

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**18th Day**

**Wednesday, February 27, 1974.**

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

**QUESTIONS**

**MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS TO METIS SOCIETY**

**MR. J. C. McISAAC:** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question perhaps properly to the Attorney General or to the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan but in their absence, and I understand why they are absent, maybe I could direct it to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek). In light of charges made over the last recent weeks by certain members of the Métis Society of the province of misappropriation and mishandling of Government funds granted to that Society, and in light of the Provincial Auditor's Report which I believe Members received yesterday — I looked at it last night — in that Report on pages 10 and 11, perhaps I shouldn't use the word 'charges' but statements made by the Auditor that point up here, "No evidence was made available to me that the required interim program was received by the Agency . . . " to the effect that two Orders-in-Council granting \$159,000 and \$134,000 in subsequent payments were improperly made. In light of these two statements and two facts now before the Government, are they prepared now to launch and initiate a full scale inquiry into the spending and the spending practices of this Government with respect to mishandling and misappropriation of funds insofar as the entire Department of Northern Saskatchewan is concerned?

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK:** (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I presume that the Hon. Member is referring to the Report of the Provincial Auditor on pages 10 and 11. I believe that he is Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and I am sure that he will have an opportunity to have the Public Accounts Committee review the report of the Provincial Auditor and be able to get all the information that he needs in regard to what the Provincial Auditor has to report in his annual submission to the Committee. In fact I invite the Hon. Member to take advantage of the opportunity to make sure that there is proper disclosure of all the facts.

We, as a government, believe that there isn't anything to hide and as far as the operation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan is concerned or any of our agencies and there are proper procedures within the Government for financial control as indicated by the report of the Provincial Auditor. We don't propose to be launching any kind of a special investigation.

**MR. McISAAC:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I certainly do intend in Public Accounts to review and investigate these particular comments here. The point is that when you take this report and combine it with other charges that have been made with the mess the Government has made in general of DNS in the North, I

should think that it was time for the Government to take some action and do some investigating of their own. You don't have to wait for a Public Accounts Committee, and that is the question I asked.

### **RENTING OF SPACE IN TORONTO DOMINION BANK BUILDING**

**MR. E. C. MALONE:** (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question to ask the Minister of Government Services, if I can get his attention. Is it true, Mr. Minister, that the Government or government agencies have rented or are in the process of renting most of the available space from the new Toronto Dominion Bank Building that is presently under construction in Regina?

**HON. J. E. BROCKELBANK:** (Minister of Government Services): — I could take that as notice of question, Mr. Speaker, and prepare an answer for it.

### **FEDERAL COMPETITION POLICY**

**MR. J. G. LANE:** (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. At what stage are negotiations between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government as to the necessary provincial legislation dealing with the new federal competition policy? A supplementary or added question. When can we expect Provincial Government proposals and do they propose a White Paper on the provincial legislation?

**HON. E.I. TCHORZEWSKI:** (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — In reply to the question, Mr. Speaker, I have personally met with the Federal Minister, the Hon. Herb Gray at which time we briefly discussed the proposal which the Federal Government is making. Our department has been looking at the proposals and looking at what is in fact being proposed. We are generally, although we have not taken a specific position on it at this time, in favor of the recommended proposals. We may be having some questions about the lack of the extent to which the amendments are going to be providing the further protection that is needed.

**MR. LANE:** — A further question, what are the limitations that you feel should be fixed up?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say at this time because our full study of the proposals by the federal people has not been completed.

### **SECOND READINGS**

**HON. G. MacMURCHY** (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 50 — **An Act to amend The School Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, Bill 50 an Act to amend The School Act contains a number of amendments. Two of the amendments, Section 118 and Section 122 are housekeeping in nature. Section 118 a housekeeping amendment changing the reference to

The Teacher Salary Agreement Act, 1968 to The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act, 1973.

Section 122 gives recognition to the education of the handicapped as an integral feature of public education. These amendments are designed to make clearer the responsibilities of school boards with respect to the provision of services for handicapped children.

More particularly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce four major changes in The School Act. This Bill will allow:

1. The introduction of kindergarten supported by provincial grants.
2. Reform of the Educational Council to allow it to become a full scale lay advisory board to the Minister.
3. Election of Indian school trustees to sit as full members of a school district board.
4. Instruction in languages other than English and French at the request of local people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, at the last session The Larger School Unit Act was amended to permit Indian trustees to sit on the board of school units. This amendment in Bill 50 will bring the change full circle. In many parts of Saskatchewan Indian children from reserves attend schools along with the white children operated by public school boards. They take the same courses, they pass the same examinations. But there is one important difference, only the white parents have representation on those school boards. We have taken care of this disparity in school units in an amendment that was passed in The Larger School Units Act at the last session of the Legislature as I mentioned. At Punnichy, Quinton and Raymore in the Govan School Unit we have the largest integrated program in the province in operation. It involves students from the DayStar, Gordon and Poorman reserves. Discussions are now under way at the present time involving the Band Councils of these three reserves, the Govan School Unit Board, the Department of Indian Affairs and, of course, the Department of Education with respect to trustees from the reserves on the Govan Board under the amendment that was passed last spring.

A similar arrangement is pending at Balcarres involving the Balcarres Consolidated School Board, the Band Councils of Little Black Bear, Star Blanket, Okanese and the Peepeekisis reserves. Balcarres is not in a school unit, it has a consolidated board and it will be directly affected by this Bill 50.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the record of the New Democratic Government in Indian education is excellent. We have made it possible for Indians to be elected as trustees to be represented on the integrated school board. We have encouraged and assisted the establishment of a special program to train teachers of Indian ancestry, the Indian Teacher Education program at the university in Saskatoon. It is now in its second year. We have named an Indian to sit on the provincial board of teacher education along with representatives from the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation,

the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and the Department of Education. Mr. Solomon Sanderson is that current member. We have introduced an amendment to allow instruction in the native language which I will discuss in more detail in a few minutes. We have encouraged the development of resource materials for Indian students. We have begun a series of steps with the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission to eliminate texts that have prejudice involved, to introduce texts on Indian culture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not all Indian people want integrated education. Many feel that it is better to teach Indian children at their own schools on the reserve. I suppose because I was so involved in integrated education in the Govan unit I do not agree with this point of view. I think there is maybe a point where a reserve is a long distance from a community, but where a reserve is within community circles I feel that integrated education is important and valuable. I feel if we are going to live together we should start by learning together.

However, it is not my job to say how Indian children should be taught or how anyone's child should be taught for that matter. And while we shall encourage integrated schools, we are also providing safeguards for the Indian people. It will be up to them to decide to attend or not to attend.

Agreements may be cancelled by the same processes that they were initiated.

Bill 50 proposes an amendment to create a new educational council and give it wide authority to investigate and to report to the Minister on current issues. The Educational Council has been with us for a very long time. Its job has been to review the curriculum for school use. In the old days, I suppose before committees came into common use, before we had hearings, before there was public involvement, before the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation took on a large role in program development the council was the public input body. Although it goes back before my time, I suppose the intention of the council was as a safety valve for the Minister on any controversy over course content and probably more particularly in any controversy over religion. But today this role is obsolete. Both teachers, and of course now, trustees, sit on the committees that draw up the curriculum. In fact, they have more to do with the nuts and bolts of programs than does the Department of Education itself. Many courses are not prescribed but simply brought guidelines to the professional teacher who may amend or change to meet his students' needs.

In view of this then, the educational council serves no real purpose any longer. Our need today is not for agencies with regulatory powers, but for a body that can act as a sounding board for new ideas. We could benefit from an agency to look into the goals of education, to make studies, to hear opinions, to advise the Minister.

Both the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association have called for a study to set goals for education. The request is that government create an agency, preferably a permanent agency, but at least a temporary one to do this particular job.

Now as you well know, other provinces have created educational goals and agencies, in recent years. Quebec has had

several studies, Ontario had the Hall-Dennis Commission, Alberta had the Worth Commission and even British Columbia had John Bremer. And in particular Hall Dennis and Worth have turned out very attractive reports. Each of the Commissions has written up a list of aims and objectives and all of them are very laudable and they have all had a great deal of publicity. So the argument for a goals agency doesn't lack for any kind of precedent. But, Mr. Speaker, what it does lack, in my opinion, is results. I think most of us here today could sit down with one or two others and list 10 or 20 objectives for the school. I'm certain that would happen on this side of the House. A goals commission could write up the list in proper academic language. They could add some backup comments and a large majority of people would probably concur. I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, what would happen next? If the people didn't agree, or if the report called for, major changes, as well it might, then what? How do we really bring about educational changes?

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, one simple fact should be faced. We have a school system and we have a pretty good school system, and it is going to be around for a very, very long time. That's not to say the school system will not change — it has already — it's changing now. But the point is, the real effective changes of the future will be made with the school system, not in spite of it. Our approach to goals is not to draw up a master plan and then try to fit everyone into it. Progress — and progress is not always the same as change — progress comes in small steps. We believe it is better, more effective and more democratic to relate to actual experiences, actual conditions, and to experiment and innovate in the classroom, in the small community schools. Many small steps will bring the larger changes.

Fall conferences on education sponsored by the government in 12 centres held in October and November, indicated people want their children's education in three areas: basic skills, reading, writing and computation; basic knowledge in life skills, how the world works; additional programs dealing with the 'why' of things, and this should be subject to local option. Within this framework opinions varied widely on the mix of basics, life skills and academics in the school program, on how to teach them, where to teach them, who can and who should teach. Delivery of education was a major issue. It was clear that the people at the conferences want to keep the community schools. Parents are prepared to trade some of the options in additional programs to keep a local school operating. There was a distinct feeling that centralization for the purposes-of broader program offerings has gone far enough, and I certainly agree. We have probably, in this province, gone as far as we can go with bussing children, with closing schools. Obviously it is desirable to educate children as close to home as possible. After all the home is the basic educational institution. Schools have taken on many jobs that used to be performed by the family. And the pressure is on to do even more. If we are to meet these demands, it must be in tandem with the parents and they deserve a more direct input.

Now there are implications and the implications refer to small schools and those implications ask the question of how can we retain viable small schools. We'll have to re-examine curriculum, we shall have to assure that courses can be taught properly without all of the highly specialized teachers. We shall have to provide solid resource back-up to the classroom

teacher. We shall have to organize consultative and auxiliary services on a closer to home basis. We shall have to develop more teachers of children and fewer teachers of subjects. And all of this is a pretty tall order, Mr. Speaker, but one that seems to me must be faced.

Most of you heard me talk: about re-organization within the Department of Education, putting it on a more decentralized basis. Other government departments and agencies have taken this approach — Agriculture, Industry and Commerce are most recent cases. Reorganization to meet these public needs will be the major theme in the next year or two within government and should be within the Department of Education.

All of these changes (and they are important changes) could well be discussed and developed with those concerned about the revised educational council.

Mr. Speaker, kindergarten has been around for a long time. It's an issue that has never really been dealt with by any government in this province until this government was elected in 1971. In the early years there was really no need to deal with it. Saskatoon had kindergartens as far back as the 1930s, but they were shut down after the war when the space squeeze came. If any group was interested it simply set up a private kindergarten — a local group of mothers got together and they found a room, and if a teacher could be found they shared the work-load and charged whatever fees were necessary to cover the costs. No standards were established, no standards were enforced. The department was still concentrating and concerning itself on building the grade one to twelve system. But in the late 1950s the department did consent to develop a kindergarten curriculum guide for sale to private kindergartens at \$1.00 a copy. They asked that superintendents visit the kindergartens now and then to keep an eye on the program, to make sure that the facilities were safe. But during the 1960s demands for kindergartens increased, and increased significantly. And that's when our friends opposite were in government, but they ignored the request and ignored the fact that private kindergartens were springing up all over the place, some of very high quality, but some of them of very dubious quality. Despite increasing realization of the numbers of kindergartens in existence, despite realizing the haphazard organization, no regulations were established governing the quality of the private kindergarten. Instead, the government of that day, the Liberal Government of that day, chose to ignore the fact that early years are the most important in developing a child's best abilities. But the pressure came on and when the pressure got too great, the government agreed to recognize the costs of kindergartens in Regina Public and in Moose Jaw Public School systems, for grant purposes. Not the Separate School systems in Regina and Moose Jaw — no recognition in Saskatoon and no recognition of the rural systems, just the two loudest and closest voices of that day. Now when the others found out about it and began to issue the same cry, what did the Liberals do?

In 1969 at the height of the pressure from the Regina Separate School System, the Liberals at that time had to do something. They brought in an amendment, Mr. Speaker, to Section 213 of The School Act, which permitted boards to establish kindergartens, providing — and get this, Mr. Speaker — providing fees were charged while still supporting the Regina and Moose Jaw Public kindergarten program. At the taxpayers'

expense, the separate school boards, the Saskatoon Board, the rural boards had either to charge fees to cover the costs or raise the mill rate. No government grant support was forthcoming. Now, Mr. Speaker, such was the state of affairs which we inherited when we came into office in 1971.

When the pressures came on the government from the separate systems from Saskatoon, from Weyburn, from the rural units, we said, "Fine, but we are not going to have a kindergarten program in this province unless it is possible to deliver the program to rural Saskatchewan."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, we asked, as a government, should we support another year of school. Do we really need thirteen years in the school system, instead of twelve? Aren't children in school long enough for twelve years, particularly if that year is just an addition to the regular program? So we set up a committee and the committee went out and heard some 130 briefs and they came back to us with an overwhelming request by parents that kindergarten should be made available for their children. They said there were organizational possibilities, that there were program possibilities — let's try some experiments and so we did.

Mr. Speaker, in the Fall of 1972, six pilot projects went into operation to experiment with alternatives to solve such problems as transportation in rural areas, problems of scheduling, problems such as program content.

We expected the major questions would involve operating the kindergartens, the physical problems, but instead we were to find that kindergartens can be operated every other day, all day, in a rural area with virtually no additional expense, using existing buses, and they can be built into the program without disruption of that program. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, alternate days one week, Tuesday-Thursday the next has worked and worked well. Major questions that turned out were those of implementing the philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, our commitment to early childhood education is a commitment to a very special kind of education. We are convinced that kindergarten must not merely be a downward extension of grade one. We are convinced that the expense to the taxpayers of this province, simply to teach our children to read one year earlier, simply cannot be justified. Attitudes towards learning, attitudes towards school and towards life, need to be the basic philosophy of establishing another year in our school system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the question — How many times have you, in your experience, seen a child by the time he got to grade four or grade five perhaps even grade three, get up in the morning and say, "Mother, I'm not feeling very well" and mother replies, "Go back to bed" and by 5:30 or 9:45 the child is feeling much better. One would like to have a child get up with a fever of 104 and say, "I'm going to school." Mr. Speaker, this business of attitude should be the philosophy of adding on another year of school to the system in Saskatchewan.

Now in testing out the philosophy, we ran into problems, particularly problems in rural Saskatchewan, where it is a

(in many cases ) an integrated situation where we had to fit the kindergarten into an existing classroom situation because of the low enrolments. Add it to year one, or year two, add it to Division I or Division II, this has created problems for the teacher. It takes real effort to develop a unique and worth- while kindergarten program that can stand on its own two feet and not be absorbed by Division I.

Another serious situation that emerged is the extent of parental involvement. It is absolutely important, particularly in the field of early childhood education, that what goes on in the classroom during the day is not ended when the child gets off the bus at 4:00 o'clock or 4:30. A child torn between two environments at that early age which are in conflict with each other can hardly be expected to develop sound, healthy attitudes toward life and learning. It is absolutely essential that the parents understand what is going on in the kindergarten class- room, that when their child comes home after the first three months in kindergarten and he is not necessarily reading, that they not be concerned. Equally important is the teacher under- standing something about the home environment. Only in this way shall we be able to understand the child and to determine what is best for him. The home-school communication is what makes parental involvement in the kindergarten programs so essential.

Many ask exactly what I mean by parental involvement. First, it is important to understand that parental involvement is not an end in itself, but rather a means to an end. The involvement of parents is not to provide a threat to the autonomy of the teachers nor is it to have parents do the job of the teachers. Involvement of parents is a means of providing the vital communication and understanding between the school and the home; is a means of allowing parents to share in that experience called school which looms so very, very large in the life of the young child; is a means of the teacher and the parent getting to know each other.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the children love it. They enjoy having parents around. They will move very naturally to the involvement of any parent who will go with them. Certainly no one can make a blanket statement that every parent should be involved in the classroom. So much depends on the parent and on the situation. Some parents will be comfortable right in the thick of classroom activity and be of a big help to the teacher there. Some are more comfortable only observing their child from a distance. Some will want to help in clerical ways. Some will have home commitments that make it impossible for them to be in school at all.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that the very least that should happen is that all parents should be involved in a meeting which discusses the philosophy, the activities of the kindergarten program. All parents should be invited to participate at whatever level they feel they can. The teacher should at the very least make an effort to know the parents of every child in his kindergarten classrooms.

These things do not work themselves out in the first year of pilot projects. So we went into 14 more pilot projects last fall with particular emphasis on the integrated program and involvement of parents. And I report, Mr. Speaker, that the reports I am receiving of these projects are exciting, they are



outstanding. I am going to make them available to school boards very shortly.

It is positive, it has taken us two and one-half years to come up with a quality program but we are confident it was worth the extra time taken. I am pleased today to be able to move the amendment to permit province-wide publicly supported kindergartens in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Another change in The School Act, Mr. Speaker, is in instruction in languages other than English and French.

The School Act now specifies that English shall be the language of instruction. The Members of the House will recall an amendment passed in 1968 which allows the department to designate schools in which French may be the language of instruction.

However, Mr. Speaker, no provision exists for languages to be used, despite the fact that we have German and Ukrainian groups in Saskatchewan larger than French. To remedy this, we are amending section 10 which will allow teaching in other languages.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — What is the value of teaching German or Ukrainian or French or one of the Indian languages.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Swedish!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Swedish, Irish.. In some cases, especially where Indian children are involved, the value is obvious.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Norwegian!

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Norwegian. Children who do not speak English cannot learn much from a teacher who does. Many Indian pupils suffer severe setbacks because they have not learned English at home.

But this is not the chief reason for permitting instruction in new languages. The chief reason is that we must move in this direction to give meaning to our state of policy with respect to cultural heritage, our unique cultural heritage in this province.

I am sure that the Minister of Culture, the Hon. Member from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) will be speaking on this particular aspect.

The other reason, an important one, is to give meaning to our stated policy of decentralizing the Saskatchewan school system.

Mr. Speaker, schools are very important in socializing children. Up to now schools have often served to homogenize the student population because they had to follow rigid centrally

determined patterns of instruction. Instead of encouraging diversity, the administration and the planning of school programs has enforced uniformity. I suppose this has had its advantages in the early years. But today our policy is the reverse of this, to make fewer curriculum decisions centrally and more of them locally. The idea is to try to adapt the school to the community as much as possible.

In a community where an ethnic language is in common use, this should be reflected in the school as well, it seems to us. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize to the Members of this Legislature that we will be interested in designating schools for special languages only where the language is in reality a part of the community.

Language itself is not a culture but it is the means by which culture can be transmitted. If no viable and distinct culture exists in the local setting, the mere use of a special language of instruction has little purpose.

Mr. Speaker, in other words our objective in amending The School Act is to strengthen existing cultural communities, to help preserve diversity in this province of ours.

Special language instruction is not just another educational toy, it is a concrete and useful tool and that is how it must be employed,

Mr. Speaker, all of this sounds easy, just to pass this amendment and go away. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, we shall have to solve a lot of major and minor problems. Introducing French language instruction has not been a simple one. Even though we have been able to call on federal money, on federal resources to help out. Mr. Speaker, for multi-language instruction we shall have to work most of these implementation problems out ourselves in this province. First of all we shall need teachers who are fluent in the language. We may have to look to our university teacher training for some new courses. We may also have to put more provincial money into training teachers who are already employed, into in-service programs and so on. But this will not be the major obstacle however. I see our biggest difficulty providing instructional resources in the new languages because there is little available in this province today by way of ethnic language texts, films, tapes and other basic tools. So I say, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of work to be done.

To sum up then, Mr. Speaker, a number of amendments, important ones: the introduction of kindergarten supported by provincial grants; reform of the educational council to allow it to become a full scale lay advisory board to the Minister; election of Indian school trustees to sit as full members of school district boards; instruction in languages other than English and French at the request of local people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of this Bill, a Bill to amend The School Act.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**MR. J. C. McISAAC:** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, it is good to hear the Minister again in some of his statements and comments about the great things the present Government has done with respect particularly to the

education of Indian and native children of the province.

I should like to set the House and records straight on some of the false and misleading statements that he made in introducing this Bill with respect to both the facilities and opportunities in education available for native people in Saskatchewan.

It was not the NDP, Mr. Speaker, it was the former Liberal government that made the original legislative moves providing for representation by Indian people on school unit boards, providing that they could vote and form themselves into a sub-unit, elect a member and be represented. I think the Minister can go back and check the legislation. We can take this up further in Committee if he wishes but we can certainly prove very conclusively to him and anyone else that those moves were made prior to the NDP taking office. So representation for Indian people, Mr. Speaker, on school boards was not invented by the NDP Government opposite.

In listening to the Minister today the amendments that are before us, if I understand him correctly, could perhaps be called the Govan School Unit amendments to satisfy apparently a local situation in that part of the province.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the extension of the concept that was legislated and originated and initiated by the former Liberal government. Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that the Centre for Northern Studies located at the university (I am not sure of the present status of that particular group begun and initiated by Father Renaud, I don't know if it is still operating as such or not, I believe it is) was initiated and begun by the former government. Also there was a curriculum a good deal more suited to the native people, particularly in northern Saskatchewan where they had no exposure of any kind really to the kind of life the neighbors and so on, that the bands in this area, the Cut Knife, and Battleford areas do. A curriculum much more suited to native people was begun and initiated and put into operation by the Liberal government as well. A teacher-aide program and the foundation of the present teacher training program that the government is operating, which I fully support, Mr. Speaker, was also launched by the former administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister and the NDP Government opposite have been promising and we have had the Minister's speech on kindergartens for about four years. Beginning in 1970-71 campaign, we heard him repeat it again the first session of the Legislature. We heard it in 1972, we heard in 1973. And four years later he has finally proceeded with some legislation. One would almost think and assume from four years, Mr. Speaker, of all these speeches that you would now see the implementation and the provision of grants in the Budget for all school boards to allow kindergartens all across the province. But, Mr. Speaker, has this happened yet? As he went on in his remarks, he told us that two years ago they began a pilot program in five or six units. Then he tells us that they began another pilot program last fall in another six or eight additional units.

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Fourteen.

**MR. McISAAC:** — Fourteen in total, was it six or eight new ones, or 14 new ones?

**MR. MacMURCHY:** — Fourteen new ones.

**MR. McISAAC:** — Well it is getting there. By about 1984 according to my earlier calculations we can look for kindergartens all across this province fully government supported, maybe '83.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the Government and the Minister's approach to the question of kindergarten education, the manner in which they have handled it, characterizes almost everything that they proceed to do. He launched a committee. Some people may remember, he launched a Minister's advisory committee on kindergartens. That concept was a good idea. He sent it around the province and needless to say the committee came back with a pretty strong recommendation that people wanted to see the implementation of kindergarten programs. It is not unnatural when one thinks that the PTA, the Home and School, the teacher groups and many other happy little groups were all there with their briefs seeking to support kindergarten programs. Now the only problem that the Minister had with the hearings in some parts of the province was trying to find an empty hall to hold the hearings. Because he had so many other committees going around and the Government had so many other thrust groups and study groups touring the province that it was often difficult to find a schedule and find time to fit in some of these things. It is interesting to note that after four years, after committee studies, after pledges in the election, we still don't have tax supported and grant supported kindergartens implemented across this province, Mr. Speaker.

We can tell them all about those systems any time at all. They already had kindergarten programs operational and they were certainly allowed to continue them.

Mr. Speaker, may I say a word or two on the Minister's most recent effort with respect to advisory committees. Let me say that his general change if you like in the direction of the educational council, I support. I think that if there is a place for a committee of this kind, it is at that level. I think if he does proceed with the changes in the educational council, surely, then he could abolish the many other Minister's advisory committees that are being established almost monthly and being set up to tour the province.

There was one that recently held meetings and held hearings in the city of North Battleford. I believe it is conducting hearings around the province and that is the Minister's Advisory Committee on family life. Let me say flatly here and now, Mr. Speaker, that the best thing the Minister — and this may well turn out to be the results of the study — can do with family life is stay away from it. Because if there is a problem with the school systems in Canada and indeed the States across this continent, it is partly because school systems have tried to split off and take over too many of the functions and the responsibilities that belong to the home, to the family and to the parents for the last 25 or 30 years. And in 25 years of increased spending in education in many states of the United States, in many cities and provinces here in Canada, new programs, new developments, new buildings, new efforts and direction in respect to education trying to solve all the social problems of the world, we have very clearly demonstrated that if the home isn't doing a good job still the schools are failing. But if the home isn't doing a job regardless of the efforts made by the school

generally speaking, they can't make up for that deficiency. You can look to Los Angeles, you can look to Chicago, Detroit, any one of those cities where many efforts — I am just saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to leave family life where it belongs.

**MR. ROLFES:** — And do nothing.

**MR. Mc ISAAC:** — And not do nothing, no. But let's not try and split it off from the functions of the family. Let's remember, Mr. Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Rolfes), Mr. Counsellor, that even the functions of counselling, properly belong in the home and as long as you are going to attempt further to split off various functions that belong there, you are certainly not going to strengthen the family unit, the very basic unit, so basic to this society. You are not going to solve all those problems by taking them into the school system, the school sphere. The socialists continue to think this, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of the very basic differences between the party opposite and their Members and the party on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there may be other ways and other ways should be looked at but I am just telling you that in 25 years of efforts on the part of organized school systems they have not solved the social problems by taking over in many cases the basic functions that properly belong in the home. I am just pointing this out to the Minister, the Member for Saskatoon and other Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation introduced in this Bill which will provide for languages other than French and English as a language of instruction, I think is good. It certainly has my support and I should like to have a few more comments to make on this and several other points raised in the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave at this time to adjourn the debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

Debate adjourned.

**HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Public Health)** moved second reading of Bill No. 49 — **An Act relating to the premium levied under the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, the tax levied under the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act and the Personal tax levied in Health Region No. 1 (Swift Current) under The Health Services Act, and various matters related thereto.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, when Premier Blakeney made his historic address over province-wide radio and television last September 21st he announced three specific steps by this Government to help the people of Saskatchewan in the fight against inflation.

1. Increased payments to people who receive social assistance.
2. Increased the minimum wage in Saskatchewan to \$2 an hour beginning December 1st, designed to help the low income earners.

3. Abolished medical and hospital premiums.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, for me, both as Minister of Health and as former health critic when in Opposition, this is a proud and happy moment. Today we confirm in legislation the intention of the Government which the Premier announced last September.

In proposing second reading of Bill 49, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but note that short of two days, exactly six years have gone by since the Liberal Government of the day introduced the infamous deterrent fees. Mr. Speaker, I remember that day so well. It was a Friday, Friday, March 1, 1968. People soon came to call it Black Friday, the day when the Liberals decided to levy a direct tax on the people who were sick.

Mr. Speaker, the present Leader of the Opposition who was Provincial Treasurer at that time, rose in his place and put the Liberal philosophy of taxation on record. I remember his words, let me quote:

Our Government believes that the amount people pay for such a service (he was talking about medical and hospital services, remember) should be related to the use they make of those services.

He went on and said:

We also feel that if those who use a service are required to pay even a small portion of the cost, their demands may be more reasonable.

I am sure that the mother taking her sick child to the hospital would have found that a remarkable philosophy indeed. I am sure that the accident victim rushing to the hospital in an ambulance would have had difficulty coping with the strange logic of the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). But neither of them, even in their moment of crisis would have had any trouble recognizing that as a Liberal philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition went on, and let me quote him again.

We believe that even a small fee will discourage abuses of these services. For this reason we will introduce utilization fees for hospital and medical services. The fee will be \$2.50 per day in hospital, \$1.50 per visit to a physician's office and \$2.00 on all other types of visits by a physician, for example, home, emergency, and hospital patients.

The Opposition Leader revealed the complete bankruptcy of the Liberal thinking when he went on and sanctimoniously said, Mr. Speaker:

It is our hope that this action will avert what could develop into a disastrous financial situation. We have made this difficult decision because we are convinced that the only way to guarantee the continuance of both these plans is to keep them within the financial means of the province and its people.

Mr. Speaker, it was a bankrupt Friday, a black Friday, when that noxious tax was laid on the poor and on the old and on the sick. Nothing symbolizes Liberal misrule more clearly than that step.

Mr. Speaker, just after our election in 1971 we moved quickly to fulfil the number one plank of our health platform, to abolish deterrent fees. We objected to the tax because it went against all fair principles of taxation, it was a tax on the sick. If you were fortunate enough to be healthy, you didn't have to pay. If you were unfortunate enough to be ill, you paid. If you were unfortunate enough to be ill frequently and over a long period of time, you paid and you paid and you paid. That pretty well summed up the Liberal Party's philosophy of taxation. Tax the poor and give it to the rich.

I was delighted that we were able to remove this noxious tax, Mr. Speaker. It was even more delightful for me when we were able, as a government, to abolish medical and hospital premiums for those 65 years of age and over because the abolition of the premium to someone on old age pension meant a great deal, a saving of \$72 to an elderly couple on the minimum pension was welcome relief indeed. Perhaps it didn't mean too much to the relatively small number of pensioners who were quite adequately taken care of financially. But it did mean something to the vast majority of pensioners.

I can tell this House that my office was flooded with letters of appreciation after our removal of deterrent fees and the premium tax from those 65 years of age and over.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear:

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I was even more pleased when we were able to announce this year that the hospital and medical premiums would be abolished from all residents of Saskatchewan as of January 1st this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear;

**MR. SMISHEK:** — I am pleased because it put \$72 a year more into the pockets of families struggling to cope with the rising cost of living. Mr. Speaker, \$72 a year may not mean much to someone on an income of say \$20,000 or more, but it does mean a welcome saving to the families struggling to get by on \$5,000 a year or less. But my satisfaction over the abolition of deterrent fees and medical and hospital premiums doesn't come simply from the fact that those on low incomes will welcome this saving. I am pleased with these moves that our Government has made, because they are in keeping with our basic philosophy and beliefs that in a democratic society taxes should be levied on the principle of ability to pay. That principle was stated clearly in our New Deal for People in the section dealing with taxation. That statement went on to say that if new revenues are required they should be raised from resource royalties, income and corporation taxes and other taxes related to ability to pay. That's why New Democrats are so pleased with these moves and the Liberal Party and its supporters are so confused about them.

Liberal governments have never understood the principle of taxation based on ability to pay. Under Liberal governments

there have always been concessions for their big business friends, but little relief for those who need help most.

Mr. Speaker, I was chided in an editorial in a Liberal paper a few months ago for saying that the abolition of deterrent fees in premiums represented a saving to the people of Saskatchewan. The editorial writers made a great to-do over my calling this a saving. But nowhere in the editorial was reference made to my explanation that this reduction in direct and indirect taxes represents a shift in taxation. To tax is based on ability to pay, a more equitable taxation system. I explained that the required funds to make up for the abolition of deterrent fees and premiums would come out of general revenues. I made no attempt to delude the people into thinking that these services would not have to be paid for, but the Liberal press, like the Liberal Party, cannot or won't understand what equity in taxation means.

Mr. Speaker, where will the money come from to pay the services that are being provided? Where will we get the money to make up for the loss of revenues represented by the medical and hospital premiums, about \$18.5 million? We have made no secret about that. The money will come from increased royalties on our natural resources, like oil and potash and increased revenues from income and corporation taxes all of which are up, due to the buoyancy of our economy. In short, the money will come from taxes based on ability to pay. For that shift in taxation we have no apologies to make, even if the Liberal press and the Liberal Party don't understand what fair taxation means, I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, but first prize for the most tortuous attempt to distort our efforts to establish fair taxation must go to the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), not to the Liberal press nor to the Leader of the Opposition. No, that prize really goes to the Hon. Member for Athabasca. In late October more than a month after the Premier had announced abolition of hospital and medical premiums, the Hon. Member for Athabasca addressed a meeting in Shellbrook. At that meeting he made an incredible charge. Let me quote:

Removal of hospital and medical premiums is a deception to the people of Saskatchewan.

That is how his remarks were reported in the October 27, 1975 issue of the Regina Leader-Post. He also accused the Government of taking the Saskatchewan health program out of the hands of Saskatchewan citizens and giving unchecked control to the Government. Would you believe that, Mr. Speaker? He went on to claim, and I quote:

The low income families did not benefit from the removal of premiums.

Well Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he checked with anybody in the low income category? He concluded his incredible remarks, incredible performance, by claiming that removal of hospital and medical premiums would somehow hide medical costs from the public. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most charitable interpretation we can place on the Hon. Member's performance in



this House, he had been out "trick or treating or Halloweening" a few days too early.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Certainly there is no way to understand how the removal of premiums would make it impossible for the Member for Athabasca or the public to know how much medical and hospital care is costing. Those costs are available for anyone to see, even to the Hon. Member for Athabasca. There is public information on these, public reports each year are made available in this House, made available to the public. The annual reports issued by the Medical Care Insurance Commission reveals all the costs in the case of medical care, the Hospital Services Plan publishes a report, an annual departmental report. Certainly, the costs of all the programs are reported, not only in the departmental reports and in the commission reports, but also reported in the Public Accounts. The Member for Athabasca knows that very well. One can only conclude he was indulging in his own little game of "trick or treats" with the people of Shellbrook. The people of Shellbrook and the people of Athabasca and the people of Saskatchewan will remember all too well that the Hon. Member for Athabasca was a Member of the Government who imposed deterrent fees on that infamous Black Friday. Mr. Speaker, in fact, he concluded his remarks in the debate on the Bill to impose deterrent fees with these words and let me quote:

Therefore I am most happy and proud to support the Bill for the inclusion of the establishment of deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it's not surprising that such a man should not understand how the removal of premiums would benefit low income families. I am sure he still feels that deterrent fees would be the best thing for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 49 eliminates hospital and medical premiums from the people of Saskatchewan and no amount of Liberal propaganda will change the basic fact. But this Bill does more than that. It also provides that employers who contributed all or part of the premiums on behalf of the employees as part of the collective bargaining agreement or a benefit for unorganized workers, that such employers continue to pay an equal sum to the employees until such time as the collective bargaining agreement is renegotiated, or in the case where there is no collective bargaining agreement, until the employees' wages are adjusted. "We felt that it would be inappropriate for a benefit which had been bargained for or which has been regarded as part of an employee's income should be wiped out in effect by legislation. Since employers and employees had agreed upon this payment in the first instance, we feel that they should be permitted to negotiate the permanent disposition of this benefit when a new contract is worked out. I would hope that these employers who have been paying this benefit on behalf of the employees not covered by collective bargaining agreements would see fit to put another benefit in its place or make an adjustment to the employee's wages on salary, which gives him these benefits in cash.

Mr. Speaker, while we have abolished the payment of premiums and deterrent fees, we have not cut back on service.

On the contrary, we have expanded health services over the last two and a half years. Mr. Speaker, the abolition of premiums and deterrent fees represents a tax reduction of \$26 million a year. Seven and a half million dollars in deterrent fees and \$18.5 million in premiums to taxpayers of this province. On January 1, 1972 premiums were removed for those 65 years of age and over. This represented \$5.5 million saving to them. In January of this year covering all the population at \$15 million saving to the people. Mr. Speaker, these are not all the health taxes that were cut or eliminated.

We amended the Liberal legislation to restore exemption for families of deceased mental patients with a saving of more than \$^00,000 a year to such families. We abolished the discriminatory 2 mill levy assessed by the previous Liberal Government against fourteen hospitals in the province, an annual cost of \$55,000.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Still, in spite of that reduction, we have embarked upon a remarkable number of new and innovative programs in the health field. Mr. Speaker, I should like to list a few of them.

We established the Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan to provide hearing aids to the hard of hearing at greatly reduced cost.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — That program has reduced the cost of hearing aids to our citizens from an average price of around \$300 and more to an average of \$75. The people of Saskatchewan have responded so well to this program, that we had to take on extra staff to keep up with the demand. We have not only reduced the price for hearing aids but we have improved the services.

When we took office in July of 1971 there were 531 Level IV beds in the province. Since that time we have approved an expansion program which will more than double the number of Level IV beds to just under 1,100.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — In addition, Mr. Speaker, we announced a new policy which allows general hospitals to utilize some of their acute care beds for the chronically ill patients in their particular areas where Level IV facilities do not exist. This means that many senior citizens who require Level IV care will not have to be moved away from their home district. We think this policy will mean a great deal to our senior citizens and their families.

Community Health and Social Centres have been approved for 10 small towns in Saskatchewan. These are located in Hodgeville, Mossbank, Neudorf, Quill Lake, Willow Bunch, Maryfield, Leroy, Delisle, Strasbourg and Zenon Park.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Some of those names will be familiar to Members in this

House and particularly to Members opposite. Remember that it was in quite a number of these communities that the Liberal policy was indiscriminately to close down these small hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, the health and social centres include out-patient clinics, the services of visiting physicians, a 24-hour on-call nursing service, public health services, home care programs and social activities program especially for our senior citizens. We think that these centres may develop a new concept for health care for our citizens based on maintenance of good health and prevention of illness.

Mr. Speaker, we have launched a new medical bursary program designed to increase the retention of Saskatchewan trained physicians particularly in areas of defined need outside the major centres. We also approved a program of incentive payments for physicians to encourage them to establish practices in areas which traditionally have had difficulty in attracting and retaining physicians. An estimated cost of \$460,000 is provided for the coming year.

We launched a province-wide public information and education program on venereal disease control to counterattack the alarming increase in venereal disease. We estimate that this program will cost close to one quarter million dollars this year. The program involves newspapers, television and radio coverage, information, a 24-hour toll-free telephone number as well as specific pamphlets and other literature. I understand that the advisory committee is meeting in the next few days and is coming up with further recommendations of how best to control the problem of venereal disease. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that just two weeks ago, attending the Health Ministers' Conference at Ottawa, it was acknowledged by all that Saskatchewan has embarked on the most effective program so far. It is a problem that is not unique to Saskatchewan or to Canada, it has become a world-wide problem.

An exciting program was announced recently which will\_ shortly begin in four rural communities — the Nurse Practitioner Pilot Project. Again, this is a program designed for areas where we have difficulties in recruiting and retaining physicians. Registered nurses will receive further specialized training which will enable them to provide a broad range of health services under the direction of a nearby physician. Some \$200,000 has been approved by the Government for this project.

The communities are Maryfield, Leroy, Meadow Lake and Fox Valley. We have agreed to develop a Saskatchewan Family Planning Program and a Family Planning Co-ordinator has been hired. A provincial advisory committee on Family Planning has been established to examine present programs, receive submissions from the public and make recommendations to the Government regarding the form and the content of the Family Planning Program.

We insured chiropractor services as of February 1, 1973 and we have just concluded a new agreement with the chiropractors to continue this program. The cost for the first year of the program is estimated at about \$1.7 million.

In the field of alcoholism rehabilitation we have increased the budget for the operation of the Alcoholism Commission in Saskatchewan by 63 1/3 per cent since taking office. The Commission's budget is now over \$1 million. We also

increased the staff from 34 to 46. I have reason to believe that our support for the Commission's work will be even much greater in the coming budget to be introduced.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more areas where we have improved health services and benefits. We revitalized the Cancer Commission and appointed new and aggressive leadership. We set up Core services to provide better co-ordination and integration of services for the mentally retarded. A new community program will promote greater understanding, new opportunities for the retarded.

There is a renal disease program which pays for drug costs of up to \$1,000 per patient per year for persons with chronic stage renal disease." This is just one of the smaller, but significant, benefits we have introduced for persons with special health problems.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant steps we have taken since coming to office is to reverse the Liberal mistreatment of the working people particularly those in the field of health. The Liberal Government's labor policy fomented dissension and strife and often led to strikes. In no area was the Liberal labor record worse than with respect to the low wages paid to the hospital workers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that we have improved the lot of the low-paid hospital workers with wage increases of about 40 per cent over the last two and a half years and the hospital workers are now in negotiations for a new agreement. There will be further increases provided for them.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, just two days ago I announced the details of our Children's Dental Care Program which will start later this year at a cost of \$3.5 million in the start-up year. A program which we feel will re-establish Saskatchewan as the pioneering province in the health care field.

Mr. Speaker, I could mention so many more programs and improvements in health which have been started in just the last two and a half years. We have done all this and still managed to abolish the hospital and medical premiums. What did the Liberals do when they were in office and they had the same kind of a chance? What they did was to impose deterrent fees. The Leader of the Opposition faced the same challenge when he was the Government that we face today, rising costs and rising expectations. What did he do about these challenges? He did his best to discredit and jeopardize our health plans by putting deterrent fees and charges against the people. We removed them. Now we removed the premiums without sacrificing our health services and without adding new taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members opposite to join with us in passing this Bill to abolish medical and hospital premiums and to help us usher in a new era in fair taxation and improved health services.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to move Bill No. 49.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D. F. MacDONALD:**(Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be

surprised if this debate went on and on because if Members have the chance to come back on some of the many, many subjects that the Minister has opened up during his introduction of this Bill we could be here for months and months.

I was rather surprised that the Speaker did not call the Member to order as he hardly ever strayed back to the Bill that he was supposed to be introducing.

The Bill, basically, is a window-dressing Bill. It is not a Bill that is necessary in this House as far as the elimination of the medical premiums are concerned. It wasn't necessary to bring it to this House at all, but speech No. 5 had to be brought to this House somehow or another. Therefore, we address ourselves not necessarily to the matter of the elimination of the medical premiums but to what the Bill is really about. That, of course, is in Section 5-

This Bill is before us really for the sole purpose of forcing employers to pay to employees the amount that would otherwise had been paid to the Government had the premiums not been dropped. Well, this would seem to be a fair and equitable objective of the Bill. After all, either by binding agreements or some other forms of agreements or by actual practice, employers have been contributing up to \$72 on behalf of their employees. This \$72, in fact, has been part of the wages of the employee, or he likely considered them a part of his wages, and this provision in this Bill also seems fair because it does not appear to require the employer to pay more than he did last year. It seems merely to force the employer to pay the same amount as he did last year. The only change is that he now pays it to the employee instead of to the Government. They started by saying that this appears fair and equitable and just, and it appears that it doesn't discriminate in any way against the employer. This is how Mr. Blakeney would have us accept this concept. However, there are two reasons why this provision is not nearly as fair and as just as the NDP would have us believe.

In the past couple of years we have seen legislation passed in this House which has imposed costs on the employer who has already signed a collective agreement with his employees. Another example of this will come later in the week when legislation is introduced giving all employees a minimum of three weeks holidays. The provision in Bill 49 will be imposed on existing agreements.

What happens in the signing of an agreement? Well, the employer and the employee sit down together and they negotiate what each side considers a fair agreement. The employee decides what he needs and should receive and the employer decides what he is able to afford, what he is able to pay the employee. After the agreement is signed the employer is then able to plan financially his future knowing what the built-in cost will be. This is all fine and good and this is the great advantage of signing a collective agreement. However, all of a sudden Mr. Blakeney comes along and arbitrarily imposes further costs on the employer, costs above and beyond that reached during the agreement, which was made in good faith between the employee and the employer. Unfortunately Saskatchewan employers have to have these impositions applied by the Blakeney Government, they have to live with these.

However, the Bill today, shows that there is a double

standard for the NDP. Up to this time we have seen no hesitation by the NDP to impose extra costs on the employer. Now we see a political measure that would be of some benefit to the employer. This is also a political measure like holidays that is brought forward after agreement has been signed and is one that apparently will benefit the employers. After all the employer and the employee have sat down and the agreement was made whereby the employer would pay and take over the responsibility for any premiums which would be imposed by the Government for medical care. That was the agreement, it was not necessary that he would agree to pay a \$72 premium or \$56 premium. It could have been a \$100 premium or a \$15 premium. But the employer was willing to accept the responsibility of seeing that the employee had no financial obligations as far as premiums were concerned.

However, the Blakeney Government has a double standard. This double standard is that any legislation or actions of the NDP that interfere with a collective agreement, signed in good faith, will always discriminate against the employer, never against the employee. This double standard arises from the contempt of the NDP for the business community of this province.

Section 5 sets a dangerous precedent by extracting out a portion of the collective agreement, made in good faith, and then subjecting this portion to legislation. I submit, a dangerous precedent.

The second reason why this Bill is not as fair and equitable as the NDP would have us believe, is the fact that this provision in Section 5 will cost the employer more money. We are led to believe that employers are only being asked to pay the same amount, this is not true. They will be asked to pay more. Any intelligent person in this province knows very well that money lost to the Treasurer, due to the discontinuance of premiums, will simply have to be paid in some other form. The employer, therefore, will have to pay out to the employee an amount equivalent to the former premiums, plus he will have to pay a higher taxation in some form or another in order to sustain our medical plans.

Let every Member of this Legislature be aware when considering this legislation, that, taken in the entire scope of Government interference with business, this is not a fair and equitable provision for the employer.

Other people at other times, and notably Governor Reagan of California, have made the suggestion that when governments introduce legislation for give-away programs they should also be forced to introduce legislation that would show how they intend to raise the funds to pay for these give-aways.

We, as a Legislature, have to face this ultimate question of raising moneys and the public has the right to understand how the public will be asked to pay for our health plans. The public has the right to know how the Blakeney Government intends to tax us, how much will income taxes be raised, how much will corporation taxes be raised.

The NDP have intimated and suggested that it somehow will be free, no taxes going to be raised and so on. Somehow the public will not have to pay for this free service. And this is utter nonsense.

The Minister of Health should outline in this House, when he closes debate, exactly how he intends to extract a tax from the public to pay for this so-called free service. The Minister should also indicate if he feels the Treasury is so rich that it is able to give this so-called free service, then why are our medical services being eroded in this province. Why are hospital operating grants being cut back and thereby necessitating hospitals giving less and poorer service? If money is available to discontinue premiums why is not adequate funding available to the hospitals?

The Minister should indicate why it is necessary to cut back on physiotherapy services given by private physiotherapists if the Treasury is so rich. Why is our chiropractic plan being eroded in the name of fiscal responsibility if so much money is available? Why must we be content with less than a perfect chiropractic plan and a plan that will become even more deficient if the Minister continues his present stance? Why must Saskatchewan people accept a dental plan that is far less than desirable if there is so much money in the Treasury?

I think the Minister cannot give us reasonable answers to these questions because the decision to discontinue the collection of medical premiums is a decision taken on the basis of pure politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — It is a decision which was made after calculating how many votes could be won in the next election. It is a decision that was made not according to the needs and desires of Saskatchewan people. It is not a decision that will really help those people in the greatest need our old age pensioners or those who are existing on welfare. They already received free medical care premiums. This is strictly a political move to try to influence votes and it is a move that will not likely succeed. Surely the people of Saskatchewan will see through the blatant political move to buy votes with the people's own money. I think we have seen great evidence of this fact already in the by- election. The people certainly showed what they think of blatant political moves such as this.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — The Blakeney Government cleverly thinks that by sending out registration cards every six months with a propaganda letter enclosed, at some considerable expense to the taxpayers, they will somehow continue to get political mileage. I predict that this will backfire and it will simply remind the Saskatchewan people about the hypocrisy of this Government. And added to this is a very distasteful practice that the NDP have instituted asking their members to contribute \$72 for 1975- It would almost appear that one of the deciding factors that influenced Mr. Blakeney to eliminate medical care premiums was his desire to fill up the party coffers. A pitiful excuse for legislative action. However, I am convinced that the people of Saskatchewan are aware of the shallow motives of the Blakeney Government. I am convinced that they will show this.

Mr. Speaker, in order to consider all the wide-ranging remarks of the Minister, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MR. SMISHEK moved second reading of Bill No. 16 — **An Act to facilitate the Making of Inter Vivos and Post-Mortem Gifts of Human Tissue.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, The Human Tissue Act, 1974- is a basic revision of The Human Tissue Act of 1968. The provisions of this new Act were taken from a model bill adopted by the 1970 Conference of Commissioners on the uniformity of law in Canada. Since that time most of the other provinces have adopted the proposed legislation. The contents of this legislation have been generally approved by those segments of the medical profession, particularly interested in the human tissue transplant procedures. Essentially the Bill provides for the donation of all or parts of one's body after death for scientific or therapeutic purposes. It also provides for the donation of part of one's body during his life, this latter point is the important change in the legislation. The change is designed to meet an increasing need for transplant donors. The most recent figure I have indicates that there are 18 persons in Saskatchewan waiting for kidney transplants. Mr. Speaker, I am told that there is need for about 25 transplants a year in our province.

Although not much publicized, Saskatchewan was the second transplant centre in Canada. At one point I am told Saskatchewan had 5 per cent of all the transplants in the world. Kidney transplants have been performed in this province since 1965. There have been more than 125 patients in the decade that has passed. Two kidney transplant patients are alive after almost 10 years, having survived since April and June of 1964-. The most common method of dealing with kidney failure is dialysis. A patient is hooked up to what is basically a purifying machine which removes the waste chemicals from the blood which would normally be dealt with by the kidney. Failure to remove these waste chemicals will result in death. A patient who has suffered kidney failure requires dialysis every three or four days, roughly 100 times a year. Mr. Speaker, when you consider that each dialysis incurs a cost of \$50 to \$75 you can appreciate that this is an extremely costly method of treatment. As of last December there were 29 people on dialysis in this province. The vast majority of these patients are suitable for transplants and transplant is by no means an uncertain procedure as it once was. A team of physicians and surgeons in Saskatchewan have had a good deal of experience in transplants and have developed a procedure to the point where there is a 90 per cent long term survival rate when a donor is a brother or a sister. Even in a case of less suit- able donors the team reports a 60 per cent long-term survival rate.

I want to emphasize to you that kidney transplants free the patient from the time consuming and costly dialysis treatment and make it possible for the patient to live a much more normal life. Dr. Maurice Foster, an Ontario Member of Parliament placed a motion on the House of Commons order paper last November in which he called on the Commons to give support to a national program of education and information regarding trans- plants. Dr. Foster pointed out the need to encourage donations of human tissue for transplant therapy and medical research. He also sought support for a uniform donor card. Dr. Foster said in a press release that the kidney unit in. Hamilton, Ontario, for example, can only carry out about one-third of the required transplants each year due to lack of donors. Dr. Foster said that when he recognized that each patient on dialysis involves



a cost between \$5,000 and \$15,000 annually the total cost across the nation is in the millions of dollars. However, I know from his press release that Dr. Foster would agree with me that the most important aspect of an improved supply of donors would be the opportunity for patients to return to more normal life.

At the recent Federal-Provincial Health Ministers Conference the federal delegation asked that this matter be placed on the agenda of the next conference of Health Ministers. As well the conference directed the committee of deputy Ministers to examine this question with a view to recommending ways of encouraging more donations of human tissues.

The new Human Tissues Act that I am bringing before you will make it easier for a donation of human tissue to be made. The previous Act provided only for post-mortem gifts. The new Act will make it legal for a living person to donate human tissue during his or her lifetime. This has particular importance to kidney transplants. As I mentioned earlier our Saskatchewan transplant team has recorded a 90 per cent long-term survival rate in the case of transplants from a brother or sister. The survival rate is much lower with a stranger or a distant relative. The new Act will make it possible for a brother or sister to donate a kidney during their lifetime. Under old legislation it was necessary for the donor to be deceased before the transplant could be placed. Since it is medically possible for a person to function on one kidney the legislation opens up whole new areas of possible donorship.

The Bill also provides for more post-mortem gifts for transplants and more uses to be made with consent given orally in the presence of at least two witnesses during a donor's last illness. The 1968 Act made provision for only written consent.

The new Act will make the process of indicating one's wishes to donate his or her body to therapeutic or research purposes easier for patients who are ill.

Another new provision of the Bill is one which spells out for the purposes of post-mortem transplant the fact of death shall be established by at least two physicians. This clause will help to eliminate possible delays which might arise due to technicalities regarding determination of the fact of death. Since one can only preserve a kidney for transplant purposes for a maximum of 10 hours and transportation to another city may be involved, delays in the transplant procedure must be kept to a minimum.

While this is a rather technical Bill, I hope that its passage by this House will also lead to some much needed publicity in the matter of donorship. The simple fact is that many people are in need of human tissue gifts to enable them to lead relatively normal lives. While I have talked mainly about kidney transplants so far, you should know that corneal transplants, eye transplants, are becoming more and more common. Heart, lung and liver transplants are still in the experimental stages. However, once the rejection problem is overcome, transplant surgery will open up a whole new field of medical activity. The question of available donors will become more and more urgent. The Human Tissue Act, 1974 will make the process of donorship easier and more straightforward for all concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to give

support to this legislation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D. F. MacDONALD:** (Moose Jaw North): — I want to support the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to compliment the Minister on the Bill. I think that it is quite a well written Bill which will facilitate the obtaining of tissue gifts while maintaining the protection that is needed by the public. This can be an emotional issue and I think that sufficient protections are written into this Bill.

One of the emotional facts in Section 8 as the Minister mentioned, the determination of death. I don't know any way that this could be written into a bill in any better form. I know that it disturbs some people and is going to be a question in the future that is going to have to be answered to the satisfaction of the public just when death does occur. All in all I can't find any particular problems in the Bill and will support it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**HON. J. R. KOWALCHUK** (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act respecting the Geographic Names Board.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be introducing this Bill, an Act respecting the Geographic Names Board.

For a good many years informal discussions have taken place regarding the naming of any geographic features of our province, names of lakes, streams, bays and other such national geographic locations with the thought in mind that a more clear-cut and sensible approach must be found. The hodge-podge method used until now with possibly the only clear and explicit exception being that of the Saskatchewan veterans who had lost their lives in World War I and II. Otherwise the naming system being paternalistic and narrow in outlook and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, even political in nature, should be replaced by a rational and acceptable approach. Other provinces have different methods, the province with the most acceptable method in my opinion, is the Province of Ontario upon which this legislation is patterned.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of Bill No. 9 to clarify policies on the selection of names for geographical features and places in the province and to determine the worthiness of proposed names. In the past any names that were suggested by the public were taken to the Minister for his approval before being sent to the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographic Names in Ottawa for approval.

All the names from the casualty list from the Second World War have been used for official names in Saskatchewan. However, there have been no clear criteria for determining the virtues and relative importance of the official use of other names.

The Saskatchewan Geographic Board Act will make provision for the appointment of a board of at least three members who will be responsible for the gathering and the recording of information on names for places and geographical features from requests from the public, Mr. Speaker. Each name will be given the same consideration. The names suggested will be taken to all concerned persons and agencies for the purpose of determining their suitability.

The board will also have the power to make recommendations for changing names that are duplicated or inappropriate to the feature or the place. Collaboration with the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names for the selection or elimination of names and the correct or preferred spelling of established names will also be a duty of this Board. When a geographic name has been approved and officially adopted, government departments and agencies, cartographers and publishers will be advised by the Board so it can be released for official public use. Any statute, order, regulation, contract, summons, information, writ or other document affecting the legal right of a geographical feature or place will not be considered invalid just because the name has not been approved by the Minister.

This Bill, while not taking any powers away from the Minister will provide him with a valuable and unbiased source of information on the selection of names that will be lasting memorials to outstanding citizens and events of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, briefly, once again, the proposed legislation outlines the makeup, the powers and the duties of a Geographic Names Board. I think that in view of the fact that nearly all of the names of Saskatchewan war veterans who died in the last war as I said before, and other Saskatchewan veterans have all been cared for in having Saskatchewan geographic features named after them, a better way should be found to scrutinize names and possibly as I said before as well even rename some of these features. This proposed legislation is the answer. For once there will be a legal mechanism for official adoption of these proposed names.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that all Members of this Legislature will support this Bill No. 9.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. T. M. WEATHERALD:** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to indicate to the Minister that we approve of what the Government is doing in this instance. It is a step which is in the right direction. I think the Americans have done an extremely better job than we have in the past of developing historic sites and adding a little glamour to the tourist industry by giving particular significance through the use of names. Of course, to be able to put into Saskatchewan history the name of an individual that is an outstanding person and has made an outstanding contribution is certainly a worthy step in the right direction.

I think it is a good idea of using a board so that all names can be considered, both individual and historic names of the past and we will be supporting the legislation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make another few comments on this Bill. They tell me there is a big . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! You can not bring in new material.

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Thank you very much. Then, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I think this is a good Bill. I think it will give the opportunity for inclusion of names in this Bill, names that have in my opinion and in the opinion of many other people have not had the chance to be included. I think it is time that we put aside our differences, we have a lot of pioneers who have contributed to this province and I am sure the board will be considering them when this board is established.

I feel very pleased that the Opposition Members have said that they will be supporting this Bill. I am sure that all the people in the province will be contributing in making this board work effectively.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**MR. KOWALCHUK** moved second reading of Bill No. 55 — **An Act to amend The Forest Act.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 35 is necessary. We well know that as required by law any deletions from our provincial forests must be done by legislation. There may be those who object to that procedure as being unnecessary, that the matter could be more easily expedited by the Lieutenant-Governor, through an Order-in-Council, however, by this route that we are doing here today the many deletions can be explained and debated if that is the way it is felt by this House. It is one way in which the public is made aware of any deletion from our forest resources. In my opinion, it is a preventive measure against governments hastily getting rid of parts of our forest without any close or any kind of scrutiny and I approve of it. This amendment to The Forest Act clearly states that the Crown land is being deleted, the description of the land and why it is being deleted.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed for The Saskatchewan Forest Act provided for necessary adjustments in the boundaries of the provincial forest to accommodate changes, as I have already indicated, in use and in administration of Crown land. The adjustments have been recommended by the Interdepartmental Committee on Land Use, consisting of the Deputy Ministers of the Departments of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment.

Firstly, a deletion of the north half of Section 16, the east half of Section 21, legal subdivisions 13 and 14 of Section 21, of Township 7, Range 29 west of the third and region, in the Cypress Hills Provincial Forest is required. That the lands have been transferred to the Federal Government for the Fort Walsh National Historic Park. And there have been some trade-offs in lands in order for this to be accomplished.

Secondly, it is necessary to amend the description of the northern provincial forest and township 50, Range 11, West of the 2nd region. The owner of the balance of Section 4 has purchased that portion of the north half of the Section which was formerly provincial forest and once again, the decision was made with the approval of, as I said before, the Interdepartmental Committee and in this case who said, that the land was suitable for good agricultural purposes and therefore that was done.

Thirdly, it is desirable to change the forest boundary descriptions in Townships 48 and 49, Range 9 west of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meridian, so that they conform to the permanent demarcation of a survey ditch rather than a fire guard. This is, again, a desirable thing because rather than following a fire guard, a survey which makes really good sense.

Finally, the following lands have been transferred to the Department of Natural Resources for future park development and should be included in the legal description of Duck Mountain Provincial Park Forest, and that as you well know is the Kamsack area. They are the north half of Sections 28 and 29 and Sections 32 to 36 inclusive of Townships 29, Range 30, west of the prime meridian and Section 5 and the east half of Section 4, Township 32, Range 31, west of the prime meridian.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the changes that are being asked in this amendment. There is nothing dramatic about them. I think they are very procedural. I don't think there is anything political about them. They are straightforward acts that have to be accomplished and these have been approved by the Interdepartmental Committee.

**MR. T. M. WEATHERALD:** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have no objection to this Bill.

I want to indicate to the Minister a matter which I think is as good an opportunity to mention now as it would be at any time since he is dealing with provincial parks. The question that I should like him to answer is what the land that has been added to Duck Mountain Park has been used for up until now. Was it bought from a farmer or is it added into the park system? I don't have that information first hand.

The second point which I did want to make, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think is of concern to many people who are interested in such things in Saskatchewan, and there are many, that our provincial park system is seemingly to be under attack from the outside, you might say, in a lot of ways. By this I mean that the geographic boundaries of many of our provincial parks were set up some 30 or 40 years ago, some of them more recently, but in actual fact if those parks are cleared and drained right up to the borders many of them are going to be very small. In actual fact many of them throughout Saskatchewan, the provincial parks, have been relying upon additional land that was outside their borders that was in private hands. It seems to me that if we continue the procedure that is taking place in Saskatchewan of clearing and draining so much land that we should use up every opportunity to buy some of this land that is very frequently very marginal and add it into our provincial park system.

I think that if we don't do this, that we are going to find the area we have left for many of our provincial parks will be extremely small because the land will be totally used for pasture or crops right up to the boundaries. So I just want to indicate that the adding of additional land at Duck Mountain I think, is a very welcome thing. I hope that from time to time as land becomes available that is up against our provincial parks, that this land could be bought and added into the park and the park boundary extended out a little farther than it has been in the past.

**MR. KOWALCHUK:** — Mr. Speaker, as I understand it is that the land that is being added to the Duck Mountain Park is being taken out of the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve and, therefore, this is just a transfer of land.

In answer to the other question, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know whether it is in order or not. When we are talking about this Act, it is in regard to land under The Forest Act that we speak of. We are not talking about land in provincial parks. Though my friend from Cannington did open up the question as to what is happening there and there is no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people are asking a lot of questions as to what is happening in our provincial parks, maybe with some reason. Maybe it does go back to the time when the people who are now in Opposition, maybe they have something to answer for what has happened in provincial park operations. The fact that the operation of foresting in the parks, etc. was greatly accelerated then. I am not saying that this isn't proper, the only thing is that this should be done very, very carefully. I think that this is the question that people are being concerned about, ecology, environment and so on. I agree with him on that matter, as do the people in my Department, and we are going to take a careful look at all of those kinds of situations, whether it is foresting or whether it is drilling for oil in a park, whatever it is, I think it is very important that we are very careful in these types of operations.

I have nothing else to add except to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this is a very simple Bill which transfers some land to its proper place. I am hopeful that we are going to be coming up with something which will make it possible to deal with similar situations which the Member for Cannington is concerned about and that is lands within the provincial parks.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Culture and Youth) moved second reading of Bill No. 31 — **An Act to amend The Centennial Projects Assistance Act, 1965.**

He said: — Mr. Speaker, this Government has in its term of office placed an emphasis on cultural and recreational opportunities for all Saskatchewan people that I think has never before been paralleled. The programs developed and the assistance that has been provided to organizations and communities have been based on the principle that everyone in our society has the right to share and everyone in our society has the right to participate in the opportunities that are available.

These programs that have been developed and the assistance

that has been provided have been based on a firm commitment that Saskatchewan communities, large and small, need not gradually be wiped out. And in this commitment we are aware that there are many obstacles that are needed to be overcome. We are aware of the mitigating policies that emanate and have over many years emanated at the national level such as policies which proposed the elimination of two-thirds of our Saskatchewan farmers; such as LIFT programs that have, to some extent, achieved that result partially; such as freight rates which have discriminated against the prairie provinces and western Canada over a long period of time.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I think it would assist the Opposition to follow what the Minister is talking about if he could identify the Bill to which he is talking to. I was under the impression that he was speaking to Bill No. 51 to make a slight amendment to The Centennial Projects Assistance Act, 1965 and not to railways.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I was just about to come to that. I wanted to point out in the remarks that I was making that although we as a province have been making some very great strides in the area of cultural recreational activities there are certain problems that have existed and do exist today.

I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Bill that although we as a province have done many things in the past and even this legislation that I am talking about was passed in 1965 by the Members opposite when they formed the Government, that there is certain assistance that we feel should be increased or made available from the federal level for these kinds of activities, for these kinds of facilities as are provided by this legislation. We are concerned that from Canada Council, for example, the Province of Saskatchewan gets very little assistance. We are concerned that although in addition to the facilities that we have in Saskatoon, which is the Centennial Auditorium and the facility which we have in Regina which is the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, we are talking about and have agreed with the city of Moose Jaw and the Western Development Museum to build a museum there. But in our approaches to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and other agencies of the Federal Government, when it was requested if there would be some assistance in the construction of that \$1 million facility, it was indicated that there was not. Even though there has been a new policy announced which is claimed to be based on the concept of decentralization.

We also see that there has been a recent announcement that there are going to be three museums built; one in Ottawa, one in Hull and one in Victoria Island, which is situated on the river between Hull and Ottawa. And somehow, Mr. Speaker, I have to question whether that in fact is decentralization.

But coming back to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I want to say because of this commitment that we have to Saskatchewan communities of all sizes, a thrust in culture and recreation have made it possible for the initiation of many various activities in many Saskatchewan communities that people today seek to participate in.

There was a time when it was thought that a province with

a small population, widely dispersed over a large geographical area, just could not have entertainment of the calibre of the Red Army Chorus or Liberace or Victor Borge, Susan Jacks or Anne Murray, just to name a few. But a determination displayed by Saskatchewan people in so many fields over the years has proven that these pessimists are totally wrong. We have, in this province, two auditoriums which receive praise from all those who visit them or entertain in them.

The Centennial Auditorium in Saskatoon and the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts serving northern and southern Saskatchewan respectively, have brought in some of the best shows and talent available, not only in Canada, and not only in North America but from throughout the world. These two centres have at the same time become community facilities providing a place to put on such community programs as the Lion's Band Concert, which is held annually in Regina, or school concerts and the two symphonies of Regina and Saskatoon.

The Centres have proven to be valuable convention facilities. They have made it possible for some conventions to be attracted to this province which might not have otherwise been held here.

In 1965, Mr. Speaker, The Centennial Project Assistance Act was passed by this Legislature as one of several measures adopted by the province in preparation for the celebration of Canada's Centennial Year 1967. And during the Second Reading debate at that time, Sandy Nicholson the CCF MLA for Saskatoon City said, and I quote:

I think that it is fitting that as we celebrate our provincial diamond jubilee and plan Canada's centennial that we should have buildings that will be a credit to our people for many years.

I don't think that there is any doubt that these buildings have continued to be a credit to this province, Mr. Speaker.

As it happened the construction of these two facilities in Regina and Saskatoon took different paths and as a result the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts is owned by this province and operated under policies established by a board of directors, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. An appropriation of \$125,000 has been provided in the Department of Culture and Youth budget to cover any deficit that may be incurred by the Centre.

The Centennial Auditorium in Saskatoon is owned and operated by that city. In accordance with an agreement under Section 1 of this Act made between the Government of Saskatchewan and the city of Saskatoon dated February 24, 1969 the Government undertook to share with that city in the payment of deficits that may be incurred in the operation of Saskatoon Centennial project, the Saskatoon Centennial Auditorium.

Clause (a) of subsection 2 of Section 4 of this Act limited the sum to be paid to Saskatoon under the agreement with respect to incurred deficits to not more than \$50,000 per annum. The objective of this amendment is simply to remove that clause, limiting the annual provincial grant of \$50,000 and substituting therefore an open-ended arrangement that will reflect in the legislation what is already established government practice.



In the fiscal year of 1972-73 the actual grant paid was \$75 000. In the current fiscal year the allocation and the grant that will be paid will be in the amount of \$100,000. A brief review of the deficits in the last three years will illustrate the need for a flexible response from the Government in determining the dollar value of the annual payment. Considering the year ending on June 30th in the year 1970-71 the deficit at the Centennial Auditorium was \$ 44,275 — the provincial grant was \$50 000. In the year 1971-72 the deficit was \$196,479 — the provincial grant was \$75,000. In 1972-73, the deficit increased to \$203,782. We have, as I mentioned previously, allocated \$100,000 to help defray some of that deficit. The 1970-71 deficit was relatively low, a figure which was lessened by the benefits accruing to the Centre from the Canada Winter Games which Saskatoon hosted that year. Since that time and in the absence of such major revenue generating events, the increased revenues are not keeping pace with rising operating expenditures.

The alternative to this amendment would be to have ticket prices increased. The step, I believe, would restrict a large segment of the population from utilizing this cultural resource.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill will allow great flexibility with respect to the level of Government grant and will be of benefit to the greatest number of people in that part of the province served by the Centennial Auditorium.

It is my hope that both centres, the centre in Regina and the centre in Saskatoon will continue to expand their accessibility to the communities outside of the two cities of Regina and Saskatoon. I do know that some communities do arrange group trips by bus to performances at the auditoriums. And expansion of this effort with encouragement by the respective centres would provide an opportunity for more people throughout the province to attend performances of their liking from time to time.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I consider these centres as provincial facilities serving the whole province. As I indicated earlier the nature of our province geographically and the dispersal of our population has presented many difficulties and yet this province has originated some of the most exciting new social innovations in North America. And at the same time we have not become too engrossed in the solving of our economic and our social problems that we have neglected our cultural needs. This province has developed a wide spectrum of cultural opportunity for our people, from our smallest communities to our largest cities. We are indeed fortunate to live in a province that has lots of room and has clean air, freedom from the congestion of the larger metropolitan centres and the beauty of an environment that has not been totally destroyed by those who put the gross national product before everything else.

**MR. DYCK:** — How about . . .

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That is going to come soon two years. We are fortunate because we have this kind of a province and at the same time have the opportunity to experience the kinds of entertainment that one normally would expect only to find in the Torontos and the Vancouvers and the Winnipegs.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

**MR. K. R. MacLEOD:** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this relatively simple amendment, I should like to respond as briefly as the Minister.

To begin with I charge the Minister, as the Minister of Cultural Affairs, with false and misleading advertising in his speech and I suggest that he challenge himself as Minister of Consumer Affairs for that kind of activity. The Minister starts out by describing how concerned this Government is with the cultural opportunities for people of Saskatchewan and promptly embarks upon a speech which lauds and praises projects which were conceived, developed and created by a Liberal Government in Regina and in Ottawa — financed, supported entirely. He then discussed the Regina Centre of the Arts, The Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, which is now under provincial auspices and he failed to mention that the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker), who was then also the Mayor of the city of Regina, did get involved in the thing and the only time that any Member of the CCF or NDP was involved in developing anything of a cultural nature in the Province of Saskatchewan they couldn't finish it, with the result that Premier Ross Thatcher was then obliged on behalf of the people of the province to bail out the Mayor of the city of Regina who embarked upon a project that he knew not how to finish.

As a consequence the province has operated it; it has operated under the auspices of the province ever since. And in many ways it was operated rather efficiently while the Liberals were in power but it is now obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the budget under the present Government of operating the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts is going to skyrocket due to, in no small measure, to the mismanagement of that Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts under the new board which was named by the Government to replace the previously non-partisan efficient board. And what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Saskatchewan has taken a totally non-partisan, non-political board and has chucked it out and replaced that board with people totally belonging to the New Democratic Party or supporting the New Democratic Party and these people have, I suggest, created a kind of a problem with the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts which obviously requires no limit to the amount of spending in that building.

Nonetheless, I agree with the Minister, with the amendment and we will support the amendment simply because it is a necessary amendment. We agree with his desire that cultural resources be made available to the maximum number of people of Saskatchewan. I would remind the Minister however, that if he were being fair in the House (and that's one of the Ministers who is generally fair in the House and I am not going to let this one little deviation from his normal fair conduct influence my future thinking so I will continue to believe that he is a fair-minded Minister). But I would suggest, that the Minister, if he were fair-minded in this respect, would congratulate the Federal Government and the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan for having had the foresight to develop centennial projects for the long lasting benefit for the people of Saskatchewan.

It is apparent from the remarks of the Minister that the only positive note in the remarks of the Minister was a complaint against the Federal Government that they didn't do more than they already do. It seems to me over and over in this House that the Government wants not to be a government to do

things for itself, it believes that it is nothing more nor less than an elected set of lobbyists sent here for the purpose of nagging away at the Federal Government to have them do something else. This Government would do far more for itself and bring far more honor upon itself if it spent its time thinking of the good things that it could do and far less time whining to what Ottawa should be doing, when in fact, Ottawa has done far more than these people. It is an indication of the poverty of this Government that we are now starting to hear the same speeches three or four times.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are approaching election time because in the House today alone, we have heard the same speeches three or four times, speeches that we have heard in the last two or three sessions over and over again. It is even getting to be a problem. I notice that the NDP seems to say there are pessimists here and there throughout society. The difficulty is this, that as long as there is a Federal Liberal Government in Ottawa it is going to be harder and harder to find pessimists anywhere in Canada and I feel sorry for the Ministers who are out seeking pessimists because they are becoming fewer and fewer. And I can tell you pessimism would be totally eliminated from Saskatchewan if we could replace the present NDP.

It is worth noting in dealing with the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts and this Bill that the Member of this House who has had more than any other person to do with failure to complete that building is not in his seat. Now as you know, Mr. Speaker, I tend to believe that it is inappropriate for Members of this House to comment on the absence of other Members of the House. It is generally a childish and futile endeavor and unworthy of Members of this House. It is however, not appropriate to allow that to apply to the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker) because there is the Member, Mr. Speaker, who on this particular point as well as the rest of the business of the House should be sitting in his seat and be prepared to be heard in this House. That Member, obviously he is a good salesman because he is able — the only Member of the House that I know of — who is able to handle two full-time jobs at the same time. And get two full-time salaries at the same time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — But I think that we should be more than aware that the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana is not sitting in the House when this Bill is here and he should be here.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Nonsense!

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Nonsense, nothing. I don't complain that the Hon. Premier isn't here because I am sure he is on the business of the Government and the same with the Hon. Attorney General. If anyone else in this House is absent I have no doubt that he is absent because he has some good and valid reason. I would suggest, however, if a man is sitting in this House and should be here, he shouldn't be taking a salary from some other group of citizens for doing a job somewhere else. He is either letting down the citizens of Regina or the citizens of Wascana, one or the other.

Now I should like to know what the Hon. Member for Regina Wascana has to say about this Bill and about the fact that a

Liberal Government completed the monkey bars that he left there so long. I should like to hear what he has to say about the Minister of Culture and Youth failing to give credit to the Liberal Government of 1965 and the years thereafter who bailed out the city of Regina. I can assure you as a Member, as a citizen of Regina and a taxpayer of Regina at the time I was very grateful to the Liberal Government at that time. And I am sure that a lot of people across the way who lived in this city were grateful too.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated we will support the Bill. It is disappointing to me, however, that in a matter that is so lofty and so decent the Hon. Minister should degrade it with low political conniving and tricks.

**MR. F. MEAKES:**(Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, may I just rise for a moment to support this Bill. I really wouldn't have except my hon. friend who just sat down kind of stirred up my spirit. I want to suggest that the Hon. Mayor serves his role in both places better than you do in yours.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MEAKES:** — I really think that the Mayor of Regina of that day was a very smart Mayor. He really felt the provincial government should put some money into it. They called it monkey bars but the city of Regina has it and I think the government should have put some money in and if we had been returned to power at that time, I, for one would have suggested the government should put some money into it, because this is the capital city. I just couldn't resist, I think the Hon. Member, the Mayor of the city of Regina, the Member from Wascana, is quite capable of filling both roles.

**HON. E. KRAMER:**(Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't a great deal to say but I just wanted to point out that my MLA has spoken and I am not very proud of him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KRAMER:** — I just want to inform this House that in my humble opinion that Henry Baker can spend an afternoon in this House and he would make a better contribution than the Member for Regina Albert Park could in a week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before this debate continues I can't find Henry Baker's name in the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I seem to be developing a reputation of getting a great deal of debate on very minor amendments, but that is good. I am glad that the Member opposite made some comments on this amendment. Sometimes relevant to the Bill and sometimes not.

I wasn't here in 1965 so I am not totally familiar with the circumstances involved then. I think it is unfortunate that the Member would — it is his right he can do as he wishes — would take a particular attack on a Member of this House who happens to be the Mayor of the city of Regina. I think it is unfortunate that he chose in his comments on this Bill to make an attack on the Member for Wascana, who is a good MLA and has been for a long time, as the electorate in the city of Regina have continued to elect him.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — It is the Member's privilege I suppose to say what he likes.

I thank him very much for the comment about myself as being fair, I think I am fair. I am glad you agree with that. I certainly try to be. I, at no time in the introductions that I made on this legislation, indicated that the project was not a good one. In fact, I started by saying that it was a very good one. I quoted Mr. Nicholson, who was the MLA from Saskatoon at that time as stating that it would be something to the credit of all the people of Saskatchewan in years to come. And I don't think that anybody in this House will question that the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts and the Centennial Auditorium are a credit to the people of Saskatchewan. I think we are very fortunate to have them.

As the Minister of Consumer Affairs I sometimes, from time to time, have a great deal to say about false and misleading advertising. Certainly I would not allow myself to get into false and misleading advertising as the Member opposite indicates, simply because I oppose it so strongly.

He said that cultural opportunities in Saskatchewan have been initiated or conceived by Liberals and not by governments of CCF or NDP. I want the Member to do a little bit of looking back into the past. I think that you should look at when, for instance, one of the greatest institutions in the field of the arts in Saskatchewan was initiated and that is the Saskatchewan Arts Board. I think, Mr. Member, you will find that the Saskatchewan Arts Board began in 1947. I am quite sure that in 1947 it was three years after the election of the first CCF Government of Saskatchewan. There was a comment by the Regina Member made that the facility in Regina operated efficiently only during Liberal years. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that for this 1973 operation we are going to find, in preliminary reports that I have, which are not conclusive yet that it is going to be the best year that the Centre has ever had.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I am not going to say that that is the case because of the new board, although certainly that might be part of it. Because I think the experiences of the old board and the work of that was done then have built a base for what the new board is doing.

The Member opposite says again that the old board was fired. I don't know, I am not a man for using strong language, so the best I can say is that that really is a bit of nonsense.

That in fact was not the case. A number of the board members who were replaced last year and some of those who were replaced this year, particularly those who were replaced this year, had their terms of four years which is written into the legislation saying that they can only serve for four years and those terms had run out.

In the appointment of the board members a special effort was made to have representation from communities throughout Saskatchewan, in southern Saskatchewan. I think that is important because the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts is meant to serve all of southern Saskatchewan. And the influence and the contributions made by those new board members from places like Gravelbourg, Weyburn, Estevan and Wynyard and other places, Melville, just to name a few have been very valuable in providing some direction for the Centre so that it can become more accessible to all the people of Saskatchewan, as it should be. Because in a sense all of the people of Saskatchewan helped to pay for the Centre through the subsidy which is derived naturally from taxation.

Mr. Speaker, my final remarks are to the Member who indicated that this is not a Government that does things. Well, if you look at last year's debates (and I think we will have the same thing this year) I think we saw them in December, the Members were saying that this Government is trying to do too much. Now, I think maybe they should make up their minds. Let me suggest to the Members opposite that if they think the Government is not doing things, they should look at the increase in the Budget in the Department of Culture and Youth in the field of cultural and recreational activity programming. Most of that money goes to provide programming in the communities of Saskatchewan. If you will examine what has happened in May of 1972, when the Department was formed, you will find that the budget has increased \$365,000, to something like \$6 million, and that surely is not a sign of a government that does not do things. We have made a commitment to provide greater opportunities in the cultural area of this province and we have carried out that commitment. We intend to do more.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — How much of that was from Ottawa?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Very little. We are getting from Ottawa some of that money which originally does generate in the Province of Saskatchewan and is drained off . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — . . . because of the kinds of policies that Ottawa has established in many ways to mitigate against the development of the economy of Saskatchewan.

Now one more complaint, Mr. Speaker, that I must reply to, and I think I am not bringing in new information, I am replying to some of the things that the Member mentioned. He complained about the Government of Saskatchewan lobbying to Ottawa. He complained about the Government of Saskatchewan going to the Government of Canada and saying — look we have some problems and here are the things that we think are shortcomings about the

policies that you have. I think there is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. I think we should be communicating with the Federal Government on these kinds of things and I think, we as a government, as they, when they were the government, were elected by the people of Saskatchewan to speak for this province, and to speak for the people of Saskatchewan. And. that is what we have been doing and that is what we will continue to do.

I think that I have covered the comments made by the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker. I want to close by saying that I am certainly pleased that he has indicated that the Members of the Opposition will support this small amendment, which is of some significance to the Centennial Auditorium. I think it is needed and I think the Members opposite recognize that it is needed, therefore, I am pleased that this Bill will go through second reading.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

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. Smishek that Bill No. 15 — **An Act for the provision of certain Dental Services in Saskatchewan** be now read a second time.

**MR. D. F. MacDONALD:**(Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, before I took my seat the other day I had a few comments. I should now like to make my position on the dental care plan very clear. I also want to make it clear that I will not be supporting the dental care plan that is proposed by the Government opposite.

First of all, I support, and the Liberal caucus supports, a dental care plan. Secondly, I support the concept of using dental nurses as technicians to assist the professional dentist.

The dental care plan that I could support, or that I would initiate, would incorporate certain minimal standards and I should like to outline these:

1. All examinations involving diagnosis and the planning treatment routines, must be given by a qualified professional dentist.

This does not mean simply that the initial examination of a child when he enrolls in the plan — it means every examination and every treatment planning.

2. All treatments given by dental nurses (these include fillings, extractions, treatment of diseased gums, the administration of anesthetics), must be given under the direct supervision of a qualified professional dentist.

By this, I mean, a dentist must be available within the same facility in which the dental nurse is working. It does not mean that dentists must be in the same room, nor does it mean that a dental nurse must only be an assistant to a dentist. This

prerequisite is not met by the plan proposed by the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), whereby supervision in the Minister's explanation means that the dental nurse will be working under the authority of the dentist in that district. In this situation I think the Minister really means supervision that is little more than administrative supervision. It is not in any way a functional supervision.

5. Especially in rural areas of Saskatchewan, local private dentists must be involved meaningfully in the dental plan.

If not, we are apt to see a depopulation of dentists from rural Saskatchewan leaving whole rural areas with no service except that provided for children which are enrolled in the plan.

4. Parents should be given freedom of choice as to the dentist they wish to serve their children.

If we have any kind of comprehensive dental care plan we must not build into that plan a compulsion as to who will provide service to the individuals.

Because, as a parent, I have already ensured the dental health of my children through a private dentist and want to continue with this program for my children, a program that I and my dentist consider to be successful, I should not be discriminated against and denied the right to enter the dental plan. Mr. Smishek's plan would deprive me of this right.

These are the basic, minimal conditions that I would demand for a dental plan for children. The Minister's proposals do not meet these conditions. It is very important that the public recognize that the dental care plan proposed by the NDP does not mean that children will be served by qualified professional dentists, nor does it mean that the dental nurses giving the service will be under the direct supervision of a dentist. Now at this point in time I think the public has a misconception about the plan proposed by the NDP.

One further point that would be well to consider as we debate this dental care plan. We have been told that the proposed dental care plan will cost some \$3.5 million and this is certainly a considerable amount of money. I have been led to believe that a saving of \$700,000 or so could be saved to the taxpayers by instituting fluoridation of water. And a more important factor than the saving of these huge sums of money, is that fluoridation of water could unquestionably improve the dental health of Saskatchewan children. It seems improbable that we should be entering into a dental care program while we ignore the single most important aspect of prevention of dental disease. Surely in this modern and enlightened age the old and possibly medieval objections to the use of fluorides have disappeared. Medical science has proven the great benefits derived from fluoridation, the complete lack of harmful side effects with the proper addition of fluorides to the water. Certainly fluorides could, in a sense, be considered toxic or poisonous, but only when administered in huge doses. The same thing applies to common table salt, or even Vitamin A. An improper use, internally, of nearly any chemical could be toxic or poisonous.

There is no more reason to object to fluoridation than



there would be to object to the pasteurization of milk. We have made it compulsory to pasteurize any milk that is offered for sale. The great benefits derived from fluoridation, just as is so with pasteurization, are well known and documented.

It is my hope that as we shall embark on a dental program we shall also encourage the institution and fluoridation of all Saskatchewan water supplies.

I would, at this time, suggest to the Minister, that he reintroduce the Bill concerning fluoridation, that he pulled back during the 1972 session. I realize, Mr. Minister, that you pulled back that Bill because you felt it would be defeated by your backbenchers. Hopefully during the last two years or so, by using the facilities of your office and your staff, you should have enlightened those Members of your caucus still laboring under the emotional, imaginary and dark age misconceptions about fluoride. I wish you much luck, Mr. Minister.

To conclude, I should like to repeat my opposition to the dental care plan as proposed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY:**(Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to speak in support of this great Bill — The Dental Care Act, 1974. I say pleasure, because it is another historic first from a government which believes in delivering to people things which people need, want and deserve.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Things that require some sort of governmental initiative. Because this plan will be another first for Saskatchewan, and because it will be experimental in nature where accrued benefits will go to the people of this province, I fully expect more Members opposite to challenge it, to pick holes in it and if this occurs, it will only serve to confirm that Members opposite are severely restricted in their capacity to be daring in thought and in step with the times.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform this House that thousands upon thousands of people in this province welcome the introduction of this plan. They welcome it for a variety of reasons. In the first place, it was an NDP campaign promise. Another reason why this plan is welcomed is because there is no doubt that the dental health of the children of this province is not in a good state of affairs — thanks, probably, to the numerous junk foods put on the market today by gouging junk food manufacturers, aided, no doubt, by permissive Federal Government legislation. Another reason why this plan is going to succeed is because of the relatively low cost involved as compared to the high cost of dental care which is now the case.

Mr. Speaker, to put it bluntly, good dental care is at present out of reach for low income families, many of whom, because of an inability to feed their families properly, are the very ones who need dental care the most. And may I remind the Member who just spoke (Mr. MacDonald) that not all are able- to be in some sort of a dental plan at present.

As for average income families, the situation is almost as bad, for they, too, are finding the cost of dental care excessively burdensome.

Mr. Speaker, as a parent, I know that all parents in this province welcome this plan to provide good service at low cost. And because of this, I know that this Government is being and will be commended for its efforts to keep costs down.

Mr. Speaker, as a teacher who has seen the mouths of thousands of Saskatchewan students, amongst other things . . .

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Fourteen year old . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Well, I might say to the Hon. Member — it's the occasion for it — I have seen a lot of mouths, but none of them have been as large as some of the mouths I have seen across the floor.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — Check the . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — No, I think that is the veterinary department, isn't it?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — At any rate, I know that teachers will welcome this bold plan because I am sure they will all agree that there is some sort of direct correlation between the dental health of students and their abilities in school.

Mr. Speaker, the other day certain objections to the plan were raised by the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald). One of his contentions was that dental nurses in the plan would be allowed to perform some types of work normally done by dentists. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a standard answer from some Members opposite who are always loathe to change or think in terms of change.

I think that what the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North was implying was that the students who are now training as dental nurses will not be reliable. I say that this slap in the face to those now in training demands an apology from him, and I hope that Members opposite will convey the message to him. Well, if he has no faith in those students, I can say that the parents of this province certainly have.

Or, Mr. Speaker, does he think that only high-priced experts can deliver the goods. Well, if he does, I am afraid he is not in touch with reality because the people of this province have all too often in the past, suffered the consequences of the actions of so-called experts — experts like LIFT plan Lang, Inflation-buster Trudeau and Sly-Steuart.

Put another way, Mr. Speaker, the parents of our school children will have a choice between high-priced experts or well-trained personnel at a much lower cost. Now I ask you, is there really any choice?

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North, in speaking for some

private dentists, I presume, would like to have people have the option of utilizing the services of private dentists with toe bills being paid for by the plan. In other words, he wishes the best of two worlds for these private dentists. Why the best of two worlds for them and not others such as the lame, the crippled, or the poor?

Mr. Speaker, this same Member opposite would mislead the public into believing that qualified dentists will not be involved in the plan. This is not true. They will be involved. Or is he implying that dentists who anticipate working in the plan are somehow not as well qualified as private dentists?

He also suggested the plan might accelerate the leaving of dentists from rural areas. Mr. Speaker, he completely missed the point because what really counts in these areas is not whether someone may contemplate moving or not, but rather, are services being rendered? And on this point I predict that no so-called rural dentist will be displaced as evidenced by the fact that most can not now keep up with the demand for their services. In fact, I think maybe you could look upon this plan as helping those private dentists getting rid of the backlog that appears to be building up.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that negotiations are now under way between this province and the Federal government which should produce, hopefully, an agreement for the inclusion of our native children in this plan. It is to be hoped that such an arrangement could be worked out because if it bogs down in red tape, it will be the children themselves who will suffer. I know the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) will do all in his power working with the Federal government to try and reach such an arrangement.

The Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North touched on fluoridation • I am not too sure whether I've got a change of heart on fluoridation or not, but I agree that that should be given some serious consideration in the future, the fluoridation of our drinking water.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude with a brief summary. This proposed dental plan is needed and wanted by Saskatchewan people. It will be low cost. Good service will be rendered efficiently and at regular intervals to our school children. What more can we ask of a plan? Any more criticism of the plan can only be interpreted as a desire to make cheap political gain at the expense of children and parents alike. It looks as if Members opposite are going to be doing just that very thing.

Mr. Speaker, I fully and enthusiastically support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. G. RICHARDS:** (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I too rise in strong support of this Bill.

Dental disease is quite obviously one of the more serious illnesses that we in our modern society have failed to come to grips with. A nice little index of this is taken from Saskatchewan Base Line Data Survey of 1971 and it showed that, this in taking children age 17 in the survey, 83 per cent had at least one cavity. We had 1 ½ teeth as the average lost tooth per child in this group. We had decayed, missing and filled teeth,

aggregate for this group of people 10.2. An average of 10.2 decayed, missing or filled teeth of children or young adults aged 17 in Saskatchewan in 1971. I think there is absolutely no question as to the fact that dental disease, dental disease in all its forms, remains a grossly untreated section of illness. Dentists report that fully 75 or 80 per cent of the population received virtually no regular dental care. Faced with that situation I commend the Government for introducing a dental plan which makes full use, not only of dentists, but of para-dental workers. I think this is one of the most important principles of the Bill and I want to dwell on it very briefly.

There are approximately 200 dentists in Saskatchewan, however, 50 per cent of them are located in either Saskatoon or Regina. There is obviously a very serious maldistribution of dentists relative to the provincial population. There is no way that without the intelligent use of para-dental personnel, and the program envisions the use of dental nurses and dental assistants in an extensive way, there is no way that we are going to get the level of dental services that we want.

The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) in raising his opposition to the plan cited virtually verbatim the opposition which has been put forward by the Dental Association, in talking about direct supervision, full diagnosis by dentists. Although there are valid points to be made I find that one of the reasons probably that the Liberal Member for Moose Jaw could so strongly sympathize with that position is that we could call it the Ross Thatcher theory of dentistry. Ross Thatcher had the concept of Government that virtually the only person in the entire Government who was competent to do anything was himself. Cabinet Ministers he was pretty unsure about and his caucus he was absolutely unsure about, civil servants were dirt and they were incapable of doing anything. The only way to solve a problem was to take it up to the top. It is plain in the criticisms being made by the Member for Moose Jaw is the failure to recognize the roles and the skills that can be fulfilled by para-dental workers. For example, and I hope the facetiousness of the analogy is not going to take away from the seriousness of the problem, I don't want an engineer to fix my car because they have less skills in what is involved in fixing a car even though he has more theoretical knowledge about an automobile engine. You do wind up with analogous situations in medicine that by the development of skills and the repeated use of these skills para-dental workers can be more skilled in the operations which they are performing than the actual dentist himself. Never ask a doctor to sew you up when you've got a cut, he'll do a lousy job relative to the nurse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this use of para-dental people is not only a question of the best utilization of health manpower and womanpower, and the Minister, I trust, has taken under advisement the problems of that bursary scheme with the sexes and is implicit there, we don't imply that the junior positions in the health scheme will always be women and that the senior positions will always be men and that the nurse practitioners must therefore be women.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is also a very serious problem concerned with the monopoly power of professions to define the scope of various health practices. I am afraid that we have the situation in dentistry as with medicine in general of the dentists jealously guarding what they consider to be their right,

their historic rights almost of feudal origin, to define what they can do relative to what other health workers can do. Unless we are prepared to recognize that the public has a responsibility and a role in defining the respective roles of different health workers and in this case in particular, dental workers, we won't arrive at an economical program. I think the time has obviously come that the dentists left to their own devices in the dental profession over the years have not created a dental system which has provided adequate health care for dental problems. Obviously there is this maldistribution of dentists. They have not resolved the problems of inadequate supply of dental personnel in rural areas and a new approach is needed. I will agree that in part this does deny freedom of choice in the sense that only one form or one model is being subsidized, a model that makes extensive use of para-dental workers. I think, however, that for the Members on this side of the House to insist that that involves a serious violation of freedom of choice is to deny the responsibility of government to declare and provide programs for the provision of services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like more extensively to get into an issue which is not dealt with adequately in the program namely, fluoridation. The Saskatchewan Advisory Committee on Dental Care for Children made very prominent mention of fluoridation. Recommendation No. 5 states:

In the interest of both dental health and economics water supplies in all communities of the central water system should be fluoridated and constant promotional education campaigns should be made to bring this about.

However, no mention of fluoridation except for the marginal note by the Minister who has been involved in this dental program.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.