

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**19th Day**

**Tuesday, February 27, 1951**

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed, from Monday, February 26, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply.)

**Mr. L.W. Larsen (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, I also wholeheartedly would like to congratulate our Provincial Treasurer on the Budget that was brought in. I think that regardless of what political affiliation we had, it would either have been new taxes or curtailments in services and since there was none, I can see the disappointment in the faces, the last few days, of the Opposition members over there. They were all prepared for it, and all I can do is say to them, "Be prepared for the Federal Budget." No doubt they will be a more contented lot if they expected new taxes.

On the Budget alone, I will open it on a financial basis, as a matter of fact I hardly know money any more. It has sunk so much that I don't know whether it is dimes or nickels or quarters down here; they are supposed to be dollars. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, that in a government that will cancel the Excess Profits Tax on our big corporations or monopolies and then on the other hand tax our co-ops, that is a movement I could not support. And if our Government on this side of the House made these tax changes, I would not be here two minutes. Whether I would move over to the hon. member, Mr. Benson, or not I don't know, but I would not be here. And I don't see why, in this crazy world of today, all members, regardless of political affiliation, can't co-operate a little bit and take some of these abuses out of our capitalistic system; a system whereby labour has to go on strike to get a little more wages so they can feed their family half decent; or like the farmers on the other hand when they had to collect dollars, cents and quarters to send a delegation of 400 down to Ottawa to ask for a little relief if they could not pay us a little more than 50 cents a bushel after the war had been on for four years. Now, a policy of that kind I cannot support, I don't care which party or which Parliament brings it in. A policy of that kind, Mr. Speaker, is not good enough for me. Now, I don't want to praise the Provincial Treasurer up too much. I know he is doing a wonderful job so I will get down to work and give a little compliment to one of the speakers on the other side of the House.

We have been sitting here for several weeks and I have listened to a lot of destructive criticism. There were a few glimmers of constructive criticism from the other side of the House yesterday, and particularly I would like to mention the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts). He is in the same spot as we often are. People who went up there and demand

**February 27, 1951**

the road is a continuous strain and financial burden on municipalities, L.I.D.'s or the Highway Department, no doubt. We used to use old trails, but with bulldozers, steel plows and the modern tractor these trails are being ploughed up day after day as new roads are required, and that is one of the biggest problems we have. I agree with the hon. member for Meadow Lake that we are not getting enough up our way. The highway stretches for 150 miles from Prince Albert to Battleford, and we have not got a road south. I also know the Minister of Highways has not got enough money to build roads all over; but I maintain that these roads should be built where they are needed the most, if the traffic warrants it. In that respect, I am sure that my demand for a road south of the constituency of Redberry and Shellbrook, part of Prince Albert and part of Meadow Lake, should take priority. But, without criticizing the Department of Highways too much, I am sure that it is mostly caused by some interference outside of the Highways Department that these roads have not been completed today. I hope sincerely – I have no guarantee on it; but these things perhaps will be remedied before we go home.

Oh, yes, I should mention our friend, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). He is quoted here, as the critic on the Budget, and might I read from the "Leader-Post" – it is supposed to be reliable – where the Liberals in 1939-40 to 1943-1944 inclusively collected \$16 1/4 million in five years in gas tax and in licence tax \$11 million. I think that is what my hon. friend quoted, according to the press here; and also the C.C.F., of course, collected a little more in their five years, 1945-46 to 1949-1950 inclusive; their gas tax in this time had risen up to \$30 million, roughly speaking, and their licences had gone up from \$11 to \$13 1/2 million. Well, I am not against that increase. It shows that people are doing a little travelling.

Well, now, according to the member for Arm River anything this government does is no good. It costs too much money and has got nothing to show for it. Well, now, that \$27 1/2 million total collected from 1940 to 1944 against \$43 1/2 million from 1946 to 1950 – when you talk in \$27 1/4 million or \$43 1/2 million, for people like myself we will cut it down to dollars; and I will say this much. I know when I go shopping I cannot get any more for 43 cents today than I could for 27 cents under the regime of the Liberals. But, I can show you people that the people of Saskatchewan have got more from the Highway Department. Instead of 912 miles of roads and highways by the Liberals we built 1303. The total rebuilds and new roads come under these figures: Under the Liberal stewardship of this province in five years they built 1543 miles as against 2226 under our Government in the same period of time. And the gravelling during those five years was 2061 against 5648 miles under our Government during the same period of time. And it is worse when you come to the hard surface roads. There were 43 1/2 miles built by our Liberal friends in these five years, and the C.C.F. in their five years have built 518 miles. Now, when you consider that approximately a mile of blacktop costs \$10,000, I think that there is a considerable difference in these miles of roads built by the two different governments. I would also say I know the member for Arm River apparently had no difficulty to get elected in his own constituency and I have no objection to that whatsoever; but I am sure that if he went home to the country of his forefathers, he could never tell them that 43 miles of blacktop was better than 518.

I should say a little bit on behalf of our farmers' good friend, the Minister of Agriculture, and nothing amused me more than listening to the criticism of the Department of Agriculture. That is one language that I do understand. And I took some of those stories that happened a week or 10 days ago. A few of the members from both sides of the House happened to meet together over a cup of tea or so. We started to discuss and, of course, chided each other, and a member from across the House came into the discussion and we told him how we missed him here. One of the members came up and said, "Well, now don't tell him too much, because all he could say about you was that all you knew was chicks and farming and so on." Well, that might be all right, too. Somebody has to represent the farmer; but I am glad that I come from a constituency of agriculture. They are not burdened much with towns or cities up there, and if I speak their language, that is fine. I am sure they speak mine.

Now, then I have a little criticism. I will go back in the years when I brought grain for the Pool Elevators for some years, 27 years. The biggest establishment in the commonwealth of the S.S.B. was established right in my home town. I have seen these old veterans not being able to keep their farm because the 5 per cent would keep on piling up when they haven't got crop or any money for their crop. And the ones that did stay had to go on and get one, two, three or four times the distance, and I don't think some of them have finished paying for it yet. I am just wondering if that system is better than what the Minister of Agriculture suggested today. I doubt it. They had the biggest soldier settlement in the Dominion of Canada in that over-all buying of grain and that was permitted by the S.S.B. in taxes and relief and everything else when some men took your hat whether they had a cash ticket or not, or you had to take it out from under the spell of the S.S.B. Now, that is my experience. Perhaps that is the only reason I can talk the farm language.

Now, we come to hogs. Now there is one place where we must acknowledge they certainly took a lot of abuse. "Jimmie" Gardiner ran up and down this province and blamed Mr. Nollet for the decrease in the hogs. It's funny. Then Jimmie Gardiner went over to England, and he couldn't get enough money for our bacon. And I am glad I quoted here in the House last year that he did not need to worry about the bacon. There wouldn't be enough for consumption if war should break out for our soldiers in uniform. I said that and you can look up the records. I don't think Jimmie Gardiner could have sold any bacon to England. I wasn't so much the price, but if England had offered him a dollar a bushel he would not have sold a pound because we did not have it to sell.

Now, if our Minister of Agriculture has got to take all the blame, I notice the figures here from the Dominion report, that from 1938 to 1950 the percentage of hogs raised in this province is up 23 per cent; Manitoba is only up 15 per cent, and Alberta is only up 11 per cent. Now, I don't know why he should go after our Minister of Agriculture in this province without taking the Ministers of Agriculture in these other two provinces to task as well. And I said last year when Jimmie Gardiner took off the coarse grain (you will remember we more or less voted on it), I guess Jimmie Gardiner got quite a few votes for the Liberal party, because in the 11th hour he came out and allowed the coarse grain to be

**February 27, 1951**

handled by the Wheat Board. But the election was no more than over before he was trying to let it go back to the Grain Exchange. And that is as true today as it was yesterday when he reduced the floor price of bacon hogs from 27 1/2 to 23 1/2. It is not only ourselves – they must have the same thing in Alberta. Our Liberal friends must have done the same thing because I remember we had some purebred sows there and when they reduced these prices we took price control off and eggs and all went down to 15 cents a dozen. I know there was not much hope to make any money in hogs. I told my man on the farm not to breed my sows till the last part of January because I wanted to finish them off on this year's crop. By that time Jimmie Gardiner had changed his idea on having a stabilized price set on feed. The floor price was down to 23 1/2 instead of 27 1/2 but at the time my pigs were up to, dressed, 205 lbs. And I got the large sum of 16 3/4 cents for these hogs that weighed 205 lbs dressed. But then when I was shopping we paid 16 cents a pound. And when I went down here this morning, I went into one of the Ukrainian food stores and I said, "How much for your spareribs?" – "68 cents, mister". Sixty-eight cents for the bones! And right today a dressed hog, that is first best grade bacon, to the farmer is 34 cents.

It is not the farmers who are holding up the prices to these people who are buying it every day. I don't know how they buy their meat at these prices, to tell you the truth. Because that is, perhaps, because I used to be on the farm myself. Well, now look at the picture as it should be. The reason beef is so high today is because the Liberal Government in Ottawa kept the embargo to the United States right up to '48 until we got sick of holding it and today there is a scarcity of beef and milk products. We even import milk powder from the United States to get enough milk today. That is the result of policies of the Federal Government, not by any Provincial Government, because it does not come under their jurisdiction. On the other hand we can say beef is high today, but the consumers today don't realize that when a farmer wants to sell 3-year-old steers today, and has raised them himself, he must have at least 50 head on hand, because you take the 3-year-old steers – he must have 10 3-year-old steers coming up, he must have 10 2-year-old steers, he must have 10 yearlings and 10 calves and 10 cows, not to mention Ferdinand himself. That's 51 head. So when you sell 10 steers you must spread that cheque over the 51 head on hand, and you can't get a man to compete with city prices of labour today less than at least \$2,000. So you have got to start putting up feed in the summertime for these critters and look after them in the wintertime, and you are paying for everything you buy. So I don't think it is an awful lot out of line. But it was most peculiar that the last embargo did come off just prior to the Federal election and it came, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Liberal Party in Ottawa.

I just want to mention some of these headlines that makes dollars and cents for this western country. I will admit that the Provincial Legislature, regardless of what province you are in, have very little to say in the economical picture within the province. Dollars and cents are based on the Federal legislation and it always comes up, whether they started at it or not.

Now I could say something about the Wheat Board. It is peculiar, the last few years, the amount of sabotegers we can dig up on

the Liberal side. I remember when we organized the Wheat Pool. She was hard slugging and it was mighty hard slugging to organize the C.C.F. But I met most of our friends in that campaign than I met on the Wheat Board. As far as some of the criticism – and I saw some letters on my desk the other day and I saw the “Leader-Post” took it up in headlines – about these marketing boards. Well, I am not speaking on behalf of the Government. I am just speaking as a private member. But when it comes to an export article like wheat, I don’t think there is a marketing board, wheat pool or open grain exchange that can handle that commodity today. The reason I say that is that to sell our goods in one market we must give them a concession on our market – a two-way trade. If you can’t get that I can see what is going to happen to agriculture today. And that is why marketing boards on articles that the producer must export is out of the question as far as my mind is concerned. But there is a great difference from handling of wheat with our neighbour to the south. I remember here, a few years ago, how we sold wheat to Great Britain so much, so much 2,000 or 3,000 of bushels, I notice that they even sold some to the home country around 70 cents. But what do we read in the paper the other day? Under the International Wheat Agreement the United States must be allowed to sell 234,000,000 bushels for export trade. Now, they used the words that our Canadian politician is very, very scared to use, “parity”. Well, I’m not scared of it. I think we should have it. We can avoid a lot of disagreements and strikes and one thing and another. But here is the setup across the border. Wheat in Chicago, today, is \$2.50 a bushel and they sell the same as we do on our International Wheat Agreement, a certain number of bushels – millions – at \$1.80. We will say, for instance, we will sell 200 million bushels or more on this International Wheat Agreement from Canada at \$1.80. That \$1.80 is credited to the wheat growers in this country. But you go across the border, they will sell 234 million bushels to the International Wheat Board, but the Treasury will make up the difference from the \$1.80 to the \$2.50 that happens to be the price in the Chicago Grain Exchange. Now there is the different set-up, because they have farm parity prices down there. If the price is below parity, it is allowed to go out, and if it is above, of course they freeze it, the same as the price control they have instituted today. But isn’t that a big difference to these producers down across the border – to get the highest every time, it doesn’t matter where it is sold? The Canadian farmers, under our Federal set-up, gets the lowest. That is another reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am on this side of the House.

I might also mention, on agriculture, and particularly to our Minister, that soil conservation in this province has improved in methods, due particularly to the Ag. Reps. that we have here and there and who are doing a wonderful job. Thousands of acres have been broken up – land that was not used by the people up there. Lake bottoms, sloughs and so on have been seeded into produce conservation. We also finished a part of a township up there, last year, and I understand that it has been taken over now. But the main thing – when it comes to agriculture, the big question, is: “How are we going to keep that quarter or half-section farming in the rural areas?” We don’t want them to move into the urban centres, Mr. Speaker. We don’t want large farmers up there who just live there three or four months a year, and I think perhaps if somehow or another that prices were on a long range both for the products that the little farmer has to buy and what he has to sell, that the farmers could get along on a small farm, today, and by co-operating in buying machinery, and

**February 27, 1951**

with an established price for the products that he raises on a farm, and if you are short of a few things to buy like feed, you should know what you have to pay for it. This spring I think the barley growers were paying around \$1.20. I know I paid \$1.43, \$1.44 and \$1.45 for barley, and it is most peculiar whenever you count the climatic conditions out here, 75 per cent of what is raised and that goes on the market in the fall, and it is always right down to the bottom – there is no floor price, that goes right out of sight. Right now I know hogs have increased quite a bit in price because there are no hogs in the country, and I am not going to give anyone a bouquet for raising the price because they haven't got the cattle; but we want a set price that is fair to the producers and fair to the consumers.

Education – well, I don't care to speak on that. I was educated in the old country with three days in school and the rest of the time looking after cows and other things. I know it is limited so I won't touch much on that. It kind of reminds me of when I homesteaded in 1909, with one team of oxen breaking up the homestead – they couldn't talk English and neither could I. I will leave the education to someone else.

Rural municipalities – well, I have worked for one for 18 years and it is in good hands.

Health Department – again, a wonderful thing. That is one thing the C.C.F. doesn't need to be scared of. I have heard a lot about this “de-centralization”, but through all the arguing and questions and so on, I like the quotation given – for Health administration, 4.6 per cent; and roughly speaking, 2 per cent of that stays out in our municipalities. The secretary of the rural municipality collects 2 per cent and that leaves 2.6 for our administration. Well even if the Liberals did de-centralize that system, it wouldn't make them very much money.

Insurance – well, that is one thing I can't see how anybody can criticize. Everyone on the road, whether walking or driving, is protected. There are a lot of fools on the highways; I think you will all agree with that. When they get that insurance not only for themselves but for anybody they might run over, for the price of one filling of their gas tank, surely they cannot be against it. Just leave their cars home for two or three days and they have saved the price of the cost of full insurance, regardless of whether you are driving or walking.

Now I am getting down pretty well to the end of it. I have spoken a lot longer than I intended to. I certainly do not want to set myself as a boring “minister of foreign affairs”, and with the cold war clouds over our heads I have no intentions of competing with the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) or the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). I have never been over to China or Korea or Russia, and so on; but I have met a lot of good Chinamen, and a lot of them are my friends, and I can say, on behalf of the Chinese people that in my estimation, they are the most friendly people that I have seen in Canada since I came over, and I don't know if we can put the blame on the Asiatic race for being a little suspicious of the white people. They have oppressed them for centuries, and I am just wondering if the United Nations had followed the example of Great Britain to reach out the hand and give them freedom, give them money to get themselves re-established, and give them the friendship, if we had

done the same thing with China, instead of spending billions of dollars on a corrupt dictator, not to mention the billions we are spending, today, in Korea and the thousands of lives that are being lost, I think we would have had the friendship of the Chinese people today. I still think there is time to do something, and of anything I can think of I cannot think of anything else that would be more important to stave off a future war than the friendship of China. Maybe that is a little close to home.

It was peculiar when I went down to check up on the prices of these spareribs, I also went into the Grain Exchange. You know an old grain buyer always listens to that ticker, the buy-ups and sell-ups or whatever it is, and to see them down there watching the blackboard; it is fascinating. It is just like any other gambling, and I am not against gambling as long as they do not gamble with my money. I would like to say to the members here, following the grain – you know you have to get the grain prices every day, as we have for so many years over the radio, so you could give the farmers whatever was due to them, according to the market. I looked up at the board, and I came to the conclusion that many of the members here could have spread their indemnity, last year, but you can see what it did. When the C.P.R. got the extra 45 per cent on the freight rate, what did it do to the stock market? Many members in this House, just one year ago today, could have gone down and bought C.P.R. stock for \$12, roughly speaking. I never bought any but of course I did not have the money to spare; but I think you could have bought it maybe on a quarter down. Well now that stock is up to \$29 this morning, and it has been gradually going up – a month ago it was \$24, but today it was \$29. If you had put your indemnity in there last year at \$12, and today the stock is \$29, every member in this House could have gone home with \$17,000, and the beauty is, Mr. Speaker, it was not taxable. Oh, those wonderful taxations – tax the little ones and a lot of the big ones go free! They can make a million dollars on that C.P.R. stock and they do not pay one nickel, but the little labour man's cheque is ripped all to pieces before he gets it home to his family – so let us go on home now.

We were told in the last election that with lots of M.P.'s down there on the Liberal side we would have wonderful improvements. Well, results do not bear that out. I remember quite clearly, that our C.C.F. M.P.'s (and we have quite a few of them from Saskatchewan in the Parliament down there) asked the Government when they took price control over to look across the fence and see what will happen here. We know what happened here; but they had an example of what would happen because the States took over the price control a year or so before we did, and now I am just wondering why the Liberals did not act when our dollar went down to 90 cents, 80 cents, 70 cents, 60 cents – no action yet, Mr. Speaker. Will it go down to 40, 30, 20, 10 cents? I think that is one of the biggest questions in the minds of the people today in Saskatchewan. They had no remedy for the depression. They were sitting there like a rabbit up till 1939 when the war broke out, and that saved them, otherwise they would have had to set up some socialistic measures whether they liked it or not. But I am saying that inflation will do the very same thing to this province, just as the depression did, unless something is done.

Will you members write your M.P.'s down there – wire them – before it goes down to 40 cents, or down to 10 cents? That is the big question in the minds of the people today, and no doubt that is why our Provincial Treasurer had such a hard time because he does not know what it is going to

**February 27, 1951**

cost him to carry on tomorrow. It seems we have no assurance under the Liberal Government, whatever. I would ask one and all – write your M.P.'s in Ottawa, before it goes down to 10 cents.

Now, I think I have taken far too much time. I have tried to touch on a few of the high spots, but I do like this price control. Depression, in my estimation, is no worse than inflation is, today. Do we want to go back to the '30's? I think that is the question. I will support the motion.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate today, I first want to extend to the Provincial Treasurer my congratulations on the very able budget which he brought down the other afternoon. I want to agree with my colleague who has just spoken when he drew the attention of this House to the fact that no member on the Opposition side has, so far, dared to make an analytical criticism of that budget. The budget is one that is designed to meet the requirements of this province and never before have we had one that has done the job so thoroughly and so well.

I also want at this time, Mr. Speaker, to extend to you my compliments for being appointed as the representative of this Legislature to the Parliamentary Association meeting in New Zealand this past summer, and I know that all members of this House agree with me when I say that we knew you would fill that post with dignity and with ability. I also know that you would be a good-will agent, not only to the other representatives from Canada, but the other representatives from the British Commonwealth of Nations.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like, as one of the farmer members of this House, to take a little time on some of the problems that affect the rural districts of Saskatchewan. I know that during the last year there have been four events of importance that have materially affected the welfare of Saskatchewan farmers. First, of course, we had the heavy frost of last August. Then, we had the reduction in the price of grains, that is the initial payment. Then, we had the increase in freight rates, and we also had, of course, the removal of price controls. All of these four seriously affected their standard of living.

I am not going to say a great deal about the lowering of the initial payment for our wheat; that has been pretty well discussed in this House. But I do want to add my protest to those that have mentioned it here because in my opinion it was most unfair that the initial price for grain should be lowered at a time when the cost of the grain production had seriously increased. This, Mr. Speaker, is in rather sad contrast to the very fat contracts that have been let for defence purposes to the great industrial firms in the east. There we find that these contracts have been let on a basis that not only took care of the rising costs of materials and labour but also provides for a very good profit on the turn-over of these firms. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is in sad contrast to the deal that was handed the western farmers when the initial price for his wheat was lowered in the fact of very materially rising costs.

In this morning's press there is an article which again gives us



some cause for worry. Dealing with the proposal of the payment on the five-year pool, I note that the "Leader-Post" is quoted as saying, "There seems no possibility of getting Cabinet to agree that the wheat growers are entitled to a rebate in consideration of having subsidized Canadian bread-consumers during the days of price control." Mr. Speaker, if that is an indication of what we can expect from the Federal Government then I say that it is time the farmers of Western Canada were letting their voices be heard. And it is not just a case of the western farmers subsidizing the users of bread. I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the report on the flour-milling industry which should have been made public before the election of 1949, and under that it is shown that the milling companies of Canada were the ones; who were subsidized by the farmers of Western Canada. And I say, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan have every right to ask that when the final payment is made the Dominion Government give some consideration to the lower price at which wheat was sold in the Dominion of Canada during the years of the war.

This whole thing, of course, is simply a ruse on the part of the Federal Government to try to get out from under their responsibilities as far as the price of wheat is concerned. Mr. Gardiner's trip to England asking the British Government to give further consideration to that agreement was just so much white wash, to give them an excuse in getting out from under paying the people of Western Canada the price for the wheat that they really deserve. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that in this morning's paper there were three articles that should give us cause for concern. The one I have just mentioned, the statement by Mr. Howe that they are not going to consider price controls, and the third is that only one million dollars is being voted for the construction of the dam on the South Saskatchewan River. I will deal with those later on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the farmers of Western Canada are not going to appreciate the fact that members on the opposite side of the House have made an attempt to defend the Federal Government in their action in lowering the initial price for our wheat. But that is nothing new for the members across there; nothing new at all. A short time ago when the freight rates in Canada were being raised and an election was coming up in the province of Saskatchewan, the freight rates were going to materially affect this province, we find the Leader of the Opposition taking a very active interest in this matter. And I have in my hand a clipping dated March 15, 1948 – this was just at the time that the Railway Companies were asking for an increase of 31 per cent and before the award of 21 per cent had been granted to them. The Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying:

"If any increase in revenue is every deemed necessary for the railways it should not be granted as an increase in freight rates, but should be done by the Federal Treasury assuming the cost of transportation over the unproductive stretch between Eastern and Western Canada."

Very fine sentiments. A little later on, a few days later, after the Board of Transport Commissioners had made their ruling giving the Railway Companies an increase of 21 per cent on freight rates, the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying:

**February 27, 1951**

“The ruling by the Board of Transport Commissioners granting the railways 21 per cent boost in freight rates he described as just an arbitrary ruling.”

Just an arbitrary ruling. And then, a few days later:

“Whether or not 21 per cent increase will be permitted is up to the Cabinet to decide.” (That is the Federal Cabinet.) “The Government can be relied upon to give fair consideration to the prairie West when it endeavours to reach a decision on this matter.”

It surely did! And then we go on, a little later, after the Federal Government had given the 21 per cent increase:

“Disappointment over the failure of the Federal Government to stay imposition of a 21 per cent freight increase until the provinces could make representation was expressed on Thursday by Walter Tucker, Saskatchewan Liberal Leader.”

And then again, on April 19, 1948:

“Dealing with the recent freight rate increase permitted by the Transport Board, Mr. Tucker said, ‘The final decision was up to the Dominion Cabinet. Our position remains as it has been since the application was made to the Government. It is that since the West must shoulder the biggest burden of any increase, if the railways need an additional increase in revenue the funds should come from elsewhere.’”

And then again,

“‘I am satisfied’ Mr. Tucker declared, ‘that until something is done to correct this inequity, western development will continue to be hampered.’”

Keeping on the warpath. And then again. The election in this province is over and the Federal election is over. This is December 2, 1949. You will recall that on a number of occasions the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned that something should be done to subsidize the railway companies. But after the election is over (this is a report from Moose Jaw), he is talking at the Liberal Convention there:

“‘The mere mention of a subsidy is sufficient to arouse most of the rest of the Dominion against the proposal.’ Mr. Tucker told the annual meeting of the Moose Jaw Provincial Liberal Association.”

He is dealing with the report submitted to the Government by this Province at that time. But now we come to July 4, 1950. The railways have been given three hikes; the increase in freight rates is now 45 per cent. Mr. Tucker is speaking to the Young Liberal Club in Saskatoon and I gather, reading between the lines of this report – and I have two of them here, one

from the 'Leader-Post' and one from the 'Star-Phoenix'; I gather from reading between the lines he is having a pretty rough time of it. The report says:

“The stand taken by western Liberals on freight rates and the party's record on control of combines were vigorously defended by Walter Tucker, Saskatchewan Liberal Leader, addressing the Young Liberal convention at Saskatoon, Monday. Answering recent attacks by western Opposition members against the position taken by western Liberals on freight rates, Mr. Tucker declared, ‘They had to submit on matters of minor importance so that the broad principle of the party could be carried on.’”

Matters of minor importance, Mr. Speaker. Show me anything that is of more importance to the farmers of Western Canada than an increase of 45 per cent on a most unequal system of freight rates.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The hon. member is undertaking to read from a newspaper as to what I am supposed to have said at Saskatoon. I want to tell him that I emphasized very much that this question of freight rates was a question of very great importance to Western Canada, and any suggestion that I suggested that it was a matter of minor importance is not a correct report of my speech.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, I will have to accept the hon. member's statement but he is reported in both the 'Leader-Post' and the 'Star-Phoenix', and I am glad to note that he agrees with me that neither of these papers are very responsible avenues of news.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not make any suggestion they were not responsible at all, I said that in this particular instance it did not cover exactly what I said at that time, and the hon. member has no right to read anything into my remarks in that regard.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, just a word or two more about freight rates, I have not time this afternoon to go into the whole question of it; but I believe that the statement that I have given you gives this House and this province a good idea of what we can expect from members opposite. If you will read the records, you will find that when these rates were up for discussion in the Federal House of Commons there was not a single member from Western Canada got on his feet and objected to this substantial raise in freight rates, a raise that was working unduly against the farmers of Western Canada.

I have here a few of the increases that took place at that time. On an I. H. C. farm tractor the increase in freight rates is 55 per cent, not 45 per cent. On an I. H. C. combine it is 55 per cent, not 45. On a Ford car the increase is 45 per cent. Now those increases run from \$27 to \$50 on each of those articles which I have just mentioned, and I want to point out to this House, because of these increases in rates allowed by the Federal Government for, as the Leader of the Opposition has just said, they could not have been allowed unless the Federal Cabinet agreed to it. That being the case, they have got to assume the full responsibility for

**February 27, 1951**

the increase of these freight rates on the goods of the people of the West.

There is one other thing I want to bring to your attention. On April 12, 1948, the 'Leader-Post' had an editorial dealing with freight rates and they say:

“A remark made by Walter Tucker illuminates a profound truth about Canadian politics. Referring to the fact that there are only four M.P's from Saskatchewan and Alberta in the Government caucus at Ottawa, he mentioned the advantage in pressing the claims of the West if there were 15 or 20.”

And then they go on to say:

“Whether the West can achieve some unity of political expression in the next two years may well determine whether the battle of freight rates is won or lost.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, they got their 20 representatives from Western Canada and the West lost their case for freight rates. Again I want to point out to this House that not a single Liberal Western member got on his feet in the House of Commons at Ottawa and protested against this increase. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, it was another betrayal of the farmers of Western Canada by the Liberal Party at Ottawa. And not a single Liberal member in this House has risen since that time and objected to those freight rate increases.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say one more word about freight rates, and that is to point out the inequality of the assistance being given to people of Eastern Canada and the people of the West. I find that the eastern farmers are being given free freight rates on coarse grains being shipped from the West to the East, and in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it has been one of the reasons for the decline in the livestock population of Western Canada. I have the figures here showing that Ontario received free freight to the tune of \$50 millions, Quebec \$52 millions, New Brunswick \$8 millions, Nova Scotia \$11 millions, Prince Edward Island \$3 millions, British Columbia \$13 millions and Newfoundland \$280,000: a total of \$139 millions on free freight for coarse grain to Eastern Canada, which has meant that the Eastern farmer, who is on the doorstep of the great markets of this country, was able to put his stock on the market in unfair competition with the farmers of Western Canada. And that, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is one of the reasons why the livestock industry of Saskatchewan has been so seriously affected.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have noticed there has been no great criticism of our highway system since this House has opened, and I think I know the reason why. If the Opposition members are going to criticize the highway system, they know that to make a fair comparison I must go back to the year 1944 when this Government took office. And they know as well as I do that they turned over to this Government 8,000 miles of highway system, 70 per cent of which was completely worn out. They only had 138 miles of blacktop, and half of that was almost unfit to travel over. There was a very decided lack of engineers on the staff of this Department. They had

more 'heelers' than they had engineers at that time. There was a lack of equipment – not nearly enough to take care of the work that must be done, and most of the equipment they turned over at that time was obsolete and out of date. In addition to that, they turned over to us a debt of over \$32 millions.

Now, what have we accomplished since that date? I noticed my friend quoted some figures today on highway mileage, and the mileages he quoted did not take into consideration the miles of road that were built as secondary highways. And I might point out that the roads that we are building on secondary highways are a better type of road than the Liberals even built on their main highway system before we came into office. If those are taken into consideration then, on that basis, we have built over 3,000 miles of road, which is equivalent to one and one-half times the entire highway system of Manitoba and equivalent to the entire Provincial highway system of the Province of Alberta. We have gravelled completely over 7,000 miles, and we have black-topped 659, giving a total of 722 miles of black-top in the province at the present time.

I quote those figures, Mr. Speaker, on a mileage basis, but it is not a fair comparison because there is no comparison between the roads which this Government has been building and the roads built by the Liberal administration. As a matter of fact, in the constituency of Elrose, the municipalities there made the boast that they had much better roads than was old No. 44 Highway, and that was the truth. We undertook to remedy this problem by giving consideration first to those areas in the outlying parts of the province and in those areas that had been neglected by the Liberal Party throughout the years, particularly in seats which had been held by Opposition members. Then we gave consideration to the building, of course, of the arteries between the main centres of population. We also gave special consideration to the construction of one main North-South artery in the province. I am glad to state that we have made very good progress in all of these various fields. In addition to that, we have undertaken to give to the rural municipalities assistance that would help them in their very great problem of road construction. We have also made an attempt, from the time that we took office until last year, to get the Federal Government to take some action in regard to giving assistance to highway construction. Not until the spring of 1950 were we able to sign an agreement with the Federal Government. At that time seven of the 10 provinces of Canada signed an agreement with Ottawa, and since that time the Province of New Brunswick has also signed, making a total of eight, whereby the Federal Government agreed to assist in the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway from one side of Canada to the other. They also agreed to pay 50 per cent of certain costs; not all of them. There were certain costs that they refused to assume responsibility for, the most important being the payment of right-of-way. I would say that on the overall picture, they are possibly today paying about 40 per cent of the total cost of this road.

Now, while we were very pleased to have Ottawa enter this picture, I want to point out to this House that in my opinion the Trans-Canada Highway should be a Federal proposition financed entirely by the Federal Government. But, as I said, we were glad at last to get them in the construction picture in this province and the Dominion. And I should

point out to this House that the first five contracts let on the Trans-Canada Highway last year, were let by the Province of Saskatchewan. I should also tell the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Dundas) that the reason we started work at Sintaluta, his home town, was not because he lived there, not any more than we built the highway on the opposite side of the track just because his garage happened to be over on the north side. That kind of thing does not enter into the picture any more, and I am sorry that we were not able to build the highway past his garage; but those days are gone, gone from the time when he told us yesterday that he was able to influence the building of No. 56 Highway. When he made the statement that he had built the road, I was rather surprised because I could hardly imagine a man who is a member of this Legislature would hold a contract for the building of the road. So I sent down to the office for particulars. I find he did not build the road. At least if he did it was done under someone else's name.

**Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I never said that I built the road — contracted for the road.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, I misunderstood you.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Now, you know very well that you — you have not got any too much up here.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Oh, yes I have, I have enough to know that the hon. member did say that the engineer's report was for the present occasion. Well, we have searched the records, and no engineer ever made a report and I would have been very much surprised if they had because I could not imagine any reputable engineer putting his name to a report that would recommend the present approach to the Qu'Appelle Valley on No. 56 Highway. I do not think they could have picked out a more unfavourable location than the present one, and I can assure the hon. member that there will be no more money spent on that hill until we can get a better approach to the Qu'Appelle Valley than the one that was picked out in his day. The only reason that I can guess for the road being built there was because it passed the homes of several of the friends of the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. And again I have to tell him that that day is gone as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Yes, that will be the day.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — During the past year, Mr. Speaker — to get back to the Trans-Canada Highway — contracts were let on the section from the Manitoba border to Whitewood and from McLean to Summerberry. On these two parts of the project next the Manitoba border, wet weather held up the work for the contractors; progress was not made as rapidly as we had hoped for. I might point out that in the vicinity of Moosomin during the past year, the precipitation amounted to over 32 inches, and these men had a very difficult time. I think there is quite a bit of credit coming to them for the amount of work they were able to accomplish under the conditions they had to work under. However, on the section from McLean-East good progress was made and last fall they had almost reached the town of Wolseley when frost stopped operations on that section. West of Moose Jaw, the section at Parkbeg was completed and work was also commenced

on the section from Herbert-East.

Having once decided on the route of the Trans-Canada Highway, this Province was able to make fairly good progress on a second East-West highway throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and last summer saw the completion of grading from Lloydminster east for a considerable section of that road. We completed the grading from Mozart to Dafoe and completed the black-topping from Langham to Radisson on the second East West highway in this province. Last summer also saw considerable work on the North South Sections of this road, and I am glad to report to this Assembly that we now have a total of 330 miles of black-top between the international border and Prince Albert National Park. In fact, we have one stretch from the international border north, a continuous stretch of 225 miles of black-top, much more than the Liberals had throughout their entire 40 years' administration in this Province.

On Highway No. 11 between Regina and Saskatoon, I would like to point out to this House that we have now reduced the mileage on that road to 166 miles from one city limit to the other and when the road is completed that will be still further reduced. I should remind you that at one time the distance between these two cities was something over 200 miles. That is the type of thing, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has been doing, not only just on that particular road but on many others as well.

One other project that I should mention that was partly completed during the last year is the bridge at Saskatchewan Landing. The six concrete arches on either side of that bridge are now completed, the steel is all in place on the three centre arches and all that remains to be completed is the flooring on the steel arches and the south approach to the bridge. We hope to have the official opening of this bridge on the first Wednesday in June, which will be June 6th, and I would invite all hon. members to be present that day and to witness, I believe, the first bridge ever built across the Saskatchewan River wholly by funds provided by this Province. With the opening of this bridge and with the completion of work that is now being proceeded with between Biggar and Battleford, we will have an all-weather artery from the American border right through to Meadow Lake and slightly beyond. Not only is this going to provide a very important north and south artery for the western part of this province, but it is opening up to the American trade a vast section of splendid park land and tourist centres in the north-western part of this province, and I believe that with the completion of these two jobs we will see a much heavier influx of American tourists to those areas than we have had in past years.

I notice that the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) and the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen) mentioned the need for further work in northern Saskatchewan. I want to assure them that this Government has not lost sight of the need for work in the northern part of Saskatchewan, and I should like to point out that in the six years that we have been in office, we have done more for the northern part of Saskatchewan in the way of roads than was ever done for that part of the province in the entire 40 years' previous history of Saskatchewan. I have not time to go into all of them. I would like to mention one or two. Last summer we completed the gravelling of that highway up to Loon Lake in the extreme north-western part of the province. We gravelled that part of No. 55 which forms the

**February 27, 1951**

connection from No. 4 over to No. 26 Highway, last year. We almost completed the black-topping of the road from St. Louis to the city of Prince Albert. Had the weather been favourable at all last year, that work would have been completed. Last year we gravelled that piece of No. 3 Highway from Big River north-west. We were gravelling on No. 55 when the bad weather overtook us. Going further east we find that we completed the grading of No. 23 Highway to Bertwell, and again bad weather interfered with the completion of No. 9 highway from Bertwell south last year.

All told, in the northern part of this province we have carried on a very active campaign of work, not one year, but every year since this Government has been in office. I can assure both these gentlemen that that work will be continued as the years go on, and the northern part of Saskatchewan is not going to be forsaken as it was by the Liberals previous to this Government coming into office. As a matter of fact, I could point out that before we took office there were very few gravelled roads in the northern part of the province. I question that there was more than three miles of gravel road in the entire constituency of Tisdale when the C.C.F. took office in 1944. I should point out to you, too, that by the efforts of this Government we were able to build, right up to Lac La Ronge, a first-class gravel road, a road that is giving access not only to fine tourist country but to the Pre-Cambrian Shield and in that area where the Department of Natural Resources is doing a very wonderful job in the development of the mineral areas of Saskatchewan.

And so I could go on, Mr. Speaker; but I want to mention a number of other things before I conclude. I should point out that the satisfactory work which we carried on last year – because it was a satisfactory year taken as a whole, we completed most of our programme; we were able to do this because we now have in the Department eight earth moving crews of our own, equipped with the very best of equipment, not only in the way of machines but in camp equipment, repair equipment and all the rest of it, because we have been able to build up a staff of competent men to take care of this work, and because we also have now in this province a number of contractors who are competent men and capable of doing a first-class job. If they are not doing a first-class job they have had to leave this province because it is one thing that this Government has not tolerated. We have not tolerated sloppy work in the construction of our highways.

I should say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that we have received some very favourable comments in regard to the highway work in Canada. Now I am not going to take up the time of this House to read much of it, but here is one article I would like to read to you. This is a clipping from the Ottawa 'Evening Citizen' by a man who was born here but had not been back for some time. He says:

“In all my visits to Saskatchewan, now nearing 20, and not including the years I lived there, I have never motored from Regina to Saskatoon. I had heard a lot about Saskatchewan's bad roads. I want to say I haven't got a single complaint against them. If it is any criterion, I managed to drive from Regina to Saskatoon in 3 hours and



33 minutes, including a detour at Dundurn. That gravel roads were good, the pavement excellent.”

**Mr. Korchinski:** — You read that last year.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Yes, that was last summer. It is a pity Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition parties in this province do their utmost to give a black-eye to the roads of this country, not perhaps to the people of Saskatchewan because they do not pay any attention to them here, but unfortunately it has an effect on people outside of Canada. Now I have here a copy of the broadcast given by a Conservative speaker who shared time with the Leader of the Conservative Party in this province. He said this:

“For instance, Moosomin, which elected an Opposition member, got only about \$20,000 for highways last year, compared with Weyburn, the Premier’s seat, which got almost \$800,000 during the same period.”

Well, it is rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that \$800,000 was the amount mentioned by the member for Qu’Appelle (Mr. Dundas) yesterday, so apparently they both got their information from the same source.

**Mr. Dundas:** — I think I was right, too.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Here is the truth of the matter. Yes, just listen to it. In 1949-50, the constituency of Moosomin had \$168,672 spent there, Weyburn had \$131,062, a difference of \$37,000 in favour of Moosomin in 1949-50. In 1950 to December 31st, Moosomin had \$317,000 against \$212,000 in Weyburn, a difference of \$105,000. This person deliberately lied when he made that statement. He said, last year . . .

**Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):** — May I ask the hon. Minister how much of this amount you are quoting was spent on the Trans-Canada Highway?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — In 1949-50 the Trans-Canada agreement was not in effect, that was entirely from provincial funds. And I might tell you right now that all the money we have got from Ottawa so far on the Trans-Canada agreement for this year is something over \$200,000. And I might tell my hon. friend here, he has mentioned about the amount and what has been done. He made the remark on one occasion that money had been wasted in that area in bringing the work done in 1949 to the Trans-Canada standard. I want to tell him that no money has been wasted there. Unfortunately, the Federal Government could not make up their minds to enter this picture until 1950. Had they done so in 1949 and had we been sure they were coming into the picture, then that road would at that time have been built to the standard now required for Trans-Canada purposes.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member another question? The other day when I was speaking in the House I asked if the Federal Government turned it down and you said you turned it down.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I’ll answer those when we come to my estimates, I’m giving you some information right now. I want to tell

**February 27, 1951**

him, and tell this House that had the Federal Government, when they first called us into consultation in the fall of 1948, been prepared, as they should have been, when the provinces were prepared, because all nine provinces were prepared at that time to sign the agreement, then there would have been no need of any extra work being done on this highway other than that, in 1949, the contractor, due to wet weather and lack of equipment, was not able to provide the necessary drainage that is required for that road. I might point out to the hon. member that last year, this Department loaned to that contractor the necessary equipment that was required to drain that road, and if he will take the trouble of driving over it, he will find that our section of that road is completely well drained. If he goes across the line to Manitoba – at least it was just at freeze-up, last year – the water was almost at the top of the grades.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh, that is nonsense.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — It is not nonsense at all. It was there and I saw it. I saw a car in the ditch and it had to be pulled out.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I go over it ten times to your once. You don't know a road when you see one. You were on the wrong road.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, the fellow doesn't know whether he is a Liberal or a Conservative, how do you expect him to know anything about roads.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Then another thing I should point out here with regard to misstatements. We had another broadcast, a "Public Affairs" broadcast, in which one of the Liberal members tried to tell the people of Saskatchewan that this Government was trying to throw the responsibility of bridge construction onto the shoulders of the rural municipalities. Well, let me point out to him and to any other member of this House that the responsibility for bridge construction was placed on the shoulders of the rural municipalities by a Liberal Government many, many years ago, and what this Government is trying to do is to lift some of that burden from the shoulders of the municipalities rather than to place any more on them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — May I ask the hon. minister a question?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — No, I'll answer your question later on, I will give you lots of time and lots of information before I am through.

I want for a moment to deal with the trend of highway development over the last 12 years. If we will take a look at that we will find that during the last six years we have increased the amount of grading by 68 1/2 per cent, gravelling by 121 per cent and black-top by 2,295 per cent. Now then, as I said a few moments ago, to deal with this subject on the matter of mileage is not a fair way of doing it, not a fair measure to take, because the type of grade which this Government is building is not only of a much higher standard but requires a much greater yardage to build than was ever thought of by the Liberal administration. If we are going to build to the standards we are now building, if we are going to continue to do this work as rapidly as it should be done, then, of course, we are going to have to spend more money than has been spent in the past,

although I should point out to this House that we have been constantly raising the amount of money which we have been spending for highways in this province since this Government has taken office. Each year we have tried to spend at least as much for highway construction and administration and net costs as is received for gasoline tax and car licenses.

Now, dealing with expenditures, I should point out to you that, according to the findings of both the British and the Canadian Governments by a Royal Commission set up to make a study of this, they have pointed out that the cost of highway construction and maintenance should be borne two-thirds by those who use the highways and one-third by those who benefit because of highways. Now the Province has the right to tax those who use the highways such as the car manufacturers, tire manufacturers and others in that category. For that reason I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government should be giving some assistance in the building of Provincial roads. We should have a system here similar to what they have in the United States of America. There you have the Federal Government assisting the various States to the tune of half a billion dollars a year, and they have been doing that since 1944. In fact, their Federal aid programme has been in existence since 1916. But since 1944 that assistance has been to the amount of about half a billion dollars a year. I believe I pointed out in this House before that in the State immediately south of us, the State of Montana, their assistance has been in the amount of approximately \$8 million a year now for some number of years. Give this province another \$8 million a year and we would show you some remarkable work in the way of black-topping and in the way of rebuilding this highway system with which we are saddled.

However, in spite of that, we have done a lot of work in this province, that has been pointed out. But I should point out that it would have been impossible for us to have done that amount of work, both in the field of maintenance and in the field of construction, without the loyal co-operation of the staff of this Department, and I want at this time to express my appreciation for that very fine co-operation which I have received. I should also point out, of course, that part of this achievement has been due to the fact that we have much better equipment. We now have eight earth-moving crews of our own and two black-topping crews. We have provided proper maintenance for this equipment. In the city of North Battleford we have taken over . .

**Mr. W.A. Tucker:** — The hon. member undertook to read from the ‘Star-Phoenix’ indicating my stand on this freight rates matter. Now then, I have here the clipping where I did refer to that matter and I just wish to refer, Mr. Speaker . .

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege must be taken up immediately. He cannot bring it up half an hour later.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I took it up immediately and the defence was that perhaps he doubted whether this was right or not. Well I just wish to read to Your Honour briefly, a report from the ‘Star-Phoenix’ and it says this: “Freight Issue not Minor.”

This is a report from the ‘Star-Phoenix’:

“Walter A. Tucker, Saskatchewan Liberal Leader said,

**February 27, 1951**

Tuesday, he had intended no reference to freight rates, particularly when he defended western members.”

Mr. Speaker, my position in this freight rate matter was misrepresented by reading from clippings from the ‘Star-Phoenix’, and I claim the right now to read the exact reference to my speech from the ‘Star-Phoenix’. An attempt was made to misrepresent my position. An attempt was made to suggest that the ‘Star-Phoenix’ did not make a correct report.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. gentleman is quite privileged to correct the statement made by the hon. Minister of Highways which he referred to, I think, a considerable time ago.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I will not take a moment more than necessary, because this appeared in the same paper from which the hon. member was taking his clippings. It went on to say:

“He had intended no reference to freight rates, particularly when he defended western members of Parliament in his speech, Monday, before the Saskatchewan Young Liberal Convention in Saskatoon. ‘I had no intention of conveying the impression that the question of freight rate increases was a minor matter’, Mr. Tucker said. ‘I have consistently taken the stand’, he continued, ‘the last round of freight rate increases should have been held up until the Royal Commission report has been presented and the Government has been able to formulate a policy based on it. I am still of that opinion. The point I had in mind in speaking about minor matters was that many matters important in themselves, as compared to the policy of the Party as a whole, are of relatively minor importance’ he said.”

There is the clipping from the ‘Star-Phoenix’.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I have here the two clippings, one from the ‘Leader-Post’ and one from the ‘Star-Phoenix’; they are both almost identical and I read them correctly. If they mis-quoted the hon. Leader of the Opposition, of course I have to take his word for it; but it is the first time that I have ever known that he had ever taken exception to the statements which I read here today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted by the hon. member I was dealing with the construction crews of this province and pointing out what a magnificent job they had done. I should also point out that our maintenance crews have done a very wonderful job during the past year. Particularly is this the case in snow removal during the present winter. We have had a winter in which there has been more than the average amount of snow. Yet I find, on Saturday last, we had open 7,525 miles of the 8,000 miles of the Provincial highway system. In addition to that, we had given assistance on a number of municipal and secondary roads. The best the Liberals were ever able to do was in the mild and open winter of 1943-44 when they kept open 2,500 miles of road.

I have here some letters of testimony which I would like to read to this House. This is one from the board of trade and from the town council:

“I previously wrote in appreciation for the work done by the truck plow, which was earlier in the season, and it seems only right that mention be made of the men with the big plow who willingly and cheerfully stuck with us through what would seem to have been an extremely tough season of plowing and done their utmost to give service where it was most needed.”

Here is another one where a young girl was seriously ill. They were able to get to the doctor. The man phoned the district engineer. Here is what this farmer had to say:

“Without hesitation Mr. Wanner, who was the plow operator, offered to plow the road back to Weyburn so that I could get my sick daughter to a doctor. He even helped me to start my automobile, which was quite a task because it was a very bitterly cold day. In other words, he played the good Samaritan and I will not forget his kindness.”

That is the type of the letters we are getting continually for the work that is being done. I have one here from a town that is a little different from that. It says, on behalf of the town council and the board of trade:

“We wish to express our appreciation and our thanks for the fine co-operation the town received from your Department in connection with the recent highway construction programme. We are sure that this service will be greatly appreciated since the new highway will be far superior to the one it is replacing.”

So why go on, Mr. Speaker? That is the type of commendation which we are getting from the people of Saskatchewan.

I have said something about the construction end of this work, the maintenance end and staff, but I want to say a word or two about the laboratory work that is now being done by the Department of Highways. This work is divided into two branches. First, we have the regular testing work, the testing of soils before the grade is built, the testing of soils when the road is being built, and I should tell this House that Dr. Hardy, Dean of the College of Engineering of the University of Alberta, speaking to the Prairie Road Builders' convention in January of this year, highly complimented the work that is being done by the Department of Highways and the University of Saskatchewan in the field of soil testing. He pointed out that we have done some outstanding work in this respect, and I should advise this House that it is in this field that we hope to make very great progress in the years to come. We now have in Saskatchewan a very fine laboratory; it is considered one of the best in Canada. I might point out also that, before this Government assumed office, the laboratory consisted of a little building that

**February 27, 1951**

they were only able to work in during the summer months, and much of this work must be carried on during the winter months. In the field work that we will be doing this year, we will have 16 trailer-type laboratories whereby we will be able to go out and make the necessary tests in the grades which are being built across Saskatchewan.

In the field of research we have done, I think, an exceptionally good job. One of the fine things that has been done by the boys is to prove that in the Lloydminster crude we have a product that makes for the very best of road oils. Now that the Department of Natural Resources, through their policy, have been able to extend that field over a very wide area and that we now know we have an abundance of heavy crudes in this province, I believe that there we have the solution to many of the highway problems in Saskatchewan. I have pointed out before that if we are to protect the roads we are building, if we are to protect the very limited supplies of gravel which we have, we must find some manner in which we can conserve them. We believe that the work that we have done that we will be able to have a method, and we will try it out in actual field operation this year, whereby by the application of these oils we can conserve the gravel of the province, conserve the grades and give the people of Saskatchewan more dust-free roads and roads that will be much more comfortable to drive over than over our gravel highways. I want to say that the boys in our laboratory have done an exceptionally good job in this respect.

We have also developed a technique of compaction of soils in this province which is proving very satisfactory. We are also carrying on work with radio-active materials whereby we hope to be able to test the compaction of soil and help considerably in doing a much more rapid job than was the case under the old method.

In the coming year, Mr. Speaker, we hope to carry on with generous assistance to the rural municipalities. During the past year, 1950, cash grants to rural municipalities and L.I.D.'s amounted to \$575,000; maintenance of secondary highways amounted to \$545,000 – a total of \$1,120,000 in those two items alone. In addition to that, I should point out that, by taking over the over 8,300 miles of highway, we are relieving the municipalities of many thousands of miles of road and in comparison to the Province of Manitoba it means we are assuming the construction and maintenance of an extra 6,000 miles. Now the maintenance of that 6,000 miles amounts to over a million and a half dollars a year. That is really extra assistance which the municipalities in this province are receiving.

I should also point out to you that it is a very good thing for the rural municipalities that they have not a Liberal Government in office at this time. And again I am going to point to the constituency of Elrose. I find that in the 13 municipalities in that constituency, under a Liberal administration, in 1940-41 only four municipalities received grants totalling \$974; in 1941-42, only one municipality received a grant to the extent of \$300; in 1942-43, two municipalities to the extent of \$1,000 — \$500 apiece. This makes a total in the three years to the whole riding of \$2,274. In 1949-50, grants to those municipalities – and they all received grants – totalled \$25,944 from the C.C.F. Government, and that is a good indication of what has been happening all across this province. These grants are not paid now, just a year before an election. They are paid every year to every municipality, not just to the ones where they think they will command the most votes.

In the matter of bridges: Last year, I placed before this House a proposition whereby this Government was prepared to go out and help the municipalities with their very pressing bridge problem. During the summer, I was able to place that proposition before the executive of the Rural Municipal Association, and I have discussed it with quite a number of municipal men throughout this province. That proposition, I am going to repeat it again, was this: (A) that rural municipalities pay the total cost of construction and reconstruction of all culverts and structures up to 19 feet or under, unless such structures are built as part of the improvement for a road on which a grant-in-aid has been made to the municipalities. In such case, the cost of culverts may be included in the statement of expenditures as submitted by the municipality. (B) The Department of Highways and Transportation to pay 50 per cent of the cost of all bridges over 19 feet and less than 100 feet, whether at old or new sites, the balance of the cost of construction to be paid by the municipality. Bridges to be built to a standard approved by the Department of Highways and Transportation. The Department of Highways and Transportation to pay the total costs of construction or reconstruction of bridges 100 feet or over, bridges to be built to a standard approved by the Department of Highways and Transportation.

In the case of the construction of bridges referred to in Section (B), the Department of Highways and Transportation will provide general engineering supervision, plans and profiles, without charge. In the case where a resident inspector is required, the cost of such inspection shall be included in the cost of construction.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the plan which we will again place before the rural municipalities this year, and I am hoping that they will take advantage of this and commence a programme of construction that will, in the course of the next six years, improve the bridge situation in this province. I want to state that I have, in my estimates for this year, sufficient money to take care of such a programme for this year's work if the rural municipalities see fit to take part in it. If this is done, then I believe that it would take six years to complete not only the bridges that are now worn out and dangerous, but also those that will be in that category within that period of time. Last year I placed the amount that would be required at \$3 million. Since that time the costs of both labour and materials have considerably advanced so that, if we are to replace these bridges in the next six years, the amount of money made available must be considerably increased.

I want to say a word or two about the future policy of this Government in connection with roads, and I want to advise you that, first of all, we will still give consideration to the roads in outlying areas. We have done that in the past and we will continue to do so. We shall continue to build as rapidly as possible those roads that are of national importance, roads from the international border to our national park, roads connecting the main centres of population. I should point out also that already many of these main arteries are nearing completion.

Now members on the opposite side of the House have complained that we have not given consideration to those ridings that are represented by opposition members. Well of course, Mr. Speaker, that is simply

**February 27, 1951**

ridiculous. It is often hard for me to understand why they made these statements. After hearing the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) yesterday, I think I have a better grasp of the Liberal mentality than I had previous to that day.

**Premier Douglas:** — You need a microscope.

**Mr. Dundas:** — You come down No. 1 to Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and we will show you.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — But I want to point out that in the past summer we have given the lie to that statement. Here we have the constituency of Moosomin, the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, the constituency of Melville, the constituency of Arm River, all of them represented by Opposition members and all with a great deal of construction work being done. But, as the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) pointed out yesterday, under our scheme, where we have an over-all plan of highway construction, when we come to a constituency it does not matter whether an Opposition member sits there or not, that highway construction work goes on. I know it is a bit embarrassing, I am sure it's pretty embarrassing for the member for Arm River that his own town should have a C.C.F. road on one side of the town, a splendid road, well built up, clear of snow, and on the other side a low-down Liberal road.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It does not bother me at all.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — But I want to tell the hon. member we hope to have that covered very very shortly.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would not mind being embarrassed that way in Rosthern.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I see the time is getting on, I have talked a little longer than I intended to but I have a few more things that I want to say to you here.

**Mr. Dundas:** — You are not saying very much.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I noticed the other day here, a statement made by a former Minister of Highways in this province, Mr. Dunn. He was talking to the Women's Liberal Club in Regina. Now I do not think he would have made these statements to any other group and gotten away with it, but I presume that the women in the city know very little about road work. He said hard-surfacing would have covered every provincial highway and all country roads would have been gravelled if the Liberals had been left in power.

**Mr. Dundas:** — That is right.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, just to show how ridiculous that statement is, it would cost at least \$243 million to perform that amount of work and that, of course, we know is beyond the ability of this Province to pay.

**Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — What about the Crown Corporations?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — But I also should point out that when Mr. Dunn was the Minister of Highways, I happened to be up in Humboldt at



that time. I think there was a by-election on up there – and we won that by-election, Mr. Speaker, with the slogan, “Humboldt Has No Roads.” And that was true. Now, when the member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) cries about having no roads in that constituency, I would like to point out to him that that is nothing new, if it were the case; but I should also point out to him that if he has been around his constituency he must know that since this Government has been in office we have built No. 5 Highway from Muenster east to No. 6. We have built that section of No. 6 in his riding. We have built No. 20 Highway from Humboldt north to St. Benedict. And furthermore, we have given them, for the first time, proper maintenance conditions in that constituency. The only time that I ever knew of any highway work going on in Humboldt constituency to my recollection, was at the time of that by-election. And you could not get in to the town of Humboldt at that time because of highway construction work going on. It started about a week before the election and stopped two days after.

**Mr. Dundas:** — You do that too.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — There is one thing I want to point out in Mr. Dunn’s address. He was critical of the large number of civil servants on the Province’s payroll, and declared that when the Liberal Government returned to power the number would be drastically cut. Well, of course, they are not going to come to power; but if they were, I presume he would practise the same methods they have always practised, of cutting highways. They were always the first things to be cut. That would mean the very fine staff that we have built up in the Department of Highways would be fired overnight and Liberal ‘heelers’ be hired in their stead. Well I know that the people of this province are not going to stand for that kind of thing, and it is not worrying me. But it gives you some idea of what we can expect from the Liberals in this province.

**Mr. Dundas:** — You got a big jolt in ’48.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — And speaking of Liberal promises, Mr. Speaker, I have here some clippings from the ‘Leader-Post’ – “Water for Regina”:

“Never before in the history of our city has the need for a water supply been so urgently needed.”

Then we have a personal pledge from Mr. McCusker.

**Mr. Dundas:** — He will carry it out.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — And then we have, Mr. Speaker, an editorial headed, “Mountain Water for the City of Regina”. Well, let us take a look at the water that the P.F.R.A. are going to give Regina. First of all of course, Mr. Speaker, they had to come to this Government before they could get any action. We had to go with the City of Regina to help them with their case. And we had to put up some money if they are going to get a water supply.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Too bad you have to do anything.

**February 27, 1951**

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — At that time we had the understanding that they were going to pump water from the Saskatchewan River to Buffalo Pound Lake. Well, what are they proposing now? They are now proposing to conserve the run-off from the Qu'Appelle watershed, and that watershed includes Moose Jaw Creek, the stream into which the City of Moose Jaw dumps their sewage. Now, Mr. Speaker, that may make very good fertilizer for the lawns of Regina, but I could not personally recommend it for drinking water. But this is what Mr. McCusker and the Federal Government intend to give to the people of Regina to help them in their water supply.

**Mr. Dundas:** — Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Do not say "Oh". We have got that from the head of the P.F.R.A. That is not hearsay. Mountain water indeed, Mr. Speaker!

**Mr. Dundas:** — They will use you for fertilizer some of these days.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Well, now, I would like for another minute or two to deal with Mr. Gardiner's pet proposal, the dam on the South Saskatchewan River. I have quite a series of clippings. I am not going to weary you reading them, but I want to remind you of a meeting that was held in this city in the spring of 1946, a Board of Trade dinner. I attended the dinner – or luncheon rather. And at that meeting Mr. Gardiner was quite bombastic. It was very windy outside; windy and dry that day. It was windy and dry inside as well.

**Mr. Dundas:** — It must have been as dry as when you are speaking.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — But that day he told us, "I do not require the request of any Government before proceeding with the dam on the South Saskatchewan River," and they were going to proceed with this work. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, and I have his words here, they were going to take the water right to the water users. Well, as the days have gone on, Mr. Gardiner has started to renege a bit on this. The last time he met us, we, the Province, had to put up quite a bit of this money and he was at that time not going to take the water to the water users. We were going to have to do that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the hon. member is speaking as a Minister of the Crown and I doubt very much if he can substantiate what he just said.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — I can substantiate it, I have it right here. Well I will give it to you then. I was not going to take the time but I will do so. If you want to hear it, you can get it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Read it. Let us hear it.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Here we are:

“We are prepared to dig ditches, to make that water available as soon as there is an organization at the other end of the ditch to use the water.

There are the words, and I am not putting anything into his mouth that he has not already said.

Now then, in 1949, speaking at his own convention in Melville, Mr. Gardiner predicted in 1950 that a start would be made on the dam. He is quite explicit, according to the 'Leader-Post' here, that they are going to start work on that dam in 1950. Well, it is not so very long ago that he met this Government to discuss this matter, and you have all seen the copy of the Premier's letter to them, telling them that we are prepared to do our share. Not that we feel we should be doing it but in order to get this big project under way, we are prepared to give any assistance possible. And again, in this morning's paper, which you all will have noticed, the only money being voted for this purpose is \$1,000,000. Well I want to tell this House that \$1,000,000 is nothing. It is only peanuts in the start of a project such as the South Saskatchewan River dam. It looks to me as though it is the hope of Mr. Gardiner to have this as a bait in the next Provincial and Federal elections. But I want to tell this House, and I am going to tell the members opposite, the people of Saskatchewan too long have they been fooled by this type of promises, and they know perfectly well that if this dam is ever built it will be built by a C.C.F. Government, just as the South Saskatchewan River bridge was built by the C.C.F. Government. And so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the Motion as moved by the Provincial Treasurer.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to take part in this debate for a short while. I hope that the bad cold I have had does not prevent me from making my voice heard throughout this chamber. I would first like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the excellent way in which he brought down the Budget. I think there is once again credit coming to another C.C.F. Budget. Of course the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) says "Yes, but the Provincial Treasurer has circumstances more favourable than any other Provincial Treasurer ever had." Well, that is natural. That is agreed. No other Treasurer ever had a bunch of C.C.F.'ers sitting around him like Mr. Fines has in this Government. And, Mr. Speaker, when any Government is elected by the people, through the financial support of the people and to act on behalf of the people, as this Government has been elected, surely we can do better for the people than a Government that has been elected and paid for by 'Big Business', to represent Big Business, to do the wishes of Big Business. We do not have any Charlie McCarthys on this side of the House for Big Business like we have on the Opposition.

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — What about Bergen?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — They are just Charlie McCarthys to Big Business. In order to prove this, they have one by the name of McCarthy now, and I think some of the statements he has made, which the Minister of Highways has shown up has proved that some of the statements that were made on highway expenditures (of which I will have more to say later on) in the south-east part of this province, were not quite correct.

I would like to take a few minutes of the time of this House to comment on my personal observations of some of the actions of the Leader

**February 27, 1951**

of the Opposition. I sit here and I think I can honestly say that I am about the least offender, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of interrupting any member while on his feet. But while watching the Leader of the Opposition I noticed that he will get up there, as he demonstrated this afternoon, and shout so loud that he cannot even hear himself think. He just goes on with a tirade that if you, Mr. Speaker, try to call his attention to any order or rules of this House, he is so engrossed with his own thoughts and so fond of listening to his own voice that he does not give a chance for anybody to correct him. Then, when he is all finished, he ends up by agreeing with what was quoted and attributed to his saying.

Yesterday the member for Qu'Appelle Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) said that the members of the Opposition stood 100 per cent behind their Leader. Well, I think it would be good for them if they would peek out from behind him once in a while and see what is really going on. They are so much behind him that they do not even realize what is happening. And, in turn, their Leader is behind "Jimmy" Gardiner, who is behind Big Business and cartels, so they are so far behind that they can never catch up to the times. It is no wonder that the people, in 1944, decided that they had better get somebody who could at least be up to the times and not always behind.

Prior to this Government coming into office, the listening public of this province, and other parts outside the province too who tune in to these broadcasts from this Chamber, never had a chance to know what was going on in this Legislature. Now they have, for the first time, under this Government, an opportunity to have a little bit of a first-hand view. But it is too bad that we did not have television installed here also. Their actions would so disgust the people who had supported them that they would never even elect one back to this Legislature, not even the member from Rosthern (Mr. Tucker).

You know, I had the privilege of having the Leader of the Opposition speak to my constituency a year and a half or more ago. He spoke in the town of Wadena. The town of Wadena has been for a number of years the Liberal headquarters of the north-east part of the province and, thanks to the Leader of the Opposition, after he had spoken there, the following June when the election came, for the first time in the history of elections in the town of Wadena, the C.C.F. had the majority. We held it again in 1949 in the Federal election, the town of Wadena still gave the C.C.F. a majority. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition would care to come and help me win a few more votes that way, I would be pleased to accept and he may come to Wadena at any time. The people there would be pleased to let him talk away to his heart's content and then they would be more sure than ever that they should not vote for him.

I noticed the other morning, while sitting in the Public Accounts Committee, when the accounts were up dealing with the re-establishment of the people who were moved north in the hungry and lean '30's on re-establishment, that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues shed crocodile tears over the plight of these people who had been moved into the north. Oh, they were so sorry for them, Mr. Speaker; the carpet was almost wet with tears running down their cheeks. But I think those people in the north-east part of this province and in the L.I.D.'s would have thought far more of them if they had given a little thought in those days

rather than crying now when this Government has done something for them.

If I were to take the time of the House this afternoon, I could tell of numbers of occasions of people being moved into the north part of this province from the south part, who were worse off than Robinson Crusoe when he was shipwrecked and left on that island in the Robinson Crusoe story. There were a good many wagons moved right through our yard on their way north. The plight and condition of those people was serious. Yet they were put in there, given an old team of horses that was not worth their weight in feed to keep them; the horses had seen better days. They were given an old, worn-out mower, that some Liberal 'heeler' had sold to the Government to turn over to these people, worn-out machinery, then told to go ahead and make a living. If they could not do it, they were told they were good-for-nothing, shiftless and not trying.

I know of one case where a man had two children and he went to the relief officer and begged to be able to buy a cow so that he could get milk for his children. He was flatly turned down. A few days later, one of his children took sick, was taken in to the hospital and, unfortunately, that child came out of the hospital feet first. The report was malnutrition. The next day the relief officer was over to see this man and offered him the warrant to go and buy a milk cow so that he could save the other child. If that is not adding insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, then I would like to know what it is.

It was amusing to me, when I saw in the Public Accounts Committee the other morning, to see them shed crocodile tears when they should have been giving actions back in those lean '30's when we had a surplus of foodstuff on every hand, hungry people on every street corner and in every farm home, pretty near, in this province, but nothing could be done. A lot of those people up there would have been very glad to have seen any of the Liberal members of the Government travel through their district in those years. And a lot of them, if they had never had a bath before they would have got one right there and then in the water-trough, because some of the relief officers got it in those days – they got a free bath in the water-trough.

We also heard in Public Accounts Committee and also from the floor of this House, statements as to how this province was so short of hospital beds, the Government should do more to get more hospital beds, that we had large Federal moneys that we could have here in this province if we would only put up dollar for dollar and take advantage of it. I would like to say that six years ago when this Government took office, we had only roughly 3 1/2 beds per thousand of population; today we have seven beds per thousand. If we are still short of beds, what were we in 1944, after having a Liberal Government for 34 out of 39 years of the history of this province? And a lot of those things could have been provided quite cheaply in those hungry '30's that I have just mentioned, when material, labour and everything else was quite cheap. Those are the things that they could have done instead of a lot of the political rackets which were carried on in those days.

I would like to refer once again to one of those rackets. I have waited every year since the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer

brought this up in the House three years ago; I have waited for some of them to come back and make some statements on it. I hear them all the time making statements that the Minister of Agriculture says “When you get this payment you have had it;” when somebody else gets this they have had that. But they have never yet, on the floor of this House or on the hustings or any place else, answered for their actions in connection with the Acme Dye, and I think the people of the province would like to know what they have to say about it. They could find lots of money in those times for people like Peter S. Deis but none for hospital beds or to help the people who were so destitute in this province. I have expected, this past two years, that the late member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) would have taken it on himself to give his version of what actually happened, in this Legislature, but he has not done it. But now he has gone to a high reward for political service well rendered to the cartels which he represents, so now we know we will never get a statement from him; but I wonder if some of his colleagues . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would like to speak on a point of order. I doubt very much if it is in order for this hon. gentleman to suggest the appointment of Mr. Justice Culliton was a reward for political service rendered to the cartels, or something to that effect. I submit that that is very much out of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, the hon. member’s opinion is his own business.

**Premier Douglas:** — He has a right to express his opinion. The hon. member would not know when a person was in order.

**Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — He has been out of order all the way through.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to take exception to the fact that the member for Souris-Estevan, who has not made a speech since this Session started, spends most of his time interrupting members and making ‘snide’ remarks across the floor of the House. If he has anything to say why doesn’t he have enough courage to get up and say it. He has nothing to say within reason.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that. I make as few remarks across the floor as anybody in this House. If there is anybody who makes remarks across the floor of this House, it is the Premier himself. I’ll get up on my feet and say something.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — It is very peculiar, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as any of us on this side of the House, whether they be Cabinet Ministers or just back-benchers like myself, the moment we start to go after the Opposition and the people they stand with for their shortcomings – and they have lots of them – they right away rise up in such an indignant attitude, against all ethics and everything else, to say that they got a reward for this or a reward for something else and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, if they would admit the truth they know it themselves. But I have heard the Leader of the Opposition say that he does not know this and that . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of order. The hon. member has no right to suggest that we know what he is saying is correct in our

own hearts; we do not know anything of the sort. What he says is quite wrong.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, he may have a point of order there. If you rule so I will have to accept it but I am afraid I cannot see. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition get up here on numerous occasions and say that I do not know any such thing. Well, this House is still waiting to find out what he does know. We know lots of things that he does not know, but we want to find out some of the things he does know, and if we suggest what he may know he jumps up and says, “Mr. Speaker, they have no right to say that I know such and such a thing when I do not know any such thing.” Let him tell us what he does know, and then we will have more to talk about.

Now, as I was saying with this Acme Dye, Chief Justice Culliton – he is not in this House now to answer for himself; but I would like to see some of the members of the Opposition justify the actions of the former Government, of which Mr. Culliton was a member, on that Acme Dye business, while the money was worth a dollar in those days far more than it is now. As has been pointed out on numerous occasions in this House, the value of money has gone down, yet the Acme Dye of that day cost us far more than it is doing now today to buy it under a C.C.F. Government. It is no wonder that the Provincial Treasurer can bring in a budget showing a lot more money to spend for social services when we do not have a bunch of Peter S. Deis to keep going.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer to a letter that I had sent to me from one of my constituents to back up my line of argument here as to how some of the people react to listening to the broadcasts from this Chamber. And, as I said earlier, I am sure that they would not think this highly if they had it on television. I am not reading all of this letter, but I am going to read it in part:

“After listening to speeches contributed by the Liberal Opposition in the Legislature this Session, particularly Mr. Tucker and Mr. Danielson, in a valiant and fanatic attempt to justify the position of the Liberal Party with regard to supporting and pursuing the philosophy of co-operation and co-operatives in general in this province and the Dominion as a whole, well, as a co-operator of long standing and as one who has taken quite an active part in the organization and promotion of co-operatives in this province, I can only reply to those loud and mischievous professions that their actions speak so loud that they cannot hear themselves talk. Saskatchewan is the co-operative Province of the Dominion, not because of any part the Liberal Party has contributed to its promotion, but rather in spite of it.

“It has become a necessity to promote and foster co-operatives to counterbalance and offset the reactionary policies of the Liberal Party. The rantings of these hirelings of the Anti-Christian and anti-social philosophy of the Liberal Party has served to remind me, and I pray many others, that our

**February 27, 1951**

membership will soon be due for renewal again. As a citizen and a C.C.F. member of the Wadena constituency, I take great pride in enclosing herewith a signed membership application renewal and a money order for \$25.00

“I wish to say that I heard Premier Douglas’ contribution in the Throne Speech and thought it very timely.”

Now, that is only a sample of different correspondence I have received.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is he a civil servant?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — He is not a civil servant and, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to divulge the name, which I am not going to do. I know the gentleman who sent this in to me; he would not care if I did divulge his name. But it is very funny. They will get up there and they will make statements, as was done by the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and when asked where he gets this information from he says, “I took the report myself.” But the moment we quote from a letter we have received — “What is his name? What is his name?” You know, it is very funny, the attitude that they take; it is quite amusing. That is why I say we should have television from this Chamber and not just the sound.

I would like to make a little comment on Mr. Cadbury who, as we all know, was connected with the services of this Government. We hear the Opposition all the time trying to belittle the intelligence and the efficiency of Mr. George Cadbury. Mr. Cadbury is a very highly trained technical man whose services are competed for not just by this province but all over the Dominion and other parts of the world. Before coming to work for Saskatchewan Government, he had been for some time a member of the British Aircraft Commission stationed at Washington during the war. He was chosen by Churchill to represent Britain in this aircraft production work at Washington. He is now working for the United Nations. His job there is a very important position, and yet we will hear sniping criticisms from the Opposition trying to drag his name down into the mud for political reasons, and any one of them could do himself credit by taking off his hat and bowing to him when he had been here. If they had had, in the days of their Government, men like George Cadbury, as sincere, as honest and as interested in seeing that the future economy of this province was well looked after as Cadbury was when he was giving technical assistance to this Government, we would not have had Acme Dye scandals in this province like we had in the past, or numerous other ones which I am not going to mention at this time. Mr. Cadbury is a man that any of us from this side of the House are all proud to have known. We are very proud to have associated with him and we would be very proud to be able to have his services back again if Mr. Cadbury was available to give his services to this province.

I would like, for a few minutes, to comment on a few different press reports, things that we do not see as a rule in the ‘Leader-Post’ or our daily papers of this province, but things I believe that the people of this province should have a right to see. We do get them in



various magazines of one kind and another, but quite often, and all too often, the working men and women of this province do not have enough time to search to find them. Without giving my own comments on these articles and these writings in different magazines, I want to assure the House that of all these which I will quote not one was written by a C.C.F'er, nor were they written by the left-wingers or the Communists or so on. They are written by Big Business or their representatives. But sometimes the truth does come out. Now, I am going to quote first from an item which appeared in the "Monetary Times," published in November of 1948, and part of it reads as follows:

"There would appear to be less argument" (they are talking in this article about whether war will come or not) "about its inevitability than about who will be the aggressor. Inasmuch as the Russians appear to be achieving great success with the peace and are unlikely to gain more by war, the conflict will have to be of our making, sparked eventually by some event either in Berlin or elsewhere in Europe where Russia and the rest may come into conflict."

And they go on to say that unless war comes, unless there is some kind of conflict, it is going to be pretty serious for business in the United States.

Now, I have a copy of a report that was taken from "Time Magazine" of April, 1946. One of the American correspondents was asked to report on his observations of what he saw in Britain, and he says:

"Lord Beaverbrook is Britain's most brilliant newspaper publisher. His principal paper, the 'Daily Express,' circulation over 3,850,000, is the largest in the world. Brief, colourful, clear, the 'Express' is also one of the best newspapers in the world.

"Last week, John Osborne, chief of Time's London Bureau reported on what a cover-to-cover reader of the 'Express' for the past several weeks would have to be lead to believe:

"The conflict with Russia is mainly a contest for power between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. Britain can and should stay out of it.

"War is unlikely and unnecessary. If it comes it will be more of the U.S.' fault than Russia's. Russia is not on the offensive, the U.S. is. Russia is calm, the U.S. is hysterical.

"Communism is bad, but it is not a threat to Britain."

Now that is a report by this John Osborne of "Time Magazine" as to how he would see things from reading Lord Beaverbrook's paper from cover to cover.

**February 27, 1951**

**Mr. Tucker:** — Does the hon. member agree with that? Does his quoting indicate he agrees with it or disagrees with it?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear that I was giving these quotes without my own personal comments. I made it very clear that if I were to go into the time of giving my personal comments on them I would use too much time of the House this afternoon. And, as the Leader of the Opposition has not spoken in this budget debate yet in this House, he will have the right to say whether he agrees with it or does not agree with it. I am trying to give to him the source of my information so that he may check for himself these articles and then make his own comments on them.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I can read without you reading to me.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if he can read without me reading for him, I wish he would do a little more reading and a little less talking at times.

I would now like to quote a little from the issue of Maclean's magazine of February 15, 1951. This is one of the latest Maclean's magazines, and this is an article written by Lionel Shapiro, and he is talking on the war hysteria and attitude of the people over in England and he says, in part:

“Today I had another question to ask her, (he was talking to a barmaid in England): Do you think we will have a war in 1951?”

**Mr. Tucker:** — We are getting the low-down now.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** —

“‘You people from America are all the same.’ she said shrilly, ‘Always talking about a war. Listen, dearie, there won't be a war. Who wants it? Maybe you people from America, but that is all. That's all, only you people from America.’

“I asked the question differently from a deep leather chair in the office of an ambassador of one of the principal members in the North Atlantic Pact: ‘Are the nations of Western Europe going to plunge as far, as fast and as deep into the American's conception of the crisis as would be indicated by their quick adherence to Dean Acheson's proposals on leadership in Brussels?’ The ambassador answered:

“‘The natives of Western Europe don't necessarily approve of every move or of every policy of the United States in dealing with the crisis, nor do they believe, in many cases, that war is imminent or inevitable or even probable. One or two are absolutely convinced Russia does not want war now. Others, who take a more serious view of Moscow's intentions, feel that wise, cool-headed

diplomacy can avert war. All Western Europe is now beginning to recover its economic fitness and its governments know it will be a difficult job to turn their people back to the economic waste and personal sacrifices of full preparations for defence.’

“The barmaid and the ambassador had spoken accurately. Each represented a phase of the dilemma attending Europe’s participation in the trouble between the great antagonism of East and West.”

And again, Mr. Speaker, from the “U.S. News and World Report,” there is an article here by John Foster Dulles. Mr. Dulles had been asked a number of questions and he has given his answer to them. I would like to give a couple of the questions and answers which Mr. John Foster Dulles gave to this paper the “U.S. News and World Report:”

First question: “Wasn’t there the feeling, however, that if anybody interfered with the airlift, military support would have been forthcoming?”

His answer: “I think that the Russians don’t want to have a war, at least not now. That doesn’t mean that they will constantly recede, that you can do anything you want with them. They will accept a war if they think we are forcing it on them, but in my opinion Soviet policies prefer not to rely upon war as a means of achieving its end.”

Next question: “Hasn’t a good deal of our thinking been predicated on the notion that almost overnight we might be attacked?”

Mr. Dulles says: “I have never shared that view, I have expressed the opposite view repeatedly. I wrote in magazine articles over three years ago that in my opinion the Soviet leaders did not want another major war.”

Now, I have numbers of other that I could give to show that there are a number of people who are seriously trying to work for peace; but I will just conclude that part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by reading to this House a small news item which appeared in the “Leader-Post” on Tuesday, the 21st of November, 1950. This appears on page 4, in a little, insignificant, out-of-the-way place. The heading of it is, “Two Officials in Agreement”. Above that they are talking about drama festival finals in London, next May. One may think, in glancing at the paper that these two officials referred to some officials of the drama festival. Or, right alongside of it was the radio programmes, and one may think it was referring to the radio review. But I would like to read this to the House: “Two Officials in Agreement”:

**February 27, 1951**

“Ottawa, November 21: Prime Minister St. Laurent said Monday, he and Russia’s Jacob Malik agreed upon one thing, their respective peoples want peace. Returning from a brief holiday in New York, Mr. St. Laurent told reporters he had two rather interesting chats with Mr. Malik, the Soviet Union’s permanent representative at the United Nations. On both occasions they talked peace. ‘I assured him’, said Mr. St. Laurent with a smile, ‘that we wanted peace, and he said the Russians wanted peace. I told him that I believed him, that I believed the people of Russia wanted peace and that I felt that if our leaders didn’t make fools of themselves we would have peace.’”

Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that in fairness to try to have peace in this country and throughout the world an item like that, a statement issued by the Prime Minister of Canada, should have deserved enough prominence to appear on page 1 in big headlines of the “Leader-Post,” instead of hidden away on page 4. Those are the things which make a lot of us very critical of the press in this country. They do not try to give to the people of this province both sides of the argument and the story. It is my belief that had St. Laurent come out and condemned Malik for that chat he had with him, it would have received page 1.

I am not saying whether the Russian attitude is right or wrong, but I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time both sides were brought out so that people would be in a position to judge the topics for themselves.

We have heard in this House as to how the Department of Education is using the Normal students and others most unfairly. I have in my hand here a number of letters which I have received from some of my constituents, talking about conditions of their schools under the former Government. And this is not back in the 1930’s; these letters are all dated in 1942. They are copies of letters sent by the Department of Education at Regina to a school district in my constituency, and it appears by the correspondence from the Department that a certain school teacher was owing the Department \$40 on account of Normal fees and examination fees which she had not paid at the time of teaching at that school. They notified the school board that unless this was paid they were withholding from the school board the grant for the spring of 1942. I want to make clear that these letters were in the fall of 1942, but they are holding back the spring grant of 1942. They were not just going to hold the fall grant, but they were holding back the spring grant of 1942 from those people of that district. It is the same district by the way, Mr. Speaker, which I referred to last year, when I quoted from a letter which was written by the Department telling the trustees of that district that if they would pay their own taxes they would be in a position to pay the teachers rather than ask the Department for money. Now these letters here point out that they were holding back the grant from that school district because this teacher was owing the Department \$40. I am not trying to argue that the teacher should not have had to pay her rightful obligation to the Department, but they could have withheld it out of the Current grant instead of the spring grant, or they could have said “We are withholding

the amount of \$40", which would have made it easier for that board to operate.

Also, we hear a lot of criticism about "baby sitter". I have also, in this list of letters here, a letter where they are authorizing that same school district to hire a teacher that has not got a certificate, and in the place marked on the certificate for the teacher's qualifications, just to put down, "Teaching by Department Permission."

Now those are the things that they did themselves, but because our present Minister of Education – through the policies which were followed by previous governments, making things so tough for the teachers, and driving them out of the teaching profession, and, through people taking work elsewhere because teachers' wages were held down so low for so long; because he finds himself in a position where he had to put teachers out, as what they often refer to as 'baby-sitters' – oh, it is most unwarranted, unwise – but at the same . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I never called them "baby-sitters" – I called them 'sitters' simply. He is saying something that I didn't say.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I never referred to the hon. member for Cannington by name. I said statements were made to that effect. Now, if he is making that statement on behalf of the Liberal Party, at all times, then he will have to accept responsibility for all the statements.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Who made the statement that they were baby-sitters, then?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Well, if you would stay in and listen you would hear it yourself.

Mr. Speaker, I am not, at this time, going to run out and bring in an article of the records of this House and start going through them at this time. I wholeheartedly want to support the Minister of Education in the long-range view and policy which he is carrying out in this province on behalf of education. He has definitely done more for education to put it on a permanent basis than has ever been done before, and I shall deal a little more with education in a few moments, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say a few words about the Carrot River triangle in the northeastern part of this province. We have heard a lot of talk about "Why isn't this Carrot River triangle opened up immediately for settlement?" I don't know how many of the members of this House have actually been into that area, personally; or actually know it from a personal view. I have been in there. I have hunted through that part of the country between the Saskatchewan river and the Carrot river on four different occasions – four different falls. I have travelled that area from almost the Manitoba border to 50 miles east of Nipawin, on foot, on different occasions, and I have a good idea of what that country is like; and I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that every precaution should be taken before that area is opened for settlement. There is not the amount of land there that one would expect. It is true

**February 27, 1951**

there is some very good land lying back on either side of the Sipanok Channel. The Sipanok Channel is an overflow river which runs out of the Saskatchewan river and runs across and joins into the Carrot river, which, in turn, runs back into the Saskatchewan river. That is why it is called the channel. The overflow from that river, in years past, when there has been a jam on the Saskatchewan river, the mud and silt settling down has built an overflow up on that river. The soil on the river banks of the Sipanok Channel is the richest soil you would ever wish to see. There are places on that channel where you can walk on the ice, in the fall when it is frozen, and look for 15 to 20 feet and you will see perfect black soil right down to the water level and not a pebble in it – it is all pure silt. But when that country has been flooded that silt has been deposited and after the water receded slowly, it has been left lying there. It has built up that way over a period of time in history past; which goes to show and prove that that country will flood again in the future, unless great care and precaution is taken to see that jams never again occur on the Saskatchewan river. I hunted in that country in the fall of 1939 and 1940. I was back in there again in the fall of 1941, and then I wasn't back again until the fall of 1945, the last year we had a hunting season on moose.

In the fall of 1945, when we went into the country we noticed that all the willow bushes at a height of about six or eight feet had what looked to be white moss hanging all over those willow bushes, and it was very peculiar because it hadn't been there three years previously when we had been in there hunting; but when you went up to these willow bushes and examined this moss, you found that it actually was a series of roots that had come out of the willows when there had been a flood on in there. In talking to the trapper up there, he informed us that, in 1942, there had been a jam on the Saskatchewan river, and it sent the Saskatchewan river down through the bush in that country and just went wild through the bush. In most of the area there was 8 to 10 feet of water lying – the water didn't go down until August. The water stopped there so long that the willows started to take root at water level, and to this day you can still go back and see those roots coming out of the willows where they were trying to take root at the water level. Then, as the water receded, those roots dried up and now look like white moss. So I would say that if we are not very careful at settling that Carrot river triangle, we will have another Red River Valley disaster like they had in Manitoba last spring; but it could be of a far worse magnitude because they wouldn't be as close to help as the people in the Red River Valley were, in order to be able to get them out.

We sometimes hear, also, that all that good land is lying there in that country not being used, that it is not producing anything. I haven't got statistics as to how many people are living off that land now, but I know that there are people living off that land. Just south of that stretch of land, on the south edge of the Carrot River, is Red Earth Reserve and the Shoal Lake Reserve – there are two Indian reserves there. I don't know what the population of those two reserves is but the people of those two reserves do hunt and trap through that country, and that country is providing a livelihood for the Indians of those two reserves. In addition, a number of native people and Metis trap and hunt that country from the Cumberland House

side, so when we talk about land that is not being used, it would be wise to make sure that we are decided as to who it is being used by, or who it is not being used by. While it is not being used very much by the white man, it is being used considerably by the natives of that country.

Fire has, however, made a mess through that part of the country. In the fall of 1939, I travelled through that area with two other fellows. We were trying to locate where the moose were staying, and we walked for about three or four hours steady through one of the most lovely stands of birch timber that I have ever seen. Every birch tree was an individual grown tree – there weren't two from one root. Each tree grew separately; they were standing 60 or 70 feet high; not a limb on any of those trees until you got 40 or 50 feet up. There must have been hundreds of millions of feet of birch in that birch forest. I don't know what the extent of it was, but the trapper said that, to the best of his knowledge, it must have been at least seven or eight miles wide and 12 to 15 miles long. But, unfortunately, in 1944 or 1945 (I don't remember which without checking the record), fire went through there and destroyed most, if not all, of that lovely birch stand. It is very disappointing when our natural resources are devastated by fire that way, when they are so much needed by the people of this province, and other parts, especially hardwood like birch – and that was lovely birch. So I would like to say that we should be very careful in settling that area that we don't destroy what is left and the good soil that is there, let it run back down the rivers and disappoint the people that may go in there.

Now we have heard, this afternoon, a very good and interesting speech by the Minister of Highways, so I won't need to go into highways to any great length because the Minister has covered that field very well. I would just like to make a few observations, though, on the highways of the Wadena constituency, which has for the last 17 years been represented by a C.C.F. member, and the Cannington constituency, which has been represented for the same period and longer by a Liberal member.

Now I find that Wadena hasn't been getting all the preference over Cannington, the Liberal constituency, since 1944. Until this Government came in, all Wadena ever had was maintenance. In 1944, the only part of the highway system of Wadena that had any gravel on it was No. 14 which runs through Wynyard; the rest of Wadena's highways, while they had the stakes upon them, were very poor highways. Highway No. 35 from Elfros south had had, on numerous occasions, signs put down, sticks put down, and the local people tell me that one thing the Liberals did do a good job of was putting those pegs in, because some of them had stood there 25 years and they still weren't rotten when this Government rebuilt the road. So they were good at putting in stakes, if they weren't any good at building a road. But I find, since 1944, between Wadena and Cannington, that in 1944-54, Wadena had a little over \$22,000 spent on general maintenance and repairs to highways in the Wadena constituency. Cannington, in the same year, had \$21,000 just a little less. In 1945-46, Wadena had \$19,000; Cannington, \$25,000 – they had more than Wadena had. In 1946-47, Wadena had \$24,000; Cannington had \$46,000 – almost twice as much. In 1947-48,

**February 27, 1951**

Wadena had \$30,000, and Cannington had \$70,000 – almost three times as much. In 1948-49, Wadena had \$46,000; Cannington had \$130,000 – well over twice as much, almost three times as much. In 1949-50, Wadena had \$45,000; Cannington, \$72,000. It is very interesting, when we hear members of the Opposition get up and say that their constituencies have been discriminated against by the Department of Highways because they are represented by a Liberal, but I didn't get these figures from the Minister of Highways – I took them right from the Public Accounts, and the hon. members have access to the Public Accounts just as we have, and they can get the same statistics and figures and see whether I am quoting them fairly or not, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — This was Maintenance. Have you got the figures for Construction?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I looked through the Public Accounts and I took the same column for both of them. I looked through two or three for capital expenditures, and this is the money that was spent in Wadena and Cannington from revenue, and in the capital expenditures, they were both just about the same on the number I looked through. So I thought, instead of having two lots of figures to compare, the one should bear the same relationship; so I would advise the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) who laughs and snickers that after the Minister has given the official figures as to what Cannington has had, and Cannington has had far more than what Wadena has had, if he would wish I could get him the figures and I could send them across to him at a later time, but then he would still say that they weren't authentic, even if I took them right from the Public Accounts. He can look them up the same as I looked these up. I won't prevent him from doing so.

That goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Highways has not discriminated against the Opposition seats. I could have taken some of the other constituencies. I could have taken Arm River, which has been represented all the time by a Liberal member, it may have shown up far more favourable than Cannington did, because as has been mentioned, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has had some blacktop in his constituency, or a road being prepared for blacktop. I didn't think that would be a fair comparison because Arm River lies between the two constituencies of Regina and Saskatoon. He is fortunate in his constituency in having a road pass through there – one of the main roads – and there is bound to be more come to him than there would to Wadena. If they start to build a main highway, or a Trans-Canada Highway between Prince Albert and Yorkton, Wadena may come in for a share of the extra expenditure of blacktop at that time, or even if it goes from Saskatoon to Yorkton it would go partly through Wadena, but on a very short stretch. So I never tried to pick out the one that was the most favourable. I just took Cannington because it has been Liberal and Wadena has been C.C.F. since the C.C.F. first started.

I could give lots more figures on the highways but I think that will suffice to show that the Opposition, if they will be fair at all, have no room to complain as to what has been done on behalf of them.



**Mr. Maher:** — Did I understand the member to say that the construction in the Cannington constituency and the construction in the Wadena constituency, in the Public Accounts for 1950, was approximately the same?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — No, I said the amounts spent for Cannington and Wadena for 1949-50, under the revenue account in Wadena was \$45,000 and in Cannington \$72,000.

**Mr. Maher:** — Did you not say that the amounts were equal as far as Construction went? That is Maintenance you are talking about.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I said I looked in one or two of them and the one or two I looked at were very much similar, so I didn't bother checking the whole works.

**Mr. Maher:** — I would just like to point out if you will permit me . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Now, we hear a great lot as to how the member of the Opposition are the champions of the farmers of this province – they are the only ones that are concerned with the farmers of this province; they are always fighting for the farmers.

I have sat in this legislature for five sessions – this will be my sixth. I went through the Journals of the proceedings of this House through the number of years I have been here. The first Session, as you will recall Mr. Speaker, in which I sat in this House was the session of 1946. On that occasion the Opposition, admittedly they were small in numbers; but the Opposition, in 1946, only moved one private member's motion asking for things which they thought should be done on behalf of the people of this province. In 1947, they still only had the five Opposition, but in 1947, they moved three private members' resolutions asking for certain things to be done which they thought, in their wisdom, would benefit the people of this province. In 1948, there was none at all; and in 1949 – we then had 21 men in opposition – we find that, instead of three as there was in 1947, we find that between the 21 members they were able to move one resolution for what they thought should be done on behalf of the people of this province. In 1950, even that one didn't have a motion to move, so there were no motions moved on behalf of the people of this province by the Opposition. This year, as yet, they haven't moved any. Maybe they will, I don't know.

It would be interesting to see what their ideas are for the people of this province, but they are very reluctant about putting them down in the form of a motion. If they want to do something for the people of this province, they have had lots of opportunities to bring in a few motions and try to see if they can get support for what they think should be done for the people of this province. I am sure that they will find little success in moving motions against the Provincial Government because we are doing what can be done, because at one time

**February 27, 1951**

they will ask us to spend more money – do this, do that, and the other; and then they will come along in a debate like this and tell us to reduce the budget. So it is pretty hard for them to ask this Government to do anything. But they are in a very favourable position to ask their colleagues at Ottawa to do something. They have a good representation from this province at Ottawa, therefore they would have lots of chance to get those members in the Federal House to do some of the things which they would like to see done.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, while speaking in the debates in this House, I found it necessary at that time to go on record as condemning the Veterinary Association of this province for their attitude in not accepting for this province veterinary students coming from Guelph with Guelph qualifications. I am very glad to find that since the time I condemned them a year ago, they have now agreed that the certificate from Guelph will entitle any student of Guelph Veterinary College to practise in the province of Saskatchewan. It has made it far easier to get the veterinaries in the province and I find that, in the past year, since the veterinaries have been able to come back with those qualifications, 15 new graduates came to Saskatchewan in 1950 compared to five in 1949. Eight of those are in Veterinary Districts, three are in private practice, two with the Provincial Government and two with the Federal Government working in this province, so that gives us 15 more veterinaries to help the farmers of this province. I want to give credit to the Minister of Agriculture and the Department of the Veterinary Services for the work they are doing for the farmers of this province. In 1950 there were over 11,000 calves vaccinated against Bangs disease as compared with 3,000 in 1949 – almost four times as many calves were vaccinated since we have been able to get more help here. I am informed now that Dr. Waechter, the head veterinarian of the province, is down east and he hopes to be able to secure the services of more veterinaries for this coming year.

In my opinion, it is very necessary to the farmers of this province, that a very vigorous campaign for the eradication of Bangs disease in this province should be carried on. It is estimated that approximately five per cent of the cows in this province are affected with Bangs disease, so it is about time that steps were taken to eradicate it. Now there are 18 veterinary districts in operation, compared with 12 in 1949. A number of veterinary services districts are formed and waiting the personnel of veterinaries to be able to put those districts into operation. A total of over 53,000 animals in 6,900 herds were tested for Bangs disease in 1950, compared with 44,000 animals in 1949. If we can continue to expand the services for the Bangs disease that way, it will not be very long until we can have Saskatchewan declared an entire Bangs-free area. At the present time there are 61 municipalities that have passed a bylaw making their municipality a Bangs-free area and of this number 27 municipalities have been completely tested. In one municipality over 18½ per cent of the herd tested were infected, and the loss, taking the loss of a cow and a calf at only \$100 – and we know a cow and a calf together are worth far more than \$100 today – the loss in the one municipality from Bangs disease amounted to over \$52,000. So I want to say once again that I don't think we can put too much emphasis on veterinary

service in this province. If we are going to have diversified agricultural farming of this province we have got to be in a position to give the services to the farmers of this province, in order that they may keep herds of livestock and know that they are not going to have them liquidated overnight by some disease of one form or another. Now, Mr. Speaker, with your permission at this time, as I am just about to change to a different topic, I would like you to call it 6 o'clock.

The Assembly resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Dewhurst (Continuing):**— Mr. Speaker, I would now like to mention the larger school unit. The Wadena unit was organized roughly five years ago now, and in this last five years considerable progress has been made on behalf of education in the Wadena unit. I have here a map of the various school districts, their assessments and what they pay for teachers' salaries, and the lawful assessment in Wadena for school taxes for this coming year is 22 mills on rural property, 25 on villages and hamlets, 28 on towns. Now, if that is all the finances they had for education they wouldn't have any more in the overall picture than enough to pay just the teachers' salaries. In some school districts they would fall very far short of having enough to pay the teachers' salaries. This list shows the inequalities of the small individual school district. For example, the School District of Algrove, No. 4977, only have an assessment of a little over \$30,000. If they had to pay their teacher's salary out of the local taxation, forgetting everything else in the upkeep of the school, they would need 78 mills of taxation in that district just to pay the teacher's salary. Now, on the other hand, the district with the highest assessment is Bradburn, No. 2810, and their local taxation in order to pay the teacher would only be 6 1/2 mills. So in the Wadena unit the teacher's salary represents anywhere from 6 1/2 mills of local taxation to 78 mills of taxation. So through the working of the unit it has ironed out a lot of the inequalities. As I have mentioned, each district, regardless of where they are situated, rural all pay the same 22 mills, villages and hamlets 25, and towns 28. On the overall picture when you take the assessment of all the school districts, including towns, villages and hamlets and rural, on the salaries paid to the teachers they would only raise just enough of the current taxation to pay their teachers. But I may point out, that while this taxation is the one that is agreed to for this coming year, the teachers' salaries are due for an increase on the start of this next academic year; so these figures will then be out of line to the extent that teachers' salaries will be going up and the mill rate won't. So while 78 mills is a high that figure may rise to 80 or 85 (I don't know what it will rise to), depending on the certificates the teachers now hold and what their qualifications of increase will amount to.

In the running of schools we all know that there is more than just the teachers' salaries. Of course, we realize that there are statutory grants and other moneys coming to them from the Provincial Government, but I would like now to give a few of the figures on the work performed by the Wadena unit. In the past five years, I find new schools

built in Wadena: in 1946, one rural school; 1947, two rural schools and three urban schools; 1948, two rural schools and three urban schools; 1949, four rural schools, two urban schools; 1950, five rural schools and two urban schools, making a total of 14 rural schools and 10 urban schools built in the last five years in that unit. Those are all new buildings. In those 24 schools there are a total of 42 classrooms. The expenditures on the buildings was: in 1946, \$17,000, on other repairs \$8,000, making a total for new buildings and repairs of \$25,000; in 1947, we spent \$102,000 on buildings and repairs; 1948, we spent \$78,000 on buildings and repairs, 1949, \$115,000; 1950, over \$61,000. The average assessment that this unit will have to pay to provide that amount of new buildings or repair work would be over 6.8 mills if that was figured on local taxation – almost 7 mills of taxation on the average of the assessment for the past five years. So we can see that the unit has helped to put schools where they were most needed in those districts that didn't have the funds themselves to finance them if it had not been done on the unit basis. In addition to this, the unit gives assistance to any student attending high school who has to travel four miles or more while attending high school. They pay 50 cents a day allowance to pupils attending such schools. Besides that, as I have mentioned, there are the other costs of operating and upkeep of schools. So I think that the Department of Education can be justly proud of the growth and the very fine record of the units of this province, and I do not think the people of this province have indicated by votes this past year (and some units did take a vote) that they will ever turn back from the system of larger units of administration for educational purposes. I know from reading different articles written by educational authorities, that not only this province but other provinces and places in the U.S., are all agreed that the larger system of administration for school purposes must come if we are going to have a satisfactory standard of education for the children of our nation. I could go on at some length and talk on the Wadena unit, but I do not think that it is necessary to do so at this time as education has been fairly well discussed by the Minister, and it would just be a matter of repeating some of the facts which he has brought before this Legislature.

I would like to turn for a few minutes to some of our Crown Corporations. We hear a lot of criticism of Crown Corporations which have been started by this Government, because there are a couple which are yet, as we call them, "problem children". We hear 90 per cent of the criticism of the two or three problem children but little talk about those which have proved to be successful. It is only natural that any corporation takes a little while after its start before it can be on its own feet and stride for itself. We can turn back to the Power Corporation, for example. The Power Corporation was organized in 1929. In 1944 when this Government took office, after 15 years of operation of the Power Commission, there was an accumulated deficit of over half a million dollars. It wasn't until after this Government took office, or started to rearrange it with the benefit of the knowledge of things that had gone before and new ideas brought in, that the Power Corporation now has made great strides forward, and I don't think that any member of this House would say that the Power Corporation should be chucked out of the window. I think that they will all agree that the Power Corporation is very successful and should be retained by this province.

**Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords):** — Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — No, I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. He had his chance to make his speech, so . . .

**Mr. Maher:** — It is a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Did the hon. member say that I said that the Power Corporation . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — No, I didn't say "you" at all. The Telephones is another corporation which has been established a long time. We could go over the records of that and find the same — that it took a period of time to get it established and to put it on a sound footing and make it pay. Well, I don't think that anybody suggested that that should be thrown out of the window. Now, in my estimation a lot of these corporations are the same as a farmer buying a quarter-section or a half-section or any given amount of land, this land being covered with bush. If you buy a farm and it is covered with bush, you put so much capital into the initial investment of land and then you hire machinery to clear that land. You get the scrub piled, then get the land broke, take out the roots, go to the expense of getting the land worked down, seeding the crop, then just before harvest starts, you don't come along and take an inventory and say, "Well, I have lost all this money." You say, "I didn't expect to get all my money back on the first crop, but at least I am not going to take an inventory till I have had one crop off it to know how it is making out." But that is the method that the critics of Crown Corporations try to employ in criticizing the Crown Corporations.

The Sodium Sulphate plant is a good example. We have heard criticism in every corner of this province of the Sodium Sulphate plant at Chaplin. We have heard of how it was such a ridiculous idea to start that corporation, spend the province's money, and you may say deliberately wasting the money, pouring it down a rat hole. Every time the Sodium Sulphate plant shut down for repairs — due to the nature of that commodity it is more or less necessary while operating to keep it operating 24 hours a day or as close to 24 hours as is humanly possible; and when you do shut it down you shut the whole works down and make a thorough cleanout. Every time it was shut down for cleaning out we heard a great cry of joy, "Oh, the Sodium Sulphate plant has closed down. It will never open again. That's that much money wasted." But the Sodium Sulphate plant is showing a very good profit for this past year, and my predictions are that it will show a far better profit this coming year. We have been informed that more and more orders are being placed every year by customers, or potential customers, for the product which we are producing at Chaplin. While some people would like to throw that out the window now, they sure wouldn't do it in a few years when the public really realizes the benefit it is bringing to this province.

In the various Crown Corporations of this province there are over 3,500 employees. These 3,500 employees who are working for these Crown Corporations are all earning a livelihood and a living. We may assume that for every one employee there are three people depending on that income. It is true that they wouldn't all be married men that are working there, with a wife and an average of one child to make three — there are some single people employed; but there are some married people employed who have more than a wife and one dependant. So, taking the average of three to each employee, there are 10,000 people in this province depending for their livelihood on the wages they receive from these Crown

**February 27, 1951**

Corporations. Not only these 10,000 people are depending on that income, there are numerous merchants and other business men in small businesses throughout this province who are equally dependent on these payrolls to bring the money into their small businesses to help their business go round. So it does add in general to the overall economy of the province. And even if there are a number of the corporations yet which are not quite out of the woods, that are "problem children", we have nothing to fear. I have full confidence that they will all, given a little time, prove very satisfactory as the Sodium Sulphate plant and the Box Factory are doing. We can well remember lots of stories we heard about the Box Factory and what a terrible thing it was that the Government took over the Box Factory and so on. But it is a funny thing, we don't hear much about it these days. It seems very funny as to how it seems to be the motto of some people to always kick something when he is down. Of course, maybe the Opposition will accuse me of kicking them when they are down, but I can assure them that if they are down politically they are going to stay there for a long time so it is too bad but they'll just have to put up with it.

As I have mentioned, some of these corporations are doing very good, others not quite so good. I hope to see the day when they will all be doing good and more will be started as a follow-up to them whereby we can put Saskatchewan on a more balanced economy so that everything isn't depending on the wheat economy, so that when we have frost like we had this last year, it will not disrupt to the same degree the income of the whole province and the general business relations. It doesn't matter what part of this province you go into right now, talk to persons, merchants or small businessmen, no matter what business they are in, they will all tell you that they are feeling the effect of the frozen crop which the farmers have sustained this past year, in addition to the lower income which they have had as an initial payment. Not only that, but many farmers have been unable to get their crop off; a lot of it lies under the snow. Last fall, the people of my area were so worried about their crops being under the snow, they didn't know what they were going to do during this winter, or how they were going to get seed. A number of the local ratepayers in the municipality there called a meeting to discuss it with the municipal officials. They asked me if I would attend this meeting also. They wanted me to give them what information I could regarding the P.F.A.A., or any assistance which they may be entitled to from the provincial government. Well, not being very familiar with the P.F.A.A. Act I didn't know just how it applied, because we have never been receiving P.F.A.A. in my area to any extent whatsoever. I made a special trip to Regina, went into the office of the P.F.A.A., put the questions up before them and asked them just how did we stand to qualify under P.F.A.A. I was told that we definitely would have no chance of qualifying whatsoever until all hope of harvesting a crop was given up. As long as there was some hope of taking off some of that crop next spring, there would be no inspection made for P.F.A.A. purposes. Whether they will see fit to change their minds or not, I don't know. I have heard rumours that the P.F.A.A. are, or have been inspecting in Kelvington municipality under similar conditions. Whether that is correct or not I don't know; but I hope it is correct. I hope that the P.F.A.A. realizes that what little bit these farmers make out of it next spring, will hardly pay more than the salvage and operations and, therefore, they do deserve some assistance under P.F.A.A. when they have paid in so many years and received nothing.

That is why it is most essential that we have in this province other things to help to build our economy, rather than just a straight agricultural economy. We hear so much about the failure of the Crown Corporations. I wonder what those same people will have to say in three or four years' time from now? They will be in the same position as they are over the Sodium Sulphate plant and the Box Factory. It is very funny, though, while one of our problem children at the present time is the Brick Factory at Estevan (and I don't think there is a member on this side of the House who isn't behind the brick factory), we hear little opposition or criticism coming forth condemning the Brick Plant at Estevan. I wonder why that is. Maybe the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) when he speaks will be able to tell us why we aren't getting criticism on the brick plant. But I want to assure the members of the House, especially those opposite, that the Government of this province here today have no intentions of doing with the Crown Corporations like a former government did with some of the corporations or enterprises of this province. A few years back a million dollars was spent in the Bienfait area to learn or to see if it was possible to produce briquettes from that soft coal. It was proved to be satisfactorily feasible to make briquettes from the soft coal. A million dollars having been spent in co-operation with the Federal Government, the Manitoba government and the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan, one would naturally have assumed then that the governments concerned, at least the Government of Saskatchewan, who had put both the money in and had this new industry within their province, would have done something to develop it. But, what did they do? They sold the entire works for one dollar. Well, if that wasn't throwing it out the window, I don't know what you would call it. But somebody was there with a dollar bill to catch it so somebody got a nice nestegg after the people of Saskatchewan had spent a lot of money trying to see if it was possible. We have never in all our Crown Corporations had a deficit equal to the losses sustained on that briquette project at Estevan. When I hear some of the talks that are made on these Crown Corporations, by some of the members opposite, I think of the saying of Confucius, which, the more I listen to them talk on the Crown Corporations the more I believe Confucius was right, especially when I listen to the Leader of the Opposition at times talking on them, both over the air between Sessions and at times in the House; Confucius was right when he said that any darn fool can talk but it takes a wise man who can sit and listen.

Before sitting down I would like to bring up one more point. I would like to discuss for a few moments the possibility of having the various Departments, whichever ones are concerned, see if they can or cannot give some publicity to getting all the fences on all road allowances throughout this province, be they municipal or provincial roads, moved back from the road about 150 feet from the centre. It is not possible under present-day methods of building roads, and the setup of keeping the snow off with the present trend of travel, to keep roads clear and built to a decent standard with a 66-foot road allowance. Even if roads are built to a good standard on a 66-foot road allowance, especially the northern half of the province with which I am the most familiar, we find that the farmer uses the side of the road – it is a good place for him to build the stone piles or any roots. Naturally in that part of the province the bush grows up along the fence, and the weeds. Consequently we have a snow trap right up against the road. It is not possible to get in there, clear off the bush or remove this trash. There isn't enough room to clean the fence, the ditch. If we could put out an educational programme to have

**February 27, 1951**

all fences moved back 150 feet and let the farmers farm right up to the ditch, we would have all-weather roads far easier with a lot less expense.

I have discussed this with the various departments. Telephones and Power tell me that where their lines are running parallel for any distance they find it necessary to have the two lines approximately 300 feet apart if they are not going to have any interference from the power line on the telephone. Well, if we could have the power line back off the road on one side 150 feet, the telephone line back on the other 150 feet, we would have that 300 feet clearance between them. The Department of Highways have recommended that snow fencing be put back about 150 feet from the centre of the road. The L.I.D. Branch say that they find difficulty in not having enough room to back-slope the ditches to make snow removal easy. They agree that 150 feet from the centre would be very advantageous for their purpose, and I am sure a lot of the municipal officials would agree also that that would give them a better width to work with. It would not take land away from the farmer. It would be just a matter of the farmer putting his fence back in and instead of farming up to the fence and then leaving a strip between the fence and the ditch, he would leave a strip by the fence out in the field and could farm right up to the ditch. He would have a strip between the fence and the ditch on which he could grow hay if he was in mixed farming, or he would have a strip there which he could keep separated from the rest of his field on which to grow a little seed grain or whatever else he liked.

I am certain that if the papers of this province, our daily press and weekly press and so on, would help to carry out a little educational campaign along these lines, this could be done without being a cost to any of the departments concerned or to the municipalities. It would be definitely an advantage to all the towns and cities and the villages and to all the farmers also, because each of them would be able to get back and forth far easier if our roads had a better chance to remain open. Now I am throwing out that suggestion. I would like the various departments, Municipal Affairs, Public Works, the ones that have these different departments, to try and help to coordinate this programme. I find now that when I am out in the country talking to the farmers about putting back the fences from the road they will say, "Well, what is the distance recommended?" If you go to one Department and then to another they may not always recommend the same distance. Consequently we do not get a continuity of line back from the road allowance. If you recommend from the edge of the road, we find that where a 66-foot road and a 100-foot road happen to join each other that edge would not be a straight line, which would make it difficult for Power or Telephones. Therefore, I am suggesting 150 feet from the centre back to the line, and I am sure that 10 years from now we will see a good many farmers' fences back in the field that distance; we will find a lot better all-weather roads and greater progress for winter travel in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have talked this afternoon far longer than I ever intended to when I got to my feet. I see some of the Opposition agree with me on that score. There are a lot more things I could mention yet and would like to discuss, but I think that at this time, Mr. Speaker, I have covered enough ground for this time. Maybe the Opposition will oblige me by bringing in an amendment to this motion and give me a chance to resume when my cold gets better and does not handicap me from talking too much. So at this time it will suffice to say that I will support the motion.



**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I probably will do my part, tonight, to emulate the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and the member who just sat down. Maybe there will be a lot of people looking at the clock before I get finished.

Before going on to the subject matter on which I wish to speak, I have two very brief comments that I wish to make that are outside the general range of my discussion. First, I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on his presentation of the budget this year. It used to be a dream of some of us when we were younger, a dream that we hoped would be fulfilled, that some day we would have a Treasurer who would be able to say that not only are we not going to have any reduction of services we presently have, but we are not going to be taxed any more to provide them. The excellent way in which he did that, I think, Mr. Speaker, is worth the emulation of our friends on the other side, if 40 or 50 years hence, they finally work their way over here.

The other comment I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is this — I am not going to deal this time, as I did the last time I spoke in the House, with wheat marketing. I just want to refer to the Wheat Board in one brief comment. I just want to express to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) the hope that before this House prorogues, he will be able to persuade two of his members to stand up in this House and state, publicly, that they have the same regard for the Wheat Board and orderly marketing, and the same antagonism toward a speculative market as the hon. Leader of the Opposition indicates that he has. The two members that I refer to who might be persuaded to do this (but I doubt it) are the members from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) and Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson).

**Mr. Dundas:** — I am just as good as you are.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I want to know what he wants me to say.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, I knew that would draw a comment from my hon. friend. I have known the hon. gentleman when he could hear better than he apparently can tonight. I said what I wanted to hear from him. His Leader listened and he can explain to him what I wish.

Now I would like to suggest to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley who, in this debate when discussing things, told us his age; I would suggest that he not allow the age that he has attained to let him become too irritable, and mumble in his ear every time anyone makes a remark.

Now, today, Mr. Speaker, I am going to devote the rest of my time to dealing with the Department over which I have the honour and the responsibility to preside, and I want to make it clear that I am going to show what the Department was set up to do, and I want to say, also, at the start, that I take no personal credit for it whatsoever. All the things that have been done have been done by the energy and the imagination of the Minister who preceded me from 1944 on until slightly over a year ago (Hon. T.C. Douglas).

It is most fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that during that time the Department has assembled in it a staff of very able and very mature people. I mention the word 'mature' here for a specific reason. There are some who

**February 27, 1951**

refer to the people on the Health Services Planning Commission, and others, as starry-eyed young upstarts and people like that. I will give a sample of what kind of description some people apply to these very able gentlemen. In March 2nd of 1950 the "Estevan Mercury" came out with an editorial headed "Health Act Amendment", and among a great many other things, they said this:

"The additions proposed to the Health Act are in line with socialistic theory that average citizens are not capable of managing their own public affairs, but must submit to an over-all planning system concocted by youthful, so-called experts, who would not have intimate knowledge of local conditions, have no interests in property concerned, have no experience in managing anything of their own, and who never have been touched by a business or property tax; and who, generally, in their immaturity, don't give two hoots what happens to others as long as they can put their utopian theories into effect."

This, Mr. Speaker, is a scurrilous attack by a very irresponsible editor of a small-town country newspaper, and I would suggest that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) who sits and smiles very gleefully to the present time without knowing why he is full of glee . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Where did you get your start?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now Mr. Speaker, I am a very patient man and I love my fellow-men, so much that I sit and rarely say a word; but I can hardly think of a time when someone on this side of the House was speaking, that the hon. member for Arm River doesn't have to interject some silly remark.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Too much temptation.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I wanted to go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would suggest that the hon. member for Souris-Estevan, when coming into Regina some time, invite the editor of this paper to come with him and take him over to meet some of the senior officials of the Public Health Department, and see then if he can go home and truthfully describe them in the terms of that editorial. He will find they are men — some of them, who are renowned all over this continent and beyond the seas for their ability in the field which they have undertaken, and which they administrate here in Regina; others who have demonstrated in Canada their exceptional ability in the field of public health and in health measures and have done it with credit to themselves and to the institutions they have worked for. I am very proud of them myself, and very glad that they happen to be there and that I have them to work with.

It has been mentioned in the House, in debates that we are given to extravagance over here in the spending of money — foolishly and without good effect. Now, I think, in fact I am sure, before I am finished that I will have definitely proven to any humanitarian person, to any person who has common sense, to any person who can see beyond his political party bounds, that we have not spent money foolishly, but have spent it in the interests of the slogan that dominates this political party to which I belong and am representing at the present time.

I want to refer, briefly, to a remark made by one of the Opposition members during the debate. If I remember correctly, it was the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) for whom I have a high personal regard for his war service, his courage and ability in that field; but I believe when he was speaking in this debate he mentioned that the Government, and particularly the Premier, would do better if he were making a greater effort to gather blood for the Red Cross than he would be making speeches on foreign affairs. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing that very thing, and doing it as well as any province. It is true the programme has been slower here, but I want those who are listening to me to hear the story. Now I said I am talking to people who, I assume, want to learn something and to know something. An agreement had already been drawn up with the Red Cross that we would establish a blood bank in Saskatoon, and the agreement stood. Now when it became known that we were going to proceed with the University hospital, the Red Cross themselves were very glad that, instead of building a blood bank apart from everything else, we made provision for that blood bank in a wing of the new University hospital. That blood bank is being built and equipped for the Red Cross according to the agreement, and the Red Cross are extremely happy to have it.

Further, after discussion with them when they came to see us last fall, we took under consideration the provision of another blood bank here in Regina, and are presently making provision for the establishment and the housing of that blood bank in the Regina General hospital – to the delight of the Red Cross Society. We will have, then, good service for the distribution of blood in this province by the Red Cross, from the places we will provide; and furthermore, when it comes to the collection of the blood, all across Canada it is left to the Red Cross to carry on the campaign for the collection of the actual blood.

I attended, along with the Premier, the other day, a luncheon given by the Red Cross of this province, and we were told there by the National Red Cross Executive, as well as the provincial, that they are extremely happy with the provision we are making at the present time; and further, we were told that as they are short-handed it will take them about the same length of time to have their staff ready to man, or staff, these blood banks, as it will for us to have them ready, and we will synchronize the two and give them that service.

Criticism is a splendid thing and I agree we should be criticized; but I do think that people who are going to criticize should make sure of their facts before they undertake to do so.

Again, some member across there – I think, if I remember correctly it was the member from Melville (Mr. Deshayes) – mentioned in the course of debate that there is quite a large amount of land in the province at the present time which is not presently bearing any tax levy for the capital cost of building hospitals. Everybody who looks at a map where the union hospital districts are set out in colour, knows that is so. It isn't something that has been overlooked by the Department. We have had it drawn to our attention by the Rural Municipal Association. We have given it serious consideration. We have had it drawn to our attention by union hospital districts who know that some lands are not bearing the same levy as they are. We are giving the matter serious study with the full intention of discovering a method whereby this inequity can be wiped out.

**February 27, 1951**

I want to point out, however, to my friends and to everybody else who might be interested in this particular thing, that you can't just take the map of Saskatchewan and colour out the hospital districts and leave the rest of it blank and say, "That part is not paying anything." There are numerous private hospitals in this province owned by religious institutions, notably, the numbers of very good, well-run and useful catholic hospitals. These people who have helped to build those hospitals have done it by private donations, some of them with very large private donations, and they can quite justifiably say that while they may not have been subjected to a formal tax levy, the fact remains they have, from their pockets, dug up probably more money than a formal tax levy might have imposed on them. They would expect some consideration when the Government is proposing to bring these presently un-taxed lands into a tax structure. Now those things must be considered. Far from the criticism that is sometimes levelled against us that we are dictatorial, one of the things that receives the most earnest consideration from this Government when we are proposing to do anything, is whether or not it is fair, whether we are treating everybody as fairly as they should be treated. In this matter we shall see that everyone is given as fair a treatment as is humanly possible for us to give.

I want to mention the Cancer Clinic. It is true that, in the dying days of after six years of the last Liberal rule in this province, when they had twice gone over their time, in the dying days of that Session, it was finally decided by that Government to introduce free cancer treatment; but again let us remember that originally the cancer treatment was started by a Tory Minister of Public Health, back in the early 'thirties. The Liberal Government had lots of opportunity, from the time they took office after the Anderson Government was defeated, until 1944, to have introduced free cancer treatment; but, Mr. Speaker, they didn't introduce it until the last session or the sixth session of their last time in office in this province. They never gave any free cancer treatment. It remained for this Government to implement the legislation that the Liberals introduced at that time, and we have done so.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. That statement is not correct.

**Premier Douglas:** — That statement is true. It has been demonstrated in this House repeatedly.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The member has made the statement and he accepts the responsibility for it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The record will bear it out. There is an account kept of all accounts paid and the record will bear out my statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have given a tremendous amount of free cancer treatment. I don't mean by that — and nobody over here ever claims — that we have achieved a point of perfection in any service; but we have given tremendous services in this direction that never were given before, and countless numbers of people are presently being cared for and great numbers of cancers are being discovered and cured in the early stages, and others are being relieved. Only last year we had, in Regina, through the clinic here, 1870 new cases; and in Saskatoon, 1896 — a total of 3766 new cases came in, last year, to these cancer clinics. Besides that, we reviewed, in Regina, 5769, and in Saskatoon, 4426; so there were 10,915 review cases in the clinics. I admit

it costs money. I mentioned, at the start, that we were accused of being extravagant. If it is wrong to give people this form of protection, then we are extravagant; but, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology, nor does anyone on this side of the House make any apology for anything that we do that can give some assistance to people who are afflicted with such a terrible thing as cancer. We only wish we could extend those services to the other things that afflict people to the same extent – and we will, given time.

We also carry on, in our Department, a division of Health Education. I know that people will say – “There again, you are spending money – for what? – for education;” and I have heard that so much all my life, Mr. Speaker. As a little boy I remember – one of the first things I remember is the minister of the church that my family went to, going to gaol, because he dared to oppose a measure that was coming to introduce, in my province, compulsory education for children, and he went to gaol for one day and was a martyr. All through the years people have claimed that any type of education that costs money and can’t show a definite profit on the balance sheet in dollars and cents, is a waste of money. I don’t believe that. I can remember a time, in this province, during the ’thirties when we valued schoolteachers at far less per month or per year than we did managers of liquor stores and beer stores. They brought in a profit; — teachers didn’t. But I never took that view and we don’t in the Department now, nor does the Government, and we have a division of Health Education.

The whole purpose of that division is to carry on, carry out and promote throughout the country the very best of information and education in the schools and among the adults, education pertaining to health and the treatment of ill health when preventive measures have not worked. We don’t believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is an extravagance. We believe that that is a good sound investment, and if it never pays off on the balance sheet in profits in dollars and cents, it will pay off in healthier boys and girls growing up into the kind of stalwart sons and gentle maidens that we want in Saskatchewan, and throughout Canada.

We recognize, also, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who are still destitute in some areas of this province. It is fairly rapidly being wiped out in the northern areas by the excellent work of my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, and his policies, coupled with the work done by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Education and what help we can give; but in that relief to destitutes, we do say that that money is certainly not wasted, and that it gives a great deal of assistance to people in that area who otherwise may not have access to any kind of health agencies such as they should have. We operate several small hospitals in that northern country. We have arrangements to bring people who require better hospitalization out by plane or other means, and we attend to them and see that they get as good medical services as it is possible for us to provide. And again, we make no apologies for the money that is spent in that direction.

Nor do we, Mr. Speaker, make any apologies for the money that is spent on our prevention of blindness, which applies mostly to children of families who are in difficult circumstances. Only last year, we supplied glasses to 165 children who might, otherwise, not have had glasses, and we saw that necessary eye operations were given to 20 of these children. Only 20 little specks of humanity, Mr. Speaker – and maybe, I don’t know, somebody can say they weren’t worth the money that was spent on them; but I say, and I think every right-minded man and woman in this country would say, it

**February 27, 1951**

is well worth the money that was spent to give those little children that opportunity to grow up with good eyesight and, therefore, better health.

We have been told by speakers on the other side, by newspaper reports and so on, that we are centralizing things, and they are going to decentralize. Well now, Mr. Speaker, there is no centralization. As I go along with this talk, I am going to refer, on several occasions, to the decentralization; but for now I just want to refer to the decentralization of public health services, which we are, as rapidly as possible, decentralizing out into the Health Regions. The province has already been divided, geographically, into Health Regions. In those Health Regions are a number of urban and rural municipalities, and the people in those urban and rural municipalities know now that they may organize themselves, elect their own district health councils, and their own board of directors for that Health Region, and administer a public health programme; and they may add to that public health programme, a medical care programme, or a dental care programme, complete or partially complete, in the provision of health services. We don't govern those institutions, Mr. Speaker, there is no power centralized here. We say to those people: if you want to undertake public health measures, then we are prepared to support you, financially. You pay one-third of the cost, and we will pay the other two-thirds of the cost, and we are doing that presently in seven Health Regions. The latest one to be organized is in the progressive area that is represented by my hon. friend on my right – Prince Albert.

That was not done with an imposition. That was done after a delegation from there came in and talked to us about it, after we had met the health committee of the council, after our people had gone up there and talked to them about it, after they had talked about it among the municipalities and the villages around there, and after the villages, having discussed it, sent in letters to me, as the Minister of the Department, asking for the region to be set up and for them to be included in it. When that was done, and all the arrangements and all the information that they wanted was given to them, they then decided themselves they wanted to go ahead with it. That region was set up and is presently in operation; and that is the way they will all come into being. Nobody will ever go out from this Government or this Department and say to any area, "You will have a Health Region." All we have said is that the boundaries are there – if you want it we will help you establish it; we will help you, financially, when you get going, and the more services you decide to give the more financial and technical and personnel help we will be prepared to give you. You will run it after it is done. Health Region No. 1, which has a very complete medical care programme, operates on their own and we make certain grants and assistance and give them whatever help we can that they ask for. I would like to make it very clear that there is no centralization insofar as Health Regions are concerned.

I want to mention a very important division of the Department – that is the Nursing Division. We believe that it is necessary not only to have a Health Education Division devoted to assembling all the information and sending it out by whatever method it can be done, through the medium of picture shows and public meetings and pamphlets and personal contacts, and so on; but we believe in carrying the practical work right out to the families and the people, and because of that our division of nurses is directed to that end, both in the Regions and in the districts that are not presently organized into Regions. I want to say that it has been my privilege and my

duty, of course, to read the reports coming in from these public health nurses who cover this province, and I only wish we had twice as many as we have, and I wouldn't consider – if we had the money, if the province could afford it; I wouldn't consider that twice as many as we have would be too many. And I would say the same thing about our Division of Sanitation.

Mr. Speaker, the more people we have who are getting the population acquainted with the preventive side of medicine, the quicker we can work the doctors of this country out of a job. That is the ultimate aim of any public health programme – to have a country so healthy, where everybody so well understands the nature of living healthily that they won't require doctor and hospital services which are so expensive. And so, in our Division of Sanitation the people are highly trained, and undergoing continuous training, by very competent officials which makes them able to do the type of sanitation inspection, in looking after the food supplies particularly meat and milk and water, the disposal of garbage, and the handling of food in public eating places. Mr. Speaker, it costs money to do all these things, but if they keep a certain number of people from becoming ill because of the work done, then I believe, it could be shown on a balance sheet as a profit in dollars and cents; but whether it can or not, as long as it provides the kind of information and the kind of service that eliminates to some extent some of the things that breed disease, then I say the money is not spent uselessly; it is not extravagant, it is well and sensibly spent.

The same thing, in our communicable disease control. I could go on endlessly in that field dealing with communicable disease control, where the immunization of children is carried on by public health nurses, and where a constant check is kept up. True, it has not eliminated all communicable diseases. I want to point out that vaccination for smallpox is a very old, established custom now, and rarely do you find anyone who will oppose it. So much so that people are inclined to think now, because we never hear of a smallpox epidemic, it never could happen again. If, however, constant educational work and constant publicity work were not carried on and people became careless and did not vaccinate their children, we could just as easily, in a few years time, have another epidemic of smallpox, as bad as we ever had before, because the germ has not been destroyed. People have been protected against it by vaccination, but the germ of smallpox has not been destroyed. It is still there; just the same as you could have scabies and be lousy, if you lived under the conditions under which people get lousy. You can be just as lousy today, or as full of scabies today, as you could have back in World War I, and I have taken many seam-squirrels out of my shirt and burned them over a candle. The same thing can be said of the other immunization programmes.

The same thing in our Nutrition Division. I want to remind my friends opposite that if they think our Nutrition Division is expensive, it was during the war, under Liberal administration at Ottawa, that we began to get nutrition-conscious – and properly so. I am making no criticism of them for doing it. It is one of the things I commend them for and I commend them for many things and this is one of them. During the war they became nutrition-conscious – good eating habits – why? because under the stress of war we need healthy people. It had been discovered during the early days of the war that Canada was not a country of such robust health as people had thought

**February 27, 1951**

beforehand, because under the harsh eye of physical examinations prior to recruitment, there were found a great many young Canadians who were not fit to serve in the Armed Forces; and so the Government – properly so – started in to see that those who did get in were properly fed so they could serve the country in the capacity which was no necessary at that time, and which they did so well.

We have followed that up, Mr. Speaker. We have followed that example and we carry on a Division of Nutrition with work in that field, endeavouring to get people to realize the need for good eating habits in the hope that, as people grow with those habits ingrained in them, many of the troubles we have experienced in the past will be eliminated and people will hardly know how it happened – because we will have established those habits.

Another matter I want to mention – it is not a serious thing, but it is the matter of V.D. Saskatchewan is enjoying a very good reputation in the small incidence of this disease; but again, this is a disease that if not constantly watched, if the contacts are not discovered and brought in for treatment, it can be spread and become a menace, both in the minor and in the major aspects of that disease. We carry on a V.D. Control programme which constantly endeavours to discover and to care for those who have become afflicted and to find those who may not know they are afflicted and give them the attention they need.

Accounting is one of the things that is very important in any business, Mr. Speaker, and what business is greater than the business of accounting for the population of the country. And the Vital Statistics Division is the branch which does the actual provincial bookkeeping for national and for provincial and local affairs. Since I have come into the Department I have made it a point to inquire from those who are competent to judge these things, whether we are doing a good and an efficient job in our Division of Vital Statistics in the Department, and I am informed by people who spend practically all their waking hours thinking of these things, because people that get into it apparently love it – I don't know whether I would like it or not; but those that are in it surely speak enthusiastically about how they can register births and marriages and all the rest of the things, and they tell me that our division is second to none of this continent.

I can say the same thing about our Laboratory Services. There is another thing, I suppose, someone could look at and could say: “Look at the expensive set-up you have there, and look at the amount of money it costs you to run it, when all you need is a little girl with a test tube somewhere in a back corner and she could test all the things you want tested.” Mr. Speaker, that isn't so. Our laboratories do a tremendous amount of work. We are even doing work at the present time for the Armed Forces; but in the main, the principal work that our laboratories have to do is to detect those things that militate against the health of the people, from samples that are sent in by various officials of the Department, and even other Departments. Not only that, but we give a great service to physicians, and to hospitals, and to other smaller laboratories who require the type of service that we can give; and because of that we are recognized as a very important and integral part of the whole health set-up in this province, and have been highly complimented by a gentleman from Ottawa, who comes out occasionally and looks



over these provincial institutions to see in what way they are giving service to the public, and in what way he could recommend improved services. We are rather proud of our laboratories. I might have said, also, that we do quite a bit of work for my friend, the Minister of Agriculture and his Department, in a number of ways.

In the matter of child health, I mentioned one or two other things a little while ago; but we have other matters in connection with child health that are also important and have to be considered. There are the crippled children, of course, and the polio-afflicted children – the cerebral-palsy and polio – and the immature births. Last year, through our Division, we supplied 79 incubators to different hospitals and considerable consultation in the care of infants born somewhat before the normal time who, therefore, require extra care. Not only that, but we have given home supervision care to 61 children who are victims of some crippling trouble, and also, in December, in the last month of the year, we had 26 in the clinic over here at the Red Cross wing, and besides that had diagnosed 116 children and had given the kind of advice or assistance to their parents – or in the clinic, as the case required – to help those children. We have also treated a number of polio children and others. Our Child Health Division, I believe, is doing a very excellent job in training the people of the province, the parents and so on, in how to look after them. It costs a little money, Mr. Speaker, but I suppose anyone could say: “Well, they got along before you spent the money.” Sure they did – and we can all remember people who grew up crippled and unhappy because they had no training to give them the opportunity to overcome the crippling effects, or made no effort to cure it, and the result is some lived very unhappy lives. Well, I believe the money spent in trying to alleviate some of that suffering, even if only partially successful, is money well spent and no humanitarian can properly say that it is money extravagantly spent.

I want to go into another fairly large division. I can remember, and all those of my age here can remember, when people who became mentally ill were referred to as “loonies”, as “nuts”. They took them to the “nut-house”, or the “loony-bin” – or if you were going to be thoroughly respectable, to the asylum”. We are learning now, and learning very rapidly all across the country and particularly so in this province, that people who are afflicted with a mental illness are just as unfortunate as people who are afflicted with ulcers of the stomach, or a broken leg, or have something else wrong with them – some disease or something else; and in a great many cases, these people can be cured. There are a great many cases in mental hospitals, today, who, had they been living in a period when the consciousness of this was as extant as it is at the present time, would not now be suffering from a mental illness; they would have been cured and out into society. Now I am not going to blame anyone for that, any more than I am going to blame myself when I was a young man, for not recognizing that; but at least we are learning as we go along, and presently our hospitals, in Saskatchewan, which care for the mentally ill are regarded very highly by people who come to see them. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has done a tremendous amount in improving the conditions at these hospitals. No longer do we depend on anybody who can be picked up.

Now, there are those who will say, “People used to get jobs in the mental hospitals because of who they knew, not what they knew.” I am not going to make that charge, Mr. Speaker, I don’t know for sure if it is

true or not; it may have been in some cases, it might have been in all cases. The point is that they were not chosen because of what they knew; they were not trained to know very much about it. People who are mentally ill require nursing just the same as people who are physically ill, and the fact that a person is mentally ill and can still walk around and do things that their mental illness prompts them to do (which may not be in conformity with established customs) does not alter the fact that they require someone there to see that those conditions are taken care of, that they are directed right and cured if possible. So we have introduced a system of training people. Now we have psychiatric nurses in training, just the same as everybody believes it is right to train girls and some boys in general hospital nursing of physically sick people – give them a 3-year course and turn them out, after they have been thoroughly trained in it, as registered nurses. So we now train them with a 3-year course to look after mentally-ill people. We recruit a class every year and they spend that year taking lectures and doing work in the wards, and learning what they can in one year, and they are examined at the end of the year. If they pass those examinations, they go into their second-year period, and the same thing – training and advanced lectures until the second examination, and then the third year still, advanced training and lectures and if they pass at the end of the third year, they are certified as psychiatric nurses. Now that is the kind of people who are staffing our mental hospitals at the present time, as rapidly as we can train them.

I want to remind the House, also, that it does cost more money to do the job this way, and I want to remind you of something else – it costs more money to treat working people fairly. We pay the people – not only the psychiatric nurses and the professional staff, but all the workers in the hospitals, at the present time in these hospitals I am speaking of at North Battleford and the two at Weyburn; we pay them decent wages. They are no longer expected to work for substandard wages. I want to remind the House of an answer to a question that was given a short time ago about the number of people that there are employed. The first question was, “What was the number of members of staff employed at the Saskatchewan hospital at Weyburn, as at July 1, 1944?” And the answer was “329.” “And what was the number of members as at January 1, 1950?” The answer was “499”. Now, “What was the average salary of ward nurses prior to July 1, 1944?” The answer – “\$83.57.” “What is the average salary of the ward nurse at this date?” The answer is \$167.24 – an increase of \$84.07. Hence, more people are engaged, who are more highly trained and more adequately paid, and, consequently, the patients receive competent care and treatment. And in the matter of hours – hours reduced from July 1, 1944, when they were working 72 hours a week to the later date when they are working 44 hours a week. Now the same conditions applied at the other institutions. Someone may say that is extravagance – maybe we could have kept people working 72 hours a week and paid them \$87 a month; but they would not have given the kind of service because we could not have got the kind of people who would give the type of care that these mentally-ill people have a right to have, to try and rehabilitate them, or give them the kind of care they should have if they can’t be rehabilitated, because they are human beings, just as human as any other of the people who are fortunate enough to be walking around. Their treatment cannot be left to people who are working at substandard wages and who are overworked. They have to be treated by people who are trained to treat them, who are paid decent wages to keep them interested and competent in their work, and work enough hours so they can work those hours efficiently.

There are other reasons why it costs money though. Because of the release of price controls – I would love to read all this and put it on the record, because all the way through this file, Mr. Speaker, is a statement of the increases in the cost of operating those hospitals. Nearly everybody in this Assembly, I believe, is married and has operated a household, and they know what it costs to operate a house and how the cost of living is going up. Let me point out then that in mental hospitals as well as the general hospitals, almost the same things that are required in a home are required, namely, bedding and food and heat and light and water and the other services, plus the kind of services that ill people have to have. And because of the release of the price controls and the rapid increase in the costs of all those things, we find it more expensive to look after these mentally-ill people than it should be. However, in spite of all that, we are still able to effect some economies. I noticed, when going through my estimates, the Treasury Board were quite pleased with the way we had established our work for the coming year in order not to over-run the amount of money that could be allotted to us.

We have improved these institutions, too, tremendously. I want to point out another thing. There are not very many mental hospitals in Canada that have any rating whatsoever as places where psychiatrists can be trained and certified as competent psychiatrists, but we have them. For instance, the Monroe wing – Dr. Stokes, who is the chairman of the advisory committee to the Royal College, is satisfied that in a very short time the Monroe wing will be rated as a training centre which will give psychiatrists credit for the entire four years of training. As a matter of fact, he has submitted that recommendation to those who are competent to certify these institutions for that type of training.

I want to point out this, too. Only two mental hospitals in Canada, Mr. Speaker, have been approved for a three-year training, that is, training of psychiatrists. Those are the Saskatchewan hospitals at Weyburn and at North Battleford. That will give you some idea of the rating we are getting. We are very happy about this rating, not because it is a feather in our cap, but because we are glad our institutions are improving to the point where they are giving the kind of service that they are designed to give. Now I want to say, also, that in the two-year approval, of the balance of the 40-odd hospitals in Canada, nine had been approved for two-year training. Our two have been approved for three-year training; our Monroe wing is to be approved for a four-year training course. Of the other 40-odd institutions in Canada, only nine have been approved for a two-year training. Now, Mr. Speaker, it costs money to run these things; but anybody who believes that mentally-ill people should be treated properly, with the very best that science can devise, will surely not quarrel with the money that it costs to provide the type of institutions for our mentally-ill people that will result in the recognition that we have been given.

I want to mention another thing. It was mentioned here, the other day, by someone on this side of the House that, in the mental hospitals, previous to the coming in of this Government, the treatment of the patients was not as good as it should have been, and a question arose from the other side – “Was someone over here suggesting or intimating that patients were not properly treated prior to the coming in of this Government?” Well, I am going to make the assertion, Mr. Speaker, that they were not treated properly at that time. I am going to give some reasons why I say this. In 1944, there

was one physician for every 344 patients in our mental institutions. At the end of last year, we had one physician for every 178 patients. Anybody knows that a doctor, or anyone attending people, can give far better attention to 178 people than he can if he is responsible for 344. I want to point out another thing; I mentioned nutrition in our public health programme, a while ago. That is important in a mental institution. These people have bodies; these bodies must be fed; they should be fed on the right kind of food. But in 1944, Mr. Speaker, there were no dieticians in these places. Now we have a dietician in each one of these institutions. These people are human beings. They have teeth with which to eat food; and if they cannot grind the food they do not digest it properly; therefore they need dental service. In 1944, the dental service consisted of a part-time dentist on a half-day week basis. Now we have a dentist in each institution. In 1944, there was no occupational therapist; in 1950, there are three qualified supervisors of occupational therapy.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to remind the House that these people are human beings, are amenable and responsive to good treatment, and are responsive, also, to training when somebody competent to train them is there.

In 1944, patients were brought to the hospitals chiefly by the R.C.M.P. Now, starting in 1945, each institution has an ambulance and all patients are brought there now in the ambulance, accompanied by a nurse. In 1944, there was no provision for follow-up of discharged patients; in 1950, there is a qualified social worker in each institution, and this social worker has the assistance of all our public health nurses in the province. These public health nurses receive a one-month orientation course so that they, themselves, on top of their public health training, will have some idea how to fit in and fill the bill when a mental case comes under their attention.

I want to point out another thing, to again substantiate the statement that I have made, and I am making the statement, not the suggestion. I make the statement that prior to the advent of this Government, of this administration, the patients up there were not treated properly, and anyone who wishes to go and inquire of some of the old-time officials in the North Battleford hospital can check the statement I am going to make now. For several years prior to the coming in of this Government, patients of a very deteriorated type had been kept in a building which had originally been constructed as a workshop. Now, as I said, they were very deteriorated patients – did not know how to take care of themselves in any way whatsoever; required constant supervision but they were not getting it, and they were herded together like sheep in this filthy old building that was built for a workshop. The present superintendent up there thought that something could be done about it, because he is a competent man, and he arranged to move these people and put them in charge of competent nursing staff, and to give them the type of training to teach them the cleanliness and habits that they should have, and I would like anyone to go up there and see that same place now. Then the building which they had been in, which was nothing but a ramshed or a bullpen, was cleaned up and now is inhabited by trusty patients – patients who have open doors, who have the run of the grounds, with a certain amount of supervision. That is the difference between the type of treatment given then and now.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that those examples which I have given are

the kind that will show anyone who believes in treating human beings as they should be treated, to prove to that kind of people that if it does cost money, and because a lot of the extra cost is on account of the release of price controls, but in spite of that, this Government believes in humanity first, and is endeavouring, as far as possible within its powers, to give those people the care they are entitled to.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there is over-crowding at these places; there is a shortage of professional technical staff in spite of all our efforts. However, it is also possible to catch some of these incipient mentally-ill people before they become ill enough to need to go to a mental hospital. We have the McNeill clinic in Saskatoon which gives consultative and diagnostic service and out-patient treatment to children. It does not cover the whole province, it does not look after everybody; but it is an experiment, we can say, or a trial, and it is doing an excellent job in discovering and helping to cure some of these people who otherwise might eventually have to be cared for in an institution for the rest of their lives. We have the part-time clinics at North Battleford, at Swift Current, at Weyburn, at Yorkton, where there is a clinic held a half-day every week; and because of that, a number of people come into them and are discovered in incipient stages of a mental illness, and they are given the kind of advice or treatment which can help to cure them. If they are children, the public health nurses and the others who have had some training, the teacher psychologists deal with the teachers in the schools where the children are, and with the parents, and in every way do what can be done, first, to see that the incipient development does not grow and renders a child or a person eventually mentally ill; or second, see that they go to a place for treatment where it can be given. Surely nobody, Mr. Speaker, will call that spending money extravagantly.

We are still very short of room. I sincerely wish (as I am going to mention further on in another part of my address) that the Government at Ottawa who frequently make statements in the press out here about the great help they are giving in the way of construction and other grants, would see their way clear to make some grants to provide auxiliary and ancillary services to these institutions. We have one institution where the living quarters of the nurses are certainly nothing to be commended. It is the best we can do; but undoubtedly we need money to build, and some grants from the Federal Government for that purpose would be very useful, and in many other ways too.

I am not going to deal any further with mental hospitals, except to say that prior to the coming in of this Government, the mental defectives were taking up room in the hospitals where the mentally ill were being treated and housed and which were consequently very overcrowded. This Government acquired the airport buildings at Weyburn and set up what is called a training school, because some of these people who are mentally defective can be trained not only to do things with their heads, but with their hands. They can be taught a variety of handicrafts. They can even be taught something in the nature of trades, or domestic work, or things like that. And because of that, the training school is operating in the airport at Weyburn, and relieving, to the extent of about 800 patients at the present time, the congestion at the hospitals where active treatment is taking place.

**February 27, 1951**

Now we are building a training school at Moose Jaw, and I hope we do get it built before the Air Force of this country reclaim the airport buildings at Weyburn, because we will be in a difficult position if they should compel us to vacate. I hardly think they would do that, and we will certainly get the training school done as rapidly as material, money and men are available, in order to accommodate them. I want to point out that, until this Government came in, there was no provision made for that type of training school, and these mental defectives were mixed up with people who could be cured or partially cured, because they were mentally ill. Now they are segregated by themselves as much as we can. Unfortunately, we have not got room for all defectives and there is a waiting list.

We carry, also, in the Department of Public Health, a very necessary little division called the Library, where the necessary kinds of all the books and publications are carried for the use of the people in the Department, and who are associated in work with the Department, and others who require that kind of thing. I make no apologies whatsoever for the expenditures on that, nor do I for the Air Ambulance. I know people have said the Air Ambulance is very expensive; but I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I will dare any political leader in this country to go out before the public and say he is going to abolish the Air Ambulance. We have given a tremendous amount of service with that Air Ambulance to people: last year, 732 flights were flown, a patient in every flight representing 732 patients, 210,000 miles, and 1,541 hours were flown. All these things were done because somebody, in a responsible position called up and said, "There is a person here ill or hurt who requires a rapid transit to a hospital", and the Air Ambulance was on the job.

Mr. Speaker, if it hadn't been for this Air Ambulance, some of those people might be hopeless cripples today, some of them might be dead, some of them might be invalids for the rest of their lives, but presently are healthy because they had that rapid service. Does anyone here dare say that they would prefer to save the money that was spent to save those people, rather than give them that service? I hope, when our estimates are on, some of these things I am saying will be remembered by people.

The same thing in our Division of Hospital Administration and Standards, Mr. Speaker. I heard it said from the other side the other day, that there is too much red-tape, and I am going to deal with that a little bit later, more extensively. I want to point out that our Division of Hospital Administration and Standards is very highly thought of by the Hospital Association and the administrators of hospitals in this province, because there they can get information, there they can find out, either by visiting the Division, or by visits to the hospitals by the officials of the division, ways that they can operate more efficiently and more effectively and more economically – and every hospital board worth its salt wants to do that very thing. This division gives them that kind of information, and is directed by a man who has had a lot of experience, both as a private practitioner and in the public health and in the hospital fields. We make no apologies for the expense of that division, Mr. Speaker. That division probably saves this province a great deal of money in hospital bills, which are, in spite of all we can do, because of the release of price controls, giving us plenty of concern. It can't be dealt with, as mentioned by my friend from Humboldt (Mr. Loehr), and I will deal with that later on.

I want to deal pretty extensively with the construction grants. There have been things said about that, both in newspapers and in speeches, that require a reply and a very extensive reply, and it is going to be given.

On top of those things, besides the Health Region No. 1, there are a number of municipalities and areas comprised of municipalities and parts or whole of local improvement districts where there are medical or surgical care or medical and surgical care programmes, and are called municipal doctors' schemes, and we give a great deal of assistance to those people to encourage and assist them financially, in the making up of contracts, and in other ways.

Now, we are not a static outfit. Some of these people that I mentioned in the early part of my address who are referred to by the "Estevan Mercury" as "youthful so-called experts" are, as I said before, not youthful so-called experts, but they are mature and able experts, and they are never static, Mr. Speaker. They are continually trying to find new ways of providing the kind of service that will carry out the policies of this Government and of this party I represent, in the field of humanitarian care of people and they do it with the most convenient and the least expense possible. We are presently considering, in fact we are making provision to give assistance to a pilot plan of home nursing similar to what is carried on in one or two areas in the United States and, I believe, one other place in Canada. There are a number of people who could be cared for, who don't require any active nursing and medical care in the hospitals, and still are not ambulatory or couldn't be cared for in a home for the infirm even if there were sufficient of these homes, but who can be taken care of within the confines of the home where they belong. We are hoping to assist in developing a pilot plan whereby nurses can give the type of care in the homes that otherwise would have to be given in the hospital at a great deal more expense and with not nearly as much satisfaction.

These things that I have mentioned just now are the kind of things that my advisers are discussing and thinking of and recommending to me, which I, in turn bring to the Cabinet to see if we can find practical ways of reducing costs.

Our medical health care – of course everybody knows about that. I know that in the early days of this Government, when it first started out, maybe innocently believing in the goodwill and the good word of the Federal Government at Ottawa when it made its proposals and promises in the green books, in 1945 and 1946; this Government, I say, maybe innocently, believed that that government intended to carry out its promises and lay the groundwork for a health insurance programme in this province. They were let down very severely, and as I go on I will show that I don't believe, and I think when I produce the evidence here, I don't think anybody else can believe, that the Federal Government ever has any intention of introducing a medical or a health insurance programme; but suffice it to say that this Government did lay the groundwork, and they said the first people to apply this to are those that require it the most – old people, old-age pensioners, blind people, mothers who have families and no supporter, and social aid cases. They instituted the care for these people in the medical field, and it becomes the responsibility of our Medical Services

**February 27, 1951**

Division in the Department of Health to see that those services are provided, and they are. They cost over a million dollars a year – and is there anybody in this House now, who will dare get up and say he will abolish it, if ever he gets over on this side of the House? Is there anybody listening here, now, who leads another party who would dare say we should save that money at the expense of the old people?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There are no strangers in the galleries.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I don't know if anybody is listening at all, over there, Mr. Speaker. It is up to them. I can give them information – only God can give them understanding.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Don't get too mad!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I can understand them not wanting to listen, Mr. Speaker, I can understand them not liking to have to sit back and realize that somebody actually is doing the things that they said they would do, after election, but never did.

I have here a little picture, and the picture is of a father holding the hand of his little girl. The little girl has spent a year in the hospital here in Regina. The little girl would still be on her back, with a leg that never would have provided her with locomotion, had she not been a beneficiary of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services plan. A healthy, pretty little girl, the same as all of us hope our daughters and granddaughters will be when they grow up; but she wouldn't have been that way had she not been a beneficiary. She would have been a hopeless cripple today; but now she can run around and play ball and play with her dolls and do the other things that normal, healthy little girls can do. I am proud of examples of this kind every time I see one. This is only one. I could cite many. I am just citing that one as an illustration of the kind of work that is done.

I want to mention something about Saskatchewan Hospital Services plan, and I know, and everybody else knows, that the cost of operating the Hospital Services plan has increased – anybody with any brains at all should know why. Over half the increase — \$1 1/2 million last year, 1950 – can be attributed directly to the fact of the increased cost of living, the release of price controls by the Federal Government. Without any regard, Mr. Speaker, for the welfare of people the Government at Ottawa allowed the cost of living to go up so that it makes it more difficult all the time to provide the kind of service that this Government is trying to provide in the field of hospital services. But we are giving them, and intend to continue to give them as long as it is possible to do so. I want to emphasize that point – one-half the increased cost in operating our hospitals was due directly to the rising cost of living, to the rising cost of everything we have to do. When I blame the Federal Government I have a perfectly good right to do it, Mr. Speaker. I want to read three items from this paper right here – one from “Maclean's” magazine, which is a quotation from Mr. MacKenzie King, who was the Prime Minister of Canada in 1945. And these are the words that “Maclean's” magazine says he said:



“Immediately after the war the dangers of inflation may be even greater than they are now. The Canadian people can’t afford to sacrifice the benefits of wartime stabilization by relaxing controls too soon”.

An implicit, or a tacit promise, rather, there, that if the Liberals were re-elected, then of course they would retain price controls. They went further and made a definite promise – in national advertising – paid for. In the “Halifax Herald”, dated June 5, 1945, this was a statement over the Liberal name – National Liberal advertising:

“Consumer goods soon to be available at 1941 prices.”

I ask anybody who is listening if there is any relationship, today, between the prices of things you have to buy in a home or a hospital and the prices of the same goods, in 1941. That was a Liberal promise; and again, in the same advertisement:

“Price ceilings. The purchasing power of your dollars maintained by price ceilings, under careful Liberal management”.

When I say they are responsible, Mr. Speaker, I have that and countless other pieces of evidence similar to that to substantiate the statement.

Now I will give you some illustrations of what has happened in our hospitals to substantiate the statement again. In 1945, there was still price control in effect. At that time you could buy a pressure sterilizer for \$997; today, when a hospital needs one, they have to pay \$1,250. In 1945 you could buy an obstetrical table for \$845; today you pay \$1,483, and you have to have them, if you are going to have babies. An operating table, in 1945, cost \$1,137; today it costs \$2,000. Rubber gloves were \$4.80 a dozen, in 1945; now they are \$6.50. Syringes were \$9.00 a dozen and now they are \$15.00. Needles were \$14 a gross; now they are \$22.80 a gross. Clinical thermometers were \$33 a gross; now they are \$54 a gross. Sutures were \$35 a gross; now they are \$57. Absorbent cotton was 75 cents a pound; now it is \$1.15 a pound. Gauze cost \$7 a bolt in 1945; now it is \$11.50. Bandages were \$3 a gross; now they are \$4.50.

Now we go into other things such as drugs, and textiles and woollens and plumbing and those things that go into a hospital. Using the 1945 index of 100, drugs are up to 188 – nearly twice the cost; textiles and woollens with an index of 100, are up to 154; cottons that were 100 are up to 167, and hospital plumbing from 100 to 108. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that our hospital costs are going up? When you buy those supplies for a hospital they have to be charged to somebody. The Hospital Services plan, being the insurance plan, pays for that service, and as those prices go up we are caught in that whirlpool of inflation and have to meet it – and on top of that building costs have gone up 40 per cent!

**February 27, 1951**

There are other reasons for the cost going up, and they are good reasons. There is better equipment in hospitals now; you get a better service, and when you get a better service from a hospital, obviously it is necessary to charge more because it costs more to provide the things necessary to give that better service and the better care that goes with it. Now, that means just that, when you have better service and better care in a hospital and the prices go up, the individual who gets a Hospital Services Card and becomes a beneficiary and is therefore insured, is insured against a greater risk than he was insured against when the costs were lower; for if he himself had to pay those prices, today, many people would have to go without hospitalization, they couldn't have it, so his card gives him greater insurance. Now let me illustrate what I mean by that. In 1947, the individual average case cost \$46.66; in 1948, the cost – partly because of the rising costs, partly because of the better service – was \$58.86; in 1949, \$60.76, and last year, 1950, \$67.67. I will put it another way. In 1947 the plan paid 420 bills – that is 420 people had hospital bills of over \$500; in 1949, it paid 991 bills of over \$500; now last year, looking over the accounts I see 50 of the very highest ones were ranging from a low in that 50 or \$3,025, to a high of \$7,353. There aren't very many individuals in this province, outside of a few on Babbitt row and a few others who are friends of those across the House who make all the money, who can afford to pay \$7,000 in hospital bills. The great rank and file of farmers and workers in this province could never have had service like that had it not been for the insurance plan. We make no excuses at all, nor any apologies for the increased costs that are attributable to better care, but we give condemnation for the causes of the rising costs because of the release of price controls, which can be attributed entirely to the Liberal Party who are in power in Ottawa.

I want to make one other observation about increased costs. If it had not been for our very close association and co-operation with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association – that is an association of all the hospitals; if it had not been for the understanding and the desire, the warm desire, on their part to help to make this scheme work, the cost would have been even greater, because the Hospital Association and hospital administrators, if they were inimical to the plan, could have done a great deal of harm to it, and thank God they haven't done that. They have done everything they can to assist us in making the plan successful, because they see the value of it, because they are human people and they want a plan instituted in this country and kept going that will provide the type of service that the people should have. We are extremely proud of the fact that both the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Conference and the Canadian Hospital Council have shown the utmost sympathy, interest and co-operative attitude to our Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan.

There is one other factor that does increase the cost of hospitalization, and that is the element of abuse that does come in. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who, in debate, quoted a statement made by Dr. Mott, the acting Deputy Minister of this Department, which statement was made, by the way, at the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. When this whole matter of the type of payment and the abuses that everybody knows goes on, and nobody tries to hide, have crept in, he was quite proper in making that statement. I made the statement, also. He did it with the full authority of his position as a responsible official of the

Department, and he was right in his statement. There are abuses to the hospital scheme. I don't know why, but there seems to be a certain number of people who seem to feel that the minute they pay a \$5 or \$10 premium on something they must go out and not only get the full value of that amount back, but all the rest they can get. Fortunately, there are not very many people like that. I know Howard Scott used to say: "Everybody is either a sucker or a chiseller and all the suckers hope, some day, to be chisellers."

I don't think we are all like that, but there certainly are a few people who sometimes feel that, in their past life they have been made suckers of, and now here is a chance to chisel, "Let me at it!" There are enough of them, though, to cause concern, and because of that, it has become necessary for us to institute the new system of paying hospitals, which I propose to deal with.

I want to mention, also, that this new system of paying hospitals has the full support of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and I want also to say that again the "Estevan Mercury" is wrong. I have here an editorial written in the "Estevan Mercury" on February 22, 1951. I still say that the editor of that paper, to say the least, must be an extremely immature individual. I would almost say that the proper place for him was in the institution at the airport in Weyburn.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Very charitable, I must say.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I don't know how anyone who would write the editorial I quoted a while ago regarding the immaturity of the officials of the Health Department, and then could write this one, could ever be trained to be anything else but one of those people that populate the training school. This is the most uncharitable document that a person could write. I have no reason to be charitable to a man like that. There is not a word of truth in what he says, and I am going to read it to show you where it is false. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker:

"Undoubtedly, in an effort to cut down their expenditures, and possibly as well to make the hospitalization plan show a capitalistic profit, the Health Services Planning Commission, for all practical purposes, has ordered St. Joseph's Hospital at Estevan, and likely the other hospitals in the province, to reduce their daily admission of patients.

"The order is couched in diplomatic phrases, such as 'submit a budget', based on drastically reduced hospital bed bases, but it still amounts to an order, and come what may, the order probably will stand.

"In the light of the cost of the hospitalization plan, the order is understandable to a degree, but only to a degree, and only from that lone point of view. The fact that such an order has been issued is directly opposed to the purpose of the hospital services plan, as it was explained at great length by all Government speakers and proponents, prior to its institution.

“Then the hospitalization plan was hailed by the socialist party as one of the major items of social legislation for the good of the people, for the benefit of downtrodden humanity, and a service to those who otherwise cannot afford it.

“Other similar phrases, probably concocted by the C.C.F. Party’s hard-working publicity office and issued to party speakers with instructions to be used generously, as required, praised the hospitalization plan to the skies, and it has resulted in the hospital care for a great many people who needed it, and who otherwise would not have been able to take advantage of the helpful benefits of hospital care.

“How then, does the Health Services Planning Commission justify its current actions in demanding reduced hospital admissions? Reduced hospital admissions by order from the Commission simply means an operation of the plan in reverse, by which people will be kept out of hospitals, instead of being admitted.

“The purpose of the plan and its administration in this respect do not seem to be consistent. The action of the Commission also has another aspect. In effect, the order from the Commission is another way of saying that the doctors, who have ordered patients to the hospital, just did not know that about one-third of the patients did not need hospital care. The Health Services Planning Commission, therefore, seems to have adopted the attitude that it knows better than the doctors who should be admitted to hospitals.

“If the move is one designed to save money for the province, perhaps a better place to start would be in some other place.”

Now then, I want to deal with several aspects of that. As I say, that is an entirely untrue article, and the man who wrote it either knew it was wrong, and therefore only one name can be applied; or else he has no sense, and should do what I suggested a while ago.

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort):** — And what is the name that you would apply to him?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The statement is a lie. My hon. friend, being a school teacher, knows the right word to apply. In the first place, the Health Services Planning Commission, or no other agency of this Department, has issued any such orders; whether they say ‘couched in diplomatic phrases’ or not, it is not an order. I have already stated that this matter was thoroughly discussed with the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. The hospital board at Estevan know this and I do not believe it would be a party to this kind of thing. If the editor did not know, he should have found out. The Hospital Association know the new method and agreed to it. There is no order.

Now then I want to come down to the other part. He says “the Health Services Planning Commission therefore seems to have adopted the attitude that it knows better than the doctors who should be admitted to hospital.” There are a lot of doctors on the North American continent; there are a lot of people who engage in study of health matters; there are a lot of those people in Saskatchewan not connected with this Government. Some of them are on hospital boards, some of them are members of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, some are members of the Pharmaceutical Association, the Registered Nurses’ Association, the dental profession, the rural municipalities, the urban municipalities, the farm organizations and the labour unions. Doctors across this country, in public health circles and other circles, and others who study these things have said that the requirements for people to serve them in their hospital needs is seven beds per 1,000 population. That has been the estimate of the requirements for a long time, and there is nobody on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who is competent to make a different decision, and back it up with any authority whatever. This is recognized in the United States and Canada as the required number of beds. We have those beds in Saskatchewan.

This group that I have mentioned are represented on the Health Survey Committee. They recognize the fact that Saskatchewan now has the necessary complement of beds to serve the population. We know, and they know, that the distribution is not as good as it should be yet, because historical growth has not taken them to some places and has put more in other places; but under the advice of this Health Survey Committee, on which are represented these various organizations I have mentioned, and under the advice of other people who are competent to give advice in these fields, we are endeavouring to see that the trend is changed so that the next historical development will result in proper service to all parts of the province. It can’t be done overnight, but for the purposes now, we have enough beds.

Now what are hospital beds for? They are for the treatment of the actively ill, people who are ill because of the incidence of sickness or because of physical injury from accidents or other causes; people who can be cared for in a hospital by nursing and medical care, cared for to the extent that they can be cured or assisted or alleviated of their illness or their pain. If seven beds will serve them, then doctors know that, hospital people know it, the people themselves know it, and we have those beds in Saskatchewan.

Now then, each hospital, in Saskatchewan, is an independent autonomous unit. Outside of two or three little ones in our administration, this Department has no control over any hospital. They are run and de-centralized – again I want to remind you of that – de-centralized, under local autonomous control. I want the people on the other side to remember that. They can forget it, and I’ll spike it every time they mention it. But listen – they laugh now; but when they get up to talk about centralization, they should explain what they mean, because I am telling them the truth. Each hospital is an autonomous local organization, run by its locality, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows it, and so do the rest of them over there who know anything. That is not too many of them, but the ones that know anything know that.

A great many of these hospitals have been built since this Government came into office. A Union Hospital Act was passed in 1918 – our Liberal

friends passed it, and they got 26 union hospital districts organized by 1944. Since that there have been 74 more, in a little over six years since this Government has been in power. Each hospital is built with an understanding with the local people that the required number of beds are so many not only according to provincial rating but also to Federal Government rating. Those beds are designed to take care of that locality. We have never said, "You have got to cut down your beds", as this editorial indicates. All that the hospital administration has done is to write to these people and ask them, in view of the agreement that has been arrived at at the convention of the Hospital Association, because of the recommendations of the officials of our Department at that convention, to try to adjust their budget so that they would have represented an average occupancy of a certain percentage, and a high percentage, of the rated bed capacity of their hospital. To do that would make it possible, then, for the Hospital Services Plan to pay twice a month to that place sufficient money to see that they always have enough money to operate, plus an amount that applies to each patient admitted into the hospital. In other words, a hospital might have a 20-bed rating, and they might go on for four months without one single patient, and they would get the full cost of operating that hospital with its 20 empty beds provided they keep the services up and the staff in attendance ready to serve a patient if a patient appears. Then, the minute a patient appears, the payment goes up to take care of the patient's care, as well as the other. There has been no order given to anybody, and that kind of editorial and that kind of talk must be promoted by people who do not know anything about what they are writing or talking about.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If the hon. member would permit a question it will give him a chance to cool off a bit. It was reported in the "Star-Phoenix" that the superintendent of a hospital in Saskatoon — I think it was City Hospital — indicated that it would pay him, I think he said, to dismantle six or seven beds, under the present provision. Now, with the shortage of beds in Saskatoon, I wonder if the Minister would explain why the manager of the hospital felt it would pay him to cut down the number of beds actually being operated.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to answer that question. In the first place, whatever report was given in the paper, if it was as indicated to the hon. Leader of the Opposition as he explained it here, it was wrong. There were seven or eight beds — I believe it was seven beds — put in places that the hospital management, the doctors, the medical staff themselves, did not think proper and the superintendent was instructed to take them out. If he tried to blame it on something that we in this Department did, that is his responsibility. We have nothing to do with the removal of those seven beds.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Might I ask, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — And I am not going to carry on a debate. I will give you one more answer . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am trying to get information in this matter.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — You should listen, then.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I'm listening, all right, don't worry about that; I guess I listen as good as anyone in this House, and I tell that to the Provincial Treasurer. The Minister has said that if there were no beds occupied, the hospital would be paid. Now, supposing the beds, for some time, are more than occupied — that is the rate of capacity; will they be paid for the excess number that are in there? Suppose the rated capacity is 20 beds, and supposing, during a period of three or four months, the rated capacity is exceeded by four or five patients per day, would they be paid for it?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — If those beds are set up there after agreement. I pointed out a little while ago, Mr. Speaker, that every hospital board and management was an autonomous institution. We do not issue orders to them, we make agreements with them. We are in just the same position as anyone buying a pair of shoes — if you buy a pair of shoes you go into a shoe store, you look over the stock of shoes, and you find out the price, what kind of shoes you can get there; if you see what you want and can afford to pay for them, if it suits your price or your pocket-book, you buy it. We do the same with hospitals. Each one of them has a service to sell. We go in there and look over their service. We bargain with them on what we will pay for that service on behalf of the beneficiaries of the plan, each one of them, separately, and we will do that in this case, again this year. They will bring their budgets in. They will tell us, "We have to charge so much because of these conditions." We will go over that with them, and we will say, "Well, now, I don't think your budget is right here or there. Let's talk it over," and we will finally arrive at an agreement. When the agreement is arrived at and a rate is struck, we will pay for it. Now, is that clear?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I still do not think the Minister has answered the question. I don't say he has failed to answer it intentionally; but supposing you had made your agreement with a hospital that you will pay up to, say 20 beds, according to your rating, then suppose the hospital, through no fault of its own, has to admit an average over a period we will say, of six months — 25 persons, and it has to exceed that agreement because of an extraordinary amount of sickness or something, does the extra cost fall entirely on that local area, and do you repudiate any liability in respect to the number over and above the amount that you included in your agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to answer that question I would have to state exactly what each agreement was going to be with each individual hospital, so I can only answer it in a general way. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggests will not happen. The rate will be struck, in consultation between the rate board and the hospital concerned, for a certain occupancy over a year — that year. Now then, if something happens like an excessive amount of sickness occurring in that place and the hospital administration called up and said, "Look, we are stuck. We have to put six more people in here", they could easily get an answering "okay." Does that answer your question?

There is going to be nothing inhuman about this. This has all been agreed to, in the main, between us and the Hospital Association; but the principle is right and now the application of the principle has to take place with each individual hospital.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I don't want to enter into debate with the Minister, but I think he wants to clear this up and I would like to understand it. Now as I read the report with regard to the Saskatoon hospital, I gathered that there had been an agreement made to pay for a certain number of beds, and if they maintained six or seven beds over that number they would still get paid for the basic number and, therefore, they would have to operate them at an entire loss to the hospital. Now that is what I understood from the report, and the Minister can say if that is right or not.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I can make it any plainer. Each individual hospital will be dealt with. The agreement will be struck on what is considered the proper amount of bed complement there should be in that hospital. The hospital board and management will know what that is when the agreement is struck. Now then, if for some reason or other some emergency arrives that requires extra beds to take care of that emergency, they will find that the Hospital Services Plan will give them all the necessary assistance to do it, and pay them for it. But they will not strike an agreement and then have the agreement broken the next day, because it happens to suit somebody to do it, and there will be some hospitals that possibly will endeavour to take advantage. I can only answer your question that way. Each hospital will be dealt with, in the first place, by striking the agreement, and, in the second place, and continuously throughout the year, on the basis of the agreement and the needs of the hospital; but there will be no orders issued to anybody.

**Mr. McCormack:** — What would happen if the hospital board did not agree – if you could not come to an agreement?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The only answer I can give to that is that an agreement will be reached, because we will not be inhuman and they have not been unreasonable. We have never had a case yet, where there was so much unreason on either side that agreement could not be reached. It may take some bargaining and some working back and forth, but we finally reach what is an amicable agreement, because, while we do not group the hospitals – we have to deal with each one by itself as an autonomous organization – we must always bear in mind that the treatment for A must be similar to the treatment for B. There must be nothing out of line or unfair advantages or privileges given to one above the other; but I could not answer your question as to what would happen if no agreement were reached. If the hospital went away and said, “We are just not going to take anything that you say”, I do not know – I do not think that will ever happen. As I say, we have never had that kind of an experience. We have no discipline over them, it is only a matter of discussion. Sometimes there are fellows like the one up there who burst into print – I do not know whether it is because he likes to give newspaper interviews; but we never have any trouble that way. It is all newspaper talk as far as we are concerned.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask just one question. I know something about your system, and I do not criticize the new system. I think it is an improvement. But we, as a hospital board, received at the beginning of this year a new type of agreement, a new plan, and I do not need to reiterate what it is. If it had been explained here I think these questions might have been avoided, but where did that plan come from? We, as a board, had nothing to do with it. We got this plan sent to



us from the Department. Who drafted it, and who put it together? We, as a board, had nothing to say about it. I am not criticizing the plan, or the change in plan, but I just want that question answered: where did it come from?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I will answer the question, Mr. Speaker. The suggestion came from the Department. That is the answer to the question.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It was not a suggestion. It was a matter of policy.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I promised to answer a question. I did not promise to give up time. I have made the statement, time and again, that this is a suggested policy which we took to the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and discussed with them. It has been discussed in the Health Survey Committee, and it is known to all the people who are interested in and intimate with hospital management in the province, that when the plan was suggested to them, after we developed the idea that this might be the way to do it, we did not say, “This is what we are going to do to you.” That is what I am trying to say for your information. That is the information I am giving you. We said, “Will you accept this?” And the Hospital Association, like my friend from Arm River, said they agreed it was an improvement on the old system, and we are trying it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But my question was – where did it come from?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — My friend – from the Department! Do you hear that?

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is the answer I was looking for.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to lose my temper, but I have raised several children, and I have never heard anything so exasperating as that bunch of people over there. They either cannot or will not try to understand. Mr. Speaker, these people over on the other side of the House have no intention of offering their services to this province to make a worthwhile plan work. They can only find some way, if possible . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — We’ll make it work after the next election . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Brother, you didn’t make it work before the 1944 election – you did nothing . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I wasn’t here.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Your Party was here, and the hon. member from Melfort joined the Party and became elected under a Party label of a party that never did any of these things when they had the opportunity. Don’t tell me you can explain anything to that kind of people. They are both blind and deaf, and some say they are dumb.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of fun now. I hope everybody has enjoyed it. Frankly, I have. I like a good rough-and-tumble and if they want to get rough, we’ll do it; but the hour is getting rather late, Mr. Speaker, and I have still quite a number of things that I want to tell

**February 27, 1951**

the House. You see, Mr. Speaker, I have been challenged to speak on the Department. I made up my mind, before I was done, I would meet the challenge completely, and I am going to do it before I give up my time in this House. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to defer some of the other things I would like to say until tomorrow. With your permission, I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 11.00 o'clock p.m.