

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
SIXTH SESSION – FOURTEENTH LEGISLATURE
22nd Day**

Friday, March 6, 1964

The Assembly met at 2:30 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INQUIRY RE RETURNS

Mr. James E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the government when I may expect Return No. 35 of February 20th to be brought down.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the legislature to a fine group of students from Wetmore School. They are a special interest class and their special interest is the study of French, and I'm sure this will be very interesting to all the members of the legislature. They have with them three teachers, Miss Debiene, Mrs. Hubick and Mrs. White. I'm sure all members of the legislature would like to welcome them and would like to thank their teachers for bringing them here and I hope they will find their afternoon interesting and profitable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this Assembly to the oratory winners, winners of the Bryant Oratory Contest from the Humboldt constituency. There are two young ladies and three young men in the second row from the top in the speaker's gallery. These young people don't come here as a gift, in Humboldt we have to work hard for everything we receive and they earned this trip by giving exceptionally fine addresses and coming with the Rev. Father Roman, who chaperoned them and I hope that all the members will be on their very best behavior, Mr. Speaker, because these are very critical young people and they do know a lot about public speaking.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Ed. Whelan (Regina City): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to this Assembly visitors seated in the west gallery, they are 65 grade 11 students from Sacred Heart Academy in Regina. These intelligent, attractive young ladies are with their teachers, Miss Berman and Sister Mary St. Jude. Also with the class is Sister Mary St. Ferdinand, and I'm sure members will recall and would like me to pay tribute to this personable and gracious lady who taught Holy Rosary School for 40 years and is now teaching a kindergarten class in her retirement. It is our wish that their stay here this afternoon will be pleasant and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

SECOND READINGS

PREMIER LLOYD: Moved second reading of Bill No. 30 – An Act to provide for the Establishment of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, and respecting the Administration, and the Planning of the Use, of the Water Resources of Saskatchewan.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to join with the others who have welcomed our visitors to the legislature this afternoon. The class that has a special interest in French makes me feel as if I ought to say something appropriate for the occasion, like "Comment ca va" or something like this and it is about as far as I could go. It is good to have the young people from Humboldt who have distinguished themselves in the field of public speaking, also the group of young ladies with their teachers from one of the other schools in Regina. Many of us would like to join with the hon. member from Regina in paying special tribute to one who has given so many years of service to Saskatchewan young people and Saskatchewan education.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated on the order paper, Bill No. 30 is An Act to provide for the Establishment of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, and respecting the Administration, and the Planning of the Use, of the Water Resources of Saskatchewan. The bill, then, Mr. Speaker, proposed to provide for the development of a new agency to deal with this very important resource, and the growing importance of it. It creates this agency by combining to begin with, two existing agencies, namely the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission and the Water Rights Branch of the Department of Agriculture. It will propose also to add to these agencies both in terms of the things it will be required to look after the work which it is given today.

Basically it is an attempt then to provide a more comprehensive administrative device for assessing our total provincial needs for water, for assessing our water resources, our water supply and, of course, it hopes to be able in this way to plan the best method for matching our water resources and our water needs.

To give some indication of the attention which is being given to this problem all across Canada and the interest in it, I thought I might refer to the February issue of a pamphlet entitled "Resources". This is a publication of the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, an organization made up of the resource ministers of all the provinces of Canada, together with representatives from the federal government.

In part this article reads in this way:

Wells in south-western Ontario have run dry. Drought beleaguers south-eastern Alberta. The great rivers, the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa, the north Saskatchewan, the St. John and the Great Lakes as well, continue as giant receptacles for man's foul discharges. Canada's precious resources threatened. Across the border, ocean salt water pours into the lowering water table supplying the city of Baltimore. New York is forced to ration its water when the supply all but runs out.

Canada, despite the fact that it is blessed with one-quarter of the world's fresh water supply finds her stocks which are readily available to her people being rapidly depleted through neglect, mismanagement and lack of knowledge. Canada has officially declared her intention to participate in the International Hydrologic Decade 1965-1975, thus joining the member countries of the United Nations Educational and Scientific Organizations in a global study of the resource.

It is, of course, our expectation that this agency, which is being proposed will help Saskatchewan to avoid some of the difficulties mentioned in this article and will help us also, as a part of Canada, to play a more significant part in the global study of this resource of water.

In order to give some basis, some added justification for this added impetus which we propose for the handling of this important resource, let me, first of all, indicate some of the developments in our own province which have brought and which will continue to bring added pressure on this important resource.

First of all there is a growing urbanization and growing industrialization in the province which does, of course, consume additional water. With regard to urbanization it may be of interest to note that if we look at the population of those Saskatchewan communities which are

now cities, we find that in 1951 their population totalled just over 200,000. By 1961 it had increased to over 320,000, increase of more than one third. From 1961 to 1963, it increased to 337,000. It has been mentioned that our two larger cities of Regina and Saskatoon are two of the four fastest growing cities, percentage wise, in Canada.

With regard to growing industrialization, one way of measuring this is by reference to the amount of power which is being used in the province. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industry and Information summarized something of this situation when speaking in the house just a few days ago.

He indicated that whereas in 1959 the power corporation system was supplying one billion kilowatt hours of electricity, by 1963 this had increased to two billion kilowatt hours of electricity. He further pointed out that whereas the increase in power consumption over the total system for the year 1963, as compared to 1962, was 17 per cent, that part of the power consumption which was due to industrial usage, had increased by some 34 per cent in that one particular year. Second, in order to measure industrial development, since power is both a producer and consumer of water to some extent, it is necessary to add to these figures what happens with regard to systems in addition to the power corporation – in the city of Regina, the Island Falls plant at Churchill Power Company in northern Saskatchewan. This, then, is some indication of the growing pressure on this resource because of power production and because of industrialization.

Third, there is the growing diversity in our agricultural industry, which is due in large part to an increased livestock population. And again this requires more water and deserves a surer source of water. Ten years ago, June 1st, 1953, cattle population in Saskatchewan was just over 1,500,000 and June 1st, 1963, it had increased to 2,147,000.

All of us are aware of the fact that there is a definite growing interest in the use of out-door recreational facilities, particularly in the summer time and particularly those that are associated with our park system. In the last six years, six new parks have been created in Saskatchewan. These are the Meadow Lake Park, Rowan's Ravine on Long Lake, the Battleford Park, Pike Lake near Saskatoon, Echo Valley and Buffalo Pound.

Three more parks are in the planning stage and will be developed in the area of the reservoir to be created by the South Saskatchewan River Dam. In the last seven years, thirty regional parks have been developed by municipalities with some assistance from the provincial government.

Finally, there is an increased pressure on our water resource because of the steadily increasing standard of living. Small boys might dispute the fact that added consumption has anything to do with increased standard of living. I'm afraid, however, that history is against them in the argument and the two are indeed related.

To these provincial factors, if one may call them that, must be added some world factors which are of great importance to us in the province of Saskatchewan. My reference here is to the steadily increasing world population, and also to the fact that this increase in world population is going to eat more in the future than it is now eating. If we are to meet the needs of this world population increase, then not only our resources but world resources generally are going to be placed under some strain. I think it is right to say that we in the province of Saskatchewan who are such fortunate possessors of resources capable of producing greatly increased foodstuffs have always recognized our responsibility in this context. We will hope to be able to continue to recognize it and certainly the availability of water is one of the factors to determine how well we do recognize it.

Let me go on from there, Mr. Speaker, to indicate some programs in the province which have been given attention and which indicate the growing importance of water resource development here. Our largest program is, of course, that on the South Saskatchewan River. This is an example of a federal-provincial multi-purpose project. It is a development which has significant regional and provincial but in addition to that, national benefits. Total expenditures on this project to the end of March of this year will amount to over \$67,000,000. Of these, the provincial contribution has been in the neighbourhood of \$16,000,000. This includes roughly \$12,000,000 for the dam and the reservoir, about a million in preparation for irrigation, some \$2,500,000 or just over for power, something over \$500,000 in connection with recreation development, and a couple of hundred thousand dollars for other purposes.

The second large project in Saskatchewan is an example of a provincially conceived and carried through program which has as part of its benefits, power and recreation, as well as some others. My reference here

March 6, 1964

is to the dam and the power plant at Squaw Rapids on the Saskatchewan River system. When the power from that plant was first officially turned into the system in June of 1963, it was, I know, a very exciting and gratifying day for the people of Saskatchewan. Expenditures on this amounted to over \$47,500,000 by November of last year. At the end of this year it had an installed capacity of 67,000 kilowatt hours. Two new units were added in January, February and March and it has an ultimate planned capacity of over 200,000. So this is a sizeable project.

Third, municipalities have been adding to their municipal water and sewer programs, some for the first time. Here you have an expenditure on the part of municipalities, on the part of individuals and to some extent on the part of the provincial government. Provincial government expenditures in this field since 1960 have been in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000. The result of these combined efforts of individuals and municipalities and the provincial government has seen added facilities of water and sewer available to some 25,000 homes with a population of about 80,000 people.

Fourth, as we know, many of our farm people are adding to the comfort and convenience of their homes by installing water and sewage programs. Here again the government has provided assistance of various kinds. Some 10,000 added farm homes, had the benefit of water and sewage since 1960. Provincial government expenditures have been in the neighborhood of \$1,075,000 for that purpose.

If I may just sum up to indicate something of the provincial expenditures on water programs, I could note that in 1958, they amounted to about \$3,000,000. By 1961 this had grown to \$23,000,000, by 1962 it had increased to \$27,000,000. In 1963 it dropped down to \$14,000,000 due to the fact that the major financial commitments at Squaw Rapids Development had been completed, but it will pick up substantially again in 1964 with added expenditures by Department of Agriculture, Power Corporation, and the Municipal Water Assistance Board. Added to these could be expenditures by the Saskatchewan Research Council, and by the Department of Natural Resources with regard to development of area in our province's parks.

Well, that is in the past, Mr. Speaker, but it seems proper to deduce that major programs over the next few years will continue this trend and probably the trend will not only be continued but accelerated. For example, the four year period, beginning in 1964 should see the completion of the South Saskatchewan Dam and the development of many things in connection with that. It should see completion of the power plant in association with it and a good start on recreation facilities. I have mentioned three parks are planned in that general area. This four year period will also see a beginning of a regular diversion from the South Saskatchewan system into the Qu'Appelle basin. The construction of the dam to control and direct this is now underway.

Second, this four year period should see a start on another – likely see a start I should qualify my remark – another major multi-purpose project in connection with another hydro dam on the Saskatchewan River. Those who have studied this situation, Mr. Speaker, say that some time in the future, certainly not in the next four years, the entire span from Squaw Rapids to Coteau Creek will be one large series of lakes because of construction of dams on the Saskatchewan River system. This same period, of which I am speaking, could also see an intensive examination of a number of other exceedingly important projects. For example, we have talked something in this house of the Saskatchewan Delta Reclamation project. It is only possible to think of doing more in this area because of the water control which derives from the construction of the dam at Squaw Rapids and the dam which will be completed on the South Saskatchewan River.

The same period also must see an examination of a multi-purpose scheme to augment water supplies in the south-east, including the Qu'Appelle system, and the Souris and Wascana systems as well. It should see a comprehensive scheme for development of the Saskatchewan-Nelson River basin and adjacent basins. This will include storage projects and diversion projects, some of which we hope will be undertaken in co-operation with the federal government and with neighbouring provincial governments.

In addition to these major programs many existing programs such as small water developments, farm water and sewer, municipal water and sewer and ground water research will be continued and perhaps expanded.

Since I mentioned ground water research, Mr. Speaker, may I turn for a moment to indicate something of the work which has been done in this field by the Saskatchewan Research Council. The Saskatchewan Research

Council for a number of years has had underway a geological survey of water-bearing strata in Saskatchewan. It is expected that this survey, insofar as the southern portion of the province is concerned – and by southern is here meant not just the immediate south but the area that is not north, more or less of the settled part of the province – is intended for completion in 1965. Some \$200,000 was spent by the Research Council on this and other water studies in the course of the last year. In addition to this, they now have a contract with the Department of Industry and Information which is seeking to determine more definitely the nature and extent of a large water-bearing aquifer called the Buried Missouri Valley, in the neighborhood of Estevan. It has already been indicated that there is a reasonably good supply of water. There is pretty good proof that the water and while it is hard, it is at least as good a quality as some that is in the province of Saskatchewan. It will be a little while yet before we can say with surety that it is a fully proven industrial water resource, but the indications are indeed quite hopeful.

May I say that if this does prove up, as it seems to be shaping to do, this one discovery will have been worth all of the money spent for all purposes on the Saskatchewan Research Council since it came into being in 1947.

In addition to this kind of work the Research Council has also been working on methods to improve ground water exploration procedures, it has done some work on research with regard to procedures for improving brackish and saline water looking forward to conserving water in sloughs and in dugouts, small drainage basin and evaporation control studies have had attention. It has developed a very interesting procedure for tritium dating of underground water. This makes it possible to tell the age of the water and so develop information of the rate of withdrawal and recharge of water in these underground aquifers. In addition to this the Council last year began a five year study of the very obstreperous algae problem in the Qu'Appelle lakes, thinking of course, to determine its causes and its effects and also possible means of control and of prevention. Well, this is the sort of thing which must be continued.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to indicate that the future requirements of water in Saskatchewan are indeed very considerable and, as a result, there is a need for a considerably expanded and extended and more comprehensively planned activity in the whole field of water development. This need arises because of the rapidly increasing demand for water and for the goods and services which water provides.

We don't have a precise forecast of future water demands but I think it is fair to assume that they will be very large indeed. For example, it is known that increased population combined with increased per capita use, requires larger volumes of water. One of the studies carried out in the United States has more than doubled in the last 50 years. It seems unlikely that 50 years ago, anybody could have predicted this because one major reason for the increase has been a whole series of new inventions and industrial processes.

In the home for example, the development of automatic washing machines, requires large volumes of water – at least, so I am reliably informed – and industrial output requires increasing amounts of water. So I think we have every reason to believe that per capita use will continue to increase very rapidly.

Second, to return to a point which I mentioned before, we must have in mind the increasing needs for water irrigation purposes. There is before us this – both a problem and an opportunity – of helping to meet the food requirements of a growing world population. As a result it seems likely that irrigation will remain the largest single user of water in the west.

The amount of land that can be irrigated is partly a function of soil conditions, but it is only partly a function of soil conditions. It's also a function of economics and of technology. For example, there are today thousands of acres being irrigated in Western Canada and United States which a few years ago would have been considered either too rough or too high. The reason why it can be done now and couldn't be done then is partly because of the higher value of crops and also partly because science and technology has developed such things as more economic pump lifts and sprinkler systems.

It is interesting to note, that Mr. E.A. Palmer, who was formerly superintendent of the experimental station at Lethbridge speaking at a meeting of the Prairie Provinces Water Board in November of last year, pointed out that in planning our water use – and I use his words:

March 6, 1964

We must consider the irrigable area in the south Saskatchewan basin, as several million acres, instead of two or three million acres.

Now, Mr. Palmer was obviously taking a long look at the situation, but we do need to take long looks in regard to a topic of this kind.

Third, industry has been using and will continue to use and require larger and larger volumes of water for processing and other purposes. For example, in 1956, the industrial use of water in the Qu'Appelle basin totalled about 5,000 acre feet per year. Five thousand acre feet per year is about half of the amount of water consumed in the city of Regina in 1963. This amount – this 5,000 acre feet, or half the amount of the consumed water in the city of Regina – is, in fact, less than the estimated annual requirements of the single solution mining potash plant. As members of the legislature will know, the Kalium Potash Plant located between Moose Jaw and Regina is using, for the first time in the world, this particular process of recovering potash ore. Several other plants have indicated an interest. Kalium Chemicals has constructed a pipe line to Buffalo Pound in order to draw water, some of which at least originates in the South Saskatchewan reservoir. So industries increasing needs are important.

So, too, is the necessity for pollution abatement. This will require large volumes in the future and unless considerable care is taken it can become one of the largest consumers of water.

One of the papers given at the recent Resources Conference in Saskatoon was by Messrs. Crippen and Stevens. On this very topic and I quote from their report, Mr. Speaker, they said:

Of the factors tending to limit or reduce supply of surface water, pollution is probably the most serious. Wastes released into rivers and lakes may render whole down stream flow unsuitable for other uses unless an adequate minimum flow is maintained to dilute the pollution. The necessity for maintaining these flows makes pollution – or rather the control of pollution – one of the major users of surface water. Control of pollution is, therefore, one of the most necessary and processing measures which must be enforced to conserve our water supplies.

I am told that to have a satisfactory pollution control, you need a dilution factor of ten as a sort of a minimum guarantee. Without such control, pollution can easily get out of hand, and this has happened as all of us know, in eastern Canada, and in the United States. It has happened in British Columbia, the “Land of Sunshine and Sunny Smiles” with water to sell. Members may recall visiting British Columbia a few years ago and seeing very large amounts of beautiful beach unused, and unfit for use, because of a pollution problem. We've had some problems in Saskatchewan, and particularly along the North Saskatchewan River, in this regard. I discount a rumor which I once heard, Mr. Speaker, that in the public washrooms in the city of Edmonton there once hung a sign which said “Please flush the toilet, Saskatchewan needs the water”. We were never reduced to that point.

There were times, however, years ago when the effluent from some of the industrial plants located in Edmonton was causing a considerable problem for cities like North Battleford and Prince Albert and other communities along the river system. Referring to the problem of pollution in the United States, the President of the “Resources for the Future” organization summed it up by stating:

That in many parts of the world, pollution has become the most serious aspect of water management. The ‘affluent society’ he said, is in danger of becoming the ‘effluent society’.

Adding to this pressure on our water resources in the future is the matter of water for recreation. This represents a very rapidly growing use, as I've tried to indicate. I think we cannot afford to underestimate the importance of this particular use. Its growing importance must be recognized in planning the other uses for water, if we are to ensure that the potential of our water bodies for recreation, fish and for wild life does not deteriorate.

Some indication of the value of water for recreation can be seen

again from some studies carried out in the United States. One study there related to the Lewis and Clark reservoir in South Dakota. It noted that attendance at that reservoir increased by 114 per cent from 1958 to 1962. It increased from about three quarters of a million in 1958 to one and three-quarter million in 1962. Similarly at the Fort Peck Dam in Montana with which some of us will be familiar, attendance in the same period more than doubled. It grew from 83,000 in 1958 to 168,000 in 1962. These are bodies of water which, like many of ours, are in the centre of a rather sparsely settled area. One study has established the fact that, in one western state, the use of water for recreation was adding four times as much value to the state's economy as would the use of the same water irrigation.

The growing demand for power is another pressure. Power isn't in itself a consumptive use, but it does provide the economic basis for many major, multi-purposes projects at great advantage to power production itself. Consultants have established that almost the entire head of 600 feet between Squaw Rapids and Coteau Creek could be developed through a series of dams.

Well this general picture, Mr. Speaker, of rapidly growing demands for water for all purposes is even more compelling when we realize that there are many sub-basins within the Saskatchewan basin that are seriously short of surface water today. In the south west, there are many basins which are fully appropriated and most readily available supplies are already in use. The Qu'Appelle area can be met by natural flows in an average year. We already have some supplementation through pumping from the South Saskatchewan into the Buffalo Pound Lake system. If we use some extremes to illustrate the problem and consider the amount of rainfall in the driest of our dry years, namely 1937, we find that it provided a run-off into the Qu'Appelle system which would have been entirely consumed by the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw in a year such as 1963. I say that this particular concern will be relieved somewhat within the next three years with completion of South Saskatchewan and the beginning of diversion into the Qu'Appelle.

And I look at an area like the south-eastern part of the province where our large lignite coal reserves cannot be fully developed for power generation or industrial purposes until we have found ways to augment the water supply there. That's why this ground water study is so important and why some of the work that the city council at Weyburn has done is so important and so gratifying.

We should note also that both the Qu'Appelle and the Souris empty into the Assiniboine in Manitoba. Manitoba has indicated that it must augment flows in the Assiniboine and the Souris to meet their demands. Well, the only source of surface water for these and other water shore sub-basins in our province is the South Saskatchewan River.

The demands on the South Saskatchewan will arise then from two sources. First of all, from direct demands on the river to serve the growing requirements of Alberta and Saskatchewan and second, from indirect demands to augment flows in water short sub-basins in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Water demands in neighboring provinces will obviously grow as fast as ours. We must remember that we share a common supply with them in the water sheds of the Saskatchewan-Nelson basin. Developments and uses in Alberta and in Manitoba will affect very directly the way in which we can develop and use these waters in Saskatchewan. It seems definite, then, that we need a means whereby we can have some comprehensive, regional and basin oriented planning. Studies seem to indicate that there is enough water in western Canada to satisfy all demands in the foreseeable future. The problem is one of distribution. All too frequently, Mr. Speaker, the water is where the people ain't or the people is where the water ain't whichever way you want to put it. Much of it lies to the north of the settled areas and flows north and west. Some of it lies west of here in the Columbia River System and flows to the south.

The great problem in the future, then, will be to plan and develop our available surface and ground water resources to achieve the best possible use at the least cost. This must be tackled on the basis of natural geographic water sheds, on a comprehensive multi-purpose basis and by all levels of government. Obviously, municipalities are greatly concerned. So is the province. Obviously too, this can only be taken so far by the municipalities by Saskatchewan, or by the municipalities and the provincial government together. It must be approached on a regional basis by all governments in the basin and the federal government working jointly

together. For example, it is probably true that Manitoba interests will require diversion from the Churchill into the Saskatchewan. It is also probably true that the best place to make this diversion is not in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan. It is certainly true that Saskatchewan's interest will require increased upstream storage in Alberta, and diversions, some of which may best be made in Alberta. It is probably true that some of Manitoba's and Saskatchewan's interests can only be served by events in British Columbia and Alberta.

It is for this reason of course that we urged the joint study of the water resources of the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin, including an assessment of increased storage facilities and diversions. This led to a conference of ministers from Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and from Canada on December 20th here in our city of Regina. I think there was some significance to this conference, Mr. Speaker. It was the first time in history that ministers of the three prairie provinces have come together especially to discuss common water problems. We were very pleased to have the Hon. Mr. Laing and the Hon. Mr. Hays from the federal government present. Mr. Laing quoted in the Prince Albert Herald on February 7th as saying:

One of the most important meetings held on the prairies in recent years was the meeting last year of ministers of the three prairie provinces to discuss the dispensation of water from the Saskatchewan drainage system.

This conference, you may recall, agreed to study the water resources of the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin, including the potential additional supply by diversion or storage. The conference set up some committees to draft terms of reference for the study and to get it underway. I am pleased to report that there have been two further meetings in this regard, since December 20.

One of the facts that has impressed us is that Saskatchewan, and indeed western Canada, is entering a stage in the development and use of water resources that some other countries, particularly the western United States, passed through within the last two or three decades. If we in Canada and we in our province are to meet the challenge which is presented by our needs for water, and by the resources to meet these needs, we feel that we were going to have to make some changes in the administrative framework for water management at the provincial level. I would suggest that changes are probably necessary at the federal level as well, if we're going to facilitate the application of the new technology, the new concepts and skills which are available.

I think there is a large major consensus that we do need changes in the administrative framework. Discussion at the Resources for Tomorrow conference in Montreal in 1961 and at the Saskatchewan conference in Saskatoon in 1963 reflected general agreement on the need for basin – wide, comprehensive, multi-purpose planning of water resources and changes in the institutional framework to achieve this. And again, there was wide general agreement on the kind of changes necessary.

Just to illustrate some of the comments on this matter, I would refer to a major paper which was presented to the Water Sector of the Resources Conference in Saskatoon. It was presented by Dr. Kristjanson, who is presently in the employ of Manitoba Hydro but who before that was with the Department of National Resources and Northern Affairs in Ottawa. He went so far as to recommend this and I quote from his report.

The three prairie provinces might consider establishment of a provincial commission comparable to the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission, with authority over water development programs on a province-wide basis.

I mentioned a while ago that there was much U.S. experience on this. Several American States have moved in the direction that I have been referring to in recent years. Of the 17 western states, for example, about one-half have established commissions to administer their water resources. Also about one-half have married the administration of water resources to an agency for overall planning and co-ordinating. After studying experience elsewhere and after analyzing our own requirements now and in the foreseeable future, we have decided that it was necessary to have the two kinds of agencies within the province: One, we needed a framework of development agencies. This will be the group of agencies which have been conducting the programs; that is, the Department of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Department of Natural Resources. These will still be the developing – the doing agencies if you will; and two, we needed an effective

means to achieve co-ordination among and between these agencies, in policy, planning and development. We needed an agency which could look at the whole problem of water as a resource and the needs of the province of Saskatchewan for that particular resource. The Saskatchewan Water Resource Commission provides for this kind of a framework. It proposes a distinction between the broad advisory planning, co-ordinating, central service and regulatory functions of water management on the one hand, the design, construction and operation functions of water development on the other. In other words, the functions of planning, co-ordinating and regulating become the responsibility of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, which would result from the passing of this bill. But the responsibility for design, construction and operation of irrigation projects, or of dams, or of parks on reservoirs, these will be the functions of agencies such as the Department of Agriculture, the Power Corporation, or the Department of Natural Resources, as the case may be.

Under the proposed act, Mr. Speaker, the commission would be given an overall advisory, consultative co-ordination, planning and regulatory function insofar as our water resources are concerned. The commission would be responsible for research, for investigation, for collection of basic data and water statistics, for the administration of surface and ground water resources, for the co-ordination of multi-purpose project planning, for reservoir land use planning and for liaison and related functions on federal provincial, inter-provincial or international water resource matters. In the performance of its research, investigation and planning functions, the technical and other resources of the development agencies will be used as much as possible. Obviously, some specialized staff will have to be employed and the bill will make provision for such employment. It will also make provision for the employment of consultants. This really represents first of all, an extension of the functions now being performed by the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission and the Water Rights Division of the Department of Agriculture. And, if we can think of it as taking the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission with all of its functions and extending these geographically to cover the whole of the province and then, adding to these the functions exercised by the Water Rights Division for the Department of Agriculture, and finally adding to these a function with regard to pollution control, we have a general picture of what the Act proposes. These two agencies, the SSRDC and the Water Rights Division form the nucleus of the new Commission.

It is proposed that the Commission be responsible to the Premier. I believe the act provides that the commission will be made up of seven members. This group of seven includes the deputy ministers of those departments that have a major concern for water. It includes, in other words, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources, and because of the health aspects, the Deputy Minister of Public Health, the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and it includes some others. In addition to this, the act provides for the appointment of what is known as Project Advisory Committees for major projects.

The first project referred to the Commission would, of course, be the present one, the South Saskatchewan River Project and we would want a Project Advisory Committee in relation to that. I would hope and expect that this will include the public members who have been serving on the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission for a period of years. When we move to a second project, such as that related with the Qu'Appelle system, then we would want another Project Advisory Committee relative to that area and that problem and made up of people who are more intimately interested and concerned with development in that particular area.

Many of the clauses in the Act are drawn directly from present legislation on the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission. In regard to the costs involved, the estimates will indicate that it is proposed that the agency would spend amount of roughly \$358,000. However, it should be noted that this includes the amounts available in the estimates for the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission and the Water Rights Division of the Department of Agriculture. Both of these will be at some point in the time be subsumed by the Commission. The South Saskatchewan River Development Commission has in the estimates a sum of \$137,500. The Water Rights Division has a sum of \$143,800. Add to that about \$77,000 and you get the \$358,000 which is proposed as the budget for the agency during the year.

With regard to staff, Mr. Speaker, the South Saskatchewan River Development Commission estimates for the coming year provide for 15 staff; the estimates for the Water Rights Division provides for 17. That's a total of 32 for these two combined and it is anticipated that an additional nine persons will be needed in order to carry out the functions of the agency during the year.

It is in order, I think, to say just a word about the administrative organization which will be established. Very briefly, I have already noted the membership of the commission, which can be 7 in number. Some of them are named because of the positions that they hold. The chairman of the Commission may or may not be a full time person. If he is a full-time person, he will also be the executive director for the Commission. If he isn't a full-time person, then, of course, there is a full-time job for an executive director.

I have referred to the Project Advisory Committees. They, of course, have a very important function.

Staff operations will be carried out in three main branches. One will provide secretarial, accounting and administrative services generally. We propose to call another the Investigation and Planning Branch. This will include people who have skills in land use and community planning who are informed in the field of economics as it applies to water and persons, of course, who have special engineering skills related to basin-planning and the water use generally. A third branch will be the Water Rights Branch, much of which will be made up of the present establishment, but to which must be added an agency to pay special attention to water pollution. May I say here that we recognize that in water pollution control, it will be necessary to work very closely with the Department of Public Health and the Department of Natural Resources. Many of the orders of this Branch will be put into effect according to the Act, following consultation with and with the consent of the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Public Health. It is necessary to have the one agency to look at the whole problem of water pollution, rather than having it divided between two or more agencies. I want to make reference before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, to at least one house amendment which I propose to move and which is contained in the section dealing with penalties. The present section I think, is quite unnecessary and probably objectionable. Anyway, it provides that a person who, having been requested under subsection 3 to collect and tabulate certain facts fails to do so, is guilty of offense and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$25.00, I have a house amendment to remove this particular section from this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need to argue or to spend time in persuading this legislature of the fact that water is one of our most important resources. It is a particularly important resource when one is making a speech, but fortunately it lends itself to a number of other much more productive purposes than that. We are aware that on the supply of water depends in some considerable part the future growth of many industries. We all know how closely the future of a number of communities is connected with adequate water supplies. If we are going to have increasing livestock production, then this, too, requires surety in water supply. Expansion in power production is closely related to water, whether it is hydro or thermo because of the need for water for cooling for the latter. Tourist and recreational opportunities must be based in large part on good water supplies. The health of people generally is affected by water.

We are concerned then with quantity and quality. We must be concerned also with machinery for planning the re-location of some of our existing water supplies. This act provides what we think is important machinery for securing our future supply and of using it to maximum advantage.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, may I thank the opposition for having said in advance that they wouldn't object, at least not too violently if I took some of the radio time which was supposed to be left to them. I have taken some of it, I must admit. With that may I move second reading of Bill No. 30.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I have no objections in the Premier having taken some of the radio time that was assigned to this side of the house on this particular occasion, because I find it most difficult to make an intelligent address supporting a program that is being instigated by the government after having listened to the presentation that the Premier made in moving second reading of this bill.

I can agree with him when he said that water is probably one of our most valuable resources. I would suggest to the house, that next to our people, water is probably the most valuable resource. It seems to me that people throughout the world have been able to survive without many resources, but no people have found a way to survive without water. I can

recall a few years ago when we had a delegation visiting this province from Israel at the time the first oil pipe line, or major pipe line was being constructed through the province of Saskatchewan and part of the tour that had been laid on for our guests from Israel was a trip out to the area where the oil pipe line was being constructed. I can recall one of the delegates on that occasion, one of the representatives from Israel, telling us that we would be much wiser to pipe water than to pipe oil. He said people can live without oil, but people cannot live without water.

Of course, this has been an experience of the people of Israel and the experience of many people throughout the world today. I don't want to find myself in the position of the gentleman who had found it necessary to undergo major surgery and then spent the next several years of his life telling his friends about his operation, but I had the opportunity, as you know, Mr. Speaker, of visiting many parts of the world very recently, parts which find it most difficult to feed their people and I do not think that the major problem in feeding their population is because of lack of ability or lack of plan but the major reason that these people are unable under the governments to provide a decent standard of living for their people is because of the insufficient supply of water. It is not easy to rectify this situation today. It seems to me that programs ought to have been implemented hundreds of years ago in those areas of the world, if they were ever to have prevented the situation that now faces them.

I can agree with the Premier that if we are going to make provision for adequate water supplies for many uses in Saskatchewan and Canada, the time to start is now. As a matter of fact we are probably 50 years too late in starting. I can recall from the trip I made into Texas a year ago, when people are drilling for a water well and they get oil, they are very disappointed. Texas has arrived at the position where if one can drill a good water well, it is much more better to have a good water well than to have a good oil well, And, of course, Texas is not very old, Mr. Speaker, but I think we could find ourselves in a similar position in Saskatchewan and in Canada as a whole, unless we make adequate provisions to retain waters on the prairie and perhaps make some diversions to bring more water into this area of the dominion.

Its is quite true as the Premier mentioned that the amount of water that is being used in Saskatchewan and in Canada is growing by leaps and bounds, and out of all proportion to the increase in our population. It is true that urbanization has brought about a greater use for water, but because of the modernization of life and the facilities that are available in rural areas today, the amount of water that is being used on our farms and in our small towns is many times what it was only 8 years ago.

I can recall when I lived on the farm as a boy, the amount of water we used was governed by the amount of water we kids would carry to the house for our mother. Sometimes it was quite difficult to get us to carry more than two or three pails of water a day. Then I can recall we installed a water system and this certainly solved the problem of getting water into the house and there was certainly a lot more water used but at that time the water ran into a pail under the sink, and of course, the amount of water that was used was again governed by the number of times we kids would empty the swill pail. This is no longer the case, Mr. Speaker, throughout most of Canada, both urban and rural. The water runs into the house, is used, and runs out again. There is certainly no limitation on the volume of water that is used today; the only limitation is the supply. I think the government have found that in many instances where there are communities and many farms having installed water and sewage plants, they found that the supply of water was not sufficient, but before the installation of water and sewer, the farmer and the community thought they had water in abundance, that they would never run dry. But once they started to use it on tap, they found there wasn't an adequate water supply.

I think the government are to be commended for the efforts that they have made in recent years in endeavouring to locate better water supplies and more abundant water supplies throughout the province.

It is also true that as our agriculture economy becomes diversified, more water will be used, and a good example would be the half section farmer who today is raising several hogs and a few cattle. He, too, has found that he has to have an additional water supply.

It is also true that as our standard of living increases, certainly we use more water. The Premier referred to the automatic washing machine using more water than the scrub board. This is quite true and I know I have seen millions of people back last November and December washing their clothes in the river, and some rivers had hardly enough water in them for you to wash your clothes in. They certainly didn't have enough water in them to supply an automatic washing machine, but if these many millions of

March 6, 1964

people are going to be provided with washing machines, automatic or not, and I suggest to you that sooner or later they will be supplied with these amenities of life, then water must be made available to them.

If the population of the world is going to be adequately fed, then the first requirement that we need is more water, and it is easier to build up the water supply in a country like Canada than it is in some of the other areas of the world where erosion and the uncontrolled flow of water for generations had created conditions where it is virtually impossible to rectify them today.

This has not been the case in Canada. The main reasons it is not is because we are a young country, and we still have the opportunity of making provision to take care of not only our future but the future of many people throughout the world. I often think of the amount of land that has been brought under cultivation in Saskatchewan, without any adequate provision for the storage of water, that is artificial story of water.

The entire cultivated area of Saskatchewan at one time was covered either with bush or grass, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you realize as well as I do that there is a tremendous amount of water conserved in soil that is covered by vegetation whether it is grass or timber. But once the grass or the timer is removed, there is virtually no conservation effect on that bare land, and summerfallow has contributed to the increase run-off of the rapid flow of water, probably more than anything else in the province of Saskatchewan. It seems to me there should be some ratio between the number of acres that we are prepared to bring under cultivation and the amount of water that we are prepared to store artificially because we have interfered with nature's efforts to store water, but I'm afraid we have not replaced this storage with man-made storage.

It is true we have made some progress in recent years with big projects such as this South Saskatchewan and the Squaw Rapids Dam, and there have been many other smaller projects, especially in south-western Saskatchewan with small dams and dug-outs.

But again, Mr. Speaker, I think we have only begun as far as the artificial storage of water is concerned in Saskatchewan. I hope that we will not lose sight of the small projects when we are dealing with the larger projects such as the South Saskatchewan or Squaw Rapids, or any of the developments, major developments that may take place in the future, because it seems to me that the smaller projects in the long run will be as important to solving this problem as the major projects will be.

Sometimes I find that there is considerable public resistance to the expenditures of public money in the quantities that are necessary to store water. I have heard many people, and I am sure all hon. members have condemn the expenditures of public monies to store water for what they say is for recreational purposes. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we are going to preserve the way of life that we have grown so accustomed to, and if we are going to make even a larger contribution to raising larger amounts of food for other parts of the world, then we have a responsibility to build dams, to dig dug-outs and yes, to include the major contracts to keep in the province of Saskatchewan and to keep in Canada, the natural rainfall and accumulation of moisture from snow in this area, even if, in some cases, the public are resentful at the expenditure of money involved.

I have often noted that in those years when it was very wet in our province, everybody is clamoring for drainage, but if governments attempt to spend any money on drainage in a drought year, they would probably be voted out of office. But it seems to me in the past we have made large expenditures on drainage during wet years, when it was very costly to implement a program, and that these programs ought to be carried out in dry years. The same thing can be said with regard to the storage of water. If you attempted to build dams and dig dug-outs in wet years, you run into criticism from all over the province. It is much easier and much cheaper to make provision to store water in dry years than it is in wet years but we have to have the dams and the dug-outs ready to hold water when the wet season arrives.

There is one other project that I wanted to say a word or two about on this particular occasion and it doesn't apply necessarily to the province of Saskatchewan, but this year I had an opportunity to see some of the work that is being carried out in and round the city of Winnipeg, on the Winnipeg floodway, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a project in the reverse. Here we are digging a ditch to get the water into the sea as fast as possible. I know that Winnipeg and area have had a problem for many years with regard to floods. But now you have the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba spending millions of dollars to dig a ditch which in my opinion will lower the water table of that area of the

province of Manitoba by many feet and at the same time we are spending millions of dollars endeavouring to raise the water table throughout many parts of Canada, and I believe that government monies would have been better spent to have controlled the flow of water to the city of Winnipeg by building dams at the head waters rather than to increase the flow through the city of Winnipeg and to move this water into the ocean as fast as possible.

I thought that when the Premier introduced this bill that he might spend some time on the suggested method of increasing the supply of water in our province by the diversion of waters from other parts of Canada, and I had prepared some remarks to reply to some of the arguments that I thought he would present, but he has been kind enough to leave by rebuttal out as well.

This is the unfortunate part of replying on second reading when you are not too sure that the introducer is going to say. I would like to say that, in my opinion, we are going to have to divert water from other sources into Saskatchewan, the time to do that is now, that is the time to make provision for these diversions is now, because as the Premier mentioned to you we have a constant demand on the use of water, not only in the provinces of Canada but in that country to the south of us, and unless we are prepared to make adequate provision today to see that the water that is necessary for future demands in Canada, that the provision is made today, than I am afraid that when the actual need for the water arises, it will not be available in other parts of Canada for diversion into this prairie region.

I'm not going to take any more time, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that every member in this house, whether they sit to your right or to your left, will support this bill. I believe that every fair thinking citizen ought to give their full support to this legislation, because in my opinion, it will not only make provision to plan for the future development of Saskatchewan, but it will be the part that Saskatchewan can play in providing for the future development of Canada, and I think the future development of many of the areas of the world.

I want to repeat that if we are going to play our part in feeding those hungry nations of the world then it seems to be that we must not endeavour to produce 500,000,000 bushels of wheat in Saskatchewan, but I think we should look forward to that day when we can produce double that amount, and this will only be done if we are able to control the water resources at our disposal, and to put them to full use, and it seems to me that the only way that we can bring this about is to have some body that is responsible for the conversation development of what I would like to consider to be our second most important resource, which is water.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in stating that I would like to support this particular bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I have just about 30 seconds. The member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) had reference to diversion and storage plans. I believe I did make reference to this, perhaps one moment when he was not in his seat. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those occasions when I sometimes wonder how the member from Moosomin got over on that side of the house. Really, all I want to say is to thank him very sincerely for his speech which was, I think, a very fine contribution to discussion of the whole subject.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney for second reading of Bill No. 48 – An Act to amend The Hospital Standards Act.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that upon my rising this is the end of togetherness, as evinced by the spirits of the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) and the Premier. I was very pleased and honoured today to receive this lovely corsage, Mr. Speaker, from the constituents

of the hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Blakeney). I think this was sent to me because they heard his speech the other day and they sent me the flowers. I think perhaps they could have sent him a wreath, but they didn't.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Public Health in the masterly presentation that he made the other day on this bill and I think being a member of his profession, I can perhaps appreciate even more than the average member what a wonderful presentation it was. Mr. Speaker, anybody can present a good case, but when you present a poor case, and do it as well as the hon. minister did you should really be congratulated. This is a sign of great professional competence if nothing else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to understand the essence of this bill, The Hospital Standards amendment, as introduced by the hon. minister, I want, first of all, frankly to say that when you take off the high sounding phrases, the historical background, the fine words said by the minister, you have here nothing but a rather ugly situation in this province, created by this government. But, Mr. Speaker, if an injustice was suffered, certainly there should be a remedy for it. I think that Liberals on this side of the house, if we are to be true to our own principles, must say as we have said throughout our history, that not one person in this province should suffer injustice and not be allowed redress and there we agree with the minister.

If an injustice were suffered by a doctor, or by patients in this province, they should be given a remedy. Where we run into difficulty is first of all to understand why the government does not see fit to give the remedy that is already set out in the act, and which is available without any further legislation, which was available without any further delay.

Secondly, I want to say this. This government is introducing this legislation, not because of a bad situation (that is inherent in the situation) but because they have brought their government pets into this province. They have, by the way they introduced certain other legislation, created a situation of distrust and lack of harmony in hospitals, and among the various persons that have to do with hospitals, and this situation is what has caused this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would say that you cannot legislate trust, you cannot legislate harmony, you can't legislate good medical care and if the government pretends that his act is going to do anything of the kind, it is, of course, being deceitful.

I want, too, to say that the analogy drawn by the hon. minister between the practice of medicine and the practice of law is so completely false that I'm sure it didn't take anyone in, everybody has heard the old joke "that the difference between a lawyer and a doctor is, that the doctor buries his mistakes, the lawyer's mistakes go to the court of appeal". There is no court of appeal if an operation has gone wrong. Those are tragedies that cannot be given redress to, and this is the basic difference.

Secondly, the hon. minister is a newcomer to this province. Maybe he doesn't realize that our hospitals are not state owned. Outside of the University Hospital, all our other hospitals have been built by local government or by charitable institutions. This is certainly different from the court houses. I won't go into the other differences because I think they are quite obvious. I think that everybody knows that no lawyer is being pressured by his client to get into court. He wants to be kept out of court. Everybody knows that doctors are every day being pressured by their patients to be placed in hospitals, and it is an amazing thing that just a few years ago, in fact, months ago, this government was saying that nobody can be guaranteed a hospital bed. This is to say that although they have promised and have on several occasions, I believe, even been elected on the promise that we would have prepaid hospitalization in this province, they didn't guarantee people that they would have a place in the hospital, and Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't for the people out in the country, the local governments, the charitable institutions, the people who have contributed through penny boxes and drives and every other way, to build hospitals, no one would have a bed in a hospital today through the good graces of this government, except in the University Hospital. This is something that this government has never acknowledged frankly to the people of this province.

They put in the legislation – they have forced people to pay hospitalization tax; they have sent people to jail because they were unable to pay hospitalization tax; but they have not guaranteed, they have not been able to guarantee beds. They can't say that because I have the hospitalization card, I must have a bed in the hospital. And yet for four or five of their little imported pets today, they can bring in legislation to guarantee these doctors hospital beds and the right to practice in hospitals

that were built and financed by individuals, by local government, by taxes on local property.

Now, I think we all agree that patients should be treated equally. We agree that people should be given as much as we can give within the limits of our resources in good medical care.

Mr. Speaker, this government frequently legislates by commission and committee, and you can always tell when this government has a scheme in mind. You can almost tell what they are going to do by the name of the committee they set up. Because if they think there is going to be any public objection to legislation they want, then of course, they won't bring it in as a bill themselves, they'll do it on the recommendation of a committee. Now, the Woods Commission brought in its recommendation in December of 1963. In February, March of the following year, we have the legislation on the books. The Saskatchewan hospital survey and master plan to be discussed in this legislative chamber. The plans set out in this hospital survey have been of the utmost importance to our local people, they have been a source of real anxiety and worry to hospital boards, to local citizens, to patients who feel that they're going to be deprived of hospital beds. This survey itself indicates that we should have fewer hospital beds than we have now. It suggests, I think in actual words, that there is over-utilization of hospital beds, it recommends in many places that there should be more home care of patients. Yet on the other hand, this government without bringing this in for discussion or for giving an opportunity to debate or disclosing what their views on this subject are, hide this underneath the desk to be produced no doubt after the election, Mr. Speaker. Now they bring in the Woods Commission recommendation and they want to implement this immediately.

True the Woods Commission would indicate that there was an injustice suffered and we are not going to sit by and let anybody suffer an injustice in this province. This is not the point. The point is that this government has withheld a debate that is of importance to almost every person in Saskatchewan but brought in this bill in order to legislate for a few people. Now, I want to read and I think it should be read into the records of this house, just a few of the recommendations that were made to this government not by a commission, but by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, which certainly should know, if anyone does, what is needed in hospitals and in the administration of hospitals. First of all, it prefaces its recommendations and remarks by saying:

That as a non-medical group, we are not prepared to argue the ethics of the situation nor are we prepared to express opinions on the adequacy of the training received by five complainants.

And then they go on to say, and I think that every member of the house will agree that:

That one of the problems that we have in this province . . .

and I'm sure in every other province in Canada . . .

is the question of accrediting doctors in hospitals.

And today it's no longer the practise as it is in our smaller hospitals where you're lucky to get a doctor and you're lucky to be able to give him the facilities of a hospital, and in most hospitals in Saskatchewan, this is exactly the case, if you're lucky enough to have somebody come into your district and practice, you don't question his adequacies in the field of hospital practice, you give him the hospital, providing he keeps the rules and bylaws of the association, there is no difficulty about accrediting him, whatsoever. It's only in the larger centres where this difficulty arises.

Now this brief goes on to say:

That one of the most frequent recommendations made by the Canadian Council and Hospital Accreditation in surveying hospitals here and elsewhere in Canada has been with reference to closer delineation of medical staff privileges in hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously something that lay people cannot do. This is where analogy between lawyers and doctors is so blatantly false. A lay person can judge the adequacy of his lawyer by the results that that lawyer

produces, he might judge him unfairly occasionally, but he judges him adequately enough for his own use. If he keeps losing his cases or not carrying out the instructions that he gives him, he will soon find another lawyer, but if you go to a doctor to have your liver removed, or even a part of it, you're going to have a hard time going someplace else to have something done about that. There is no appeal from a doctor's care. Today with very complicated specializations in the field of medicine, it's almost impossible for a lay person to know what doctors are capable of what technique and how far his right to practise in a hospital should be extended to him. We must rely on the medical opinion that is given to us and certainly this government would have done well to study some technique for prospecting the type of medical accreditation that could be given to doctors that could be applicable to all hospitals in Saskatchewan and that could be a real assistance to our people in safeguarding their health and in safeguarding the hospitals' responsibilities. In this regard, this brief says:

A joint committee of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association was working on a system whereby individual doctors could be evaluated by regional medical advisory committee. This was an effort to evaluate individual physicians to individual hospitals and was prior to becoming occupied with various other problems.

It's not too difficult, Mr. Speaker, to guess what those other problems were.

Now the Saskatchewan Hospital Association is of the opinion that the present mechanism of a board of conciliation as set up under the regulations under The Hospital Standards Act is the proper mechanism. The decision of such a board as set under existing regulations is not binding on the hospital boards but are merely recommendations. Under this as you know, Mr. Speaker, the minister can appoint whomever he wishes to act in the capacity of chairman of the board and could if he wanted appoint a judge to do so, he could also appoint whatever medical staff he sees fit, as advisors.

Now, I just want to add the final recommendation of this brief that if such an appeal body as set out in this bill is set up contrary to the recommendations of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, then it is strongly urged that provision be made for access to the existing courts of appeal. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of voting against this bill because I do realize that we have to accept the word of the Woods Commission for the fact that someone has suffered something less than fair treatment under our existing situation. I certainly think that this situation, first of all, need not have been created and was not in existence until this government created the situation, and once it was created, I think it could have been remedied. I want to warn ourselves that if we are going to introduce the type of legislation that is going to force people to abrogate responsibilities that they now have, we are loosening the strength, we are taking away the strength of local government, we are making them lose interest in local institutions and we are destroying the very basis of democracy.

I can't stress how important this is and I am sure that all of you realize this, because everytime you render futile and impotent local government bodies, you are making worthwhile people lose their interest in these bodies, feel that they're nothing but rubber stamps to this government and therefore, we are losing the best people that could serve in those capacities.

This brief was not rendered out of thin air or in caprice; it was rendered to this government by responsible people who are in charge of hospitals, who have the welfare of hospitals at stake. The thing that worries me is that hospitals are today responsible for the medical men on their staff. If they cannot themselves decide who is going to practise in that hospital, but are subject to an appeal board, who then has the responsibility of malpractice or negligence. Is this appeal board going to be responsible? Or is the government going to take responsibility for so-called independent board and its decisions become responsible for these actions in the hospitals, or is the responsibility going to be removed from the shoulders of the hospital boards? Surely there has been no answer given as to this type of question.

Mr. Speaker, we are interested in one thing and one thing only. We are interested in seeing that our people have the very best of medical care, and I would seriously warn this government, that the antics that it has displayed, the antagonisms that it has aroused in various parts and sections of our medical people is not conducive to good medical practise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Batten: — You can force a hospital to accept certain staff; you can force the medical profession to accept this staff; but you certainly are not going to give us good medical care if they have to work in an atmosphere of distrust, suspicion, lack of harmony. Mr. Speaker, I don't care whose fault it is, I'm not here to apportion blame, I'm not here to make out that somebody is pure white and somebody is black. I am interested in that patient that is lying in the hospital bed helpless without any ability to judge who is a doctor capable of looking after him and how far he is capable in looking after him. This patient has absolutely no say once he is in the hospital under the care of a doctor, but to accept whatever the doctor does. This is the man that we have to look after and, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that we have had good medical care in this province, not because our doctors were merely adequate, not because our hospitals were merely adequate, but because our doctors and the staff in our hospitals gave a lot more of themselves than adequacy. They were in there fighting for the life and for the health of the patients and they were working as a team; they were working together to make sure that the patient survived and became well. This practice of medicine, Mr. Speaker, is not the practice of one person working with cold equipment; it is the practice of a team working together and if the team can't work in harmony, you are not going to legislate that harmony.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel this legislation is inadequate. I don't think this is the best solution and at the same time we feel that we must support whatever will help cure this present situation because the situation exists. We can't close our eyes to the fact and the basic fact that the situation exists because of the antics of this government. This does not remove the responsibility that is now on our shoulders to try and remedy this situation. I will support this bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak but after listening to the hon. member from Humboldt, (Mrs. Batten) I couldn't just take it. I don't think I heard so much nonsense mixed up with some good common sense in all my life.

I was glad to see that the hon. lady boast of her corsage, it made her look more attractive but then I began to think she was wiser before she got the corsage.

Mr. Speaker, medical needs of people are so essential and precious that unpredictable happenings can be a great tragedy sometimes. When people pay for hospital facilities, it is with the intention that these facilities will be theirs in case of an emergency. It does not have anything to do with doctors. It's generally accepted by members here, that patient-doctor relationship requires that the choice of a patient insofar as the doctor is concerned should be respected. After all, general practitioners or specialists in our province are properly licensed and surely must have qualifications to practise and they should have access to hospitals.

In the past and before medicare became a reality in this province, there were cases I admit, or very few cases if any, where the doctor coming into a community was refused privileges in hospitals, but since medicine has become a social benefit to the people of this province, it has been our experience to learn of some disgraceful and unhappy situations in our province where certain doctors could not get into hospital to serve their patients who want them to look after them. And I need only mention one case. It happened to me. It was a case where I had Doctor Hjertaas – who has been my personal doctor for some time now, who could not get an assistant in the city of Prince Albert to assist him in a simple and minor operation. Well, Dr. Gale was not an import, Mr. Speaker. This was a doctor, a qualified doctor from Melfort and it was admitted in Prince Albert by all the doctors that he was a qualified doctor in Prince Albert, yet the hospital board on which I sit, received instructions from the medical group there and refused to give Doctor Gale courtesy privileges in my hospital. The hospital that I pay for, the hospital in which I am sitting as a member. And as a result of that, I had to go elsewhere for treatment.

Now along with other members of the hospital boards, I had hoped that legislation would not be necessary. But the facts as they come to light indicate most clearly that we would fail in our duty if we left The Hospital Standards Act intact. These amendments are urgent, Mr. Speaker, and they're timely. We have been circulated recently by petitions, I have one here, and letters emanating from the former KOD's and of course the KOD and the Liberal Party are very synonymous to me at least.

Now the proposals that have come from Justice Woods and which are being incorporated to some extent at least into this act should receive support of everyone in this house and I'm glad the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) said that she would support it. Yet, I cannot see how she could do otherwise, if as she has said, she wants to serve the people of her constituency.

Certainly I am going to support the amendment and I would like to see this legislation brought up because it is in conformity with the Saskatoon agreement and with the commitments that have been made to the Saskatchewan people, Sir. Doctors and hospitals should not be restricted to an exclusive club, only to those who are favoured by the College of Physicians and Surgeons or other such people. They must be allowed to serve their patients whether it's at home, whether it's in their clinics or whether it's in the hospitals that are built and paid for by, as the hon. member said, by the pennies and dollars of the people of this province. Whether it's publicly paid for or personally paid for. But boards, Sir, should not be placed in the position as we have been in our board – and I suppose it has happened in other places – where they get recommendations from medical advisory committees, I think this is an unfair responsibility to put upon laymen. And I think the hon. member there will agree with me. We are not and cannot be expected to be judges, to decide the qualifications of any doctor. But we have been perturbed in cases such as I have mentioned where a doctor has the qualifications and yet for the simple reason that he isn't a resident of a particular city or community, he cannot look after or help to look after certain patients. By having an appeal board, qualified doctors can find justice; true facts could be assessed and if there are prejudices, or other inappropriate reasons, an applicant doctor could have his case reviewed and these qualified people could decide whether there were prejudices or not. This act, Mr. Speaker, does not take anything away from the hospital boards. What does it take away? It only increases the power actually held by boards because they can go to a higher authority for advice. Just like anybody else, doctors can go to a court of appeal.

Mr. Justice Mervin Woods found that hospital privileges were denied as mentioned in his report, because of philosophical differences. The question facing the commission was and is whether such differences should result in denial of hospital privileges to doctors from co-op and Mr. Justice Woods saw this condition very clearly. That is why I think he made the suggestion that there should be an appeal court.

I sometimes wonder what doctors disagree with Justice Mervin Woods, and I know of very few. I know very few. There are a few that are very vociferous and have made themselves heard across the province, but I believe very sincerely that most of the doctors and most of the hospital boards in this province would be very glad to have a court of appeal where such a situation could be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote something I read yesterday in the library. The president of the senior college of Canada said at an annual meeting, on page 549 of the 33rd annual meeting of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada and I quote:

It is salutary to remember that all our colleges and universities, all our societies and research laboratories, all our libraries and museums, yes, and all our degrees and diplomas, lead us ultimately, simply to the individual suffering patient.

Later he says:

Let us always try to be the whole doctor to the whole patient.

And again on the same page:

Medicine has no boundaries, it has no discriminations in respect to color, creed or political dogma.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us make our laws so that there would be no discriminations whether in color, creed or political dogma. These and other expressed sentiments are concurred with, Mr. Speaker, if these are sentiments of the medical profession and if the ultimate goal is the purpose of healing and

relieving of patients, then let us have the kind of laws that would preclude no one from this purpose, be it accidental or deliberate bias. Certainly no hospital board should deny a patient the right to have his own doctor in his own home or in his own hospital

Today, Mr. Speaker, the hospital is the home of the individual, so let us pass this law and maintain good laws and see that we have high hospital ethics, have a board understanding and above all, let's be human and fair, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — I hadn't intended to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, until the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) spoke. It was rather interesting to hear him say that politics has been added into the medical profession.

It has. I've lived in this country 60 years and I never saw any indication of that until you people stirred it up. I don't think there's any place else in Canada; it applies only to Saskatchewan. Another thing I want to point out is this. They're making a mountain out of a mole hill. I think I know what I'm talking about. The only place we have those problems is in the large places. You can't have a sponsoring doctor, it's impossible to have one in less than a 20-bed hospital; it's possible to have one in a 50-bed hospital. If you work that down, it's only very small percentage doctors, a very small percentage of people who are trying to confuse the issue and hiding behind something that isn't a reality. Well, I say, for gracious sakes, let us get down and do a little plain thinking and get rid of some of our prejudices and try to work this thing out.

Now, I admit that there have been mistakes made on both sides but they are under the bridge so for gracious sakes, don't let's get up and make a mountain out of a mole hill and don't let us try to think that all the knowledge and all the good will is on one side of this house, because it isn't. I've worked in this country for a great number of years. Our municipality was one of the first municipalities to have a municipal doctor and it was so new that we had to come up here to the Deputy Minister in Regina to get him to look over the contract that we were going to sign with the doctor. Some of the people over there are inclined to say that the Liberals are not interested in medicine. Well, we have just as many people and probably more people on this side of the house who are working for medical care in this province than you have over there. And it really burns me a little when someone over there gets up and makes that statement. It's absolutely incorrect; they can't prove it and when they're making all this fuss about the admission of doctors, it certainly applies to some places, but it's a very small percentage. You know that down in the country today we're in bad shape. Our hospitals are so disorganized our doctors are here and there; the people who run the hospital, the hospital boards are upset and why? Simply because the people at the head aren't using their heads. If a doctor walked into almost any town I think, in my constituency, where there was a hospital and said that he wanted to practise there, the board would have no alternative but to take him in because the turnover of doctors is in that shape that it wouldn't be a matter of sponsor, but a matter of getting someone to work and that's true to a great extent. And yet people get up here and try to make out that a sponsoring doctor is a widespread thing. It isn't. I put a question on the order paper the other day, I thought I had it here, but I haven't but I think there are if I remember right, 72 hospitals with less than 20 beds, and any of those doctors, any of those hospitals with less than 20 beds, it doesn't apply to them at all, it can't.

There are a great many more with a larger bed capacity that it doesn't apply to either. Let's get our thinking straight and let us be honest and try to do a job, let's not set up these straw men and knock them down; let us not for instance say, that the Liberal Party was responsible for doing something that they are not. I've worked in this province for a great number of years along those lines and I just object to some johnny-come-lately over there telling me that I'm working against the interests of health in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health): — I just wanted to say a few words in closing the debate, largely in comment on some of the remarks made by those who have spoken previous to me in this debate.

March 6, 1964

I wanted to comment on one or two of the remarks of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) just one or two which I though were perhaps unfortunate. I agree that all of us should, I think, do what we can to engender trust and harmony. Members may well believe that members on this side of the house and particularly the Minister of Public Health and a member may not have conducted himself always in that regard. I am not sure that any derogatory references to doctors practising in the province at the present time will materially assist in that regard, and I'm rather sure that the remark labelling some of them as government pets was designed to be derogatory . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I left that impression. I certainly don't mean it to be derogatory to the doctors. I did intend it to be derogatory to the government because I don't think the government should make pets of one section of the medical profession and not of the other . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER!

Mr. Blakeney: — I see. We have elicited the fact that it was meant to be derogatory. I did want to say one or two other things though. It seems to me that the member opposite is saying that the government at some time has promised that there would be hospital beds and that the government has not acknowledged the position taken and the very great contribution made by those sponsoring groups, be they municipalities, or charitable or religious organizations, who have been the prime movers in establishing hospitals in the province.

I would question the accuracy of this. It is possible in talking about providing health insurance to talk about hospital care loosely but the position of the government has, I think, throughout, been that they are operating a hospital insurance program; a hospitalization program; that they pay the bills. They have not guaranteed hospital beds and I think that no insurer, even a government insurer who is somewhat more involved with the provision of facilities than a private insurer would undertake to guarantee hospital beds. There is in the hands of the government no way to control the demand for hospital beds and a government would be taking on a very substantial obligation if it guaranteed that there were hospital beds.

Mrs. Batten: — Will the hon. member permit a question? Is it not true that it is in the hands of the government to control the supply of beds?

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, this depends upon whether you are of the view that the government is building the hospitals, or whether the private organizations of which I have just spoken are building them, by and large. If, in fact, the obligation and the responsibility with respect to providing hospital beds rest with private groups, even with government assistance, I think primarily we would have to say that the supply demands upon the activities taken by these private groups. Now, I hasten to add — just a moment . . .

Mrs. Batten: — May I clarify my question? I think the hon. member seems to misunderstand me, but I think the hon. minister does realize as well as the other hon. members in the house, that it is the government who has stopped private . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! I don't think the hon. member can make a speech in the form of a question.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Quite in order, quite in order.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I will sit down if the member has the floor . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — You still control . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm perfectly happy to answer questions but if we want to enter into debate . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I might, I might . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . into debate on hospital beds, I am perfectly happy to do this. I think it is out of order on this bill but I think it may be in order on another one, and I have a number of things I wish to say on this point, I might say. I have some material here on the number of hospitals beds that are provided in Saskatchewan compared with any other province, and I would be more than happy to compare it with any other province that ever had a Liberal government, but I will pass that by, and go on to the matters under debate. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government has consistently taken the position that they are providing a hospital insurance program and that they provide substantial assistance to private groups, municipal and other, in the provision of hospital beds, and may I say with respect to our grant formulas they are as generous as exist in Canada, with the possible exception of Alberta. You can argue this point. May I say with respect to consents which may have been given or denied, that the effect of those consents which may have been given or denied — that there are now more beds in Saskatchewan per capita than in any other province, so they cannot have been as niggardly as the member suggests.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But may I return . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — It's still control . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — No sir . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — You still control the number of beds that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — ORDER! ORDER!

Mr. Blakeney: — The hon. member appeared to be reading in the bill something to the effect that there was an attempt to guarantee beds to particular physicians and this was her phrase "This bill, while not prepared to guarantee beds to other people, is trying to guarantee beds to particular doctors," and this was my note, if I have misconceived it I am sorry, but I am sure there is no suggestion of this in the bill.

I did want to say a few words about the hospital survey report, because I think the member has raised this point and she has frankly distorted what the hospital survey report is, what it intended to be, and the recommendations which were made to the government with respect to it. Intentional or otherwise, I am not alleging that the member intentionally distorted this. Her remarks were misconceived, or misunderstood: this is possible. The hospital survey committee is a committee of the Health Services Planning Commission. The Health Services Planning Commission is a widely based public body admittedly convened by the Department of Public Health and chaired by an official of the Department of Public Health, but on which the Department of Public Health does not have a majority or anything resembling a majority. It has very small representation. It is a body composed of representatives of the municipal organizations, SARM, SUMA, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the College of Dental Surgeons, The Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the SRNA, and the rest, and there is a substantial number. I think members in the house will be familiar with the activities of the Health Services Planning Commission, which has existed in this province for a decade. That commission appointed a committee the hospital survey committee, to do a general survey of the hospitals within the province. The committee included two representatives of the Department of Public Health, one of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association, one of the Hospital Association, and one of the College of Physicians and Surgeons; a five man committee, a very distinguished committee Dr. H.D. McDonald, Drs. Leishman, Clarkson, and Swanson, and Miss Ethel James of the Registered Nurses' Association. They produced the hospital survey committee report, which dealt with the organization of hospitals in the province and also dealt with their recommendations with respect to future organization of hospital services. They reported, very naturally, to the Health Services Planning Commission, in April or May of 1962; their letter of transmittal is dated April 30th.

The Health Services Planning Commission forwarded this to the government in November of 1962, with a letter which will be in the front of the volume which the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has. This letter indicates perfectly clearly that the Health Services Planning Commission feels this is a good piece of work, but that it ought not to be acted upon without specific surveys and specific additional work in various areas.

March 6, 1964

The Health Services Planning Commission believes that the hospital survey committee should be highly complimented. The magnitude of this report does not permit the commission to give its full endorsement to the whole report at this time.

The commission believes

that the recommendations of the committee should be given full consideration by your department in regard to the specific recommendations on the hospitals concerned.

and I may say this has been done.

In our view, the report does not examine (certain items) in sufficient detail to permit the commission to reach decisions and the commission believes that a clarification of some outstanding questions will be desirable.

Mr. McCarthy: — Is he in order?

Mr. Blakeney: — I beg your pardon, there were some very specific references by the member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) to the hospital survey committee. My point, Mr. Speaker, is this: that far from the government neglecting the report, and not bringing in legislation as the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has suggested, there is one piece of legislation on the order paper which springs directly out of this report — the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act, which I do not propose to debate . . .

Mrs. Batten — We thought this was . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I think you are again in error. May I say, with respect to the other recommendations, this committee report is receiving careful and close attention, and is being acted on in certain areas.

The member for Humboldt offered a further comment with respect to the board of conciliation, and suggested that she wondered why this method of solving the problems which apparently exist, was not adopted.

May I make a comment or two on this? I think a reference to the regulations under The Hospital Standards Act under which this board of conciliation is erected will make it perfectly clear that the board is intended to deal with disputes between hospitals and doctors, in situations where the hospital could be adequately represented by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and the doctor could be adequately represented by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The board suggests that there shall be representatives of the college and of the hospital association on it, it suggest that there shall be a chairman, chosen by the minister. It permits other people to be added and it would be possible for the minister to add other people, but I am suggesting to you from the context of the regulations that it is clear that it is meant to be a bi-partisan or tripartite board with an independent chairman and a doctor represented by the college and the hospital represented by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association.

Mr. McCarthy: — I did say . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I'll come to the other points you may raise in a moment. I think it is clear and it was certainly clear to Judge Woods that this was not the nature of the problem. The problem was, as he indicated, a dispute between two groups within the medical profession, which dispute had spilled over into areas of hospitals, and the specific problem which is being dealt with here is an effort to exclude this dispute from the area of hospitals, or to provide for the adjudication of such disputes when they do encroach upon hospital problems.

Another difficulty with respect to the board of conciliation, and a reason why it apparently didn't commend itself to Judge Woods, who, of course, was perfectly familiar with these regulations, is that the decisions are not binding and, indeed, they are not likely to be affected in many cases. May I give one example.

Judge Woods suggested in December that alternate arrangements be made when the operation of the sponsorship clause prevents a doctor from being considered for an appointment to the medical staff. He suggested this in December. Only two hospitals have sponsorship clauses of this nature possibly three, the Regina General Hospital, the Grey Nuns' Hospital. This recommendation was made by Judge Woods, supported by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association in the brief from which the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) quoted, and notwithstanding the fact that it was made by Judge Woods after an exhaustive inquiry, supported by the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, no single hospital with sponsorship provisions has acted upon it.

Is it therefore reasonable to suggest that the recommendations of a board of inquiry would have been any more effective? Here we have one which is made by the Judge, supported by the Hospital Association, but not acceptable to the hospitals. The problem still remains. I think that under these circumstances Judge Woods reached the right conclusion in believe that this was an ineffective way to solve the problem.

May I make it perfectly clear that these provisions with respect to a board of conciliation have been in the regulations of The Hospital Standards Act for some time. They are able to be placed in operation and a request is able to be made by either a hospital or a physician. They may refer the matter complained of to the minister for consideration by a board of conciliation and notwithstanding the fact that problems have arisen in a number of hospitals, problems which have been vexing both to the doctors and to the hospitals, no single doctor and no single hospital – note this: no single hospital – has felt that this particular method would be effective in resolving their difficulties.

I'm not surprised, therefore, that when doctors and hospitals and Judge Woods think this would be ineffective, I'm not surprised that others, including members on this side of the house, reach the conclusion that this particular method was not effective in resolving the difficulties with which we are confronted.

I want to make another comment. I have heard a substantial number of statements and I read a substantial number in the press with respect to the legal responsibility of hospitals for the malpractice therein of doctors. I have asked and repeatedly asked for someone to show me one case in Canada, just one, where a hospital was ever found liable for the malpractice of a doctor within the hospital. I say this is not law; I say that when the act is the act of a doctor, then the hospital board is not liable; and I say that it is not good law, but bad law, and will not be enforced by the courts. If you say that the hospital board is, or will be, responsible for an act of negligence within that hospital, committed by a doctor, there is only one circumstance under which this can be so, I suggest to you, and that is where the hospital board has been negligent in appointing this man to the staff. Now you may say this is the very case we are talking about, but I am just suggesting to you that in no case in Canada has it every been held that a duly-qualified physician or doctor is not an appropriate person for a hospital board to appoint to their staff unless there were circumstances which suggested that he had lost his competence by reason of addiction to alcohol or some other affliction. No doctor who would generally be said to be in good standing has ever been the subject of a malpractice suit in which the hospital has been found liable.

If someone can point one out I would like to see it. I may have missed it, but I think that it is time that it was said a good number of times that as a matter of law, a hospital which has not been negligent in appointing someone to their staff is not responsible formal practice or negligence of that doctor within the hospital.

The member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) seemed to minimize the scope of the problem by suggesting that it applied only in the one or two hospitals where there are sponsorship provisions . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — I did say . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm sorry – right – but may I call to his attention and to the attention of the house the fact that a hospital like the Saskatoon City Hospital does not have a sponsorship arrangement, and yet there has been difficulty there. I'm not alleging that the hospital board would be right or wrong. I am alleging that more doctors have been denied appointment to their medical staff in the last two years than in the previous twenty, I am alleging that, but I'm not alleging any . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Whose fault is that?

March 6, 1964

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm not here to assess praise or blame, if I may quote the words of the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) I'm just saying that a problem exists, a problem which is much greater than it has ever been before, and it is a problem where there is a hospital without sponsorship provisions. May I say that there are some problems in small hospitals?

Mr. McCarthy: — Some . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I simply want to point out that the problems with which the bill would deal are not confined exclusively, as the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) may have suggested to the large hospital. I am not suggesting that there is any impropriety on the part of a hospital board — I want to be careful on that score — nor that there was any problem with respect to the doctor himself, but I have here some clippings from the Melville Advance dealing with a hospital privilege problem at a hospital in Neudorf. Neudorf is a small hospital; it is a one-doctor hospital, at most, or two. There had been some problems in Eston. Eston is a three, four, six doctor hospital. I'm not sure, but it is in that order. It is not a large metropolitan hospital. And I may say that there have been problems previously in hospitals which have been small hospitals, hospitals such as in Wilkie. I would not wish members to get the idea that these problems are confined to large hospitals.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have dealt with all of the points which I wished to deal with, raised by members opposite. I am appreciative of the fact that while they find some parts of the bill that they cannot fully support, on balance at least some of them will find it possible to support the bill.

I think the bill may not be perfect but I think it is a good bill and I think it deserves the support of all members in the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — May we take it that this has carried unanimously?

Mr. Speaker: — Is it agreed that it can be said that this is carried unanimously, are there noes? I declare it carried unanimously.

Motion agreed to unanimously and bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS

HON. MR. BROCKELBANK moved second reading of Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1957.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a few amendments to The Vehicles Act and I would just mention a couple of them, the others are quite minor, and can be discussed in committee. The bill provides for destruction of records of drivers after five years clear, so that if they had a bad record and were good for five years, that record will disappear. That is one thing, I am sure all hon. members will be glad about that.

There is a section to provide for automatic correction of error made by magistrates in giving people too many points on their records. These now have to be corrected by Order-in-Council. The act will provide that the Traffic Board, if the magistrate gives our points when the law only allows two for an infraction then the Traffic Board will automatically reduce it to two and the other important one is to provide for a uniform pink slip indicating financial responsibility. There has been a great deal of work done across Canada and this financial responsibility will be acceptable all across Canada, and the \$35,000 public liability and property damage, I would now move that the bill be now read a second time.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — What happens if the magistrate gives you two points and it should be four?

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Highway Traffic Board has no authority to increase the points.

Mrs. Mary Batten (Humboldt): — Has the minister thought of giving a lecture to the hon. Attorney General and magistrates in the law so that they would know how many points to give?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, I have . . .

Mr. Speaker: — If any member has any debate on the question, he may adjourn the debate, but we can't permit questions back and forth like this.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 p.m.