

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 31, 1978

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to welcome to the House 32 students from St. Paul's High School in Gander, Newfoundland. I understand they are located in the Speaker's gallery accompanied by 32 students from Moose Jaw high schools. The Gander students are visiting Saskatchewan as part of an exchange program sponsored by the Secretary of State Department. There are eight Moose Jaw students from each of the three secondary schools in Moose Jaw and they had the opportunity to visit Gander between March 22 and March 29. I am sure our Moose Jaw students had a pleasant stay in Gander, Newfoundland and I hope that the hospitality that Newfoundland always shows Saskatchewan visitors is being offered to the Gander students who are visiting us. I will have the opportunity to visit with them a little later and I am sure the House will want to offer a warm welcome to these students from Gander.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — I would like to join with my colleague, the Hon. Gordon Snyder . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Member for Weyburn.

Mr. Skoberg: — Sorry.

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you, to all members of this House, some very special guests sitting in the west gallery. They are girls' basketball team from Victoria, British Columbia, some 20 in number, between the ages of 16 and 17.

During exhibition games in British Columbia they remain undefeated. These girls are guests of the Holy Rosary Raiders of the Regina Church Basketball Association. They are here on a cultural and athletic exchange which saw the Regina hosts travel to Victoria in February. The girls, I understand, Mr. Speaker, will be touring farms in our province, potash mines and other points of interest. They have with them Mr. Vic Derman from Victoria, B.C. and Mr. Dennis Hall from Regina who is host group of the girls while they are in this city. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am expressing the wishes of all of you when I say that we welcome these girls and we hope that their stay is pleasant and enjoyable and that they enjoy this Saskatchewan hospitality. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, the Hon. Gordon Snyder, is welcoming the exchange students from Gander, Newfoundland and also the students from Moose Jaw. I am sure that we all appreciate the fact that the friendship and companionship of those of us who have had the opportunity of visiting Newfoundland is very evident when we go to that province. I

might also suggest to the students of Newfoundland that we in Moose Jaw are very, very proud this year that we are celebrating our 75th anniversary. I am sure the city of Moose Jaw has made it very plain to those that are visiting us that they are pleased to have you with us on our golden jubilee and our 75th anniversary. I, along with my colleague, will be meeting with you a short time later.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.A. Larter (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I would like, on behalf of the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) to join with the other two members in welcoming the visitors from Newfoundland. I sailed into Newfoundland during the war all the time and I helped Newfoundland people win the Second World War and it is a pleasure to welcome you here on behalf of the members and wish you a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SEDCO

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of SEDCO. I have given to the minister some information. As the minister will know, under the seven years of Liberal government SEDCO never failed to make a profit and under years of the NDP government SEDCO has lost over \$7 million by their accounting. My question to the minister is whether he would not agree with me that the phony accumulation of so-called equity and the non-payment of interest on the so-called equity money, badly distorts the economic return by SEDCO. I wonder if the minister would not agree with me that when you include a reasonable interest loss for the \$49.9 million now called equity in SEDCO, the real loss for this year in SEDCO is almost \$5 million, bringing the accumulated loss during the six years of NDP reign to \$20.5 million.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the member have a question?

Mr. Merchant: — I just asked it.

Hon. N. Vickar (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, to answer the first part of the question of the hon. member, I might suggest that back in the Liberal era, SEDCO's participation in the total provincial economy was very minimal. Since 1973 and particularly since SEDCO got involved in the economy of the province under a New Democratic government, there is no doubt that some of the losses have increased but so did the loans and the equity of the corporation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Merchant: — I ask the minister if he does not recall my standing in my place last year and asking him whether you would be increasing the so-called equity in this year. If you do I think you will recall that you indicated there was no plan to increase the equity to do the sort of phony bookkeeping that SEDCO does. Yet I see a \$9.1 million increase, and I ask the minister whether this does not distort the return of SEDCO, and make the loss and profit picture a brighter loss and profit picture than it is in reality.

Mr. Vickar: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the minister gets the idea that we do

phony bookkeeping. I think if he really wants to get the answer (and let's get him straightened out), I think he had better ask those questions in the Crown corporations.

Regulations of Lotteries within Saskatchewan

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Consumer Affairs. Just before Christmas, by Order in Council, there were some regulations placed on lotteries within Saskatchewan and recently you have announced that these regulations have been dropped. I am sure that I join with all the service clubs in Saskatchewan in commending you for doing just that. Outside of the press statement regarding the removal of the regulations which were placed by Order in Council, are you anticipating any other means of communications for getting this message out to the people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. E.C. Whelan (Minister of Consumer Affairs): — In answer to the hon. member's question, we will be contacting all of the people who issue licences, and I think that is going to be done, if it isn't done, it will be done immediately. It is in the process right at the moment. This advice will be set out so that we will be reverting to what the regulations were back in 1970, and there will be explanatory notes so that they will understand what is involved.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I asked the minister if he would not consider in the normal way of government advertising, to exercise the advertising rights and privileges that they often use, in making it well known to all the people of the province and not just to those issuing licences, so that people such as this can go to service clubs and can be readily available to all people in the daily and weekly newspapers across the province.

Mr. Whelan: — I think the hon. member will realize, Mr. Speaker, that we are under constant criticism for advertising. That makes it pretty embarrassing but we will take what you are saying into consideration. We will look at it.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Supplementary to the minister. Would you not agree that it is somewhat inconsistent to advertise merely the programs that seems to benefit the government politically, but you are afraid the advertise your mistakes that were penalizing the public and that you are now forced to correct because of efforts made by the PC caucus?

Mr. Whelan: — No, I wouldn't agree with the hon. member on most things.

Effect of taxes on Tourist Industry

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board. I believe there has been an announcement that effective tomorrow the fixed price of a bottle of beer will rise in beverage rooms from 75 cents to 85 cents. There has also been an announcement that there is going to be an increase in the price of the spirits and alcohol of approximately 5 per cent. In light of these facts and in light of the fact that our tourism industry already has a sales tax, the 5 per cent sales tax on hotel rooms, the 5 per cent tax in general and the fact that the Alberta government has removed the provincial tax on gasoline, is the government considering any sort of procedure or change in government policy where they can help the tourist industry? Certainly changes like this are very damaging to those people who are now approaching the summer period and we in Saskatchewan, particularly those involved

in the tourist industry, are working at an extreme handicap.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's question is directed primarily to the question of liquor prices and particularly prices which are charged to tourists and will need to be charged by the tourist industry. I think that these prices are primarily those of drinks served in licensed premises. My recollection, I could be in error there, is that there are no such limits on prices in Alberta and accordingly our prices are in all likelihood likely to be lower than those in Alberta, both with respect to spirits and respect to bottled beer. I understand that the prevailing price for bottled beer in Alberta is 85 cents as it will be in Saskatchewan. I, accordingly, do not expect any adverse effect on our tourist industry as compared with Alberta since I think the prices will be comparable.

The question with respect to gasoline remains a difficulty but I anticipate that the difficulty which we have had in the past because their tax was lower than ours will continue and will be modestly but not greatly exacerbated by the fact that the gap is now widened.

Mr. Stodalka: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I also notice that in your price structure you used to have a differential for the low alcohol content of the beer and the regular content and your price structure now is moving the low alcohol content to exactly the same price as the regular alcohol content. If I remember correctly the price differential occurred to discourage the actual consumption of alcohol and I wonder how this fits in with previous established government policy?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of that. My understanding was that the differential was to remain. I'll take notice of that and ask the hon. minister to report more fully.

Mr. Stodalka: — Final supplementary. In the new regulations that were sent out to the hotel people that in the change of regulations they are now going to be forced to pay what you call a security tax, that the former 5 per cent sales tax, E&H tax is going to be removed and it is going to be replaced with a 10 per cent tax. Some of these hotel people claim that they are being asked to actually pay a tax in advance of collection of the tax and they figure that this is unfair treatment, that there is no one else that has been singled out like that. They actually have to pay the tax in advance of collection.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there is no security tax proposed. My understanding is that the regulations and legislation will provide for security deposits to guarantee the due payment of tax. I do not think that these need to be paid in cash. I think it is a way of providing that recovery will be made. Once again, I am not fully familiar with the proposals that the Liquor Board or others may have and I will take notice and ask the minister to reply more fully.

Exorbitant Taxi Fares – DNS

Mr. G.N. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — In the absence of the Minister of the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan), Mr. Premier, in a quick review of the public accounts of last year I find that the DNS has paid some \$160,736 in taxi fares for the year. Would the Premier not agree that this \$160,736 is a rather exorbitant amount of money to pay for taxi fares for the DNS, especially in the light of the fact that so many of them have government vehicles at their disposal?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would not agree for one moment. The hon. member is suggesting that these are taxi fares for people who are employed by DNS. He well knows that the great number of those are for taxis to take people from the DNS region primarily to hospitals outside the DNS regions. He knows that the big costs are to get people out from say, La Loche to a hospital in Saskatoon and he knows that, on balance, the cheapest way to do that is by taxi. He accordingly knows that these are not fares paid by DNS employees but on behalf of people in the DNS area who do not have cars like the hon. member does. He assumes that everybody has a car and everybody has at his disposal, that type of transportation. Such is not the case with people in the DNS area and I am not prepared to admit that these taxi fares are in any way excessive.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wipf: — A supplementary question, Mr. Premier. There is a part in the public accounts there for the ambulance services that come out of the North but, in the light again of the fact that \$160,736 was paid for taxi fares, (and maybe it is not for the employees of the DNS but it seems like a lot for the other people), would you not consider that rather a high or an exorbitant amount of money being paid in comparison to \$94,400 paid to Norcan Air, the chief carrier in the North.

Mr. Blakeney: — No, I am not aware that air transport is noticeably cheaper than taxis where roads operate or where roads are in existence. Generally speaking, ground transportation is cheaper. I know also that hon. members opposite feel that any moneys spent on northern residents is wasted money and when hon. members opposite (not the particular member who is speaking) were in government they didn't make that error and they didn't spend any money in the North, and social conditions remained deplorable. I may say that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, I think we are getting into . . .

Report of Nursing Home Death

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services.

There is a report in the March 23 Star-Phoenix — a very serious accusation by a coroner's jury regarding a death in a nursing home in Regina of a Mr. Ernest Rieux, 72, who died on January 21. The coroner's jury ruled that there was a shortage of nursing or of staff in the hospital at that time; there was one psychiatric nurse for the total residence of 228 patients and there were only two nursing aides on the floor of 62 patients where Mr. Rieux passed away.

Now, the Crown Prosecutor goes on and says it is difficult to understand how one registered nurse with two aides on the main ward could provide adequate personal care. Could the minister tell me if the special care homes branch in his department is aware of the death? Have they investigated to see whether or not that particular nursing home is abiding by the standards of the Department of Welfare in relation to nursing homes in Saskatchewan?

Hon. H.H. Rolfes (Minister of Social Services): — The answer to all of those is, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: — Could the minister indicate whether or not he is satisfied in light of the Crown Prosecutor's remarks and the coroner's jury's remarks about the shortage

of nursing home staff in nursing homes in Saskatchewan and the danger that it involves for patients within those nursing homes? Is the minister satisfied that the regulations of the department are adequate? Has he asked for a review in order to upgrade or lift or increase the nursing staff within those particular homes?

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have certainly asked my staff to have another look at the regulations. I am concerned about that and I do want to inform the House that that incident took place in a private nursing home and that I have asked my officials to contact the owners of those nursing homes to investigate it further to see if we should maybe put . . . make our regulations more stringent. I am aware and certainly concerned about it.

Mr. MacDonald: — I wonder if the minister would also indicate whether or not (it would appear that they are), and I am not pointing a finger at the nursing home, I'm pointing a finger at the regulations. Can the minister indicate whether or not the budgets approved by nursing homes in the province of Saskatchewan are adequate so that the proper number of nursing home staff in Saskatchewan can be made available to those nursing homes to care for the aged?

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is up to me, as minister, to decide whether or not the budget for nursing homes is adequate. They are an autonomous . . . Certainly I approve the budgets but that doesn't mean that we set the budgets for them. They allocate their budget according to the means that are available to them, they are an autonomous group of people, as you well know, the private and the community owned nursing homes. I have indicated previously that I am concerned about it but I have asked my officials to review the regulations, whether they should be made more stringent. They have been updated in the last four or five years. I think we certainly have to have another look at them and we are doing that at this particular time.

Government Borrowing

Mr. Collver: — I direct a question to the Premier. Yesterday in this Assembly he agreed and saw that the Minister of Finance was unaware of the borrowing of some \$44 million by his officials. I ask the Premier whether he has given instructions to his cabinet ministers and to the officials in the Crown corporations that no borrowings of that kind by officials can be made without the consent of the elected representatives.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly have given no such instructions. I have said, as I said yesterday, the function of political leaders is to set policy, not to deal with individual borrowings and we have indicated to our officials that in our judgment it is perfectly appropriate for them to arrange bridge financing on a short term basis with any appropriate lending agency. I am not aware of the dealings which the minister may have had with his officials but I would not want to be consulted on each one of those that might be arranged by my officials. There are many, many dozens in the course of a year. I have great confidence in their ability, confidence which is well merited on the basis of their past performance and I see no point in my attempting to second guess them. They are far better than I at judging whether or not a particular borrowing transaction should be proceeded with.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I am sure the Premier is aware that I did not suggest that he review the borrowings but that his officials, his elected officials, review significant borrowing by any officials of the government. Surely it is incumbent and surely the Premier will agree that it is incumbent upon the elected officials to review the financing of the government of the province of

Saskatchewan and surely the Premier will agree and will he not agree that it is the elected officials of the province of Saskatchewan that are responsible to the people of Saskatchewan and not the officials of the Sask Power Corporation and of the Sask Potash Corporation and other such corporations? Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is simply this: will the Premier not now instruct his officials or his Cabinet that it is the elected representatives of the people incumbent in the Treasury Board that they review material borrowings of this kind of nature before they are entered into by the officials of the Crown corporations and the government departments, in order to prevent such happenings as has occurred in Sask Power with \$44 million.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, first I agree with the hon. member, that it is the function of elected officials to set policy. Secondly, I assert that that has been performed. Thirdly, I assert that the borrowings which were proceeded with were in accordance with government policy. Fourthly, I do not agree that every time that somebody acts within a previously set down government policy, there should be prior agreement by an elected official. I simply do not agree with that. I think that is simply attempting a . . .

Mr. Collver: — \$45 million.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member will attempt to make his speeches when he is on his feet. He makes better ones when he is sitting down, but nonetheless, the rules require that he stand. I assert that a borrowing within the laid down policy of the Government of Saskatchewan by the officials is the way that governments should be run and, in effect, are run everywhere in Canada.

Committee for Marital Violence

Miss L.B. Clifford (Wilkie): — To the Minister of Social Services. The Status of Women Committee asked that a committee be set up to look at marital violence, particularly concerning incident and nature of spouse assaults, processes contributing to marital assault and possible changes needed in the court system or in the department. Will you take the initiative to set up such a committee?

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, when I met with the women's group I indicated to them that I had a fair amount of sympathy for their suggestions in this particular area. I have asked them to give me more information and more details and I would certainly take the initiative at that time to discuss it further with my colleagues.

Miss Clifford: — A supplementary, is it a fact that your department is considering cutting down funds for crisis centres instead of expanding them, and would you agree that with the continuation of the family unit breaking down it is your responsibility to find out the cause and solution of these problems?

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly certain what crisis centres she is referring to and if she is referring to rape crisis centers — what crisis centres are you referring to, then?

Miss Clifford: — Homes where battered spouses can go to take shelter at the time of the assault.

Mr. Rolfes: — The answer to that is absolutely no.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — To the Minister of Finance, are you today still refusing to name the names of the persons who made the allegations to you about some hon. members abusing the franking privileges?

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I will take the next question.

Reparations Proposals

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier. Some of us are left rather confused with respect to the attention of the government about the reparations proposals and what your . . . For two years, the Minister in charge of SGIO has been indicating that the reparations proposals would be introduced and that was the reason why the benefits under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act weren't being increased despite the fact they were eroding badly as a result of inflation. Now, I asked him on Tuesday last whether or not the government had not come to a decision to, in effect, shelve or delay implementation to the reparation's proposals and he said, no. I noticed in a news conference some days ago that you said if that was the case they wouldn't be introduced this year. Would you please clarify for us what is the government's intention with respect to those reparations proposals.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is government policy will be announced in due course. We have no intention of introducing the reparations proposals in the immediate future. They are receiving further and additional consideration. That is our present position.

Mr. Cameron: — May I ask you by way of supplementary, first, who is doing the additional studies with respect to the proposals and secondly, whether we are soon likely to see legislation introduced to increase the benefits which haven't had an increase in more than 10 years?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know firstly. I'll answer both questions. Firstly, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office is doing additional work. Secondly, with respect to benefits which have not been increased for 10 years, I am not aware of any such benefits that have not been increased for 10 years. Certainly the increases of the payments under Part 2 of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act were more than doubled when we came to office less than 10 years ago. One recalls the very low level that they were at in 1971 at \$25 per week then. Now it is \$60 per week and that is a good less than 10 years ago when that change was made.

Mr. Cameron: — My final supplementary then, Mr. Premier . . .

Mr. Collver: — Are you recognizing the member?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes. I am recognizing the member for Regina South for a final supplementary.

Mr. Cameron: — My final supplementary, Mr. Premier, is, can you give us some indication of when your government is likely to bring before the legislature amendments to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act to increase the benefits which haven't been increased in some years?

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, we look back on the history of the Liberal Party which remained in office for seven years, seven years without raising them one nickel. Lean,

long, gaunt years. We have more than doubled them in our term of office. We are looking at them again but we are not offering any date for any new proposals. Government policy will be announced in due course.

STATEMENTS

Natural Gas D & C Board Report

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the Natural Gas Development and Conservation Board. However, I would first like to make a few brief comments with respect to the background to the report, its recommendations, and the government's response to those recommendations.

The Natural Gas Development and Conservation Board was established in the fall of 1976. The board is responsible for making recommendations to the government on the orderly and efficient development of Saskatchewan's natural gas reserves. In June of 1977, Mr. Speaker, I asked the board to consider and make recommendations on a number of specific matters, including the scheduling of production from Saskatchewan's reserves, and the field gate prices which should be paid by SPC (Saskatchewan Power corporation) to the producers. The board held a public meeting on these matters in October 1977 and submitted its report to me earlier this year. Mr. Speaker, the board made 16 recommendations in all. Eight concerning the scheduling of production of Saskatchewan natural gas reserves, seven concerning field gate pricing, and one concerning the allocation of production to particular natural gas properties. Of these 16, 12 have been accepted by the government, and steps are now being taken to see that they are implemented. Some of the more noteworthy of these are:

- (a) That a production target of 40 billion cubic feet per year from Saskatchewan sources should be set for the years 1978 to 1981.
- (b) That current policy governing exports of natural gas from the province be maintained.
- (c) That a reasonable target for production of Saskatchewan's natural gas be within the range of 40 per cent to 45 per cent of domestic requirements for the 1982 to 1990 period.
- (d) That a new price schedule, in which new natural gas prices vary between 40 cents and 60 cents per thousand cubic feet, and all natural gas prices vary between 26 cents and 39 cents per mcf, be implemented and be made effective April 1, 1978.
- (e) That no producer receive a lesser rate under the recommended price schedule than he currently receives.
- (f) That the price for all gas being collected from oil wells as of April 1, 1978, or from extensions to gas gathering systems as they exist April 1, 1978, receive a price of 60 cents per mcf, the highest price otherwise recommended under the new price structure.
- (g) That particularly for the period 1978 to 1981, when the natural gas market in Saskatchewan will remain relatively restricted, new contracts should be issued to natural gas properties in the following order of priority:

- 1 – Natural gas production from oil wells collected by gas gathering system.
- 2 – Production from natural gas reserves being drained off by off-setting gas wells owned by another producer.
- 3 – Production from reserves of natural gas located outside of pool boundary.
- 4 – Production from potential natural gas reserves from natural gas leases where the owner has been denied development because of restricted market conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the board's recommended targets are goals which Saskatchewan Power Corporation will strive to achieve. We must keep in mind however, that the Corporation's first obligation is to service its Saskatchewan customer, serve the Saskatchewan customers with an assured supply of natural gas at reasonable prices.

Mr. Speaker, I table the report of the natural Gas Development and Conservation Board.

Mr. Larter: — I am pleased to see this report tabled. As a matter of fact, I had a question on the Order Paper today asking when that was going to be tabled and I am pleased to see it tabled. I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions. Are you considering the other four points? You mentioned 12 out of the 16 points that were recommended. Are you considering those other four points at the present time?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it is appropriate to . . . (interjection) . . .

Mr. Larter: — All right. I would also like to ask you . . . a new position is being created which the gas industry advises us is the first time in history they've ever heard of a natural gas advisor research officer 4 which is being advertised for in all the financial papers. Is this natural gas advisor going to be working with this board? Aren't you permitted to answer those questions?

Mr. Messer: — No, I am sorry.

Mr. Merchant: — I am pleased to see that the report is being brought in. As I said, when the board was formulated I considered it a step in the right direction and I consider the recommendations a step in the right direction. I say to the House and I think the minister knows that the industry rightly objects to the massive controls that it continues to face in this province unlike Alberta and British Columbia. Secondly, lest there be any misconceptions created by the minister, a 40 to 60 cent rate is still less than the rate that is available for new mcf production in Alberta and British Columbia so that we will go on, even with these increases, to not attract development . . . well, the minister shakes his head though he knows full well that it is about 65 cents in Alberta. We will not attract new development and we will not attract development at the rate that could be possible if this government were prepared to open Saskatchewan to production in the same way that Alberta and British Columbia are now open to production.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Points of Privilege

He said: Before Orders of the Day, I have a statement which I intend to give. On March 30, 1978 the member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. Malone) raised a point of order, inquiring when a point of privilege can be properly raised. The practice in our Legislative Assembly, like that of the House of Commons, has been to raise points of privilege on Orders of the Day. However, in exceptional circumstances, the business of the Assembly, except a division, may be interrupted by a point of privilege. In the interim report of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures, March 12, 1976, it was stated that points of order should be raised later on Orders of the Day and not during the oral question period.

No mention was made of points of privilege. Having stated that, I would hasten to point out that Beauchesne's Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, citation 113, states in part:

Members often raise so-called "questions of privilege" on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in the debates or the proceedings of the House . . . a dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

It follows therefore, that points of privilege will occur only very rarely. Unparliamentary remarks, contemptuous actions, or remarks or imputations of motives should not be confused with genuine privilege. This is dealt with under rule 6 of our Legislative Assembly.

Mr. H.W. Lane (Sa-Su): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House the Minister of Finance rose and withdrew an allegation that he had made previously in the House, and I thought at that time, unqualifiedly, as to allegations he had heard that there were certain members of this House abusing their franking privileges. Now, only a very short time after that, press reports started to flow and my information is (and the member can correct me if this is wrong) that the hon. member then went to members of the press corps and indicated to them that he would not name the names of the people who made these allegations to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, clearly the member does not choose to lay the matter to rest. He clearly continues to maintain by that kind of action, some kind of an aspersion against every hon. member of this House. Now, at this time, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I have listened to I think a sufficient amount of the member's comments on his so-called point of privilege and I would say that as far as I am concerned, the matter is closed. The minister has withdrawn his remarks, as a matter of fact, twice.

Mr. Lane (Sa-Su): — In the House?

Mr. Speaker: — In the House. If the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland is concerned about what is happening outside of the House perhaps he should go outside of the House and deal with it there. It is no concern of this House what happens with regard to that. I would suggest to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland that the matter is closed.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — We have a precedent . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That point of privilege is closed. The matter has been dealt with. If the member has a point of privilege or a point of order, I will be prepared to listen to it.

Mr. Lane (Qu'A): — On a point of personal privilege then.

We have a precedent in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, a precedent ruled by yourself and by members of this Assembly by a majority vote last session, that a withdrawal in the Assembly and a statement outside of the Assembly re-opens the matter and continues the matter and makes it a whole new matter again.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The member can produce no evidence whatsoever that a ruling I made in this Chamber was based on what a member said outside of the Chamber. Any rulings that I made in this Chamber had to do with what happened in this Chamber. The fact that a member goes outside of the Chamber and makes some statement to the press is no concern of mine. The member does it on his own volition. It has nothing to do with me. I will make rulings with regard to what happens in the Chamber.

Mr. Lane (Qu'A): — I did not indicate that I would . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would caution the member about pursuing something that is closed. The matter is closed and if the member has a new point of order or has a correction of some type, I will accept it but there is nothing in the rules that provides for a personal point of privilege. The member has to bring forward something concrete which is within the rules of the House.

Mr. Lane (Qu'A): — . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order with reference to today's question period and with reference to what I am concerned might appear to be to some, an uneven-handed approach in terms of the way that the Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Will the member put his point of order rather than casting aspersions on the Chair because the Chair has no opportunity to respond to your debate.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, I would in no way cast aspersions on the Chair.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The record will clearly show that the member cast an aspersion on the Chair just before I interrupted him.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, I as an individual member on a point of order, may express concern that outsiders may look at this Assembly and may take into account the fact that there may not . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I don't care what outsiders do. I care what the members in this Chamber do and if they are going to raise points of order, they raise points of order and not raise debate . . .

Mr. Collver: — I'll raise the point of order like this, Mr. Speaker. What I would like to know this morning is this. In every other question period that we have had in the last six months, any extra time that has been granted with . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The member today had more than 25 minutes in question period, more than 25 minutes.

Mr. Collver: — On the point of order and I'm not going to debate the fact. The fact is that on every other question period and I'm allowed to raise this point, on every other question period that we've had in the past any introduction of guests that interfered with the question period if it started at 10:08 or 10:09 the three or four minutes were added on the end. This morning, Mr. Speaker, we were cut off precisely at 10:30 without the three or four minutes.

The second part of the point of order is this. Today in this question period every single speaker in the Liberal caucus was granted two supplementaries, two, but, Mr. Speaker, it was granted when requested. But today, Mr. Speaker, you cut me off on a final supplementary question to the Premier. Was that because the Premier refused to accept responsibility?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I would encourage the member to study the rules that govern the question period and I would encourage the member to attempt to learn how to place a point of order rather than firing a shot gun at the Speaker. Now the member said that that the question period ended at 10:30. That is false. The question period ended after 10:30. The member said that every Liberal member was allowed two supplementaries. A check on the record will clearly show that several Liberal members were not allowed second supplementaries, either whether they didn't take them or whether they were cut off because I didn't allow them. The member is concerned because he was cut off on a supplementary. Well, I invite the member — Order! — I invite the member for Nipawin to check the record and check the rules that govern the question period in this House. If he can show that he was not debating the issue then I am at fault but I suggest to him, it's quite clear from the record and it will show that he was debating the issue and he was making statements and giving his opinion. That is not permitted under the rules of the question period. I would ask the member to remember that because it makes it very difficult for me to govern the question period when I allow him to do that and then I get called to order because I allow a minister to wander all over the same territory the questioner has.

Mr. H.W. Lane (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, on a new point of privilege. I would, in light of what has happened yesterday in the press with the hon. member, the hon. Minister of Finance, I would ask Mr. Speaker to put it to the member whether it was me who abused the question of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Are there any further points of order. Order! The members of the House I'm afraid are abusing that statement, point of privilege. I just read a statement with regard to that matter and I have asked the members to study it because it causes a great amount of confusion for me and I'm sure for the Chamber. If the member has a point of order, I'll take it.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — New point of privilege. I wanted to clarify for Mr. Speaker's position that when I raised the matter earlier about a ruling from the Chair, I very carefully said a ruling of this Assembly. A ruling of this Assembly was made in the last session, that if a member makes a statement in the House and then withdraws, that's inadequate and not good enough if he re-affirms it outside the Assembly. That was a ruling of this Assembly as I say by a majority vote. Now that is the precedent that we have, Mr. Speaker. I say that it is most clear that this same ruling, the same precedent applies to the allegations made by the Minister of Finance. We therefore challenge and ask the Minister of Finance through you, why he still refuses to when outside the Assembly he continues the allegations.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. It is obvious from the member's comments that he is dissatisfied with a majority decision of this Chamber. I feel the same way with him, because at times in this Chamber I have been dissatisfied with the majority decision. Unfortunately or fortunately, as you view it, that's the system we have chosen, that we have to live by a majority decision. If a majority decision is made in this Chamber, we can't rehash it, we can't review it. The matter is decided. It can't be raised again in this particular session.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask one question if I might, just one question. Are you stating in that statement that you as the presider or the occupier of the Chair are prepared to go against a majority decision of this Assembly?

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I would just ask the member to go back and read the transcript when it comes out and he will understand, I hope, what I said.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. D.L. Faris (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 22 – **An Act respecting Elementary and Secondary Education in Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased now to get down to some serious business in this House. I am sure many members of the House will share my sentiments in saying that the decorum has never before reached this kind of level.

Bill 22 now before the legislature for consideration is the result of three years of study, research, consultation and public discussion. I would venture that there are few pieces of legislation in the history of the province concerning which public knowledge is greater or more widespread. Literally thousands of interested individuals in every corner of the province have participated in some way in the evolution of this bill and in fact, have contributed to what I believe the people of this province will regard as the most up to date and forward looking educational legislation in Canada. Because I attach a great deal of importance to the process by which this legislation was developed, I wish to take a few minutes to outline the several phases of this project. School law in the form of territorial ordinances existed before 1905 in the area which then became the province of Saskatchewan. In that year the three existing ordinances were adopted by the provincial legislature in the form of The School Act, The School Grants Act and The School Assessment Act.

Since 1907 when The Secondary Education Act was passed, a total of almost two dozen new and separate acts were passed from time to time each designed to meet a new need as the province grew and developed. By 1975, 17 separate statutes pertaining to elementary and secondary education existed in Saskatchewan. Despite

frequent amendments to several of these statutes the government as well as organizations interested in education came to recognize that changing conditions and needs in education dictated a complete overhaul of existing law. Such an overhaul was necessary to eliminate obsolete features and streamline the law in such a way as to make it more comprehensible to the public and to elected officials and administrators.

The central themes became very clear, the need for some form of consolidation of school law and the need for updating or repeal of obsolete law. Early in 1975 the then Minister of Education took the first of a series of steps to investigate the means by which consolidation and updating could best be accomplished. He appointed the School Law Review Committee consisting of Mr. Amundrud as chairman; Mrs. Coleman, Dr. Egnotoff, Dr. Gathercole, Dr. Sterling McDowell, with Mr. Lyle Bergstrom as co-ordinator. The terms of reference given the committee were briefly; (a) to study and analyze all school law in the province and (b) to report its findings and recommendations concerning consolidation and updating of school law. The report of the committee was received early in 1976 and was published and widely distributed as public information. Although the report did not propose specific legislative content in draft form, it served the all important purposes of evaluating existing law, of establishing the guidelines and governing principles for a revision and in defining objectives of school law, which should be reflected in future legislation. It also recommended consolidation of 15 of the 17 statutes administered by the Department of Education. This report, with its 40 recommendations, provided the necessary basis for the several stages of development which then followed.

Firstly, from April to May, 1976, a series of 11 public hearings for public discussion of the report and receipt of at least 150 briefs and submissions. Secondly, from July to August of 1976, study and analysis of these briefs, followed by the preparation of a draft white paper on school law. The white paper contained proposals for a bill, proposals which were a reflection of the basic recommendations of the School Law Review Committee and of the public discussion, including the briefs and submissions received in the spring and summer of 1976. The white paper approach, at this stage, was adopted as a means for promoting and facilitating the discussion of legislative proposals. It was stated and emphasized that although the white paper outlined a basic approach to a new act, all proposals were open to discussion and comment before decisions would be made on the content of a bill. Thirdly, in March of 1977 the white paper was tabled in this legislature with an invitation to interest organizations, groups and individuals to study it and respond with their views, opinions, criticisms and suggestions. The response was enthusiastic and widespread. Over 250 briefs, letters and submissions were received. Although no court was kept of meetings and local studies, one of the most encouraging features of this phase of the project was the evidence of meetings of various groups throughout the province, probably numbering several hundred, to study the white paper, or parts of it.

Again, the department engaged in an exhaustive study of briefs and other responses to the white paper. Following that analysis and a thorough re-examination of legislative alternatives, a draft bill was prepared. Eventually this draft emerged as Bill 43. This bill, which was introduced in November of 1977, was widely distributed throughout the province primarily to allow the interested public to become familiar with it during the period between the fall and winter sessions. Given the magnitude and importance of this legislation, together with the fact that there had already been established a pattern of public participation, we fully anticipated that there would be a great deal of public interest in the bill.

Again, we made it known that we would welcome further comment and suggestion. Following a careful review of the consultations and representations since the fall session, I introduced into this House Bill No. 22 which, as members will be aware, is essentially the same as Bill No. 43, but contains some minor revisions and a small number of important changes.

I wish to emphasize again the extent of public participation and consultation which has been involved in the development of this bill. Since February 1975, there has been a deliberate and sincere attempt to keep the public fully informed of the progress of the project. Moreover, lines of communication with my office have been open throughout. Finally, there were three specific stages or phases, during which provision was made for direct public involvement and participation. I suggest that there has never been a time in the history of this province, which so many of its people have been as familiar with current school law. There may well be those who question the values of these procedures, for they are both time consuming and by no means the easy way of preparing legislation. Moreover, with literally thousands of views, opinions and suggestions on various aspects, covering the whole range of education, some participants may feel that their contributions were not fully reflected in the end product. This is both understandable and inevitable. But it does not mean that public participation played a minor role in the shaping of the bill.

The suggestion has been made that certain features of this bill are different from the white paper and Bill 43. Surely this is the best evidence that one could put forward as proof of our stated intentions, to invite public input and to listen to and hear those voices. Certainly Bill 43 was influenced by the public responses to the white paper. Likewise this bill reflects the influence of continuing public response to a few points which have emerged since last November. We make no apology for this, for it is completely consistent with our stated intentions throughout the past three years to promote public involvement and to take serious account of all views expressed. Surely if one is sincere in this regard there will be situations when better ideas, reasoned argument, and the products of debate, will dictate changes in the interests of improving the legislation. It requires far less courage to take a stubborn position and to adhere to it mindlessly than it does to respond to well reasoned and logical argument.

Anyone who has participated in the process of evolution of this bill throughout the past three years, will in fairness agree that the present bill is a far better one and certainly more generally acceptable to the Saskatchewan people than it would have been without the involvement of such a wide cross section of the interested public.

Bill 22 is a large bill. It consolidated 15 of the 17 statutes currently in force. It embodies the whole range of legislative provisions pertaining to elementary and secondary education, in about 140 pages – less than half of the total space required by existing statutes. More importantly, it is set out in a format and a language designed for convenient usage not only by school officials, administrators and educators, but also by individual citizens. The consolidation of school law as set out in the bill, reflects several governing principles which will be very clearly apparent to the thoughtful reader.

1 – It takes full account of the historical context of educational development in the province, of our philosophical perceptions of what education is about, what schools are and do, according to the value systems of Saskatchewan.

2 – It takes account of the constitutional, social, political and economic heritage of the province and its people, and therefore aims to reflect a sensitivity to the expectations, values, and aspirations of parents and citizens.

3 – It emphasizes democratic practice in the shaping and governance of the educational system, and provides a new focus and emphasis concerning the rights of pupils and parents.

4 – It endeavors to portray the rules of governing authorities, educators, parents and local community, so that each sector in the educational community may be the better enabled to do its part in accomplishing the goals of the school system.

5 – It aims to facilitate and promote the means by which educational planning, and the solution of educational problems becomes a co-operative activity involving the school and the community.

Turning to the substance of the bill. The particular attention of hon. members is drawn to the following:

1 – The necessary relationships between the provincial government and local school governments have been stated in a manner intended, firstly, to clarify the separate and joint responsibilities of these two levels of government; secondly, to minimize intervention of provincial authorities in local government functions by eliminating many of the traditional statutory limitations, ministerial approvals, and departmental regulations, in matters of school boards and school operations; and thirdly, to promote co-operative intergovernmental relationships in areas of shared responsibilities.

2 – The basic unit of local school administration, at present a mixture of no less than nine different types of districts established under three separate statutes is replaced by the school division. Likewise, the several types of school boards are replaced by the Board of Education for each school division. All present school districts which are areas of school administration under boards with fiscal and management authority will become school divisions on the basis of their present boundaries.

3 – Boards of Education, in the school divisions will be elected essentially in the same manner as under the present law, except that:

(i) elections will be held tri-annually with all members elected at the same time and on the same date in all divisions;

(ii) the terms of office will be for three years in all divisions.

Now although some reservations have been expressed concerning the tri-annual election, it has been adopted in the hope of stimulating greater public interest in school elections. Throughout the public discussion stages of the development of a new approach to elections, major concerns were expressed regarding:

1. Public apathy to school votes, attributed in part to the frequency of elections and partly to difficulties in attracting candidates for office.

2. Lack of public discussion of education and educational issues.

3. Lack of opportunity for the electors to effect significant change in the membership of

boards. Although reservations concerning tri-annual elections on the grounds of some risk in maintaining continuity of membership is understandable, there is no evidence to indicate the likelihood of disruption in school board management and administrative policies where this practice is currently used. Moreover, no other alternatives to raising the profile of school elections emerged as possible solutions to the difficulties already mentioned.

4. The bill provides for a new approach to citizen participation in the affairs of the schools in which their children are enrolled. Firstly, in rural divisions, the traditional school district, which until the 1940s was the symbol of rural education, is replaced by a new school district with boundaries corresponding to the attendance areas of operating schools.

Since World War II approximately half of the traditional rural school districts have disappeared entirely and many of those still in existence no longer elect boards. One of the consequences of this has been that many parents and citizens were in effect disenfranchised insofar as the school used by their children was concerned. Under the proposal in this bill every elector in the new school district will have a direct vote in the election of the trustees on the board of the school district in which their children attend school.

For all practical purposes, the remaining small rural school districts will cease to exist, except for purposes of boundaries within which a new separate school division may be established.

Secondly, in urban divisions, provision is made for establishing local school advisory committees. These will function, where established under local initiative, in somewhat the same manner as the local board of trustees in a rural school division. There is no comparable provision in the present law. These committees will provide for input by urban parents into matters pertaining to the schools in which their children are enrolled.

5. The concept of ratepayer as defined in present law, has been replaced by the designation 'elector'. The expression ratepayer has long since ceased to be an accurate description of persons entitled to vote in school elections. It should be noted in this connection that electors will be eligible to vote on money by-laws, a right, which in the past was confined to burgesses. I will discuss this matter in more detail later.

6. Provision is made for an Educational Boundaries Commission to replace procedures of present law which were designed for a time when the basic unit was the traditional school district. The commission is a provincial body with advisory powers only. It will review any question of boundary changes of school divisions on referral by the minister and make recommendations to him.

7. The bill emphasizes the policy-making or legislative role of boards of education, in part by providing guidelines for definition and publicizing of board policies on educational services and administration. In addition, it makes specific provision for locally employed directors or superintendents as the executive arm of the board. This approach is intended to enhance and round-out the legislative and management functions of local governments.

8. Turning now to the central figure in the school, the bill addresses itself specifically to firstly, a new emphasis on the rights of pupils both in general and in specific terms, to

ensure that every pupil, irrespective of condition or location is guaranteed access to appropriate educational services. Secondly, an expanded recognition of the educational needs of the handicapped and gifted pupils. Very great gains have been made in the past decade in providing for handicapped pupils, thanks to the willingness of school authorities, administrators and educators to co-operate in these programs. These people have devised and carried out a wide variety of programs, often under limitations imposed by sparse population, distance and high cost. However, sufficient progress has been made to warrant a full commitment of services to all pupils with special needs. Thirdly, a new emphasis on diagnostic and remedial approaches to school discipline and attendance problems. The traditional approach of enforcement is largely replaced by procedures which emphasize prevention, where schools and parents can co-operate in efforts to understand the causes of such problems. The assumption is that the solution will be found in measures to remove those causes.

This represents a shift in focus from treatment of symptoms to treatment of causes and presumes responsible participation of the pupil and parent, as well as the school.

9. Provisions with respect to language education have been updated and brought into line with the present state of this aspect of education in the rest of Canada. Intensive studies and consultations have taken place during the past two years within the province, interprovincially by the council of Ministers of Education and in federal-provincial meetings.

The bill recognizes the multi-cultural nature of this province. It provides for wide options other than English as languages of instruction. Moreover, it recognizes the status of the French language in Canada and strengthens the basis for French as a language of instruction in designated schools. Particular emphasis is given to the right of a pupil to have access to instruction in a designated school.

10. In the area of financial administration particular attention is drawn to the following. Firstly, in regard to borrowing for capital works, under present law, in school districts organized under The School Act and The Secondary Education Act borrowing for capital purposes is subject to the vote of the burgesses. However, this requirement is not applicable to school units under the larger School Units Act. Quite apart from this inconsistency in the treatment of various local units of administration, it has become increasingly apparent that voter interest has steadily declined.

The bill does not preclude the possibility of a vote but provides that a vote shall not be mandatory unless ordered by the local government board or in a petition of the electors or on a motion of the Board of Education. The board is required, however, to publicize its intention to borrow and to make provision for public hearing. The purpose of these procedures is to ensure that electors are informed concerning borrowing plans and to give them an opportunity to express their views before the decision is finally taken. It should be noted that, in the same connection, where a vote is held, all electors are eligible to vote. As I stated earlier the concept of burgess is abandoned. Public discussion of this subject almost unanimously supports the view that firstly, limiting the vote to burgesses improperly disenfranchises a large section of the population which has a very real interest in the manner in which funds are spent for capital purposes. Secondly, the fact that an elector may not own taxable property does not, in fact, exempt him from school taxes for these are, in most cases, reflected in rents and charges otherwise required of him. Thirdly, the inclusion of electors may enhance the level of interest taken in votes on money by-laws.

A uniform tax rate is made applicable to all taxable assessment in a division. This is the case now in districts organized under The School Act. But in school units, variations in rates are permitted. This provision was necessary in the earlier years of the school units to permit reasonable adjustments and agreements among boards when a school district joined or was incorporated in an existing unit. These rate differentials have gradually decreased or disappeared. This is recognized in the bill by eliminating rate differentials entirely. It is an updating of law rather than an introduction of any new principle.

Amongst miscellaneous items, it will be noted that no provision is made for formal budget reviews by the department. Also present constraints and boards regarding honoraria have been eliminated entirely.

11. I now turn to those areas of the bill which elicited a great deal of discussion and diversity of opinion. In regard to collective bargaining, we proposed no major changes in the collective bargaining section of our proposed legislation. This was an area in which the STF, in particular, strongly indicated was in need of major revision. The only revision we have proposed for this section is a new sub-clause, section 243(4), which requires that a certified copy of the decision of an Arbitration Board be filed in the office of the local registrar of the Court of Queen's Bench. This decision was made at the request of the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation) to remove any doubt that such decisions have the force of law. The decision not to make any other revisions at this time was not made hastily. In fact, even the white paper gave no indication that there would be any changes in the 1973 Teacher Collective Bargaining Act.

Traditionally, teachers have found the terms of our 173 Act too restrictive while trustees have traditionally found the act not restrictive enough. This serious dichotomy cannot be resolved simply by providing "free and open collective bargaining" as was requested by the teachers' federation.

I have recognized that neither the STF nor the SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association) has been particularly happy with our present negotiation process; however all hon. members must recognize that through this process, in spite of its shortcomings, teachers have received substantial benefits through universal and improved salary scales and fringe benefits since 1973, and no school board has gone bankrupt as a result. Although there has been no expansion beyond the mandatory items negotiated at the provincial level, considerable expansion of negotiated items have occurred in many local agreements. These facts lead me to believe that we will be able to live with our present collective bargaining legislation for a while longer. The full potential of our present legislation has not, indeed, been fully exploited. Collective bargaining legislation is a highly sensitive issue, both with the STF and with the SSTA. As a result, it has been a highly sensitive issue with me and with this government. Because of the sensitivity and because any major change in collective bargaining legislation could very well result in a major change in the relationships which exist between teachers, trustees and government. I firmly believe that the changes in this legislation can be effected only through continuing specific discussion with the parties concerned. I will, therefore, be taking steps, later this year, to initiate specific discussions between trustees, teachers and the government to determine what changes might be required and possible in this portion of the legislation.

As teachers have pointed out to me, our legislation must contain counter-balancing mechanisms and nowhere is this more important than in relation to the process and

scope of collective bargaining.

In regard to hours of work, of all of the concerns which were raised regarding Bill No. 43, section 165 was, by far, the most unpopular. As I have said many times before our intent in drafting section 165 as it appeared in Bill No. 43 was simply to do two things: Firstly, to reflect and legitimize what was happening at the time in many school systems and secondly, to provide some legal base for the protection of teachers working in schools beyond the usual 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. frame. At no time was there any thought given to extending the required working day of individual teachers. However, we quickly learned that section 165, as it appeared in Bill 43, was leaving that impression. In an effort to clarify this intention, section 165 has been reworded in our new bill. This rewording is very close to our present legislation, section 204 of The School Act, which requires ministerial approval for any daily schedule which varies more than three minutes from the traditional 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. schedule.

In regard to co-curricular programs section 179 was almost as unpopular with teachers as was section 165. I deem the problems rose exclusively from a misunderstanding of intent. The teachers told me that they feared that this section 179, if it were enacted, co-curricular involvement would become a mandatory requirement of teachers as part of their daily work. Our intent was to officially recognize that boards could authorize extra-curricular activities which teachers and pupils are presently engaged in. These activities are not presently recognized and there was some feeling that recognition would provide legal protection for teacher and pupil for some incident involving personal liability, should it occur. We did not intend to imply that teachers are required to participate co-curricular programs. Our revised legislation simply gives school boards permission to authorize such programs. The new section is silent in regard to any reference to management, supervision or general discipline of the school, which is felt to imply the required involvement of teachers in these activities.

In regard to duties of teachers, section 227 of Bill No. 43 raised some concerns with teachers and these concerns took two forms: Firstly, the preamble which suggested that the teacher was solely responsible for the quality of the educational program, was unfair. Secondly, the list of duties was too long.

In relation to the first concern, with the wording of the preamble, I agreed that it was unfair to imply that the quality of the learning experience is the sole responsibility of the teacher. That section of the preamble has been removed from the new section 227.

In relation to the extent of the list of duties we must consider some factors. First of all, teachers require some form of job description which provides them and their employers with an idea of what their duties are. Such a list of duties also affords teachers protection against unreasonable expectations being placed upon them. If we can accept the premise that there is merit in having a description of duties, we must then decide how these duties are to be defined. There are three possibilities. Firstly, they can be drawn up by the employer as a job description. Secondly, they can be negotiated as part of a collective bargaining agreement. Thirdly, they can be embodied in law. I am certain that the first alternative is unacceptable to teachers. I am equally certain that trustees would categorically reject the second alternative. I am not altogether certain that even all teachers would accept this option at this time.

Through the process of elimination, we are left with the third alternative. This has been the traditional method of describing the role of a teacher. Our present section 227 is largely a carry-over from section 241 of The School Act. Except for a few minor

changes and the elimination of the requirement, the teacher's posted class timetable, section 227 in our new bill is basically unchanged from Bill 43.

Section 175 which deals with the duties of principals has remained unchanged as well.

In regard to appeals of contract terminations: On the basis of the mail which I have received from teachers expressing their concerns about Bill 43, I believe that the single most important issue in their minds was the failure of the bill to provide access, by all teachers, to an appeal board which makes binding decisions. This serious concern and disappointment undoubtedly resulted from the fact that the white paper provisions replaced the traditional Board of Conciliation and Board of Review with a Terminations Appeal Board. This provision was not contained in Bill 43. Instead, we elected to return to existing legislation. This return to the status quo was made for two major reasons: first, the Terminations Appeal Board was a provincially appointed body. Serious questions were raised regarding the legitimacy of such a board ruling on cases specific to individual communities and providing a binding decision. Second, the decision of the Ontario Appeals Court which ruled that it was unconstitutional for a Board of Reference to rule on a case involving the dismissal of two separate school teachers in Ontario was brought to our attention. This case is in fact still waiting to be heard by the Supreme Court of Canada. The possibility that legislation which provided binding arbitration for all teachers might be declared ultra vires through the pending Supreme Court decision caused us to take a serious look at the mechanism which had been suggested in the white paper.

As soon as Bill 43 was made public, teachers began to express their great disappointment with the bill in regard to its failure to provide access to binding awards in the case of contract termination. Because of this concern and because the proroguing of the Legislative Assembly provided us with a bit more time and flexibility than we might otherwise have had, we were able to review this section carefully. We concentrated on the development of proposals which deal effectively with the concerns which prompted the return to existing legislation proposed in Bill 43. We believe that our new proposal in regard to appeals of contract termination answer both concerns. By eliminating the Board of Conciliation and by directing all appeals of termination to a Board of Reference we have provided for appeal to a board which provides binding awards and which is locally appointed.

Our legal advisors feel that our proposed section 222(2) will deal effectively with the possible constitutional issue. We expect that opinion will continue to differ widely on this principle. Trustees feel that their right to determine who is to be in their employ will be infringed upon and that it will be next to impossible to discharge a teacher, irrespective of the reason for doing so. I wish to make it clear that the right of a board to dismiss a teacher is not in question. For it is fundamental that a board should employ or continue to those teachers in whom it has confidence. The issue then is not whether a board is empowered to dismiss but rather, that a teacher on being dismissed have access to an appeal. Nor is the issue whether a tribunal is a better judge of a teacher than the board. The tribunal is not a better judge of a teacher than the board. The tribunal is not called upon to make that judgment. It is called upon to ascertain the facts, the evidence surrounding the dismissal and to judge whether or not the employer acted within his powers under law and in a reasonable manner in the exercise of those powers.

We have also increased the permitted scope of a Board of Reference award to allow them to make appropriate orders other than simply to confirm or deny determination.

Section 221(d). In addition, section 223 requires that the judgment of the Board of Reference be filed with the local registrar in the Court of Queen's Bench.

Our new bill provides for a continuation of the two-year probationary period which has been traditional in Saskatchewan, but limits the right to appeal on demotion or change of employment status to principals, vice-principals, supervisors or consultants.

My proposed legislation also contains revisions which were requested by trustees and the SSGA. Firstly, we made the requirements for the establishment of a separate school division more flexible by changes to section 22. Secondly, section 35 which dealt with conflict of interest of school trustees has been modified to incorporate the best aspect of conflict of interest legislation found in rural and urban municipal law.

Subsection (3), section 34 has been revised so that members of a board of education are not required to be residents of the subdivision which they represent. This again is in keeping with the existing practice in other kinds of local elections in the province.

Fourthly, in addition, we have modified our section on French language education, section 180, to provide the right of access to an education in the French language to students whose parents request it. This change is the result from combined requests from some trustees and Francophone parents. This section also provides for education in language other than French or English, reflecting our commitment to national concerns and to the ongoing multicultural complexion of Saskatchewan.

With an act which is as massive as our new education legislation, the question of implementation is a critical one. Obviously to have the act come into effect on the day of assent would create major administrative difficulties. We, therefore, altered the last section of the bill to state that this act or any provisions of the act will come into effect on the day or days fixed by proclamation. This will allow for a planned phasing in of the provisions of the new legislation.

This discussion of Bill 22 is necessarily confined to the highlights of this legislation. The thoughtful reader will find that it touches the whole range of educational activity, but only to the extent of basic parameters which lie, generally, within the area of public interest.

The bill is built on the foundation of existing law, which is itself the product of more than three quarters of a century of development. It also addresses itself to the realities of the present and prospects of the future. It aims to strengthen the role and potential of local government in leading the expectations of the local community. It strives to close the gap between educational authorities and educators and the people who entrust them to govern wisely and sensitively in the administration of educational services. Above all, its major objectives is to direct goals, objectives, policies and expectations to the central figure in the educational system – that is the pupil.

This bill is not motivated by any desire for change for the sake of change. If, as has already been suggested, it proves to be a landmark in educational legislation in this province, my most earnest hope is that it will earn that recognition for its attempt to envisage school law in the terms of the needs of our times and of its potential for contributing constructively to the future growth and development of the school system, as an integral and vital force in the fabric of society in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to move second reading of Bill No. 22.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I rise, as I suppose you might say, as a bit of a skeptic wondering whether or not the bill that we are looking at today and the comments which the minister has made on that bill, are really going to be the bill as we are going to see it when we finally get down to the voting on the readings on Bill 3. We have had so many changes since we have started this procedure that one wonders how many more changes might finally result before the day of passage of this particular bill.

I think that I would be the first person to recognize that there, indeed, was a need, a need for revision, a need to consolidate the existing legislation, a need to update it and to modernize it; also a need to make it more comprehensible and easier for people to understand.

I also accept the minister's statement that the procedure used in changing and going about changing this legislation was, indeed, commendable. The various stages of using the Law Reform Committee and the regional seminars, many seminars I believe could also be categorized as being a part in the establishment of this legislation and then following it up with the white paper and the two bills, Bill 43 and Bill 42. I realized also at the time that the objective was to try to reach a consensus with all the different groups that were affected with education and that this, indeed, was probably a very difficult task to perform in line with some of the past positions.

I would begin to evaluate the procedure. I suppose we might be able to say that in areas where there was consensus it worked admirably well, but in areas in which there was conflict I don't think such was the case. In fact the procedure, I believe as the minister described it in an address to the Saskatchewan teachers the other day, had tendency to probably polarize the positions of parties more than they were before. For instance the areas probably in which there was greater polarization was the right of management to govern and possibly a second section was that on job security of teachers and the third section would be the collective bargaining.

Now, really when we start to take a look at these areas of indecisiveness, what was really the record of the government in these particular areas? Certainly it was really very evident that we had a very indecisive group of people who were working on this. I almost imagined one like a rudderless ship. One day we seemed to go one way with the existing legislation; another day we would be going another way. It was this way, this way, that way, and that's why when I started I began to wonder if the government was on course yet or whether or not we were going to have another diversion to the left or another diversion to the right. It will be interesting to see what might happen.

If we take a look at this I think it is really evidence of this government's indecision, particularly when you look at the one topic of job security. We started out with a piece of legislation that provided for a probationary period, a conciliation period and in some cases, Board of Reference. Then we followed that with a white paper, a second piece of legislation or suggested legislation or proposed legislation in which we then had a move you might say in which the awards would be binding. Then the trustees of Saskatchewan in my judgment organized probably a very effective campaign and had some influence on the minister, because when we had Bill 43 we again had a reversal of policy. We came up with a system in which we moved more to a position which was

suggested by the boards of education in the province of Saskatchewan in which we would have reconciliation procedures and boards of reference. Then finally, during the last few weeks since the introduction of Bill 43, we know that a very effective campaign was launched by the teachers in the province of Saskatchewan and, of course, this campaign had the effect and the resultant Bill 22 in which there was a complete, you might say, almost reversal of Bill 43. You really began to wonder, as I say, where do we go next? Are we now finally on the position that we are going to be seeing here or if the trustees of Saskatchewan happen to organize and get out and have all kinds of representations from parents and trustees, is it going to have an effect on the minister. Certainly his past record would indicate that pressure groups do have an effect upon him.

Really, I can see the minister – we have suggested in our caucus on different occasions that we, as members of this Legislative Assembly, would be in fact the ones who in the end would have to pass this legislation and that we really had, I think you might say, a right to be informed, a right to be informed about the legislation as the minister is informed; that we should be able to have some situation in which there is some give and take with some of the people who are interested in education. That's why we had suggested that we should have the education committee of this Assembly called so that we could hear representations from the various bodies. But I can really understand why the minister is very reluctant to have this education committee called. It is evident really that he, of course, would be subjected to some pressure and we know what happens when this minister is subjected to pressure. He probably would have the same problem that he has had in the past. We would have a change of positions. And so, while we in our group, feel that we really in fact do have a right and should have the opportunity to talk to these various groups, we imagine that probably with the use of the government's majority in this Assembly we will not have the opportunity to do so.

The Legislative Committee is not something new to the parliamentary system as we know it. All one has to do is to take any areas of concern at the federal government level particularly, as well as other provinces and even in the province of Saskatchewan when we had special problems, legislative committees were convened. They are an apparatus that enables members to understand and to become more acquainted with and more informed about the legislation that is presented. I presume possibly that one of the reasons that we may never see this committee again was the fact that last year witnessed the effect of the legislation on the medical profession in the province of Saskatchewan when we had the legislation presented by the Minister of Health. We also note that the member for Cutknife launched a very effective campaign and the legislation was eventually withdrawn and the minister is no longer the Minister of health. So I imagine the gain here and looking at the Minister of Education, this again would justify some reason for his of not being able to support the concept of calling the committee into session.

As far as the bill in itself, (the member wants to get into the bill) – the bill itself – just a few comments I would like to make initially today before we adjourn debate and are able to prepare our presentation more formally as the minister had today. One thing I have always objected to in this Assembly ever since I arrived here is the fact that one never seems to know what is going to happen the next day. You come to the legislature and find out that morning what may happen that afternoon. We have a problem with our whip often being able to find out exactly what is going to happen the next day. We did find out last night though that the bill was going to be on today. Just as an instance, the first reading of this bill, and introduction by the minister, I had asked him on what day he was going to introduce the bill and he said he didn't know, he wasn't sure yet and a little

later on the same day I think it was, we read in the order paper and it was indicated that first reading would take place.

Now, I think we may even take a look – just a few brief comments on some of the problems we are going to have. Certainly the minister, in the case of Bill 43 built up some of the aspirations of boards and now what has he done in Bill 42? After he has built some of their aspirations up, he is going to be faced during the next time and with complaints I guess you might say, from board members.

Taking another issue I would like to make some mention about is the idea on job security of teachers. Now while the probationary period I'm sure is an acceptable period or acceptable compromise I guess you might say, to numerous bodies, it is going to create some problems for beginning teachers. It is going to be creating some problems for people who are changing jobs. These people of course are going to really have what I feel, is less security than they do at the present time because boards and administrators are probably going to have to practice (which might be good) you might say, a better evaluation of the program but in any case where there is any slight element of doubt. I am afraid that the person will probably no longer be with the board. For beginning people you are certainly going to have a problem there, in fact with less security than what we have had before.

On the other hand it certainly has an infringement on the rights of boards. It makes it more difficult for boards to dismiss people. We in our own particular party have always had some, I guess you might say, reservations about the fact that quasi-judicial bodies – their decisions are not subjected to courts and there isn't a final appeal to the court and we will be making a decision on that particular piece of legislation whether or not we think that there should be an opportunity for either side to take their decision to one of the courts. We felt this was the case in the case of the Labour Relations Board and other quasi-judicial boards as well.

Now really the last week I have found it interesting to watch the actions of the Minister of Education. I really have the feeling that he spent this entire last week sort of playing politics with education. Last Thursday he introduced the bill here into the legislature. I understand that about at the same time there were some negotiations going on for the provincial salary grid in the city of Saskatoon. I have also been told that the bill was made available in Saskatoon about the same time that it was made available here in the Legislative Assembly to members of this Assembly.

The minister then felt that he was armed properly to proceed to the Saskatchewan Council of the Teachers' Federation and he had in his pocket, I guess you might say, a salary agreement that provided for an approximate increase of 7 per cent. He also had in his pocket, the Bill 22 which he felt was certainly a concession to some of the demands that the teachers had. He approached the convention this week as sort of glad-handing and initially I used to attend those council meetings and I don't remember any little minister preparing some little booklet with glossy paper inside in which he was able to present his presentation and arm all of the supporters and the likes with the little pamphlet which they could take and return back to their areas of the province. I just wonder again what the particular little effort cost.

I also presume that the second reading of the bill was planned as well for this morning simply for the reason that council doesn't end (if my information is correct) until some time tomorrow afternoon, and the minister is hoping that we in the Liberal Party and our colleagues to the left will be saying a few things that probably are not in complete

agreement with the teachers of the province and he would be able to go down to the council, in the last two days with his emissaries and be able to glad hand, move them out, the counselors, sending them all back to their areas of the province with an expression of the opinion that the NDP were really and truly the allies of the teachers and the other fellows over here were, of course, doing everything that they could do to hassle teachers and make it more miserable.

With that thought in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Faris: — On a point of personal privilege. I understand the member, in his address, to suggest that some people outside this House had received a copy of the bill before members of this House did. That is not a fact; that is not the case. If the member suggested that or implied it, I hope that he will withdraw.

Mr. Stodalka: — I said they were available in Saskatoon about the same time, I understand. If that is not correct . . .

Mr. Faris: — That is not correct.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Department of Health

Vote 32

Item 1

Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health): — I wanted to say before we get into the estimates proper, that mention has been made in the last several days of a terrific program we have in Saskatchewan called “Feeling Good”. I hope that through that effort we will help people decide for themselves to get the most out of life that they possibly can. I can’t think of a better example of that, then a certain gentleman who is celebrating a very important event today. That gentleman is celebrating his 50th birthday, a very active individual born in the province of Saskatchewan. I would like to ask the members of the House to join with me in wishing well to a Saskatchewanian, Gordie Howe, who is celebrating his 50th birthday today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, yesterday we had some considerable discussion about some information that the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) was seeking — whether he was seeking the information or whether he had other motives, I am not sure. I wish he was here now, with this great urgent desire to receive the information which I am going to provide for him, as I indicated yesterday that I would. I am pleased to be able to say, as I provided the commitment yesterday, that we have prepared — the department has now prepared — a 21-page document. It has required a great deal of rush effort to accommodate the wishes of the member opposite. It took over 12 hours and the departmental officials worked until 2:00 o’clock in the morning to have it ready. I want to emphasize that the report covers the 12 months of 1977 and this is a different period in the period for which the estimates are prepared. I would like to send over these reports, one for the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) and one for the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver). Once again, I wish he was here to get it, because he wanted it so desperately yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I want to emphasize, again, that this is a report, or some information, up to the end of 1977 and there are certain points that I want to alert members to. I want to alert members that the statement is being tabled in the House, today, is very preliminary and tentative and it represents an audited accounting of the financial position of SHSP and is subject to any necessary accounting adjustments. The financial statement outline expenditures for the 12-month period January 1, 1977, to December 31, 1977 and are incomplete in that they do not include the last three months of the fiscal period.

As you know the current fiscal period for SHSP is 15 months, from January 1, 1977 to March 31, 1978, accounting payments for the last three months of the fiscal period will only be available following closure of books. However, I would caution members that there are extra expenses in this period and I want to give you some examples of what they are. Advances to hospitals to cover the extra cost of salaries will ultimately be negotiated and required for the first quarter of 1978. Advances to hospitals to cover allowances approved in 1977-78 for equipment but unexpended to date; preliminary payments to cover the cost of year end adjustments to hospitals to accommodate any approved changes that have occurred over the year. Hospital rates are based on preliminary estimates of requirements for the year and must be adjusted to actual where this is approved. The members should use caution in attempting to make any special inference from this statement, due to extra expenses that will occur during the last month and since the amount of expenditure changes over the fiscal period, monthly expenses are lower at the start of the fiscal period than they are at the end.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with those remarks of explanation, I want to say again that I have passed over the interim statement to the members as was requested yesterday and which I said we would prepare. I want to express my appreciation to those of my staff who worked, as I said before, until 2:00 o'clock in the morning to get it ready. I think that they have done an outstanding job and I hope that now the Leader of the Conservative Party will permit the legislature to proceed with these estimates, which I am persuaded we could have been completed by now, had he so agreed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley): — I have one other question. Could the minister inform me where the University Hospital Board report is?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The University Hospital is on the revised fiscal year and we have to wait for the hospital to provide us with a report which will come at the end of the fiscal year.

An Hon. Member: — When?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — After March 31.

Mr. MacDonald: — Now, Mr. Minister, was that included in the act, the Union Hospital Act of a year ago?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It was the University Hospital Act amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: — Well, Mr. Minister, I want to make just a couple of comments and then I am going to let my colleague, the member for Nipawin, who has pursued this question of the SHSP report. The minister indicated yesterday that the Conservatives

didn't say anything about revised hospital acts last year. I want to tell the minister that I said plenty. Not only that, I refused to vote for the bill because I predicted exactly what would happen this year would happen a year ago. I pointed out that we would come before the estimates of the House and no member of the House would be able to carry out his responsibility, no information would be provided. It is rather interesting about the University Hospital report. A year ago it was the most damning report that was submitted to the legislature by the government. It indicated that the previous year had been a year of turmoil and dissention between government and university that has been a question of cutting hospital beds, of reduced service, of the diffused number of patients that had been looked after and continual conflict between the government and the University Hospital Board. This report here, 1976, is without question the worst report and the most critical report in health care that I have ever had the opportunity to read since I have been a member of the legislature and I am sure that every member of the Department of Health and everybody would also agree with that.

I might even give you the first paragraph, if the minister doesn't remember.

The year 1976 can best be described as a year of strikes, threats of strikes, budget restraints, staff cuts . . . (inaudible) . . . and operating budget and significant stress within the medical staff with regard to facilities available for service and teaching requirements. It is sincerely hoped that the day-to-day crisis situation, etc. etc. . . .

It goes on through the entire report indicating just exactly what kind of year the University Hospital Board had. Then subsequent to the filing of the report, came out statement from the University Hospital Board about vicious staff cuts that would be required in the new fiscal year as a result of the health cuts a year ago. Now we come into the Assembly and not only is the SHSP report not here but now we find the University Hospital Board report, who of any one group in the province of Saskatchewan who were critical of last year's budgets and last year's estimates, it was the University Hospital Board and the medical profession in the University Hospital in the city of Saskatoon. Now, Mr. Speaker, once again we find another report, another piece of information that is not available to members of the House about a very important aspect of health care in the province of Saskatchewan and about a group who traditionally have been very independent and very objective in their comments and their remarks about the government and about the quality of health care and what the implications of government action would have upon their hospital and upon the general overall health standards in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to point out that despite all the sanctimonious comments of the minister, I started off the debate on estimates by saying that it was a farce. Because without the proper information no members of the House, the member for Nipawin has pursued it. I merely want to point out a second aspect that is equally as important as SHSP, perhaps not in the total dollar value, but certainly in the quality of medical care that is being provided, particularly for the Saskatoon area. As you know the University Hospital provides a very special service for all the residents of Saskatchewan who become sick or who require very special treatment. The University Hospital, when it comes to open heart surgery, while very extreme or very difficult cases and I don't want to pinpoint exactly what the specialties are in Saskatoon particularly with the opening of the university hospital in Regina (or the Plains Hospital) but I point out they have a very special function and the quality of health care in Saskatchewan, once again we find another report that is not in and once again I point out to the fact that I would recommend immediately (and I want the minister's comments) that that Order in Council be changed and that at least

tentative estimates be provided for the Legislature prior to the calling of Health estimates.

I would also say that once again we might be able to stand the Health estimates until May 1 because I am sure the University Hospital Board has to submit their report and after earlier in the month of May we should be able to tackle Health estimates again with all the information available, particularly from the University Health Board, as well as the SHSP.

I now want to have an opportunity to look at the SHSP report and make a comparison with last year and I am sure that the member for Nipawin has some additional comments.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I find it rather interesting to see the member for Indian Head-Wolseley now take onto the pitch taken by the Leader of the Conservative Party for the last three days. If the member for Indian Head-Wolseley would bother to take the time and do a little bit of work on the document which I just passed over he would find that there is some indication there of the funding in '77 that was provided to the University Hospital and in spite of the fact that he tries to make a great deal of some things that were obviously difficulties, from time to time that happens in any organization, he should also take the time to take a look at the fact that between 1976 and 1977 there was an increase in funding to the University Hospital of over \$2 million, from \$25 million to over \$27 million.

Now, we agree that it is a hospital with a special function and role to play in the province of Saskatchewan and that's the reason why this government is providing to the University Hospital something in the area of \$30 million, more than any hospital in the province of Saskatchewan. The commitment is there and the service is being provided.

I won't go into the very extensive and major renovations that are taking place at the University Hospital because I have already spoken about them and if the member wishes to know what I have said he need only to look into the recordings of the discussions on these estimates that have already taken place.

But there are also other things that have taken place. In 1977 we provided a special adjustment for the University Hospital of well over \$600,000 because of some of the concerns that were expressed that he mentions over there. I wish the member would make a point of mentioning them as well.

Now coming back to the question of the annual reports. Every member of this House knew, and the legislature passed, knowing the amendments that were provided through such legislation as The University Hospital Act and The Union Hospital Act and others changing the fiscal year. Every member in the legislature knew that it was done to make it more uniform across Canada. Every member in the legislature knew and I never said that the members in the Liberal Party never opposed it, in fact I made a point of pointing out the member for Indian Head-Wolseley said he had reservations. But they knew that the hospitals in Saskatchewan supported that legislation changing it to the fiscal year. Because in the past, before that, although they had to have their budgets prepared on January 1, they were not able to find out what the appropriations and the budgets were going to be until April of that same year. What has happened now, is that they will be able to find out within a very short period of time what the appropriations are and, therefore, able to finalize their budgets.

So there is a very positive and good reason for changing it to the fiscal year. Now, that's not unusual. The Public Accounts comes in the same way as the annual report for the Saskatchewan Hospital Plan is going to come. The Department of Health report has come for as many years as anyone can remember on the same basis as the annual report is going to come. In order to bring the thing into line as we have done, whether it was done last year or next year or 10 years from now, or whether it might have been done by the Liberal government and probably should have, way back before 1971, there has to be this interim period of 15 months for the adjustment to take place. I am attempting to assist the members opposite to the extent that I can by providing, at least for the 1977 year, the statement which I have just given, because the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) requested it. So we did some work and we put it together in order to be able to assist the opposition in the work that they want to do and the questioning they want to make. You have got it and we are prepared to do that and have done it. I don't think we can do that for the University Hospital because the University Hospital has to sort of put their thing together and provide it to us.

So, I think, Mr. Chairman, for the member to suggest that we should again stand the Health estimates is not a particularly constructive suggestion. And I don't think we should be prepared to do that.

Mr. MacDonald: — I wonder if the minister knows that it will be two and a half years before you will be able to examine the annual report of the SHSP from the time the fiscal year began. Let me just point that out. From January 1, 1977 we will not be able to examine that year 1977-78, we won't even be able to examine it until 1979, in the spring of 1979. That will be well over two years. Is this the kind of a sense of responsibility that the government indicates that it will be at least a year and a half, even to the final date of that fiscal year. The minister also said about how he made some very dramatic changes in university budgeting, gave them an additional \$600,000. He turned around and put in a massive renovation program and an improvement of the facilities. I want to tell him it was a result of the annual report of the University Hospital Board and the devil that was raised in this Assembly by members of the opposition as he just indicated. It was a shame and it was one of the most disgraceful treatments of any group in the health field in the province of Saskatchewan for a long, long time. It was made apparent by this particular report. Then the government went back in an admission of a lack and failure of carrying out the responsibilities to the University Hospital and the medical staff. Don't you recall the Premier's investigation about what went on in the University Hospital in the city of Saskatoon? That's what brought about the \$600,000 and that's what brought about the massive infusion of funds in the renovation of facilities. That was one of the results of the University Hospital Board report as well as the devil that was raised by the opposition. I point that out to indicate to you, again, that what kind of a step you have taken by that particular Order in Council and by changing of that particular act. As I say, and I tried to bring this to your attention last year but you ignored it. I say to you again, that by trying to examine something that went on at the end of January 1977, in the end of January 1979, is nonsense! It's nonsense. It makes a farce out of the estimates and it makes a farce out of the whole concept of the opposition reviewing the expenditures of the government.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Just one comment, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to say that the University Hospital increase last year in 1977 was 8 per cent. If you want to compare that to anywhere else, you will find that the Alberta teaching hospitals got an

increase of 4.3 per cent. The more important thing that I want to reply to is this: I am amazed that the member for Indian Head-Wolseley who is one of the veterans of this House would put aside or misunderstand the functions of two different committees of this legislature. There is a Public Accounts Committee. The purpose of the Public Accounts Committee is to consider expenditures of the past. That is what the Public Accounts Committee is for. The purpose of this Committee of Finance is to consider expenditures proposed for the new fiscal year . . . so that the two don't necessarily fit in that well. He is confusing the two and trying to make a debating point out of it. I want to also correct him on something else. He tries to make a big issue out of the fact that it was the opposition over there, who pressured the government in doing certain things at the University Hospital in the line of the major renovations that are taking place. I want the member to be reminded that before last year had even come close, those major renovations at the University Hospital had already been planned and were already taking place. In fact, it had been happening for, how many years? As a matter of fact I am told that the renovations to the University Hospital were approved in 1972. How the member can sort of determine that it was the function of those gentlemen opposite that brought about those major renovations, I am not sure and I guess it doesn't really matter that much – but I just wanted to sort of bring that to the attention of the House.

Mr. Collier: — Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to express my appreciation to the staff of the minister and the diligent effort I am sure they had to use, to put together these interim reports. Certainly it does surprise me, Mr. Chairman, however, that much of the information appears to have been printed already and just xeroxed, so I suppose that information in reality was available yesterday or the day before, and it was surprising that we could get it. However, perhaps today, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions as they relate to the community clinics in the province of Saskatchewan. Now I realize that it is difficult for the member to assemble all this information, since it is pulled from many parts of the statement. Why these aren't put nice and concisely in each statement I don't know, but however, we will take that for what it is worth.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that the payments under the Medical Care Insurance Commission to the community health associations in the province of Saskatchewan, went from \$2,149,000 in 1976 to \$2,249,000. I would ask the minister, would he not agree that it must, of necessity, be for less services since the inflationary increase in that period of time was at the very least 10 per cent, which would have been \$200,000 increase. So that in fact, if the payments were only up \$100,000 under the MCIC program which is payment for physicians' services, there would have to have been fewer services provided by the medical people at the community clinics.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — First of all, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the question and I also want at the same time to suggest that once again this is a specific question I think more appropriately belongs under the subvote of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, rather than under subvote No. 1. We have had, I think, sufficient time to debate the general policies and approaches under subvote No. 1 as I think is appropriate under that particular subvote. But I want to say to the member that the calculations of the budget he refers to are not made only on the number of services; the department does it on the line by line basis, and is worked out on the average fee-for-service salaries of doctors in the province of Saskatchewan. It is not done necessarily on the number of services.

Mr. Collver: — I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding last year in questioning the Minister of Health, that the SHSP payments to the community clinics in the province of Saskatchewan, in other words for the year ended December 31, 1977, the payment by SHSP to the community clinics of Saskatchewan was \$2,057,855 in total. Those payments were the line by line type payments, but the MCIC payments to the community clinics were based on the fee-for-service basis to the medical doctors who are associated with those medical clinics. Is that not correct that the MCIC basis is on fee-for-service, but the SHSP is line by line?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The answer, as it is provided to me, is that the amount paid by MCIC (Medical Care Insurance Commission) is determined in this way. There is approval provided to the community clinics based on the number of the establishment of doctors. There is approval provided to the community clinics on the establishment of physicians. That has got to be, first of all, kept in mind. There is a certain establishment that is approved.

Now, the MCIC payments to SHSP (Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan) are calculated on a basis of the numbers of the establishment approved and also the average fee-for-service income in the province of Saskatchewan. So it does not have anything to do with the number of services; it is based on both components.

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Minister, I would think that you would certainly agree that if the payments from MCIC, based on the average fee-for-service and the medical doctor component, was approximately the same in 1977 as it was in 1976, that therefore, because of inflation, in real dollars, the payment in 1977 would have been less – in real dollars. In 1976 dollars, it would have been less. Would you not agree with that?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, that is not true, Mr. Chairman, because there are all kinds of factors that may come in. A very major one might be – and often is – that the community clinics may not have been able to recruit certain specialists, so that will make a difference.

Mr. Collver: — That is exactly what I am getting at, Mr. Minister, and I am glad you said that. The fact of the matter is that if the same payment (or relatively close) was made in 1977 over 1976, that would mean that there were fewer physicians in the community clinics in 1977 than in 1976, would it not?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It may be that there were fewer physicians and that is one factor that may come into it, but not necessarily that one alone, or it may be not even necessarily that one. It could be also that they may have recruited at a lower level. Instead of recruiting a physician at the top of a scale they . . . often it does happen the physician is recruited at a lower scale which, as the member may well know, can make a very considerable difference in the amount of the expenditure money.

Mr. Collver: — So there are just the two factors. Am I correct there, Mr. Minister, that given the fact that MCIC gave to the community clinics approximately the same in 1976 and 1977, that two factors could have been involved: one, there could have been fewer physicians with the community clinics, and two, they could have recruited doctors at the lower level of the scale. Are there any other factors that could be involved?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I was going to add a few more things that will determine the allocation. I already have mentioned the range of the scale on which a new practitioner may have been employed. I want to also point out that one of the other things that may

make a considerable difference in the mix of specialists versus general practitioners. That changes from time to time. Another factor that comes in also is the availability when there is recruitment. Also another factor is the mix of certain specialists such as the mix of optometrists and physicians, the changes in fees will make a considerable difference, so it is not just simply two examples which I gave you earlier. It is a mix of all of these things.

Mr. Collver: — Yes, Mr. Minister, but what I am saying is that you can establish surely, in your mind and I am sure your officials can as well and all I was trying to get were all of the factors. You can eliminate the factor of changes in fees and you can eliminate the inflation factor at this point because by saying that they are both at the same level approximately, the increase of \$100,000 from 1976-77 in terms of the constant fee schedules were used from 1976-77 that the inflation factor would mean that if that was a 10 per cent level it would mean that there would be \$200,000 more spent rather than \$100,000. That means that the other factors must have come into play.

Now I am in agreement that this is all a mix. But what I am trying to do is to eliminate for purposes of this discussion the discussion of the fee changes and the discussion of the increase in the fee-for-service items in the College of Physicians and Surgeons schedule of fees. What I am getting at is that we could put those aside and say 'I think without argument that the level of payment under the fee schedule item and for purpose of inflation would necessitate that it was going down'. Would that not be correct?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I have had a little consultation here and I want to assure the member, because it seems to me he is attempting to come to the defence of the community clinics and I am rather pleased that he is doing that, but I can assure him, as the community clinics will be able to assure him, that the funding provided for the community clinics has not necessitated them to reduce the services that they are providing. They are able to provide the same level of services that they have.

If that is not what the member is getting at I would appreciate very much if he would explain what indeed he is asking.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I will try again to explain what I am asking.

What I am attempting to find out is, whether or not the community clinics in the province of Saskatchewan from 1976 to 1977 had in sum (on the one side) a totality of fewer physicians, lower scale of physician or a change in the mix of specialist to general practitioners, that those factors had to be on the decline because the amount paid to them was relatively constant between the two years.

So what I am really getting at here is this (and it is not a matter of whether the . . .) I know the minister pays to community clinics in accordance with who is there so it doesn't have to be with whether or not the payment by the minister would reduce the staff. I am not saying that and I am not saying that the payment provided by the minister would reduce the services. What I am saying is, that the people who are there were either fewer or of lower scale or of a different mix, specialist to general practitioner, in the year 1977 or over 1976. That's what I am getting at. Would the minister agree with that statement?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am informed that there is no significant change. I can't give you the precise analysis of it other than to give you that assurance. It would take some time for us to get the specifics of it. We don't have it broken down that fine, but my staff tell me that there has not been a significant change in that component that the member refers to.

Mr. Collver: — What the minister is saying, that is between 1976 and 1977 there may have been a very significant downward movement in terms of the number of specialists or the mix or the lower scale, but nothing of any significance. In other words, it was either the same or slightly less, is that correct?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It depends which specialization you are talking about. In some cases you will find that the numbers will go up, in other cases you will find that the numbers will be down. Overall there is basically no change.

Mr. Collver: — I would ask the minister to take these numbers down because they are not put here in the comparative way, so I would like him to take these numbers down carefully because I want to be sure that we get them absolutely correctly. In 1976, in accordance with the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan record, annual report, there was a payment to the Eston Community Health Services Ltd. Of \$23,093. There was a payment to the Lloydminster clinic of \$36,600. There was a payment to the Prince Albert clinic of \$529,453. There was a payment to the Regina Community Clinic of \$331,624. There was a payment to the Saskatoon Community Health Clinic of \$837,621. A total of \$1,758,391 was paid by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to the community clinics of our province. In accordance with the document tabled here today, there was a payment to the Eston Community Clinic — I'm sorry, it looks like a recovery from the Eston Community Clinic of some \$3,000. That is Appendix A2. There was a payment back. I gather the Eston clinic closed and there was some kind of an adjustment in terms of the provisions made before. There was a payment to the Lloydminster clinic of \$46,000. I wonder if the minister would mind since he wrote down the other numbers, why don't we write these numbers down for 1977 next to the numbers of 1976. You will recall yesterday I asked for a comparative statement, I notice there are no comparisons on these particular numbers, so that's why it is necessary to go through this exercise. The Lloydminster clinic \$46,576; the Prince Albert Community Clinic \$627,803; the Regina Community Clinic \$380,660; the Saskatoon Community Clinic \$1,500,816, for a total payment under the Saskatchewan Hospital Services of \$2,057,855. Now, my question to the minister is this, why if there was no change in the number of physicians, no fewer or no more — they are recruiting at a lower scale the minister said — that is the mix generally speaking there was no change or a little less, certainly no great change, why did the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan pay an additional \$163,000 to the Saskatoon Community Clinic, an increase of 20 per cent? It went from . . . for the benefit of the Attorney General I just want to mention the numbers again . . .

Mr. Romanow: — What do you oppose?

Mr. Collver: — What we oppose, Mr. Attorney General, and if he wants me to make my point now I will. The point is this, Mr. Attorney General, for your information and edification. The salaries paid by the community clinics to the medical doctors are not contingent upon the amounts paid by MCIC to those clinics. They are lumped into the total budget of the community clinic and then allocated to the doctors in accordance

with some arrangements that have been made between the community clinics and the medical doctors of the community clinics. The fact of the matter is that the government of the province of Saskatchewan in attempting to support one particular brand of medicine against all others, one particular kind of the practice of medicine against all others; it is rewarding the community clinics with moneys that could be booked into the hospital system so that we didn't have huge lineups waiting for surgery. His putting the money into these medical clinics in an inefficient fashion, in a fashion that the provision of medical care through those organizations are, at the very best, extremely inefficient and far, far less efficient than that provided by the fee-for-service physicians in our province and provided in the hospital system of our province.

So the point is, Mr. Chairman, . . . (interjection) . . . well we are presenting the facts today . . . (interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, the point is this. Last year, and we haven't got it – if the Attorney General is suggesting I go through with the Minister of Health today the exercise I had to go through last year with the then Minister of Health to find out how much per physician was provided to the community clinics by the Government of Saskatchewan and how much per physician was paid to the fee-for-service physicians in the province of Saskatchewan, by the Government of Saskatchewan in total, I think that the minister will find that the same relationship holds true, that last year twice as much per doctor was paid to the community clinics as was paid to the fee-for-service doctors in the province.

Now the point is no one is objecting to a community clinic concept, no one. But they should be paid and reimbursed by the Government of Saskatchewan on the same basis as every other medical doctor in the province. They should be reimbursed for their services on the same basis in order to be efficient, in order to prove one way or another whether that's the best possible mode for the practice of medical care or not, whether that's the best possible model for people to attend in those clinics or not. The fact is that if the government is being even-handed and we have certainly noticed today a very uneven-handed approach to the rules of the Assembly by members opposite. The point is if the government is to be even-handed, I say to the Attorney General, it is necessary for them to reimburse physicians and the provision of medical care across the province on an even-handed basis. Then, if the people want community clinics and they want to have that kind of a health service facility then it will be incumbent upon them to provide it within the bounds of those general rules.

What has happened, Mr. Attorney General and Mr. Minister of Health is this. In the last number of years the Government of Saskatchewan, through manipulation of these numbers, is providing to the fee-for-service doctors of our province half what it is providing to the community clinics for the same services. We proved that last year. If you want us to go through and ask the questions to prove it this year we will do so, but that's the fact. Furthermore, the minister in his own words today, has agreed that there was no change in the number of physicians in those community clinics from 1976 to 1977 but the allocation to the community clinics, if you like, in total went up 18 per cent not the 12 per cent that the minister increased through general health services around the province. The allocation by SHSP to those community clinics for the same number of services, the minister says and I quite frankly think that it's lower, I believe it is lower but the minister says it's the same, has allocated \$2,057 million out of SHSP to the community clinics this year and \$1,758, 391 last year.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — For '77-'76?

Mr. Collver: — 1977 was over \$2 million, 1976 was \$1758 million. If you will recall

last year then, well Mr. Minister wants to be dicey with words in terms of this year, these are the numbers we got this year. The 12 per cent increase furthermore is not the increase for the Department of Health this year, it is 8 per cent this year, you said so yourself, 9½ per cent, sorry, 9½ this year. Last year, Mr. Chairman, the government said that the increase to the health care system was 12 per cent, last year. So the year under review, the year which we are discussing right now, the minister said the allocation to overall health care was 12 per cent, yet the allocation to the community health clinics for the same services is 17 or 18 per cent. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned about the uneven-handed double standard of the Department of Health, We are concerned that like many other areas in the province the government is going on a political theory against all common sense and against all rational reasonable behavior by a government that was attempting to look after tax money.

Introduction of Scouts

Hon. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Chairman, I think it probably may be refreshing that we have a little change of tone here for a minute. I am pleased to introduce a group of Scouts and Beavers from Battleford, Saskatchewan. Battleford, I think, most people recognize to be the most historic town and most historic spot in this province. All these young people and their leaders are residents of that area and I would like them to stand, both them and the chaperones and leaders, please. Scout leaders, Roy Tornberg, Ulrich Pelletier, Raymond Cobbis driving the bus for them, I believe. The Cub Master is Verna Telford and Beaver leaders, Rose Cobband, Sarah Pelletier, also Don Panbrom and all the junior people. We want to welcome you here to Regina, to the capital. I want to assure you, I know the capital was once Battleford. I am continuing to strive to bring it back to Battleford and one day we will succeed and get legislation out of the muskeg that is Regina and up on to the heights and the better and more intellectual levels that are evident in the northwest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — Once again, on behalf of the House and through you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Speaker is out of the Chair, and all members of the House, I would like to extend you a hearty welcome and bon voyage on the way back. Good luck and may you enjoy yourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I forgot to thank them for the scarf. I shall treasure it.

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we appear again today to have established a very, very important point here. We have previously established in the consideration of these estimates certain other things and the longer the member for Nipawin speaker, the better it is for us to clearly understand what his and his party's position is on certain fundamental issues, as they relate to the health care delivery system in the province of Saskatchewan.

We established, yesterday, and we established the day before, what Conservative policies are with regard to medicare premiums and deterrent fees. We know, Mr. Chairman, that Conservatives across this country are proponents of and, indeed, implement the premiums or health taxes and deterrent fees across Canada and that those members opposite would do precisely the same. We established that and that is

clear and understood by everyone.

We also established, yesterday, and in the days prior to this by the comments opposite, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Nipawin couldn't care less about what the medicare system and hospitalization system is all about and what it provides the citizens of this country. There was not a group of people more vehemently opposed to the establishment of medicare than the Conservative organization in the province of Saskatchewan in 1962 and that has not changed one little bit. They are still vehemently opposed.

If you take an analysis of health fees or deterrent fees and medical premiums or health taxes and you apply it into the Ontario situation, you have to conclude very quickly and very easily that the whole intent of all those efforts by the Conservatives there, as they are in Alberta, is to destroy the medicare system by making it unattractive to a large number of people, who ought to be getting the maximum amount of services from them. That is the tactics that we are seeing, Mr. Chairman, from Conservatives, who all the way through the establishment of universal health care programs for people, have opposed them, each and every step of the way – hand in hand and step in step with the Liberals who now sit beside them on the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party, talks about some efforts that he imagines to establish – one particular brand of health care over another. He refers that as to be the community clinics in the province of Saskatchewan. I want the member to know that the community clinics are an alternative; they are one alternative in a mix that we have. We happen to believe in the New Democratic Party and in this government that that is an alternative worth exploring. We happen to favor the support of community clinics and we provide it as we provide support to general hospitals across this province and we will continue to provide it. It is very interesting and I know that it is very good that it is on the record because I intend to be talking about it around the province of Saskatchewan – that the Conservative Party is out to destroy the co-operative efforts that have gone into establishing of community clinics. The Leader of the Conservative Party has made it clear today that they will do away with community clinics if they are ever elected because everything he said in his remarks earlier pointed to a constant and complete criticism of the community clinics as they are in Saskatchewan today. We do not accept that. We support community clinics because we think that they are one of the good alternatives that exist, and the kinds of developments that have taken place have been very good developments for Saskatchewan.

I want the member also to spend some time, or get some of his research people to spend some time doing some inquiring into the issue of community clinics across Canada. I would suggest to him that he should dig up a certain committee report that was done some time not – how long ago was that? – about four years ago, called the Hasting's Committee. The Hasting's Committee was shared by Dr. John Hasting from the University of Toronto and it was set up by the federal government. It unanimously, including representation on it from the Canadian medical Association, unanimously recommended that the establishment of community clinics, as one alternative, be pursued across Canada.

I am proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that in this province, we are probably one of the few provinces – if not the only one, where we have taken the initiative to follow up on those recommendations, so that we do have some community clinics that exist.

Now the member looks at the figures that are provided there and he says, why an increase? Well, obviously the Conservatives would either freeze it and would not provide an increase or they would do away with community clinics altogether. I predict, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what they would do. They would take the Sterling Lyon approach of Manitoba and they would walk in with a meat axe and cut out a lot of programs. Those members over there are on record now of saying that they would do away with what they call "frill programs." The member for Nipawin has been even in my home town of Humboldt. Glad to have his visit for a little while, but he did say and it was quoted in the local press, that they would do away with the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan and implement a different plan – totally unacceptable, and which would cost the average citizen of Saskatchewan hundreds more dollars, if he happened to be taking drugs. There are certain people who would have to pay, because they would be on a particular drug, as much as a thousand dollars more a year – a thousand dollars more a year than they are having to pay under the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan. That is their approach to health care. That is not our approach. They would do away with community clinics; we are prepared to defend them.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that this party believes in consumer involvement of the consumer wishes to get involved in the establishment of health care services for the consumer. That is himself and that is what community clinics are all about.

He worries about the increase from 1966 to 1977. Surely you have to recognize that in any period over a year there are certain factors that come about which would necessitate an increase. There is a change in the fee-for-service incomes that happen in the medical profession that would have to be reflected in the increase of the budget, and I wish the member was listening because he might learn something. That would certainly have to be reflected in an increase in the budget for community clinics.

There are also some increases in non-medical staff which would require some increase in the budget that is provided from one year to the next. There are also some increases maybe of some individual programs in one or two community clinics where we also provide some additional money. We can find that for the member opposite. He chooses to ignore all of those things. He chooses to ignore the fact that some community clinics may have decided to do some work on nutrition and preventative medicine – the kinds of things that we are promoting as a government now to try to bring a better balance to health care in Saskatchewan. He chooses to ignore all of those things and with his funny arithmetic, again tries to make a point which cannot be made. The only thing that has to be concluded and the point that he indeed has made (I am glad that he is on record) is that he is threatening the community clinics and every community clinic in Saskatchewan knows it and are going to reflect that knowledge when it comes around to voting time in the province of Saskatchewan. I can assure the member opposite of that and I can also assure the member opposite that every person in Saskatchewan is going to know the Conservative party opposition to community clinics; the Conservative Party opposition to universal health care; the Conservative Party opposition, along with the Liberal Party, to the dental plan and the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan which they have called as 'frills' and which they would do as is now happening in Manitoba (some of your members have called them frills) – just as the new government in Manitoba is doing, they would do away with those programs. They would use the Ontario-type technique of making them so unpalatable (you will see CNR and the CPR has played this game very well). They have reduced services gradually. They would pour a little of the service out and say to the community that they

were pulling out of, you know – we are going to improve your service but nothing happens. They come around again and they reduce the service some more and pretty soon the service is so lousy that when they shut it down altogether the people say that they don't know, or they say, what's the use it's not worth anything anyhow.

That is the kind of approach the Tories would take if they were a government of this province. That is the kind of approach that the Tories are taking all over Canada. They are on the attack on universal health care and every province where there is a Tory government is showing with their increases in health care, in Ontario for example where they pay now more than some people pay in income taxes, that they are out to destroy universal health care; they are out to destroy medicare.

I can tell the members opposite right now that we are going to do, in the New Democratic Party, everything in our power to let the people of Saskatchewan know that and help them prevent it from happening.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, that was certainly quite a dissertation. On the delays created in the Assembly that the member talked about all yesterday about delaying the Assembly . . .

Mr. Romanow: — Filibuster!

Mr. Collver: — Filibuster, yes, from the government side of the House. Now apparently, Mr. Chairman, the minister doesn't want to answer the question.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — You never asked.

Mr. Collver: — Oh yes, the question asked of the minister was this: why, when the services provided by the medical doctors and the community clinics in the province of Saskatchewan were either constant or less, why would you increase the payment to the community clinics in Saskatoon by 20 per cent, in Prince Albert by 19 per cent, in Regina by 15 per cent? Why? Now there is an easy question to answer – why?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make one brief comment while the minister is digging up the answer to the specific question. I recall very specifically in the first question which prompted the Minister of Health to make his statement, the Leader of the Conservative Party provided his own answer to that question and everybody in the House heard you. I remember you were responding to my sitting-from-the-chair comments and I kept on asking you 'so what?' Now I said so what, you said, the answer to that was that the community clinics were operating a very inefficient form of delivery. What you said, you said that the money should be moved from the community clinics and into the regular hospital plans to stop the delay in hospital beds. You provided the answers. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister of Health is perfectly in order to have brought that to the attention of the Legislative Assembly. I am very interested to see that the member for Prince Albert supports you in this position because the Prince Albert area has a very active community clinic, one which encompasses the entire community.

When I go to Prince Albert next month, next month speaking there, I am going to point out to the people of Prince Albert that the Conservative Party Leader recommends that this is an inefficient method of delivery system and that the money should be

transferred from community clinics and back into the regular system of operation. I think I am entitled to point that out to the Saskatoon people as well.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think that when the PCs take this kind of a position, when he is trying to take the attack against the community clinics, I thought, Mr. Chairman, that we had solved this problem in Saskatchewan some time ago – the battle about community clinics – but obviously we haven't because not now is there one party against the clinics, the Liberals have now been joined by the PCs in their opposition as well. So I am very pleased that the minister has pointed this out. Do you want to offer that answer now?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the member asked a question. I don't know, having heard him speak a little while ago about inflation and about things of that kind. The other day he talked about increases of other services that hospitals must provide and he used some imaginary figure of 15 per cent. I don't know where he got the 15 per cent figure from, but it seemed to him I guess a good figure to throw out. He reaches up (and the Attorney General is demonstrating) and he sort of pulls it out of the sky. I watched a movie on TV the other day, "Ben Hur." There were kinds of things happening, some people were reaching up and pulling things out of the sky. Somehow the member opposite, although he is just about dated that far back in his attitude and his philosophy, seems to be using the same kind of approach.

Mr. Chairman, surely the Leader of the Conservative Party, with the application of some degree of knowledge of the business world that he obviously must have would know that from year one to year two there are certain costs that increase. He would know that the fee-for-service of doctors. So that would be a contributing factor in the increase of the funding provided to the community clinics. There have been a few new additional non-physician positions provided to the community clinics. That would have to necessitate an increase in funding. If the member wants for me to provide him with the specific additional positions that were approved and were provided, I can provide them for him. We don't have it right here, but by the time we get into SHSP by Monday, we'll be able to provide it for him.

The member should know that in every year there are salary increases of staff besides the medical fee increases that doctors have. That would necessitate an increase in the budget and money provided for community clinics. The member ought to know that just like there are in anything else in this world in these days, there are increases in costs of supplies. Now if he would use a little bit of his pencil work and his arithmetic and put that together, he will find that those are basically the reasons why there has been an increase in funding to community clinics in the same way as there has been an increase in the funding for our schools in the province of Saskatchewan, as there has been an increase in the funding in that same time to our hospitals in the province of Saskatchewan, as there has been an increase in funding to all kinds of other institutions as the University Hospital, which the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and I had a little discussion about. The whole thing gets back to the fundamental issue that is before us, Mr. Chairman. That fundamental issue is that the Conservative Party and particularly the Leader of the Conservative Party are out to get the community clinics. They are out to get any effort that a group of people joining together, forming a co-operation and doing something for themselves, try to do, they are out to get that. Because that seems to be their warped sort of definition of what private enterprise is all about. They talk about free and private enterprise. Well to them, you know what that means? Private

enterprise to them means that nobody should have any rights to join together as a group of people. To them private enterprise means that a group of people ought not to be able to join together and form a co-operative community clinic. That's not our impression of private enterprise. We have said in this party and we say as a government that there is room for a mix of those efforts. We support that and an example of that is our support of community clinics.

Mr. Collver: — That was another interesting dissertation, Mr. Chairman. Again, the minister refused to answer the question on why these increases have incurred. He says he will provide it some time next week and of course next week we will anticipate with eager enthusiasm his remarks and his answer to that question which was, in our judgment, a very important question.

Mr. Chairman, here is the point. The people of Saskatchewan, whether they live in Prince Albert or whether they live in Saskatoon or whether they live in Regina, want the best possible hospital and medical care system that money can buy. That's what they want, the best possible. Mr. Chairman, what they want is the most bang for their buck. What they want is to ensure that people who are ill can get into hospital. What they want is to ensure that medical doctors are available to them.

Mr. Cameron: — There are a lot of people prepared to . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Collver: — Well, the member for Regina South can say that but the people of Saskatchewan are paying dearly right now for a lot less than that, Mr. Member for Regina South. These are the facts. The fact is that what the people of Saskatchewan want is a return to common sense. They want, certainly they want community clinics if the community clinics can provide the service as economically as all the other providers of the service in the community and that's fair game. If the community clinics can provide the service at the same rate as everyone else the people of Saskatchewan in Prince Albert and in Saskatoon and in Regina will continue to attend those clinics. They will go there because the doctors are good, because the staff is nice and because they are getting good medical treatment. But what the people of Saskatchewan are not prepared to do is to pay extra for theoretical nonsense. What they are not prepared to do, Mr. Chairman, what they are not prepared to do is to pay extra for unaccountable services.

Now here's the point, Mr. Chairman, here's the point. The physicians who work for the community clinics are fine people and fine physicians but they are not paid on the same basis as the fee-for-service doctors. They are paid a lump sum to the clinic based on formulas outlined by the Minister of Health. But wait, that's what goes to the clinic, over and above that the minister's department line by line budgets out of SHSP that is a total sum of money also paid to the clinics. This money is then allocated in total by those community clinics and organizations by those doctors, to themselves as they see fit. And I know that the Minister of Health and especially now the Minister of Revenue, has a great understanding of what went on in Saskatoon last year and the year before that as it related to some differences that might have developed between some physicians associated with the clinic and the board of that particular clinic. I know the minister is aware of that, the Minister of Revenue, and I know the Minister of Health is aware of those kinds of problems and difficulties that are developing in this system because the Government of Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, refuses to accept even handed distribution of the province's money across the board, the way they should, common

sense across the board. If you think, for one minute, Mr. Attorney General, or Mr. Minister of Health that the people of Prince Albert who attend the community clinic there, or the people in Saskatoon who attend the community clinic in Saskatoon are prepared to say that the government should unload money on this place just so we can have this service, again to the detriment of everybody else, to the detriment of our hospital system, if you think they themselves are prepared to say that, you are mistaken. These people, as the Minister of Revenue will well state, those people want common sense in the provision of that service as well. They want common sense from the Government of Saskatchewan, they want common sense from the community clinics themselves. What they are looking for is to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that their particular kind of clinic works, that their particular kind of clinic operates well. The fact of the matter is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Attorney General is attempting to counter this particular statement because he knows very well that the people in the province of Saskatchewan are not prepared to go on indefinitely unloading their tax money and their hard earned tax money, as the Attorney General continues to suggest, on the government's theory – Oh not the clinics' theory – on the government's theory. Oh yes, we are going to take the people of Saskatchewan's money say the government, and we are going to expend this money on some basis that we dream up because a few people who are at the head of those organizations, are hard core in our political party, a few people – and they are going to lay on them a \$100,000 per doctor instead of the \$50,000 that is laid on the fee-for-service doctors in the rest of the province. And out of that, every doctor has got to pay his nurse, his receptionist and the cost of the office and so on. I just suggest to the Attorney General that when he goes back to Saskatoon . . .

Mr. Lane: — If.

Mr. Collver: — If – no, no, if he is going back Member for Qu'Appelle, he is going back for certain, so I hear.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Attorney General that maybe what he should be doing is taking out a membership in the Saskatoon Community Clinic . . .

Mr. Romanow: — I am a member.

Mr. Collver: — Well, then you must get the financial statement. If you get the financial statements then you know what went on last year and the year before that and the year before that. And you know yourself that the representatives of the people, of the people who are receiving the service, are sick to death of the kind of inefficiency that your government are perpetrating. And they were sick to death, the people themselves, were sick to death of the kind of accounting that your government is perpetrating. The point is they themselves believe in that concept. The people, the members, of the Saskatoon Community Clinic, the Regina Community Clinic, Prince Albert Community Clinic, believe in that concept themselves, but they do not expect from the Government of Saskatchewan special consideration. What they expect is the same kind of consideration for the same treatment, because they, themselves, are also taxpayers for the benefit of the Attorney General. They, themselves, realize that if they are to have the best possible medical care; if they are to have the best hospital system in the country and in fact in North America, the moneys have got to be allocated, not on the basis of political friendships, the moneys have to be allocated on the basis of reason, on the basis of common sense and on the basis that they can stand on their own feet and meet any other kind of competition in the province of Saskatchewan.

The people that I know, certainly in Prince Albert, who are members of the clinic, the

March 31, 1978

people in Saskatoon who are members of the clinic, believe just as strongly in common sense as does our party on this side of the House and does the party, I think, in this area to the right of me, but certainly not the party that you are representing on that side of the House. Because in no way would you reward a special group, when the services went down, as they did this year. The services go down and the costs go up. More than inflation. And only there, only there – only in that jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I will be most interested when this committee resumes again, I will be most interested to hear if the Minister of Health finally answers the question. Why?

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, before I move that the committee rise and report progress, I just simply want to say that the last time I heard this kind of speech was under the late Premier Ross Thatcher, 1969-70-71, the attack on tax. Lo and behold there is nothing new under the political sun.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:02 o'clock.