of the agreement. That is the best that I can say to him today with respect to the details of the loan. That I think can be better explained and perhaps more accurately by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) when he takes his place in the House, I am told, tomorrow. He is up there involved in making the statement. I just can say also in answer to the question by the Leader of the Opposition that, to my knowledge, Intercontinental Packers is certainly a very healthy, viable and profitable industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. And I want to say also in response to the Leader of the Opposition when he suggests that the deal may have been motivated more for the interests of Mr. Mendel's family that belies the character and nature of Mr. Mendel. Anybody in this province who knows Mr. Mendel must know that he has been unselfish in his dedication to the Province of Saskatchewan. So all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we will certainly take into consideration the request for additional

information on the agreement.

Mr. Steuart: — A supplementary question, I wonder will part of the new product be called NDP bologna No. 1 brand?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — No, I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that it won't be because I think the products patent for "boloney" was taken out by the Liberals when it took power in April, 1964.

STATEMENT

Release of Details on University Act

Mr. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a Point of Privilege and clarify a point of confusion which may have arisen during debate yesterday when unfortunately I could not be in the House that I allegedly released details of Government legislation to amend The University Act.

I did not personally release to the media the published details of the proposed Government Bill on the University reorganization. Nonetheless I commend the legislative journalists for the investigative work and hope that it will serve to initiate a much needed public discussion of the place of the university in Saskatchewan society. For too long this discussion has been limited. I personally think the Government and senior university administrators are wrong to ignore NDP policy passed at its 1972 convention and continue support for the discredited one-university concept.

It is past due when the Regina Campus should be given complete autonomy from Saskatoon. The usual argument against separation is that a province of our population cannot afford two universities. With the present administration of the board of governors and president we soon will be unable to afford one university. Manifestly the example of the fumbling decision concerning the Engineering College, Mr. Speaker, indicates need for reorganization of the university. The Government must take an increased responsibility for major university decisions involving large capital expenditures.

The concept of academic freedom which is essential to strictly academic matters must not be abused as an argument to deny the Government's responsibility.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — On a Point of Order, a Point of Privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Actually the point rose yesterday when the statement put in the paper by a private Member was questioned. Had I known at that time that it was a statement by a private Member, it was out of order. The Member rose now on a Point of Privilege to make a reply to statements made yesterday. I have no way of knowing whether it is a point or not until I have heard him. But the statements which he is making is getting away, I believe,

from the statement which was in the Press. I believe he is bringing in . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — I believe it too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . I believe he is bringing in new information in a statement and I think the statement should pertain to what was in the Press yesterday. The Press of yesterday should not have been raised on the floor of the House because it was a statement of a private Member made outside of this Chamber.

Mr. Richards: — Accordingly then, Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling and refrain from completing my statement. However, I should like to repeat that I did not release in my statements to the Press any confidential information relating to Government legislation. However, in conclusion, I must congratulate the Press again for what I hope will be the beginning of a much needed debate about university re-organization and the need for leadership within the University.

QUESTIONS

Department of Agriculture Meetings and Surveys

Mr. Gardner (Moosomin): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Attorney General in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier. Yesterday I asked a question regarding a survey being conducted by the Department of Agriculture, if you will recall. We received no answer from the Minister and it is a matter of some urgency. Although I understand that the Minister did admit to the Press immediately after that this survey was being conducted. In the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture could the Attorney General inform us if this matter is being investigated and if consideration is being given to having the Human Rights Commission look into this serious invasion of the privacy of the farmer?

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — I would advise the Member that I was not present during question period yesterday, so I am not sure precisely of the question or the Minister of Agriculture's response. I can tell the House that I am advised that an investigation within the Department surrounding the circumstances of the question that you raised yesterday is being carried out by the Minister of Agriculture. Hopefully, in due course he will be either reporting to this House or will be able to respond to questions that you may direct to him on subsequent days.

With respect to the second aspect of the question, whether or not the matter has been referred to the Human Rights Commission, the answer is: It has not been referred to the Human Rights Commission by myself. That of course does not limit anybody else in society, a Member opposite included, if he wanted to bring it to the attention of the Human Rights Commission, or for that matter the Human Rights Commission picking it up on its own volition if indeed it is a matter of violation of human rights for investigation.

Government Policy on Unemployment

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, and in light of the ruling that you have already made today. In light of the fact that an emergency debate has been ruled out on the question of unemployment and there is no mention of Government policy dealing with unemployment in the Budget and your refusal on the last two days to let me ask questions about the Government policy on unemployment, Mr. Speaker, we would like a clarification of your earlier ruling. Secondly, our question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Finance: What is the level of unemployment that the Government opposite expects this summer and what are the Government's policies to deal with this tragedy?

SPEAKER'S RULING

Reading of Articles from Newspapers Etc.

Mr. Speaker: — I think I shall have to read to the Members the rules of the House. I think I can read the rules and it will explain what the rules of the House are. This is from Beauchesne, the Fourth Edition, Chapter 177:

Reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to questions when the Orders of the Day are called is an abuse of the rules of the House. It is not good parliamentary practice to communicate written allegations to the House, then to ask Ministers to either confirm or deny them.

It is a Member's duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of parliament. This has been decided long ago in the United Kingdom House of Commons.

On the 14th of June, 1882 Mr. Speaker, in preventing a Member reading a telegram from a newspaper and founding a question on it, pointed out the extreme inconvenience of founding questions on every telegram and every paper.

I am bound to say he added that it does appear to me that before such questions of such gravity are put, an Honorable Member should take some measure to ascertain the truth of the telegram.

Citation 178:

Questions addressed to a Minister should relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected to proceedings pending in parliament or to any matter of administration for which the Minister is responsible . . . Within these lines an explanation can be sought regarding the intention of the government, but not an expression of opinion upon matters of policy.

It is not in order to ask merely whether certain statements made in newspapers are true, but attention may be drawn to such statements if the Member who puts the question makes himself responsible for their accuracy.

If, for instance, a Member's question is based on a newspaper report to the effect that a serious offence has been committed by a certain government officer, the Member vouches for the accuracy of that statement which later on is found to be untrue, he will suffer the consequences of having induced the House into error and may be censured or sentenced to a penalty which the House may deem proper to impose upon him. Should the Minister concerned answer the question before the falsehood is detected, the House would be justified in punishing the Member with the utmost severity. If the Member refuses to make himself responsible for accuracy of the facts reported by the newspaper, the minister is not bound to answer the question. If a Member proposes to read a communication in its entirety or even a portion without divulging the name and address of the sender and the Member refuses to take the responsibility for the truth and accuracy of the statement such a communication should be laid upon the table and particularly, if so desired by any Member of the House. The principle upon which this is based is that where information is given to the House, the House itself is entitled to the same information as the Member who made or quoted the statement.

I would advise Members to continue to read the Parliamentary Rules and Forms from where I have left off. Ministers can be asked questions on their department, but not on future policy. That is my ruling.

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I have asked no question on future policy. I have made no referral to a telegram, I have made no referral to a newspaper comment. I have said we have been ruled out on an emergency debate on unemployment, we have been ruled out from asking questions on unemployment. There has been a complete screen of silence by the Government opposite on unemployment, Mr. Speaker. How are we to deal and ask questions on the tragedy caused by the Government opposite unless we are allowed to ask questions, Mr. Speaker? I have not referred to a telegram or to a newspaper. I have not asked about future policy, Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Minister of Finance, what is the estimate figure of unemployment this summer and what is the figure projected by the Government, and that figure should be available at this time. Mr. Speaker, it is an immediate question. I have also asked, Mr. Speaker, of the Government opposite what they intend to do about that tragedy, and it is not future policy, I want to know what their policies are right now, because we can't find out anywhere else, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — They are immediate questions.

Mr. Speaker: — We are now in the 25th sitting day of this Session. There has been nothing to prevent any Member from placing a substantive motion on the Order Paper. To ask the Minister of Finance what the estimated unemployment will be this summer, is asking for information which he doesn't have at this time. Under the rules he is to have information for what he is responsible for, he is not responsible for statistics which may appear

six months hence. I say that those are questions based on future facts, not on present day facts. Therefore the question is out of order.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services) moved second reading of **Bill No. 62 – An Act respecting Family Services.**

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, The Family Services Act which I have the pleasure of submitting for second reading today is in my opinion a very important piece of legislation for those children and families needing special assistance in order to function within our society.

The well-being, stability and health of individual members of society is, I believe, a direct result of the family life in which he or she was raised. While a child has rights of his own, such as the right of life, the right of happiness, the right to hope, the right to a proper upbringing, it seems to me that we can best protect these rights by creating a social climate that will help the child's family achieve its objectives. This Act establishes legislation to develop services to help the family meet these obligations.

Today, as all Members know, there is a great deal of pressure to make the family subservient to community institutions; to set some sort of preconceived pattern or role, to fit into what the institutions want rather than what the family needs. This trend must be reversed. Welfare agencies, schools, health facilities, are here to serve the family, not to have the family serve them. I am sure that all Members of this House would agree with me in saying that the family is the most basic and one of the most important parts of our society. The late George Vanier, while he was Governor General of Canada said this, and I quote:

During the past 35 years as we moved about various parts of this and other countries, my wife and I have been impressed frequently and forcefully by the vital importance of family life. We have witnessed the inner strength and confidence of those nurtured in the love of a true family. We have observed the lonely hopelessness and moral difficulty of those deprived of the support that only a family can provide.

It would, I think, be extremely difficult to overemphasize the importance of the family. No other structure in society plays such an important role in the welfare of the whole of society. As we are all aware families today are facing stresses that have never before been present. We are faced with an increasing breakdown of family structure, with sky-rocketing divorce rates, tense and often bitter relationships between children and parents, between men and women.

The Family Services Act was originally introduced at the last session of this Assembly. Since that time it has been the subject of a great deal of discussion throughout the province. Agencies and individuals have spoken to the Government about the contents of the Act. The initial distribution of the proposed Act was circulated to an extremely broad group, a group which included the judiciary in Saskatchewan, native representatives, police forces, including the RCMP, the regional offices of the

Department of Social Services, Provincial Public Health and Education Departments, Ministerial Association of Regina, the Saskatchewan Law Society and the Saskatchewan Medical Association, the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers, Foster Parents Association and indeed many other groups. Every group that wrote in asking for information was supplied with a copy of the Act for study.

Our Government went so far as to circulate the document to the Canadian Council on Social Development, the National Health and Welfare Department and the Child Welfare League of America of which we are also a part. We asked these groups for their comments and their recommendations on the Act. We received a good number of replies. Indeed I suggest that probably no other Act has ever been so widely circulated and had so much input from the public.

Many of the suggestions contained in the representations we received have been incorporated into this Act which is now before the House. Our Government feels the whole question of family support services has been well debated and analyzed by this process. We feel that now is the time to go ahead with implementation of the Act itself.

Mr. Speaker, while this Family Services Act is similar in some respects to legislation in other jurisdictions outside the Province of Saskatchewan, our Government feels that its uniqueness lies in the emphasis on co-operation between the agency or agencies involved in providing services and the clients themselves. This voluntary co-operative approach to this extremely important area of life, we feel, is a progressive move forward for the residents of our province. Further, this attitude does not prejudice those who come to the Department of Social Services requesting aid for a particular problem.

A second area of uniqueness contained in this Bill is the continuity of service provided. From preventative services within the family, an area that is perhaps the most important, and an area that our Government intends to ensure is stressed through the social services regional organization; through foster care on a temporary or permanent basis; to the involvement of the judiciary, the opportunity for continuity of service is provided within this Act. The Act will bring services to the children of Saskatchewan in the proper context of relating first to the family unit involved and then, only if absolutely necessary, through the further provisions of the Bill. The child in question is no longer seen as an isolated person, but rather can be viewed by our workers involved within the total context of society and can be dealt with accordingly.

The Act recognizes a responsibility to provide support services to families who need them while the child is still living in his own home and while the family can still help itself to care properly for its children. The idea being, Sir, that here our attempt shall be to keep families together wherever it is at all possible and practical. This Act recognizes the Department of Social Services' responsibilities as the largest child-care agency in the province to promote the growth and development of community services that support and sustain family life. We must assist in the detection of potentially crippling family problems. We must try to prevent families from breaking down. To accomplish this, services such as homemaker services, family counselling, day treatment centres for children, recreational services, family life educational

programs, day-care centres and so on must be provided. Some of these facilities are now being provided by private agencies. It is our belief that when feasible the non-governmental agencies, the non-profit agencies, should continue to provide these services. However, the Department of Social Services will assume its responsibility in promoting these services in the future. The Department will help by supplying technical, organizational and in some cases financial support. The Department will assist and co-operate in having services established where the need is shown to exist.

The Family Services Act allows the Department of Social Services to provide services directly to the family, when the family feels that it requires these services. The criterion for the provision of service will be that total needs of a family and not simply a financial test of need, as has so often been the case in the past. The principle here is that concern of the child cannot be separated from concern for the child's family. In short, when a family feels it is getting into trouble, it can approach the Social Services Department for help before the situation becomes critical instead of waiting until after a crisis has developed and has already destroyed the family relationships. They will be able to receive help without the child becoming a ward of the Minister and without the family being in need of public assistance.

Direct services to families where the child cannot continue to be cared for in his own home and must be removed will be provided through a non-ward care agreement. That is, the child may, by voluntary agreement of the parents and of the Minister be placed in the custody of the Minister for the period of the family crisis. When the parents are in a position to assume total responsibility for the child, the child can then be returned to his own home. This provision in the Act will constitute the primary method of providing services to families where children have to be temporarily cared for outside their own family unit. This service is given on a co-operative and voluntary basis. The parent is not subject to an unnecessary court experience.

The parent does not at any time lose guardianship rights to his child. It will keep to an absolute minimum the separation of the child from his parents. The court will be free to devote more time to those family cases coming under its jurisdiction where the force and the presence of the court are required.

Sometimes the basic rights of the child are violated even while he is in his own home. Parents sometimes cease to function as responsible parents. We may not like to admit that such situations do exist but the facts indicate they are very real. Children may be in serious jeopardy as a result of parental neglect or inability. The child, we believe, is not a chattel or possession to be used or to be abused. Our province, through our courts, must protect the child in this unfortunate situation. This Act continues to provide the protection of such children. When the child is in need of protection and the parents and the child or both are not prepared to co-operate voluntarily, our courts must have the power to protect the child in such circumstances. Unfortunately this sometimes involves removing children by court order from their homes and providing them with substitute care. This situation can be temporary or permanent depending upon the case.

However, such action will always be initiated in the interests of protecting the rights of the child. Benefits to the child will always be placed first.

Through this Act the Department of Social Services will continue to assist the single parent in making plans for her child. She has the choice of keeping her child and raising it on her own or committing the child to the Minister for the purpose of adoption. If the mother chooses to relinquish her guardianship rights to her child she will be allowed to do so with dignity. There will be no moral judgment involved on our part. There will be no accusation of disinterest or neglect in that decision. The method of committing her child to the care of the Minister may be by voluntary committal. At present the parent in this situation usually has to appear before court and in effect say that she is neglecting her child because she is unwilling or unable to care for the child. Then, on the basis of this admission, the court permanently commits the child as a neglected child to the care of the Minister of Social Services. This Act will allow the guardianship of the child to be transferred from the parent to the Minister by agreement of both parent and Minister. The primary purpose of this provision is to assist the unmarried single parent to plan realistically for her child. It is important to note that the Minister has to agree to a committal under this provision if it is to be valid.

For those situations that may be uncertain or situations where the force of court is appropriate, this Act makes provision for the voluntary committal of the child through the court in order to compel the Minister to receive the child.

In addition to strengthening the family and providing for the protection of children, the Department of Social Services provides substitute families for children committed permanently to their care. This Act makes provision to continue these services and to update services to these children and make them even more effective. These services include our adoption, foster care and institutional programs within the Department.

This Act also simplifies the total adoption procedure. It abolishes red tape and yet maintains a balance between the rights of the natural parent, the child and the adopting parent. The adoption service is first and foremost a service for children. While the needs of the prospective adopting parent are appreciated our responsibility lies foremost with the child. Therefore, simpler adoption procedures and streamlined court procedures will provide a better service to children waiting to be adopted and also, we believe, to adopting parents.

The Act separates the legal aspect of the adoption program from the service component. Major changes in the adoption legislation are as follows: A married couple or single person may petition a judge to adopt a child and this includes widows or divorced persons. When a child is placed in a home for adoption the prospective parents may within thirty days from the date of the consent of the natural parent, or within 30 days of the committal of the child, petition the judge for the adoption. This eliminates the automatic six months to one year waiting period before a petition for an order of adoption can even go before a judge. The petition for an order of adoption must be made within one year of the date of the placement of the child in a home for adoption. The Regional Director of

Social Services will submit a report for the case to the court at the time the legal documents are submitted for the court requesting an order of adoption. There will no longer be any need to obtain the Regional Director's approval in order to file a petition for order of adoption. The Department of Social Services will continue to provide services to the prospective parents throughout the adoption process. The Department, upon the request of the adopting parent, will provide a counselling service to them at any time before or after the order of adoption has been granted.

Step-parent adoption will also find its procedures streamlined. The Department of Social Services will provide a legal service to process a step-parent adoption application. We will provide a social service to the applicant upon the request of the court.

The Family Services Act also provides for assistance to children with special needs or who are in special circumstances as a result of which they are unable to get adoption homes. It is hoped that by providing for these children's special needs they too will receive the benefit of an adoption home, so that hard-to-place children may indeed find a home situation.

For the purposes of The Family Services Act a parent will no longer make a legal designation of the child's religion at the time the child is committed to our care. This will eliminate the legal necessity of having to match the child's religion to that of the adopting parent at the time the child is placed for adoption. This is not to say that the Department and its workers will ignore the fact of the religious background of the child. The religious preference of the parent, and in the case of older children, the actual religious upbringing or training of the child will play a significant role in the planning for the child. The new Act indeed spells out that the preference may be stated. The child's religion will be considered as are other factors that comprise the identity of the child. Wherever possible the natural parent's religious preference will be honored. This eliminates, however, difficulties present by the present Child Welfare Act where only Protestants and Roman Catholics can legally adopt a child. People of other religious beliefs have to swear that they belong to one of these faiths before they can legally adopt. Under this legislation any person can adopt a child regardless of his religious persuasion. A home, we believe, is a child's right, and without a proper home its religious designation will be of little benefit.

In conclusion I should like to say that our present Child Welfare Act has been substantially the same form since 1946. There are many concerns and values that The Child Welfare Act doesn't take into account. The Family Services Act, I believe does reflect contemporary values and needs and makes provisions adequately to serve these needs. It is our hope that it may provide a better and more positive way of meeting the needs of families in the 20th century living in Saskatchewan. Instead of approaching a family only after a crisis has developed, only after the family is already in trouble, we may be able to help families avoid trouble in the first place.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to move second reading of the Act respecting Family Services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on Bill 62 that the Minister has introduced today. I should like to go back and go over the history of this Bill. Certainly, it was first introduced in 1946 and there have been many changes since that time but in 1970, the government of the day under the Minister, the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), was holding conferences, as the Minister well knows, on child welfare with people invited to those meetings from all over the province. General discussions went on into the framing of a new Act. These discussions went on for some time and finally they were in the drafting stage with the department heads drafting a new Bill. Then the election came along, but if you look back in the records you will find it was at the drafting stage. We on this side of the House welcome this Bill because we feel it is a good Bill because, we, as a government at the time, had a lot to do with it.

There are certain things that we want to watch very closely in this Bill. I think the social worker is the key to the Bill. We don't want to give the social worker too much power, we don't want the social worker to be a stereotype who has just graduated from university and hasn't been out in the world to know what's going on. I certainly think that these are things that we must look at very carefully.

The Minister mentioned community services, and this we agree with. I feel very strongly, as do many Members in the House, that community organizations do a wonderful job and they seem to have the touch of the people and they get closer. The total needs for a family certainly are recognized and we certainly go along with this. But I think we have to look at the social aspects of the Bill. We have to learn to understand people a lot more and work with people a lot more. Mechanisms in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, must be watched very carefully and this we will be studying. At this time I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate because my colleagues would like to say something along these lines.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services) moved second reading of **Bill No. 54 – An Act respecting Children of Unmarried Parents**.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 54, The Children of Unmarried Parents Act is designed to provide the unmarried mother with the legal means of establishing paternity and of obtaining financial support for herself and her child. Previous to this Bill provisions for these actions were contained within part 3 of The Child Welfare Act. With, however, the introduction of The Family Services Act at this Session of the Assembly, The Child Welfare Act would then be superseded.

The provisions contained within The Children of Unmarried Parents Act contain those parts of The Child Welfare Act that have been excluded from The Family Services Act. The reason behind the two Acts is simple. We felt that the legal relationship between unmarried parents should not be viewed within the service function that is the basis of The Family Services Act. These services will be provided to any parent within the province under The Family Services Act. The Children of Unmarried

Parents Act is rather an Act dealing with legal relationships between unmarried parents. It provides, as I have stated, for the legal means of establishing paternity of the child. It provides for means of support for the child either through voluntary agreement between the two parties involved or through court action. It provides the unmarried mother with the basis for collecting expenses associated with pregnancy; and it provides for legal assistance for the unmarried mother to pursue claims for child support. The provisions for voluntary agreement between the mother and father is contained in this Bill, because we believe that if such a matter can be settled amicably between the two parties involved it is much preferable to forcing them into a court action. We believe the parents of a child should be treated by the laws of this province as adults, capable of assuming their responsibility. I might add that this provision was contained within the section of The Child Welfare Act I mentioned earlier.

We also believe that the mother of a child is entitled to collect the expenses she incurs for the lying-in period. Depending on circumstances, of course, this provision allows the mother to collect costs directly related to the pregnancy. This could include the loss of employment time, the cost of clothes, travel if necessary, additional medical expenses not covered under our Hospitalization and Medical Care plan, the cost of maternity home and so on.

The Act also continues the practices set down in the 1967 amendments to The Child Welfare Act which eliminated the Minister of Social Services as a third party to agreement. Once again we feel the people involved should be treated as adults. The old attitude of paternalism fostered for many years by many welfare departments is outdated and this was recognized in the 1967 amendments. Inclusion of the Minister as the third party is therefore unnecessary.

A change included in this Act speaks to the area of providing legal counsel to the mother. In the old Act provision was made for the Minister to provide counsel to the mother where this was deemed advisable. Under The Children of Unmarried Parents Act the Department of Social Services will provide the financial assistance necessary for legal action where it might be required. But it will be up to the woman involved to make the final decision on this matter. In addition to this the Act provides that a single parent under the age of 18 may initiate filiation action. Or if the single person is mentally incapacitated a friend or parent may act on her behalf. The Minister of Social Services will become involved only in those situations where the single person is already a ward of the Minister. This provision allows for a person who has not yet reached the age of majority to enter into a legal contract where that is necessary, without the intervention once again of a third party be it the Minister, her parents or guardian. It will allow a single woman under the age of 18 to deal with the legal steps necessary for her future as well as her child's.

Mr. Speaker, this Act is intended to complement provisions contained within The Family Services Act. The Children of Unmarried Parents Act I feel quite certain will receive support from the Members of this House. Therefore I would move second reading of Bill No. 54.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say a few words on this. This is something that had to be brought in and we don't see too many things wrong with it. Section 10 and Section 11, are sections that we are checking over, Mr. Speaker, these are the sections pertaining to where one or two or more persons may be the possible father of a child born. It is my belief that this is already covered but I should certainly like to look into this very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education) moved second reading of **Bill No. 56 – An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act, 1972.**

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill, An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act makes provisions for the payment of grants by the Department of Continuing Education. The grants will include new money in the community college projects. I should like to indicate the grant figures for some of these major items in this Bill since it gives us an opportunity not only to talk about the grants and the transfer of grants, but it gives us an opportunity to talk about the budgetary items as well.

The budget provides for \$675,000 for program costs in the four pilot projects now under way in community colleges. We hope to have all four areas ready to operate some courses by this fall and this Bill will permit the payment of money to cover those costs. You can talk a lot about community colleges but I have given notice today of a Notice of Motion of a Bill on community colleges and we will get time to debate and discuss this program later on in this Session.

As well as this new program and this new money, Mr. Speaker, there will be a considerable transfer of program and grant funds from the Department of Education. This includes the adult education money, roughly \$150,000 for programs now funded through school boards. For 1973 these programs are likely to remain largely unchanged because of our new emphasis on community colleges, the only difference being that the Government support will be channeled through the new Department. Another transfer of grants will occur with the \$906,000 in operating support for private colleges and colleges affiliated with the University. Another \$50,000 in capital money for these colleges will also be transferred. Several small grants such as the funds for Frontier College, the Labour College of Canada, the University Admission Service known as SACU and our grant to the Saskatchewan Association for Lifelong Learning are also to be shifted and there are others.

All of these shifts total \$1,112,100. Together with the new community college allotment, we expect that our payouts under this provision come to almost \$1,800,000 in 1973-74.

It is a very straightforward clause, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased to move that it now be read a second time.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I have very little to comment on this amendment.

It is an administrative technique in order to make the Bill and the establishment of the Department of Continuing Education an effective instrument to handle the administrative funds that are required. There is nothing new, nothing different in the Act. It is a transfer as the Minister indicated from certain fundamental responsibilities of the Department of Education to those new responsibilities which are now designated to the Department of Continuing Education and the Opposition will be pleased to support this amendment.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that **Bill No. 47 – An Act to amend The Larger School Units Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Thibeault (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this Bill, because I feel that it is a move in the right direction.

First of all I want to point out, I believe about 1960, the Indians were given the right to vote in this province under the Douglas Government. Prior to that they were given the right to vote, federally, under John Diefenbaker. I should like to point out that I certainly believe that it is a step in the right direction.

Last summer I had the privilege of visiting the Parliamentary Conference in Africa and we spent two weeks visiting with many different Members from different parts of the world. The question of minorities comes up quite often. But one that really ran very parallel to that of ours is the Australian situation. And when talking to the Australians the number of native people in their jails runs much the same as ours. Natives about the same percentage as what we have.

Their discontent, the attitude towards the rule of law by their native people is also pretty well the same as ours. They fight over aboriginal rights which also run pretty well parallel to those of ours.

When you speak to countries like New Zealand there the picture is altogether different. The natives integrated quite well with the white people so, therefore, it rouses your curiosity and you want to find out why has it worked a little better there when it has not worked too well here. Why does Canada run so parallel to Australia on the question of minority rights and aboriginal rights with our treaty Indian?

When you look at New Zealand, out of the House of 87 representatives, they have four Members who are elected to the House from the Maori group. Now by electing trustees to the Unit Board from the reserve, it gives the natives of the country a voice in government.

I want to see it go one step further. I think it would be a good move if we allowed four Indian representatives or native representatives in this Legislature. Oh, I know a lot of people would not agree with that and say, oh, we are starting something. In the discussions it was made quite clear and I want to read from the report of the 18th Parliamentary Conference, only a summary and it stated that problems of minority lay in the fear of exploitation, suspicion and jealousy.

Well, how are we going to do away with this jealousy and suspicion? I think one step in the right direction is to give them representation in the seats of our government. I want to complement the Minister of Education for having taken this step. It is a great step in the right direction.

As I said before, I would not want to see this stop there. Let us see if we cannot make our native people feel more at home by wiping out the suspicion. They have very little chance to elect a Member to this Legislature. We have given them the right to vote, we can find a lot of excuses not to give them a seat. It would be a very simple thing to allow so many reserves to elect a few members to this Legislature so that they could communicate much more closely with their government.

Therefore, in closing, I think it would develop a better attitude towards the rule of law by our native people. I also want to congratulate Mr. MacMurchy for his step forward and I hope that this is not the last one, that this is only the beginning.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I too want to add just a few words supporting this Bill.

I will try not to repeat what my hon. friend from Kinistino has said as many things that he has said I agree with.

Certainly it is a step in my life and in supporting this Bill it makes me very happy. I may sound as though I am boasting and I don't mean it this way. It was in 1958, the then Member for Cumberland, Mr. Berezowsky and myself, moved a motion in this House asking the Government to consider the possibility of giving the Indian people of Saskatchewan a vote. In the following year that was done. I think this is one more step, one more very necessary step, in getting the native people, not only the right but the opportunity to start being able to speak on their own behalf within the seats of government.

Two, or three years ago when meeting with Indian groups in my constituency one of the things that they mentioned is that they wanted to have some representation on the school board. In my home community we have complete integration now of Indian children, something like 260 Indian children out of about 550. I certainly am glad and I want to congratulate the Minister in bringing this one more step forward. I am certain that our Indian people are going to be very happy to have the opportunity to elect someone to speak on their behalf on the Unit Boards.

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we welcome this step. It is not the first step that has been taken, as the

Hon. Member pointed out, one of several. When we were the Government we made it possible for the Indian people to exercise their franchise when their reserve land, was in fact, rented out by non-Indians. They had up to that point no voice in the affairs of the Units or sometimes the RM and we changed that.

I should like to say, however, that in the middle of their self-congratulations about the great concern for the native people that they had a great chance and opportunity to have an Indian individual representative in this House by the name of Ray Jones, who almost had their nomination. But they did everything in their power, including expelling him from their party and then smearing his individual character in a manner that was unbelievable in the Athabasca by-election.

I should also like to challenge this Government, while they are taking all these wonderful praises to themselves for the real concern about the native people, I challenge them that there are fewer people of Indian ancestry working for this Government today than there were 19 months ago when they took office. I think that is also true of the Crown corporations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — They talk big about their help for the native people but when it comes down to real action — and this isn't action by half of the Government, this isn't making any effort for action by this Government to allow the Indian people to have a voice in some other level of government and there is nothing wrong with that. This isn't doing anything within our jurisdiction a provincial government. I would support this more but I would also like to see this Government continue to use some kind of a program. If they don't want to use a supernumerary program that we left behind, and they found some fault with it — and there was some fault with it — use some other program. But again I say, there are fewer people of Indian ancestry in the employ of this Government today than there were 19 months ago.

So while they are heaping praise on themselves let them examine their own consciences because their record is not all that clear, that good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few words in respect to Bill No. 47.

I want to agree with some of the words that were said by previous speakers on this side of the House, and I too would like to say that I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in respect to having a representative of the native from Saskatchewan in this Legislature, whether it is on this side or that side of the House. I think the time has come, in other parts of the world, in other countries, where people, the native people have representation. I think that it is time that we should, too, have a representative from native people in this House.

I think with the organization and development of the

Department of Northern Saskatchewan, I am sure that the native people will take the necessary steps to make sure that in future elections that they do have a representative sitting in this Chamber.

In respect to employment of native people, I don't know the number that the province at this time employs. I do know that efforts have been made and will be made. Efforts were made by past governments to give the native people employment in Crown corporations and in the public service, but I can recall a statement made by the late Premier and he said that it was very difficult because the people have no technical training and that they would not hold jobs. I think, probably with technical institutes and training people in the operation of heavy equipment, which is being done by the Department of Education, that these people will probably take more and more employment in government and in Crown corporations.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this Act is being brought in. I, as a school teacher, taught in a school unit where integration of a reserve into the unit was made in 1959. That was 14 years ago. The Muskeg Indian Reserve was integrated with the Blaine Lake School Unit and some 70 students from this reserve attended the Marcelin School.

I can recall, and I have discussed this matter of integration with some of the members who were the Unit Board members at that time, that the only negotiation for the integration of the reserve with the school unit took place between the Department of Indian Affairs, their agent and the school superintendent and the Larger School Unit Board.

The people of the reserve had no say at all. After negotiations were completed, I think the only fact that remained to the council and to the Chief of the reserve was to see who would be busing the students from the reserve to the school. This was the only participation they had. I know, as a teacher and I taught in Marcelin for four years, a large number of these students from the reserve were in my classroom and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time that their intelligence and the ability of the children – our native children – is just as good as any of the white students who were in the classrooms. As a matter of fact I know some of the students in my class and other classes were top students.

So, intellectually, given full opportunity for an education they are as good as any other ethnic group in the province. I know that when problems arose, and there are problems, between the children coming from the reserve and some of the teachers on the staff, it was very difficult to communicate with the parents, because there was no representation. Had this reserve had a representative on the school board, and the principal of the school had a monthly meeting with the Unit Board, this Indian representative could have spoken on behalf of some of the things that were vital to the students from the reserve at the Unit Board meeting and would have been able to communicate with the principal and a lot of problems would have been overcome.

Then in 1960 the Mistawasis reserve was integrated from Shellbrook constituency and was integrated into the Leask School in the same school unit. The same methods and means of negotiations took place as was done with the Muskeg reserve.

I am pleased, and I want to congratulate the Minister for

introducing a program for the training of the native students as teachers. Native teachers will fill the needs particularly in the northern part of the province of Saskatchewan. Teachers trained from their group, from the native group would know the problems, they would know the cultural background, and the needs of those children. I think that this is the right step in the right direction, to educate some of their own Indian personnel to become teachers to teach the students of Indian ancestry, will be good.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this Bill is very timely. It is only regrettable that this Bill was not brought into this House at an earlier date, but I think the fact that this Bill is being brought in at this time, I am sure that this will rectify some of the inequities and probably give a little more justice to the native people in northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two on Bill No. 47. Before beginning my remarks I want to point out to the Hon. Member for Redberry who just took his seat, and to all of them for that matter, that this isn't the first step as far as integration and giving Indian people a voice in school boards.

The Hon. Member for Redberry pointed out that he wished it had been done years ago. Well let me tell him that he can check back — it was 1969 — when amendments were made to The School Act in this province to permit the formation of a school district out of an Indian reserve, so that they could then come into either a unit or a sub-unit as the case may be, and at that time the objective was exactly the same as is intended, I am sure, by the Minister of the Government now, to give the Indian people, the parents, a voice in the affairs of the schooling and the education of their youngsters. So when the Hon. Member for Redberry and many other opposite, that have us believe that they just invented this concern for the Indian people, that this is a brand new move, an unheard of move, and a great forward step. It is a forward step and a progressive one and I commend the Government for it, but I want to point out to all Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, it isn't the first one, it isn't a new one and it is not one that has just been recently invented.

Three or four years ago that was the approach that the Indian people wished to take to become a district and then, if they wished, to be a part of a sub-unit or indeed come in as a total sub-unit if they so wanted. I think, again, we can all appreciate in this House the difficult political times if you like, the Indian people themselves have been going through in recent years, new found concerns for where they are going, dealing with the Federal Government and so on. I do know that only one or two bands did eventually form a district and become part of a school unit in the province. I believe there were one or two. And that again for a different reason really then because they were concerned with being on school boards.

So I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the present move of the Government opposite is a good one. It is not a new one, it is an extension of various moves and measures that have been taken in this regard through the years.

They had the right before to sit on Unit Boards and this,

of course, will make it that much easier for them to get on Unit Boards. The Indian people and their representatives have been involved in curriculum development over the last half dozen years or more. They were involved in reviewing the textbooks and the kind of changes that we would all like to see, as was pointed out by the Member for Nutana South in this debate the last time it was up for discussion.

They were involved, as was the previous government, in the establishment of the Curriculum Resources Centre at the University. Here, Father Andre should receive the greatest credit, more than any other single individual, or government for that matter, for the development of that Centre. The Teachers' Federation is to be commended for the work they did at that time in making those curriculum materials available, circulating them among the North and other integrated schools throughout the province.

As I say there have been many steps taken to integrate, if you like, or make for greater opportunity for involvement of Indian and Metis people in school affairs in the province.

The Northern School Board was expanded and representation was made possible in our term of office a few years ago. That in itself was a step and a beginning and I realize that changes have been made since that time in that regard, but this was one more step.

The other aspect of job training certainly was the heavy duty equipment operators course and I believe the Member for Redberry referred to that in his comments. That course was designed not entirely for the Indian and Metis people, but certainly it was one they utilized to a great extent and was one of many manpower training programs that were set up all across the province, not only in the North but everywhere to assist those people to get some job training. I think of the Basic Literacy Program and the Five to Ten Program. As a matter of fact, I am sure Members opposite may not be aware that those two programs, as are used here in the province, were pioneered by several people in the Department one of whom, I believe, is now back working in the Northern Affairs Department. But those programs are now being used by other provinces, by Manpower all across the country and they were pioneered in an effort to adapt and adopt and build programs suited to upgrading the literacy level, if you like, of the Indian and Metis people of the province.

The agreement to develop a program to train teachers of Indian or Metis origin is one that I want to congratulate the Minister on. It is one that has been discussed and looked at for a number of years. It is one that came out of the Indian Education Task Force Report. It was one that certainly had the wholehearted approval of the former Government and was agreed to at that time. I say that I congratulate the Minister on getting the University to move and get the blinders off and bring in such a program. It was a little difficult to talk to them with a view to making some deviations to accompany a program of this kind in the time when I had the opportunity to talk with them.

We did bring in a program of teacher-aids in the schools in northern -Saskatchewan, where the teacher-aids were of native

origin and this was another move.

So, Mr. Speaker, there have been many moves really to better integrate and to give better opportunities for Indian and Metis people to have a more direct say in the education of their children in this province. The Northern School System I am sure all Members are aware, to mention only one aspect was almost completely rebuilt over the last eight or ten years. This, in itself, has resulted in more and more students and a better attendance record. The percentage of students in the North who finished Grade Eight six or seven years ago was something less than five per cent. At that time you couldn't find enough people to put them into a teacher-aid or teacher training program, but because of an improved physical system because of many other steps that were taken by the former Government, Mr. Speaker, the schools that were built, the programs, the staff and the effort that went into it and the work of many good civil servants, many of whom are still with the Government, the situation is such today that more and more native people are indeed finishing high school and as such are able to go on and take up the programs that the Minister is now making available.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other questions on certain other aspects of this Bill that I think would be perhaps better left until such time as the Bill is in Committee.

We will be supporting the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like also to join with those who have preceded me in congratulating the Minister on introducing this Bill.

The Opposition has spoken, a number of their speakers indicating their support. They have talked about some of the programs that they began and I think in all fairness many of the programs they had were beneficial to the native people.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) mentioned the Supernumerary Program and he said it was the Supernumerary Program we left behind. I am not going to deal at any length with this program as I have spoken on this before and I think the way the program was developed, that is a good way to describe it — the program that was left behind.

Earlier in this House I mentioned the need for local control, for control being put in the hands of the native people. I was talking then specifically about the North. This Bill, almost exclusively deals with native people in the South. Giving native people some control over education is a positive development toward further local control.

In my constituency there are two reserves which could be affected by this Bill, the reserves of Redearth and Shoal Lake. These two reserves have their own Indian Affairs schools up to Grade Eight. Following Grade Eight the students go to the Nipawin Comprehensive School. Every year more and more of them are going. Presently out of these two reserves and some other native communities approximately 60 or 70 students are going. I am confident, given three or four years, there will probably be 150 students or more going.

And with this substantial growth in the number of Indian students attending this provincial school, I think it is going to become increasingly more important that these native parents, the parents of these children, have a right and have a responsibility to look after, to look into the education of their children. I think that we all admit that most of the important educational decisions that are made today, in Saskatchewan, as they apply to a specific school, are made at the Unit Board level.

This amendment will give those parents that opportunity to participate in planning their children's education. For this reason I am very pleased to say that I will support the Bill and pleased, again, to congratulate the Minister for bringing it in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few brief comments with respect to this particular Bill.

I noted that the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) said that it wasn't the first step and I agree with him. A number of steps were taken by the previous government in this regard. I am not interested whether it is the first step or the 10th step or the 22nd step or the 51st step, but I think that we must continue to make steps in this direction in relation to solving the problems between native people and ourselves.

Some evidence of this clearly shows up, even in the constituency of Nutana Centre, where large numbers of native people are moving into the city. I have had some meetings with these people and I realize, both from meeting with them and from studies that I have carried out in university classes, that the white man owes a great debt of attempting to do something, at least, to close the gap between ourselves and native people.

I think the Minister and the Government are to be commended for introducing this legislation, in the same way that I commend the previous government for introducing any legislation which might in any way improve the relationship between native Canadians of Indian or Metis origin and ourselves.

It is also an example, I would contend, Mr. Speaker, for our concern for local autonomy. The Opposition often thinks that this is a rather crude joke when we mention this but nevertheless it is true, we are concerned about local autonomy. We are interested in people having participation in their own affairs.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to add my voice to that of the Member from Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) with respect to the situation in Australia and New Zealand. I have visited those countries and the remarks he made — and I want to give a bit of emphasis to this — certainly hold true. The aboriginal problems in Australia are very acute and they are very similar to the problems that we have with native Canadians and Metis people in this province and, indeed, in other provinces in Canada.

Respect for the rule of law, can, I think, Mr. Speaker, be

appreciably improved if native people are actual participants in matters which affect them. I think that this is something that is apparent to all of us if we think about it at all.

The new Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Gough Whitlam, head of a Labour Government has said that he is going to do something about the aboriginal problems and I think that you can anticipate some improvement in the relationship in that country over a period of time.

As the Member for Melfort-Kinistino mentioned, for comparative purposes, we would be wise to take a look at another country which has had a much different experience in this regard in relation to native people, that is the country of New Zealand. Currently there are four members of the Maori people who are Members of the 87 Member House in New Zealand. Incidentally for the edification of the Members opposite, they are all Members on the Government side and in the Labour Party and, indeed, two of them, I believe, are Members of the Cabinet of that particular government, the Labour Government of the Hon. Norman Kirk, Prime Minister of New Zealand who was elected on November 30th last.

An Hon. Member: — Is it Liberal?

Mr. Robbins: — It is a Labour Government. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't lack talent, he just suffers from one fatal flaw which is common to most would-be comedians, lack of humor. People on reserves have some say, through a sub-unit board in a larger school unit board and this is an excellent step. As I said before, not the first step and it doesn't matter how many steps we take in this direction, if we are wise, we will take many more steps in this direction.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I again commend the Minister and the Government for introducing this legislation and I am quite willing to admit the previous Government deserves commendation for anything they did in this regard. I will certainly be supporting Bill No. 47.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a word or two of approval to this Bill.

I was a bit amused, again, by the antics of the Leader of the Opposition in trying to play politics, talking about the virtues of his Government, versus the virtues of this one. The tragedy of all this is that we are talking about and dealing with the people that no government in Canada has any reason to be proud of the way that we have treated them.

Certainly it is a black mark and certainly it is not something that any of us can claim any great merit or credit for. So I think that it is unfortunate when a government is trying to move, even in a very small way, that it should develop into a competition of who did most or who did the least. I think the treatment of our native people deserves better than this.

The inclusion of the reserves as a sub-unit will do one of several things but it will do this one very important thing — it will give them some recognition and some moral support in knowing that at last they are being recognized at the

policy-making level. That they are going to make such a great contribution is not to be expected. The point that is very important is that they will be there and the contribution that they will be able to make can be recognized and can be put into affect and built on.

It is my sincere conviction that as time goes on they will be able to make an ever greater contribution. Even though these people may suffer from lack of ability to express themselves, it should not be a deterrent to them being included, nor should it be a deterrent to them being listened to. Certainly this opens an avenue for them to express themselves.

In their struggle for recognition, in their struggle for self preservation, these people have a very tough and a very rough role to play. The native people have very good reason and very good grounds to worry about where they are going, both as a culture and in their way of life and in the future of their children. My association with them has shown that they are equally concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the direction of their culture, their children and themselves as any society on earth. That we make every avenue open to them to express themselves is a step in the right direction.

I would, too, want to compliment the former Government on the steps they made. I have not been one who has ever tried to ridicule what they did. I think it should never be forgotten that it emanated from the other side, that very little can be done for them because they breed like rabbits. This is not the kind of statement that these people are worthy of or should be made about them. So I want to state very clearly and emphatically that I have not at any time ridiculed any of the programs of the former Government. As a matter of fact, I did what I could in my own way to support them. And I would expect that the Opposition ought to do the same in this respect. A small step, but an important one and I want to commend and congratulate the Minister for bringing it forward and look forward to the time when we can move this a little further.

I agree with the Member for Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) that representation in this House is an extremely important matter that all Members ought to concern themselves with. I look forward to the day when probably from this side of the House we may be able to introduce a Bill that will make this very important milestone in the lives and in the history of these people possible. So, for these reasons, I can compliment the Minister and will support the Bill all the way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes of the time in the House to bring a few ideas regarding Indian integration that I have picked up in the last year or so.

I should like to point out first of all that I am in favor of the move towards integrating Indian children into our schools where they want to do this. This is no doubt a very forward and necessary step. We've got to give the parents of Indian children a say in these school affairs if their children are attending. We've got to give them a voice, there's no doubt about that and I have had opportunity to witness how this has progressed in the last few years in my own area where this has been carried out. No doubt this has created some serious

problems and it is to these problems that I want to turn my attention today.

I find that the problem of integrated schools is that they are not really integrated as such, they are white dominated to a large extent. Even in cases where the total number of students in a school is larger in number for the Indian population than it is for white, the school is still white dominated. We find that we don't like to talk about discrimination but it is still there because too many of our white people, and some on school boards as well, have the idea that the Indian has got to be shown the right way – that we, as white, we've got all the answers and we have got to tell them how it is to be done. I think that this is not the right attitude that our people back home have to take, or that they should be taking. I find, too, that in schools where our Indian children are attending, the classes that are offered and the subjects are straight white dominated, academic. Now you tell me what real interest that is to an Indian child. Really, does that help them to do better at school? We've got to go one step further than this legislation, we as the Government, and provide some type of incentive for teachers and boards, or direction if you like, whereby programs can be devised that will interest our Indian children and not just sort of ram down their throats the white dominated, academic culture.

For example, what's wrong with a school which has a large number of Indian students taking up a special class in Indian history. That would interest them – it's their culture and it would be excellent. What is wrong, Mr. Speaker, with our schools teaching Cree as the second language instead of French in these schools? You tell me. I would be proud to have my son, or my daughter going to school and taking Cree so that they can communicate with these children, if that is the case and I think this is the direction that we have to take in the future. Too often, we as legislators, sit in this ivory tower (if I may call it that) and say we are passing good legislation, it's going to do great things for people, but out there it is not happening. It's not coming through and I wanted to raise this matter today. Too often our ideas are just merely more writing on paper up here, they don't really take effect. Out there in the integrated schools things are not going as well as we think.

As a result of the types of programs that we are offering in these integrated schools, we have the problems of our Indian children showing little interest in school, quite often playing truant; attendance is a problem and as a result their level of achievement is not up to what we would consider white standards. It all boils down to – what are we doing for them in schools?

Now I can bring to mind a situation in my own riding whereby a school has been integrated now for nine years and in discussions with the school board I said, "Now what kind of a program are you offering to these people?" The enrolment, by the way, in this particular situation, is something like over 200 Indian and 87 white children and that's in an integrated white school so to speak. It's a white territory. What kind of program are you offering these children after nine years? The answer was the "straight academic white curriculum". This has got to be appalling. "How is your attendance?" "Oh, it's terrible; we have a terrible time with these children, although they are getting better now that we have a kindergarten we can try to educate them in our way from kindergarten." It was the same type of thing throughout the school. You talk to the teachers and say,

“What are you doing?” “I’m teaching them the white curriculum.” “How many children have you got in your class that are white?” She says, “I’ve got two whites in one class and the white curriculum is taught.” Now these are the things that I think we’ve got to look at. Take it one step beyond what we are proposing here now and we will have to bend our efforts as the Government to see what can really be done to make integration meaningful and not simply a white man telling the Indian that he has got to do something and it’s not his way at all. No doubt, this legislation will be the first step, but we are going to have to follow it up and do something meaningful and concrete to really get down to the problems at the school for the Indian children and the white children together if we want to solve our problems for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Bill without a doubt.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased with the support that has been received for the amendments to The Larger Units Act, particularly the amendment dealing with the clause which empowers the Minister to create within a school unit a sub-unit consisting of one or more Indian reserves.

I thought the debate, Mr. Speaker, was excellent, with Members on both sides of the House participating. It is unfortunate today that one of the Members in the debate strayed away from the topic of education and to a degree I thought spoiled the afternoon, particularly with respect to the discussion.

I was pleased with the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) for outlining the developments that took place over the last seven years and they weren’t without problems. Certainly one of the reasons for the move toward election to unit boards was that the previous legislation allowing the reserve to be set up as a district, only providing access to central boards and we all know the power enshrined in The Large Units Act with respect to the administration of the schools under the Unit Board. This, of course, is a step from the school district now to elections to unit boards, where there is, in fact, fiscal responsibility there have been indications from the native people that they wish this kind of responsibility and they wish this kind of election. This particular amendment makes that opportunity available to them.

I was pleased also as he outlined some of the developments at the University and I appreciate his congratulations on getting some action with respect to the training of teachers of Indian ancestry. The legislation is indeed a progressive step and I am sure that the Members of this House, the people of native ancestry, all Saskatchewan citizens and even more so, citizens in all provinces are looking forward to its implementation. This move, combined with the training of teachers of Indian ancestry is not only a progressive step, it seems to me it is an exciting step. It will have a significant effect, not only in the schools in northern Saskatchewan, but it will have significant effect in integrated schools, it will have a significant effect in all schools in this province.

The support for this amendment that has come forward, the

support for the amendment dealing with payment of sub-unit trustees, makes me proud to close debate on this Bill to amend The Larger School Units Act, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that **Bill No. 18 – An Act to amend The Small Claims Enforcement Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, the amendment which the Hon. the Attorney General has proposed to The Small Claims Enforcement Act, is an indication of some fundamental bias of the Government against corporations.

This Act is intended to give a swift, simple procedure to decide small and uncomplicated claims. At the present time the Act is available to corporations or individuals with claims up to \$200. The present amendments will discriminate against many of our small businessmen. For example, Mr. Speaker, if a plumber carries on business in his own name, he can use this procedure to sue for claims up to \$500. But if that same plumber should choose to incorporate his business he would be limited to suing for a maximum of \$200 through this procedure.

Mr. Speaker, there are no logical reasons why this plumber should be restricted because he has chosen to carry on business in the corporate form.

An essential feature of this particular Act is its simplicity. Admittedly, this Act does not provide for the trial of complicated issues, nor is it intended to. It does have the benefit of limited cost to the participants. Plaintiffs and defendants alike can have their rights determined with a cost of \$5, plus service fees. The Government is not helping the defendant in any way by limiting corporations to suing for the smaller amount. I remind the Members of this House that each of these actions involves two parties — the plaintiff and a defendant.

The Act is frequently used by landlords against tenants for failure to pay rent or for damages to premises. In these disputes, it is essential that the tenants have their obligations resolved at a minimum of cost. The present amendment would require landlords who have incorporated, who might have claims in excess of \$200, say \$275, to sue in the most expensive courts and is the more expensive procedure. This could result in substantial additional costs being charged against defendants. The present amendment, therefore, is a form of discrimination based on ideological ignorance. This amendment discriminates against such corporations as credit unions, religious organizations and service clubs. It discriminates against these defendants who will pay higher costs because their plaintiffs are forced to sue in the more expensive courts. This is an example of the government that we get from people who feed on prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I am totally opposed to the dissection of these rights into different levels of amounts. There is absolutely no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the claim amount should not be increased to \$500 across the board. If the Hon. the Attorney General had

chosen to substitute the \$200 figure with \$500, without any of the fancy provisions, Mr. Speaker, it would have received the support of this House. But the attempt to increase the figure to \$500 for some people and limiting it to \$200 for other people, Mr. Speaker, does not meet with our approval and as a consequence, Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I note with interest the remarks that have been made by the gentlemen opposite who took part in this debate on second reading and I again remind the House albeit I think there is an argument perhaps in this point. In any event the principle of the Bill is to increase the allowable ceiling thereby opening up to the Small Claims Enforcement Courts an avenue of relief to a number of people who up to now have been denied relief.

Now the Opposition sees fit to attach to that principle another principle. A principle of what they call political discrimination. In my judgment I really don't see that argument as holding particular merit — I don't think that that is the principle of the Bill. I want to say in particular though, that if this Bill does have the legal effect of excluding partnerships, unincorporated partnerships for example, we don't want to do that, we want partnerships to have the right to go to the Small Claims Enforcement Courts. My solicitors have advised me that in fact partnerships are not excluded by the provisions of this Act as was suggested by the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) in his second reading remarks last day. But, if in fact, there are any doubts about this we will take the appropriate amendment in the Committee of the Whole and make sure that individuals and partnerships are allowed the benefit of the new Act up to \$500.

Now, why the corporations — why are the corporations in effect discriminated against or a difference made with respect to them? Now the first point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is the obvious point. Lest anybody be under any mistaken impression about this Bill, the Bill as it exists or the amendment, this amendment does not take away any existing rights which corporations have. The existing right of the corporation, as the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) said, is to take the small claims up to \$200 and seek relief for it.

Again, I am not saying that this was said by the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), but in listening to his remarks, one could get the impression that somehow this Bill was taking away that right. I make that absolutely clear that the Bill does not touch the present corporate rights that exist with respect to small claims enforcement.

A second point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is a little bit about the history of this Bill and how the Small Claims Enforcement Act came into being. I wasn't in the House at the time, Mr. Speaker, the former Attorney General was one Robert A. Walker and when he instituted the Bill it was quite clear from the address that the Bill was to be a Bill for individuals. It was to be a Bill that would make for individual persons a very quick and easy way for the solution of legal problems and relatively small claims. The argument was that they would be able to get justice quickly, but they wouldn't have to worry about the

complicated and costly details that would be attached to a more costly law suit, if I can put it in those terms. They felt that \$200 was the appropriate limit. They gave it to individuals and they agreed as well that corporations would be included. The basic thrust of the Bill was and is that it should be a court for people, that is to say, non-incorporated bodies, individuals who have disputes and who want a quick ready access to a court without the details of lawyers, without the detail of rules, without the detail of carefully worded statements of claim and the like, to be able to get quick and good justice dispensed.

What has happened? We are advised in my Department in any event, is that very frequently corporations, small or large, use the court merely as a collection device. They are using it as an extension of a collection agency and there is nothing in law that says they can't. You might say as Members opposite that should be their right and that is what this Bill should do. But the result is I am told that in many cases and jurisdictions a corporation whether it is a small corporation, whatever that means, or a large corporation, whatever that means, will just walk into the magistrate and say, here is a claim or a file of 40 claims, will you please handle all of the matter of drafting the statements of claims, hearing the cases and the like. I say with respect, Mr. Speaker, that if we raise the ceiling to \$500 with this practice now becoming prevalent, it is even going to become more prevalent, because why shouldn't the corporations take advantage of this ready way and use the court as an extension of a collection agency system. I say that the purpose of the court is not to make it a collection agency for corporations, small or large, whatever those terms mean.

The purpose of the court is to set up a remedy for relief for individual persons, for the average farmer, for the average working man, for the average small businessman. I may say, the average small businessman, you could pretty well delineate him and I think the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) would agree on this, on the matter of whether or not he is incorporated. I know in my practice in law that there are small businessmen who are incorporated who can't make a go of it, but there is no real reason for them being incorporated. If he has gotten any legal advice going he would know that the differentiating mark between in effect the man who is getting into a larger business because he wants to protect himself on tax savings, he wants to protect himself with respect to legal liability. Therefore he incorporates and a good lawyer will advise him and say, look, you incorporate because you have that type of economic development that makes incorporation worth your time and your money.

When we exclude corporations, I say that although we might catch individuals who are in a real small corporation, I say with all sincerity to this House, and the Member for Albert Park, that by and large incorporations is the bench-mark I say that if this court is to be used for individuals, then we have got to be careful not to open it up, so that it is open to possible misuse by large corporations, by credit unions, by anybody who wants to use it merely as an extension of collection. If they are incorporated they should have the resources available to them for a ready collection of their debts.

I also want to say to the Hon. Member from Albert Park that we have had discussions with the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Bence and the Chief Justice has agreed to amend the District

Court rules and he will now as a result of the amendments permit small debt procedure in district court to apply to debts up to \$500. This will therefore have the effect of providing a simplified method of corporate bodies and of course individuals as well, but corporate bodies to bring actions and respective debts in the brackets of \$200 to \$500 in the district court, a little more expensive, but still a simplified procedure opened up as a result of the amendment complementary to this amendment for corporations.

So I can say with all due respect to the Members opposite that I don't feel incorporated bodies will be prejudiced by this amendment at all. In fact it is going to be as I say a form of consumer protection legislation, a right without over-running the court for our individuals, over-running it by excess demands by corporate bodies.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I must make one other comment with respect to the principle of this Bill. I note that the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) and the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) both will oppose the principle of this Bill. The principle of the Bill being as set out in my second reading remarks. Both the Members from Lumsden and Albert Park say they will oppose this Bill. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party's opposition to The Small Claims Enforcement Act is not new. Opposition to The Small Claims Enforcement Act making a court readily available for our poor people and low income people is not something that the 1973 Liberals were able to uncover. The Liberal Party has a history of opposition to The Small Claims Enforcement Act. You will note that when the Member for Lumsden spoke on this Bill, I looked at his transcript – I won't say so much for the Member from Albert Park who I believe honestly thinks that the court has something to contribute – but if you peruse the remarks of the Member for Lumsden I don't think you will find there any statement of support for The Small Claims Enforcement Court. Rather the entire remarks were about the business of discrimination politically. That may have appeared to be an oversight, but I say that it was not an oversight. I say that when the Liberals say that they are opposed to these Small Claims Enforcement Court amendments, they are really saying that they are consistent with their position when the Bill was first introduced, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was introduced in 1959 and I have in front of me Part I of those Debates and Proceedings, and I am quoting from page 51 where the Attorney General of the day, Mr. Robert Walker introduced this new court and explained the purposes of the court. There was one critic from the Opposition side, who was the Attorney General's aid, who is now on the Bench, her name was Mary Batten. Mrs. Batten was the MLA for Humboldt constituency. I want you to hear this, Mr. Speaker, what she said about the Small Claim Enforcement Court when she opposed it. I am quoting from page 54:

Secondly, that case is not then heard before that magistrate but before another court . . .

Mr. MacLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. It does seem that the Hon. Attorney General is wandering far afield in the defence of his position. Now I recognize that the weaker the position the stronger he has to shout and the farther he has to go afield, nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, we had a marathon debate this afternoon on other matters, perhaps we could limit the debate to something a little less broad.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Point of Order is very simply this, as I understand it. In closing a debate on second reading a Member may not bring in completely new material. This is what I believe the Attorney General is doing.

Mr. Speaker: — The Point of Order raised by the Member is correct that new material cannot be introduced in closing the debate. You may only answer statements which were raised during the debate, you cannot bring in new material.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, just on this point, my point is simply this, that the Members opposite during the course of this debate have stated one thing. They have stated that they oppose this Bill. In rebuttal I am asking this House and the Legislature why do they oppose the Bill? What I am saying is that they oppose because historically they have been opposed to this Court. What I should like to do is to establish for the record just exactly where the opposition took place when the Bill was introduced. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit with all due respect, and I am not going to belabor it but I do submit that the brief statement as to what was said at the time when the Small Claims Bill was brought in, to show that the opposition to the Bill still runs clear, is in order.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order. I appreciate the point the Hon. Member is trying to make. But he must base his remarks in closing this debate on the remarks made by participants in the actual debate. There is no way he can go back to 15, 13, or 12 years ago and associate the remarks of someone who is no longer in the House with the remarks of the people opposite here now. In this particular debate you can't take the remarks from another debate and say that represents the thinking of the Members opposite in the current debate.

Mr. Speaker: — It is true the Minister cannot introduce new materials in closing debate. He can answer the statements made or criticisms, but not introduce new material.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I am still not sure what the ruling is. Perhaps to save time I ought not to go into this. Are you saying I can read this or not?

Mr. Speaker: — If it introduces new material you cannot. If it is a direct answer to the statements made in this debate, it is permissible. If it is new material, I don't know what you have before you, but if it is new material then it can't be introduced at this time.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't quote this passage. But I can say that the critic at the time was an MLA by the name of Mrs. Batten who, when the judge . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Don't say anything about judges.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — I am not, I think she is an excellent judge, a perfect judge, I think she is impartial like all judges, magistrates and district court judges are.

I can say that at the time when she was an MLA she was slightly biased, politically biased, in any event. I want to tell the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and tell this House that the Member at that time, the only speaker for the Liberal Party was that critic who opposed The Small Claims Enforcement Act and on division. It finally took a vote, a standing vote of this Legislature in order to get that piece of legislation through in 1959. Reasons were advanced by the Liberal party at that time which were opposed entirely to The Small Claims Enforcement Act. We are seeing these reasons again today, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. If I understood your ruling the Attorney General is again straying miles away and 13 years back on your ruling. I suggest respectfully that you call the Attorney General to order.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Attorney General is getting away from answering the debate. We must stay to answering the questions . . .

Mr. MacPherson: — We will support you on this too, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I object to being muzzled by those 13 in the Opposition like this. They are using their heavy-handed minority, to oppress the majority.

All I can say is that they have been opposed to this Bill right along, they oppose it now and the amendments. I am sorry they do, because the people won't support them on this. I think this Bill is tremendous in amendment and therefore support it in second reading.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that **Bill No. 34 – An Act to amend The Hospital Revenue Act 1966** be now read a second time.

Mr. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments that we are considering to The Hospital Revenue Act will allow for diverting the 1 mill from the 2 mill levy to Union Hospital Boards for the purpose of operating some form of health centres in small communities. I don't have any particular quarrel with the concept that municipalities will be able to divert funds in order to support the operation of some form of health service within the broad community. I therefore expect to be able to support this Bill, but by so doing it should be made perfectly clear that I do not necessarily support the concept that the Minister of Health has for these institutions, that he calls the Community Health and Social Centre.

There will also be little argument that there is some need for alternative health services in communities where hospitals have closed and where hospitals will close in the future. I think it is fair to assume that hospitals will close in the future, either voluntarily or by the actions of the Minister of Health. It is debatable in the case of Delisle, for example, whether it was voluntary because the Minister wanted Delisle closed.

I could also use the example of how the Minister of Health is now planning to have the Providence Hospital in Moose Jaw voluntarily close its doors. I think he has tried to arrange this voluntary closure for about 1976. However, whatever the case, I do not object to finding alternative sources of health services in these communities. As I said the other day, there are some serious questions that must be answered about the plans of the Minister of Health as they are now emerging.

In introducing the Bill the other day he said, "These health and social centres are not only alternatives to hospital closure but are also serious experiments in finding new methods of health care delivery." I cannot condone the practice of experimenting needlessly with the health of our people. This isn't a concern of the NDP who always seem only too willing to experiment. It doesn't matter whether this experimentation is with our resources or with our economic development or with the health of our people. They are quite willing to experiment at any time. I won't deny that at some point experimentation may have to be done, when all the research has been done and the theoretical hypotheses have been put forward, then the proposal has to be tested in the real world.

Being in the scientific field myself, I realize that eventually after following through the necessary preparations endeavors must be put to the test. It is in this regard that I find fault with the NDP methods and with the Minister of Health. The Minister admits that this idea of health and social centres is an experiment. Yet he is trying these experiments without doing the necessary ground work. This is not warranted. He also admits that by carrying out these experiments he hopes to find some new methods of health care delivery. This objective of trying to find some new methods of health care is very good. But before setting up these experiments, the Minister should have consulted with the Saskatchewan Medical Association, the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. These are the people that really know what our existing form of health care delivery is all about. These are the people who could have assisted in the setup of this so-called alternative to closing hospitals. These are the people who know the capabilities and limitations of the medical professions.

The Minister of Health when he announced this Bill grandly and proudly announced that he had discussed the Bill with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and that they endorsed the legislation. Of course they do, they endorse it the same way I do. I hope that the Minister doesn't hope to imply that this means that the association has had any input into the health and social centre scheme. They have not. The Minister of Health also said that the development of health and social centres equally has the support of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and the medical profession. Of course he has. The medical profession has just as much interest in the development of health care delivery as does the Minister of Health.

Again I hope the Minister does not mean to imply that the Medical Association has had any input into this scheme, for they have not. None of them, the hospitals, the doctors, or the nurse have had any input into this scheme. I think that this is scandalous.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — What is the Minister afraid of? Why does he refuse to accept the experience and knowledge of the experts. He knows he has the support of these groups to explore ways to improve the delivery of health care. I think the answer is the Minister does not trust the professional people and he has no respect for them.

This attitude shows through on many occasions. This attitude showed in the way he treated chiropractors and the shoddy way in which he forced them to take part in Medicare. This attitude showed in the Act which relates to dental nurses. Again he ignored the dental profession. The Minister seems not to trust a professional, the professional in the field of health. And he is not prepared to consult with them or seek their advice. The NDP as a whole don't trust the professionals. They don't like them and they won't talk to them. I think that this is truly unfortunate for Saskatchewan.

There is also a concern about the lack of regional planning as related to development of new centres in this province. We have seen one example already in Saskatchewan where a system of rural health care was developed without proper regional planning. Several years ago the former Premier, Tommy Douglas, brought a Dr. Sigerist into this province to help formulate plans. And at that time there was not sufficient regional planning. It would be unfortunate to see a repeat of the Sigerist mistake in which hospitals were built throughout the province without regional planning. There absolutely must be regional input into the planning of future facilities within a region. Both as regards new buildings and as regards phasing out of old ones. However, in spite of all this if the Minister was still prepared to do his own experiments, I think he could have done it on a limited scale. Surely one or two communities could have provided him with enough information to evaluate this program and to find out the pitfalls and the deficiencies. Surely the Minister had the opportunity to test his experiment in a couple of communities where hospitals had closed. Why is it absolutely necessary to test this scheme in a place like Delisle, where a hospital had to be voluntarily closed before the experiment could be tested? I would surely hope that the Minister does not have an ulterior motive, in his actually using this experiment as a guise to close down hospitals like Delisle.

If these health and social centres ultimately prove to be an effective alternative then this might be acceptable. But to this point they have not proven to be anything except an idea of the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek).

I think that the most glaring fault made by the Minister of Health was the fact that he did not consult with the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association. First of all they could have lent their expertise and experience in the formulation of this scheme and thereby give the scheme a better chance of being effective.

But even more important this scheme was instituted without consultation with the nurses. The very people who are finding the scheme very difficult to work within.

Mr. Cody: — Have you checked with them?

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, we certainly have checked with them. And that is exactly what they told us. This concept of health and social centres put the nurses into a different role than what they are accustomed to being in. A role which she has very little previous experience with. And in talking to nurses they find they do not fully realize what their responsibilities are within such a scheme. They don't know what the full extent of their duties are nor do they know exactly what limitations they will be working under. There are not concrete guide lines as to the function of a nurse within the scheme. They do not even know what their liabilities are to be. Surely the Minister and the Nursing Association could have met together and ironed out these details before entering this experiment. Even if the Minister didn't want their knowledge he could certainly have negotiated with the profession as to what he expected from them.

The NDP talk a lot about consulting with the people involved. Their consultation is usually superficial or else it is merely for the sake of appearance. But this is a case of no consultation whatsoever. This appears to be the rule with the NDP rather than the exception.

The Minister of Health follows the footsteps of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) like when he shut down the irrigation project with no consultation with those involved. The attitude seems to be don't let any facts get in the way of my marvellous plan.

I think the first obvious result of this failure to consult with the professions has already shown up.

When the Minister set up this scheme he set it up to emphasize health rather than sickness. The scheme has failed in this objective already. And unless changes are somehow made it will remain that way. The centres that are operating have become sickness centres and not health centres. The centers are nothing more than reception areas for illness. This certainly is not the desired alternative to health care delivery that is being sought after.

Mr. Speaker, I will not quarrel with the objective of the Minister to find better methods and newer methods of health care delivery. The medical profession will not quarrel with this objective either. However, I am not in the least satisfied with the methods that are being used by the Minister of Health. And if he were to succeed it would certainly be by accident and not by design. I think his approach is callous and his mistrust of the various medical professions is completely unfounded. I think that the people of Saskatchewan have a right to expect all safeguards to be taken by the Minister of Health before instituting health experiments.

Mr. Speaker, my support of this Bill in no way should infer that I condone the actions of the Minister or that I agree with the way the community health and social centres are being instituted.

Mr. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, as a Member who comes from a community wherein the hospital was callously closed by the former Government without consultation with any of the community people, I might say . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — I would like to submit that the new proposed health and social service centre in Mossbank is being very well received by the community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lange: — Furthermore I think it is worth recording that there is a great deal of community participation in the direction which that health and social service centre is going to take. As a matter of fact, even the medical profession in Mossbank is being consulted, the present doctor that we have in Mossbank has practised in many places in the world. And he points out that Saskatchewan, of all the places that he has been, has the highest bed utilization rate of anywhere in the world. He says that a community health and social service centre is a very viable alternative to reducing bed rate utilization in Saskatchewan. It is also an alternative to reducing rising costs in the medical profession, an alternative to regional disparities which are associated with rural communities.

I would say that I support this motion because it is far better to support an experiment of this nature which may provide some viable alternatives for hospitals than to support an experiment of the nature of the former government which was involved in closing hospitals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant (Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I was hoping I would be spared the pain of speaking in this debate because the amendment is such a simple one and helps to implement what may be a partial solution to our health problems in Saskatchewan, that I felt it wouldn't be necessary to participate. But, unfortunately, Mr. Smishek, the Minister of Health, in his usual sanctimonious manner, introduced the Bill and completely departed from his explanatory notes and got into a long dissertation about the closure of hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the last one to claim that the closure of hospitals in Saskatchewan or any province is an easy thing to decide on and is an easy thing to do once you decide on it. I think I probably have more first hand experience than anybody in the House in that regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — But I might say that many of the people whom the Members opposite claim I executed are still on very friendly terms with me. There is the odd one who I don't think is friendly with me and I have in mind Mr. Haussecker down in Maryfield but he wasn't friendly with me previously because he was head of the NDP section down there and was expecting to be

a candidate. Of course, he was using it as a sounding board for his coming candidature in the election.

But what really stirred me up were the comments made by the Minister and I will refresh the memories of those present. When he spoke on Monday he said that the amendments before us seem relatively minor and I agreed with him up until that point. "They do contain an important provision for financing, in part, a new and exciting development in the health field."

Now, I will dwell a little while on this new and exciting development. But he also said that there were eight of them being developed. As the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. MacDonald) has pointed out, the Cabinet, I believe, has only approved seven of these exciting new developments. But already the Minister has departed from Cabinet approval and he has eight of them on the go. I think this is getting beyond being an experiment. It is already a foregone development. I don't really think, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to make any difference if he does listen to the nurses or the doctors or to anyone else because he reminds me of that old saying, 'don't confuse me with the facts because I have already made up my mind'. I think that is the way he is listening in this regard. He has already made up his mind and he has no intention of changing it.

Now, in his observations of that same date, he said the Liberals decided to close these hospitals without giving serious attention to the local district hospital needs, without examining alternative methods of delivering health care to these communities. This is just so much hogwash, it is not correct. No minister or no government could take the action we took without giving attention and consideration to the outcome of it.

"Hospital after hospital was closed in Saskatchewan by the Liberal Government. While at the same time numerous railway stations and post offices were being closed by their colleagues." Now what that has to do with my action as far as the hospitals are concerned, I don't know but it shows the far reaching effect of his remarks. He got into rail line abandonment, closure of post offices and he says if a community hospital couldn't meet the problems of the '60s the Liberal solution was to tell the community to lock the door, then move up the track and find your health services somewhere else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that in 1958, I think it was, we had 155 hospitals in this province. We now have 130. I closed 11. By golly if my mathematics is correct that leaves 14 hospitals that the NDP have closed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Criticism has been going on since 1969 and I am just fed up to the gills and I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan are, with these sanctimonious types criticizing us for closing hospitals when they closed more than we did. They knew perfectly well that these hospitals had to be closed. They would have liked to have done it in 1962 but they didn't have intestinal fortitude to do it, Mr. Speaker, and they heaved a sigh of relief ever since because we did do it. One only has to look back to 1961.

Before doing that I should like to comment about

Dr. Sigerist. This gentleman was from Sweden. He was a distinguished humanist, a medical historian and he was going to plan the health program for Saskatchewan. He came here at the invitation of Tommy Douglas. He met him in Ottawa and was very impressed with this great man. I think he was probably a great socialist from Sweden. But there are lots of things that come from Sweden that I don't approve of, and a bit of this socialism is one of them. But, just a minute until I get to the meat of this. There is a lot about Dr. Sigerist but very little about Saskatchewan. Dr. Sigerist was pointing out the difficult situation that was developing in Saskatchewan due to the rural-urban switch which was taking place. And the fact, that doctors couldn't be retained. He proposed rural health districts each with its health centre to which the patients might go. Well, this was in 1944, in the autumn of 1944. This great socialist medical planner suggested to the government of the day to create these health districts and it took them until 1973, almost 30 years to get moving in the direction of these health centres. He also suggested demonstration areas be developed as experience grew, as personnel and equipment becomes available. But after waiting almost 30 years the Government of the day is not using demonstration areas, they have already plunged into eight of them.

Back in 1961 there is a volume headed, "The Summary of Saskatchewan Hospital Survey and Master Plan, 1961". This was commissioned by the government of the day. It was received I believe in 1963, sometime thereabouts. The Library received their copy on July 17, 1963. But the then Minister, the now Premier of the province, Minister of Health of the day and the Government of the day didn't like the sound of it because in here it suggested closing 16 hospitals immediately and closing two more in a couple of years. So the Hon. Premier, then Minister, kept this report and the other thicker one that goes with it where it spells out the details about each hospital, in his desk in the Health Department. And it wasn't until Mr. Steuart went in there in 1964 that this great volume was found. We decided that a lot of money had been spent on this survey. It seemed to make sense that there were too many hospitals, there were too many beds. These hospitals by the way multiplied as a result of Dr. Sigerist's visit here because he recommended the smaller community hospitals. And it wasn't very long until the fallacy of this program was realized and the government of the day started to close down hospitals.

I will just read a few of the recommendations in the 1961 report:

Much of Saskatchewan's rural population have a multiple choice of hospitals within 20 or 30 miles. Highway and grid road systems have reduced the need for small hospitals to be close to one another. The population shift will promote the consolidation of the small hospitals into larger and better units. Some of these small hospitals have been perpetuated despite the recommendations of the 1951 Health Survey Report.

So even as far back as 22 years ago they were recommending the closure of these small hospitals. But our great humanitarians for political reasons, I claim, and nothing else but political reason, continued these hospitals. I will point out that they haven't changed their policy, their policy is still to reduce the number of hospitals but they are going to do it in a very

sneaky manner.

Now the hospitals — just a minute until I get to the section about hospital closures. Anybody in any hurry? Hospitals recommended for closure, page 48:

There are a number of evolutionary changes that have affected the small community hospital.

And then it goes on to repeat about the grid roads and the rural-urban shift and the likes of that. They say that many small hospitals which were originally designed for hospital purposes and others that were constructed for a limited function usage had become outmoded in relation to present day standards. Hospitals have found it difficult to recruit professional personnel. I think everybody in the House is familiar with the question of people by-passing the small hospitals to go to the larger areas and the difficulty of recruiting personnel. The standard of patient services and care in many of the small hospital units is not considered adequate in terms of today's treatment.

The number of hospitals involved. Of the 155 hospitals in operation in the province on December 31st, 1958, the study recommends 16 of these hospitals for closure during the period 1961 to 1965. Two additional hospitals should be closed between 1966 and 1970. In other words a total of 18. I didn't go quite that far I only got to the number of 11. Mr. Speaker, the Minister and the Members opposite know just as well as anybody else in this province, in fact they know better because the Department of Health personnel have been recommending the reduction of the number of hospitals for years and years and it is going to happen whether the NDP are in power or whether the Liberals are in power.

What burns me up is to have them stand up and condemn us for closing these hospitals and say in their election propaganda that they are going to re-examine the closures that have taken place, inferring that they were going to do something about reopening those hospitals. Now to my knowledge they have no intention, they haven't done so yet, of opening any one of the 11 hospitals that we closed. In fact reading today's paper it is kind of interesting. Take Hodgeville for example, that's a good one. Their policy is to wait and see. I want to comment now on this 'new and exciting policy' that the Minister is developing. It's so new that the Board of the Hodgeville Hospital has been operating a Health Clinic in parts of its building since its hospital grants were discontinued in 1969 or whenever I closed that hospital. So this new and exciting concept has actually been in use in hospitals since 1969. I know the Minister will say, oh, well, that was just the start of it. We are expanding it and making it a social centre. That's true and I don't condemn them at all. If there is a need for that type of a service, God bless them, I hope it works out well. But let's not fool the public that this is a new and exciting concept.

He speaks of home-nursing care. When we took over the Government in 1964, I think there were one or two home-nursing programs in the province. When we turned the Government over to you in 1971, I believe there were nine home-nursing programs. Now, Mr. Steuart or I didn't start the home-nursing programs. It was started before we took the Government over, we recognized

that and we expanded it. So let's not try to mislead the public that this new and exciting concept suddenly came further after June 23rd, 1971. It has been in the mill for a long time. You started it in a small way, we expanded it and all you are doing now is expanding it a little further. Here is what the Board Chairman in Hodgeville says:

We have a clinic and the senior citizens have the rent-free use of a large Elks Hall on main street. We have full clinic service including x-ray and laboratory services but our drug store has been closed. A Clinic Social Centre complex proposed by Mr. Smishek would cost about \$50,000 with the Government contributing about \$18,000.

I presume he is referring to capital cost there.

We are not prepared to spend the difference for services we already have, he said. We still have hopes of getting our hospital reopened or renewed.

Now I should like to have the Minister tell us in his closing remarks what plans he has to meet this demand from the Hodgeville people. He is speaking of when they started this clinic:

Permission was granted to operate part of the hospital building for a community health clinic for outpatients for which we received \$818 a month.

I think that was started under my term of office. They rent space of \$150 a month to the Swift Current Health Region for the use of its public health nurse.

Now, he says:

The residents have not sat back and cried the blues since we lost our hospital, but have continued to expand and make an effort to make this a good place to live, said Mayor Duncan, who operated a large John Deere dealership.

So there is a town, they have lost their hospital and they would like to have it back. They are not too happy or sold on your idea of a health clinic because they are reasonably happy with what they have.

Now let's look at Mossbank. I am sorry the Hon. Member for Bengough is gone. Now this is one area that was a difficult one to decide on because the building, although it was a converted Air Force building, a military building of some sort, was well maintained but its proximity to other centres convinced us that there was no need for that type of hospital service. He says:

While the clinics were being put into use, the board's battle with the Government (that's the Government of today) to have the hospital reopened continued, but to no avail, (Mr. Egerton said).

So, Mossbank has been fighting with the present Government ever since June 23, 1971 to get their hospital reopened but the Hon. Minister sits over there, yawns, and says, "We're not going to open them up, we're a little bored with the whole thing." But I just want to remind him that while he criticized us for closing them they haven't the intestinal fortitude to open any.

I offered a challenge in this House sometime ago, I forget the dollar value I put on it but it was worthwhile. I said I would pay the Minister so much money and I will be glad to look back in the records to see what it was and I still leave the bet or offer, whatever it was. I'll pay him a cash price for every hospital that he opens of those 11. In fact I could make it \$1,000 each because I don't think he is going to do it.

In Mossbank I'll tell you what they want more than a clinic. If they can't get their hospital open they would like to have a senior citizens' home. Now we couldn't do that under our policy because we doubted the wisdom of opening these senior citizens' homes where there wasn't a hospital. But you fellows have changed the rules there and now you can go ahead and build them a senior citizens' home.

Now let's take a little look at Neudorf. Neudorf is still fighting and I am glad the Hon. Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) is here. The Hon. Member was one of 300 odd people or 200, I didn't count them, who marched on the Legislature back in about 1969 — on the steps out here. I went out and endeavored to speak to them but like the present Minister they had made up their minds and they didn't want to be confused by the facts so they wouldn't listen to me. I might say the Hon. Member from Melville was right in the front, boy, and he was waving his fist at me. I also note that Neudorf is still fighting for its hospital. Now I am surprised that the Hon. Member from Melville hasn't been able to prevail on the generosity of the present Minister to have the hospital opened. We'll just read what it says now:

The board will have to be convinced that spending money to convert the hospital to anything is an economical expenditure and this has not been done, (said Mr. Bender).

Now, Mr. Bender I gather is the Chairman of the Board there. No the Chairman is Mr. Herndeer, but Mr. Bender appears in this article but it doesn't identify him. He may have been a previous board member.

Okay, we have one more — I mentioned Maryfield and Mr. Haussecker is still active down there. The last one on the page, and I don't want to bore the House too much, is "Willow Bunch museum". They have turned their hospital into a museum. Oh say, before I leave Hodgeville I might mention that when the hospital was closed they hadn't had a doctor there for two years. There really hadn't been a patient in the hospital, an over night patient for two years. So I doubt very much whether they are going to reopen that hospital but I would hope the Minister would listen to them.

Here we have Willow Bunch. Now Willow Bunch I can't recall the exact details but I am not too far wrong, I think they were much in the same category as Hodgeville. They had their doctors going and coming so fast that they hadn't had many in-patients. But they point out that the Board has operated a community health centre in the community 120 miles southwest of Regina since its government grants were discontinued and closed in June of 1969. So here we have this 'new and exciting concept' in health care and it has been going on in Willow Bunch since 1969.

The board was recently awarded \$9,951 provincial money

to assist it to purchase and renovate a 40 by 100 foot former bakery to house a community health clinic, social centre, town offices and fire hall. Total cost is expected to be about \$18,000. The \$25,000 clinic, in operation since the hospital closed, is too small to house a social centre, (Mr. Swan said).

So if that hadn't been added they could have got by with what they were running.

Here is one that I doubt. Willow Bunch claims that when their doctor left they received 25 applications from doctors but none would open a practice at Willow Bunch when they learned the hospital was closed. I doubt whether any of those 25 would have come to Willow Bunch even if the hospital had been in existence.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up I don't object to the Minister proceeding with his health and social centres. I think it is beyond the experimental stage and I don't think he has any intention of stopping at seven. I doubt very much whether it is going to result in a reduced cost of our health care. I think it is going to be an added cost, its another structure on top of what we already have. I would hope that it would result in a lower cost of care but I doubt it because I think these are going to be sickness centres to a large degree and people are going to continue to patronize our hospitals. I would hope that the Minister would face up to the fact and be honest about this, or challenge him I guess is the word, he has no intention of opening any one of the 11 hospitals that were closed. If I am wrong I would invite him to correct me and I will certainly withdraw the statement. But until he convinces me I have no compunction about saying that he has no intention of opening any of those hospitals. In fact he is going to close more because his tightening-up of the hospital bed count is going to hit these small hospitals and they are slowly but surely going to be ground to a halt.

I doubt very much whether he has consulted to any degree with the Regional Hospital councils on the location of these health and social centres and this was one of the recommendations of the Hospital Survey Report and Dr. Sigerist remarks that the region should be consulted before the medical centre is set up. I think, Mr. Speaker, that covers my remarks. I am sorry I was so long today. I wouldn't have even commented on it if the Minister hadn't got into a long dissertation about hospital closures. I hope that this issue of hospital closures is closed once and for all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to enter this debate, there hasn't been that much about so-called new experiment that the Minister talks about that is implicit to any extent in this Bill. As the Hon. Member who just spoke pointed out the experiment is neither new, and for many of the communities that will be getting one of these centres, it really is not very exciting. In his opening remarks when speaking to this Bill the Minister himself dragged in as his custom on every opportunity, the question of closing of the eight or whatever number of hospitals

we closed. Now it has been pointed out by Mr. Grant in this debate, Sir, that the number of hospitals squeezed out of operation or closed under the old CCF and under the present NDP exceed in number those that we closed in a forthright manner. But there is a larger question that was alluded to again by the Hon. Member from Regina Whitmore Park and that is the number of . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Steuart: — I should like to join, Mr. Speaker, with the Hon. Members opposite in welcoming back the sausage kings from Saskatoon and saying to them on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan that I hope that they didn't get taken too far down the road by that canny Mr. Fred Mendel, but I am going to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Steuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, to return to the subject at hand, we have had information from almost every major hospital and many small ones in this province that because of the budget squeeze, because of the financial squeeze put on them by this Government, by the present Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), by the new Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley), by the NDP Government in fact, they are being forced to lay off dozens of people. In fact . . .

Hon. Mr. Smishek: — Name one!

Mr. Steuart: — Okay, the Victoria hospital in Prince Albert, the Holy Family Hospital. They have already received word as have many other hospitals, Mr. Speaker, that their budget has been cut and so they are going to have to lay off or what they have said is this: we won't lay any of you off today but as you retire and as you quit, in other words as attrition takes place, we will not replace you. So those hospitals now know that as of today or as of some time ago the number of staff allocated to those hospitals are going to be reduced and reduced very sharply by this Government. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, the quality of help will be reduced as well.

Now, because I want to find out all the facts because we haven't been able to get them from this Government, of exactly how many people will be laid off, how many jobs will be taken out of our hospitals, how many positions will be taken out of our hospitals. We know already from the budget that they are taking out many positions from the Mental Hospitals in this province but just how many will be discontinued in the acute-care physical hospitals, physical care hospitals, in the province we don't know yet. I think that information since the Minister brought this up in speaking to this Bill on second reading, should be put before this House as we consider this Bill. The fact is that when the truth is known this NDP Government will have squeezed out of operation far more hospital beds by the back door, by the sneaky method as the Member for Regina Whitmore Park said, than any government, including ours did by straight forward methods.

So, Mr. Speaker, because I want to find out this information, I beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.