

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE

21st Day

Thursday, March 5th, 1964

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER RE TABLING OF LETTER

Mr. Speaker: — While I am on feet, calling Orders of the day, I would like to make the following statement.

The house apparently found itself in some difficulty the other evening when the hon. Minister of Social Welfare quoted from a private letter, which made reference to the proceedings in this house during the present session.

I would draw to the attention of the hon. members, citation 157-5, in the fourth edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and forms, in which he says:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications, emanating from persons outside the house and referring, or commenting upon, or denying anything that is said by a member, or expressing any opinions reflecting on proceedings within the house.

It would therefore appear that the hon. minister was out of order simply by reading the letter.

The rules with respect to tabling documents quoted in debate are quite clear: official state papers must not be quoted in debate unless the member is prepared to lay the document on the table; the same rule does not, however, apply to private letters and I would refer the house to Beauchesne, fourth edition, citation 159-3 and Mr. Speaker Parker's ruling in this house on February 4, 1935, February 20, 1936 and February 9, 1938.

Nevertheless, since the house is entitled to the same information as the member who quotes from a private letter, it has become established that even private correspondence quoted in the house must be tabled, or at the very least, the member must divulge to the house the name and address of the sender, unless the member himself is prepared to take full responsibility for the truth and accuracy of the contents of the correspondence. I would in this connection cite Beauchesne again, the fourth edition, citation 179-2.

If a member proposes to read a communication in its entirety, or even a portion, without divulging the name and address of the sender and the member refuses to take the responsibility for the truth and accuracy of the contents, such a communication should be laid on the table and particularly if so desired by any member of the house.

In my own opinion, the most acceptable practice is for the member who has quoted from a private letter to lay the document on the table.

I do not feel that it would be in order for me to insist that the minister table this correspondence for I am sure that the house would want to respect the privacy of correspondence, but I feel that since the house permitted the minister to quote from the document in the debate the other evening and since he offered at that time to table the document, he should either lay the letter on the table or divulge the name and address of the sender or he himself should accept fully responsibility for the truth and accuracy of the statements quoted.

Hon. A.M. Nicholson (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for your ruling. I am pleased to lay the letter on the table; I have communicated with the writer; the writer is Mr. M.G. Henderson, the manager of the Saskatoon branch of the Toronto Dominion Bank. He has no objection whatever to this letter, which I explained was a copy of a letter to the Provincial Treasurer written on the 24th of February.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to, on behalf of all the members of the legislature, welcome to the galleries here this afternoon, a very fine, a very outstanding class of students from the new composite high school located at Clavet. That school, as hon. members have noted, may have noted is pictured in the annual report of the Department of Education. It is an outstanding school because of its architecture and because of its facilities but it is also an outstanding school, Mr. Speaker, because of the fine young people who attend it, and we have here an excellent sample of the classes who attend that school, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Adrian. They are in the Speaker's gallery here today and I am sure I don't have to point out just where they are, if you look around you will see a flock of very bright young people, and that is them.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of every member of the legislature I want to welcome them here, I want to express the hope that they will have a fine tour through the natural history museum and that they will have a safe journey back and that some of them eventually will find their way into this legislature as members.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Ed Whelan (Regina city): — On behalf of all the hon. members I would like to welcome to this assembly 70 intelligent, capable, attractive young ladies from Sacred Heart Academy, they are the grade 12 students from that school, they are with their principal Sister Mary Winnifred and Sister Mary St. Matthew, and I am sure all hon. members will extend to them our sincere wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be both pleasant and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina city): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call your attention to a very fine group of young people in the Speaker's gallery, if you are looking for bright students they come from Argyle School, grade 8 and that is them. I am sure that we welcome them here, they are here with their teacher, Mrs. Dowrin, and I hope that they will find that their visit here is educational and enjoyable.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEATH OF HARRY JONES, M.P. FOR SASKATOON

Mr. Nicholson: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members have learned with regret of the passing of Harry Jones, M.P. for Saskatoon. Mr. Jones was born in the Lloydminster district, attending public and high school there, collegiate and university in Saskatoon. He joined the R.C.A.F. in 1941, and had a most distinguished career with the armed services. Since his return to Canada he was admitted to the bar, practised law and was elected to the House of Commons in 1957. I had the good fortune to be a member of the House of Commons during that parliament with Mr. Jones. He was the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs. Mr. Jones was active in the John Howard Society, and a great number of national and international organizations during his short lifetime. I am sure that all hon. members will wish to extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Jones and the family in the passing of such a young and promising Canadian.

March 5, 1964

Mr. A.T Stone (Saskatoon City): — I, too, would like to express the sorrow of all the people of the city of Saskatoon over the passing of Harry Jones, Member of Parliament for that city.

I don't think there is any person who has captured the hearts of so many people and the loss will be greatly felt in the community.

I first became acquainted with Harry while he was at university, and was president of the Young Progressive-Conservative Party and our friendship has been most cordial. It was very sad and a difficulty thing for me to believe that such a charming person and one who had, and could, contribute so much to the community would be taken away in his prime of life. I, too, wish to add my condolences to his family in their bereavement.

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — I would like to join, as I am sure all the other members would, in expressing our sympathy to the bereaved family and I would like to say, that all those of us who have had anything to do with the late Harry Jones were impressed by his courage, his gallantry, his utmost and heartfelt dedication to his party and to his country. He did a task well, he carried on even when his strength gave out, and I am sure that he has set a fine example for all of us in public life to follow.

CORRECTION TO NEWSPAPER REPORT

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — A news report of an exchange in this legislature yesterday, while the Minister of Mineral Resources was speaking, mentioned my name as the one taking part. I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that I was not in the house when the exchange took place, so, therefore, could not be involved.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION RE RAIL LINE ABANDONMENT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Thiessen's motion re rail line abandonment and the proposed amendment thereto.

Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, during the debate on amendment two weeks ago, I pointed out in this house that the possibility of abandonment of hundreds of miles of railway line in Saskatchewan was the cause of utmost concern to the people of this province.

I also stated I was sure that every member of this legislature was opposed to any wholesale abandonment of branch lines in Saskatchewan and that the only difference in our opinion was probably a matter of degree and approach. Just before I adjourned, or rather moved adjournment of that debate, I was engaged in a discussion with the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Agriculture on the question as to where I had secured my information with regard to the committee to be set up by the government of Canada to deal with this problem, and which was to be known as the Branch Line Rationalization Committee. Now when I advised the house the source of this information I was accused by the Minister of Agriculture of making an official announcement on behalf of the federal government and divulging confidential information.

I am sure that all hon. members of this house will realize that these were only frivolous statements. Now the only reason, Mr. Speaker, that I gave the source of that information was that all hon. members of this house might know that the statement was based on fact and not fiction, and for the further information of the house I would like to say that an hour after our personal conversation, the hon. Mr. McIlraith told 175 people at a public banquet what he had told me and certainly there was nothing confidential about it whatsoever.

But the hon. Minister of Agriculture appeared to know nothing about the plans of the federal government to deal with this problem which faces the people of our province. Actually, I thought that I was being rather kind to him, because what I might have said was that if he read the newspapers I am sure he would have been aware of the situation. I notice too that the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources, has made quite an issue over the fact that he has to read to page 13 in the Regina Leader Post to find some item pertaining to his political party. But I can assure the hon. members of this house that there have been several items in the same paper over the past some time dealing with the situation of the abandonment of branch railway lines in this province.

I would refer to the Regina Leader Post of January 27th, 1964, and I would like to quote Donald Gordon when he said and I quote:

He had not discussed the new rationalization agency with the government and knew no more about it than what he had read in the press.

And I would also quote the Hon. George McIlraith in the same issue of the same paper as follows:

The branch line rationalization authority would be under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture.

And I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that he did not refer to the hon. provincial Minister of Agriculture across the way. Then he goes on and I again quote:

This is recognition that branch line rationalization is primarily a concern to rural communities and farmers of western Canada.

Now certainly these statements were not on page 13, Mr. Speaker, – I don't think that anybody would have to read beyond page three.

As far as I am concerned this is one case where the hon. Minister of Agriculture has pulled the wool over his own eyes, because he didn't wish to see. He just did not want to see anything that might give hope to the people of our province in facing this problem which they do face.

Now, Mr. Speaker, rail line abandonment is not a political matter. But it is the responsibility of government and it is the responsibility of the government of Canada because the question of rail line abandonment comes under that jurisdiction. It is the responsibility of the government of Canada also because that government is responsible for all of Canada and certainly Saskatchewan is a part of Canada. We are a young province and we are distinctive by virtue of our small population compared to our large area. If you will check a map showing the network of railway lines in our province, you will see how closely allied our growth and population pattern are with our railway system.

What is going to happen to our rural areas and our smaller urban points if these services and facilities are removed? I would suggest that the whole pattern of the social and economic life of these communities will be disrupted and broken down with fantastic financial losses by depreciated property values and by increased farming costs. We do not see any abandonment or proposed abandonment of branch lines that serve potash mines – but agriculture, the basis of our Saskatchewan economy, is to suffer, and our smaller urban points will become ghost towns or will possibly disappear entirely.

Now I said earlier that the government of Canada is responsible for all of Canada, and how can the federal government expect such an integral part of Canada as our province of Saskatchewan to grow, to extend, and to make its contribution to the national economy if those basic services, needed for our development are curtailed or removed. This is not in the national interest, Mr. Speaker, and mark my words, the Liberal government of Canada will not stand idly by and see any wholesale abandonment of branch railway lines in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — However, as the legislature of this province, it is our duty to bring these matters to the attention of the federal government and in so doing we should be decisive. I believe that my colleague, the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) described the motion before the house as wishy-washy, and I do not believe that he could have described it more accurately.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people in our Weyburn constituency are very much concerned about all of the talk which has been going on about rail line abandonment and about the resulting changes which would of necessity take place if the railway companies proceed with their program of wholesale branch line abandonment. If the suggested plans for our area are carried out, we could lose well over 100 miles of railway lines in our community. The communities affected would be the city of Weyburn, Hume, Griffin, Froude, Stoughton, Goodwater, Colgate, the town of Radville and Ceylon. Radville for example, once a divisional point for the Canadian National Railway would not have one single line in or out of that town. So you can see why we are concerned, and you can see why any wholesale abandonment program must not be carried out.

March 5, 1964

Possibly, Mr. Speaker, it might be in the national interest if the government of Canada would further subsidize these railways rather than allow the disruption and breakdown of our Saskatchewan communities, and certainly it would not be the first time that a federal government has subsidized an economic area of this country.

Just look at the subsidies paid to the coal mining industry in the Maritimes, and look at those areas just recently classed as depressed areas, with assistance to be given by way of tax concessions and accelerated depreciation. These are just forms of subsidies and so, Mr. Speaker, there are ways and means of resolving this problem which faces us here in Saskatchewan.

Now it will be the responsibility of the Branchline Rationalization Committee to fully investigate all facets of branch line abandonment, and the effects of branch line abandonment, before any further disruption of our rail facilities would be allowed to take place and I think that our fears might be somewhat allayed if we all understood the meaning of the word rationalization.

I believe that this word expresses the real outlook of this committee and points out the duty of the committee which is to rationalize this whole situation of rail line abandonment. If you will refer to Websters Dictionary you will find the word rationalize means and I quote:

to rely solely on reason for guidance.

The word rational means to be agreeable to reason, and a rational man is one who will listen intelligently to both sides of a question. And I think that the meaning of these words is the key note of the work which this committee will be doing. I would like to forecast, Mr. Speaker, that this committee will hold public hearings in those communities which might be affected, and will be more than prepared to hear the whole story of the effect that branchline abandonment will have on both the social and economic life of those communities and I think that time will prove that this statement is correct.

I am very critical of this government for the part that it has played in promoting fears and misgivings in the minds of our people with respect to this situation, and surely, if this government was honestly interested it would have investigated the true facts and the full facts and it would have given our people the complete and true picture which is something which this government seldom does.

The hon. Minister of Industry and Information could have secured exactly the same information that I have, but instead of that, what has he been doing? He has been sending his staff all over this province crying blue ruin. Now this is an old story, Mr. Speaker, – create an issue in the minds of the men and then in the hope of political advantage oppose the very issue it has created. True Jekyll and Hyde tactics, which appear so often in the actions of this government when political expediency is involved.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Staveley: — Now I would just like to read the amendment – it is very brief:

That this assembly urge the federal government not to allow the abandonment of any rail line which might adversely affect any community in Saskatchewan.

And dealing with those words, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to all members of this house, that this amendment is decisive, it is brief, and concise, and it completely represents the wishes of those thousands of people who might be affected by branch line abandonment. The intent in this amendment is not covered over and smothered up with unnecessary and excessive verbiage as is the case with the original motion. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. members to your right will put the interests of our province before the interests of their political party, every one of them will support this amendment as I will support it.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. H. Ray Dahlman (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I had been so happy up until this point being able to take part in discussing this resolution, believing that there were no political implications involved, but after listening to the member from Weyburn I believe I am going to change my mind just a bit.

This is one resolution with which we must not, if we are going to be effective in our arguments, play politics, but all political parties must play the same way, and I don't think that the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) was justified in suggesting that the Minister of Industry and Information sent agents out to cry blue ruin. He sent them out to gather facts. Now this is the truth of the matter.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Dahlman: — We have discussed this resolution at some length now and the details are not going to vary very much from here on in, but I think we have to assess the position that we are in now in respect to the railway abandonment, in going back in history and reviewing for a moment, just how our railway system was set up.

It seems to me that we are coming to an era as far as transportation is concerned over the whole of the dominion of Canada, yes, in all of North American, because these problems exist in the States as well. In the beginning, as civilization moved westward over the plains, railways moved in to help develop the country. This was not done according to any plan. Here again we saw private enterprise moving in, in reckless competition to one another, railway companies moved in and yes, they built lines, one running parallel to the other, and we have a hodge-podge system today.

Now we have come to an era where most of the express and the lighter freight is being hauled on rubber. We are in a transition period now from steel to rubber. The main carrier will still remain on steel while the fast-moving freight will move on rubber. As a matter of fact, railway companies today in Canada are using what they call the piggy-back system, where they move trucks and then deliver the goods to the branch lines.

In the prairies, of course, we have a different problem than exists in the rest of Canada. Here we have a captive market in the wheat industry. There is no other way in which we can move wheat off the prairies to the terminals or to the mills except by railway. The whole system must be assessed as a unit in determining its profit and loss. We would have no rivers did we not have streams, or their tributaries. The same thing prevails with railroads. If we were to assess the mainlines on their own traffic area, the freight they pick up along their own routes, they would not be self-supporting either, if this was the case.

I'm just thinking now of our position down south of the CPR main line, which the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) is concerned with, that if we were to take and use the formula that is being used by the railways in assessing the profitability of a line then there would not be one remaining line south of the main line. Now this is the position that we are in.

Now are we going to have two sets of farmers? Those who live close to the line and can carry on with small trucks the way we are doing now and are we going to have a group of farmers who must haul their produce for 100 miles? Now that is the position we are in.

I think that if you were to ask the elevator companies what their choice would be, you would find that it would be profitable for them to carry on the way they are, rather than having to move their facilities up on the main line, in making what you might call inland terminals. This is their concern, that they must have no piecemeal abandonment of branch lines, but a planned withdrawal in some areas if this is necessary, so that duplication of facilities need not affect them as adversely as a company or as providing facilities to farmers.

So I think there must be some responsible authority and who are they. The member mentioned that the responsibility was the federal government's which it is. Also provincial governments and others are concerned. And the proposition of a railway rationalization board being set up is the only avenue that I see that is workable at the present time. I understand this committee is going to be set up and their work will be to determine and appraise the effects of rail abandonment on the whole economy. We must equate the operating loss of railways with increased costs to farmers, elevator companies, roads,

March 5, 1964

our municipalities and government, loss of trade by merchant and service agencies, dislocation of schools and service centres generally through the loss of railways. The loss of tax revenue of the local government who provide these social services are certainly greatly concerned.

I was glad to read in the Leader Post, I think it was last night's Leader Post, where the federal budget having brought down an estimate of \$100,000,000 to be set up for railways subsidization. I think that we have reason to be hopeful that whatever committee is set up by the federal government, will take all these considerations into view and with this amount being set aside for railways, subsidization would indicate to us at least, that they are concerned enough and prepared to render subsidies in view of railway abandonment at this time.

I don't think there is very much else that I care to add at this time, Mr. Speaker, except to say that when the rationalization board has been set up, we may also have to have an advisory council on transportation. The federal government may have to have jurisdiction of inter-provincial trucking which will certainly in many instances replace the freight traffic on the railway lines.

What are we doing in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is not that we wish to debate it in the legislature but what we want to do in this legislature is deal with it and assure the people of this province that this legislature is ready to go to work on their behalf.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Dahlman: — We are prepared to do all in our power to see that no one will suffer undue hardships because of the loss of service by main carriers of freight and express, and I think this is all that I need to say at this time. I want to assure those people who are listening in today and this discussion this afternoon, to feel assured that every member of this legislature is willing to do all that he can on the behalf of those people who are under apprehension of railway abandonment. With that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I'm going to support the original motion. The amendment, I am sure that the member who moved the amendment had real concern and I would agree, except that I don't think we can point out in detail just what advice to give the rationalization board.

I think this is their job to make this survey and make this assessment and I don't think that at this time, we should pin-point exactly what the results of their investigation will be.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would not sit idly by and see a resolution on the magnitude of this topic go by without taking part in so important a debate.

I want to assure the members of this legislature that I am very interested in this resolution at the present time because I may be one of the few members in this house who has had actual experience of watching a branch line or railroad line being pulled up and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that railway companies today pull up a mile of railway an awful lot faster than they put it down 50 years ago.

I have had the actual experience of seeing about a mile and a half of railway pulled up right through my own farm, and I have the experience of seeing how the abandoning or pulling up of a railway line affects certain communities. In view of these facts, I want to offer some suggestions to the legislature here this afternoon. I was disappointed at the seeming lack of a definite stand taken by the members of the government side of the house. When the two members who spoke originally on this motion introducing it in the legislature about a week or so ago, they seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, to be almost apologetic, and then after listening to the member who just spoke, I thought he too, should have taken a more definite stand, and that is why I am so very pleased that my colleague, the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) and my colleague the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) have taken a real realistic and definite stand on this matter.

The line that I have most experience with that is now abandoned, is the Wolseley-Reston line, a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when this line was up for abandonment, the people concerned banded together and they formed what they called a "Railway Retention Committee" and so they came to the appropriate department of this government for help and for legal advice and for counsel and the government was good enough to provide the services of a man for them. And over the course of a year or so, before the actual pulling up the line took place, many committee meetings were held in the various communities among the municipalities concerned, both urban and rural and businessmen and farmers and all the residents in the area. As far as I was concerned, I thought these businessmen and the people by and large had put up a very good case. It is true that in the end, we lost the railway.

I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to you, my concern of developments within this government later. Just a few weeks ago, I was very concerned as all the people in the area that I represent were, because we found that the C.N.R. supposedly had listed another great stretch of railway to be up for discussion before the Railway Rationalization Committee and this stretch of C.N.R. line is as far as we are concerned, the main C.N.R. line south of the C.P.R. trans-Canada line, and if anything was to happen to this line, Mr. Speaker, the farmers and the businessmen of that area would have to go back to conditions that their forefathers put up with some 50 years ago, where they would have to haul their grain and haul their supplies a distance of some 30 miles to the north or 30 miles to the south and we felt for the security of our communities established along that line and so we were very concerned, and further to that, we had a branch line of the C.N.R. from Peebles to Hansworth, a distance of some 30 miles involved, also.

So all in all, we had two lines of railways that would concern 21 or more shipping points and shipping points that in the last two years alone have taken out millions and millions of bushels of wheat and as far as I am concerned, and as far as my people are concerned, they have hauled enough grain to pay for the operation of those lines and we see no reason in the world why those lines should be even considered for listing. But I am convinced and I am assured in my own mind with the intended legislation being proposed by the federal Liberal government at Ottawa at the present time and in view of the committees that are going to be set up, and the way this whole problem of rail line abandonment is going to be handled, that these two lines will not be taken out in the immediate future.

But having the experience of what happened on the Wolseley-Reston line, and what happened as far as the provincial government agencies that we thought were protecting our rights, I want to draw to the attention of the Minister of Information right now, that I think the effort this time should be more sincere and more concrete than in the past. Now, the gentleman and the agencies of the government that handled this business for us, we believe were sincere. As I say, we lost the railroad, and now when this C.N.R. line has been listed for abandonment, the Department of Industry and Information has seen fit to call the meetings in areas all along that line. Now I would hope, Mr. Speaker, when they call these meetings and ask the people to be out, that this time they will do all they can in their power to see that nothing happens to these lines, because I was quite concerned, as was everybody down in that area concerned, when they saw a statement attributed to the Minister of Industry and Information. The statement that he gave was that we didn't say much about the pulling of the Wolseley-Reston line at the time and because after all there was a parallel C.N.R. line. Well, that may be fine, Mr. Minister to make that statement, but the people who were concerned certainly thought you should have said more and I hope that this time, when you are going down to that area, and when you are leaving the impression with the people of that area, that you are trying to do something for them, that you are doing it sincerely and if anything should happen to this line and if it should be pulled up 15 or 20 years from now, somebody couldn't come along and say, well we didn't say too much because after all there were lines 30 miles to the north and 30 miles to the south.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the experience that we in our area have had in respect to rail line abandonment we want something positive, we want something definite, and something sincere from this government at this time.

Mr. Speaker, having pointed out the problems in my area at the present time, and the problems we have had in the past, and having pointed out to the people that are concerned, that in my opinion at least because of the legislation that is before the federal Liberal government at Ottawa at the present time, I am firmly convinced that nothing will happen to this vital line of ours. But then having had the experience of what has happened to other lines, and

March 5, 1964

what may happen to other lines in the province, I want to suggest some steps that this government should be taking immediately because they didn't do this in my area, especially east of the town of Winthorp, Kennedy, Kipling and right through to the Manitoba border.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that every community in Saskatchewan that is being faced with possible loss of rail lines, should now compile information as to how this situation would affect all segments of the communities, especially farmers, and we want to be sure that before any action is taken, not just the position of the railways be taken into the consideration, but most important of all, the position of the people and the business and economic position of the community, be the prime factor of consideration.

We must convince the provincial and the federal governments, as well as the Board of Transport Commissioners that more people will be affected by rail line abandonment than just the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. It appears that past action regarding the lifting of rail lines took the position of the railway company into account more than the consideration of the people of those communities affected. This should not be the policy in the future.

This matter of proposed rail line abandonment is so important that this provincial government should be seriously adapting definite programs now, to deal with emergencies in communities that would be affected if any given line were taken out. The Department of Highways should be assessing – if the minister of muttering would stop muttering maybe we could get this across and I want him to pay particular attention – the Department of Highways should be assessing improved highway requirements necessitated by having to haul grain and heavy freight to and from points affected. The Department of Municipal Affairs should now be studying grid road requirements to service a new pattern of trading centre developments.

This is very important, the Highway Traffic Board should not be allowed to sanction excessively high rates for greater passenger travel for other agencies including Saskatchewan Transportation Company by virtue of the fact that there is no longer competition from rail travel in areas where rail lines have been discontinued.

The Department of Industry and Information should now start interviewing elevator companies to see what their policies are in regard to future expansion or centralization of grain handling facilities. The whole continuous process of centralization by this government itself must be reviewed if a clear picture of future development in the province are to be scrutinized.

I am convinced that most of the difficulties which we find ourselves in today are because of the policy of centralization by this government. For years now, we have been hearing and are hearing that smaller urban communities are a thing of the past. Their policies are pointed towards a single trading centre for a specific area. Millions of dollars have been spent in this province to propagate this theory, is it any wonder then, that railways as well as other corporations are shaping their programs to fit these conditions.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that that trend was stopped, and it is time that someone started championing the rights of urban and rural preservation and developments.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. McFarlane: — When this is done, then most of our difficulties will disappear, and instead of curtailment of services and development, situations will arise where we will be increasing services and to add to rapid development of these areas to a point where population will be maintained and increased. Along with an economic upsurge, with the result, we will be building our province to a point where more transportation facilities will be required as we have seen in the history of other provinces of Canada and other countries of the world.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in the very few minutes that I have had at my disposal, I want to assure you that as far as I am concerned, along with my colleagues on this side of the house, we are convinced that a definite and a positive stand must be taken at this time. We are convinced that we cannot come in on this resolution, we must be brief, we must be to the point as the member for Gravelbourg done, when he stated that

this assembly urge the federal government not to allow the abandonment of any rail line or lines which might adversely affect any community in Saskatchewan.

And by the reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, and by the statement and the conditions that I have tried to bring to the attention of members of this legislature this afternoon, you will realize that I am going to support this very important amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — Mr. Speaker, I feel I should say a few words in this debate on this resolution because some comments have been made with respect to the activities of the provincial government and particularly the transportation branch of the Department of Industry and Information which is charged with responsibility of dealing with this very, very real problem.

I want to say right now though, that I suppose as long as I remain in this house, I'll never cease to be amazed at the antics of my friends opposite. We have again, in dealing with this resolution, witnessed the same kind of a situation which invariably develops. A situation where there is a problem which in fact is under the jurisdiction of the federal government and the opposition are trying their best to say that it is our fault that the problem is here and that we should solve it.

I never heard so many contradictory statements as have come out from the speakers across the way. They talk about a realistic plan. The hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) says we must take a realistic line, well, I wonder how realistic the members are being because when you read the amendment, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there was little point in continuing past the word "lines" in the amendment, because the remainder says "which adversely affect any community in Saskatchewan".

Now does anyone really believe that any line can be taken out without adversely affecting some community? You might as well stop right there. And when you talked about being realistic, my hon. friends opposite talk about the rail line rationalization committee which is going to be established — they are going to sort this thing out. Well, in doing so, do they really believe that somewhere along the line, if you are going to rationalize this system, that you are not going to lose some lines? Well then be realistic, and face the problem and let's deal with it. And let's quit trying to play politics with this kind of a situation.

The gentlemen opposite said that this is some dirty horrible plan that the government has got to do away with the urban communities. We don't run the railroads. You can't blame us for this kind of a problem. You talk about a wishy-washy resolution, my hon. friends should be a little more up-to-date. What is the general thinking of the people in the area where this problem lies? If they had taken the trouble to attend some of the meetings which had been held, if they had taken the trouble to attend the big meeting, which was held in Regina in November of all the retention committees, if they had taken the trouble to check the report of that meeting and seen what the resolutions called for, they would have found that the resolution which was placed on the order paper is in line with the thinking of the people who are most closely concerned.

I'm intrigued too by some of the gentlemen getting up, one of them gets up and says it's a whale of a problem, it's going to have some fantastic effects on the people of the province, and I'm inclined to agree with him that this entire program if proceeded with, will indeed have a terrific effect on the people of this province. Another gentleman gets up and says oh, it is not really that serious, it is only the Minister of Industry and Information and his staff, that are trying to magnify this issue and excite the people. Well, I wish they would make up their minds; one of them must be wrong.

The hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) says in one breath he is assured that now that the federal government have proposed this legislation, that nothing is really going to happen to that line that he is so fond of in his constituency, and I hope he is right. But in the next breath he goes on to tell us all the things that we should do to deal with this

March 5, 1964

problem and I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that if he had taken the trouble to find out, he would have found that everything that he suggested should be done and looked into, is already underway. It is only lately that the members of the opposition suddenly realized that this is an issue with the people of this province. Once again let's get on the band wagon; let's get the monkey off the back of the federal government; let's toss it on the back of the provincial government. I watched this, Mr. Speaker, in the last 12 years that I have been in this house.

I have taken the trouble because I think there will be some value in really bringing to the attention of the members of this house exactly how this problem has developed, where it stands at the present time, and what in fact has and is being done in order to assist the people that are concerned to deal with this problem. Now since the MacPherson Royal Commission on Transportation began to examine this problem of transportation in Canada in 1959, abandonment of 38 lines in Saskatchewan for a total of something like 1,931 miles of line involved. Of this total, four lines totalling 178 miles have been abandoned by order of the Board of Transport Commissioners. The lines abandoned in Saskatchewan include the C.P.R. from Wolseley to Reston and the C.N.R. lines from Grainland to Dunblane. The application to abandon the C.N.R. from Grainland to Dunblane was agreed to because it would be flooded out by the damming of the South Saskatchewan River. Similarly, no opposition was expressed to the abandonment of the Rose-town Gunnworth line of the C.P.R. as no economic use was actually being made of it. This government assisted the local retention committees on both the Reston-Wolseley and the Neptune lines to present a case for their retention. Largely because the Wolseley-Reston line closely paralleled the C.N.R. line for most of its length, the Board of Transport Commissioners ordered that it should be abandoned. The local retention committee on the Neptune line were successful in retaining that part of the sub-division in extending Southall to Tribune.

In 1961, the C.P.R. made application to abandon the Rockglen to Kildeer branch line. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that a public hearing was held in Assiniboia in October of 1962. By the, of course, the full implication of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Transportation in regard to branch lines was becoming abundantly clear to all concerned. The government then, this government, decided to accurately intervene on its own behalf and in the Assiniboia hearing as well as to assist the local retention committees which were established at the Assiniboia hearing. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture on behalf of the government requested the Board of Transport Commissioners to adjourn the hearing pending a full statement of policy of the federal government on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Transportation insofar as branch lines were concerned. You may recall, that the Board of Transport Commissioners refused our request and continue the hearing. We made our position quite well known. It was unalterably opposed to any suggestion of piecemeal consideration of branch lines. However, the Board of Transport Commissioners pointed out that under the present law, the law at that time, they had no alternative but they must entertain any applications of the railways to abandon any part of the railway plan or service. Consequent to this hearing Premier Lloyd again, you may recall, took the initiative and called a conference of the government of the three prairie provinces on December 20th, 1962. And simultaneously the main public organizations affected by proposed rail line abandonment, meeting both separately and together, a conference agreed on a four point program: One – an immediate stop to the present policy of piecemeal abandonment; two – a clear statement from the federal government as to its responsibility and policy; three – a study of the special interests of the agricultural economy in any program of rail rationalization; and four – recognition of the need for rail rationalization and the joint responsibility of all public organizations for a solution to rail line problems.

Following this conference the federal government called the railways and the grain companies to a meeting in Ottawa on January 4, 1963. It was agreed at that meeting that the railways would request the Board of Transport Commissioners not to process any further applications pending the implementation of new railway legislation.

This, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, was the first major victory by western Canada in its struggle against the massive program of branch line abandonment. A little over a year ago, in February, 1963, Premier Lloyd, Premier Manning of Alberta, and Premier Roblin of Manitoba, met with the federal cabinet and at that time they requested certain things: (a) that no piecemeal abandonment of branch lines be undertaken; and (b) that the social and economic cost of abandonment, which would fall on farmers and rural communities be fully ascertained before any abandonment proceedings were instituted.

March 5, 1964

Again on June 3rd and 25th, 1963, Premier Lloyd and myself, accompanied by representatives of our main public organizations, interviewed the new federal government of Prime Minister Pearson. Our Premier, speaking on behalf of the provincial government and the people of Saskatchewan, spelled out in greater detail the social and economic costs which should be studied. The Premier pointed out that such studies should be undertaken by a committee of investigation, separate and apart from the Board of Transport Commissioners. In this respect, the Premier, of course, reflected the position taken by our major provincial organizations and I would suggest by the same group in the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta.

According to the former Minister of Transport, Mr. McIlraith, who was the minister at the time we went to Ottawa, the new railway legislation has incorporated in it a proposal to set up, as was mentioned earlier this afternoon, a rail rationalization authority, which will undertake the necessary economic and social studies. If this is so, and we have no reason to doubt it at this stage, I would suggest to you that this will be the second major victory for western Canada in its struggle to retain rail line services.

When the new railway legislation is actually brought down in the House of Commons, I can assure you that your government will continue to make further representation. We are concerned about the terms of reference of the rail rationalization authorities. In this respect, we support the resolution passed by the conference of local retention committees, held in Regina, as I mentioned a moment ago, on November 22nd, 1963.

I know that some members on both sides of the house attended this tremendous meeting of representatives, 47 of the 48 committees, and by observers of all of our main public organizations. I only regret that some of the gentlemen who now are so concerned with this problem didn't see fit to also be in attendance. I think they would have been much better versed on the whole problem if they had taken the trouble to attend that conference.

I would like to quote from page 31 of the proceedings of that meeting which refers to the resolution which I mentioned a moment ago. This is it:

Therefore be it resolved that any board of inquiry appointed by the government of Canada to study the re-organization of railway plant in western Canada, be specifically required to study the following economic and social costs of rail line abandonment.

1. The cost of extra difference farmers will have to haul grain.
2. The cost of re-organization of the market grid road system and provincial highways.
3. Reduction of municipal taxes and the financial position of municipalities.
4. Capital losses which may be suffered by businesses in towns, villages and hamlets as a consequence of a branch line being abandoned.
5. Depreciation of land values.
6. The necessity of compensation for municipal services, such as re-location of grid roads, which are directly consequent on abandonment.
7. The impact of abandonment on schools, hospitals, old peoples homes and other social services or institutions.
8. Whether or not mineral rights, or other advantages, held by railway companies, as a result of land grants given to build rail lines should revert to the crown, if, indeed, the branch lines are abandoned and this to be used for compensation.

That, Mr. Speaker, was the resolution which was passed by this mass gathering of rail line retention committees, and I suggest to you that it reflects the thinking of the people most closely concerned with this problem of line abandonment and I suggest further it is in line with the tone, the tenor of the resolution which was originally placed on the order paper for discussion.

March 5, 1964

Now, why is it necessary for us to make such representation? As I mentioned a moment ago when this legislation is brought down we certainly intend to be on hand to have something to say about the implications of it. The Premier Minister has indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, that the social and economic costs will be studied. Mr. McIlraith stated this publicly a few weeks ago in an address in Saskatchewan, which the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) referred to when he was speaking. I don't know whether or not the Leader of the Opposition was really impressed with the seeming waffling of the former Minister of Transport but I suppose time will tell who was right and who was wrong.

As far as the Saskatchewan government is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it has been our stand that eternal vigilance is the price of railways insofar as our province is concerned. We want, and will insist that the terms of reference of the rail rationalization authority be spelled out in the legislation. We want to know specifically what social and economic costs will be thrown into the scales when the abandonment of a particular branch line is being considered.

I would like to illustrate this with some concrete data which we have produced in our transportation branch. As I mentioned, the transportation branch of the department is conducting, in co-operation with the local retention committee, and the municipalities, an extensive study of economic and social costs consequent on the abandonment of any rail branch line in Saskatchewan and I suggest again, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) could have had this information if he had wanted to take the trouble rather than to take an opportunity to get up and make a political speech.

Now the first nine branch lines for which railway preliminary cost figures have been obtained, indicate this to us, and I want to mention that we have only been able so far to do the work on the first group of nine. We will before the end of this month have completed the work on all of the subdivisions in which there are lines they propose to abandon.

Here are some figures which I suggest, Mr. Speaker, are interesting, if not, indeed, quite startling, and our research has indicated that the ten year average loss per annum claimed by the railway on these lines is approximately \$1,300,000. The annual cost to the producers for extra distance that they will be required to haul grain if the lines are indeed abandoned, come to almost a like amount, \$1,200,000, but to this you have to add, or you must take into consideration the reduction in rural municipal assessment that will be involved, will be almost \$3,000,000, as a matter of fact, \$2,980,000. Again, too, there will be a reduction in property values, calculated on a annual basis of some \$750,000. In addition to these costs, of course, there are the costs of building new roads and upgrading of the existing roads. The loss in tax revenue to the urban municipalities also has to be assessed, as well as the impact of abandonment on services in the area of employment and the general depreciation of urban property values. Therefore, there are numerous other losses and inconveniences that may be suffered to a greater or lesser degree by the public concerned. Finally, there are the losses which could be incurred by the grain handling organizations.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, Mr. W.J. Parker, President of the Manitoba Wheat Pool, speaking in Winnipeg on Wednesday, February 26th, 1964, stated that a capital cost of \$8,000,000 would be sustained if the three-fourths of existing elevator capacity on branch lines now being considered for abandonment in Manitoba had to be rebuilt.

I would suggest to you that as Saskatchewan has, I believe, three times the number of elevators on branch lines now being considered for abandonment at the present time, that the capital cost in Saskatchewan could then quite easily exceed some \$25,000,000. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when one takes a look at figures of this kind, they should indeed, and I hope will indeed, give any government cause to pause and reflect before a program of branch line abandonment is actually undertaken.

I mentioned a moment ago that by the end of March we expect that the transportation branch of the department will have more complete cost data on all of the 35 sub-divisions in Saskatchewan which are now being considered as candidates for abandonment. The provincial government and the local retention committee, which have been very active, will be in a position to arm ourselves with this kind of information, this kind of data, when we do, indeed, find an opportunity for further talks with the federal authorities.

March 5, 1964

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that our position is indeed very clear. It is this – that taking everything into consideration, if the cost of rail line abandonment to local governments and communities exceeds the operating losses claimed by the railways, then not a mile of line should be abandoned. Now I want to point out that this does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we in fact oppose all rail line abandonment in Saskatchewan. Our rail transportation system is too important to our agricultural economy to play petty politics with it, and this is the obvious intent of the amendment that was moved by my hon. friend across the way.

As the technology of agriculture and transportation changes, so will everything else gradually change in our rural communities. I want to make it abundantly clear that the provincial government is fully committed to do everything in its power to assure that any changes that are made will be made with the minimum dislocation and injury to the people of Saskatchewan. We do not, however, sit like King Canute, and order the tide of progress not to flow in.

Some charges have been made by my friends opposite, mentioned a moment ago, that we are trying to conduct a scare campaign in this province, that these communities are going to lose rail service, that the organization of these local retention committees is unnecessary, because in reality nothing is really going to happen, and that if Saskatchewan government hadn't raised the question there would be no problem of rail line abandonment.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this province, I'm sure, is fully aware of the fact. This government has absolutely no control over the railways in this province or anywhere else. This government has no control over the activities or the decisions of the Board of Transport Commissioners. All we can do is to provide our people and ourselves with the most factual data that we can in order to put up a first-class fight on behalf of the people who are going to be concerned with this problem in their particular area.

I want to suggest to you that the attitude of the members opposite, that this kind of poppycock illustrates the rather juvenile and uniformed attitude of the opposition, and I regret, Mr. Speaker, that they are so uniformed insofar as this problem is concerned.

I want to say this, that Saskatchewan is, indeed, much better prepared than any other province in Canada to handle this question of branch line abandonment. In the first place, not only is the government studying the problem in depth, but on every branch line on which the railways indicate that they may desire to abandon a section, the local municipality, the farmer, the business man, everyone, have organized themselves into committees to study their own particular situation, and they, with the help of the provincial government, will make the strongest kind of representation for the retention of rail service.

Again, such representations will, indeed, because of the work that we do have and are doing, be based on facts, and not on wild imaginings, such as some of the proposals which have emanated from across the way.

Take a look at what is happening in our neighbouring province, Manitoba, one which we usually get held up as a prime example. I would like to quote from the Winnipeg Tribune of February 24th, 1964, the headline reads "The Province Will Fight Railways"

The Manitoba government for the first time is officially going to oppose railway applications to abandon more than 1,200 miles of branch line trackage in the province.

Mr. Speaker, if anybody is a little late, I would suggest that it is unfortunately our neighbour to the east.

The people in Manitoba are in a somewhat different situation than we are here in Saskatchewan. In Manitoba the municipalities and the grain companies and other groups have had to organize their own branch line association and, indeed, have had to employ a firm of economic consultants at considerable expense to themselves to do the work which this government has been doing for the last years in this question of rail line abandonment.

March 5, 1964

In Manitoba they now have 15 local committees active on some 1,200 miles of branch lines. Here in Saskatchewan we have 56 committees on 1,760 miles of branch lines. Our committees have done a tremendous job. Their co-operation, Mr. Speaker, has made it possible for our transportation branch to circulate some 7,000 questionnaires amongst the farming population concerned, of about 20,000 and because of the returns which we have received, we have been able to do the kind of research that has been providing us with the factual data which is absolutely essential if you are going to make a proper case for retention of any particular branch line when you appear before the Board of Railroad Transport Commissioners.

I want to pay tribute to the people who serve on these retention committees. They are an alert, active, and enthusiastic group, a group that has done a tremendous job in the interests of their own communities and in so doing have done a great service to the province of Saskatchewan generally.

We take the information which they produce, sent in to us by way of questionnaires and otherwise and we process this data as it comes in. From this we are able to assist them in the preparation and presentation of submissions to any federal authority on any matters in connection with their own particular branch line.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want to just give a bit of information, which I think will again point up, just how serious this problem is and how it will, indeed, have a very serious effect on the people of this province in the areas which the lines are proposed to be abandoned.

Now, I have some data here which we have worked out on a computer, which I think will be of interest to you, and I would like to take just the question of one sub-division, number one, and give you some figures. The information we have would appear that the present weighted average distance that a farmer may have to haul his agriculture products to market is about 7.4 miles at the present time. The future weighted average distance which a farmer will have to haul his grain is something like 31.8 miles. This is a 514 per cent increase in the cost of hauling his grain. The ratio of increase in a ten year average railway loss is about 284 per cent. The average yearly real estate loss is \$174,282, the assessment loss amounts of \$722,628 and the decrease in spending which is indicated by the studies which we have undertaken is around 50 per cent.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — The district number one — would you specify where that is, so we would have something to go on?

Mr. Brown: — I think maybe I could tell you that. I'm not sure, I will have to dig that out, but I can find it for you.

Now I could go on and give you similar figures in comparison for the nine subs which are involved. I think maybe it would have more impact if I simply referred to one particular sub-division, and the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) will be interested in this, because it concerns his particular area.

The trucking cost in the Gravelbourg sub-division, the distance at the present time works out to 5.2 miles. The future trucking distance works out to 14.1 miles. The cost per permit holder at present \$71; future costs \$274; total cost to the sub-division which has something like 197 farmers delivery just over 5,000,000 bushels of grain on a ten year average is this. The present — \$91,715; in the future it will rise to \$355,000. This, Mr. Speaker, represents an increase in cost to those people concerned of something like 287 per cent.

There are real estate losses to be taken into consideration. The market value, present losses as compounded at six per cent over a 20 year period, a yearly loss is calculated by dividing this by 140, this is the assumed period when all farms will be sold at least once. The loss then works out on this basis: each permit holder would lose on an average some \$1,883 on the value of his land if he wished to sell after the line had been abandoned. The assessed value: the R.M.'s and villages on the Gravelbourg sub, would lose approximately \$750,000 on assessments on farm lands alone if the line was abandoned.

Now, there is a lot more of this kind of factual information, which we are producing at the present time, all of which, as I say, will be available to the local retention committees when they are appearing on their own behalf. The information will be available when we, along with representatives of the committees, find it necessary to appear before the federal authorities to ascertain just exactly what is involved in this new legislation which is to be brought down.

All of us, the retention committee, and ourselves, naturally are waiting to read the fine print on this proposed railway legislation. If the federal authorities accept the advice that they have received from the people in Saskatchewan, and the other western provinces, and write it into the legislation, it will be very good indeed. If they don't, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you and this house, and the people of Saskatchewan, that parliament hill and the federal authorities will hear considerably about it from Saskatchewan people and the Saskatchewan government.

Now there is much more that could be said along this matter, and I think I have taken up enough time of the house. I did want to present the complete picture, as closely as possible, to all members of the house, in order that they would be fully aware that this matter is being given top attention insofar as this government is concerned. I regret that my friends opposite by virtue of the amendment that they brought in are now trying to play politics with this particular matter. I regret that they couldn't get solidly behind this resolution, a resolution which is again, I suggest, in keeping with the thinking and the attitude of the people who serve on these rail line retention committees. I am afraid that we would be wasting a lot of time, Mr. Speaker, by simply passing the kind of a resolution which is proposed by the amendment; if we are to be realistic then I think we must accept the fact that a resolution along the lines which is urgently proposed is the sort of thing that will have more impact on the powers-that-be in Ottawa than anything else that we could produce.

I don't know what I will say I will do about the amendment but I certainly intend to fully support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of adding my voice, and my expression of concern, to others of this house who have spoken on this resolution and the amendment thereto.

Regarding the comments of the hon. Minister of Industry and Information, in which he complains about the amendment moved by this side of the house, I might say that the reasons for moving this amendment were very valid indeed, because the major part of the original motion, Mr. Speaker, has devoted itself to proposing the setting up of a federal agency along the lines mentioned by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). A branch line rationalization authority was already in the process of formation, obviously rendering the first part of this motion superfluous. Then the main motion goes on to suggest that railway companies might rationalize their operations and thus forego any abandonment at all in the first part, and in the second part the main motion concerns itself with the allocation of mineral rights upon abandonment. When the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) described the main motion as being wishy-washy, I think he was very accurate, particularly in this last respect, because certainly the main motion, if one read it carefully, had a defeatist attitude about it. It seemed as if the mover had already accepted the principle of wide-scale abandonment as being inevitable and did not propose to launch any strong protest against.

So I say that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) was a sincere amendment, and when the Minister of Industry and Information stooped to his usual tactics which we have become very familiar with in this house, of accusing us of playing politics and of having an uninformed attitude, in my opinion, this deteriorated the tone of the debate seriously. It is only because we on this side of the house, Mr. Speaker, are only too well-informed of the tactics and types of strategy employed by the members on your right, that the Minister protested so vigorously. I say that the amendment which I certainly will support, moved by the hon. member for Gravelbourg, was sincere and was an attempt by our side to suggest that we do take into consideration first and foremost, the welfare of the communities in the province.

March 5, 1964

I might qualify my remarks on this motion, Mr. Speaker, by expressing my concern over two areas in the constituency of Turtleford, which are included in the plan of the federal railway company. And I refer to the Bolney sub-division from Spruce Lake junction to Frenchman Butte and the Amiens sub-division from the Medstead junction through Spiritwood to Shellbrook. These are two very important and valuable railway lines in the northwest and can only result in hardship to the people in these areas should the railway companies proceed with their announced intentions.

With reference to the first sub-division from the Spruce Lake junction through to Frenchman Butte, I wish to emphasize the importance of retaining this important line until such time as we receive a bridge over the North Saskatchewan River. For several months of the year, as the hon. Minister of Highways knows our transportation of grain and cattle is severely curtailed by the river in this area. Now I don't wish to go into the many local problems raised by the proposed rail line abandonment here, since I realize the motion is pointed towards the general problems throughout the province, but I do feel that it is my duty as a member from the northwest to bring to the attention of this house the economic problems that would result if these important lines were abandoned. The Amiens sub-division is much lengthier, joining two very important railway routes from a very important agricultural and grain area. The people are very concerned as was shown by the excellent representation from both sub-divisions at the provincial conference, referred to a while ago by the Minister of Industry and Information.

Now, just a few other comments, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the announced policy of the C.N.R. They suggest that the yardstick or the basis for abandonment should be whether or not the continued operation of the line is uneconomical, if there is no potential for improvement in the foreseeable future, and where there are adequate alternate transportation facilities available in the area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for any community in this province, to qualify in all three of these, I think would be very difficult. Certainly, if we go along with the B portion here, we then admit some lack of faith in the future of the province to suggest that there is no potential for improvement. The matter of alternate transportation facilities is something which will be very difficult for us to get around indeed. In many communities of this province, the rail line is the only means of all-weather transportation. When I refer to the Amiens sub-division, I hope the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) will support our amendment, since about half of this sub-division lies in the constituency of Shellbrook. I know, he will agree with me, that during the winter months, the movement of cattle and grain would be severely restricted if this sub-division were closed.

Now, when we examine the number of applications filed with the Board of Transport Commissioners between January 1st, 1962, and October 21st, 1963, we see that there has been 30 applications for abandonment in Saskatchewan as opposed to 19 in Manitoba and 11 in Ontario. If one is looking for some of the repercussions of the lack of population growth in Saskatchewan, this might well be one of them, since we have nearly twice the number of applications for abandonment in Saskatchewan as opposed to any other province in Canada.

Now I was interested to read the proceedings of the provincial meeting held in November and to note that delegates from the Amiens sub-division from my own constituency moved one of the resolutions, number 8:

That it be resolved that the Minister of Industry and Information be requested to appoint from members nominated by the local rail retention committee, the delegation to proceed to Ottawa.

As far as I'm concerned, the people of Saskatchewan have in the past and will, if given the proper opportunity in the future, stand shoulder to shoulder on behalf of their existing rail lines. That portion of the amendment which the Minister of Industry and Information would have stricken out, namely:

That the federal government not allow the abandonment of any rail line or lines which might adversely affect any community in Saskatchewan.

In my opinion, a very vital and very important part of the amendment, Mr. Speaker. Certainly if we are not concerned with the welfare of all of our communities, particularly our smaller communities, then what exactly are we concerned with in this and other motions in this house. When we consider the fact that many of our smaller hospitals in this province have been placed in jeopardy by this government, when we consider what has happened in many other aspects of centralization in Saskatchewan, surely, this house could on this particular amendment, stand together on behalf of the communities of Saskatchewan.

On that basis I wish to congratulate previous members of this debate who have supported our amendment and I will support it when the question is put.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate, I just want to comment a bit on what the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) said. He invited the hon. member from Shellbrook (Mr. Thiessen) to get up and state his position in support of the amendment. He obviously doesn't realize that the hon. member for Shellbrook introduced the original motion when he made his great appeal to the house to stand shoulder to shoulder. I would suggest to him that he had an opportunity when the motion was first submitted to the house, he had full opportunity at that time to stand shoulder to shoulder and support it. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. May I ask the hon. minister a question at this time?

Mr. Speaker: — No, I don't think so. A motion to adjourn the debate is before the house and I can't take points of privilege when there is a motion before the house. I wonder if the members would let me pose the question before they interfere, I am not through posing yet.

Motion to adjourn debate agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas – 28

Messieurs

Lloyd	Thurston	Semchuk
Johnson	Wood	Perkins
Brown	Davies	Thiessen
Blakeney	Nicholson	Snyder
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Peterson
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Broten
Meakes		

Nays – 19

Messieurs

Thatcher	McFarlane	Coderre
Batten (Mrs.)	Gardiner	MacDougall
McCarthy	Staveley	Snedker
Barrie	Foley	Gallagher
McDonald	Boldt	Erb
Danielson	Horsman	Steuart
Cameron		

Debate adjourned.

March 5, 1964

SECOND READINGS

HON. O.A. TURNBULL (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 53, An Act to Amend The Secondary Education Act.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 53, proposes certain amendments to The Secondary Education Act, and the purpose of these amendments is to eliminate double taxation for high school purposes where separate school districts exist in secondary school districts.

In outlining the principle and the way this bill attempts to resolve the question that is posed by the possibility of double taxation in these circumstances, I would ask the indulgence of the house for a few minutes to briefly sketch out the Saskatchewan school system.

I believe it a fair thing to say that the question of separate schools is not of provincial making. Separate schools exist in Saskatchewan by virtue of the fact that the constitution of Canada and the federal legislation that establishes the province has clearly set for the principle that a religious minority, whether they be Protestant or Catholic, can separate from a school district and elect their own board and levy their own taxes and be subject only to those taxes. I think it is a fair thing to say then, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan at the time it became a province had two parallel publicly operated school systems and was identical to Alberta.

You have the school system which can elect its board and this board has full powers of assessing and raising monies and has full academic jurisdiction from grade one to grade 12. From this system, the separate school system can divide, providing it is either Protestant or Catholic, and the separate school system has identical powers in respect to taxing. It can only tax the property of its supporters; it has full academic jurisdiction from grade one to grade 12 and has the full rights of collecting grants in exactly the same manner as the school system by application of the same formula.

In 1907, the Scott Government of this province passed The Secondary Education Act. This gives rise to the third board-operated system. This system has academic jurisdiction only between the grades nine and 12. This system elects a board, but the board does not levy the tax. The board requisitions the city or town and the city or town council levies the tax. Because this is so, all residents within the town or city pay that tax. Now bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the emergence of the secondary school system in no way reduces the power of the separate school system. The separate school system still has full academic jurisdiction. I have a list of the schools where secondary schools are so organized. They have the right to teach to grade 12, I would like to read out the names. They are: Assiniboia, Estevan, North Battleford, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Weyburn, Unity. These separate school systems operate high school rooms, they hire teachers, they collect grants, they levy taxes; but because they exist within secondary districts (or high school or collegiate districts to use the more proper term), they must also pay the collegiate tax of the high school tax.

This situation does not obtain in the remainder of the separate school districts where no secondary or high school or collegiate district exists, and these are: Biggar, Lloydminster, Marquis, Meadow Lake, Melville, Radville, Rosetown, Spiritwood, Vonda, Watson, Wilkie, Wilcox, Wood River. The difference between this latter group and the one that I read formerly, Mr. Speaker, is that these do not exist within a high school or collegiate tax.

We suggest that this is an unfair situation. The issue, I think, that is before this legislature and Saskatchewan is not whether separate schools have the right to exist for this has been clearly established; but whether or not we should treat them with fairness and equity when they exist within the high school or collegiate district or not. We think that the amendment that we propose will allow a decision to be made so that the separate school supporters, if they wish it, may avoid paying the collegiate tax.

The method that we use to arrive at this position, is to allow a separate high school district to be established. We do it through permissive legislation, allowing the separate school supporters to decide whether or not they wish to do it. Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there may be some areas that do not wish to do this, and there is not compulsion on them.

Another reason why we have chosen the separate high school district concept, is because we were approached many times to have a different method of declaring a separate high school supporter or a high school supporter, as compared with the method that is now used in being a separate school supporter, or a public school supporter, and I want to make perfectly clear to the house what the difference is. The declaration which determines whether you are a separate schools supporter or a public school supporter is determined by faith, not a personal declaration. And if evidence can be brought to show that a ratepayer is of a certain faith, then he is deemed to be the supporter of that system. But under these amendments, this matter of faith is not in question; it is a matter of personal declaration. We think this is a better and a more flexible method. True there are some problems with it, but we agree with those who have made the representation and therefore, we have written this into the amendments and it is the main reason, one of the main reasons, of the separate high school district emergence.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to just touch briefly on the method of establishing a separate high school district if persons so desire. We have endeavoured to set out as long a time period as possible for consultation and study between separate schools supporters and the general public, between the separate school board, and other school boards, with no automatic time factor imposed by the legislation in this particular period of time. The method, or the steps rather, would be that consideration first of all would be given by the separate school boards. They can petition the minister for the erection of such a separate high school district.

Following this the minister would request that a plan be drawn in respect to the buildings that would be required, the staff that would be necessary, the extent of the programs; whether or not, the board is going to move into special education, retarded, vocational and technical and the financing of the plan, which is not the least of the problem. Bear in mind there is no time limit on this. Following the drawing of this plan, and after whatever length of time is required, the separate school board may file the plan with the minister. With the filing of this plan with the minister, we look on an automatic timing device, that calls for a poll to be taken in not less than 90 days and not more than 24 months. The poll is to be taken by the separate school board, and the poll would be for or against the establishment of a separate high school district. One month prior to the poll, the plan or an approved summary of the plan would have to be published, whether in a newspaper that normally circulates the area, or by some other approved method so that ratepayers by the time the polls are taken, would have had the benefit of whatever consultations and public discussion had been entered into, during the whole period of time. They would be made perfectly cognizant of what the plan was, what commitments they would be undertaking in respect to buildings and financing and the like. If a district is established, we then come to the declaration of the ratepayer as to whether or not he becomes a separate high school supporter and this is found in section 13.

The method that we have chosen is that if the rate payer is a separate school supporter, he is automatically placed on the roll of the separate high school; if he is a public school supporter, he is automatically placed on the roll of the high school until such time as he declares contrary and there is a double cross-over, Mr. Speaker. The separate school supporter, if he wishes, can designate himself to be the supporter of the collegiate system, send his children to the collegiate system, and of course his taxes would go to that system without a declaration of faith. The Protestant, if he wishes, and many do, can send his children to separate schools and pay tax monies to that system.

There is a problem of stability here. We recognize this but we do think that if this method were chosen and the systems were established, there would be comparatively little shifting in and out. However, we are not fully aware of the degree of shift that might take place in any one year, but we are willing to risk that. We think it will be small and it meets the demands for such flexibility of declaration.

Where the ratepayers decide not to divide the high school districts, Mr. Speaker, we have written into sub-section (2) the possibility of the collegiate board designating a school which would in fact become a separate school in the high school academic area, operated by the collegiate system. Here we have written into law a bit of the concept that has already been possible and has already been legal. We have written in a slightly different fashion those agreements that have already been made between private schools and school boards.

If either system is chosen, Mr. Speaker, the problem of double taxation is solved. We think then we will have moved a step towards resolving

March 5, 1964

this question of inequity that now exists in 14 of the 16 high school or collegiate districts in Saskatchewan.

There are, of course, a number of concerns in this type of legislation. I am suggesting to this house, Mr. Speaker, that in placing responsibility on the two publicly operated systems, we are taking a positive and good step in maintaining high standards of education without fragmenting the concept of public education and public responsibility.

There is nothing, as we have said before, in this act that refers to private schools as such. The possibility of private schools making agreements with school boards remains untouched by this legislation. They have exactly the same rights in this respect they had prior to the consideration of these amendments.

Another part of this bill has nothing to do with this proposal is found in section (2) of the bill, which has to do with the disorganization of a high school district. These two parts are not related. This section is written in, following a number of requests from city systems stating that they wish to consider setting up a single board of education, and we haven't been able to move as quickly as we would have liked in consideration of this type of legislation. We thought that by writing in this section, which deals with disorganization of a high school district we would let the people of Saskatchewan know that we are interested in moving in this direction. If any city districts are interested in moving in this direction and I could let you know that Saskatoon system has contacted us on it following this amendment, if it should pass this house, I'm sure we will be sitting down to consider what other legislative steps may be necessary as further consultation indicates it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, those are the main parts of this bill. I am confident that when the people of Saskatchewan fully understand the concept and fully understand the problem that has emerged as a result of secondary or high school collegiate districts, and separate districts, they will be prepared to go along with these amendments and I would not move second reading.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the minister on the way he presented his views on this legislation this afternoon. The Liberal party has no desire to place a such a matter as the issue now before us, in the filed of political controversy. Our position has been clearly stated on numerous occasions and particularly at our annual convention last November.

Hon. members may recall that during the throne speech I outlined those views in some detail, and I see no purpose in repeating them this afternoon. The Liberal party believes that approved private high schools of all denominations should receive fair and equal treatment. We believe that such institutions are entitled to equitable financial assistance from this government.

Upon taking office a Liberal government will provide such assistance.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Minster of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 48 – An Act to Amend The Hospital Standards Act.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill designed to amend The Hospital Standards Act, and the amendments deal with matters relating to hospital staff appointments. Matters with respect to hospital staff appointments have always caused problems in hospitals, not only in Saskatchewan, but elsewhere. The problems have almost always in Saskatchewan revolved around the medical competence of the doctor as judged by the application of the standards applied by the hospital, existing and well known and frequently applied standards.

The possibility of hospital staff appointments revolving around other problems has always existed and in point of fact, I think that a fair assessment of the hospital staff appointment problems which have occurred in Saskatchewan in the past would acknowledge that on occasion other matters, other than competence, have become one of the considerations. Frequently there have been some personality clashes, particularly in smaller hospitals.

The possibility of hospital staff appointment problems revolving around differences other than differences in medical competence, was recognized at the time of the Saskatoon Agreement. It was at that time recognized that other differences between medical men, differences of attitude of physicians to the medical care plan being inaugurated, might be the basis of difficulties with respect to the hospital staff appointments.

With this in mind a particular provision was agreed to and incorporated in the Agreement, I think members are familiar with it, but I will just quote briefly from it to refresh our minds; a number of articles 8 to 14 deal with the matter, but rather than taking an extensive period of time, I would just refer to article 11, which deals for the most part with this subject. Article 11 reads:

There must be no discrimination against any doctor in whatsoever way he practices. In particular there must be no discrimination against any doctor in the matter of hospital privileges and attachments, referrals from one physician to another, or other professional activities involving assistance and co-operation between physicians.

The College endorses this view. 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. Accordingly, the College undertakes that in advising on applications for hospital appointments applicants shall be judged solely on their merits.

Following the Saskatoon agreement and the inauguration of the medical care plan which is provided for in The Medical Care Insurance Act as amended, there were persistent reports of difficulties with regard to medical staff appointments. There was a similarity with respect to the cases. Almost every case involved a doctor practising directly under the medical care insurance plan and a substantial number of the cases involved doctors associated with community clinics.

The general question of medical staff appointments is a very serious matter, not only for physicians but also for their patients. It is generally recognized that a family doctor, a general practitioner, carrying on an ordinary practice of medicine in Canada – with the type of medical organization which we have in Canada, with the type of relations between doctors and their patients and doctors and their hospitals, and patients in their hospitals, with this set-up which we have – to carry on his best work must have access to a hospital.

I could quote a good number of authorities in support of that proposition. There has been, not too long ago, a book published, entitled “The General Practitioner” by Dr. Kenneth F. Clute, a study which was prepared at the instigation of the College of General Practice of Canada, and carried out at the University of Toronto. During the course of the very exhaustive study which is represented by this book, into the patterns of medical practice, particularly in Ontario and Nova Scotia, a number of conclusions were reached, and I would like to refer to one or two of them with respect to this matter of the relationship between a general practitioner and a hospital.

In the foreword to the book a Doctor Victor Johnston, a director of the College of General Practice of Canada, reaches the conclusion that the College of General Practice has consistently maintained that the privilege of participation on the active staff of their neighbouring general hospitals, including teaching hospitals, is a fundamental privilege which assures able general practitioners a place on hospital committees and departments and enhances their competence as medical practitioners. This is a general statement. There have been a good number of others. There is in Dr. Clute’s book an excerpt from the 1957 bulletin of the College of General Practice in which Dr. S. Robinson, an official of the Toronto Academy of Medicine, states the view that he believes that it is time that general practitioners sought recognition of certain fundamental rights and he goes on to say that another fundamental right is that of being enabled to perform any service or procedure in a hospital of which he has proven himself capable.

Another is the right of the general practitioner for equal opportunity with the specialist to admit his patients to hospital. And he goes on –

March 5, 1964

another is the right of the general practitioner for equal opportunity with the specialist to admit his patients to hospital. And he goes on – another is the right of the general practitioner to admit his patients to hospital in the district, even though it is not a hospital on whose staff he happens to be. There are similar points of view expressed on page 119 of Dr. Clute's book where he quotes the May, 1958, bulletin of the College of General Practice, and quotes a Doctor Morley A. Young, the then President of the Canadian Medical Association, to the effect:

that every medical practitioner should have hospital privileges.

Dr. Young goes on to say:

Whenever hospital privileges are denied, someone has caused a step to be taken which lowers the standard of practice.

In the November, 1958, bulletin of the College of General Practice, the following resolution is recorded:

Be it further resolved that the Canadian Medical Association uses its full influence to discourage any arbitrary restrictions by hospitals against general practitioners as a group, or as individuals.

There are a number of other quotations to this effect, all to the effect that practice as we know it in Canada is best facilitated by giving access to hospitals to the family doctor.

There is a very forthright statement of this point of view quoted in page 122 of Dr. Clute's book where a Dr. J.A. McHugh, the Conservative member of the Ontario Legislature for Lanark, is quoted on this subject, and Dr. McHugh is very forthright in his views. Among others he says and I am quoting from page 122 of Dr. Clute's book:

There is a condition existing in this province today, which I believe is unjust and completely intolerable. This is the fact that there are many hospitals in existence which will not allow a family doctor to become a member of their staff nor to treat any patient of theirs within the hospital.

And he goes on to say:

I would like to see legislation introduced which would require every hospital board at present not doing so, to take the family doctor on to their staffs.

In other words, let the doctors into their hospitals. Wherever they cannot now do so, why should there be any medical caste system anywhere? Why should there be any discrimination in a democracy such as ours?

Well, the general tenor of these remarks is to the effect that it is wise and prudent in most hospitals to allow general practitioners, and indeed all doctors to have access to those hospitals to carry on their practices to the extent of their medical abilities.

A similar point of view is expressed in The Canadian Doctor for February, 1964. There is an editorial there which talks about the need for public re-education on the best way that a doctor can serve the public. Therein they state the point of view that for the public to believe that a doctor, an individual doctor, a person who is a doctor, can be available to them twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, is unrealistic. No man, no individual, can maintain that pace, and the public ought to be re-educated so that when certain crises arise, they will call their local hospital or call an ambulance to take them to their local hospital where the patient can be dealt with, rather than waiting for a particular practitioner if in the view of the patient the crisis is acute.

They are again commenting on the developing pattern in medicine, and towards the end of the comment they go on to say:

If, on the other hand, the patient is not ill enough to need immediate attention, he can safely wait to see his doctor during the daylight hours, either in his own house or in the doctor's office, or at the hospital. The increased use of the hospital obviously makes it essential that every doctor should have hospital facilities available to him.

March 5, 1964

I think that I could outline for the house a great number of similar points of view, similar expressions of this point of view, and I think it is very widely accepted that in our system of medicine it is entirely appropriate for virtually every doctor to have access to hospitals where he may treat his patients again to the extent of his medical ability.

In the light of persistent reports that reached us that there were difficulties with respect to hospital staff appointments, the government arranged to appoint a Royal Commission. There had previously been a Royal Commission dealing with this general topic and it was reactivated and the government was, as we believe, very fortunate in securing the services of Mr. Justice Mervyn Woods. I think all members will know that Judge Woods is a man of very wide experience in the life of Saskatchewan. He has been a practising lawyer in Saskatoon, and had an extensive clientele. He has been active in many community affairs and organizations, particularly active in the Canadian Legion and has been National President. He has been a Professor of Law at University of Saskatchewan. He is a Doctor of Jurisprudence; he is a member of the Court of Appeal of Saskatchewan; and he has altogether a very distinguished record of public service.

In the course of discharging his duties he carried out very exhaustive investigations and hearings. There were something like 50 sitting days in which he heard testimony, the testimony, aggregating well over 5,000 pages. In fact he carried out a most exhaustive, a most careful, a most detailed inquiry into the question of hospital staff appointments in the history of Saskatchewan.

Now I think we shouldn't believe that questions with respect to hospital staff appointments are confined to Saskatchewan. There have been many other problems associated with hospital staff appointments in other places, and other methods of dealing with them have been evolved. These problems are very common in the southern United States, where the problems usually surround race; they are quite common in other parts of the United States; and they have been the subject of a good deal of litigation and some legislation in the United States. Other general problems of a similar nature, problems of relationships between physicians and hospital boards, have come to light in Canada.

In the United States the general law of the United States offers some solutions not available in Canada. They have as part of their sub-stratum of law, a right of action wherever there is restraint of trade, and a good number of actions have been taken against hospital boards and against local medical societies where a doctor alleged that because of the actions of the local hospital medical board, or medical society, in his view they were acting in restraint of trade in a monopolistic way and these events have occurred in a way which would bar him from hospitals.

In New York there has been litigation and there has more recently been legislation. I think a good number of members will have had called to their attention legislation passed in February of 1963, in New York, dealing specifically with discrimination in hospital staff appointments, and I would just quote briefly from it and then try to summarize the import of the bill. The bill is in the style of American Statutes which is terse as compared with our own. The bill says:

Discrimination in hospital staff appointments and privileges is prohibited. It shall be an unlawful discriminatory practice for the governing body of a hospital "a" – to deny or withhold from a physician, staff membership or professional privileges in a hospital because of his participation in any medical group practice or non-profit health insurance plan authorized by the laws of the state.

It shall equally be unlawful and a discriminatory practice:

"b" to exclude or expel a physician from staff membership, or to curtail, terminate, or to diminish in any way a physician's professional privileges in a hospital because of his participation in medical group practice or non-profit health insurance plan . . .

March 5, 1964

And the act goes on to set up procedures where it is alleged that this is occurring. The procedures are that a commissioner may be appointed and he may hold a hearing, and if upon the evidence at the hearing the hearing officer which is the name given to the deputy commissioner, shall find that a respondent – which is the hospital – has engaged in any unlawful discriminatory practice, the hearing officer shall state his findings of fact and the commissioner shall issue and cause to be service on such respondent an order requiring such respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful discriminatory practice. I think for one to appreciate this one has to appreciate that under the American system a commissioner is the nearest equivalent to the cabinet minister. He is normally an elected official and heard of a bureau or department of the government of a state.

This is the solution which has been arrived at in New York. The Quebec solution to a somewhat similar problem is contained in the new Hospital Act of Quebec, 1962, and they are dealing here with disputes between hospital boards and the organized medical staff. This statute says that any dispute between the Board of Management, that is the Board of Governors in our parlance, and the executive committee of the medical board of a public hospital, respecting a medical or scientific matter including the appointment, reappointment, or dismissal of medical staff must be submitted to a joint committee consisting of an equal number of representatives of each party, and any dispute not settled by the joint committee must be submitted to a conciliation committee consisting of a chairman and two others appointed by the Ltd. Governor-in-Council.

This so-called conciliation committee is to make a decision and the unanimous or the majority decision of such a committee shall be final and the board managing the hospital must give effect thereto. This is chapter 44 of the 1962 statutes of Quebec, 10 and 11 Elizabeth, as they state in their province.

These have been some of the methods of dealing with these problems which occasionally arise as between individual doctors or groups of doctors, and boards of governors of hospitals. We will note that it has been common to get litigation in the United States and court orders ordering hospitals to place doctors on staff. We have in New York legislation on the point, and we have in Quebec legislation providing for an arbitration board on not dissimilar points, – in particular, an arbitration board which can rule out the appointment, reappointment or dismissal of members of the medical staff.

With this background, and with the exhaustive hearings which he carried on, Judge Woods reached certain conclusions. I think these again are well known to members of the house and I will not read Judge Woods' conclusion except only to say that they really can be summarized as being three: he recommended that there be an appeal board, a board to be established dealing with refusals, deferrals, or delays in granting of hospital privileges; he recommended that the findings of the board be binding on all parties; he recommended further that reasons in writing be given by the medical staff or any committee or persons acting on behalf of the board when hospital privileges or hospital staff appointments are denied. He further recommended that where a hospital is using a sponsorship system, an alternative system should be available so that sponsorship would not be a bar to admission to hospital staff appointments. Mr. Speaker, the bill with respect to the amendments to The Hospital Standards Act follows very closely the recommendations of Mr. Justice Woods.

I will take some time now to review portions of the bill so that members of the house may be able to relate portions of the bill to the Woods Commission Report, if they so wish.

The bill itself, in section 2, contains a series of definitions. Some of these are new definitions and others of them are definitions which were in the act previously. The definitions of "institution", "minister", "participating hospital" were previously in the act, the definition of "patient" was in the act, in a very slightly different form. I will in my remarks refer to not the sections in the amending act, but the section numbers as they will appear if and when they were enacted. I will then refer to section 13A and say that this deals with the granting of temporary hospital privileges to physicians. Judge Woods deals with this in the course of his report on page 19, and here we have followed the general suggestion which he has put forward, and in particular, we have followed quite closely the suggested medical staff bylaws, rules and regulations which are published by the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation.

They have in their suggested bylaws in section 6, some bylaws with respect to emergency and temporary privileges and these have been followed fairly closely in section 13A.

Section 13B is an attempt to set out criteria which shall be used in deciding whether physicians should be appointed or reappointed to the staff and emphasis, of course, was placed upon the professional competence, the training, the experience and the character of the physicians. Then it is recognized that there may well be some other considerations which would not fall squarely under these heads and an attempt has been made to respect the codes which may deal with other criteria. An attempt has been made to respect the codes which religious hospitals may impose on practitioners who practise within their walls or at least in respect to the practice that they carry on within their walls. An attempt has been made to deal with the University Act, and in sub-section 7, a number of things which are not to be considered with respect to hospital staff appointment are enumerated; here we have matters of race, creed, religion, color and this is fairly closely copied from the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. We have other provisions with respect to sponsorship. I would point out to hon. members that the act does not do anyway with sponsorship, it merely provides that alternative methods must be found where an applicant is unable to find a sponsor – an alternate method of supervision in the manner again suggested by Judge Woods.

The other sections here are relatively self-explanatory. A rather cryptic reference to the medical profession on page five is to deal with improper methods of remuneration and is not an attempt to make valid or make proper any methods of payment which are now considered to be improper under The Medical Profession Act.

Section 13B, the next large section, tries to set out time limits within which a physician may expect to get answers from a hospital board. May I say that if the hospital takes longer than the time limit prescribed, this does not give the physician any claim against the hospital, it only means that the physician has what might be called a prima facie case of delay and the appeal board is then able to look at the problem.

Section 13E deals with written reasons and there has been an attempt in this section to protect hospital boards and members of medical staffs against actions for defamation which could conceivably be against a board or a medical staff committee for giving an honest but erroneous opinion on the medical competence of a physician. This was one of the points raised with me and with others of us who met with representatives of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and I believe that this point has been effectively managed.

Another point raised by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association in the course of our consultations with them was a desire expressed on their part that some procedures may be found where appeal board provisions might not apply to hospitals until they might be needed. They felt that the problems were only arising in a relative handful of hospitals and they are at big hospitals and that probably some way could be found of rendering the appeal board provision not applicable to a hospital until the need was apparently upon us.

Section 13F is an attempt to say that the appeal board provisions will not apply until the hospital has designated. The minister must designate a hospital if a board asks that it be designated, and the minister must designate it if a physician asks that it be designated and it appears to the minister that the physician is a person who would be able to make an application to the appeal board, and that he is a physician at that particular hospital he has made application and so on.

In each case provision is made for consultation with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the purpose of this being to enable the hospital association firstly to be informed and secondly to have one further opportunity to use any good offices which they may be able to use in the solution of the apparent problem.

Section 13G deals with the appointment of the appeal board and it will be noted that provision is made for the chairman to be a member of the judiciary in the manner recommended by Mr. Justice Woods. It is provided that the majority of the appeal board of seven shall be physicians; it is provided for physicians to be appointed. Mr. Justice Woods suggested that at least half of the majority shall be appointed on the nomination of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and this is provided for. The possibility of delays because members of the appeal board could not be available has been approached by providing for alternate members and it will be noted that in effect three alternates will be provided. They will alternate for the appropriate members of the board as designated by the chairman.

March 5, 1964

There a number of procedural sections dealing with the operations of the board. Section 13H attempts to set out in some detail the circumstances under which a physician may appeal to the appeal board, and again they follow quite closely the recommendations of Mr. Justice Woods, although they do deal with re-appointments as well as initial appointments. It will be recalled that Mr. Justice Woods in the course of his hearings dealt only with cases of first appointments, because these were the only cases referred to him. The appeal board is given the usual power to retain staff. Perusal of the act will note that a number of powers which might in some statutes be left with the board as such have been in this act placed with the chairman, by reason of the fact that he is a member of the judiciary, and he can perhaps discharge some of these tasks in a way which would be more acceptable than if the board as a whole decided. As an instance of that, I would refer to section 13J, where we provide that the hearings of the board shall be in public, except where the chairman of the board otherwise directs. Here I think we can rely upon the chairman to use his good judgment on whether or not the circumstances are such that the hearings should be in public. The decision of the appeal board is binding.

Further sections deal with procedural matters such as costs, and the service of the documents. I would refer hon. members to section 13N, because this is a little bit about the other sections of the act. This provides that the board of governors of a general hospital may make what amounts to an informal application to the appeal board for advice, and in this case the appeal board may call for such information as may be useful to them, in assisting the board with the problem posed by the board.

This was an attempt to deal with the recommendations of Mr. Justice Woods, contained on page 103 of his report, where he suggested that a similar right, meaning a right of application to the appeal board, should be open to the governing body of the hospital before acting upon a recommendation or making a final decision. It seemed to us appropriate that where the board is essentially seeking advice the procedure ought to be somewhat less formal than where they are carrying on what is essentially their duty.

Section 13 O is the usual section saying that no existing legal rights are being done away with by this act.

The new section 19 is a section which attempts to remove any doubts as to whether or not the Department of Public Health can make available to the public copies of medical staff bylaws which are filed with the department. There has for some years been a requirement that medical staff bylaws be filed with the department. Some people had been of the view that these then became documents which the department is free to make available to the public, acting as a registrar like the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies or the Registrar of Co-ops or as the case may be. Others have felt that these were filed for the internal use of the department and not to be made public. The act resolves the question in favour of the fact that medical staff bylaws are public documents and in this regard I think quite properly so.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into some detail in outlining the nature of the act and background leading up to the act. Members will be aware that after Mr. Justice Woods' report was received, rather extensive consultations were undertaken both informally and later on a rather more formal basis with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association and representations were received from a substantial number of other bodies. I think the press reports outlined these and I won't take the time of the house to outline the views of the various groups. It suffices to say that some wished that Mr. Justice Woods had gone further, some supported his views wholeheartedly.

The Saskatchewan Hospital Association supported one recommendation, had reservations with respect to the second and rather substantial reservations with respect to the third. The College of Physicians and Surgeons express their reservations with respect substantially to all of his recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed to deal with the report of Mr. Justice Woods and to implement the recommendations that he has put forward. The problem which he investigated is essentially a problem of citizens' rights. Our hospitals are publicly supported hospitals and they are part of a publicly supported health system. I believe that all members would agree that they are meant to be used for the benefit of the general public. I view them in a not dissimilar way to our legal system. It seems to me that as we created a health system to serve our needs, the needs of the whole community with respect to health matters, we created a legal system to deal with legal matters. We have doctors, we have lawyers, and I know viewing it from a lawyer's point of view, I would think that I should have the right to practise at the bar, and that right ought not to be curtailed for any reasons which is not associated with my legal competency or my moral standing. If I am legally competent and not guilty of moral turpitude, it seems to me that I should have the right to

practise at the bar. It also seems to me that it would be wrong for any fellow practitioner to attempt to curtail my rights for any reason not associated with my legal competence or moral standing.

I think it would be wrong, and morally wrong, for any legal practitioner or any fellow member of the bar to attempt to curtail my right to practise in a way which would affect my ability to serve my clients and his. It seems to me that if he would try to deny me the use of the courts, deny me the use of going to court and using the public facilities that are there, the judges that are appointed and paid for, the library which is there, or any reasons other than my incompetence or moral turpitude, then he is in effect denying my clients' rights to use the public legal system which is established not for my benefit, not for my fellow practitioner's benefit, but for the client's benefit.

I think equally so that some analogies can be drawn in the health field. I am not saying the analogy is perfect, I am just saying there is an analogy there, and that it seems to me that generally speaking patients ought to have the right to have access to hospitals, being treated there by the medically qualified physicians of their choice.

It seems to me that this is a right which inheres in citizens by reason of the fact that they as taxpayers have built the hospitals and paid to operate them. It seems to me also that Judge Woods in the course of his analysis found that there was, at least in his view and in some cases, a denial of this right. Where there is a denial of such a right for reasons not associated with medical competence or moral standing, there is in my view a wrong, and where there is a wrong, in my view there should be a remedy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this bill provides the remedy. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Some Hon. Members: — HEAR! HEAR!

Mrs. Batten: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Hon. W. G. DAVIES (Minister of Public Works) moved second reading of Bill No. 51, An Act to Amend The Public Service Act.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the principle aimed at this bill is to clarify the position and to offer some additional protection to an employee in the Public Service, who becomes a candidate for election to the Legislative Assembly of this province. The proposal in the bill is to amend section 53 of The Public Service Act, so as to overcome any situation that may perhaps adversely affect a person who does become a candidate under the circumstances contemplated.

I felt that as matters now stand a Public Service employee who is a candidate for election to the legislature may, unless he has resigned, prior to being elected, expose himself to a penalty of being unseated. Manifestly a public employee who does become a candidate can't know whether he will be elected or not before election day at least. It would seem to be rather unjust that he would have to have filed his resignation before the election results were known.

Now, the amendment proposes to state that such a candidate will have been deemed to have resigned his office or his place of profit, or employment, as stated in the act before Election Day, if he is successful in getting elected. A number of obvious exceptions are included in this amendment to cover such variables as re-counts, the setting aside of the election, and so forth.

So, in a nutshell I think as I have said, the amendment seeks to offer an additional amount of security for a Public Service employee who does seek office in the provincial legislature, and thereupon becomes successful at the polls.

I think with this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

March 5, 1964

HON. O.A. TURNBULL (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 52 An Act to Amend The School Act.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 52 provides for a number of amendments to The School Act. They fall generally into three areas, one has to do with the establishment of the divisional system, which is to group grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 into divisions. It appears in this section because where the division is 7, 8 and 9, we list under (2) which is an amendment of paragraph four, section two, we amended this section in such a way so that this division can qualify for high school grants. The reverse had been true. If the high school did reach down and pick up seven and eight and make it a junior high school it would qualify for high school grants. Now this does the reverse, in this respect, for this school system.

There is a matter of administration in this paragraph three, section three, amended, which has to do with the regulations of the department and this has to do, as you see, with remuneration. It is requested by the audit.

We have had certain activities taking place that are listed here, special committees, boards of reference, conferences and the like, which have been handled under section five of The School Act, which is rather broad and an omnibus type of section re powers of the minister. The audit suggested that we ought to write in something a bit more specific, thus this one rises.

There is a bit on the numbers of school board members, trustees, which is an amendment to section 102. This has relation to the consolidations that are taking place, and increases the number from five to seven.

On section six, it is related to the other section I dealt with, which was the amendment to section three. An amendment to section three provides for the money for the divisional system; section 114 provides for the structure of the divisional system. Another section deals with the powers of trustees which has to do with payments of gratuities to employees, other than a teacher on retirement on account of age, which is permissive. You will note the (b) part of that section has, (I think, section 125) has to do with absence with pay for person other than teachers, where granting level of absence is thought to be desirable. This has to do, in the main, with school secretaries who do leave to take up-grading at the university and the like and it will allow school boards, if they wish to, to grant leave of absence and grant pay.

There is another small section there, section 179, an amendment, which allows equal payment of debentures, and the last bit, section 229, refers again to the part of the divisional system and is necessary in order that where school boards wish to shift to this structure, they may so do.

I would, therefore, move second reading.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — I have a question before the minister takes his seat. I was just going to ask the minister if it is the intention of the department to put in to effect the new system this fall, compulsory in all schools, or will it be on an optional basis.

Mr. Turnbull: — On an optional basis, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. E.I. WOOD (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 55, An Act to Implement the Provisions of the Municipal Development and Loan Act (Canada).

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will no doubt be cognizant of The Municipal Development and Loan Act (Canada) which was passed last summer, whereby monies are made available to the municipalities throughout Canada, in regard to capital works which they would not otherwise be doing, in order that they might improve the unemployment situation throughout Canada. There has been a good deal in the papers about this and I don't think it is necessary for me to discuss it at this time.

When this first came up we had to look at our law to see whether we were authorized to act as mediators in this, to accept money from the federal government and loan it to the municipalities as is proposed under this act. We felt that we did have the necessary legal requirements in some relief acts back from the thirties whereby the government was empowered to make loans to the municipalities, and we felt that up to this point we have been acting on firm legal basis. At any rate we felt that it wasn't worthwhile calling a special session prior to this in order to make sure that we were on a sound legal basis, but we felt that in dealing with this act through the ensuing years, that it might be better that we make certain that we have the proper legal basis for doing what we wish to do under this act in agreement with the federal government in making these funds available to the municipalities.

This act is very simple and straightforward, I believe. It simply provides permission for the Department of Municipal Affairs to borrow these monies from the federal government and to loan them to the municipalities. I don't think there is anything controversial about it that I have noticed and I would now move second reading.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit a question before he sits down?

Mr. Wood: — Certainly.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — Are you renting it out at the same rate of interest as you get from the dominion government?

Mr. Wood: — Yes, we would be lending it at the same rate. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have agreed we would do this. We would get the money from the federal government and we will be making the contracts directly with the municipalities and we will, of course, have to have the approval of the federal government in regard to each one.

As the hon. members know the loans can only be made up to two-thirds of the amount of the project that is being undertaken by the municipality. The municipal development loan can be two-thirds of the project that is undertaken and of this the federal government is prepared to forgive 25 per cent. This full 25 per cent of forgiveness will be passed on to the municipality and the money will be passed on at exactly the same rate as what we obtain it.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 49, An Act respecting the Establishment and Operation of a Hospital Centre for the Residents of Southern Saskatchewan.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to incorporate or establish a board which will have the responsibility of examining into and probably presiding over the construction and operation of a hospital centre for southern Saskatchewan.

The genesis of this bill dates back some considerable time. There had been in the city of Regina some major hospital development in the late 1940's and early 1950's in the form of a substantial addition to the Regina General Hospital, the so called Alexandra Wing, of 263 beds, with a small addition in 1955 of isolation beds. There was similarly an addition on the Grey Nuns' Hospital of some 156 beds, and then in the middle and later '50's the geriatric centre came into use. While these beds created in the geriatric centre were not general hospital beds, they assisted in relieving pressure on some of the general hospital beds in the two major hospitals in this area.

However, the city of Regina and the population of the province that uses Regina as a hospital centre continued to grow and during the mid and later

March 5, 1964

1950's the need for a more comprehensive review of hospital facilities in Regina was felt. In 1958 the Regina and District Medical Society dealt with this matter and appointed a committee to study the needs for further hospital beds in Regina. The committee proceeded with its work and felt that a more formal and more elaborate survey should be undertaken. This committee of the Regina and District Medical Society felt that the study should be undertaken by the city of Regina, and accordingly recommended that the Regina and District Medical Society approach the city of Regina to proceed with a study of the hospital bed needs in Regina. The committee of the Regina and District Medical Society was of the opinion that a thorough study covering the whole area was necessary and desirable and they believed that anything short of proper assessment of the whole situation would be real folly.

This effort did not bear much fruit, at least I am not aware of any positive action taken by the Regina City Council with respect to an area-wide survey of hospital bed needs in Regina. However, the Regina General Hospital did undertake an analysis of the needs of that institution and they, with the consent of the Department of Public Health, did proceed to retain consultants and evolve a plan for expanding the facilities of the Regina General Hospital.

Prior to the receipt of the report of the consultants engaged by the Regina General Hospital, or prior to the latest report of the consultants retained by the Regina General Hospital, the government was in receipt of a number of reports from advisory bodies which had been appointed, either by it, or by agencies created by it. In particular the government received in 1962 the report of the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care, that is the President Thompson committee, which dealt with a wide range of health topics in Saskatchewan. For the purpose of this discussion I merely wish to refer to two or three of the recommendations made by the Thompson committee. They took the position that the approach of the government with respect to the treatment of psychiatric diseases was a desirable one, that is that the province should move to the creation of smaller psychiatric institutions associated with general hospitals. In general, as I read the report, they endorsed the type of institution which is presently under construction and about to be opened at Yorkton; that is a psychiatric institution of 150 or 200, or perhaps 300 beds, depending upon the population of the area to be served, in association with the general hospital, but with a sufficient degree of isolation so that the psychiatric patients, or the patients suffering from psychiatric disorders could use the outdoors as part of the therapy area.

I quote the Thompson committee:

The provincial government should proceed at once with the gradual implementation of a modified form of the Saskatchewan plan for community-based, decentralized services to the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

My point here is simply to say that they endorsed the idea of having smaller psychiatric institutions in association with the general hospitals, and institutions approximately of the type of the Yorkton institution.

In dealing with tuberculosis they envisage the day when the Sanatorium at For San might operate on a more restricted basis and when Sanatorium units might be associated with general hospitals, and in their report, page 140, they envisage the possibility at some time in the future of a tuberculosis in-patient unit being established at Regina in association with the General hospital.

The next and the major piece of advice which the government received was in the form of the report of the hospital survey committee. This committee as members will know, is a committee appointed by the Health Services Planning Commission. Members will also recall that the Health Services Planning Commission is a broadly based advisory group advising the government on a general range of health problems. It has representatives of SARM, SUMA, Registered Nurses, College of Physicians and Surgeons, College of Dental Surgeons, the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the Federation of Labour and a substantial number of other widely representative community groups, or professional groups interested in the health field.

Well, this Health Services Planning Commission appointed a hospital survey committee to do a survey of the hospital needs of Saskatchewan. A survey of the hospital needs of Saskatchewan had been done in 1951. That survey had recommended that a re-survey be done sometime during the 1950's; time passed on and the problem wasn't attacked until 1961 when, I believe, the committee was appointed, or 1960. It did most of the work in 1961, and reported to the Health Services Planning Commission in 1962. That commission studies the report and prepared an analysis, or perhaps I should say a commentary

of the hospital survey report, and passed it along to the government in November of 1962. There were in the report of the hospital survey committee a number of recommendations which had a good deal of relevance for the Regina situation.

In particular they reported, page 242, that

At the present time the Regina General Hospital has received approval from the Minister of Public Health for a construction and renovation program which would provide an integrated hospital unit having a rated capacity of 750 active treatment beds.

The hospital survey committee feels there is further merit in reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of all criteria affecting construction and expansion of facilities on the existing Regina General site.

After giving this matter considerable thought the hospital survey committee is of the opinion that there may be a distinct advantage in considering the construction of a third hospital in the city of Regina, rather than expanding large sums of money to expand facilities on the existing sites of both the Regina General and the Grey Nuns.

Then the committee goes on to say that they do not exclude the possibility of construction or renovation of the Regina General; they recommended, and here I am quoting from page 160 of the hospital survey report:

It is recommended that a thorough study of the use of existing beds and facilities in the general hospitals and related institutions in both the cities of Regina and Saskatoon be undertaken to determine how available beds are being utilized. The provision of the additional beds that will be required in both cities, within the overall total recommended by the committee, should be guided by the results of this study.

In effect, therefore, they were recommending, Mr. Speaker, that the possibility of a third hospital in Regina be considered, and that a thorough study of bed needs in Regina and Saskatoon should be made.

They further recommended that base hospital services be a provincial responsibility and that one hospital in Saskatoon and one in Regina be designated as base hospitals. They further recommended that a provincial owned base hospital be constructed in Regina. This then was the nub of their recommendations. Having received these recommendations, having received the other recommendations which I earlier referred to from the Thompson Committee (suggesting the desirability of a general hospital complex which would combined easily with a psychiatric unit of the type we have at Yorkton and combined possibly with a tuberculosis unit), the possibility of constructing a third hospital on a quite different site from the two existing hospitals presented itself with some force. Accordingly, we advised the Regina General Hospital that we would ask them not to proceed further with their planning at this stage; that if they had incurred expenses on planning we would meet their bill; we then set out to pursue the recommendations contained in the Hospital Survey report. We obtained the services of two hospital consultants working together and in this regard I think we were very fortunate indeed.

We arranged to obtain the services of Doctor G. Harvey Agnew and Doctor Gerhard Hartman. Doctor Agnew is of the firm of Agnew, Peckham and Associates of Toronto, and Doctor Hartman is of Iowa city, U.S.A.

Dr. Harvey Agnew has been regarded for many years as probably the foremost authority in Canada in the field of hospital planning. From 1927 to 1931 he served as the executive official of the Canadian Medical Association Hospital Advisory Service. From 1931 to 1950 he was engaged as the executive official of the organization representing hospitals in Canada, being organized originally as the Canadian Hospital Council and subsequently becoming known as the Canadian Hospital Association. In 1939 he was president of the American Hospital Association. He is a former professor of hospital administration of the University of Toronto, and now carries on his profession as a full-time

March 5, 1964

hospital consultant. He has been engaged as consultant for such places as Metro Toronto. He has done work in Halifax, he has done work in Saskatoon for the university hospital, and for a substantial number of other institutes across Canada.

Doctor Gerhard Hartman is a younger man. He is professor of hospital administration at the University of Iowa and director of the University Hospital at Iowa City which is associated with the University of Iowa.

They were asked to proceed as rapidly as possible with part one of their studies. Part one dealt with whether or not we should proceed with a third hospital or alternatively with the Regina General Hospital renovations. In November, 1963, they made available to us part one of their report and in brief, the consultants recommended that a hospital centre be created in Regina, in which various types of specialized services would be provided.

I do not know whether hon. members would be interested in perusing the report of Doctors Hartman and Agnew, but the report spells out their concept of a hospital centre. They envisage a centre which would be designed to provide highly specialized services, which would have the very specialized operating rooms, laboratories, and similar specialized facilities which might be needed in one hospital in a base centre. They recommended that these be included in this specialty unit and that a number of beds be provided as well. They envisaged that there would be associated with this all of the other types of care which one would associate with a large hospital complex. They envisaged that there would be as part of the complex, and in physical juxtaposition with the specialty centre, a general hospital of the type that we have always known.

They wished the complex to be built in a way which would allow the psychiatric unit of the type to which I earlier referred to be built sometime in the future in association with this complex. They wished that the complex would be such as to enable it to be expanded, to enable it to provide facilities for the tuberculosis unit to which I referred earlier, and generally to be expandable to meet a number of other potential health needs.

They envisaged that at some time in the future this hospital complex would be providing a very substantial number of the ordinary hospital beds needed by the city of Regina. They envisaged I think that these would be part of the complex, but that the general hospital as we have known it might be operated by the same board which operates the specialty centre, or it might be a union hospital or it might be new facilities for the Regina General Hospital. They felt that all these methods of administration were open, and they were able to point out for us instances, particularly in the United States, where hospital complexes existed which had a number of units which were administered in part by different boards, but which combined to give an extended range of services to patients.

Our thinking, therefore, is that we should proceed along the lines outlined by Doctor Hartman and Agnew. They are currently engaged in a further study to inform us just what facilities should be in this specialty centre, just how many beds there should be, and just how many beds the city of Regina will need for its present needs and for its future needs. In the meantime, without waiting for their final report, I think we are in a position to proceed to do detailed planning for the specialty centre, which as I say will be designed to accommodate other types of institutions, general hospital, a psychiatric unit and otherwise as might be advised.

We are accordingly introducing this bill and the bill itself does no more than create a proper identity to proceed with the work which I have outlined. The bill itself does not make mandatory the construction of the hospital which I have outlined. I felt that the house was entitled to get general background material so that all subjects and all matters which some might consider relevant in consideration of this bill could be raised.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to take a little time to review the bill itself so that members might know precisely what is proposed.

In general, the bill is patterned very closely after The University Hospital Act, and the thought is to create an institution which would be organizationally very similar to the University Hospital. I hasten to add that it is not intended that this hospital would engage in the undergraduate education of medical students. No duplication of facilities of the College of Medicine at the university is intended, but, of course, the hospital if it comes into being would work in the post-graduate education of medical students as do most hospitals. They provide facilities for interns and for residence. I would then refer you in particular to the act.

The board which is created is very similar to the board created by The University Hospital Act. There are some differences. I won't have an opportunity to point out all the differences, but I did wish to call to the attention of the members that if they did want to compare it, to get some idea of what we had in mind, The University Hospital Act is the best model. It is envisaged that two of the board members would be appointed by the recommendation of the Board of Governors, one to be appointed as a representative of the College of Medicine and one other representative of the University. We would be anxious to obtain any assistance that we could from the College of Medicine in the course of planning facilities such as this and I would also be anxious to obtain any assistance which we could from the university generally.

A hospital such as this would be a natural training ground for paramedical professions for degree nurses; for occupational therapists; for laboratory technicians; for medical record librarians; for various other technicians, X-ray and ECG; and generally for that large and growing group of specialized personnel which our modern medical needs require in order to offer a full range of services. Many of these people are trained at our existing hospitals, many others are trained at the university. In all likelihood the hospital which is envisaged by this act would engage in similar activities. The assistance of the university would be of great benefit in planning this sort of activity.

I would like to refer to the powers of the board which are found in section 7. The board is charged with the responsibility of examining the factors to be considered in establishing and operating a hospital centre at or near the city of Regina for the benefit of the residents of southern Saskatchewan, and subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council charged with the responsibility of establishing a hospital centre at or near the city of Regina to be known as the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre.

You will see that the board is to consider what sort of an institution needs to be build and, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, proceed with the construction and operation of such a hospital.

The other provisions of the act are relatively routine in their nature having regard to the corporate body which we are seeking to create, but I would particularly draw your attention to section 9, sub-section E. We propose to give the board power here to enter into an agreement with any person or board or commission or department of the government of Saskatchewan or of Canada, or a municipality or a board of a health region, or any other hospital, for the joint provision of hospital services or purposes incidental to the administration of the hospital. What is envisaged here is the possibility of contractual arrangements between such a hospital centre and the Regina Grey Nuns' Hospital and the Regina General Hospital, either located at its present site or on some new site, which contractual arrangements would define the relationship between the hospital centre and the other hospitals. It is quite likely that some services would be provided on a common basis by one or two other institution, and the power to make these contracts of this nature we consider desirable.

There is a general feeling, I think among hospital administrators that as cities grow and as one needs to provide very elaborate hospital facilities which are getting more and more specialized, it is not possible to have each hospital in an area offer a full and complete range of services. Some of them must specialize in cancer, some of them must specialize in heart surgery, some of them must specialize in brain surgery and some of them must specialize in other types of highly specialized areas.

We have, of course, recognized that principal in Saskatchewan for many many years. We have confined our facilities for the treatment of cancer of a highly specialized nature to two locations, one at the Grey Nuns' Hospital and one at the University Hospital. We have confined some of our highly specialized facilities to the University Hospital at Saskatoon. We have confined some of the others to other institutions. I think that the only artificial kidney as I recall it is in St. Paul's Hospital. We have attempted to husband our resources, and this sort of tendency is going to have to increase rather than decrease, simply as a function of the increasing degree of specialization of medical science and the increasing expense of installing facilities and the increasing scarcity of the personnel to operate the facilities. Accordingly, it is necessary to cluster some of these things round one or other institution where there are three or four hospitals in an area. The purpose of section 9E

March 5, 1964

is to facilitate contractual arrangements along that line.

The other provisions of the act are very similar indeed to The University Hospital Act in the general powers of the board to operate the hospital, to buy and sell land, to borrow money and generally to carry on those functions which a hospital board in the ordinary discharge of its duties would carry on.

This, Mr. Speaker, outlines the content of the bill and outlines the background of the bill. It is my belief that the concept evolved by Doctors Agnew and Hartman will be one which will be of great benefit to the citizens of Saskatchewan and particularly to the citizens of southern Saskatchewan.

We have reached the point in the evolution of our province where another hospital of the nature of the University Hospital is desirable. It is desirable not only for medical reasons but it is desirable for organizational resources.

There are, I think, substantial logical reasons to be advanced in support of the proposition that a couple of base hospitals ought to be financed by all of the people of Saskatchewan, and not by the citizens of any particular community, when the hospitals are providing facilities for residents of a very wide area. It is entirely likely that the people who use this hospital will be from points outside of Regina, in greater numbers than they are residents of Regina. In fact it is entirely likely that the minority of the patients of this centre would be residents of the city of Regina. Accordingly, it seems only reasonable that the facilities be paid for by all of the citizens of the province. It also is, reasonable and desirable that they be organized; that the university as a provincial institution be brought into the planning phases, particularly since these institutions play such a major part in the education of medical personnel as well as the provision of medical services.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that this concept will be one which will be a very potential benefit, not only to the citizens of Regina, but also to citizens of all southern Saskatchewan. I believe that we have a real opportunity to make a very substantial forward stride in our hospital facilities in Saskatchewan. We are in the happy position, in one sense of the word, of having to start a long way back. We need to make a major expenditure on the hospital facilities in Regina. Whether or not we go ahead with this concept, a substantial expenditure will have to be made on hospital facilities in Regina. Being committed by the facts to such a substantial expenditure is, of course, not too palatable to the treasurer and is a disadvantage in a sense that it is going to cost a good deal of money, but it is a really advantage in a sense that we can take a fresh view and spend our money in a way that will give the most lasting advantage to the citizens of the province. I think we have this opportunity start afresh to build an institution which would be expandable. It would allow us to try out the concepts evolving in respect to mental health, try out some of the ideas with respect to tuberculosis care, try some of the ideas with respect to rehabilitation of chronic cases and generally to try out the many ideas which have been put forward by some of the advisory committees which have been labouring in this province in the last few years in a way which will cost the minimum amount of money and give us the maximum opportunity for success. Not too many cities have the advantage or disadvantage of having to take a major step forward in hospital construction at one time and while having to put out the funds, at the same time having the opportunity to take a fresh look at hospital facilities for a whole large area. We have got it here in the report of Hartman and Agnew, a lively and I think a workable concept, one which will not be expensive in the long run and one which will give us the very best value for our dollar and for our expenditure of trained personnel.

Because I believe that this opportunity is opened to us, and because I believe that we should see as a community of Saskatchewan, I, Mr. Speaker, would take great pleasure in moving second reading of Bill No. 49.

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all hon. members appreciate the lengthy review that has been presented by the minister in moving second reading of this bill. It is one that probably is of great interest, not only to the residents of the city of Regina, but to all the people of southern Saskatchewan. However, I would like to point out this evening that in bringing in this bill at this time, that the government has waited and has held back and has upset the medical care of the people of this city and this part of the province for the past six years and has brought the position of the hospital bed supply in this part of Saskatchewan to a very dangerous level. The act that we now find before

March 5, 1964

us is one that I think that each of us, in the province must consider very carefully and that we must examine very carefully because of some of the new ideas that it does establish in this field of regular medical care in this province, and in the field of general hospital care. Because of the lengthy explanation that has been given here this evening, because of the information that we have received from the minister, I think that all members in the legislature would like to have an opportunity to take a second look at this act and for that reason I am going to ask permission to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.