

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
6th day**

Thursday, February 13, 1964

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

LA RONGE FISHING PARADISE

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw to your attention and to the members of this assembly, the pamphlet which has been placed on your desk. As you are all aware, La Ronge is the newest fishing paradise in Canada and in the province of Saskatchewan, and if you will refer to the pictures in the brochure I am sure that they will bear out this claim to such a title.

This pamphlet was prepared by the newly formed La Ronge Outfitters Association in co-operation with Mr. Harvey Dryden, director of the Saskatchewan Travel Bureau. I would like at this time to take the opportunity on behalf of the association and the people of the area to thank the travel bureau for their assistance in the printing of this brochure.

I hope that all members of the legislature will make an effort to spend a holiday in the La Ronge area with their friends and with their families, for I can assure you that they will receive accommodation and service second to none in a natural setting whose beauty will overwhelm them.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to welcome a group of some fifty-odd pupils from the Lorne Hazleton School in Saskatoon, along with their teacher, Mr. Hibbert and Mr. McCaskey. I am sure all members will join with me in saying how delighted we are to have them with us and to hope their trip here will be a profitable and enjoyable one.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Michayluk for an Address in Reply.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate yesterday, I had congratulated the mover and the seconder of the address in reply, also the Honourable Premier, and I made some comments on the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, and some of the tactics of the opposition on the hustings. Now today there are other matters I wish to discuss. There are many announcements in the speech from the throne that I would like to talk about, but first I would like to say a word about my own constituency, the thriving city of Regina.

In 1963, Regina celebrated its diamond jubilee and what a wonderful year to celebrate our jubilee. It was a record breaking year on almost every front. Regina is one of the four fastest growing cities in Canada, and at the rate we are progressing, I think it bids fair to reach the top spot. Our population climbed to 122,000, up 45 hundred in one year. The tourist trade was up 25 per cent, which in spite of certain remarks from the opposition, is nothing to be sneezed at. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I had time to read the whole report of the Industrial Development Office, but if I did it would take almost all my time, so I just want to summarize a few highlights of happenings in Regina in the last little while.

In the last three years, Mr. Speaker, thirty-five new industrial plants, with an investment exceeding \$35,000,000, have located in and around Regina, and this does not include Kalium Chemicals, a \$40,000,000 investment. On top of this 40 local companies have undertaken major expansion. One of the newest and most promising announcements was the \$5,000,000 fertilizer plant to be built by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting, and this is just a first stage of a \$15,000,000 program they expect to carry out.

Nineteen sixty-three was a big year for construction industries. Some \$35,000,000 was invested. Twenty-five new apartment blocks were built with over 500 new suites.

There has been very keen competition for two valuable business sites: the old city hall site and Broad Street park. And again we see an investment in the offing of some \$18,000,000. Retail sales reached an all time high in our city. There has been rapid progress made on the first phase of Regina's new university building, a \$7,000,000 investment at this point, expected to be ready for 1,200 students in the fall of 1965. I am sure you will all see how much this development is going to mean to the city of Regina and our province, and I would remind the members that this has only been made possible by the generous and rapidly increasing grants given by our government to the university expansion fund.

There has been good progress, Mr. Speaker, in the Wascana Centre Project, which will make Regina one of the most beautiful and one of the most interesting cities in all of Canada, and I am sure that it will greatly increase the recreational and cultural opportunities not only for the people of Regina, but for the people of the province as a whole, and will make Regina a mecca for tourists.

So, Mr. Speaker, you may see that Regina is rapidly becoming an important industrial and distributing centre and what is equally important a major educational centre. The recommendations of the Agnew-Hartmann report are implemented, and the comprehensive medical centre concept that they are suggesting, means, if they are accepted, our city will progressively become one of the finest and most modern medical centres in the whole dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — Mr. Speaker, in all this growth and activity our CCF government has played a leading and decisive role.

Now does anybody want to suggest stagnation in Regina, or in Saskatchewan? May I refer to the headline in the Leader Post of February 6th, 1964:

Legislation to Spur Saskatchewan's Economic Boom

This talk of stagnation, Mr. Speaker, sounds pretty foolish, very unrealistic and absolutely unbelievable.

Now before I leave talking about Regina, there are two particular matters I would like to mention. First, I must mention our beautiful new Power Building. This building is a matter of great pride to Regina citizens and to every citizen of Saskatchewan who has an opportunity to see the building. And we have receiving praise and congratulations from hundreds of visitors from outside Saskatchewan. This building, as stated by the hon. Premier, not only provides a new skyline for Regina, but reveals a new sightline for our province. This building is very much a part of the fabric of Saskatchewan. It represents a great achievement of Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I say it is very much a part of the fabric of the city, and there was a very nice editorial in the Leader-Post and I am just going to quote a little bit of it about the Power Building. It says this:

To a remarkable degree this structure is a Saskatchewan product. It was designed by a Saskatchewan architect, Joseph Pettick of Regina, with engineering work being done by Regina firms, its steel frame was fabricated in Regina, and the vast quantity of cement used in concrete for the footings was made in Saskatchewan at the cement plant near Regina. The precast prestressed hollow core concrete slab flooring was made in Regina. The exterior brick comes from Estevan. The paint was made in Regina and except for some supervisory personnel, the workmen who assembled the multiplicity of materials are artisans who reside in Regina.

There is more of Saskatchewan in this splendid new structure than in any large commercial building erected up to now in our province.

So with the official opening celebrations, Regina will be acknowledging the acquisition of an attractive civic asset and the people of Saskatchewan generally – including the people of Regina – will pay tribute to their province and to themselves for this triumphal achievement which would not have been possible even a decade ago.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — Now the other thing I wish to mention is Interprovincial Steel. IPSCO as it is called is now the largest single employer in manufacturing in Saskatchewan. Ninety-three per cent of its shares held by Canadians. Thirty-eight per cent by Saskatchewan residents. They have a pay-roll of \$2,600,000, and in the past six years they will have paid \$8,450,000 in salary and wages, and its present level will accumulate \$2,600,000 in increments annually. Through the purchase of scrap steel, IPSCO has pumped \$6,622,000 into circulation, and the major portion of this into Saskatchewan. IPSCO is now well on its feet, and showing a healthy profit. It is a tremendous boost to Saskatchewan's economy.

I got these facts from a very excellent article in the Leader-Post but for some reason or other they forgot one very significant fact, and it is this – without the CCF government's very substantial financial assistance and guarantees, IPSCO would not be here today.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — Unquestionably, Mr. Speaker, the government did take a very sizable risk in the extent to which it backed this private enterprise. Was it worth it, certainly it was.

Now how much did the Liberals do to help this venture? As usual, tear down, try to destroy confidence, and attack the government for their assistance. But, Mr. Speaker, our CCF government had faith in this enterprise, and in the people who invested in it. The Liberals apparently didn't have that faith. Our government realized how important a basic steel industry like this was to the future economic welfare of Saskatchewan, and so our CCF government showed the courage and the enterprise to help put this industry on its feet. And again, I say, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have reason to bitterly regret their behavior in this situation.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — Turning now more directly to the speech from the throne, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this speech is further evidence that the energy and the vision and the courage of our CCF government has not diminished, and is as apparent today as it was in 1944. Even our worst enemies, Mr. Speaker, could never accuse us of being a do-nothing government. We've kept them so busy opposing all the good programs we have brought in that they couldn't call us a do-nothing government, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, in retrospect the Liberals bitterly regret the vocal opposition to the so many programs so successfully launched by this government. They wish they could be stricken from the records but unfortunately it is too late. The records are there – their remarks about our hospital program; our medical program; our museum; – our museum which is recognized as one of the finest in Canada which thousands of school children have visited. All the Liberals could say about this when it was being built was that it was a place for stuffed gophers. Such vision and such understanding of the purpose of our museum. I doubt very much if the people will forget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while there are many other things I would like to comment on, because of the limitations of time, I am going to concentrate on only one matter which I feel is of paramount importance.

I was pleased to note that in the speech from the throne, the announcement is made that there will be legislation to implement certain of the recommendations of the Woods Report at this session.

Now the nature of the proposed legislation is not yet disclosed, but it is my fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that the three major recommendations of that report, will be implemented.

Turning now to the Woods Report itself, the commissioner's recommendations are addressed to three groups – to the College of Physicians and Surgeons – to Hospital Boards and to the government.

To the College of Physicians and Surgeons what was said in effect is this: – By virtue of the Medical Professions Act, you have been given great powers; high on the list is the exclusive right to license and discipline physicians, and I quote:

But legal sanctions are sustained by public acceptance and confidence, such confidence is the most valued resource of any profession. Professional responsibility, however, is never completely encompassed in the provisions of a statute, the same degree of care and fairness is demanded in all matters. Confidence will only be maintained when it is made to appear that this standard is satisfied.

He reminds the, Mr. Speaker, of the pledges that were made and the documents that were signed by duly authorized officials of the College of Physicians in the Saskatoon Agreement. He refers specifically to section II, which provides “that there must be no discrimination against any doctors, in whatsoever way he practices and in particular, there must be no discrimination in the matter of hospital privileges” and I might also add in the matter of referral.

He includes in this report the following statement agreed to by the College and I quote:

It is no wish of the college that there should grow up divisions between physicians and it will exercise its full influence to prevent discrimination in matters of professional practice and accordingly, the college undertakes that in advising on applications for hospital appointments, applicants shall be judge solely on their merit.

Now he states further:

No profession would give such an undertaking, lightly. Accordingly the public is entitle to expect that leadership and direction will be provided within the profession itself to resolve the kind of problems that were anticipated when this undertaking was given.

Now he reminds them:

Those doctors who are not associated with community clinics are in the majority. They have control of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. They also control the medical staff, committees of the four hospitals involved in these hearings, and no doubt, in many others, they, therefore, have a heavy responsibility of sitting in judgment on those with whom they are in basic disagreement.

And he adds, I quote:

The responsibility that is on them is both onerous and obvious. The college should therefore undertake the leadership in securing the confidence of the community clinic doctors by frank discussions and clarification of all matters of difference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what action the college will take in response to these recommendations is something that only the college itself can decide. Certainly action along these lines I believe would be helpful. It would remove existing tensions and make for much better public relations and in the long run I believe, Mr. Speaker, bring a sense of relief and peace of mind to the medical profession as a whole.

However, Mr. Speaker, the recommendations referring to government action are separate and apart and in no way depend on any action which our college may or may not take, as a result of the advice given by the commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the three main recommendations that were directed to the government. One of the most important of these recommendations is that a permanent appeal board be set up to settle disputes regarding hospital privileges and that the decisions of this board should be final and binding on all parties concerned. He suggests that the chairman of the board should be a judge and that the majority of the members

should be doctors and that half the majority of the doctors should be appointed by the college.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this would make for a very representative and competent and knowledgeable body, and it should leave no question in anybody's mind as to the board's ability to settle disputes in an objective and capable manner. Recourse to this board would be available to all doctors who may feel aggrieved, whether they operate in community clinics, whether they send their bills directly to the medical care commission, re-route them through private agencies, or send them to the patients to reroute.

Complaints could be dealt with speedily, which is very important to all parties concerned, and a major cause of friction would be eliminated.

Now there have been objections from the college, and I believe the hospital board, to this recommendation. They oppose the setting up of any such board and they argue that if such a board is set up there should be an appeal from the appeal board.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the commissioner, a judge himself, does not recommend this, should have a great deal of weight with all the members of this legislature. By its very composition and specialized knowledge, such an appeal board would be in a better position to assess any particular situation and render an equitable decision than any other body. Further appeals would mean lengthy delays which would increase tension, and this is unsettling to all parties involved, and appeals might also involve expensive litigation for the hospital boards and for doctors seeking privileges.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is unnecessary and undesirable and in my opinion the Department of Public Health should proceed as rapidly as possible to set up an appeal board along the lines recommended by the Woods Report.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — The next recommendation deals with sponsorship. It is my understanding that very few hospitals do have a sponsorship bylaw, but the commissioner recommends that in hospitals where sponsorship bylaws are in existence, inability to find a sponsor should not bar a qualified doctor from obtaining hospital privileges and in such cases alternative methods of supervision should be provided.

Mr. Speaker, a study of the evidence revealed in the commission's hearings, makes the necessity and the urgency of this decision very clear.

Take the case of Dr. David Road of Regina as a good illustration. Dr. Road is a very highly qualified medical practitioner. Judge Wood reports that the competence of Dr. Road was never in question, but he was unable to find a sponsor and so was not eligible for hospital privileges. Now the evidence shows that the General Hospital Board in reviewing this case on March 26th, passed a resolution asking the medical staff to investigate and recommend, (notice – and recommend), an alternative method of supervision. This resolution was unacceptable to the medical staff and the vigor of their opposition and particularly the nature of their opposition caused the hospital board to back down and reaffirm their policy that sponsorship is a requirement for staff privileges. The report points out that in this case sponsorship was used as a means whereby individual staff members deferred the consideration of Dr. Road's application, and I quote:

It is the view of the commission that on the facts of Dr. Road's application, and the manner in which it was dealt with, the sponsorship bylaw did not serve a commendable purpose. It has in the past served to provide a satisfactory type of supervision, it should be restricted to this purpose and not used as a means whereby individual members of a medical staff make decisions that are the responsibility of the board. Alternative procedures should be available in such instances.

He also points out that if the board had decided to alter the sponsorship bylaw, they would have been faced with a hostile staff and I quote:

The board was in effect forced to agree that Dr. Road and Dr. Beaglehole were unethical or lose the support and co-operation of its chief medial advisers. It should not have been faced with these alternatives. Dealing with it as they did, the board of governors was in an invidious position. The medical staff dealt with it in a manner that compelled the board to do so.

The commissioner states that the question of ethics raised in the Regina hearing did not relate to patient care in the hospital. "It would appear to have no relationship to the ability to treat and care for patients in hospitals, it rose from philosophical and ideological differences." I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this evidence places responsibility squarely on the shoulders of this legislature, to pass the necessary legislation that would relieve hospital boards from again being placed in this invidious position, and prevent the sponsorships bylaw from being used for a purpose for which it was never intended.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — Spokesmen for the college and the hospital associations, have raised objections to such a measure, stating that it would interfere with local autonomy. In the case I have just dealt with, Mr. Speaker, local autonomy seems to have been pretty badly frustrated, to say the least. It would seem to me that implementation of this recommendation would prevent placing local hospitals boards in this position again, and to this extent at least, increase not decrease local economy.

The other recommendation is that when a doctor is refused hospital privileges, he should receive written reasons as soon as possible. Again, a study of the evidence reveals that this is a fair, reasonable, and necessary procedure. I haven't the time to mention the evidence on this point, but I do certainly agree with the recommendations. If a doctor received written reasons for refusal, it might prevent unnecessary and futile appeals to the appeal board. If the reason is given as some technicality in filling out an application or more information is needed, the applicants could rectify this immediately. If the reasons were lack of medical qualifications in some specific areas, the applicant would be in a position to judge whether or not he should appeal. But if a doctor is not made aware of the reasons for refusing his application, he's in an impossible position, and this, Mr. Speaker, was the situation in many cases that came up before the commission. Objections have been raised again, that written reasons might damage the applicant's medical reputation. However, the commissioner suggest that provisions could be made for hearings in camera and this should remove any such fear.

The other objection raised, is that written reasons might involve hospitals in litigation. Now I find it hard, Mr. Speaker, to understand the reasoning. Not being a lawyer I won't attempt to comment on this point except to say this: The commissioner, being a man well versed in the law, did not appear to have any such apprehensions when he included this recommendation in his report.

Mr. Speaker, Doctor Barootes, as spokesman for the college of Physicians and Surgeons, voiced strenuous objection to all three of these recommendations. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in Time Magazine, which I have here of July 5th, Doctor Barootes is quoted as saying, and I quote:

Our doctors have been very unfair to these English doctors. It is human, I guess to resent fresh competition.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in opposing any legislation that would provide these doctors with a fair opportunity to compete, Doctor Barootes is still being very human, but I would like to say to the College of Physicians and Surgeons and to Doctor Barootes, on whose behalf he is speaking, that they should realize that there are thousands of taxpayers in this province, who support our publicly owned hospitals and they are also very human, and they are justified in expecting that they should have equal rights with any other patients, regardless of who their chosen physician may be, and this means the rights of admission to the public hospital if their doctor so advises, the right to be treated in that hospital by the doctor of their choice, all this providing that he has the necessary qualifications, and I would add one more thing, the right of community clinic doctors to have fair allocation of available hospital beds. Also, Mr. Speaker, the public has the moral right to expect that an agreement to this effect, the Saskatoon Agreement, duly signed by the responsible authorities of the College of Physicians and Surgeons would be honoured by the members of that profession.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, in spite of certain difficulties that I've mentioned and which I hope will soon be a thing of the past, our medical care program has been successfully launched. It wasn't an easy task to launch this plan, we knew it wouldn't be. It took a great deal of faith and courage and determination on the part of the government, and we

have certainly appreciated and were strengthened throughout a very difficult and trying time by the constant loyal, and unswerving support of many of the Saskatchewan citizens who had faith and a vision of the benefits that a plan like this, could bring to our Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Cooper: — Our faith in the plan has now been fully justified, and every day we're receiving fresh evidence that the plan is being well accepted by the public, many of who admitted that they were fearful, some of who admit that they were active workers against the plan. They now agree that it is a good plan, and they regret their earlier efforts to block it and we do appreciate it when they tell us so. Mr. Speaker, a government that possessed less courage, would have backed down under stress, and there were some who did possess less courage, and who did back down, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the years to come the people of Canada will say to our CCF government, "Once more Saskatchewan, you have led the way and because you pioneered, we the people of Canada have followed in your footsteps along the trails you blazed."

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. D.A. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part this debate this afternoon, Sir, I will confine my remarks to two main items. First of all to the contents or lack of contents in the throne speech, and secondly, to comment on the criticism leveled at the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Thatcher) yesterday afternoon by the Premier in his speech on this debate.

For the benefit of my constituents I should like to say at this time, because I have agreed to share the radio time this afternoon with the member from Melville (Mr. J.W. Gardiner) it will be impossible for me to cover many of the problems of my constituency but I can assure them that these problems and these issues will be dealt with in a future debate before the end of this current session.

I cannot agree with the lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) who just sat down, when she got up to speak yesterday and called the speech by the Premier a magnificent effort, I believe that was the word she used to describe the speech of the Premier. However, I may be a little bit biased. I will agree, his delivery was quite good, his voice was loud and clear as usual, and I am sure that the contents of the speech that he delivered would have the desired effect on his NDP supporters out in radio land. In his usual vehement way, I should say, he spent most of his time attacking the Leader of the Opposition. He started off by spending at least five minutes arguing that the Leader of the Opposition hadn't spent enough time talking about the throne speech, or the contents of the throne speech. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the contents of the throne speech deserve just about the same amount or the percentage of time that the Leader of the Opposition spent on them. Because, Mr. Speaker, it was more the lack of contents of the throne speech that we are concerned with than what the throne speech contained. What deserves attention was the fact that it appeared to be more of a document of self praise than an outline of the government's intentions for the coming year. If it is an outline of government activities for the coming year, then I can only say it does not attack the basic problems facing the Saskatchewan people in 1964.

The Premier went to some considerable trouble to try to discredit claims of the Leader of the Opposition that we have lost opportunities for industrial expansion in this province. He even went to the trouble of quoting a former Liberal Premier of this province to try to prove that it was a shortage of forestry resources that prevented us from having a pulp mill in Saskatchewan. A former CCF Premier and some of the cabinet ministers who sit in the opposite side of the house today couldn't have thought that there was a shortage when they announced three or four different pulp mills in this province, Mr. Speaker. The member for Canora, (Hon. A.G. Kuziak) couldn't have thought that there was a shortage of forest resources when he made trips to New York to talk to the Swedish Pulp interests, I know that he must have gone down there with good intentions, but, Mr. Speaker, we still haven't seen the pulp mills, The Premier made mention of the meat packing industry, and how it had slipped at the end of the war. He doesn't need to tell us why the meat packing industry hasn't developed in Saskatchewan. You can't expect any processing industry to develop if you haven't at least a fairly large market for its product at home, and even the Premier must know this. We have failed to hold our population here in Saskatchewan, and that is the reason processing industries such as meat packing or vegetable canneries are not

established in this province. The Premier mentioned the figure of \$1,000,000,000 in agricultural production in Saskatchewan in 1964, and suggested the Leader of the Opposition thought that this was stagnation. May I comment, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we do not think our agricultural industry is stagnant, but the Premier of Saskatchewan's influence had nothing to do with the \$1,000,000,000 agricultural production that we enjoyed in 1963.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gallagher: — The elements of nature, and circumstances over which even the Premier of Saskatchewan has no control were responsible for our record agricultural production last year. He thought that he had really hit a tender spot when he tried to belittle the Leader of the Opposition for accusing the government of instituting many new taxes. He said naturally, and I believe this is where he started to quote from several old speeches that he had made in this before, he said:

Naturally, there were no schedule of fees for potash, because there was no potash mine. There were no oil burner fees, because there were no oil burners. There were no fees for technical schools, because there were no technical schools. There were no fees for air ambulance, because there was no air ambulance. No royalties needed on power poles, because there was no power.

Now I will be fair to the Premier, Mr. Speaker and admit that much of what he said in this connection was true, but let us start back at the beginning.

First with potash. I think even the Premier of Saskatchewan knows that twenty years ago, all three of the prairie provinces were predominantly agricultural provinces, and it has taken twenty years of a CCF government to get one major industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Now surely he doesn't give the NDP credit for inventing oil burners. May I remind him, that twenty years ago, Alberta had produced very little oil, and we're a long way behind them after twenty years of CCF progress in this province. The Premier mentioned that twenty years ago there were no air ambulance fees, because there was no air ambulance. Admittedly there was no air ambulance service twenty years ago. Transportation and communications changed rapidly in the century. But may I remind the Premier, and I will be fair enough to admit that this is a good service, that it is far from a free service provided by this government, from some of the reports that I have received from people who had occasion to use this service in the past. Then he mentioned that there was no need for royalty on power poles before 1944, because there was no power. Might I remind the people who sit to your right, that twenty years ago there was very few people in the province of Manitoba, who are neighbors of my constituents, who had power, and that twenty years later, they have power, the same as the people in my constituency, and they got it not with a CCF government and they got it without a CCF price tag. I was interested to note the other day, or some weeks ago, I believe it was, that the minister in charge of the Power Corporation suggested that there would be a decrease in power rates. Surely it was time. Electric rates in this province were 50 per cent higher than the province of Manitoba, and farm rates about 70 per cent before he started making his announcements, and he is going to try now before an election to buy some votes with a little reduction in power rates. I believe that the Premier mentioned something about the parks in Saskatchewan. We all agree, I am sure, that it is desirable to spend money on parks. He mentioned the hundreds and thousands of people who enjoy these parks. If my memory serves me correctly, he even mentioned the roads that are built into these parks. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of these parks lies immediately north of the constituency that I represent and many of the people from Yorkton and Canora use this park. A few years ago, a road was built from no. 9 highways into this park, a distance of some ten or eleven miles. Now, I believe this road was built with some very limited government assistance, and I might mention that this road lies within the boundaries of the Canora constituency. Now a request was made some two or three years ago, for a grant to build a part of a road leading west of this same park to no. 14 highway. This particular road less within my constituency, this was the road used by holiday parties from the Foam Lake and surrounding areas, and it is not only a road to the resort, but a main market road for the farmers around the village of Theodore, and the request for government assistance on this particular piece of road was turned down, Mr. Speaker, was turned down by our very generous friends of the CCF government of this province. I hope that when those same people come down to this city next week requesting the same kind of help that they were refused two or three years ago, that the big-hearted Premier will have some influence on the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Mineral Resources in seeing to it that these people get some help in building a road not only for the people who live within this

particular municipality to use, but a road that is being used by outsiders who are using these parks that the Premier was boasting about.

Now it has been suggested that members of the opposition and the Liberal Party must be opposed to spending money on education, because the throne speech indicated a new increase in school grants, and we're going to oppose this. We are opposed, Mr. Speaker, not to the expenditure of millions of dollars on education, but rather the loss of the students who leave this province after we have spent millions of dollars because they can't get jobs in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR

Mr. Gallagher: — I notice in the Premier's remarks that this theme has changed this year from one of togetherness in 1963, to priorities in 1964, and in winding up his remarks, he mentioned that the first priority of the NDP is people. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if people are their first priority, if the people of this province are their prime interest then they wouldn't keep exporting them to other provinces of Canada and into the United States of America.

May I now turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to a paragraph in the throne speech concerning rail line abandonment. This question greatly disturbs the rural people and the people of small communities all over this province, and I am especially concerned in view of the large percentage of CNR lines that are listed as slated for abandonment in the past few months in my particular part of the province, and at the outset may I say all of us should be vitally concerned with this problem, and it does not become this government or its supporters to try and place the blame for this abandonment, or these abandonment proposals, on the Liberal government in Ottawa. In a desperate attempt to try to gain back rural support in my constituency, NDP supporters are going around trying to sell the story that this is a Liberal plan. First of all we should remember that the recommendation to abandon uneconomic branch lines was made by the MacPherson Royal Commission on Transportation, and I am not at this time suggesting or insinuating that rail line abandonment is Conservative policy. The MacPherson Commission was, however, set up under the Diefenbaker government, to inquire into the whole field of railway transportation and one of the recommendations of this commission was to abandon some of the uneconomic branch lines in this province. Some rail lines we realize have always been uneconomic. However, because of policies followed by this government during the past twenty years, many more lines have become uneconomic. The continuing trend to centralization that has been fostered by the socialist government of this province has made ghost towns out of many of our small urban communities. All one has to do is drive through the streets of many of our small centres and count the numbers of stores, of warehouses, implement agencies, garages, banks or any other business establishments that have been locked up and the windows boarded and one will readily understand why the railroads are slated for abandonment in the province of Saskatchewan.

The policies instituted and followed by the government to your right, Mr. Speaker, policies that tend to centralize, policies that abandon our small communities, policies of big government in a few large urban centres, have contributed largely to a condition that makes rail lines uneconomic. Then, Mr. Speaker, to try and appear as the champions of these communities, the minister of propaganda launches a grand program to save the railroads for the people concerned. I am not criticizing at this moment the government for taking the initiative to set up railroad retention committees. This was not only desirable, but most appreciated. However, this government in its usual manner, has tried to use rail line abandonment as an issue to get back in the good graces of the rural people of Saskatchewan. The Department of Industry and Information, with its propaganda machine in motion, through press releases and radio and TV reports tried again and again to appear as the champion of the poor trodden Saskatchewan resident, taking his arm and helping him to save his railroad. let me say this, Mr. Speaker, the surest way to save many of our uneconomic branch rail lines in this province from abandonment is to defeat this government at the next election and reverse the trend to centralization and return many branch lines back to a position where they will be economic to operate in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gallagher: — I would like to turn for a moment to another subject. The speech from the throne has announced an increase in the minimum wage in this province. This announcement I welcome very much. The constituency of Yorkton, that I have the honor of representing, Mr. Speaker, is composed of many working people, in fact the majority of my constituency might be classed as laborers, and I am very proud, Sir, when I say that a majority of these working people supported me at the polls in the 1960 election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gallagher: — It is rather revolting, however, in fact down right disgusting, to hear speakers from the NDP stand in their places and suggest that I myself, or the Liberal party, are anti-labour, that we are opposed to any thing that is beneficial to the working people of this province. Mr. Speaker, it is no idle boast when I say that in 35 years, I am the first representative from my constituency, including the CCF representatives, from the Yorkton constituency who can truly claim to represent the working people of my seat. Most of my friends in the city of Yorkton are people who work for wages for a living and no NDP member of this house needs to tell me that they and they alone represent the thinking of working people in the province of Saskatchewan or in this country of Canada. Surely the results of the federal election last April should indicate which party represents labour in this country. Most of the industrial constituencies across Canada elected Liberal members of Parliament last April 8th. I would like to review just for a moment, just to refresh the memories of some of the people who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, some of the legislation that was passed by Liberal governments over the years as a help and protection for our working people. Liberal governments, provincial and federal, have enacted nearly all the legislation on our statute books for the safe-guarding of the rights and the welfare of working people across this country. Before 1944, there was a code of more than a dozen laws on the statute books of Saskatchewan placed there for the benefit of the workers. The following notes on a few of these provincial acts are — The first Workmen's Compensation Act was passed by a Saskatchewan Liberal government as early as 1910. This act made employers liable for compensation for accidents in certain industries, such compensation to be recoverable through the courts. The present Workmen's Compensation Act was enacted by a Liberal government in 1928. This greatly extended the application of the compensation provisions and set up a collective fund to which employers must contribute. A board was established to greatly simplify and speed up the awarding of compensation. The need to resort to courts was ended. From time to time Liberal governments amended this act to improve the machinery of administration and to make compensation more generous.

The First Trade Union Act was passed in 1938, again a Liberal government. It provided for collective bargaining and opposed penalties intimating union members. This was replaced by the Labor Relations Act in the first session of 1944. This enacted into law the provision of a dominion government Order-In-Council which had been endorsed by Canadian labor leaders. It contained all the provisions of the most up to date labor legislation. It provided for compulsory collective bargaining, certification of the bargaining agency elected by the majority of the employees concerned, prohibition of unfair practises, grievance procedures and conciliation machinery. This legislation was enacted in Saskatchewan after consultation with an approval of provincial trade union leaders. Back as early as 1907, and this will show some of the people who sit to your right the concern that the Liberals had for the working people of this province, as early as 1907, The Mechanics Lien Act was passed by a Liberal government to give the worker an automatic lien on the property on which he was working for the recovery of his wages and payment of materials used. In 1908, The Thresher Employees Act gave the worker a claim against his earnings by his employer. In 1913, The Workmens' Wages Act — in 1908, The Factory Act and The Gold Mining Industry Act, to provide the betterment of working conditions and for the safety and the welfare of the workers concerned. In 1918, The Employment Agency Act, to provide that no employment agency could charge fees for those seeking work. This ended the frequent abuse of persons seeking employment. Government employment agencies were established.

In 1930, and this was, I must give credit here to a Conservative government, The One Day Rest in Seven Act, provided that most employees in cities should have one day rest in each seven. In 1931, and this was another act passed by the conservative government, The Weekly Half Holiday Act. In 1937, The Minimum Wage Act. In 1937, The Industrial Standards Act, passed by a Liberal government. This act is for the purpose of confirming collective agreements concerning wages, hours and conditions of work, made between employers and employees, making such agreements enforceable by law. In 1939, The Trades Schools Regulations Act, providing regulations to protect from exploitation persons enrolling for training in private training schools. The Apprenticeship Act in 1944, the first session, contained provisions respecting the hours of work, the rates of pay and other matters vital to apprenticeship.

All the foregoing acts were passed by Liberal governments, Mr. Speaker, together they constituted a code of labor legislation so complete that the CCF government has been able to add very little to this. This legislation furnishes convincing proof of the abiding interest of the Liberal Party in the welfare of the working people of this province and this country.

Although labor matters are largely a matter of provincial government jurisdiction, federal Liberal governments have supplemented provincial laws with federal measures. The Dominion Department of Labour was set up as early as the year 1900. In more recent years, a program of grants to the provinces for building and operating vocational schools, for apprenticeship training and for the training for the unemployed. Grants to promote employment on municipal projects in winter months. Provisions that female employees received equal pay for equal work with men in employment, in any work in federal government works undertakings. Unemployment insurance was an act passed by the federal Liberal government of MacKenzie King as early as 1940. It required an amendment to the British North American Act to permit the dominion government to implement this measure. The act provides contributions from employees and employers and the government. Before the Diefenbaker government was elected, I might mention, a fund of about \$9000,000,000 had accumulated in the unemployment insurance fund. There was an extension of the winter works program of which the federal = pays 50 per cent. Legislation has been passed establishing a municipal development loan of \$400,000,000 to be used during the next three years to increase capital expenditures on municipal projects. These are very recent things that have been done by a federal Liberal government, headed by Prime Minister Pearson to help the working people of this country. Just recently a \$500 bonus is being paid to the first owner of each dwelling that is built during the 1963-64 winter months. The government will pay \$75 a month of the wages of each person of 45 years of age or over who is hired and has been unemployed for six months or more in the last nine months.

The manpower consultative service to develop employment security has been established. An Economic Council of Canada has been set up to keep track of industrial potential, to promote research and to supply information to governments and to private agencies. The Canada Development Corporation was established to further the development of the country's resources and industries. The Department of Industry has been established to promote and co-ordinate all activities concerned with industrial development.

Mr. Speaker, I said a few moments ago I welcomed the announcement of an increase in minimum wages. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the fact that so many people in this province have to work for minimum wages. I suggest that members who sit to your right should imagine themselves in the position of a Saskatchewan laborer, a married man with four or five children, trying to support them on minimum wages in this province. I can assure you, Sir, they will only have an existence, not a decent living, but still many people in this province, because of the insane planning of this socialist government, are either forced to raise their families on minimum wages, or take social aid to keep body and soul together. The true barometer to compare the status of the workers of this province with other provinces is a comparison of the average weekly earnings of people in this province with the provinces in the rest of Canada.

I have in front of me a chart showing that we are the second lowest, we have the second lowest average weekly earnings of any province west of the maritime provinces. Even the Liberal province of Quebec that my friend from Canora seems to like to compare Saskatchewan to has a higher average weekly earning for its many laborers than the province of Saskatchewan with its NDP government. The government of Saskatchewan has announced an increase in minimum wage at a time when its labor support has been slipping and slipping badly and fast. Your labor support started slipping first in the 1960 elections. At that time you lost three city constituencies – Yorkton, Estevan and Melville. Since then you have lost two more, you lost the constituency of Weyburn and Prince Albert. At the next election you will lose some more, Mr. Speaker,. Yes, you will lose some seats, if not all of the seats in the constituency of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gallagher: — I am proud, Sir, to have on our roster of candidates, men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brows, men like Ron Atchinson, the man who is going to be the next member for Regina north, and I believe that as long as we have men like Mr. Atchinson in the new Liberal government after the next election, the working people of this province don't need to worry about NDP propaganda, that the Liberal party is anti-labor or anti anything

else. Mr. Speaker, I hope to be a member of that new government, and I pledge myself to one thing – if the working people of Saskatchewan are no better off four years from now than they are under the NDP I will resign my seat in this house.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that I am using some of the radio time for the member from Melville. May I only say this before sitting down. Because the speech from the throne contains nothing that would seem to me to reverse the centralizing effect the government of Saskatchewan has had on the province of Saskatchewan – because there is no sign of relief from the burden of taxation on our people – because it promises nothing that will stop the exporting of our greatest resource, our men and our women from this province, I can not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — In rising to speak on the address of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, I would first like to take a moment or two to say a few words about those members of this legislature that have in the last few weeks announced their retirement from public life.

We have on this side of the house two of the veterans that are sitting with us in this house that have announced their intention of leaving politics, in the person of the member for Cannington and the member from Wilkie. Both members have not only their work in this house, but in their work on behalf of the people that they represent before they became members of this legislature, shown the interest that they had in the welfare of the people that they represent. For many years before entering this legislature, both these members had played a very active part in the municipal life in the areas they represent. I am certain that along with the Hon. Mr. Williams, the Minister of Labour in the provincial government, that we should pay tribute to all three for the service that they have rendered to the people of their particular constituencies, and to the province of Saskatchewan, as representatives in this legislative body.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — I would also like to add to that reference the other members as well that are going to leave our presence through retirement: Mr. Stone, the member for Saskatoon city; Mr. Klein, the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch; and Mrs. Batten, the member for Humboldt. It would be my hope that particularly the younger members that are in this house at the present time that have found it necessary, for one reason or another to retire from public life may find it possible to return to give service to the people of their communities, in perhaps other ways, and perhaps even in representation in this legislature in the future. So that to those younger members I would hope that we will not be saying farewell to them, that there might still be the possibility that in the future they might find it possible to return and take the active part that they have been taking in public life.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — I would just like to make one slight correction in the previous speaker's remarks to indicate to him that I believe Melville holds the record of being the first city to return to the ranks of the Liberal party in 1956, instead of 1960, so that one of the fortresses of labour in this province has been represented in this house since 1945 by a Liberal member. I can assure members in this house that they regard that I hold for the working people of our province is no less than my friend the member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), because I have come to know their problems over the past few years, because I have come to respect their desires and their wishes, because I have come to know that they as well as the farmers, and school teachers, the professional people and those of us that might be engaged in industry or business on our own behalf, they, as well as all others in this province, desire the best that we can provide for them as their representatives in this legislature. I say here today that it is in the responsibility of you and I, as members, to represent, to work for the interests, of all those that are in our constituencies, whether they be workers, or whether they be farmers, whether they be businessmen or whether they be professional men, whether they be women, and particularly for the young people and the children of the constituencies that we represent. We have a responsibility in this house to see to it that our efforts at all times are aimed at

providing the best that is possible to provide for the people of our province, and I hope that my friends on the other side of the house will consider, as they have not in the past, that every political party in this province is desirous of carrying on the government of this province in such a way that we can provide the best possible service to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

In the remarks of the Premier, in his attempt at answering the remarks of the previous day of the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier indicated as mentioned by the member for Yorkton, (Mr. Gallagher) that the Leader of the Opposition had failed to deal with the speech from the throne. Well, I am even going to differ with the member from Yorkton to an extent, in this case, because I feel that if you listened carefully to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in his address, that he did deal with, perhaps not mentioning the items specifically, but he did deal with every subject that was mentioned in the speech from the throne, and he did indicate to the people of Saskatchewan, as is his right, what the Liberal government would do, because after all what is the speech from the throne, except the document from the government which is supposed to indicate their approach to the problems of the day.

Surely the Premier does not think that the Leader of the Opposition has not the right in his turn to present the methods and means by which he best feels that these problems can be dealt with. But apparently the only thing that the Premier thinks the Leader of the Opposition should do, is either criticize or approve the actions of the government of the day. That is not the total responsibility of any opposition, and I think for years past of the addresses that have been made by members of the government, when they have criticized members of the opposition side of the house, for continually opposing, or continually tearing down, as the member for Regina mentioned this afternoon. Here when the Leader of the Opposition comes out with an address which is to build up, presenting the program of his party, then again the insults come from the other side of the house, that this wasn't the proper medium that he should be using. I want here, this afternoon, to pay tribute to the Leader of the Opposition. Because here is a man, who in the last four years has gathered about him the support of thousands of people of this province. Not only members of the Liberal party, because I think my friends sitting opposite and those of us sitting here, know that when it comes right down to the bare facts, that there are only a certain percentage of people that at any one time belong to any particular party, and therefore, that you and us must appeal to the rank and file, who are not active supporters of our party, our political party on this side of the house, or yours on that particular side of the house at the present time.

So I say here today that it is with a great deal of pride that I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for the address that he made. It is with a great deal of pride that I congratulate him on the fact that he is addressing himself and did address himself to all the people of the province of Saskatchewan, not only to members of the Liberal party.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — I have always considered it the right and the responsibility of those that are seeking the support of the electorate, to seek the support, if possible, of every elector in their constituencies. I know full well that everyone in my constituency is not going to be a supporter of the Liberal party. I know full well that every person in my constituency is not going to be a supporter of my own candidacy. I, at least, should present a program and a challenge to those individuals, not because they are Liberals, not because they are conservatives or Social Credit, or NDP, or whatever they might be, but because by providing a challenge, which will present a program to them and to all the voters, that they can support, they can get behind and help in forming a strong province, and a strong economy. So I say here this afternoon that the address of the Leader of the Opposition in this throne speech debate, was one that I think will present itself to the people of this province in a manner and in a light which will gain their support in the election which we expect will come this June.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — The idea of organized destruction of leading people in political life in this province — this has been the order of the day since Mr. Thatcher took office as Leader of the Liberal party in this province. It was carried on against previous leaders of the Liberal party by my friends that sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, since they have been in office in this province, and I want to say to them, that I think in the last few months, Mr.

Thatcher has gained the respect of all the people of this province for the manner in which he has accepted the abuse that has been heaped on him by those at one time with whom he served in the same political party. You know this is a rather odd fact, the Premier the other day was making reference to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had made reference to other political parties "people that live in glass houses, shouldn't throw rocks".

I don't have to look back very far in the political history of this province to find the day when my friends opposite were appealing to the same particular groups that they today accused the Leader of the Opposition of appealing to. I can remember the day when they supported and refused to run candidates in seats in this province in the hope of defeating the Liberal government, and one of those constituencies was my own, Melville . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . where they supported a Social Credit candidate in the 1938, and the man who in the next election sat as the CCF representative for Melville, acted as a policeman at the meeting of Mr. Aberhart that was held in Melville the night before the election, throwing the electors of Melville out of the hall when they dared to ask questions at that particular meeting in 1938. Six years later he was the candidate of the CCF party in the Melville constituency, and sat in this house for four years.

An. Hon. Member: — Did he go in?

Mr. Gardiner: — I also remember election night, 1944. Listening to the radio, and I mentioned this in the house before, and various elected members were speaking on that occasion thanking their voters for having elected them to office, and I can remember the former Attorney-General, Mr. Corman of Moose Jaw, when he was invited to address his electors, thanking them for electing him as the social Credit member for Moose Jaw . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — Yes, and my friends, that was just a few years after he had been the Social Credit candidate in the city of Moose Jaw, So when the Premier berates the Leader of the Opposition for his appeal to people of other political faiths, to support the Liberal party in this present election campaign – he makes fun of it – he forgets the fact that his own political party, not too many years ago, appealed to those same groups for support in order to defeat the Liberal party.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — Yes, and my friends say they are still doing it and of course they are, and they will use every means they possibly can to try to gain some of the votes of the other political parties, and I hope they do. That is their democratic right. That is also the democratic right of the Liberal party and their leader, to appeal to all the voters of Saskatchewan. I am going to say this: we are appealing in this election, not only to Conservatives and Social Creditors, but we are appealing to thousands of voters, all of those who have supported the CCF or NDP in past elections, who are leaving that party today and are going to bring about the defeat of the present government.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

An. Hon. Member: — Oh the Premier left. Scared him out of the house.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I desire to spend a few moments now dealing with the items that I think are of some interest in the present throne speech debate.

You will remember that in the remarks of the Premier in dealing with the address of the Leader of the Opposition, one of the first points raised by the Premier was the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had promised that he would not try to spend his way to victory in the next provincial election, and he indicated that Mr. Thatcher in his remarks to this legislature had left the impression that, at least with him, his promises that he made to the people of this province would mean the expenditure of some \$20,000,000. This was mentioned the first day. The next day he made reference to tens of millions, now I don't know which figure is correct, whether he even took the trouble to find out. But let us assume for argument purposes that the statement made by Mr. Thatcher, and the program that is

being presented to the people of this province today, were to cost \$20,000,000. I think all we need do is pick up the estimates of the last two years that have been presented to this legislature, along with the revenues that have been collected by this present government, to indicate to members in this house that the people of this province, that if those promises do amount to \$20,000,000 we are still short-changing the electors of this province. We can still grant the, not only the advantages that they should have, but the reduction in taxes that we have in years to come.

Why do I say that? I say that for reason of the last two budgets that have been presented, not the one for this year, but the previous two years. If we go to the year 1962-63, we find that the provincial treasurer budgeted for an expenditure of \$174,000,000. Actually in that particular year there were raised at the end of March 31st, 1963, a total of \$195,000,000 or an increase of \$21,000,000. In other words the estimate of the provincial treasurer in 1962-63 was just out by \$20,000,000.

During the session of last year we saw him quickly hide \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 of that budget by bringing in supplementary estimates. When he presented his budget for the present year, in spite of the fact that he had collected \$195,000,000 the previous year, he estimated expenditures of \$187,000,000 for this present year and he estimated revenues, remember this, he estimated revenues of \$187,000,000, after he knew he had collected in the present year \$194,000,000, and I don't think there is anyone in this house today that would be over-estimating if he predicted that at the end of the present budgetary year, that he will again have under-estimated at least to the extent of \$20,000,000 and maybe more. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the program that has been presented by this government in the last two years could have been extended by \$20,000,000 on each occasion. Twenty million dollars could have been used to provide for services for the people of this province in the year under review, not under supplementary estimates thought up quickly at the end of the year to hide the fact that they had taken more monies from the taxpayer than they should have.

So I think that if the promises of the Liberal party in its election campaign, and personally I doubt they would reach \$20,000,000, we are still under-estimating the potential revenues of the province of Saskatchewan at the present moment. I don't think there is any government in this province that should be in the position of under-estimating revenues and expenditures to the extent that the present government has done over the past two years.

I say to the people of Saskatchewan, that I am quite certain that the Liberal party under the leadership of the member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher) can provide a program to not only give new services to the people of this province but as well provide tax relief to every man in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — I wish to deal just a moment with some of the items in the speech from the throne. The one reason I desire to do that is this, that as you read this address one wonders why the Premier would want anyone in this house to bother discussing it. Because as was suggested by the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) it is very bare, it is very barren. There is nothing new about it. There is nothing challenging to the people of this province. In fact most of the suggested cures for the ailments that exist today, could have been written by this government twenty years ago and weren't. They are twenty years behind the times, as has been indicated, twenty years behind our neighboring provinces in development. No one is going to deny here, least of all myself, that there isn't development going on in the province of Saskatchewan at the present time. Of course there is. If there wasn't some there wouldn't be one of the members sitting opposite that would deserve to have one vote in the next election. Of course there is development going on in the province of Saskatchewan. There is not the development that our people should have expected over the last twenty years under a socialist government. Particularly after the bright promises that were made by my friends, many years ago in 1944.

There are people, of course, that keep their promises. That was one of their election slogans. I think the first one was "humanity first", and after they got into office they forgot pretty largely about humanity. It didn't matter whether you were without or with, you paid the same for most of the services that they provided to the people of this province. It didn't matter whether you were a person who earned \$2,000 a year or whether you earned \$50,000 a year, the cost for most of the services that have been provided by this government, have been the same to all, whether you are a "have" or a "have not".

Many of the services, Mr. Speaker, people have gone without just because of the fact they couldn't pay the piper's tune. Just because of the fact they couldn't pay for the services they so badly needed, they went without.

The Power Corporation is the worst example in this province of Saskatchewan. For those on the fringes of our urban communities have been refused power without paying high fees, while those that were in a certain line, an automatic line, drawn up by the Power Corporation, were provided power without cost. Those on the outskirts were charged anywhere up to \$400. Many of them couldn't afford it and many of them today are going without the services of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Is this "humanity first", my friends spoke of in 1944. Is this the "humanity first" that we were to have.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that people had gone to jail because they had not been able to pay their hospitalization payments in this province. The government cannot deny it. Is this "humanity first"? Is this the type of treatment they said they were going to give the people of this province in 1944.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle Wolseley): — Socialist humanity . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Let us read some of the socialist promises. Benefits of medical services available to all, without money and without price, a statement by Mr. Douglas. The CCF stands for free medical services for all. CCF program for Saskatchewan: — adequate medical, surgical, dental nursing, and hospital care without charge, a CCF pamphlet in the election of 1944. Medical, dental and hospital services irrespective of the person's ability to pay, this was the CCF pamphlet in 1944. Here is the one against any form of flat personal contribution, in other words, our hospital and medical cards which are in a reality a poll tax and as such largely mean a redistribution of the income of the needy among themselves.

These were the views of those who keep their promises twenty years ago in 1944, and what do we find at the present time, Mr. Speaker, with regard to health services in this province? We find that in spite of the fact that my friend the Provincial Treasurer, slouched in his seat, that my friend the Provincial Treasurer voted for and supported The Medical Insurance Act in 1944, he has just accomplished two small items over a period of twenty years. Just two of them. He hasn't accomplished them without charge to the individual as was promised by himself and others in 1944. He's carried them out only with the charging of excessive fees in many cases to the people of this province, for service that they were to receive free of charge in 1944, and so I say to the Provincial Treasurer, that when he boasts that his Premier, boasts about the fact that they reduced the hospital and medical tax in this last year by \$5,000,000. They have only gone a very small way in the direction of carrying out the promise made to the people of this province twenty long years ago. Of course, this action bears out one of the points that was brought forward by the opposition during the medicare discussion some two years ago, and that was the warning to the people of this province, that the government of -Saskatchewan would continue to use the health and welfare of the people of this province for political purposes, and of course, that is what they are doing with this reduction.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — This isn't the first time this has happened. This has happened before three previous elections in this province. Three times the government has carried out this action of reducing the payments for hospital and medical services immediately before an election. What happens when they are re-elected? The premiums go up again, the cost to the public goes up on every occasion, and I give this warning to the people today, that this government manages, which I know they're not going to, that if they are ever re-elected in this province, the medical care premiums will be raised immediately by the provincial government. You know it is quite odd that the Minister of Health, on the occasion of the announcement, and I think the Premier as well, indicated that the progress of medicare had provided them with the necessary money to reduce the premiums. Certainly after less than a year of operation, no one even with the brilliance of our Provincial Treasurer, can tell what such a program is going to cost. I'm quite certain that all the brains of all the economic advisers in this province could not tell this government what the eventual program is going to cost in order for them to relieve the taxpayers of the taxes because of the cost of the service. Even today, with the plan in operation two years, I don't think there is any government that could indicate what the total cost of the program would be in the future, and be able

to lay down a cost plan or a tax plan to carry that program forward.

I say the only reason, was in order to use it as an election bribe for the people of this province, and it wasn't done because of the careful study of the economic picture in relationship to medicare and hospitalization in the province of Saskatchewan. Of course, if the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier had wanted to be magnanimous to the people of this province, they could have found many other ways and means. They could have found many other avenues of providing money in order to reduce taxation in this province, but of course, there wouldn't have been the same political implication to giving the money to our municipal people, to provide advantages to their people and to reduce taxation in our municipalities. It wouldn't provide the people with the same implications that it was the government that had done it for them, and someone else might get the credit, and, of course, in every case, this government across the way has refused to give credit to any agency in this province, be it municipal government, be it the local school board or be it any form of local organization. This government has refused to give credit day in and day out to these organizations for their work and effort in this province since they've come to office and taken it unto themselves.

And so I say that in the field of medicare at the present time, as was indicated by the Leader of the Opposition, the stories and the remarks of the Premier, following that address, were ones that I didn't think would come from a man who is quoted as being such an honourable person by Maclean's Magazine only a few weeks ago. After listening to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, in his address, the Premier would try to say that it wasn't very convincing to him; in other words – that the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't carry out the pledges that were made and didn't believe in the plan that had been instituted in this province.

I don't think it was a fair statement for a person in the position of the Premier, to make on that particular occasion. I am going to say this, that the record of the party that sits to your left, Mr. Speaker, at this time, is clear, has been clear on medicare, even before the inception of the present government in this province, because of the fact that the present Provincial Treasurer sat in this legislature and passed the legislation to make it possible, and then he didn't have the courage, and his party didn't, to put it into effect and it is still on the statute books of this province today, the measure to provide all these services.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — I say that the record is clear. The position that we placed before the people in this province two years ago in this house was very clear to the people of this province and I have no fear of going before the electors in opposition to the Premier of this province and stating that the position of the Liberal party is clear and that we supported the medicare provisions that were presented to this house. The principle of prepaid medical services to the people of the province of Saskatchewan were supported completely. The administration of that plan, which would make it acceptable to all the people, not only to the practising profession but to those who were to receive the services, was the avenue which we asked the government to use to amend their bill. To see to it that it could receive the support of all of the people of this province, and had they done so, we would not have had the repercussions that took place in the summer of 1962. We would not have had the many difficulties that have come our way since that time, difficulties between friends, misunderstandings of all different types, that were completely unnecessary and were only made possible due to the actions of the government that sits to your right.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit with regard to medicare that the people of the province of Saskatchewan would have had exactly the same benefits that they are receiving today, but they would have had them in a sense of cooperation, they would have had them without the anxiety, without the difficulties that followed the actions of this government, if they had accepted the amendments proposed by the Liberal party when the original act was placed before this legislature.

The Premier in his address also referred to and dealt with the question of education, and I would here just like to make a brief reference to the grants that are to be provided by the government and have been mentioned in the speech from the throne. All of us realize that over the last two or three years, it has been almost absolutely necessary for the government of this province to grant at least \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 increase in school grants every year to maintain the position of our school boards, not to put them in the position of reducing taxes but to try to assist them so that they

don't have to increase taxes any further. In other words just retaining the increases that are necessary each year in the cost and operations of our schools, and I'm quite certain that the \$5,000,000 provided this year will again only take care of the immediate increases that will have to be paid by our school administration in this province in the next year and in many cases they won't even take care of the needed improvements in our schools. One reason I say that is this, that in the last week or two, many school boards have come in from various parts of the province for assistance for construction of their schools. I know we came in from the town of Lemberg — we are building a \$15,000 addition to our school as that particular point — the government told us that they would provide us with a grant of \$8,000. Well, surely we might have almost as well stayed at home, as bothering to go to the expense to come to Regina to get a measly contribution of \$8,000 from the Provincial Treasurer. You know you quite often hear government members speak about paying 40 per cent of the cost of the operation of our schools in Saskatchewan. This is a misnomer and it is a mistake. The government of this province in the last complete year under review paid only slightly more than 30 per cent of the cost of operations of our schools and do you know this year there is a change in the Department of Education report, that I noticed in reading it over last year. The change in the financial statements. Last year, the financial statement included the entire cost of operation of our schools, this year it has been cut down to the revenue account only and in the financial statement the capital costs of operation of our schools is not included. Of course, when you put the two of them together, you come to only one conclusion: the government of this province provided only approximately 30 per cent of the total cost of the operations of our schools last year, and I think for a government that in 1944 said they would accept the responsibilities for education that this is a shame and something which should not be allowed to continue in this province.

So I say that the program of the Liberal party as announced by our leader, and which will be presented in the coming months to the people of this province previous to the election, will provide a challenge, a challenge to our young people and a challenge to the parents of the children of this province, to provide education which will meet the needs of today, and also meet the needs of the future. The only way in which we can do that is to accept the greater share of the cost of the education that is being provided to the children of this province, and the Liberal party will do that. The Liberal party will carry out that pledge because we feel, and I think that this is the principle of the program laid down by the Liberal party at this time, that is we have a responsibility to the youth of our province to provide them with the opportunities which will enable them to go out into the world of tomorrow so that they can make a decent living wage for themselves and their families during their working years and be in a position to provide themselves with a good life when they can no longer work for themselves. I think that is the ambition and that is the aim of the Liberal program that was presented the other day to the people of this province by the Leader of the Opposition, and I think in the next few weeks that we will be providing to the people the balance of that program, along with the leadership of Mr. W.R. Thatcher, along with the men and women who have presented themselves to this province. When the election is held in June, I have no doubt of the result, I know that my friends across the way will no longer be here.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — There is only one other item I wish to deal with in closing my remarks this afternoon and that has to do with the balance of the throne speech debate.

There were three items that the Premier mentioned and that have been mentioned by other members opposite. They probably have had the opportunity or know what the various provisions are going to be in the legislation that is going to be placed before this house, so that they have an advantage not only on the Leader of the Opposition, but the members that sit on this side of the house. I can assure the Premier that as soon as he places the legislation of his government before this house it will be discussed and it will be fully discussed. When he comes to the members of this legislature with a throne speech with a couple of lines about a particular bill that he is going to present to this house and then accuses the opposition for not discussing it in full, then I don't think he realizes the importance of the position of this legislature. I don't think that any one of us without having the complete information that will be provided when the bill is brought down should be in the position of either criticizing or approving of the actions of this government.

I say that in those fields that the Premier accused the Leader of the Opposition of not dealing with, I believe he was taking the best possible

position, and when the Premier brings down these bills he will hear the opinions expressed by the members of this side of the house.

The final part of the speech of the throne dealt chiefly with federal provincial relationships, and I want to say here that in the last few months we've heard a great deal about these relationships. In the last few months, we have heard a great deal about problems that we have never heard of in the last twenty years, brought before the people of this province in an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail as far as the record of this government in this province is concerned. I don't think the people of Saskatchewan are going to stand by and allow the Premier of this province to draw that red herring across the trail again as he has attempted to do in the past, sometimes with a great deal of success, because of the fact that the people of Saskatchewan realize that it is this government after twenty years that has placed it in the position that it finds itself in today, and no one else. There is no one else in Saskatchewan that must accept the blame for the position this province finds itself in today, whether it is in regard to the Dominion Provincial Conferences, whether it is in regard to the rail abandonment policies that are presently being discussed in this country or whether it is in regard to the other issues in relationship to dominion provincial affairs.

You know that when you came into office and shortly before, we had influence in the federal house, in Ottawa, at that time we were still the third largest province in Canada in population. We had the third largest representation at that time in the House of Commons at Ottawa, when we were a voice to be reckoned with. Where are we now since you have been in office for twenty years? We are now in a position where we could possibly be down to a representation of 13 members out of 265 in the House of Commons instead of 21 out of 245 when the socialists came into office.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — That is the position we find ourselves in and yet the Premier would accuse others of being responsible for the fact that Saskatchewan hasn't the proper voice in the affairs of our country, and the voice he thinks we should have. In 1944, we were ahead of both Alberta and B.C. and Manitoba in population. Today we are not ahead of any of them. We are behind them all in the present year, not the last census when we were still 4,000 ahead of Manitoba. But I'm quite certain, that if the census were to be taken this very day we would find that Manitoba has surpassed the province of Saskatchewan in population.

Is this the great record? Is this the progress that the Premier spoke of in his address? Is this the progress that the lady member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) spoke of in her address? Surely if we had the programs, if we would have had the advances in industry, if we have had the advantages that had been enjoyed by other provinces during the last twenty years, surely our population would be at least equal to and should be ahead even of the province of British Columbia.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — I want to say to the Premier, that when he tries to draw red herrings at every point, he will have citizens of this province getting up and pointing their finger at him, at members of his government and members of his party asking "Where have you been for the last twenty years?" Where is the influence of Saskatchewan gone?" It has gone the way most of our brothers and sisters have gone, it has gone the way many of our parents have gone, gone the way of many of the people, as the Premier calls them, the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Surely, if the people thought this government had their well-being so much in mind, surely the people wouldn't have deserted the province of Saskatchewan. Did you know that within the last ten years we have had a natural birth increase of 172,000 people? In that same period of time we have lost almost 100,000, a net decrease of almost 100,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan, with a growth increase in the birth rate of 172,000 people. Surely that isn't a record that any government can be proud of, in the province of Saskatchewan or any place else.

I may here this afternoon about the remarks the Premier made in attempting to defend the actions of his government that it doesn't matter what he has to say about industrial production, it doesn't matter what he has to say about the smoke stacks, it doesn't matter what my friend from Regina has to say about the Wascana Centre — the truth of the matter is, that the people in this province have left in droves, they are not returning,

and we weren't even able to persuade the boys when they came back from the forces in 1945 to return here to the province of Saskatchewan because of the actions and the activities of the present government that we have sitting to your right.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Gardiner: — So I say I cannot find solutions to the problems of the future in this speech from the throne. I cannot even find the solution of the problems that face you and I in this province at the present time. I can't find a solution to the problems facing our school trustees throughout the province of Saskatchewan. I can't find an answer to the problems facing our municipal people in this province, and I can't definitely find an answer to the problems facing our young people, who must be provided with a challenge, who must be provided with the advantages that they can receive elsewhere in the dominion of Canada. I am quite certain that they will want to stay at home because that is where our young people would like to be, right here in the province of Saskatchewan. I am quite certain that with my remarks I have indicated that I could not under any circumstances support his address that has been presented to us the His Honour the Lieutenant Governor R.J. Hanbidge on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, I cannot accept it because of the fact that it does not provide a solution to the problems of our people.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me at this time to take part in the debate at a time when Saskatchewan approaches its diamond jubilee year and Canada is at the same time looking forward to her centennial celebration in the near future.

Across the country, activity is being shown, there is a good deal of emphasis being placed on progress and on advancements in the cultural, the economic, and the social life of Canadians. In this context, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Saskatchewan has played a leading role which was expressed in a very capable manner by the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the speech of the throne.

Developments in the petroleum industry, in potash and manufacturing and an all time high in retail sales which has been reinforced by the second fine crop in two years, is evident to all, I believe, except those who are inclined to be blinded by political bias. So I wish at this time, Mr. Speaker, to express my sincere congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply for a very factual and a very concise job in this connection.

In relation to the growth and development that I have just made reference to, my own constituency which is represented by myself and the Hon. Minister of Public Works (W.G. Davies) has enjoyed the benefit of this buoyancy and expansion. Unemployment in the city of Moose Jaw has shown a marked decline over the seasonal average of previous years, with the new potash development directly east of Moose Jaw assisting a great deal in this respect. Moose Jaw's license inspector reports that 36 new businesses were added to the roster during the last year, 1963. WE have enjoyed a steady growth. It has not been spectacular as was that of Regina and Saskatoon, however, who, all members know, have joined Calgary and Edmonton as two of the four fastest growing cities in the whole of Canada.

A number of new endeavors, Mr. Speaker, have stimulated the interest and the imagination of the people of Moose Jaw and district residents, and I would like to comment very briefly on two of them this afternoon.

The development of the Buffalo Pound Provincial Park has proceeded on schedule and people from all over the province are enjoying the facilities that are provided there.

The addition of the winter recreation area that I made mention of in the throne speech debate last year is also contributing a great deal to the enjoyment of people, not only from Moose Jaw and Regina and surrounding districts but from people from all over the province. Since speaking on this debate last year, a snow making machine has been installed and a T bar lift, which is presently providing facilities for skiers from all over the province, and with these facilities being offered, it has made this a first rate winter sports area.

In addition to the skiing facilities, there have also been arrangements made for skating and tobogganing and I suggest that this completes the picture and makes this an ideal family recreational area that we are all extremely pleased with.

The announcement of the provision of a special grant for a provincial zoo in the city of Moose Jaw in connection with the centennial project is also being accepted with a great deal of enthusiasm throughout my constituency and elsewhere. A number of local people and organizations have brought forth imaginative suggestions for the reincarnation of a prairie main street in connection with the provincial zoo. It is intended that this prairie western main street will consist of a general store, an old harness shop, the notary public office, a church, a railway station with an authentic steam locomotive, and I suggest that with the addition of this western main street in connection with the provincial zoo, and the improvement of the nucleus we now have in the form of the Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park, this will provide Saskatchewan with one of her primary tourist attractions and I would like to invite all members to join with the tens and thousands I am sure will want to visit it upon its completion in time for our centennial celebration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne has been covered in an extremely adequate fashion by all those members who have spoken so far – the mover and the seconder, the Premier and the honorable lady member for Regina. I question whether there is a great deal that can be added at this stage, without being accused of being repetitious. I do, however, want to direct a few remarks to a feature that was mentioned in the speech from the throne, in connection with the continued attention by this government to one of the aspects of government which I believe most people will agree has been given a good deal of attention over the past two decades. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the attentions to the aspect of government which we refer to as the humanitarian aspect, for the needs of people, for their physical needs, irrespective of their ability to pay, and I suggest the programs that have been initiated by this government have gone a long way in this direction in providing security for people, irrespective of their financial circumstances and preservation of that feeling of dignity and self-respect at the same time.

So it is about this aspect of government that I wish to deal with for a short while this afternoon. I believe that most people will agree that this is one of the responsibilities that governments must be obliged to acknowledge.

So without wishing to be redundant, Mr. Speaker, I intend for a few minutes this afternoon, to count some of the ways in which Saskatchewan people over the past number of years have been assisted and allowed by joint efforts to help themselves, and at the same time be spared the humiliation of being treated as second-class citizens.

Health care, I believe, Mr. Speaker, must be regarded as the first consideration of any responsible government, for without the necessary emphasis on these programs, often educational opportunities and employment opportunities have very little meaning. Sickness is peculiar, of course, to no age group or segment of society, it strikes the rich and the poor, without regard to their ability to pay. So in 1947, I believe Saskatchewan residents acquired a new freedom, the freedom from fear in respect to hospital bills, and since that time Saskatchewan residents have not been obliged to wait in the corridor of hospitals while the officials of the hospital managed to contact municipal officials in order to determine whether they would accept responsibility for the payment of this service.

Now, 18 months ago, Mr. Speaker, after considerable furor, a new aspect of health care was begun in Saskatchewan. It was a step which caused health authorities elsewhere to remark that Saskatchewan had reached the “highwater mark” in the care of the sick. It was a step, Mr. Speaker, which set the wheels in motion for comprehensive, prepaid medical care for the whole of Canada.

Dedicated leadership, and a sincere desire by this government to provide medical care without discrimination made this possible, and we who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, are justifiably proud of this event.

In recent years, the record of Saskatchewan in the field of mental health has been unique and it has been studied by others who regard it as the most advanced on the continent in terms of treatment and discharge of patients back to their community to live normal productive lives, and I believe that the success of Saskatchewan’s mental health program, can be attributed in the main to three particular features.

First – to the provision of large sums of money to provide the necessary facilities.

Secondly – and perhaps this is the feature that should have been mentioned first, to the dedication and the sincerity of those people who have chosen this field for their life's work, and

Thirdly – to the fact that Saskatchewan spends more dollars on research than all the other Canadian provinces combined.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snyder: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a program that cannot be measured in terms of dollars spent, or in terms of numbers of patients treated. The anguish and the frustration which is suffered by families who are charged with the responsibility of caring for a mentally ill or a retarded relative is impossible to measure. In recent months I have been close contact with a number of families who have had retarded children admitted to the Moose Jaw Training School, a number of them on a part-time basis. To these parents, Mr. Speaker, this has represented to them a new lease on life. It has represented an opportunity for them to live fairly normal lives. Unlike some other provinces, Mr. Speaker, members are well aware of the fact that this service is provided out of general revenues, out of tax sources, and provides no additional burden upon the people who find it necessary to seek this service.

Saskatchewan's welfare programs, I believe, Mr. Speaker, need a few words of comment by myself this afternoon. Saskatchewan's welfare programs involve something over 60 thousand people in the province of Saskatchewan for whom the province assumes either whole or partial financial responsibility. This group includes the aged, the blind, disable persons, dependent families who lack the support of a father, those on social aid and wards of the government. In this general category I want to mention this afternoon a specific group – those that we refer to as our senior citizens. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has a senior citizens' care program of which we are entitled to be proud, with well over 4,000 being accommodated in modern housing and nursing homes, which have been built by municipal or by church and charitable organizations with government assistance. Around 700 others are accommodated in provincial geriatric centres, and for this age group I think it is reasonable to expect that I should remind all members that Saskatchewan led the way in the provision of supplemental allowance for those people over 70 years of age, and pays out in excess of \$2,000,000 annually to this particular program.

Old-Age Assistance for those between the ages of 65-69 is another program, which is a further indication of the assistance offered to those in need and I suggest it indicates and reflects the sensitivity of the present government to the needs of the unfortunate who are unable to provide for themselves a minimum standard of living.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that recipients of any kind of public assistance, be it on a municipal or the provincial level, are entitled to have their business conducted in a confidential manner – to have it handled discreetly and whenever possible without the knowledge of third parties.

The Department of Social Welfare and their employees are to be commended on the manner in which they conduct their work. I have had a good deal of contact with them in recent years.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I direct my remarks both to the government and to members who sit opposite, that when it is necessary for a social worker to visit a client, that that recipient of social welfare deserves the courtesy of being called upon in an unmarked government car. A department insignia on the door of a social worker's automobile would serve only to notify neighbors that the person in question was obliged to seek public assistance, and it is to be hoped the government will continue to resist efforts by the opposition to have recipients of public assistance identified in this manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the few instances that I have mentioned, for the examples that I have mentioned here today, and many more that time will not permit me to deal with, I know that the people of this province will commend the government of Saskatchewan for this aspect of government which is such a vital aspect in a complex and a changing world.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, when the opportunity presents itself, the people of Saskatchewan will indicate their approval for a government which has earned the right to be referred to as a "humanity first" government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on November 11th last I had the opportunity to listen to a television broadcast which bore the caption "The Winds of Change". It was a television broadcast by the Leader of the Opposition and I was rather interested and encouraged by the advance newspaper advertising that was carried in the Moose Jaw Times Herald. I listened in the hope that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition had suddenly become aware of the fact that he was indeed living in a changing world. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the television audience was then exposed to a repetition of Liberal reaction, which has become the trademark of that political party in this province.

Once again the Leader of the Opposition invited members of all political stripes to join with him in his efforts to defeat the CCF-NDP government in Saskatchewan. Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that the "winds of change" are blowing. The "winds of change" are blowing across the entire earth. Only a short while ago Prime Minister Nehru of India announced that he intended to establish a democratic socialist administration in that country, in order to provide for his people a greater degree of equality and social justice. This decision was made, I suggest in recognition of the failure of the present economic system there. These "winds of change" were referred to also, Mr. Speaker, by Primer Minister McMillan of Great Britain, and he made reference to the fact that these "winds of change" were blowing across the entire earth.

I thought in connection with the remarks made by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) last night that what I am about to say is indeed appropriate, and I congratulate him for his remarks made to the gathering of students in the Dome cafeteria last night. It was one of the most perceptive speeches that I have had the opportunity of listening to from a member of the opposition. I would indeed like to congratulate him if he were in his seat.

I want to re-inforce the view that he expressed last night by extending to him also the suggestion that these "winds of change" are particularly strong in those countries where mining interests, where fruit, oil and sugar companies, monopolize the wealth of these underdeveloped countries and leave the majority of the population in destitution and poverty.

Today, Mr. Speaker, millions of people are in revolt against conditions which have long been intolerable in these underdeveloped countries. These "winds of change" are changing old colonial empires into newly emerging nations which are struggling for self-determination and independence in every sense of the word.

Nearer to home, Mr. Speaker, it is being recognized by more and more people, that there is a definite connection between the enormous profits made by large corporations and the load of public and private debt which must be borne by the Canadian taxpayer. I suggest to you that it is a relatively simple matter then to equate this burden with the excessive profits with waste, with planned obsolescence, with untrue, expensive, misleading advertising, and with the industrial combines that have been very prominent in the news in recent months.

Now, it has been said, Mr. Speaker, that there are none so blind as those who refuse to see. Rather than recognize a problem and apply an obvious remedy, there are those who would prefer to perpetuate the waste and the debt, and scream socialism at any time when any service is provided to our people at cost.

The Western Producer of November 1st, carried an editorial "Pump Priming on a Grand Scale". It is an editorial which dealt with the unemployment problem which is facing an out-dated economic system in a day of automation and abundance.

Gerald Piel who was the former science editor of "Life" magazine was quoted in this editorial as saying this and I quote one brief paragraph, Mr. Speaker:

During the past twenty-five years our technology entered upon an era of automatic production. The real work of extracting nature's bounty from the soil and rock and transforming it into goods, is no longer done by human muscles and less and less by human nervous systems. It is done by mechanical energy, by chemicals, by machines under the control of artificial systems. Mention of unemployment brings us back to economics. The most critical problem confronting our economic system is the insidious growth of unemployment. With each ripple in the business

cycle the number of workers left high and dry on the beach has increased. Our economic system and our economics are confounded by abundance because they have their roots in the history of scarcity that lies back in the time beyond industrial revolution. That revolution has come suddenly to fulfillment in our time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, within the confines of the authority vested in the provincial government, I suggest that in Saskatchewan sufficient public ownership has been established to act as a cushion against some of the inherent results of a system that thrives on scarcity and breeds unemployment. I think statistics help reinforce my point. I think members are well aware of the fact that in the province of Saskatchewan total percentage of the unemployed labor force is presently less than one per cent, I believe it is .9. The Canadian average is somewhat larger, about four times that of Saskatchewan, and in effect, Mr. Speaker, 98.2 per cent of all unemployed people are to be found in the other nine provinces in Canada. In addition, Mr. Speaker, over the past two decades in Saskatchewan, the value of community ownership has also been recognized, and for this reason the co-operative movement has enjoyed the assistance in a variety of ways and has prospered, in part as a result of the assistance offered to it by the department which was set up for that particular purpose. The co-operative movement has been encouraged and has provided for the people of Saskatchewan a greater degree of self-determination.

The inability of other jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker, to deal with some of our more serious problems has been recognized by this government in the provision of various public services including the health and welfare benefits which I mentioned just a short while ago.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the "winds of change" are blowing. Unfortunately with this movement taking place the Leader of the Opposition and a large number of his followers have preferred to remain stationary. With the introduction of prepaid medical care this service was provided to our people at cost, the attitude of the opposition seems to have been that a citizen made a more attractive, a more acceptable kind of a patient if he was insured with a private agency at a profit.

The Times Herald of April 30th, 1960, reported a speech made by the Leader of the Opposition before a public meeting in North Battleford, and at that time the Leader of the Opposition was quoted as having said this and I quote:

A Liberal government would have prepaid care under the M.S.I. or other such plan.

This he said would cost about a third as much as the government's proposed plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition as the official spokesman for the Liberal Party has thus stated his position in connection with medical care and this cannot now, I suggest, be concealed under the vague generalities that he has presented to this house and on the hustings. His conclusions are also at variance with the facts. In this connection it should be borne in mind that Alberta has introduced a prepaid medical care plan, if we wish to refer to it as such, along the lines suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. The cost of Alberta's plan is estimated at \$55,000,000 or \$41 per capita while the cost of Saskatchewan's plan, as members well know, stands at \$21,000,000 or \$23 per capita.

Now, the statement, Mr. Speaker, that a private plan would cost a third as much as the government's proposed plan represents an error so glaring that I think the most charitable thing that might be said about it is that the Leader of the Opposition had done his homework. I think that this should be remembered in appraising future statements emanating from the same source.

Now, throughout Canada, Mr. Speaker, and in parts of the United States also, the value of public ownership in a number of fields has been widely recognized. When the Premier of British Columbia nationalized the B.C. Electric, he declared that he was doing this in the interests of all the people of British Columbia. Premier Lesage of Quebec took the same action some time later and expressed somewhat the same feelings.

A comparison of typical monthly electrical bills at the Tennessee Valley Authority basic rate with average bills prevailing in United States cities of over 50,000 population makes the point clear that publicly owned power is superior to privately owned power, I believe. I intend to give you three comparisons only, residential, commercial and industrial rates.

Now here are a few comparisons for 500 kilowatts, \$6.90 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, \$10.35 from a private company. Commercial rates show a disparity also, 1,500 kilowatts cost \$22.80 with the Tennessee Valley Authority, \$52.00 from a private company. Industrial rates too, Mr. Speaker, make an interesting comparison with 200,000 kilowatts costing \$1,810 the Tennessee Valley Authority, and \$3,235 with a private company. I am sure that all members are aware that the Tennessee Valley Authority is a publicly owned utility, established in the United States some thirty years ago, and I think that the figures that I have just presented, Mr. Speaker, tell a story in themselves. I think that they show that publicly owned power systems which do not need to pay dividends on watered stock are able to provide more attractive rates to industrial, residential and commercial consumers.

It should be remembered that the Alberta Liberals at their pre-election convention decided on a policy of public ownership of power in that province. The provincial party leader, Dave Hunter, who was instrumental in bringing this resolution before the convention was quoted in the Western Producer of November 29th, 1962, as claiming that this was the greatest new idea in Alberta Liberal history!! The greatest new idea in Alberta Liberal history, Mr. Speaker!! Now it is quite apparent, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the more enlightened, the more thoughtful, and the more progressive elements in the old parties are finally abandoning the traditional beliefs and the positions held by some of the political dinosaurs in their own parties.

Further evidence, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the "winds of change" have found the Leader of the Opposition and some of his cohorts in a rather stationary position, is this constant charge that we have heard in this house a number of times in respect to stagnation and unsatisfactory population growth. This is an old record, Mr. Speaker, that has been played for so long that it has become so badly cracked and out of tune that it can hardly be expected to attract an audience any longer. I think it would be presumptuous of me, however, to expect anything I might say, or any facts that might be presented to members opposite, would put a stop to the efforts of Liberal politicians in their efforts to degrade a province that has done so remarkably well since ridding itself of a Liberal government some twenty years ago.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, there are certain facts, however, that must be taken into consideration involving geography, location and climate.

To attract new industry one of the prime essentials is an abundance of cheap power and it is to be expected that Saskatchewan's position would have been better yet if the previous federal Liberal government had not declined over the years to assist in the building of the South Saskatchewan Dam, declaring election after election that this was not in the national interest. Now Saskatchewan, as all members are aware, is at a disadvantage in respect to transportation costs to markets and tariffs, compared to the other prairie provinces and I think the Stanford Research Institute in its report of December, 1959, made this clear and I would like to quote one paragraph:

The producers and consumers in Saskatchewan are farther from the markets in which they buy and sell than any other province. The industries that use prairie natural resources as their raw materials and whose operations require a production scale considerably beyond the possible consumption of the prairie region and must, therefore, seek markets in eastern Canada, British Columbia and the United States and overseas, are obviously handicapped in reaching their markets by tariff and transportation barriers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, opposition members are fully aware of these facts, but rather than acknowledge them they prefer to race about the hustings crying stagnation and lack of population growth.

Now, under these circumstances, I think it should be permissible to make a realistic comparison in spite of the fact that in his throne speech address, the Leader of the Opposition pooh-poohed the idea that North Dakota should even be considered in comparison with Saskatchewan. I think we should note that North Dakota has a similar geographic location, it has a similar climate also, but it does have the advantage of not having a tariff barrier between that state and the great American market to the South. Now members are aware that between 1951 and 1961, Saskatchewan's population grew from 831,928 to 925,181, or an increase of 11.2 per cent, meanwhile during the approximate same period in North Dakota the population increased from 691,636

to 632,446 or an increase of only two per cent. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this was the great industrial area that I believe was visited by the Leader of the Opposition just a few short years ago, and according to reports he got so much smoke in his eyes and he ran into so many tall chimneys that could scarcely find his way around.

It has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that a good novelist requires great powers of imagination. I do suggest that it would not be asking too much to expect members opposite to recognize certain unmistakable facts. Much of what they criticize today is a result of positions that they and their colleagues took in the past and continue to hold to this day. The present federal government and its predecessors must accept some responsibility for population losses which provincial Liberals seem to complain about with amazing regularity.

A cover article in Macleans magazine of July 27th, 1963, bears the caption: "Three and quarter million Canadians in the United States of America". Now this article states that among the three and a quarter million Canadians now living in the United States are included scientists, writers, the famous and the men behind the famous. Together, this article suggests, they are the largest and quite likely the brainiest group of immigrants that the United States has ever had. To quote just a paragraph from Macleans magazine:

This year (that was 1963) between forty-five and fifty thousand Canadians, that is around 130 a day, will pack their bags and move to the United States. What is new is the increasingly high proportion of immigrants who are the kind of citizens that Canada can least afford to lose. University teachers, doctors and trained businessmen. These people are leaving Canada in greater numbers than ever before.

An editorial in the same issue of Macleans stated that this year, (that was 1963 again) "1,200 scientists and engineers will leave Canada for the United States. At least 4,000 more practioners will go with them."

Now I think it should be hardly necessary, Mr. Speaker, to remind members opposite that since Confederation, Canada has not had a socialist government, they have always been capitalistic to the core, so it cannot be said that these 50,000 Canadians said to have left Canada last year were fleeing from socialist tyranny. It is only when we come to Saskatchewan that we are expected to take seriously the crocodile tears and the childish nightmares that seem to overwhelm members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan housewife who watched and listened to that "winds of change" broadcast on November 11th last, may be inclined to be a little wary when she is asked to help consolidate the free enterprise vote for the provincial Liberals. For, in her efforts in recent months to keep within the confines of her household budget, she has experienced considerable difficulty because of the exorbitant rise of one of the basic commodities which she must buy namely sugar.

I think it would be apt perhaps to read into the records of the house a letter that was quoted by Mr. T.C. Douglas in the House of Commons on December 13th, 1963. It is a letter from the president of the B.C. Sugar Refiner Company to all permanent employees. I quote:

Due to the higher price of sugar that prevailed through the most of the last financial year, the profits of the overall company have proven to be greater than normal. Under these circumstances the directors of the company have decided that a special bonus must be paid to all permanent employees. The amount of each individual bonus has been determined by a formula which takes into account, the length of service of each employee. Your bonus cheque is enclosed with letter. I wish to point out that this bonus does not establish a precedent, it is being made as a result of most unusual circumstances, it might not arise again in future years. We hope that it will be accepted in recognition of your years of service to poor years and good. The company has no wish to receive any publicity for making this payment, and I would be obliged if each of you, would keep it as confidential as possible.

Yours very truly,
Forrest Rogers, President.

Now I think it is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that this last minute seemingly benevolent gesture was nothing more than an attempt to conceal a true picture of the company's operation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the voter when asked to deliver this so-called free enterprise vote to the provincial Liberals will be justified in recalling events of the recent past. In connection with the price of sugar, in connection with the price fixing conspiracies of electrical industries which was very prominent in the newspapers only a short while ago, and also the exorbitant cost of drugs as was brought to light by the committee of the late Senator Kefauver in the United States. I suggest also that the free enterprise medical care plan in Alberta and the one proposed in Ontario should be examined by the electorate when they are given these suggestions to join with the Liberals in consolidating the free enterprise votes. I believe their conclusions will be made very obvious to the Liberals some time in the not too distant future.

Now, before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few minutes with a event which under normal circumstances can be expected to come about 1964.

I refer, of course, to a provincial election. Members will recall that after the 1960 election the first 12 months were used by Liberal Party in apologizing and explaining for the lack of confidence which the Saskatchewan electors expressed in their party. The remainder of the term has been spent by the provincial Liberals in an attempt to degrade their province and in an attempt to destroy humanitarian legislation which is now accepted by an overwhelming majority of Saskatchewan people. Over the past three years, Mr. Speaker, the popular Liberal pastime has been in the issuing of a challenge to the government to go to the people and now that the time has just about arrived, there seems to be considerable doubt as to whether the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite are quite ready for the fray.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house acknowledge and appreciate the anxiety of provincial Liberals to have an election called prior to a time when they would have to accept some responsibility for the action of their counterpart in Ottawa. What a sad thing, Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the Opposition and the provincial Liberals to view now, from their present prospective, Mr. Pearson's vital 60 days of decision. What a sad thing, Mr. Speaker, for the member for Morse and his colleagues to reflect on a new federal parliament with a brand new Minister of Finance, impotent and incapable of doing those things that he declared were so necessary prior to his election and his appointment to that high office.

The 30 per cent takeover tax that was conceived I presume by the experts that were imported especially for the job had to be withdrawn. Apparently, those who gave birth to the budget, were working on the assumption that the parliament of Canada had some real authority and some real responsibility in this matter, but it seems that this was not the case as it was made quite clear that a 30 per cent takeover tax was not acceptable.

For further evidence, Mr. Speaker, to reinforce the argument of the provincial Liberals that a provincial election should have been held some time ago, appears in a form of the national portable pension plan. Now this was heralded by the Liberals prior to April 8th last as a giant step towards the security and the well being of those people who reach retirement age. Now this idea, I assume was conceived with the understanding that the parliament of Canada had some responsibility in this connection also. Here it is in its original form as it was presented to the electors prior to April 8th, as outlined in a brochure by the Liberal Party of Canada, "Better Pensions for All", "What a Liberal government will do". In this original form, a good deal of opposition was expressed by the same people, Mr. Speaker, who opposed the national hospitalization plan. In its original form as proposed in the brochure, the plan together with old age security would have provided for a couple of age 70, \$295 a month and \$230 for a single or widowed person. Contributions were to apply on earnings up to \$500 a month with the individual having the opportunity to take a somewhat smaller pension at age 65.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks this proposed plan of the federal Liberals has been undergoing major surgery, and I trust that I'll be forgiven if my material is not completely up to date, and I am sure that members will appreciate the difficulty in commenting on a subject with changes taking place momentarily. The decision of the government to reduce retirement benefits, from 30 per cent to 20 per cent of pensionable earnings represents a retreat of major significance. Contributions now, I understand, apply to earning up to \$4,400 a year only and I understand there are no benefits

for survivor dependents and no disability benefits. Typical benefits as were described in Regina Leader Post of January 22nd, can only be described as disappointing and substandard in view of Liberal pre-election promises. A married couple with an average earnings of \$300 a month could retire at age 65, with a pension of \$162 a month. Single person with the same average earning, retiring at 65, would retire on \$111 a month. Of course, it is recognized that a person may work until age 70 and would then qualify for old age security and a somewhat larger pension.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable to assume that when the Canadian voters placed the Liberal Party in their present position of authority in Ottawa, they did so in the hope and trust and the naive belief that the national pension plan proposed by that party would be something that would represent something considerably better than a subsistence allowance. All indications point to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals in opposition are tender, sensitive and compassionate people, but when entrusted with power this sensitivity and this compassion for people is replaced by arrogance and contempt.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the national medical care plan, which the Liberals spoke of with apparent enthusiasm and sincerity prior to April 8th have been deliberating on since 1919, has now assumed such a remote position on the priority list that is unlikely that it will even receive a passing glance by federal parliament of this day. I suggest, however, that it will be trotted out and dusted off and overhauled and presented to the electors, however, at some future date. Now all members of this house, Mr. Speaker, I believe will remember the present Prime Minister prior to his election stating that the election of a Liberal government to Ottawa would immediately restore confidence in the country. In effect, Mr. Speaker, the only significant deed resulting from the vital 60 days of decision has been the acceptance of Canada into the nuclear club under American control.

So, Mr. Speaker, remembering the declaration of Mr. Pearson, that the simple fact of the election of the Liberal government to Ottawa, that this would immediately restore confidence in Canada, Saskatchewan people will perhaps be forgiven if they fail to respond to the pleas of the Leader of the Opposition here, when he suggest "Elect us, we'll restore confidence in Saskatchewan, we'll lead you to the promised land".

Mr. Speaker, I've called attention to the recent failures of the federal Liberal government to implement recent campaign promises, because they provide fresh evidence of the gulf that separates Liberal promises from Liberal performances, and suggest that Liberal promises are no more reliable today than they were 45 years ago when they promised the people of Canada a national health plan. It is reported that the Leader of the Opposition has come up with some new planks for his platform. More appeared in his contribution to the throne speech debate a few days ago, and it may be expected that as a result of desperation, more of these hastily conceived contrivances will appear from time to time, not as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the decisions made at Liberal party conventions, but rather a product of what has been referred to as the "unenlightened policies" of the Leader of the Opposition. These planks, Mr. Speaker, will constitute a platform not designed to stand on, just to run on, and one that will generally be appraised as having no value.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be please to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all I must apologize that I have a bad cold, and after listening to the lengthy harangue from the hon. member from Moose Jaw, (Mr. Snyder) in which he praised the performance of the party to which he belongs and damned the federal and provincial Liberals at length, I'm quite sure that the house doesn't want to be wearied by a long address on my part at this time. So I shall speak only briefly until I adjourn the debate.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the mover of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) and the seconder, the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Whelan). Of course, they read their speeches, Mr. Speaker, very well indeed. As a matter of fact they have done so well that they are going to need very little practise for rendering the same speech during the election, but it does seem rather a pity that these two speeches should have been their swan song . . .

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — . . . and just when they are becoming somewhat adept at speaking they should have to leave this house. It reminds me of the song “When I have sung my song to you, I’ll sing no more”. I was also amused by the Premier when a few weeks ago he appealed to the members of the legislature through the news media, expressing the hope that because of the nearness of the election that proceedings in this chamber would not become debating for it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, listening to the mover and the seconder of the speech in reply, one gathered that they completely ignored what their chief and leader had suggested; and judging from the very contented look on his face they were obviously saying what he wanted to hear, and he didn’t mind at all. I also want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for his excellent address, I thin, frankly, that I was the finest address he has made in this chamber.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — Certainly from the excellent reports that are coming in from all parts of the province he has created a fine impression. I think all the abuse that has been heaped on the Leader of the Opposition throughout these years has only rallied support behind him, has only strengthened his position as Leader of this party. And that is precisely what our fiends opposite don’t like to see. Well, his outline of the Liberal platform or program ought to silence for some time, I hope, those critics who have been asking “what is the Liberal program”.

Well, I can assure my friends opposite, that the Liberal program, as the election approaches, will be revealed step by step. And I’m sure it is going to be the kind of program that will commend itself to the electors of Saskatchewan.

My hon. friend from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) was talking about the “winds of change”. Well, I quite agree that they are indeed blowing an the political weather vane unquestionably points to a Liberal government under the leadership of Ross Thatcher, after the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, the throne speech makes certain recommendations with respect to the hospital survey committee. The throne speech proposes legislation establishing a board to study the recommendations contained in the report of the hospital survey committee in respect to the feasibility of establishing a provincial hospital in Regina. For over four years now, this NDP government has waffled around on the issue of the Regina General Hospital. On November 11th, 1960, based on a survey report of the Ellerbe and Company of St. Paul, Minnesota, who had been engaged by the Regina General Hospital board to make a survey of the needs of the hospital in view of the broad area of Saskatchewan it services, I, as the Minister of Public Health in a letter to the Regina General Hospital Board authorized them to proceed with preliminary plans to rebuild Regina General Hospital. However, a further study in respect to location, together with a study of progressive care units in the United States was deemed advisable, and the commencement of construction was, therefore, delayed until a report of these studies was made. Well, on May 3rd, Mr. Speaker, 1962, after a resubmission by the consultants of schematic drawings, the former Minister of Health, the hon. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw) wrote to the General Hospital Board and I should like to quote the relevant section from his letter:

On the basis of a formula which presupposes that 7.5 beds per thousand population is sufficient to meet the reasonable needs of Saskatchewan for active hospital care, and that the needs of referral centres like Regina, will be at a higher rate ratio, it can be estimated that Regina will require approximately 1,550 beds by 1970. This assumes that the population growth of Regina and the areas tributary to it will continue at the present rate. After considering these needs, I am prepared to approve construction of Regina General Hospital which will result in a hospital having a total bed capacity of 1,850 beds. This together with other beds which will be available, excluding the Psychiatric wing with approximately 100 beds, would result in the city having approximately the recommended number of 1,500 beds as well, or 1,550 beds before 1970.

This conclusion represents a modification of the previously proposal of the Department of Public Health and was arrived at after thorough examination of the future needs of Regina and the area that is serviced by the hospitals in this city. In my opinion, this represents a generous view of the projected needs.

Now after receiving this authority to which I refer from the minister, the consultants of the Department of Public Health made their comments after schematic drawings were submitted to them for consideration, and, under the date of August 30th, 1962, the senior hospital consultant of the Department of Public Health advised as follows:

In reviewing your revised departmental area distribution as provided by your consultants, the observation can be made that the over all space of location proposed appears quite reasonable in view of the requirements of an 850 bed hospital.

Now, of course, to fully realize the potential, Mr. Speaker, of any expansion program, the present D.V.A. wing at the hospital must be involved. Negotiations took place with the federal government and under the date of August 29th, 1962, the board was advised, that approval had been attained from prairie counsel to use the D.V.A. wing as a 100 bed Psychiatric Hospital, as recommended by the Psychiatric Services Division of the Department of Public Health. Now, following the general acceptance of both the board and the Department of Public Health, the consultants were authorized under date of December 6th, 1962, to proceed with detailed preliminary drawings in line with schematic space allocations presented by the consultants.

On March 7th, 1963, preliminary drawings, cost estimates and anticipated grant participation were submitted to the minister for his final approval. The preliminary drawings as submitted were acknowledged by the minister, the hon. A.E. Blakeney, on the date March 8th, 1963, with the advice that these documents were passed to the division of hospital administration and standards for their attention.

Well, now, at this point, Mr. Speaker, the rebuilding of Regina General Hospital came to a halt. I think it should be noted that the NDP government reneged on two commitments made to the General Hospital Board by two former Ministers of Public Health authorizing the hospital board to proceed with their plans. Now we are told that a provincial hospital is more desirable. Both the lady member for Regina, in the throne speech debate last session, and the member for Regina, who seconded the motion in reply last Monday, went to considerable length to promote this idea.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, after failing to ram down the throats of the medical profession an unacceptable medicare act and further rankled over the fact that the doctors of their brain child, the community health clinics, were unable to obtain hospital privileges under the traditional procedures, a provincial hospital is precisely what the NDP government and its followers want. For a provincial hospital means complete government control of its operations and administration. Make no mistake.

If it can be shown, however, Mr. Speaker, that an entirely new hospital in Regina is feasible and desirable, I have no quarrel with such a conclusion. However, the citizens of Regina will insist, and we on this side of the house will insist, that its operation, administration and control be vested in the citizens of Regina through their elected board.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Erb: — This control must extend not only to the general hospital portion of the new hospital, but of the specialties unit as well.

Now if a new hospital in Regina becomes the final decision then this government, which prides itself in it geriatrics program and sensitive, no doubt, to the long list of persons awaiting admission to the geriatric hospitals, ought to without delay take over facilities of the present Regina General Hospital. Indeed their most recent hospital consultants, Doctor Harvey Agenw of Toronto and Doctor Gerhardt Hartman of Iowa City, have recommended the General Hospital as a physical medicine unit which should be integrated with the Regina Geriatric and Physical Restoration Centre. By the government taking over the Regina General Hospital for its book value of, I should say, some three and a half to four million dollars, the citizens of Regina through their hospital board could apply this amount towards the construction costs of the new hospital which would be approximately the amount required as their share under the present grant structure for base hospitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in doing so, there could be no argument about the propriety or the legality of the autonomy of the Regina Hospital Board in respect to this new hospital. I suggest that the people of this province are sick and tired of the turmoil, dissension and mistrust this government has created in its attempt to control medical and hospital care services.

A provincial hospital whose administration, operation and control is vested in the government will further add to the deterioration of the standards of medical practise, Mr. Speaker, and strain further the poor relations this government has created with the medical profession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being close to 5:30, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:34 p.m.