

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Tenth Legislature
34th Day

Tuesday, March 18, 1947

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into a committee of Supply.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): —Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom of the other speakers who have taken part in this debate to compliment the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Fines) on the presentation of his Budget. I do not think there is any need for me to compliment him, but I do want to say that, when we took office in this province a little over two-and-a-half years ago, there were many dire forebodings about the portfolio of the Treasury. It was said that here was a group of visionaries and dreamers with no experience in the ways of finance, and that, in all probability, the province would soon be plunged into debt and its credit ruined. I had a great deal of confidence at the time in the man who was selected as Provincial Treasurer; I have a great deal more confidence in him, today. After two-and-a-half years, he is able to come before this House and show that this province has reduced its indebtedness by \$72,000,000 has increased its position on the money market so that, today, bonds which were selling, when we took office, at \$91 for a \$100 bond, are selling, today, as \$114 and \$115.

In the two-and-a-half years that he has occupied this position, the Provincial Treasurer and myself have had occasion many times to go to Ottawa to meet with the officials of the various provinces, to meet with the Minister of Finance (both Mr. Ilsley and, later, Mr. Abbott) and with their Deputies and with Mr. Towers, the Governor of the Bank of Canada; and I want to say, quite frankly, that after watching the Provincial Treasurer in action alongside some of the best financial minds in the Dominion of Canada, I am proud to be able to state here, today, that in my opinion we have one of the best Provincial Treasurers in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the budget of a Government is a most important document because the budget sets forth the objects of the Government and asks the Legislature to vote the money in order that the Government may carry out the policies which it has outlined. A vote against the budget, of course, is a vote to withhold from the Government the money to carry out the policy which it has enunciated.

We have had some criticism of this Budget, and nearly all of the criticism can be boiled down to one sentence, and that is that the Budget is much too large. That was the criticism of the official Opposition, the criticism of my friend, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. J. Benson) and the criticism of the Hon.

March 18, 1947

and gallant Member for the Mediterranean Area (Mr. Embury); that the Budget was too large.

I want to take a few moments to deal with that statement. First of all, I want to remind the Assembly that we cannot fairly compare our budget with the budgets of the other western provinces. The comparison is not a fair one insofar as we are concerned, because, Alberta, Manitoba and British Columbia all give a 'net' budget, whereas we give a 'gross' budget; that is, the money which they get from the Federal Government for old age pensions, or for venereal disease control, or for technical education, is not shown in their budgets. We, on the other hand, show it as coming into our revenue and as being spent as expenditures, so that our budget actually, in figures, is probably give or six million dollars higher because it is a 'gross budget' than if we were to place our budget on a 'net' basis as do the other western provinces.

However, even ignoring that difference what do we find, this year?

COMPARATIVE BUDGETS OF THE WESTERN PROVINCES

	1946-47	1947-48	Increase	Increase
	\$	\$	\$	%
Alberta (Net)	32,981,325	47,002,734	14,021,409	42
British Columbia (Net)	42,089,508	58,781,334	16,691,726	40
Manitoba (Net)	20,042,000	29,405,000	9,363,000	47
Saskatchewan (Gross)	39,996,889	45,571,114	5,574,225	14

Note these percentages: Alberta is up 42 per cent; B.C. is up 40 per cent; Manitoba is up 47 per cent; and Saskatchewan is up 14 per cent. I almost feel that we are pikers; that we haven't expanded sufficiently to meet the demands of the age in which we live, when we compare our expenditures with those of the other provinces in western Canada.

Now this constant talk about 'too big a budget' is not put forward because they would like to create the impression that we are laying more and more taxes on the people's backs. Yesterday the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Procter) quoted from the Table appearing at the back of the Budget Speech and although I tried two or three times to get him to say what this Table represented, he did not want to do so. This is a Table giving the 'Comparative Statement of Gross Revenue on Revenue Account' - 'Gross revenues', but he did not say that.

Then he went one step further; he tried to compare the year ending April 30th, 1943, with this year. His Government was also in office on April 30th, 1944; but if we take even the gross revenue (not the taxes, but the gross revenue) what do we find? We find that the revenue in 1936 was \$17.31 per person and that in 1944 (when this Government was still in office), it grew to \$40.65 - from \$17 to \$40 an increase of 250 per cent! At the present time it is \$47.70 - that is at April 30th, 1946. For the present fiscal year it will be down. Even referring to last year's figures, however, whereas my hon. friend's revenues went up \$23 per person, it has gone up only \$7 per person on gross revenues during this administration.

Mr. Speaker, gross revenues do not indicate an accurate picture. The impression my friend was trying to create was that

this \$47 per capita consisted of taxes collected from the people of the province. This Table, which he quoted from, is broken down as to taxes. If the Hon. Member will look at this Table, he will see that it specifies as one item. Let us look at these taxes. The taxes are broken down and show that, in 1944 (the last budget which the Liberals brought in) the per capita taxes were \$13.36 and that the per capita taxes at the end of April 1946, were \$15.58. But my hon. friend's taxes had gone up considerably. In 1936, the per capita taxation was \$6.11. It increased up to \$13. That is, they doubled in amount between 1936 and 1944. Taxes doubled in that time. The increase since we took office has been only some \$2 per capita.

If we go below and look at licences (there has been a great deal of talk about increased licences), we find that licence revenues are down one million dollars as compared to the last budget which my hon. friends brought in.

Now let us look at this question of taxation. My hon. friends always want to create the impression that total revenue represents total taxation as it falls on the 'man in the street.' The other day, when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, he paid me the compliment of saying that I was a much better orator than I was a mathematician. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot compliment him on either score, because he made the statement that whereas I had said that the Education Tax had been cut 40 per cent, the amount which we were receiving from the Education Tax was as much as ever. Of course, that is understandable. The volume of purchasing has increased, but he knows – no one in this House knows better – that the amount of Education Tax which we would be collecting today, would be higher, although we are levying 40 per cent less by virtue of the fact that this Legislature, last year, took the Education Tax off foodstuffs and off meals.

As a mathematician my friend interested me, because one of the statements in his speech was that when his Government left office in 1944, it left no unpaid accounts. That was interesting. It was interesting because, within a few weeks after taken office, we were down in Ottawa wrestling with the fact that his Government had \$83 million worth of Treasury Bills lying in the hands of the Government at Ottawa. Within the first twelve months that we were in office, we had our hands full trying to meet some of the debts which my hon. friend had incurred. If my friend does not call \$83 million worth of Treasury Bills, 1938 seed grain, 1935, 1936 and 1937 seed grain and relief accounts, which the province had promised to pay as outstanding accounts, as liabilities which had to be met, then I do not know what an outstanding obligation is.

Mr. Speaker, if we come to the question of taxes, we do not need to look at total revenues, all we need do is to look at the estimates (and my hon. friends have no doubt done so), and, on page 14, they will find the taxes which are to be collected in this financial year, beginning April 1st, in the Province of Saskatchewan by the Government. The total amount of those taxes as is shown there, is \$13,593,800 and not \$47,000,000 – the fantastic figure that the Member for Moosomin tried to pile up yesterday: \$260 per family. Just \$13,593,800 and, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Hon. Members to compare those taxes to be collected with the taxes collected under the same items in the last budget which my hon. friends presented before leaving office. Their taxation at that time was \$14,300,000. Actually, in terms of taxes collected under these items, this Government is collecting

March 18, 1947

\$800,000 less in taxes than my hon. friends were to collect in the last budget they brought down.

I know that the Member for Moosomin is going to say, "Ah! but the Hospital Tax should be added to this!" The Hospital Tax does not come in to consolidated revenue, and if my hon. friend wants to add the Hospital Tax as a tax collected by the Government, he must put over on the other side of the ledger, the fact that the people of Saskatchewan, last year, paid five and one-quarter million dollars in hospital bills which they will not be paying this year. So, when my friends go out into the country and try to tell people that this Government piled up taxes, I want them also to tell them that, on these items, on this amount of money collected by taxes under these estimates, we will be collecting \$800,000 less than they estimated they would collect in the last budget which they presented in this province.

Mr. Procter: — You'll have a time telling them.

Mr. Douglas: — When the hon. gentlemen opposite criticized the budget for being too large, I noticed that they were very careful not to tell us where they thought it ought to be reduced. The member for Last Mountain thought that a \$35 million budget was big enough. Well, that means a cut of 25 per cent right down the line. How do we go about cutting a budget 25 per cent? The Hon. Member suggested some of the things he wanted to commend the Government for doing. Well, Mr. Speaker, those very things that he was commending the Government for doing would have to be cut out if we were to reduce the budget to \$35 million. You can't eat your cake and have it too.

We can very easily have a smaller budget. You can have a smaller budget by stopping the medical, hospital and dental care for old age pensioners, for mother's allowance cases, for the blind. You can have it by reducing the old age pensions. You can have it by stopping grants to municipalities to hire municipal doctors. You can have it by stopping the grants to communities to build hospitals in sparsely-settled areas. You can reduce your budget by discontinuing equalization grants for education to help the backward districts and communities in a financially difficult position. It certainly can be done.

My hon. friends have not said where they would like to reduce this budget except in two particulars. In two matters they said they were willing to cut the budget. The first thing they objected to was the size of the staff, the size of the Civil Service. They said that it has grown alarmingly and they objected to its growth. They also objected to the increased salaries for the Civil Service, which it is estimated will cost in the neighborhood of a million dollars this year.

Let us look at these two matters. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province, I think, recognize that you cannot have service without personnel. What did we find when we took office? The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Phelps) and myself went up to northern Saskatchewan; we found whole areas had never been supervised by an inspector of the Natural Resources Department; we found cases of companies that were supposed to have been paying royalties, whose books had not been checked since 1931. In the Department of Child Welfare, when this Government took office the whole of the social services in this province were in a deplorable condition. They were turned over to the present

Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Valleau) and organized into a Department. He has had to hire trained social workers; he has not enough yet, but he has had to add considerably to his staff. He had to hire trained personnel and I believe sufficiently in the boys and the girls and the men and women he is looking after, to believe it is a good investment to spend money on the kind of staff that he is bringing into the Department of Social Welfare.

In agriculture, there was not enough staff to give a proper agricultural representative service; we had to increase staff.

I come to my own Department, Public Health Nurses, at one time were so few, that we enjoyed the services of only ten in this province and when we took office there were 21. Twenty-one to cover a province the size of Saskatchewan! Today, there are 56 and there still aren't half enough. The Leader of the Opposition complained the other day about the number of cars purchased; every one of these nurses required a car. We did not have enough sanitary inspectors.

We came to the Mental Hospitals, Mr. Speaker, one could write a book about the Mental Hospitals: they were overcrowded and in deplorable condition; psychotics and defectives were herded together like cattle; staff was overworked and there was not sufficient staff; wards carried on with one girl on duty alone – if anything happened to her, no one was there to get her out; doors were locked and there were no means of communication. People worked in those wards for twelve hours a day, and my hon. friends at one time paid them the magnificent salary of \$65 a month for a married man starting to work in a mental hospital on shifts of 72 hours a week – and then they talk against an increased staff!

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the people of this province want services on that basis. If we are going to take care of our mentally ill, if we are going to take care of our old people, then surely, we have a duty first of all to pay decent wages to those that care for them, to demand that those who look after them shall be properly trained and properly qualified and to see to it that the hospitals, where these people are kept, are clean and as homelike as it is possible to make them. That is why the staff has increased.

In the case of mental hospitals, the employees of which were on a twelve-hour day, we reduced hours to an eight-hour day; instead of two shifts of twelve hours each in every 24 hours, completely new staff right throughout both mental hospitals. We took the defectives out of the mental hospitals and placed them in a separate institution. That meant a completely new staff. Mr. Speaker, the last things that I am going to apologize for are: first, providing some room and some decent care for the people who are mentally ill; and the second thing I am not going to apologize for, is paying reasonable wages to those who look after them.

Because we are paying decent wages, and because our employees work decent hours, we are able to set high standards. We are able to say that we are not going to allow anybody at all to push these patients around. We are able to say: "Before you become a mental hospital nurse, you must take examinations and you must write examinations each year. We will give you training; but if you are not able to progress and learn how to do

March 18, 1947

this work sympathetically, and give these people the best possible kind of care, we do not want you in the service”, and because this work is now financially attractive, we are able to pick and choose and get the right kind of staff.

The second thing my hon. friend objected to was not only the size of the civil Service but the additional money we were going to pay the service. Again I do not apologize for that. The cost of living has gone up. Our civil servants of this province will be interested to know that, if the Liberal Party ever gets back into office, one of the first things they will do is cut their salaries down to where they were when they left office. No, Mr. Speaker, when you come to talk about more people to man our mental hospitals, our old folks’ homes, our jails, our agricultural services, more persons to provide health service, public health nursing services, cancer treatment – when you talk about those things, it is not a matter of whether we can afford to pay more; it is that we cannot afford not to pay more! We cannot afford to allow these services to go back to the deplorable conditions in which we found them in July, 1944.

Of course, the Opposition did not only fail to tell us how they would reduce this budget, they even went on and told us how we ought to spend more money. The Leader of the Opposition told us that the budget is too big, but incidentally, asked: “Why don’t you give a wool bonus?”, “why don’t you give a hog bonus?”, “why don’t you give a milk subsidy?” Of course he was careful not to say that he never gave them when he sat over here. But now he says, “why don’t you do it? I want the budget down; but I want you to spend more money!” Nobody has ever been able to solve that one. Houdini used to pull rabbits out of a hat, but he never tried to make a living out of selling them when he had pulled them out of the hat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this discussion of the budget, we have had a chance to see the real difference in the political philosophies the Liberal Party and of the Government. The Leader of the Opposition summed it up far better than I could do, when he said this in the course of his speech:

It is rather disconcerting to see the very considerable percentage of the total expenditures of the province that are being provided for a comparatively limited number of percentage of the population.

There it is in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition had just been talking about the old age pensions’ increase, and about the health services for these people. The Leader of the Opposition feels that it is disconcerting to see the large amount of money that we are going to spend on a relatively small group of people. After all, if the rest of us can get by, if we do not need security for our old age, if we do not need insurance against an automobile accident, if we are always able to pay our hospital bills, why should we be taxed to help somebody that cannot pay those bills?

That was the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition, when, the other day, he talked about the home for the Infirm at Wolseley, and about the increase in the cost of operating that home. When I interrupted and said that we were feeding them now, this was the reply of the Leader of the Opposition: “The response of the Premier is typical of his approach to the practical problem of finance.”

Mr. Speaker, that is the greatest compliment that has ever been paid me in my public life. I take it as a compliment that in facing the practical problems of finance, I insist first and foremost that the people shall be fed, and particularly the aged people who have served this province so long. But here, Mr. Speaker, we have the kernel of the whole question. My hon. friends do not like, and their friends do not like, having to help pay taxes to look after the needy, and the sick and the aged, and the orphans, and the widows. If they can get by, why should they have to be concerned about other people!

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the frankness of the Leader of the Opposition and also the frankness of the Member for Moosomin, because they have shown us Liberalism with the mask off: the Member for Moosomin, who talked about the creation and sharing of idleness, which, he said, was becoming an established practice in Saskatchewan, and the Leader of the Opposition who said, "The farmer of this province is beginning to appreciate that he is being compelled to pay for many privileges and many benefits which he cannot possibly enjoy. He cannot have a 40-hour week. He cannot have one-day's-rest-in-seven. He cannot have time-and-a-half for working so many hours a day."

That is the official Opposition; but Mr. Tucker wants something for everybody and on page 28 of the "Liberal Program" (very suitably bound in red) this is what they say: they pledge themselves to:

The enactment of such legislation, applicable to the industrial and service employment so as to encourage the bringing about of the 40-hour week.

The 40-hour week no less! The Liberal Party is for the 40-hour week on the platform, but, in the Legislature, the Leader of the Opposition says the farmer does not get a 40-hour week, and the farmer is beginning to realize that he is having to pay for a lot of services which other people get and which he cannot enjoy.

How are we supposed to reconcile these statements? Mr. Tucker, the reformer: Mr. Tucker for a 40-hour week; yet, over here, the gentlemen in Opposition are opposed to a 40-hour week. They are opposed to taxation, which, as the -Leader of the Opposition says, helps only a certain small fixed percentage of our people!

Mr. Speaker, there you have the difference between the Liberal and the CCF philosophies of life. The Liberal Party takes what I consider the callous and selfish position: those that can get by should get by; as for those that cannot get by, it does not matter. It is every man for himself – as the elephant said as he was dancing among the chicks! It is very nice if you happen to be an elephant; but it is pretty tough if you happen to be one of the chickens.

Over against that philosophy of life stand the CCF philosophy of life. We believe that every man is his brother's keeper. We believe that those that are strong ought to help bear the burdens of the weak. We believe that any society, most of all a Christian society, is measured by what it does for the aged, for the sick, the orphans and the less fortunate who live in our midst. That is the policy of 'Humanity First' and, Mr. Speaker, by that policy this Government is prepared to either stand or fall.

March 18, 1947

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that not only have we no apologies to make for this budget; we are going to leave the apologizing to the people who vote against this budget. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to 'stand up and be counted', as Mr. Trestrail likes to say. Only, I want the people of this country to know that a vote against this budget is a vote against those things that have made necessary increases in the budget.

The reason this budget is larger than the budget of my hon. friend is that it provides new services and those who vote against this budget are voting against those new services. When my hon. friends register their vote against this budget they are registering their vote against the increase in old age pensions. You cannot have increased old age pensions unless they are provided for by these increases in the budget. When they register their vote, against this budget, they really register against over \$1 million in this budget to provide for medical care and hospital care and dental care and optometrical care for our old people, for the widows and the orphans and the blind people of the province. Over \$1 million is in the budget for that purpose because others will be added this year and the cost is growing and will continue to grow. Those who vote against the budget will vote against the grants for municipal doctors which are provided in this budget.

Another reason for an increase arises from the cost of providing a cancer service. Cancer services now cost at least half a million dollars a year, because the number of people going through our cancer clinics is steadily increasing and because the kind of service we are giving is steadily improving. That is the reason for these increases. My hon. friends oppose the increased costs, then they must oppose the increased services which are provided in that vote. They are casting their vote against a million dollar increase in grants for education; against a quarter of a million dollars for irrigation and conservation of feed; against the building of a medical school, a university hospital, to give us a medical centre in this province to give our people adequate care without having to travel long distances as they do today; against providing an agricultural building at the university, which we need if we are to have proper agricultural training. To vote against this budget is to vote against increased power facilities being provided here, to help take over certain power lines and to integrate the power system for the Province of Saskatchewan. To vote against this budget is to vote against increased highway expenditures – money provided for hard-surfacing highways in the province long neglected by my hon. friends and badly needed today. A vote against this budget is a vote to say, "we do not want that." It is a vote against a new mental hospital to permit us to take care of people who are mentally ill; against building a new old folks' home so that we can take care of many old people who have no one to turn to and no place to go.

I am not, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, apologizing to anyone for this budget. What we say is that those who vote against this budget had better do the apologizing, because they are voting against a budget that will do more to help the common people of this province than any budget that has ever been introduced in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the remarks which were made yesterday by the Hon. Member for the Mediterranean Area. The Hon. Member, yesterday, read to this House an essay that,

in my opinion, almost bordered on the psychoneurotic. We have all heard of such people as are mentioned in the song: "Pink elephants on the ceiling; Pink elephants on the floor. He saw them coming in the window; He saw them coming in the door." Well, my hon. friend sees Reds everywhere; he sees communists at every turn ...

Mr. Embury: — I do, from here!

Mr. Douglas: — ... and I think that that is a pretty unfortunate state of mind to be in. Now the attack of my hon. friend, yesterday, on this group — accusing them of being communists and Communist controlled and having Communist tendencies — that, of course, is not a new thing at all. I do not think the people of this province will be greatly perturbed about these charges and certainly the Members of this group are not going to be greatly perturbed about them.

Mr. Embury: — You seemed to be worried about them.

Mr. Danielson: — They worried you.

Mr. Embury: — You were worried, yesterday.

Mr. Douglas: — Well my hon. friend will certainly be worried before I am through.

Between 1934 to 1944, for ten years, the people of this province were subjected, about three times a week, to radio broadcasts by a gentleman called Mr. W.F. Kerr, and the same sort of story was told to the people day after day, week after week. People soon got wise to that. The Hearst Press has been carrying on the same sort of campaign for years and everybody they disagree with is a Communist, or is Communist-controlled; every organization they do not like is Communist-dominated. One has only to read, for instance 'Mein-Kampf' — Hitler used to do the same thing. He called the Socialists, 'Communist'. After he pretty well had all the Socialists in concentration camps, he started to call the Liberals, 'Communists.' He finally wound up by calling the Catholic Church, 'Communist', and he closed the Masonic Lodges because there were supposed to be Communist meetings going on in the Masonic Lodge.

You see, Mr. Speaker, it is always true, either of an individual or a party, that, whenever they become bankrupt of ideas, they resort to witch-hunting and Red-baiting. It is a sure sign of bankruptcy — whenever a person has not the capacity to be for something, then he is always sure to be against something. We have had very good examples of this in this province over the years.

My hon. friend came in, yesterday, with a carefully written speech, made charges which he could not substantiate; charged my deskmate here, with having been Chairman (I think) for Tim Buck's meetings. I do not know who told him that. I do not know who wrote it for him, or who persuaded him to put it down; but certainly it was not true. The hon. gentleman might have tried to find out the facts, but that is not his characteristic: you make the charge first and then you find out about the facts afterwards.

March 18, 1947

Now how did all this come about? I am sorry that it happened, but this is how it happened. The other day, my hon. friend made the charge across the floor that there were Communists in this Party and I invited him to tell us who they were. I invited him to name them and he said he would.

Mr. Embury: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say I'd name them. If we must have this continual distortion of the facts by the Hon. Premier – I never said that I would name them. I asked him to name them.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. Member state his Point of Order?

Mr. Embury: — The point is – I suppose it is a Point of Privilege. In any event he has misquoted me in saying that I would name them. I never said I would name them. I said he should name them.

Mr. Douglas: — I'll leave it to the record of the House Mr. Speaker.

My hon. friend was going to tell me who they were and when he got up yesterday, after a great deal of bluster and shaking of his fist and going through considerable histrionics, all he could tell me was that it was up to me. He said, (using the rather coarse metaphor) that since I was 'sleeping' with them it was up to me to name them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to name them, because I am not associating with any communists – and what is more, I am not, while posing as a Soldier Representative, going about the province clandestinely trying to get myself nominated as a Coalition candidate for the city of Regina.

Mr. Embury: — On a Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has suggested – and I take it that the same rules that applied to me, also apply to him; he has suggested that I am posing, and that I am here pretending to be something different. I'll ask that that be withdrawn, if the same rule applies to both sides of this House.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. member should confine himself to the Point of Order and not try to show me my duty.

Mr. Embury: — He told me I was posing as a soldier representative!

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if it will soothe the hon. gentleman, I will withdraw the word 'posing', if it will make my hon. friend feel better. One of the characteristics of his class is that they can hand it out but they can't take it. I have always noticed that.

Mr. Embury: — I did not notice you take it, yesterday.

Mr. Douglas: — I want to say this and I want to repeat it so that my hon. friend will get it -- that I am not associating with Communists.

Mr. Embury: — You seem to be.

Mr. Douglas: — But neither am I, while a Soldiers' Representative, going about the city under sponsorship of the Editor of the Regina Leader-Post trying to get myself nominated as a Coalition candidate for the city of Regina.

Mr. Procter: — No, you didn't make such a good job as a soldier representative, did you?

Mr. Embury: — And you are not fooling anybody either.

Mr. Douglas: — I do not know who my hon. friend thinks he is, but the CCF is a party with nearly a million supporters in the Dominion of Canada, which has laid out its program year after year, and made perfectly clear its stand; and the moment my hon. friend requests that we should suddenly denounce Communism, he expects us to drop everything else and hasten to acquiesce in his request! Because we have not denounced Communism the moment that he suggests we should, my hon. friend concludes that the CCF is Communist.

Now, I am going to tell my hon. friend and I will take a few moments to do so, although I do not like to take the time in the Budget Debate; but since he has brought it up several times now, I am prepared to tell my hon. friend and to relate to him just where the CCF Party has stood over the years with reference to both the Communist Party and the capitalist parties in the Dominion of Canada. The only difference between my hon. friend and myself, so far as being opposed to the Communist Party is concerned, may I tell him, is that I know why I am opposed to the Communist Party. I have studied the Communist Party. I have studied Karl Marx. I know something about their philosophy. I believe it is wrong. I believe it is unsound economically, morally and sociologically. My hon. friend is not so much opposed to any change which he thinks will take away the special privileges of the kind of people that he represents.

Mr. Procter: — He represents a pretty fair bunch.

Mr. Embury: — Not a bad lot.

Mr. Douglas: — Now, let us look at the CCF record with reference to Communism.

Mr. Embury: — Well, it's the same as yours.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Douglas: — The CCF was formed in 1932. Its manifesto was laid down at the Regina Convention in 1933. Anyone who cares to follow the history of the CCF Movement knows perfectly well that throughout the first six or seven years of its existence, while there were large distances between our scattered organizations, we had to fight at almost every turn to prevent infiltration by members

March 18, 1947

of the Communist Party, to prevent them from boring in as they always do into trade unions, into labor movements, into anything and everything, with a view to disrupting whatever organization they bore into. Twice, Mr. Woodworth, then National President of the CCF, disbanded the entire Ontario organization and started over again, once he disbanded the British Columbia organization and started over again, because the Communists had made such inroads that it was almost impossible to carry on the organization on a democratic basis. I say that very frankly. There was a constituency in this province, where, back in the latter part of the 1930s they had also bored in and where Mr. George H. Williams, former Provincial Leader, had to put some members out of the organization, with the consent, of course, of that organization and the Provincial Council, because the Communists were doing the same thing there.

Mr. Embury: — My point, exactly.

Mr. Douglas: — Ah, yes, but my friend does not stop there. After having put these people out, what has been the story from there on? When the war came about, there was no group in Canada more vigorously attacked by the Communists than the CCF. At a meeting which I held here in the city of Regina, the Communists stood at the back of the hall and handed out pamphlets accusing Mr. Coldwell and myself of having betrayed the working people because he had voted for a declaration of war, whereas, Mr. Woodsworth had voted against it. Communists were opposed to the war. They helped to defeat a good many CCF candidates by some of the misrepresentations they circulated in Ontario and British Columbia in the 1940 Dominion election.

In 1941, Russia came into the war. The whole picture changed. The Communist party was not supporting the war. They came out of hiding, many of them. They had been a banned organization. They changed their name to the labour-progressive party and were allowed to continue to organize although the ban on the Communist Party still continued by order-in-Council. Then they decided to make love to the Liberal party and ...

Mr. Procter: — They didn't have much success there.

Mr. Douglas: — Oh? They had some wonderful success! Mr. Tim Buck and 'Mitch' Hepburn had a 'love feast' in the maple Leaf Gardens, and Mr. Tim Buck came out here in 1944 and put a half-page advertisement in The Leader-Post, five days before the last provincial election, telling the people of Saskatchewan to vote for my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition. In 1945, we had the amazing spectacle of Labour-Liberal and Liberal-Labour candidates springing up in various industrial centres, especially in two-member seats. In Windsor and in Hamilton, we had a Liberal and a Communist running side by side. Why, when I went down to Windsor, I was surprised to see the big sign telling people to vote for the Labour-Progressive candidate (who was, at that time, President of the United Automobile Worker's Union) and to vote for Mr. Paul Martin, who is now the Minister of National Health and Welfare. There they were, side by side!

Mr. Patterson: — Same as in Saskatoon in the 1944 election.

Mr. Douglas: —There they were, happy as a couple of bugs in a rug. There was no question, then, of denouncing the Communists!

Mr. Procter: — Now, tell us about Mrs. Neilson.

Mr. Douglas: — I will tell my hon. friend something. He said that we had not denounced the communists. Let me refer him to a newspaper report and this since he has come back from overseas. Some of these other things he might not know about, but this has happened within recent months. Here is the Leader-Post of October 18th, 1946:

Labour-Progressives spurned by Douglas.

That is the heading of a reference which I made in the Portage by-election.

Mr. Embury: — That's the other way round.

Mr. Douglas: — Winnipeg Free Press, October 18, 1946:

Mr. Douglas refuses LPP aid and attacks two other parties. Toronto Daily Star, October 18, 1946:

Douglas feels okay of LPP attempt to embarrass us.

And so on – so that if my hon. friend will take the trouble to go back over the history of CCF he will find that our stand with reference to Communism is a stand for which we need apologize to no man.

Mr. Procter: — Now's the time for you to do what Woodsworth and Williams did.

Mr. Douglas: — The difference between the CCF and the Communist Party is well known to any person who will take the trouble to read the program of the CCF.

Mr. Embury: — What is it?

Mr. Douglas: — I am coming around to that. I shall tell it to my friend, I will not guarantee that he will understand it, but I will certainly be glad to tell it to him.

I would say that there are four main things in our program. The first is that we differ as to the method by which a better society can be brought about.

Mr. Embury: — What, with murder?

Mr. Douglas: — We believe, that a new society can be brought about by democratic means. I have here our Manifesto which says:

The CCF is a federation of organizations whose

March 18, 1947

purpose is the establishment, in Canada, of a Co-operative Commonwealth in which the principle regulating production, distribution and exchange will be the supplying of human needs and not the making of profits.

We aim to replace the present capitalistic system, with its inherent injustice and inhumanity, by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated, in which economic planning will supersede unregulated private enterprise and competition, and in which genuine democratic self-government, based upon economic equality, will be possible.

Mr. Embury: — Will the Hon. Minister permit me a question?

Mr. Douglas: — Yes, certainly.

Mr. Embury: — You read there an article saying that you proposed to do these things by peaceful means. Do you concur with the Hon. Minister of Labour, when he condones a wicked murder?

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows better than I do that there was no attempt to condone a murder, but I have noticed ...

Mr. Embury: — The Minister did exactly that.

Mr. Douglas: — He did not. But, I have noticed that when the same Mr. McNair whose thugs murdered some of his workers who were out on strike for nothing else but the right to eat the bread they earned by the seat of their brow, my friend never made one reference to the fact that these workers were killed. He is only interested in the fact that somebody shot Mr. McNair. Now, I am sorry that somebody shot Mr. McNair, but I am saying that my friend has shown little or no sympathy for the workers who were murdered by Mr. McNair's thugs ...

Mr. Embury: — I only referred to the statement of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Douglas: — ... and he has not, for a single moment, said that he is interested. My impression is that he is not interested at all.

Now may I go on with my reading in which I was so rudely interrupted, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Procter: — Well, you ought to recognize a rude interruption.

Mr. Douglas: — This is from 'Left Turn Canada'.

The new social order (the CCF Manifesto says) at which we aim, is not one in which individuality will be crushed out by a system of regimentation. Nor shall we interfere with cultural rights of racial or religious minorities. What we seek is a proper collective

organization of our economic resources, such as will make possible a much greater guarantee of leisure and a much richer individual life for every citizen. This social and economic transformation can be brought about by political action through the election of a government inspired by the ideal of a Co-operative Commonwealth, and supported by a majority of the people. We do not believe in change by violence.

There is the CCF manifesto. This is what we believe and this is where we think Karl Marx and those who follow him are wrong. Karl Marx, living in the days of Bismarck, felt that democracy was something that the ruling classes would take away the moment that the common people started to use it to secure economic democracy; and, of course, in Germany, that is exactly what happened. But, we believe that our political and democratic institutions are so firmly rooted in our social life, that they cannot be taken away, and that it is possible to have a revolution by ballot. They had it in New Zealand; in Australia. In 1945, they had a revolution by ballot in Great Britain. In 1944, we had a peaceful social revolution here in Saskatchewan, when the common people turned out of office the 'choreboys' of the vested interests, and themselves took control of their own affairs in this province.

We believe in change by democratic procedure and we think that these democratic processes which are here and which are ours, can be used to bring about a new society without violence and without resorting to violence.

The second difference, Mr. Speaker, is that in the new kind of society that we wish to see, we do not think, as the Communists do, that there should exist a one-party government. The Communists believe that they should have one party; that there should be democratic procedure within that party, but that only one party should exercise control. The Communists have a lot of arguments (which I shall not go into) as to why that is the only kind of society that is desirable. We do not believe that. We believe that society moves forward best when there is some conflict of opinion, where there is an opportunity for a difference of view, where there exists the greatest amount of freedom, both of expression and of thought. For that reason, we do not believe in one-party government; nor do we believe in a dictatorship of the proletariat which too often becomes a dictatorship for the proletariat.

Mr. Procter: — You practise dictatorship, though.

Mr. Douglas: — The third difference, I would say, is that we do not believe that the end justifies the means, because the means determine the end. If you use the wrong kind of means to get an end, the end itself will be wrong when you get it. If you use vicious means and immoral means to gain a certain end, you will have destroyed the end when you have reached it. If you use bloodshed and oppression to form a new society, the kind of society you get will be based, not on reason, not on brotherhood, but on bloodshed and oppression. We have never believed that the means justify the end. We believe that the means determine the end.

The final difference and this applies to a great many of us, I think – is that we believe fundamentally in the tenets of

March 18, 1947

the Christian Church. My hon. friend over here, the Minister of Agriculture, whom my friend, yesterday, said had Communist tendencies, is a member of a church which has condemned the tenets of communism. There are many of us who are socialists across the world, who are not only democratic Socialists, but who also claim to be Christian Socialists; people who believe that there is a Power not of ourselves that makes for righteousness; that the world is not merely a play of blind chance, and of forces that move hither and yon without guidance; that there is working through the lives and minds of men, a force that is gradually pushing mankind upward and onward toward what we believe ultimately will be the Kingdom of God. Believing that, and believing that Socialism, rather than being incompatible with Christianity, is inseparable from Christianity and is the application of Christianity to our everyday lives, we cannot, at the same time, accept the purely materialistic doctrine of the Communists.

I want to say to my hon. friend, and I say it with all possible kindness, that when he comes into this House, as he did yesterday, and when he uses the terms 'Socialist' and 'Communist' interchangeably, when he labels a man like Dr. Harry Laidler – one of the greatest professors on this continent; one of the greatest scholars on this continent – labels people of that calibre 'Communist' and says, in essence, that Communism and Socialism are one and the same thing, he is not just insulting the members of this group. I do not care about anyone insulting us here; we can take care of ourselves. But he is insulting Socialists all over the world. He is insulting the people of some of the Scandinavian countries and of Holland Belgium and New Zealand and Australia and in the United Kingdom, the Mother of parliaments, where today we have a Socialist Government. There, they have the people of Great Britain solidly behind that go, as its by-elections have shown, seeking to work out their economic salvation in a very difficult time. Their stand in Greta Britain with reference to the communists is well known, as my hon. friend admitted yesterday. When anyone tars every Socialist with the Communist brush, he is not just insulting the small group here; he is insulting a growing body of opinion all over the world which is moving and marching forward under the banner of Socialism.

When I look at the men who are leading the British Government, leading some of the other Governments of the world, who are proud to call themselves Socialist, I have very little regard for the taunts of the gentleman opposite. But I want to tell my hon. friend that he not only insults these people, he insults some of the men who had the privilege of fighting with him and under him – who fought for some of the things that this Government is trying to bring about. The men who went to fight in this war, did not go to fight to make the world safe for Tories or for Toryism ...

Mr. Embury: — Did I say they did, Mr. Premier?

Mr. Douglas: — Many of them spent time in the Bennett 'concentration camps' at twenty cents a day, and Tory treatment; many were run down asking their inalienable right to work and to live. They went to war. They went to war because they believed that out of the war would come a better society, a society in which unemployment and insecurity would be abolished.

All of us know some of these young men. I can think of one of them, one I knew quite well. My hon. friend knew him too. I can think of a chap like young Jack Western – born in this province; went through the bad times of the '30s as most of these boys did; went overseas; became a lieutenant – in fact an officer in the Saskatoon light Infantry, in my hon. friend's unit. He became a candidate, as a matter of fact, in the 1944 election.

Mr. Embury: — He was a great friend of mine. I had just as much admiration for Jack Western as the Hon. Premier had.

Mr. Douglas: — I am quite sure my hon. friend had. He was a candidate, in 1944, as was my hon. friend. He was transferred from my hon. friend's unit to another unit as a reinforcement officer, and was killed before the election came; otherwise, he might have been sitting in this House. But, before he went into action, before he was killed, he sent some letters back to Canada: the House would be interested in hearing them, but I am not going to weary the House with them now. But he knew what he was fighting for. He was not fighting to maintain the world as it was; was not fighting to maintain the status quo. He was fighting because he hoped and believed that, out of the war in which he ultimately was to give his life, there would come a better society. Jack Western was a Socialist, and when my hon. friend stands up here and calls socialism 'Communism', he is casting reflections on some of these men, some of his own comrades, who gave their lives because they hoped that, some day, we would see in this world the kind of society that this Government is seeking to realize.

I do not want to spend any more time on this matter, except to say to my hon. friend that when he came to this House, two years ago, I think all of us treated him with every courtesy and every respect. We had a high regard for him, not only for himself, but for the men whom he would represent. The first two years my hon. friend was here, he supported the Government's Speech from the Throne. He said, last year, from his place in this House, that the Government ought to stay in power if for nothing else than to keep the Liberals out.

Mr. Embury: — A lot of people woke up with me!

Mr. Douglas: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government has not changed. The policies we are carrying out, today, were in the very Speech from the Throne for which my hon. friend voted.

Mr. Embury: — You have changed your tactics.

Mr. Douglas: — The Hon. Member, however, has changed. The Government has not changed; my hon. friend has changed. My hon. friend, who came back with a desire to do something for the men he represented, has been finding that, in the interim, if you are going to be a successful lawyer and if you ever hope to get on the bench, you had better support the status quo.

Mr. Embury: — I speak to a Point of Order, that the Premier suggested that I have personal motives and some personal interest in expressing the views that I do in this House. I would thank him to withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

March 18, 1947

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to hasten to assure my hon. friend that I was not suggesting for a moment that he had any personal aims in view at all. I will withdraw what hurts my hon. friend's feelings, certainly. But, I am suggesting to my hon. friend that he is a very different person, today ...

Mr. Embury: — You are different!

Mr. Douglas: — ... from what he was two years ago.

Mr. Embury: — That's your fault.

Mr. Douglas: — I will tell my hon. friend whose fault it is. On the day when my hon. friend stood up in this House and said, "I was a Tory before, and likely when I'm over being a soldier's representative, I'll be a Tory again," my hon. friend revealed once and for all, that you cannot be a Tory before and a Tory after without being a Tory all the way through. You cannot change your convictions like you change your shirt.

Mr. Embury: — You cannot change your communism either.

Mr. Douglas: — My friend has always been a Tory and as far as my hon. friend is concerned, in this House, he has made it perfectly clear, as far as I am concerned, that he is now, in the main, not speaking for the veterans (many of whom wanted a new society), but he is speaking for the Tories who, throughout the years of this country, have opposed every kind of social change that would take away from the privileged classes any of the privileges which they have enjoyed.

Mr. Embury: — Would you mind adding, he got wise to the CCF party?

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said – and I regret to be talking so long: but a great deal has been said about international affairs. There has been an attempt to create an impression that the CCF is anti-American. Repeatedly, statements have been pulled out of their context and this idea has been very carefully and assiduously created and propagated across Canada by the daily press. I want to say, that, as far as the CCF is concerned, we are not 'anti' anything. We are not against ideas or objects; we are for certain very real and important things. We are for world peace based on collective security, based on collective action. That is what we are for.

We recognize, however, what some of the dangers are in the post-war world. One of the dangers of the post-war world arises from some people on this continent who, for their own sinister motives, would like to keep us in a constant state of war-hysteria, keep us constantly fighting somebody or something. When you secure a spirit of war-hysteria, you can always get away with reactionary measures at home that would not be tolerated at any other time. There are those who constantly want to bring out and parade the 'bogeyman' of Russia. and this is the case, not so much in this country as in the great Republic to the south of us. This attitude does, however, apply to some extent in this country as well.

Now let us state the facts. The fact, first of all, is that in spite of all the propaganda, the Soviet Union (men like Leland Stowe and other very reputable journalists tell us) is not in a position to fight a war with any major power. If the Soviet Union, in the war now ended, has had exactly one-half of its people left homeless, has lost eleven million of its people by killing, we all realize that it will take the Soviet Union anywhere from 15 to 25 years to become re-organized, to rehabilitate its economy and to reach the point where it could face the prospect of any major conflict. One of the things we should seek to present, it seems to me, is the constant attempt, in various parts of the world, by sinister forces, to work up a war-hysteria.

There are three attitudes, it seems to me, which can be taken to this problem. The first is the attitude of those who accept the inevitability of war between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies. If we take that view, the inevitable end is war, and what has been said is true, that Canada would, in all probability, become the Belgium, or one of the Belgiams, of the next war, if war should come. I, personally, am not prepared to accept the inevitability of war between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies.

The second attitude, which I think is equally wrong, is that we should supinely acquiesce in all Russian aggrandisements; that whenever Russia wants to acquire any small neighboring state, we should all either clap our hands or just look the other way. I am equally opposed to that point of view. I have held, throughout my adult life, that the greatest force for peace was laid down in the fourteen points of Wilson for the League of Nations, the principal one being the self-determination of small nations. I believe that small nations have as much right to self-determination where the Soviet Union is concerned, as they have where Britain is concerned or America is concerned, or turkey is concerned. I believe in the self-determination of small nations. I am opposed to large nations being allowed to gobble them up in a game of power politics and I refuse, simply because it is the soviet Union, to constantly acquiesce in a program of expansion if or when the soviet Union embarks upon such a program.

I think there is a third course and that is the course that has been taken in the main, by the British Labour Party and particularly by the men who moved the amendment, recently, criticizing Mr. Bevin. Their position was simply this: that Britain is in a central geographic and political position; that we ought not to be tied to the American program supported by some who accept the inevitability of war between the Western democracies and the Soviet Union. We ought not, on the other hand accept the position that we should always acquiesce wherever Russia seeks to spread her frontiers, because Russia has become increasingly nationalistic as the years have gone by and more and more, the mantle of Peter the Great has fallen upon the shoulders of Stalin. The Socialists have taken the position that either of these courses leads inevitably to a war that will make the last war look like Bingo on Saturday night.

Socialists believe that the solution lies in building a United Nations – a United Nations that will have its own Court of Justice and its own police force, that will exercise international control of the atomic bomb. Thus will the world secure the most potent weapon in the world by which the nations who want peace may collectively subdue and restrain any ‘gangster’

March 18, 1947

nation which insists upon using force to gain its own ends.

That is the only way we can have peace and it is to that we refer when we, in this group, talk about refusing to be a party to any American imperialist ambitions. I am not saying that because we are anti-American. Personally, I owe a great debt to the American people; we all owe a great debt to the American people, and we all owe a great debt to the Russian people. Let us not forget that just a few years ago, when every paper off the press said that the Russians had stopped the Germans at Stalingrad or at Leningrad, we were cheering, because every time they inflicted loss upon the enemy, they were saving our lives and saving our future. We have no quarrel with the people of the Soviet Union nor with the people of the United States but we must take care that there are no sinister forces in any of these countries, who seek to lead us into war – a war whose only result can be to destroy civilization and all its works.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said these few words about foreign policy, I wonder if I may very briefly trespass upon the patience of the House to say a few words about my own Department. I must apologize for talking so long but I think that I can cover the work of my Department fairly quickly.

May I say first of all, that the work of my Department can be divided roughly into two categories. On the one hand, there is the traditional work of the established Department: looking after established institutions; providing certain fixed services; carrying on a program of prevention and hygiene. On the other hand, there is the Health Services Planning Commission, whose task it is to survey the whole field of public health and to bring into operation new curative services, the expansion of health insurance, thus making available to the people of the province the health services which they so urgently need and I think, so greatly desire. I mean to deal first of all, with the Department itself and then, for a few moments, with the work of the Planning Commission.

With reference to the Department, I will run over, briefly, its Branches.

The first is, the Air Ambulance: The Air Ambulance now consists, as most Members know, of two Norsemen situated here in Regina. We had some difficulty in securing space and because the CPA were moving out and we were renting space from them, we have had to take over the entire hangar which has involved considerable expense and means that we will have to supply gasoline and refuelling facilities at the airport for other planes that come in and so there has been a considerable expense involved. The Air Ambulance has done a remarkably good job in the little more than a year that it has been operating. The service has, in all, made about 427 flights. In 17 of those flights, plasma or some other drug that was urgently required, was carried; and 410 of those were actual 'mercy flights' to bring one or more patients into hospitals.

I think I explained to the House, last year, that we operate in the following manner: we bring patients from anywhere in the province, for a flat fee of \$25. Of course, \$25 does not pay for much more than taking the plane off the ground: it can never pay for the whole service. But we feel that people will appreciate the service more, if they make some nominal payment for it. Of course, if anyone cannot pay, there is no hesitation and we carry the patient in any event. If they can pay, they do pay; but if

any person is in financial difficulties, the question of money is never raised.

Then, I want to say a word about the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission. We have clinics both here in Regina at the Grey Nuns' Hospital and the City Hospital in Saskatoon. During the last year (that, the calendar year) there were 3,295 cases of new admissions, an increase of 507 during that period. That is a very remarkable increase. There was also, an increase of 1,430 patients who came back for re-examination during the year 1946; that is, we are most anxious not only that patients shall come early to these two clinics for whatever treatment or surgery they may require, but that, when they are discharged, they will come to the clinic regularly, every six months or every year as ordered by the doctor, to make sure that the cancer does not recur. The costs, of course, for providing surgery and providing hospitalization for these people who go through the Cancer Clinic, is increasing very rapidly and, as I intimated to the House earlier, this year, our cancer program will probably cost in the neighborhood of half-a-million dollars.

We are, as most Members know, having built for us a Cancer Clinic here in the city of Regina. It is now under construction. We are hoping it will be opened either in July or September of this year and when we have that new clinic, it will also house the Provincial Laboratory. We will be able to give even better service than has been given in the past. A new Cancer Clinic will be built in Saskatoon on the University campus close to the Medical School and close to the University Hospital. When these two Cancer Clinics are constructed, I have not any hesitation in saying that we will have one of the best cancer organizations to be found anywhere on this continent.

Mr. Speaker, we are extremely fortunate, in so far as cancer is concerned, in having at the head of our program. Dr. Allan W. Blair. Dr. Blair is considered one of the outstanding men on the North American continent in the field of cancer research and treatment. This is indicated by the fact that, the other day, when the Canadian Cancer Institute was formed, he was named its provisional president. We have good reason to be proud of him. Dr. Blair is a Regina boy, a Saskatchewan boy, who spent seven years overseas doing post-graduate work in cancer research and is now considered to an outstanding authority in the field. He could leave this province and receive several times the salary which we are able to pay him. He has stayed here out of loyalty and also because he feels that he is being given an opportunity to provide a cancer program the like of which is not to be found anywhere else on this continent.

I would like to say a word, now, about the Division of Communicable Diseases. There have been 9,872 cases of communicable disease reported during the year 1946, which is an increase of 4,244 over the previous year. This large increase is mainly due to measles and mumps, which are not generally regarded as serious disease, although, of course, they can be. The total cost of vaccines and serums for 1946, was \$44,041.20, which is an increase of \$9,947 – almost \$10,000 more than the previous year. There has been a constant demand for an increase of immunization and with the opening of Regions, further increase is expected.

I would like to say just a word about the question of

March 18, 1947

immunization, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. members know, we provide vaccines and sera for immunization, so that any person can go to their doctor and have their children immunized against a communicable disease, or, where there is a public health nurse, the public health nurse will immunize children without any cost whatever to the individual. We supply the service and we supply the vaccine, or the serum. This is one of the many cases where a stitch in time saves nine and where a dollar invested in immunization can save a hundred dollars in medical or hospital care. One of the sad things is that we get tremendously excited about things like poliomyelitis, of which we have only a relatively small number each year in the province and about which we can do relatively little, as I shall explain in a moment; but about simple things like whooping cough, mumps, scarlet fever and diphtheria, for which we can do a great deal, it is difficult to get many people to do anything. It is inexcusable, for instance that any children should die in this -province, from whooping cough, as it costs nothing at all to have children immunized against whooping cough; and it is inexcusable that children should have died from diphtheria when they could be immunized against diphtheria.

One of the reasons why I mention this, is because I am asking the co-operation of the Hon. Members and the co-operation of the general public, now that these facilities and these vaccines are available, that they be made use of. We cannot blame ourselves if somebody contracts an incurable disease but we can blame ourselves if they contract a disease against which there is almost perfect immunization. We ought to be making the fullest possible use of these facilities.

I want to say a word about poliomyelitis, because infantile paralysis is something which has been given prominence in the press, and about which people are always very much concerned. Last year, the United States experienced one of its worst epidemics in a decade and eastern Canada suffered very heavily. Saskatchewan was fortunate, with only some 33 cases.

We have an infantile paralysis, or poliomyelitis, clinic at Saskatoon, where such patients are treated. We have nurses there, who have been trained at the Kenny Institute, in a modified method of treatment for poliomyelitis. Last year, four cases remained from 1945; 28 acute cases were admitted to the clinic, during 1946. There occurred one death, leaving 31 acute cases treated during the whole of 1946. Of these, 24 have been discharged. I ask the Hon. Members to note that, of these 31 cases which were looked after during 1946, 24 have been discharged with without any brace or support. Of the remaining seven, it is estimated that only three all need orthopaedic appliances. This fact speaks for the excellence of the treatment which is being provided.

I say that, because I think we should allay some of the fears which people have about poliomyelitis. I am not trying to belittle the seriousness of the disease; but if, out of 31 patients whom we looked after last year, there are only three who, we estimate, will require orthopaedic appliances and that 24 have walked out apparently unretarded by their illness, it means that if the parents throughout the province who have children who, particularly in the season when poliomyelitis is prevalent (which is August and September and early October) have any of the symptoms of infantile paralysis, they should co-operate by immediately calling their doctor and having that child taken by Air Ambulance (if the Air Ambulance is available) to

Saskatoon and admitted to the clinic. Early treatment is the answer, and in the few cases where braces and appliances were necessary, they were found to be where a good deal of delay was occasioned before the patient was brought into the clinic. For the sake of the children and for the sake of these who are trying to help them, every possible step should be taken to bring them to the clinic as quickly as possible.

I am not going to say much about the Division of Health Education. A program of health education is being carried on throughout the province by our Department with very limited funds. We could do much more. There is much more to be done; but we have limited financial resources in that Branch. This Branch has been carrying on, throughout the year, a Food Handlers' School. Some of you may have read the article in Maclean's Magazine about restaurants. If you have not read it, I suggest that those of you who have to eat in restaurants do not read it until the Session is over, because it is an article which tells you some home-truths about some of the poor conditions in many restaurants.

We have in this province one of the best epidemiologists in Canada. We were fortunate in persuading Dr. Doyle to come here, and he has been doing very excellent work. With his co-operation, the Sanitation Branch has been inspecting restaurants and doing more than inspecting them by trying to make certain that they are clean and sanitary. They have been conducting schools for the people who work in restaurants so that they may learn the latest methods of taking care of food. We had a very bad epidemic in Province of Saskatchewan, I think last fall. I do not think any people died – they all recovered but there were over 125 persons ill, very seriously ill and it was not because of any dirt; it was simply because of the process by which the food had been prepared and stored. Certain cream pies had been prepared hot and left out hot all night and then hot meringue had been placed on the top of them, and that hot cream, covered over by meringue, made a perfect breeding-place for streptococci. We had there a very serious situation, not because of dirt, but simply because people did not have the knowledge that food should not be prepared in that particular manner. Therefore, Food Handlers' Schools have been held all over the province. I have heard people say: "What's the Government doing wasting money holding these schools?" Well, if we save 20 or 30 lives and if we save a lot of people from ill health from food poisoning, I think that the small amount of money that it has taken to hold these Food handlers' Schools is well spent.

The Health Education Branch has carried on a good deal of publicity with reference to venereal disease. It has carried on a good deal of educational work, also, with reference to pasteurization, and that is something again on which I am hoping we will get the co-operation of the Hon. Members. In certain communities, there is a prejudice against pasteurization. Sometimes, it is occasioned by people who want to sell milk but who have no pasteurization plant, and do not wish to go to the expense of purchasing one. At other times, it is people who have been reading articles which tell them that pasteurization takes all the good out of the milk; but I would suggest to any of my friends who are interested, that they get all the literature which the Branch of Health Education can give them on pasteurization and compare the figures, which will show that where pasteurization has taken place, the amount of illness and the number of deaths, among children particularly, are immediately reduced; on the

March 18, 1947

other hand, in the places where there has been no pasteurization, or where pasteurization has been discontinued, a very serious situation has generally developed.

Pasteurization is not something that we can force upon the people of Saskatchewan. It is something that will come in Saskatchewan only when we have had sufficient health education that the people themselves ask for it and I am delighted when, once a week or once every two or three weeks, a letter comes in from some community telling us that they have passed a pasteurization bylaw. It is a forward step, and shows that our people are raising their sights; but there is a long way to go yet and I think the Hon. Members could help a good deal in that regard.

We also have carried on programs of education with reference to cancer, to acquaint people with its symptoms. Similarly, with mental illness, in order that people may become familiar with the symptoms and may take steps to have those who show symptoms of mental illness immediately treated.

Then we have the Division of Industrial hygiene, which is organized in conjunction with the Federal Government. The Federal Government supplies us with the personnel, with Dr. Rogers, a very excellent hygienist and we supply the space and the rest of the staff and the equipment. Their job is to see what occupations are hazardous to health and discover what safeguards can be taken in making those occupations less hazardous.

We have the Provincial Laboratory, which is upstairs (as most Members know) and which, as I said, will be removed later on, into the new cancer clinic in Regina when it is completed. They are doing very excellent work. The Hon. Members will be glad to know that since the legislation that the House passed last year, making blood test compulsory before marriage, the laboratories have been able to handle quite well, the extra volume of work, and I do not think any great inconvenience has been occasioned. We have been able to help many people who, otherwise, might have gone into matrimony without knowing the exact condition of their own health.

Then, as I said in my earlier remarks, we are continuing, this year, to provide all health services for the old people, the blind and the mothers' allowance cases and so we estimate the cost, this year, will be \$1,044,002.36.

We are embarking upon what is a fairly ambitious Mental Hygiene Program, Mr. Speaker. We have been extremely fortunate in persuading to come to the province one of the outstanding psychiatrists in Canada. That has been told to me on all sides, and I have had occasion to hear it again since Dr. McKerracher came here. Dr. McKerracher is proceeding to organize what will be an up-to-date mental hygiene program. We have the hospital at North Battleford and at the airport at Weyburn we have the training school, and we hope later to have a mental hospital on the University Campus near the Medical School in Saskatoon. To us, however, what is the more important thing, more important than the institutions where treatment is given, will be the Mental Hygiene Clinics which we hope will act as screening places to help pick up cases in their early stages and provide early treatment. Many cases can, if dealt with early, be prevented from reaching an institution at all; other cases can be treated in the local hospital, so that they never need reach the stage

where institutional treatment is required.

May I say a word about the Nutrition Division. One of the Members from Saskatoon, yesterday, referred to it and I agree with him that there is a tremendous need for expanding this Division. I may say that it did not exist when we took office. It is now at the point where we have three nutritionists. It could be larger, but in this, as in everything else, we have had to go only as quickly as we felt we could provide revenue and that we could justly ask for finances. I would have liked, this year, to have established a Dental Hygiene Program and a Maternal Hygiene Program, both of which we had to abandon for lack of funds. The same is true of the nutritional program. It could be expanded, of course, but finances are such that we can only expand at a given rate. Nevertheless, the Division had done an excellent job. Miss Oddie, the Head Nutritionist, has worked very closely with the Department of Education. Forty-four schools were visited, last year, in connection with school lunch work: 26 rural, 10 town and village schools and 8 city schools. She makes visits to the Normal School and lectures to the teachers on the matter of dietetics; attends teachers' conventions and so on.

One of the important things I would like to mention is that the Federal Government sent a team out here, last year, which, along with our own Nutritional Branch, made a nutritional survey of some 1,500 children in the province. These were very carefully selected; there were some children from the cities, some from the towns and villages, some from the heavy land area and so on, in order to secure representative groups. These children were included in a nutritional survey, last April, with a follow-up survey, last October. Blood tests were taken, an outline of the meals they had for a given period of time was made and I think the Hon. Members will be interested to know that there, in the Province of Saskatchewan (the bread-basket of the world) we had definite signs of malnutrition, not from insufficient food, but because of faulty selection of foods. There were cases of vitamin deficiency, cases of thyroid conditions in a good number of children and it showed that there is need for a very definite job to be done in nutrition.

The schools and the homes are the two places that can play an important part in this matter. Work is being done, as I said, through the teachers at the Normal Schools. I think there are now something over 500 schools throughout the province – individual schools – where there are hot lunches being served. There should be a great many more, not because the children are not getting enough to eat, but because they are not getting the kind of balanced diet necessary to build healthy bodies and to give them resistance against disease.

In the matter of Public Health Nursing, I think I have already mentioned that we now have some 56 nurses and that they are extending their work all over the province and are doing a very excellent job.

I mentioned the matter of the Division of Sanitation and the Food Handlers' Schools – some 21 schools were held last year. This Department has made some 16,600 inspections, and has given over 2,641 opinions on the condition of water and sources of water supplies.

The Division of Venereal Disease received 2,769 reports of

March 18, 1947

cases during 1946, as compared with 2,289 the year before, an increase of 408. Some 267 doctors reported venereal disease cases, as compared with 203 the year before. One of the important things in dealing with venereal disease is the follow-up of contacts and 392 contacts were located, of which 50 had syphilis and 207 gonorrhoea.

That is an unpleasant type of work, Mr. Speaker, and yet very essential work which we are now providing. Thus, when some person is reported as having venereal disease, we now go out and try to find out from whom it was contracted. The person responsible may be totally unaware that he or she is suffering from the disease. As a result of tracing down contacts, last year alone we located 50 cases of syphilis and 207 cases of gonorrhoea in people who had infected another person, but who, themselves, were not taking any treatment.

In the year 1946, we distributed 1,172,800,000 units of penicillin compared to 390 million the year before, an increase of about three times. We distribute free penicillin to make it possible for any person to go either to one of the five clinics that we have established and receive treatment there, or go to any physician in the province, who can use this free penicillin which we make available to treat the patient immediately. Penicillin has been a great boon in speedy, and, apparently, effective treatment. It has not been in use long enough for anyone to know whether or not the cure is permanent, but certainly its immediate results are apparently good.

Mr. Valleau (A.S.V.R.): — Will the Hon. Premier permit a question?

Mr. Douglas: — Certainly.

Mr. Valleau: — Have you any reports as to whether or not the penicillin being used is losing its effectiveness?

Mr. Douglas: — Yes, the reports of the biochemists and chemotherapists is that there seems to be a tendency of the bacteria in the human body to build up a resistance and that they appear to be building a resistance in the case of those who have received penicillin, so that it is having less effect because the bacteria have built up a resistance against it. One of the reasons, as a matter of fact, why the Department of Health stopped drug stores from selling penicillin without a prescription, was just that very reason. A lot of people were taking penicillin pills every time they had the sniffles, with the result that when that person took seriously ill and the doctor sought to administer penicillin, the small amount of penicillin had acted as a vaccine and the patient built up immunization, so that when they really needed penicillin, the penicillin would not act. It is true that a person who has been receiving it, may first find that the bacteria have built up resistance against it, just as they do against any of the other sera that are injected into the body.

That is all I have to say about my Department, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is need for me to say very much about the Health Services Planning Commission; I can say more about that when the legislation concerning it is before the House. Its

work is largely, as I said, divided into two parts. We have organized Health Regions. There are four Health Regions now operating; there are two more which have been voted for and which are being set up. That will be six health Regions which will be operating this summer.

We have had requests from a great many other areas asking that Health Regions be established. Of course, the setting up of health Regions is dependent upon our being able to get enough Medical Health Officers, enough Public Health Nurses (and they are very hard to get) and enough Sanitary Inspectors (and they are equally hard to get) to staff a region. The hold-up is, therefore personnel and also, of course, there is the question of finance, because in the Public Health Regions we pay two-thirds of the preventive costs and 50 per cent of all the diagnostic costs and services. There is, therefore, a very considerable outlay involved and we cannot expand too quickly although we think that we are expanding as quickly as staff is available.

On the other hand, the Planning Commission's task is to expand health facilities. This House authorized, two years ago, \$150,000 towards the construction of hospitals. Last year, it authorized \$250,000 and this year we are asking for \$300,000. That will be \$650,000 in all, that will have gone out in three years toward the construction of hospitals in those areas where the people cannot finance the building of a new hospital, or the extension of the hospital they have, without some financial assistance from the Government. I believe that those grants have made possible the opening of hospitals that would not have been operating and the building of hospitals that otherwise would not have been erected.

The Commission also is engaged in helping regions which desire to experiment in health schemes. Region No. 1 is trying a complete Health Insurance scheme, and Region No. 3, last year, for six months tried out a hospital scheme before the provincial hospital scheme came into operation. I am hoping that some of the other regions may try out some health scheme under the supervision of the Health Services Planning Commission, because it does two things for us: first, it gives us some experience in establishing that kind of work, and secondly, it gives us some statistical data with reference to costs.

The Federal Government has been extremely interested in these schemes in the regions and they are very much interested in our hospitalization scheme. They have asked us to give them all of our data, and they have made available some of their statistical machines to help us in correlating that data. This will be the first time in Canada that we have been able to obtain specific figures on what it does cost to provide health services for a large number of people.

Our Hospitalization Scheme – the Hon. Members know enough about that; I need hardly say anything about it. There is legislation to come before you with reference to the plan. I know there will be many questions you will want to ask. I would like to say this about the scheme: on behalf of the commission, on behalf of the Government, I would like to express our thanks to the municipal secretaries, particularly and to the town clerks, throughout the province, for the very marvellous response which we received and the excellent co-operation we enjoyed, from them and from the general public, last fall, in collecting the Hospital Tax. We thought that we would be lucky

if we collected seventy per cent of the tax. At the present moment, there has been more than that received and some has been paid in advance, which is not due until next June. There has been paid about \$3.5 million which is three-quarters of a million dollars more than we expected to have to date and there are still many who have more than \$15 to pay for their family, who do not have to pay the balance until next June; yet many have already paid in full, and there will be more received in June.

The co-operation has been excellent; people paid and paid willingly; municipalities collected and money has been forwarded; cards have gone out. In some cases, there has been delay about sending cards, because for example, initials were not filled in properly, or addresses were not filled in properly. We are making it clear to the general public that their receipt, when they paid their money, will be regarded as a card if they have to be admitted to a hospital.

The co-operation of the hospitals has been very commendable and they are doing an excellent job. I do not mean by that, that there are not cases of misunderstanding. Sometimes, a hospital will charge a patient for x-rays when x-rays are included as part of the service, or some other little misunderstanding will occur. But in the main, these difficulties are being ironed out and when we consider that this was a scheme covering over 800,000 people, that nowhere on this continent had a scheme been attempted which would provide for as many people at as low a cost, I think that the success which it has enjoyed to date, is a fine tribute both to the people who are operating the scheme and to the people who are working with them, namely the general public, the municipal secretaries and the town clerks.

That, I think, fairly well completes the report for my Department, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say, in closing that there has been a great deal of talk throughout this debate, about a big budget and about high costs. I want to say that the greatness of a society cannot be measured by its skyscrapers, cannot be measured by its fine-looking residential districts, cannot be measured by its great cities. One of the important tests of a beneficent society is the health of its people. Many of those civilizations that have vanished disappeared because there had been too little concern for the health and well-being of its people, too little attention paid to both preventive health measures and curative health facilities. If in this province with the limited facilities that we have and our limited natural resources, we are spending a considerable amount of money in health, I suggest to this House, Mr. Speaker, that these expenditures are the best investment that the people of this people[r have ever made.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS -- 42

Douglas (Weyburn	Williams	Putnam
Wellbelove	Boyle	Houze
Valleau (Melfort)	Daniels	Burgess
Fines	Darling	Howell
Corman	Stone	Wooff
Phelps	Heming	Cuming
Feeley	Harris	Swallow
Trew (Mrs.)	Howe	Van Eaton

Buchanan	Willis	Brown
Hansen	Aitken	Connon
Nollet	Thair	Arthurs
Douglas (Rosetown)	Murray	Dewhurst
Lloyd	Lazorko	Gibson
Sturdy	Lee	Valleau (A.S.V.R.)

NAYS – 7

Patterson	Danielson	Embury
Procter	Marion	Dobie
Hooge		

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION – MUNICIPALITIES RESERVE ACCOUNT

Mr. W.J. Patterson (Cannington) moved, seconded by Mr. Danielson (Arm River):

That, in the opinion of this Legislature, the Government of Saskatchewan should give early consideration to determining and putting into operation a plan for the equitable distribution to the municipalities of Saskatchewan of the \$1,260,192.27 now held in a Reserve Account to provide for an adjustment of public revenues to equalize the levies made following the reassessment of Rural -Municipalities commended in 1938.

He said: The above Resolution should not have been necessary because by this time the matter involved should have been determined by the Government and some policy and action should have been taken. However, that has not been done and consequently I felt that I should bring the matter to the attention of the House.

Prior to the formation of the province and during the early years of the province the levying of, at least the assessment of lands in the rural districts and the levying of taxes was based on what was generally called a flat rate. By that I mean that it was on an acreage basis. Two men in the same municipality or in the same school district, if one happened to own a section of land he paid twice as much taxes as another resident who happened to own a half section, without any regard to the value or the productivity of the land involved. That unfairness was recognized and after a good deal of debate and controversy in 1922 the assessment and levying of taxes in rural areas was based on what is called the equalized assessment. That is where land is valued on various factors, its quality, its productivity and matters of that kind and naturally this change-over created a good deal of controversy and a good deal of debate and dissatisfaction. But considerable credit is due to the success with which the change-over was accomplished through the work of a former citizen of Saskatchewan, unfortunately now deceased, a man who in his day was Reeve of his municipality and chairman of the Association of Rural Municipalities and ultimately a Member of this Legislature. I refer to the late Murdo Cameron. We in Saskatchewan owe a considerable debt to him because of

March 18, 1947

his sound practical methods and his sound practical approach to a question that has long ceased to be a matter of serious controversy but which in its day did agitate the minds of many people in this province.

Now, the equalized assessment as I have stated was established in the year 1922, that was just following the boom period of the latter part of the First War and immediately following it and naturally land values established at that time were rather high. At the time they were acceptable but as we went through a more difficult period in the late twenties and the 1930s a great deal of dissatisfaction arose throughout the province because of the high level of rural assessments, the assessment of rural lands, and this matter was brought to the attention of the government of that day on a number of occasions by the representatives of the rural municipalities through their provincial executive. In 1938 the government of that day agreed that the question should receive not only study but should receive action and the government agreed that there would be a general re-assessment commenced in 1939. At the time that it was undertaken it was recognized that it couldn't be done in a year or two years and the representatives of the rural municipalities agreed to that and accepted that. It was agreed that it might take probably five years to complete an entire re-assessment of the rural areas of the province to create an equalized assessment on a basis more comparable with the values of that day. Actually the reassessment I think took just a little longer than that although it was completed in the main in about six years.

Before undertaking this general re-assessment the government had a very careful study made and a basis of valuation very carefully worked out. Again we were fortunate in this instance in that the Minister in charge of Municipal Affairs at that time, now his Hon. the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan was a sound, practical, successful farmer with long municipal experience both as reeve of his municipality and as a member of the executive of the Municipal Association. Naturally, in carrying out the work certain difficulties arose, certain differences in opinion arose, but I think we could properly say and truthfully say that the carrying out is a rather large undertaking and rather important undertaking. The job was accomplished with a minimum of objection because before it was undertaken the proper preliminary steps were taken to train assessors to set up a proper schedule or standard upon which the valuation of the land or the assessment of the land could be established. Such matters as the crop record or the distance from markets and freight rates and many other factors would enter into and should properly enter into, in proper and fair assessment of rural land.

When the assessment was first promised and undertaken, it was generally expected that it would result in a reduction of the total assessment over the whole province and in the case of most municipalities, there ere odd exceptions of perhaps 20 per cent to 25 per cent but I think the final figures will show that, that original estimate was fairly accurate, taking all the factors into consideration. While with this very early evidence of those who are interested in the matter, that insofar as the public revenue levies were concerned (which is a tax imposed by the Government of the province on land values at 2 mills) insofar as rural areas are concerned there is early evidence that

this was going to result in an overall or a total reduction of 20 per cent or 25 per cent. There would be an unfairness as between those municipalities that were reassessed at the beginning of the plan and those which were not reassessed until later years. Naturally, as the reassessment was completed the public revenue that was paid by a municipality which had its assessment reduced by 20 per cent or 25 per cent and I think in some cases as much as 30 per cent; and naturally those people began to pay a lower contribution to the Provincial Treasurer in the form of the Public Revenue Tax. Again this problem was discussed with the Government by the municipal executors and the inequity or the unfairness was quite evident to anyone, as I say, who had given any thought or study to it. It was agreed that when the reassessment was completed an adjustment would be made as between those municipalities that enjoyed an early decrease of their total assessment as compared with those which were not reassessed until a later date. I quite appreciate, Sir, that the present Government is not bound by the promise of the undertaking that was given at that time. It was never in the form of a Statute or in the form of a law, it was merely an agreement between the Government of the day and the representatives of the municipalities.

An Hon. Member: — There was no written agreement.

Mr. Patterson: — No, I quite agree there is no written agreement and I doubt if there is any correspondence, although there may have been a letter written but I do not remember it. But, the matter was brought up, not once but on several occasions and a development which I will refer to subsequently, in a few moments, or with the process of that development it was explained to these representatives from year to year.

Now, as I say, I quite appreciate and quite realize that the Government of this day is not bound by that agreement or that promise, we might suggest of course, that they had plenty of their own promises to fulfil without asking them to carry out those made by the previous Government. But, in this particular case, that I am going to explain very shortly, we promised to do this and the agreement can be carried out and completed without any strain or without imposing any additional charge on the people of this province. For this reason, having given this undertaking and having made this promise in 1941, the Government of the day set up a reserve to accumulate the funds anticipating that this reassessment would be completed about 1944 and 1945. They set up a reserve to provide for the readjustments when the time came to carry out the terms of the agreement. A certain amount was added, I think the first year, again I am speaking from memory, I think the first year \$250,000 was set aside and each year from then on, as long as the former government was in office, additions were made to this reserve. The result was that in 1944, on July 10th, there was a reserve of \$1,145,000 standing in a trust account or a reserve account or whatever you like to call it, its actually in the public accounts under trusts, I think, if I remember correctly, anyway there was \$1,145,000 on deposits or in reserve to enable this adjustment to be made when the time came. But today, according to information given in answer to a question that sum has grown to \$1,260,000. Again, I am not certain but I imagine that the increase is the interest that has been earned, certain part of this reserve is invested in Dominion Government bonds and I imagine

March 18, 1947

the increase is the interest that has been earned.

As I say the amount standing to the credit of this reserve or trust as listed in the public accounts of 1945-46. Under the schedule of trust accounts, it is on page 37 with the Roman numerals. Now, there are 303 rural municipalities and there are, of course, a certain number of Local Improvement Districts that are interested in this question. I do not know how many Local Improvement Districts are concerned but suppose we leave the \$260,000 for them, it would leave the million dollars to be distributed among 303 municipalities or an average of \$3,000 a municipality. I am not suggesting, Sir, that the sum should be distributed on that basis because that of course would not be fair, having in mind the original intention and the purpose of unjust conditions that the adjustment was intended to correct. According to our municipal reports, apparently the average assessment in rural municipalities in Saskatchewan is approximately two million dollars. I presume these figures are on the completion of the reassessment and before the reassessment was undertaken the average assessment of the rural municipalities would be somewhat higher. 25 per cent of the average assessment would be \$2,500,000. For the reasons which I have tried to explain, a municipality which did not have a reassessment until the fifth or sixth year in the general undertaking of reassessment, would of course, be entitled to a substantial amount. Whereas the municipality which was reassessed in the first year would not be entitled to anything, they immediately got the benefit of the reduction in their total assessment. So you can't figure it out on an average basis but, that's what it would amount to if it was to be distributed so much per municipality, or it may be that some of the details of this reassessment have not been completed. I do not know, if there is anything still to be done. It must be of a very minor nature and the general reassessment has been completed now for a sufficient length of time to enable the Government to undertake the distribution, that is providing that they want to carry out the agreement we made or the undertaking we gave the municipalities back in 1940 or thereabouts.

A question naturally arises on what basis should adjustment be made and I am quite willing to admit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not an easy matter to determine just how it should be done. It's not a difficult matter at all, at least it may require some accounting and some studying of figures, it should not be a difficult matter at all to determine what share belongs to each municipality. If a municipality has been five years as compared with another one that's been four years, another one that's been three years, longer in getting reassessments taking into account the amount by which their total assessment has been reduced, I say it is a comparatively easy matter to determine how much of this fund each particular municipality is entitled to. The question arises as to how it's best applied. That is, suppose this municipality that was only assessed in 1944 or 1945, if it's established that it has seven or eight thousand dollars coming to it, how best to pay that or how best to get that benefit back to the people in that municipality. On the other hand, the municipality that only waited one year to have its assessment reduced it might only have a thousand dollars coming, many have even less than that or maybe a little more but as I say it shouldn't be difficult, it should not be impossible at all, to establish with a very definite degree of accuracy just how much of this is coming to each particular municipality in the province.

During the time that this reserve was being built up, during the time when the question of this adjustment was first raised and it was brought up every year because the representatives of the municipalities used to bring the matter up every year to insure that we were still continuing what we had undertaken to do and various proposals were made as to how the adjustment of the money should be passed back to the municipality. Now, I think it will be agreed in general, Sir, that the men who should as far as possible get the benefits are the men who paid the taxes in the year when the assessment was higher than it should have been and I quite agree that in order to pass the benefits back to the individual land owner might present considerable difficulty. However, there was one municipal secretary, if I remember rightly, it's some time ago now, who lived in the northwestern part of the -province who submitted his ideas and I might say incidentally that I asked the municipal men and the municipal secretaries to give some study to try and work out a practical and reasonable scheme. It would be manifestly impractical and at a totally prohibited cost to attempt to return 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 or 60 or 70 cents of taxes or even two or three dollars to the individual taxpayers. The Government today has an Advisory Board, that they might if they wished refer the question to and get the benefit of their opinion but the Resolution is merely asking that some action be taken, some definite specific action be taken.

I was going to explain this one proposal that was made and it seems to me it's the most feasible one; here is a municipality, we'll say, under this plan to have \$3,000 returned to it; it's public revenue levy for the current year is \$6,000; allow that municipality for the current year instead of levying two mills levy one mill. The levy of one mill plus the adjustment that is coming to the municipality will meet the public revenue levy of that municipality for the current year. That has this advantage, Sir, that it passes the adjustments back to the men who originally paid the taxes with this one exception, that if a change of ownership has taken place in the interval, it's the present owner of the land who will get the benefit rather than the original owner who paid the taxes in the first case. Now, there is another way and it amounts to approximately the same thing. If this municipality has we will say, \$5,000 coming to it, leave the public revenue the same for the current year or for the next year but pay that municipality that amount and let it reduce its municipal levy correspondingly and then again in that respect the benefit goes back as much as can be attained to the men who originally paid the excessive amount.

There are suggestions that the amount should be put in a fund to be expended on road work and I think some municipal men would accept the proposal that this money be paid back to the municipalities for them to expend and I haven't any great criticism of that provided that the fundamental idea is maintained that out of this fund the money goes back to the municipalities to which it is properly due or properly owned. That is, that it would be entirely unfair to take this million dollars and say to every municipality in the province; here is \$3,000 to build roads because that is not the basis or not the purpose for which it was primarily established. There may be a technical argument as to who this money belongs to. There is no argument as to who has it, the public accounts show it, there has been no disputing that. There may be some argument as to whether it's a trust fund or a contingent liability or what have you, I'm not going to argue the merits of that particular

March 18, 1947

question. The fact remains, Sir, as I have said, that the money has been set aside from year to year. The fund was established for a specific purpose and the time has come when that purpose can be carried out and the promise or the undertaking that was given to these people can be complied with. As I said a few moments ago I'm not greatly concerned. I think it will be possible to work out a scheme or a plan, first of all, without difficulty, as to the exact amount of this reserve or this trust which is coming to each particular municipality. A little more difficulty may present itself in determining how that adjustment or that return can get as nearly as possible 100 per cent back to the people who created it or paid it in.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Hon. Member a question at this point? What was the plan that your government had in mind to carry out this?

Mr. Patterson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that we hadn't fixed a plan. We were concerned at that time with establishing so that when the day came that conditions would permit us to make an adjustment that it wouldn't be any strain or any burden on the finances of the province in that particular year. Money wasn't as buoyant or as plentiful then and we didn't want to approach the completion of the reassessment and find ourselves faced with having to dip into the public treasury for a million or a million and one-half. We didn't know how much would be required actually, we figured it out as closely as we could but we wanted to be in a position when the reassessment was completed that the fund would be there, the money would be there to enable us to make this adjustment. Now as I say, I am quite frank, we hadn't worked out a definite plan but what was in the back of my mind and probably I had more to do with it, although the Minister of Municipal Affairs was intensely interested but some scheme or some plan along the line that I have suggested. We realize as every practical person realizes that in some cases where the reduction in the assessment of land is only \$100 or \$200 that two mills on the dollar even over four or five years doesn't amount to very much. It would be impractical to try and convey back to each individual the few cents or the few dollars or in some cases a considerable number of dollars that might be specifically due that particular person. But either one of the alternatives that I have suggested would accomplish that result without a lot of bookkeeping. The only measure of unfairness that I can see about it is, as I say, where the land has changed hands the immediate reduction in the levy either for public revenue purposes or for general municipal purposes it would be the present owner of the land who would benefit rather than the original owner who was originally assessed at the higher rate. Now I don't know any practical way of getting around that. That is, any workable or sensible way. I propose to move the Resolution, seconded by Mr. Danielson, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — I want at the outset to say that with a great deal of what the Hon. Member has said I am in agreement. First of all, that this question should have been settled long ago by the government and that his motion should not be necessary. I would remind the House that this was decided upon in 1938, that is from 1938 to 1944, six years that we had a Liberal Government. Why was the policy not settled? We are told today

even ...

Mr. Patterson: — ... wasn't completed in 1946.

Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, surely my hon. friend would not make an agreement. Now he is the only one that I have been able to find that knows of this. I have discussed this matter with all the officials of the Treasury, the men he had with him and they can tell me of no agreement, they know nothing about it, of the details of this particular agreement. In other words I rather suspect that ...

Mr. Patterson: — The Deputy Provincial Treasurer knows it.

Mr. Fines: — He doesn't The Deputy Provincial Treasurer does not know of the terms of this agreement or any manner by which this money should be repaid. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly confused with all this after listening to him today and reading his statement, but I don't know what to about it, so I am going to wait for further enlightenment.

Debate adjourned on the motion of Mr. Aitken.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION – CONSTRUCTION OF SASKATCHEWAN LANDING BRIDGE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Gibbs (Swift Current):

That this Assembly urge the Dominion Government to commence immediate construction of a bridge at Saskatchewan Landing, as a part of the South Saskatchewan River development programme, in order that existing facilities of transport across the south Saskatchewan River at that point may not be interrupted when the proposed dam at Elbow is completed.

Mr. D.M. Lazorko (Redberry): — By asking the Federal Government for the construction of a bridge at Saskatchewan Landing, I can see a parallel which we had in paralleling the necessities of a similar bridge in the northwestern part of the province, where a bridge has been built in the past, a parallel to the necessity of a bridge at Saskatchewan Landing. I refer to the important bridge on the North Saskatchewan River between North Battleford and Saskatoon on the No. 5 Highway. From the year 1931 we saw a total of 35,000 passengers go over the ferry at that time and in 1936 the total went up to 77,000. The cars, in 1931 from 20,000 went up to 31,000 in 1936. All the traffic from the northwestern parts of the province and all the traffic from Highway No. 4, No. 26, No. 55 and eventually down on No. 5, crossing the river and out towards Saskatoon and other parts of the province the vital necessities to the people in the northwestern part of the province.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House, that

March 18, 1947

while we did have this necessity, we had a bridge, in North Battleford sixty miles to the northwest and another one at Province of Saskatchewan, merely another hundred miles or little more to the northeast. A bridge at Saskatchewan Landing would double the traffic of Highway No. 26, No. 40 and No. 55. We have no bridge west of the Saskatchewan Landing. The Hon. Member for Moosomin, using the report of the Department of Highways for 1945-46, argued that if we take the number of vehicles crossing any ferry, we should have a bridge built soon at the Saskatchewan landing. I would also like to draw to the attention of the House that the two ferries situated about six miles apart carried a total of about 93,000 passengers but they are only about 30 miles from the Boyden Bridge and about 80 miles from the Province of Saskatchewan Bridge.

I do not believe that we should look at the Saskatchewan Landing Bridge from the stand point of the number of vehicles crossing this ferry or any others, or the number of passengers using this ferry or any others, but we should look at it from the stand point of necessity that will service a large portion of our province. The Hon. Member for Moosomin also, stated in this House during the debate of this motion that the Saskatchewan Landing Bridge would have been built had the Liberal go been returned in 1944. I remember by a good many other similar statements in our constituencies and similar promises. We have an unfinished branch of the CPR which had been promised to the people of Redberry constituency for a good many years in the past. We have also had the promise of a highway between No. 40 and No. 55 every election that I can remember in the past. I believe the Members will also remember similar promises that have been made by Members in our province only during election. I would say that a good many Members in the past have coasted eagerly into their provincial and federal seats over promises of roads that never have been built and I'll add to this that in 1944 the last Government went out on those roads and bridges which they built only during election.

As I stated before, the Hon. Member for Moosomin said that this bridge would have been built if the last Government had been returned in 1944. I'll venture to say that there was no intention of doing this. First, there was no provision in that estimate for a bridge at Saskatchewan Landing. The other, we all know, we couldn't get cement, we couldn't get steel, we couldn't get other building material. We found that out since we've started building hospitals and other things throughout the -province over the last number of years. And further, had they built a low level bridge at Saskatchewan landing, when a dam had been completed at Elbow this low level bridge would be flooded and useless again to the people of that part of the province and I'd say that to have built a low level bridge knowing that at some time a dam will be built at Elbow that that would have been poor judgment both on the part of the federal and provincial governments.

The Hon. Member for Moosomin also stated that we should go ahead and build a temporary bridge, using lumber to finish off the crossing on top, which incidentally when the dam at Elbow had been built would stand a very good chance of floating down the river. He also stated that the PFRA would pay all additional

costs of building or completing a high level bridge when the dam had been built. Then further on, he went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government will not hand over two million dollars to a provincial government for a bridge at the Saskatchewan Landing. I would like to ask on what authority these statements were made, that the PFRA would pay the additional cost of the bridge and the PFRA would pay the damage to highways and other flooded area and also on what authority the statement was made that the federal government will not hand the two million dollars to the provincial government for a bridge at Saskatchewan landing.

The Hon. Member for Moosomin also stated that he could see no reason why the provincial government cannot go ahead and build a high level bridge at Stewart Valley. He also stated that his Department in the last Government estimated the cost of such a bridge, a low level bridge at \$437,000. A low level bridge would have had a span of some 1,200 feet, a high level bridge would be with a span of over 3,000 feet, two and one-half times as long and with an additional elevation of 53 feet. I venture to say that with the estimates given by him and the additional size of the bridge that this bridge will cost in the neighborhood of \$2 million. The Hon. Member for Moosomin having stated that he can see no reason why this Government cannot go ahead with building this bridge, I would like to know why the last Government did not go ahead with the building of this bridge and also why they didn't go ahead with similar projects in the province financed by the province alone.

The bridge at Outlook was built with the province paying only ten per cent of the cost of the bridge. The Broadway bridge in Saskatoon was built on a similar basis; the Borden bridge, costing \$322,120, the province paid only ten per cent, a sum of \$32,202; even a little railway overhead bridge in our constituency which today, from the past experience we have had in using it over the last ten years or so, we can see, especially the people living around Krydor, that is what we may call a white elephant, left as a monument to the blundering of the last Government. Even this little undertaking costing \$16,878, the province paid only 25 per cent of the cost of this overhead bridge. The last Government as I have tried to show by these few examples, the last Government did not under any circumstances even where small expenditures were concerned go ahead on its own to build any bridges on a large scale or anything else and finance that by themselves.

In supporting this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Federal Government should commence the immediate constituency of a high level bridge at Saskatchewan landing because this crossing is of vital importance to all the people in the west, central and the southwestern part of our province and also important to all the tourists --- trade and tourists coming in from south across the border and going to the northern parts of our province through the western part of our province. This bridge being important as it is to the people and the tourists will be a dozen ferries or more will be out of commission, then a high level bridge at the Saskatchewan landing will be of vital importance and a vital necessity to all the people in the southwest part of the province.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:25 o'clock p.m.