

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
22nd Day

Monday, March 10, 1952

The House met at three o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I have a correction to make in my remarks in this House a few days ago. This correction does not alter conclusions that I made, but I would like to have the record corrected. Perhaps I can read the statement.

In speaking during the Budget Debate, on Tuesday last, I inadvertently used an incorrect calculation. The total amount of assistance to school districts and taxpayers directly provided in the present estimates should total \$7,385,400 — not \$8,385,400, as stated on that occasion. That amount is \$267,420 less than the proceeds of the Education Fund referred to — it is consequently 97 per cent, not 107 per cent, of this amount. It is approximately twice — not 2 1/2 times, the amount proposed for similar purposes in 1944-45; and approximately 2 1/2 times — not 3 — the amount actually spent in 1943-44.

The error does not alter any of the conclusions drawn from the comparison, but I should like to have the record corrected accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the consent of the House given to have the records corrected?

(Agreed)

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Friday, March 7, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

Mr. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking in this House on Friday, I congratulated the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on the excellent presentation of the Budget; and more particularly on the excellent arrangements he had made, through his Budget, for the operation of the various departments, particularly the Department I am responsible for, and which, of course, has a great deal of health and welfare work to do in co-operation with the Department of Social Welfare on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

March 10, 1952

I wish to repeat those congratulations here, because the more I think of the budget and its preparation, the more I read in the paper of what happens in other places, the more interest I have in this one here, in its economy and care of preparation. I notice the province immediately west has a budget that, if not quite twice as large as ours, is nearly so, and I do not think they provide services any more valuable to the people than we provide here. I notice the one to the west of them has an even larger budgets and the comments coming from Ottawa — corridor gossip and so on, from the papers — would indicate that we are not likely to get any relief from taxation from the Government of Canada, either. Although the budget here has been prepared and presented, and is somewhat larger than last year — quite understandably so, when one considers the increase in the cost of everything brought about because the Government of Canada failed to have any measure of price control introduced to protect us — to be able to bring in a budget such as our Treasurer did, without any increase in taxation, I think is a remarkable piece of housekeeping.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before going on to the main part of what I wish to say, this afternoon, I think it might be well just to give the folks in the House here, and anywhere else where they may be listening, some little idea of the country I come from, the part that I represent. As you all know, I am presently the sitting member for the Gull Lake constituency and the candidate for the new constituency of Shaunavon, all of which are in the south-west corner of the province. I find, in talking to people who are not too well travelled in the province, there is a tendency to feel that the south-west part of Saskatchewan is practically indigent — that we do not make much of a contribution to the provincial and national economy, and that we suffer from drought every summer, or some other serious thing, and the consequence is that we do not provide any of the great new wealth of this country. So I would like just to mention here and now that in that part of the country there is a tremendous amount of new wealth produced every year from the agricultural economy that is operating there. Many, many millions of bushels of grain are delivered to the grain elevators; many, many millions of pounds of beef and other types of livestock are produced there, and provided for the people of this country, and to our trade and commerce overseas wherever we trade.

I would like to disabuse the minds of any, in other parts of this province, or in Canada, who may think we are a country of indigents. Definitely we are not. You will find the people down there like anywhere else — they are pretty independent, and pretty much individualists. On the other hand, you will find them extremely co-operative in any of those undertakings that are community enterprises. For instance, they are all members of Health Region No. 1, and they support that Health Region and its medical care programme not only by words, but also by the payment of their taxes, and you will find that the tax collections, both there and in the hospital services plan tax, and in other forms of taxes, are well paid; the percentage is as large as, if not larger than, any other place in the province.

And they are quite human down there. They love the outdoor sports, and they do some pretty notable things in the field of outdoor sports. You will remember, just a few years ago, our team of junior ball players from Gull Lake managed to capture the provincial championships of that year, and this year it was only by a hair's-breadth that Mr. Cochrane and his rink failed to take top honours here in the greatest bonspiel ever held in Regina. So, I just want to remind the people in other parts of Saskatchewan that we are a very definite, and, I believe, a very useful part of the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to thank my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, for the excellent work he has undertaken down there, which, when brought to completion, is going to help to add immeasurably to the productive power of that country.

I would also like to mention one or two other things before going on to departmental matters. I listened, last Thursday afternoon, with a great deal of interest and some amusement, to the act put on by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson). I do not know whether his flights of fancy provided him with a dream that he was a gallant young knight on a white horse galloping hither and yon across the country, saving the world from all the evils that he and his imagination could conjure up. He built a great many straw people or something else; and then proceeded in his own way to knock them down. He did not strike me as a Sir Galahad, Mr. Speaker. He struck me, or it reminded me, rather, of that old tale of the little old chap that wore the rusty suit of armour, and rode around the country on a sway-back, flea-bitten, flop-eared old male, with a broken lance that was dulled at the end, and tilted wind-mills here and there across the country-side to the plaudits of all the little Ponchos that were around him, at that particular time. If you remember, he tilted wind-mills all the way from Saltcoats to Milestone, in order to go down (as he said) and advise those people, whom he thinks are poor, benighted heathens, of the danger they face in the future, if they continue to support our jovial and happy friend who is presently representing Milestone in this Assembly (J. Walter Erb).

Even the "Leader-Post" referred to him as "the imp of Saltcoats" (the words of the "Leader-Post", not mine, Mr. Speaker). Kind of a devilish appellation to give a man. I wondered if, possibly, it was a printer's error and somebody forgot to put an "s" in front of it.

I would like to mention also that the Leader of the Opposition always seems to have a great deal of fun in his speeches here and outside the House. He also likes to trot around with a swinging axe chopping off the heads of civil servants, going out to the country and telling them that he will cut our taxes here and there, and that he will also increase services. I cannot help but believe that he must be the inspiration for that song which we hear on the radio so much these days: "Come on to My House . . . I'm going to give you an apricot, a cherry and a plum . . . I'm going to give you everything."

Now, coming into the more important matters of the afternoon's debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the most important division of

March 10, 1952

the Department of Health; that is, the preventive services which are undertaken in this province under our direction, and under our co-operation. For a good many years now it has been recognized by western countries, and perhaps by others too (but maybe western countries have gone further with it), that the need for public health preventive services was assuming more and more importance. Those services were pretty badly neglected, Mr. Speaker, before this Government came to power. However, I think I mentioned the other day and gave an illustration of how my friends opposite seemed to regard these kind of measures and similar ones as frills, and even the Liberal press prints cartoons showing that they believe they are unnecessary frills, because as I pointed out, they in their cartoon made a dollar sign out of the "S" in Social and the "S" in Service, indicating that they consider all these things as frills. However, this Government does not. This Government considers it very essential, and when they came to power they found this province was considerably behind most of the other provinces and many of the United States in the provision and the mechanism of providing for Public health services, Mr. Speaker.

The result is that an effort was made, immediately this Government came to power, to correct that situation, and the effort has borne fruit. The first thing that happened, the province was divided into health regions geographically; then the people in those areas were told, "If you wish now to set up a public health programme, we will assist you to do so. The responsibility and authority will be yours." The member municipalities comprising the health region will among themselves, provide the administrative and directive authority through a board of health of that particular health region; and as an incentive to indicate the good-will of the Government, provision was made by the Government to pay two-thirds of the total cost. That results, at present day costs because of inflation, the direct responsibility of the Government of Canada; that results in the cost of approximately, for the individuals in these health regions where they are organized, of 40 cents per year. I have heard people say they did not want to be taxed to that amount to provide this. Forty cents a year, Mr. Speaker, is less than the price of one package of cigarettes today; it is just the same price as four glasses of beer; so the tax cannot be considered high. That is the share of the people in those regions — the share they must pay.

And further than that, if, for any reason, in the allocation of the levy that is ascribed to the residents of the region, it should turn out that it is more than 50 cents per year to each taxpayer, then any additional amount is also taken up by the Provincial Government over and above its regular two-thirds share.

Now then, when a region is formed, as I say, it is formed for the purpose of originally providing public health or preventive services. They may however, if they wish, provide themselves with any or all medical services, dental services, or other such services as they may wish in the field of health, for treatment and that sort of thing. I want to point out, and I would like to emphasize this point: this Government does not impose time programmes either for preventive services or for treatment services on any area of the province. We do say that as you go in the public health field we will assist you and if you want to undertake treatment services,

we will also give assistance to you there. We stand ready to assist at any of the stages that they wish to proceed with. We also provide the trained personnel. It would not be expected that every region which is formed would have the trained personnel. We undertake to make provisions for those personnel in the way of medical health officers, public health nurses, sanitary inspectors and statistical people.

Now, I said at the start, and I would like to repeat, that we regard this preventive service as of paramount importance in this province and anywhere else. It is not just treatment services that are required to prevent or correct illnesses when they occur that are important, but we regard the highest measure of physical and mental well-being as the goal to be achieved, and the objective that we aim at, and the more that can be done to prevent the incidence of sickness or accident, the more well-being there is going to be among the people of this or any other area in the world. We know the tremendous amount of money that is spent by public agencies, as well as by individuals on the treatment services after people become ill or hurt, and we believe that the small amounts necessary to provide the base for preventive services will eventually relieve many people, and the public, of the responsibility of such large expenditures when illness and sickness do occur. Because of that we are anxious that everybody undertake to organize themselves into a health region in every area of Saskatchewan so that we will have those services.

Now, I realize, Mr. Speaker, and no one more than I, that, in the present state of the world, where everything is in such a dangerous state of upheaval and nobody knows for sure just where we are going to wind up in it, we must have a very powerful military body in the country to protect whatever we can protect, and as much as we can protect, our lives here. I realize that, and I would not want anything to be done to lessen the protection we are presently providing. But I do believe sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that one of the best forms of defence is healthy, able-bodied men and women and children. I know that military training is great — I have had some. It takes our strongest and best young men and women, and it looks after their health and it makes them stronger and healthier than ever. That is good. I have no objection to that; it should do that. On the other hand, I do not think it should at the same time prevent the rest of the people who are not in those services from also enjoying a large measure of health.

When I say that, I mean that the country as a whole, the nation as a whole, through its central government, should make contributions to national health on the basis of need; and I do not only mean fiscal need, I mean the needs that arise because of the distance, and other difficulties that might be in existence in one area, as compared with another. I believe by doing that we would be making a contribution to the general welfare of the country, and I believe that the Federal Government is, to a great extent, evading its responsibility in its failure to provide greater finances for the development of health not only in this province, but in all the provinces of Canada that have not the resources that two or three of the provinces presently enjoy.

I think someone said here in this House — I believe it was the member for Redberry, who is not in his seat at the present time

March 10, 1952

but he ought to be back in a moment. I believe that he at one time objected to comparing Saskatchewan with Saskatchewan; he thought we should compare Saskatchewan with other places so as to see what we are doing here and measure it with what is being done elsewhere. Well, I suppose it would be just as much sense as a school-teacher comparing Johnnie with Mary. Johnnie may be a strong boy, and Mary may be a delicate girl; one may be very good in their lessons and the other one not so good. The teacher, the good teacher, I believe, does the best to develop each according to its ability, and does not try to make little delicate Mary like big strong Johnnie, any more than we would expect to make the member for Melfort exactly like his leader. It just could not be done at this stage of the game, and probably never could be done.

Now, I am going to compare Saskatchewan with Saskatchewan just for a moment, because I believe that is the way to measure the development in an area, and I, of course, differ from my friend from Redberry in that regard — a little later on I am going to agree with him, and compare it with some other provinces in some other respect. But I want to point out, in this field of public health, that until this Government came to power there were only 102,000 people in the province who enjoyed full-time public health or preventive health services — whenever I say public health services I mean the preventive field; and all those people were all in the cities of Saskatoon and Regina, because the city councils of these cities provided full-time public health services. In 1903 that was the case: 13 per cent of the people, 102,000, enjoyed full-time preventive health services. By 1951, 327,000 people were enjoying it. Because of the development of health regions, a great many rural people, and the smaller urban centres, were enjoying the full-time public health service that had been enjoyed only by the cities previous to that time.

I mentioned there were 13 per cent in 1943; today there are, Mr. Speaker, 52 percent enjoying those full-time public health services, and that has happened all in seven years. I do not blame the hon. member for Redberry for not liking that; a comparison of that kind is not creditable to the party which he represents; but that is a statement of fact.

Now, I know the Liberals and their press, as I said before, regard these things as frills, and I do not expect my next set of comparisons to impress Her Majesty's loyal Opposition sitting on your left, Mr. Speaker, although I would be willing to bet, mind you, that they would impress Her Majesty very much if she were here to listen to them, and I think they will impress the people of Saskatchewan.

For instance, we make another comparison between Saskatchewan then and now — that is a favourite amusement with a lot of people, and I see nothing wrong with it, except that the member for Redberry does not like it, but I would not expect anything I did to meet with his approval, because even if I did the opposite he would still find some fault with it. However, in 1943 — I am going to take Public Health Nursing, for instance, which we regard as an extremely important part of our programme of public or preventive health services. In 1943, the total number of home visits made by public health nurses for all purposes were 15,000 visits; in 1951, there were 26,900, nearly 27,000 — almost twice as many. Home visits to infants, that is infants

under one year of age, made by nurses in 1943 were 2,262; in 1951, 5,793. Infants and pre-school children seen at Child Health Conferences, where mothers bring their children to receive information and assistance from the trained personnel which I spoke of, a little while ago; in 1943, there were 3,045 of these infants and pre-school children seen at these Conferences; in 1951, 37,549 attended. I do not expect my friend from Redberry to like that comparison, but there it is, on the record, kept carefully, showing the regard which this Government has for the health of the people and the assistance given to provide those people with the information and aid they require in order to give them the greatest opportunities.

Here is a striking little piece of information which I would like to give my friends opposite, and anyone else interested in the welfare of infants, the raising of children in this nation, who will be Canadians. In infant mortality rates in 1943, of every thousand babies born, 47 babies died. Going back to 1929, 73 out of every thousand babies died before they were a year old. In 1943, 47 died; in 1951, 30. Now I am not going to be foolish enough to ascribe that lower death-rate among infants entirely to this. Dealing with the hospital services (I will later on) I will show then, if I have the time, Mr. Speaker, that that also had some effect on it, because babies are now being born in hospitals; but nevertheless, the fact remains that we have been able to save 17 more babies out of every thousand born than we have been able to do before.

In the field of Sanitation, the story is just the same, Mr. Speaker. Total inspections by sanitary inspectors in 1943, when the province was unorganized in every way, there were 15,306 total inspections; in 1951 there were 51,009 inspections. The member for Redberry the other day mentioned some lady (he did not give her name or location) who had been closed up because the sanitary regulations were strict. Well, Mr. Speaker, the public health is worth something, and the public are entitled to know . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister just said, a moment ago, that I mentioned some lady . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Pardon me, I meant the member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe).

Mr. Korchinski: — Be careful how you talk.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — All right, I meant the member for Turtleford.

Some Hon. Member: — Now you are getting it right.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — We have a lot of milk inspections these days, because milk is an important food, particularly among infants and young children, and so the figure I gave there included 1,222 inspections done by milk sanitarians, from which they collected 7,150 samples. The inspection of public eating places and public drinking places and living places is important, whether my friend from Turtleford thinks so or not. Other people besides us regard it as so, because the Paper Containers Institute of the United States of America conducts research across this country, and watches every province and state that conducts schools for food handlers, and they make these reports on it. If my friends across the way would take the trouble to

March 10, 1952

read these reports on it. If my friends across the way would take the trouble to read these reports, they would find that every month in their reports three or four more Saskatchewan towns are coming on to their reports as having gained their recognition because of the holding of food-handlers' schools.

We believe information is important. Our friends across the way make a lot of talk about the educational things here, and they charge this Government and the Minister of Education with all the particular things they want to charge them about in the academic schools. Education takes on other aspects besides the classroom, and we provide a Health Education Division, to inform and help the people to understand and know their health services and health practices. This was not done before this Government came into operation, or got into power, Mr. Speaker. We have six health educators now. We distributed, even last year, over 250,000 pamphlets and leaflets of one kind or another, at the various picture shows, dealing with health programmes, and have had audiences totalling over half a million people. By doing so, we have spread the information to the public, which is a responsibility which is accepted by this Government and was not accepted, but considered as "frills", apparently, by our friends on the opposite side of the House.

Our Laboratory Services, Mr. Speaker — the same way; they had Provincial Laboratories before. Their expenditure in 1943 was \$38,000. Now I suppose, they think ours is too great because it was \$102,000 in the last fiscal year ending March 31, 1951. They have total examinations of 87,000 during the last year they were in office; last year, we had 201,000 examinations. We do a lot of examinations for rural hospitals, for practitioners out in the fields. We carry on blood counts and haemoglobin examinations and so on. Compared with their total of 967 in 1943, ours totalled 4,160 last year.

In the bio-chemistry field, in their last year of office they had 1,895 examinations; we had, in our last year, 9,505. We do a number of things, Mr, Speaker, that are infinitely more advanced than the things they did.

Now, in the unorganized regions, or rather areas which are not organized into regions, we carry on also public health nursing, sanitation, health activities and so on, and while they are not as fruitful, I think, as in the organized regions, nevertheless we do believe those activities will result in regions being formed in other parts of the province.

I have not the time to speak of the Divisions of Crippled Children, Communicable Diseases, Venereal Diseases, Nutrition, Dental Health, Research and Vital Statistics, and all the other divisions which go to make up the Department, but the details of those will be provided on estimates to anybody who is interested enough to want to ask intelligent questions about them, Mr. Speaker.

I want to mention the Air Ambulance. I would like to mention that this is an institution which is entirely new in this province since this Government came to office, and it has done a tremendous amount of valuable work for the people. In actuality it has been what it is supposed to be —

"mercy" flights. Last year, it made 714 flights and carried 748 patients. Since it started in 1946, Mr. Speaker, the Air Ambulance has flown 225,000 miles, and has carried nearly 4,000 patients. Now, this is a risky business, a little different from any other kind. They have to land sometimes in adverse conditions, stormy weather, snowy fields, or bare fields, and sometimes the fields are not so big. I have been out myself on flights when the patch looked very small, looking down at it from above, and I wondered how the pilot was ever going to sit down on it without busting something up when he did, and get off from the same field. These people fly a risky service, and they have done it well. They have brought through these patients — nearly 4,000 as I mentioned — without serious injury. The pilots, the flying crew, the nurses cannot be too highly regarded by the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, for the work they have done, and I might also say that the ground crew, the engineers, and the shop workers out there who must keep those planes in the air fit to fly, with the record that they have had, also are deserving of the gratitude of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker: — How many miles did you say you have been flown?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Over 225,000 in 1951. Oh, pardon me — slightly over 200,000 miles since 1946, the year the service commenced.

I would also like to mention something of our Medical Care Programme which again has never been adopted anywhere in the North American continent under government supervision until it came into effect here; that is the medical care that is provided for old-age pensioners, blind pensioners, mothers' allowances cases and those categories. This Government provided those and continues to provide them. It is a costly thing. If anyone deems it is a "frill" that these old people should be allowed to depend on the charity of doctors and hospitals, or go without the services, well, of course they are entitled to feel that way. The consequence is, Mr. Speaker, that provision has been made for their care and will continue under the terms which have been expressed before in statements made in this House, this year and other years.

Now, we have not socialized the doctors in doing this. We have made a contract with them, and they are paid on a fee-for-service basis, based on a schedule of fees which they themselves have drawn up. It used to be, a few years ago, that we started out by paying on behalf of each beneficiary in the groups mentioned, \$9 apiece to a fund out of which the doctor was paid when he performed the service. However, that has gradually gone up until last year, it was \$12.50. I guess you will all remember that, last September when the medical men met in Moose Jaw, they passed a resolution at their annual meeting demanding that the per capita fee be increased from \$12.50 to \$15. We felt, that was more than we could really afford, if it was possible not to, because it meant an increase of \$70,000 in that particular fund. So I met with the negotiating committee and the advisory council, and we dealt with the matter, but I was unable to persuade them to modify their demands. The result is that we will be faced with that extra expenditure this year, because we must see that these people continue to receive these services.

March 10, 1952

We also want to maintain good relations with these professional people, because in the main they have been very co-operative and helpful in many ways. I might mention here that we have agreed between the Department and the College that a committee composed of people from both will be set up to study all phases of the provision of medical and hospital care to the groups which I have already mentioned, and we expect that from those studies we will benefit greatly, possibly in the improved services, and there may be a way to cut corners or reduce expenses to some extent, we hope. In the meantime, the provision is being made.

I would like to mention the Saskatchewan Hospital Services, Mr. Speaker, because it, I think, is the shiniest gem in this Government's crown in the field of health, and possibly in all its fields. I want to mention it was the vision of the former Minister and the Deputy Minister (who has recently departed), which made this plan possible. I do not want to discount for one moment the value of the work which the staff, under their direction, did. A loyal and devoted and sincere staff have worked unceasingly ever since that plan started, in order to provide the people with the best possible hospital care this province could provide, and with the least possible cost to the taxpayer concerned.

The Commission which was set up by the Province of British Columbia to enquire into their plan felt it worthwhile to come down here, last summer, and examine our plan. It just so happened that the Chairman of that Commission, now a resident, of course, of B.C., used to be a resident of Saskatchewan — down in the southwest corner, Mr. Speaker, where they produce some pretty good people. He was quite proud of the results of the plan which had been instituted by his former province.

It does produce some problems though, particularly in the field of rising costs of everything: food, drugs and equipment. And because of the cost-of-living, it requires an increase in the pay of the people who work in these places, and it all reflects on the Department and the money that has to be produced in order to pay for the services given. The Federal Government made such a complete failure of its price controls that we face this situation and we have no control over it.

I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that there are many people (and I think of some of them across here, possibly, or their friends, if not these gentlemen who sit opposite us now, exactly), who did believe that when price controls were released that the tale of the manufacturers would turn out to be true. The story of the manufacturers was that, with price controls removed, there would be an incentive to produce more and more quantities of goods all over the country, then the element of competition would come in, the law of supply and demand would work, and the prices would come down to a normal level. Well, the controls were released, and the abundance of goods were produced, Mr. Speaker, but they have not been made available to the public. They have not flooded the market with these goods to bring them down, because the owners of them are apparently able to control the law of supply and demand, and see that these goods that are produced are packed on the shelves of the warehouses, and are not available to the people.

I would not like to make a statement of that kind without some pretty good evidence to support it, Mr. Speaker, so I am going to produce some. I am going to produce a quotation taken from the December "Letter" of the Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan, and my friends opposite have stood up and said they were the "fathers of co-operation"; they love the co-operatives, they believe in them and anything they do. So they cannot deny the value of a statement issued by the Saskatchewan Co-operative Union in their Monthly Letter of 1951. So I am going to quote here, Mr. Speaker, from that letter:

"Another current and misleading presentation is to picture the business world as one vast and glorified auction sale, with too much money chasing, too few goods."

"This one is a honey — we are asked to accept as reality a scene in which thousands of people, their purses bulging with money and their brains like rice puddings, irresponsibly bid the price of coffee up and up and up from 50 cents a pound to over a dollar; bidding, demanding, clamouring a flood-lit and lovely refrigerator, until the price advances to \$550 from \$300.

"What diseased minds these mental prostitutes must have! And what addled morons they must think the average Canadian citizen is! Perhaps one of these scintillating jewels of free enterprise intelligence can concoct an explanation for the following:

"If, as they would have us believe, the present inflation is caused by too much money chasing too few goods, why is it that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics informs us that, unsold production — that is inventories presently in existence; unsold production has reached a peak of \$3,400 million dollars worth of goods? Why, if our housewives had been indulging in a wild and anti-social orgy of spending, have these inventories increased by \$899 million in the last 12 months?

"Not being experts, and having had no flair for writing fairy-tales, we are very puzzled, not to say amazed; (the Leader of the Opposition here will know what "amazed" means — he is frequently amazed) . . .

I will now go on with the quote:

Mr. Tucker: — Can you blame me?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — After having listened to this, I hope he is amazed. I am myself. I go on with the quote, Mr. Speaker.

March 10, 1952

"On the one hand we are asked to believe that goods are very scarce, compared to purchasing power, and on the other hand we are told by such an august and unimpeachable government department as the Bureau of Statistics that produced and unpurchased world goods have piled up to a peak of \$3,400 million; either we are exceedingly dense, or somebody is trifling with the truth."

That is the end of that. Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I quoted that was to show that somewhere in the scheme of things, somebody who has more control than the people of Saskatchewan, somebody who has control over the Government of Canada, has been able to compel them to release price controls and have permitted them to bring about a condition such as was described in that letter from which I quoted.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Turtleford go out and explain that to his constituencies — that is to the people who will be his constituents until the next election.

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the Minister who wrote that?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — The writer is not quoted. I got the quotes from the Saskatchewan Co-operative Union letter of December, 1951. The writer can no doubt be discovered in there.

Mr. Danielson: — It couldn't be Les Bright, could it?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, it could have been Les Bright. If it was, he is one of the brightest stars in Saskatchewan's crown in the Co-operative Union. Anyway, it is true. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics say it is true. They write that — I will remind my friends of that. It is their figures that are there — \$3,400 million worth of goods piled up according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Hon. Member: — Maybe they can get the Bureau of Statistics to change their mind — I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Now, then, Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes said that we have a plan which is too expensive. I am going to agree with that; it should not be as expansive, but this is the reason. Sometimes we are told that the reasons are for other causes. To support the statements I have just made, I will give you the figures from our own Department. I will assure you they are authentic, because we have very competent people over there making it up. The figures I am going to give show the difference in the cost of operating the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, brought about on the one hand because we have increased utilization, and brought about, on the other hand, because of the increased cost of the things which we have to buy to operate them. Over the year 1948, the cost of the plan was \$1,669,000 more than in the previous year. Of that amount, \$780,000 was attributable to increased days of care; \$889,000 was attributable to the increased cost of operating hospitals, and directly attributable to the cost-of-living. In 1949, there was another increase of a million and a half in the cost of operating the plan; \$579,000 was

attributable to increased days of care; \$978,000 was attributable to the increased costs. In 1950, another million and a half increase in the costs, \$609,000 of which was attributable to increased days of care; \$909,000 was due to the increased cost of goods and services for those hospitals. In 1951 there was an increase of \$1,400,000, \$41,000 of which was attributable to the increase in days of care, and \$1,377,000 attributable to the increase cost of operating hospitals brought about by the very thing that I mentioned a while ago — the increase cost of living.

I would like also to draw to the attention of my friend from Redberry — if he does not mind my calling him "friend" across the floor. He did not like, as I said before, Saskatchewan compared to Saskatchewan; he wants it compared with some other places — only, of course, if the comparison suited his purposes. I have already once today compared Saskatchewan to Saskatchewan. Now, I am going to follow his advice and compare Saskatchewan with British Columbia. We find in the editorial page of a Vancouver paper the "Vancouver Sun" of a recent date, that this is the situation out there. The editorial is headed "Bed Costs Query". It says:

"a hospital in Saskatchewan with 61 beds which gave 22,531 patients-day service in 1950 at a cost which provincial insurance serviced at \$118,000. 61 beds — 22,531 patients at \$118,000.

"A hospital in B.C. with 63 beds gave 23,752 patients-day service at a cost of \$197,000."

The B.C. institution had 5.5 per cent more patients-days but cost 60 per cent more in actual dollars. Is that a good comparison? Not very favourable to the counterparts of our friends opposite, who operate the government and the B.C. Hospital Insurance service in B.C.

Mr. McCarthy: — What is the name of the hospital?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I quoted from the editorial of the "Vancouver Sun." My friend can look it up — he has eyes. I am not giving any unauthentic quotations here. I am giving them straight, and if my friend from Cannington would take the trouble to read all about the B.C. hospital inquiry, I will lend him a copy of the Report. He can get all that information out of there anyway.

I wanted to mention, also, that in the figures I just gave, a moment ago, it showed that our days increase in patient-day care is decreasing to some extent, and for that we are grateful. We have provided sufficient beds we believe, under all known standards of measurement, for the population of Saskatchewan to receive their care for acute hospital cases. That was not so in 1943. In 1943 they did not even keep the correct kind of records. This may raise a laugh over here, but they did not leave the records here if they kept them, because we cannot find them. So either they did not keep them or something happened to them before we got into office.

March 10, 1952

But in 1947 we had 4,229 beds and in 1950, 5,418 rated bed capacity. That rated bed capacity means the number of beds that should be in the hospital, according to the construction of the hospital, on a rating by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare, as well as our own. Now then, the bed complement is greater, because, after you have a bed in every rated spot, then somebody may find it necessary to set up other beds. In 1943, it is estimated (we had to make some estimate because we had no records) that there were 3,848 beds set up. However, in 1947, we know that there were 4,896 and in 1950, 6,435 — an average of 7.7 per thousand people of the population of Saskatchewan.

There were a number of things I want to speak of, Mr. Speaker, but I must share the radio time with my friend, the Minister of Social Welfare, (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), so I just want to make one other observation here. We were told by the member for Melville (Mr. Deshayé) that our method of arranging for the occupancy of hospitals based on 80 per cent ready capacity was niggardly. We have been told we are ungenerous. I want to make a quotation and give an opinion expressed by outsiders who are closely allied with this. I told the House here on other occasions, that the present method of paying hospitals and asking them to operate approximately on 80 per cent of capacity, was based on an agreement reached between ourselves and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and the Catholic Hospital Conference.

Now then, this year, Mr. Smith, who was the Secretary of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, was reporting to the Board of Directors of the hospital which he superintends, the Yorkton hospital; and his report contains this statement, and I quote:

"It can be stated that the new method of payment of the S.H.P. which came into effect January 1, 1951, has proven to be a very excellent one, and well covers the cost of operation, but it does not encourage the over-crowding of hospitals in order to secure increased revenue as was formerly the case under the previous plan.

"This method of payment has received the full endorsement of the executive of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association."

Mr. Bassett, President of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, and manager of the General Victoria Hospital in Prince Albert is a very able, young and capable man, who came up the hard way by energy and an application to work, and has turned out to be a most excellent acquisition for this province. He is the President; and he stated before the British Columbia Hospital Inquiry board that "we like the present Saskatchewan Hospital Services plan payment whereby the hospital is paid a definite sum twice monthly by the plan", and he believes this assurance of a certain monthly income acts in some measure as a deterrent to over-crowding of hospitals, and the temptation to secure as large an occupancy as possible. Those are the opinions of people who are quite closely connected, who work with us, co-operate with us and give us the benefit of their advice and ability on all matters relating to the operations of hospitals in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said there are many, many things I would like to speak on in our Department of Health. Many of them have been dealt with on other debates, during the passage of Bills through the House or on estimates, but for now this is all the time I have to deal with.

Mr. Deshaye: — Would the Hon. Minister answer a question? You admit that the payment of hospitalization is on an 80 per cent bed capacity basis, is it?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That is the general guide, yes.

Mr. Deshaye: — Because I just wanted to correct. I believe when I mentioned that, that the Premier said that this was not the case.

Premier Douglas: — It was not the case that it was the only payment they got. They can be paid more, if necessary. He should have this explained to him, if he cannot get it through his head.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I see that my 35 minutes on the air have already been reduced to 25, so I shall omit the amenities that we usually associate with a budget debate and I shall avoid any exchange of pleasantries with the hon. members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will expect me to say something about Saskatoon, which I am happy to do. It continues to flourish as the most beautiful city in Saskatchewan, indeed the fairest gem of the prairies. Its people grow more friendly and optimistic day by day, and Saskatoon's cultural development continues to be the envy of all of Canada. Its schools from the kindergarten to the University continue to improve and develop year by year. All Saskatchewan can take pride in our University, in the diversity and high standard of its education, in the efficiency of its staff, and in the beauty and functional qualities of the University campus. The extension of the University buildings since this government took office is significant, and a matter of personal satisfaction to my colleague, Arthur Stone and myself, and if we have been overly insistent that the lag of the past administration in building and developing the University be rectified by this Government, be sure that it was not from selfish motives. These additional University buildings have benefited all of Saskatchewan. The new wing of the Engineering building, the fine new school of Agriculture, the soil and dairy laboratory, the Veterinary Science Building, the gymnasium and with the new medical college and the 700 bed University hospital now under construction, we are confident that in days to come, Saskatoon will be the leading medical centre of Canada.

Last week I attended the first anniversary of the Saskatoon Nursing home. It is a modest home, last year it was converted by the government at a cost of less than \$100,000 and on the day I visited it, there was 104 patients comprising chronic cases and aged persons. The Government may not know this yet, nor do I commit it, but I look forward to the day when Saskatoon will have a modern nursing home of 300 beds. With a special department in the health care of the aged and chronic diseases in our medical college, and with our University and City Hospitals, this development would seem

March 10, 1952

to be a natural one.

Saskatoon, I feel, is on the eve of a great industrial development era. If no obstacles are placed in the way, Saskatoon will be the first city to be serviced by natural gas, that efficient and cheap fuel and power so necessary to industry. It is estimated that Saskatoon will require 200 billion cubic feet of gas over the next 20 years. Already some 40 billion cubic feet have been proven up within a distance of 100 miles from Saskatoon.

One of the most pressing problems of our city is housing. I predict Saskatoon will require 5,000 houses in the next five years, or ten at most, and nothing must be permitted to stand in the way of housing by any and every means. Any person or group of persons who stand in the way will be guilty of a serious disservice to the city of Saskatoon. Mr. Stone and I look forward to working with the City Council, the Board of Trade, with Labour and Employer groups, to overcome the serious lack in home construction in Saskatoon. I was very happy to receive a message, and not 10 minutes ago from Moose Jaw to the effect that an agreement has now been signed between the city, the province and Ottawa (C.M.H.C.) on 75 houses under Section 35 of the National Housing Act.

Mr. Speaker, I will turn now to the work of my department, and may I express appreciation to the people of Saskatchewan who have insisted on and then helped with the many welfare programs in the three welfare departments of education, of health and social welfare. It is a matter of pride to the Saskatchewan people that we have come so far in so little time. May I express appreciation, also to the many municipal and provincial organizations, to churches, Home and School, affiliates of the Community Chest, and private welfare agencies who helped day by day to make Saskatchewan one of the brightest spots in social advancement on the North American continent. I am reminded that this is Red Cross week, a great international welfare organization, one that has rendered a great service in Saskatchewan, an organization that has stood the test of time in many important welfare fields.

In my own department, some 50,000 Saskatchewan people are helped by our various programmes. I shall deal with our corrections programme first. This province, to my knowledge, is the only one in Canada where the treatment of offenders against the law, both juveniles and adults, is placed under the Department of Social Welfare. The reason is that Saskatchewan's approach to a solution of this most serious problem is not punitive but corrective. Delinquency, crime, is a disease. A good physician seeks out the causes of the disease and then endeavours to remove these causes. Our approach is exactly the same. In the past we have dealt only with the symptoms of the disease. We put the offender behind bars, with little or no training or retraining in various trades, there was no formal education, although many offenders were illiterate and over 82 per cent of the inmates of our jails had less than grade 8 education. There were no psychiatric or psychological services or trained social workers. First offenders were mixed with hardened criminals, so that our jails were veritable schools of crime. Recidivism, repeaters, were as high as 80 per cent. All this is changed in Saskatchewan, at least to a degree, that caused Mr. Edmison, who is one of the leading Penalogist authorities on the North American continent, and the President of the Canadian Penal

Association, to say, and I use his exact words, "Saskatchewan leads the provinces in penal reform."

Much remains to be done, but our programme is paying off. Delinquency in Saskatchewan has progressively decreased during the past few years, where elsewhere in Canada it is on the increase. We have been able to close one of our provincial jails, much to the disappointment of the hon. members opposite. Elsewhere in Canada, many other provinces are going in for bigger and better jails. Our expenditures on corrections are actually less, as the estimates for this year reveal, than they were a couple of years ago. In fact, our programme has been so successful that the Opposition, and the Leader-Post (the two are synonymous) are endeavouring to find fault and that, Mr. Speaker, is a sure sign of success on the part of this Government.

The success of our juvenile delinquency programme has exceeded our fondest hopes. The number of boys in custody in our Saskatchewan Boys' School has decreased by two-thirds. I hope the day will come when I can turn the key, metaphorically speaking, in the door of that building and announce to the world that this building is no longer required for the purpose for which it was constructed. On that day I shall invite my Irish compatriot the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), I will invite him to a celebration that will be heard about all the way from Cannington, to Donegal. You know the hon. member recently gave a radio address, deprecating the closing of the Moosomin school, and the high cost of maintaining the Boys' School here at Regina. As an Irishman, I thought he would have welcomed closing a jail. Evidently he still has a nostalgic interest in these institutions. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) to this celebration that I am looking forward to, but he would only be a death's head at the feast. He would keep reminding us that we had failed in keeping this school full to capacity.

May I state, Mr. Speaker, in passing, that all space in the school is fully utilized. It is the headquarters of our correction staff. Our Civil Defence headquarters are located there. There is an instructional school for crippled children, and a further school for mentally handicapped children is being organized. Campion College, Air Cadets, the Little Theatre of Regina, as well as other organizations use the auditorium and gymnasium. It is true that the staff of 19 at the Boys' School could take care of twice the number of boys; however difficult those boys may be, but if they can make good citizens out of the boys under their care, society will have been re-paid many, many times for the cost of their services. Indeed, if this staff can save one boy from penitentiary, a life of crime — I think that they will not have laboured in vain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I note that the Hon. Mr. Cross (he is the Minister of Health for Alberta) has taken exception to our hospitalization plan, and predicts the downfall of the British Columbia Government on the basis of that plan. Mr. Cross, as Minister of Health and Welfare, would be better employed if he concerned himself about the condition of delinquency in the Province of Alberta. Mr. Cross may also take satisfaction out of the fact that

March 10, 1952

there are thousands upon thousands of Alberta people who are going without hospitalization services because they cannot afford them. Mr. Cross evidently does not know that there is a vast difference between hospitalization plans in British Columbia and in this province. You know, you have to believe in a thing to make a success of it. This Government has believed in hospitalization, just as it has believed in penal reform in this province, and because they believed in it, they worked at it, they washed the bugs out of it; we slaved over it until we made a success of it. It would appear to me that had British Columbia been interested in the hospitalization plan that it would have been in the healthy position that our hospitalization plan is in this province today.

Returning to delinquency, I know something about the delinquency problem in Alberta. I know that for a time they placed their delinquent boys in foster homes without any trained social workers whatsoever. If they ran into difficulty, they placed the more difficult cases in mental hospitals. Imagine putting healthy young boys who may have come from problem homes, in mental hospitals. They also placed the juveniles in jail, fraternizing with confirmed criminals, and that was the way they attempted to solve their juvenile delinquency problem. I understand that they are now in the process of building two new institutions. They have also inaugurated a police force whose special duty it is to look after juvenile delinquency. I was amazed to get a letter from the Department of Justice, Ottawa, the other day, asking our opinion on an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquents Act of Canada, 1928. A province, and you do not need to use your imagination to name that province, wished to amend Section 28 of that Act to provide punishment by way of "paddling". Now, I do not know whether you know what paddling is, except in the natural way. But in the institutions they have a mechanical device. It is a device that comes out of the medieval and barbaric days and to attempt to apply that kind of treatment to the solution to the problem of juvenile delinquency is cruel, ineffectual and unethical.

When an individual politician or a government wraps the cloak of piety and patriotism around themselves, I become suspicious, and that goes for the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) who is not in his seat today.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Child Welfare Branch of this Department . . .

Mr. Tucker: — (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I have been very kind to the Leader of the Opposition. Last year the Child Welfare Branch of this Department had in care 2,532 children. These children came from broken homes, children of divorced parents, homes deserted by the bread winner, homes with serious marital problems, homes stricken by accident or illness or death. These children also included children of unmarried mothers. These were neglected or potentially neglected children. The Child Protection Division of the Child Welfare Branch seeks through a case work service to strengthen and preserve family ties and prevent family breakdown. Naturally, we believe in the retention of the child in the home of its natural parents. The preservation and improvement of the home is very often most difficult, and I am pleased

to report that of the 1,508 homes who received services from this branch in 1951, it was only necessary to take 171 children into non-ward care, and 140 became permanent wards of the Minister. Non-wardship is a temporary arrangement lasting usually from one month to a year, and is due usually to the illness of the mother, or for other temporary causes. These children are returned to the home when these causes are removed.

In the unmarried parents division in the past year, services were extended to 1,480 unmarried mothers. Unmarried mothers are encouraged to keep their children and arrangements are made to make this possible. 196 children of this group were received into temporary care, 269 became permanent wards of the government. I am delighted to report the progress that has been made in this most difficult problem, where not only the future of the child is at stake, but the future of the mother and very often the putative father. I am pleased with the care, the skill that has been exercised by the Child Welfare Branch in this field.

By the Child Care Division the great majority of these 2,532 children have been placed in foster homes. Of paramount importance is the selection of suitable foster homes where the child will develop normally, and enjoy the security of a good home and all the understanding and love of good foster parents. I am pleased that the number of foster homes last year increased by 13.5 per cent. Society — this province, owes a debt of gratitude to our foster parents in this province.

I am pleased to report that the number of child caring institutions has been reduced to two — the Babies' Nursery in Regina, and also Embury House here. Both of these institutions are used for emotionally disturbed children, who for health and other serious problem such as maladjustment, mental disturbance, cannot be placed in foster homes and so they are placed in these two homes, and when the problems are solved they are then placed in foster or adoption homes.

Lastly, by our adoption services, the ultimate aim of our Child Welfare programme is to place children in carefully selected adoption homes. 301 adoptions were finalized last year, and 621 homes where children were placed on a probation adoption basis were supervised.

Mothers' Allowances, Mr. Speaker, were paid to 3,190 mothers, who received \$1,106,000 last year by way of assistance. During the past two years we have extended the payment of mothers' allowances until the child reaches the age of 18 years if in school. The idea of this, of course, is to place the family in an earning position so that it can in the future become a self-sustaining family unit. You are aware, of course, that family allowances are cut off at the age of 16. Frankly, I think they should be continued until age 18. I am pleased to announce that commencing the first of next month, mothers' allowances will be increased by \$10 a month. The question has often been asked, why does Saskatchewan pay more in mothers' allowances than Alberta, and Manitoba, when their rates seem to be higher than ours? That is very easily answered. It is very difficult to get on mothers' allowance in Manitoba, where the number of categories are very limited. Here in Saskatchewan, we pay Mothers'

March 10, 1952

Allowances to widows, to wives whose husbands cannot work, whose husbands are in institutions. We pay it to deserted mothers, to divorced mothers, and unmarried mothers. Now let us make some comparison. In 1949-50, the last year that I have a report by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Alberta paid mothers' allowances to 1,668 families in the amount of \$672,000. Manitoba paid to only 947 mothers a total amount of \$606,000. Saskatchewan paid to 3,190 families, \$1,106,000 and this does not include free hospitalization and health services which are not paid in Manitoba, although they are in Alberta.

In Social Aid last year the Provincial Government paid \$975,000 — the municipalities for urban and rural \$421,000. The hon. members opposite, especially during an election campaign, when their statements cannot be successfully repeated on the hustings, are fond of saying that municipal taxes in Manitoba and Alberta are lower than they are in Saskatchewan. Nothing is further from the truth. And I will tell you why. Take, for example in Social Aid and mothers' allowances the Alberta Government, again I am quoting from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, paid \$1,511,000; the municipalities \$501,000, the ratio is 75 to 25. Saskatchewan paid \$2,120,000 — the municipalities \$434,000. Manitoba Government paid \$1,230,000 — the municipalities paid \$1,253,000. In other words, this government paid 83 per cent, the municipalities paid 17 per cent. Manitoba Government paid 49 per cent, and their municipalities paid 51 per cent. And, if we add to that the cost of hospitalization and medical care of old-age pensioners and mothers' allowances, and their dependents, the contrast is still more startling still, because Saskatchewan paid \$2,165,000 for these services to 30,132 persons. Alberta in the same year paid \$1,162,000.

It is not reported the number of persons to whom it was paid. Manitoba has no true hospitalization and medical services to old-age pensioners or mothers' allowances, and if you want some further contrast here they are. The last year that the Liberals were in power, 1943-44 in Child Welfare, old-age and blind pensions, social aid, the Liberals paid \$1,215,000. In 1951-52, the present year, we are committed to an expenditure in the same fields of \$6,586,000. And if you want some additional statistical information, I shall be happy to supply it for you — if I can find it. Here it is, and I would advise you in the reading of the report of the Committee on Provincial-Municipal relations — the Cronkite-Britnell report — read all of it, and tell the people the whole story. You do not do that, you do not tell them all the truth.

Table 3 in the report reveals this that in 1947-48 the per capita expenditure on health and welfare services by British Columbia was \$15, Alberta \$10 and Saskatchewan \$7, Manitoba \$6, Ontario \$7. And that is why taxes in this province to municipalities have not gone up nearly as quickly, or to so great an extent as they have in the surrounding, neighbouring provinces of Manitoba, and Alberta that the gentlemen opposite are so fond of quoting.

I would like to deal briefly with the Rehabilitation Branch of our Department. It is a relatively new branch, and very few provinces in the Dominion have such a service. We have many hundreds in common with other provinces, of physically handicapped people who cannot work, and whose problem is a very serious one. We are endeavouring to do something about this.

I would like to deal briefly with the Rehabilitation Branch of our Department. It is a relatively new branch, and very few provinces in the Dominion have such a service. We have many hundreds, in common with other provinces, of physically handicapped people who cannot work, and whose problem is a very serious one. We are endeavouring to do something about this. We assess many of these peoples' handicaps, we conduct a vocational diagnosis of their cases, we discover if there are trades and professions for which they can be trained. These are people who have never worked a day in their lives, who depend on social aid and their families to support them. Their conditions, their outlook on life and very often their psychological problems are very, very serious. Last year we provided 293 of these people with our vocational rehabilitation services. We actually placed 39 of these people in employment for the first time at an average cost of \$400 per case. It is a good investment to have people who have never worked before earning their own living, taking a greater interest in life, developing within themselves the sense of self-worth and conscious of being of some value to society. We also pay a grant of \$10,000 a year to the Moose Jaw Sheltered Workshop where over 20 seriously deformed people, girls, are employed in the needle trade industry. That industry has made good progress, and it comes within 25 per cent of paying its way. The girls there are employed at weekly salary, which is at least the provincial minimum. Last year I am happy to announce, nine of these girls were and still are, employed in private industry for the first time in their lives.

Last year we spent \$52,000 in the rehabilitation of Metis people in this province. This is a serious problem — one that I do not pretend that we have begun to solve. This is a problem of long standing, and it is closely associated with the Indian problem in this province, and that, God knows, has not been solved. Very little progress has been made in assimilating the Indian people, and bringing them along down through the years. Unfortunately, wherever there is a large Indian reservation there is a contiguous Metis or half-breed problem. As we found at Crooked Lake, for example, a half-breed colony outside the Indian Reservation, the children there have not received education, they were not permitted to attend the school on the reservation. We have built a new school there. It was opened last year. Similar schools have been built at Crescent Lake and Duck Lake. There are certain of these half-breed colonies where their local means of livelihood have entirely disappeared as in such cases as Baljennie, in the R.M. of No. 374, and in Glen Mary near Prince Albert. We removed from that municipality — the Metis themselves volunteered to go, 79 people — to the Green Lake projects. Also certain families from R.M. 374 and Baljennie. At Green Lake they have opportunities in fishing and in trapping and employment and land is provided for them. Their lot in life has been considerably improved. Down south at Willowbunch there is a Metis group there, and they too have reached the end of their resources. There is no local employment for them.

I wish to pay a tribute to Father Blanchard who has developed a very fine co-operative in that area. He first established a co-operative and credit union, and we purchased a farm and made certain grants this past summer. Those people are rapidly becoming self-sufficient, and any social aid that we have paid in the past has been progressively reduced during the past two years. Our Metis farm at Lebrét, where there are between 70 and 80 people living, continues to give them a relatively high standard of living, and a degree of security that they had not hitherto enjoyed. I do not profess that

March 10, 1952

that this problem of the Metis has been solved. I do not think it ever will be solved until both the Provincial and the Federal Governments come to some agreement — to some agreement respecting both the Indians and the Metis.

I am not going to deal with the Old Age and Blind Pensioners at any length — those were dealt with at the special session in December. I have some criticism to offer, however, regarding the Federal Government in the field of pensions. It is true that they pay \$40 a month to all those who are 70 years and over, but they provide no housing, they provide no nursing care, no health services, and no welfare workers to help those in distress — a great deal remains to be done if we are to care for the aged people of this province in the manner in which they should be cared for. On the other hand, Ottawa requires the Provinces to administer the Old-Age Assistance (the 65-69 age group) on a strict means test, covered by some 10 pages of regulations, and if the province does not stick to those regulations, then it can be made to pay the full amount of the pension. As far as we are concerned, I have instructed our field workers to thoroughly explain to every pensioner, every applicant, the implications of these regulations, and I have also asked them to grant maximum pensions based on the widest possible interpretation of these regulations. I am happy to announce that, of the first 2,600 applications for the 65-69 group, that only 300 of them were turned down. I think the field staff is doing a pretty good job of interpreting the regulations.

Just a word about our veteran land settlement, because this will probably be the last occasion on which I will mention it. The Branch of the Rehabilitation of Veterans has now been transferred to the Department of Agriculture. It was retained in my department as long as it was considered a rehabilitation problem, so long as there were negotiations to be made with Ottawa, with V.L.A. and with the Department of Veterans' Affairs. I wish to say that I had the most cordial and friendly and business-like relations with the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and the Veterans' Land Act. Believe me, I will give the Federal Government credit for this, that their land policy act subsequent to this war is infinitely superior to what it was after the First World War. It is a matter of pride that we have settled 2,088 veterans on provincial land. There have been 66 cancellations during the past two years, but that is natural. Some of these boys returned overseas with their wives who had become dissatisfied with farm life in Canada, there were health and other reasons, but of the 66 farms that were given up, because of our land policy, these were turned over to other veterans. If we had sold these farms to the vets, then the farms would have been sold to the richest farmers in the community who did not need them. No veteran, I venture to say, would have gotten any one of these 66 farms that were given up.

I recall that last year we had a lengthy discussion in this House on a resolution brought down by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) indicating that there was dissatisfaction with our Land policy. That many of the veterans wished to know the price, that they would pay for the land and they wished to purchase their farms. Well, we spent hours and hours, Mr. Speaker, of this Chamber's time on this question, and I naturally expected a flood of applications because that resolution was passed. I instructed the staff to explain the situation to veterans,

and have them write in to our office to Regina if they were dissatisfied with our land policy, if they wished to know the price that they would pay when they could purchase the land. I have had exactly 4 letters during the past year. Exactly four letters, and one of those was an enquiry; the other three wished to know what they would be required to pay for their land. And so you see, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. McCormack: — You got rid of them.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — . . . that, in spite of the doubts that the Opposition and the hon. member for Last Mountain had attempted to plant in the minds of the people of this province of veterans' dissatisfaction with our land settlement scheme, no such dissatisfaction exists. Now, I am happy that this branch is going to my friend, the Minister of Agriculture. I think that the future of the boys on these farms is pretty well assured. The Department of Agriculture will extend their best services in improving land utilization practices. I am confident that this settlement scheme of ours will prove an outstanding success.

I am not going to deal with housing, because I am going to deal with that on a resolution which is now before the House.

In Civil Defence, I might mention that we have a good organization in this province under a capable director, John Probe. We have trained a relatively large number of patriotic Saskatchewan citizens in civil defence organization. I regret, however, that we have not received one single cent of financial assistance from Ottawa for the development of our civil defence seriously — then they must contribute very substantially to the cost, certainly they can afford to do it out of the \$775 million that they have amassed in surplus already during the present fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident, and I regret to say this, that the old ship of state of the Liberal Party is in trouble. It has wallowed in the sea of indecision and gathered barnacles during the last 40 years. It has now piled up on the rocks of political ineptitude. The crew, Mr. Speaker, is beginning to leave the ship. The hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) professes or gives the excuse as stress of business. Well now, I am sure that any patriotic Saskatchewan member would not let business stand in the way of public service. And then my old friend, the hon. member for (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) pleads the excuse of ill health. I ask you to look at him, gentlemen. He is one of the healthiest looking gentlemen in the House, and when we heard him deliver that speech of his with all the vigour of a very young man, I am sure it is not so much his health as it is his conviction that the old ship is about to flounder, and he might as well get safely off.

Mr. Dundas: — We will have another one in my place, to take my place.

Mr. R.A. Walker: — The hand-writing is on the wall.

Mr. Dundas: — We will have another one to take my place.

March 10, 1952

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Then there is another member in the Opposition, a member who had rendered great service to the Liberal Party. He was indeed a shining example of a prudent Liberal politician — as a matter of fact there were very good prospects of him being leader — he was financial critic of the party, but when he thought that the ship was about to founder he found a safe berth, God bless him, for the rest of his life. And then the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) who has in the past been held up by the Opposition Leader, and by The Leader-Post (the two are synonymous) as a great authority on the north country. The hon. member for Athabaska knew the problems of the Metis and the Indian and the citizens of the north. He understood trapping and fishing and mining. He was the authority of the Liberal Opposition on the north country. Well, he became so dissatisfied with the sabotage that the Opposition was employing to prevent the development of the north, and he was so pleased with what has been done in that north country by the C.C.F., that he crossed the floor of the House and now sits, Mr. Speaker, on your right.

And may I assure you that the people of Saskatchewan are not going to risk their hard-won gains of the last few years by turning the Government of this Province over to you gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Dundas: — We will sure be in there next time.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The hospitalization, the larger school units, our automobile insurance, our northern development programme, our power corporations, our transportation company, to mention a few of them. Do you think that the people of this province would risk turning these over to people who have declared in the past that they do not believe in many of them? Who have consistently sabotaged them? Well, Mr. Speaker, like the people of this province, I am filled with optimism as to the future of Saskatchewan, and the return of the C.C.F. with increased majority at the forthcoming election. I shall be happy to vote for the motion.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Minister of Social Welfare this afternoon, I was somewhat disappointed that he did not say a little bit about the Fort Qu'Appelle golf course, and the purpose that that served to this Government and the people of Saskatchewan, or to the tourist centre; but he saw fit to keep those things to himself.

Premier Douglas: — You can read about them in "MacLean's" magazine.

Mr. Deshaye: — He also spoke about the Boys' Home in Regina, and I think that with many of the things he has said we can agree. At the same time, I think that he should have informed the people of Saskatchewan that it costs more to keep each student or person in the Boys' Home in Regina than it would to keep them in the Saskatchewan Hotel. I think that is something he might have told; that is something that probably, with all other merits

of the scheme with which I agree, he should tell the people of Saskatchewan what it is costing them to operate that school.

The Minister of Social Welfare did not tell us, either, about the operation of the Metis farm at Lebret, which he might have. He might also have told us of the picnics that he attended there last year, and of the chickens that he plucked while he was there — I just do not know who won the prize yet.

Mr. Speaker, I think that still, in Saskatchewan, our primary industry is agriculture, and that is what I am going to speak on for a while in this Budget Debate. I think that we must concern ourselves with keeping the young agriculturist on the land, and I think, today, there is a deplorable abandonment of the farms by our young farmers, who are flocking to the cities outside of Saskatchewan for employment. I think that we must do something to keep these young people in our basic industry. I think, also, that there are four things that must be done to keep the young farmers on the land. One, I think, is better and more adequate rural schools and education for the children of our younger farmers. Two, is more speedy rural electrification and subsidized cost to the farmers in order to provide better living conditions on the farm for our young farming people. And then, I think, we must give more Government assistance to build better market roads and maintain those roads in order that the farm people may be able to get out and enjoy life a little more. Then the fourth point which I think we must provide the rural people, is reduced taxes. That is why we, on this side of the House, regret very much that the Government members have again refused our request that they abolish the Public Revenue Tax.

I think that if those four recommendations which I have mentioned were adopted, we would have more of our people remaining on the farms. We could produce more milk, butter and other commodities that we consume, from our own Canadian farms, and we would not be driven to the necessity in Saskatchewan of importing powdered milk and butter from foreign countries. I think that a lot of the policies of this Government are to blame for that necessity.

The other day, when the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) spoke, he painted a very rosy picture of his Department. However, he did not tell us that it is much easier to build roads today than it was when the Liberal Government left power in 1944 and the years prior to that. After the end of the war, super machinery was brought into road construction, which was not available until the war's end. There is no denying of that; people everywhere in Saskatchewan are aware of that. But despite the introduction of this super-machinery that we have available, not only in Saskatchewan, but in every province of the Dominion of Canada, and every State of the Union, since the war's end, this province's road record is nothing to brag about. In 1944 we had 8,006 miles of highway in Saskatchewan, and that figure is taken from the annual report of the Department of Highways. In 1950, six years later, under the C.C.F. Government, we have again taken from the annual report of the Department of Highways, 8,308 miles of highways in the Province of Saskatchewan, an increase of 302 miles in six years, or 50 miles a year.

March 10, 1952

As I said before, those are outstanding figures. In 1944, we had 8,006 miles of highway in Saskatchewan; in 1950 we had 8,308 miles of highway in Saskatchewan. In six years of C.C.F. Government we have an increase of 50 miles a year. Now, if the former Liberal Government had built highways on that basis, we would have had less than 2,000 miles of highway when they left power in 1944. However, I am glad to say, and quite proud to say, that instead of 2,000 miles of highway in 1944, which we would have had on the basis of the C.C.F. Government's building of highways and with the equipment that they have, we would have had only 2,000 instead of 8,006 miles. That is pretty good reasoning. They may build a lot more this summer, Mr. Speaker; after all, this is an election year.

I have another set of figures here that I think will prove the inefficiency of the Department of Highways of the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan. To go back to 1944, in that year, when the Liberal Government left power — this is to end of 1943 — we were operating 42 ferries in the Province of Saskatchewan at a cost of \$91,217.90 which is an average cost of \$2,171 per ferry. There were 42 ferries. However, this Government has cut down the service provided to the people of Saskatchewan, and are today operating only 36 ferries, at least they were in 1950. And in 1950 this Government was operating 36 ferries only, at a cost of \$144,176 or an average cost, Mr. Speaker, of \$4,000 per ferry — practically double the cost that the Liberal Government was operating ferries for in 1943. The people of Saskatchewan were receiving service from 42 ferries instead of 36, and they were receiving it at practically half the cost per ferry. That is what this Government is costing the people of Saskatchewan.

With all of that, there is 145,000 miles of market road that this Government has left the municipalities to take care of, and to operate and to maintain. I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, to you this afternoon, that the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan have never, in the history of this province, had less assistance from any government for the maintenance of its rural roads and bridges than it is getting from the present C.C.F. Government in this province — never has it had less assistance. That is another reason why we, on this side of the House, have tried to persuade this Government of ours to abolish the Public Revenue Tax. We are convinced that some additional assistance must be given to the rural municipalities of this province. And if this government refuses to give them assistance in additional grants to build roads and bridges, then, I say, let us give them what assistance we can in the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax, which would at least save our municipalities in this province \$1 1/2 million a year. That is why we ask the Government to again consider its decision to abolish the Public Revenue Tax — and this applies to the Provincial Treasurer, too.

I want to speak on one more thing. On March 4, the Leader-Post published a write-up that the department of Natural Resources received \$100,000 for bids on six oil exploration permits. I was very interested in reading that write-up, Sir, because a year ago in the House I had suggested during discussion of the estimates of the Department of Natural Resources that that is what should be done, that these oil permits should be auctioned off. The Minister of Natural Resources ridiculed it, and had that silly grin

(just as he had a moment ago) on his face. He stood up in his seat (and I do not think he will deny it today), and said it was impractical, it could not be done — and he grinned just as he is grinning now. However, I see that the Government finally did adopt that policy to auction off six permits that had been dropped by previous takers; six permits that did not amount to very much in the whole scheme of the oil operation of this province, because they had been taken up and dropped. Still, Mr. Speaker, those six permits brought \$99,588 into the coffers of this province. So, wherever the Minister got the idea, whether it was from that suggestion or not, I am glad that he finally adopted the policy and at least has brought \$99,588 to the people of Saskatchewan which would not otherwise have come. However, Mr. Speaker, very sad to say, the situation is regrettable that the policy was adopted after, shall we say, the bird had "flown the coop." After practically all the resources of this province had been given away for a pittance, and less, they adopt this policy of auctioning the oil permits.

There are several instances — we might state, for instance, the transaction which has already been spoken of in this House, the transaction that was dealt with at length by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), popularly known as the "Rhubbra deal", in which 14 million acres were handed out to one group of individuals, Mr. Rhubbra and his associates, at one-tenth of a cent an acre. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if that 14 million acres had been auctioned off on the basis that these six permits that had been dropped by previous takers have been auctioned off, those 14 million acres would have brought to the people of Saskatchewan \$3,900,000 on the basis of this auction. The Provincial Treasurer tried to laugh that off, but on the basis, I say, of this transaction, if he will take out his pencil and figure it out, he will find that will bring \$3,900,000 to the people of Saskatchewan. The Provincial Treasurer might laugh that off, but I do not think the people of Saskatchewan are so anxious to laugh it off.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — May I ask the hon. member a question? I wonder could he tell me how much the land that was under exploration by the Imperial Oil, 20 million acres, would have brought on that basis?

Mr. Deshaye: — I am looking at the average that you would work on the Rhubbra deal. There might be a permit that was given in the Rhubbra deal that might have brought \$100,000 for one permit, there is no telling. I am talking about averages. Here we have an average to work from; the figures, I imagine, come out of the Minister of Natural Resources' department, and they show that for six permits they got \$99,000.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That 20 million acres would be about \$5 or \$6 million, then.

Mr. Deshaye: — You take your pencil, too, Mr. Minister, and work it out. You will find that it comes to \$3,900,000 that the people of Saskatchewan have lost on the basis of what these permits have brought. That is not the only deal; there is another one here. Let us take the 600,000 acres that were given to Dr. Shumiatcher, the former civil servant, adviser to the Premier, etc., etc. He paid \$3,750 for what he got, and in two days he sold that for \$15,000, and also got 25,000 shares in the company to which these permits were sold. He netted himself \$11,250 in cash, and \$25,000 shares.

March 10, 1952

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if those permits had been put up for auction, the very least they could have brought would be the price that Dr. Shumiatcher obtained two days later. They might have brought much more, because they would have been advertised. Dr. Shumiatcher was able to find, in two days, a purchaser who would give him \$15,000 for a permit that he paid \$3,750 for. So I submit that the people of Saskatchewan have lost at least \$11,250 and 25,000 shares, if not more, because I submit they could have brought more if auctioned off. And this same man, Dr. Shumiatcher, gets another buy from this Government for \$500, which he sells for \$15,000 in a few days, plus 100,000 of fully paid up shares in Search Corporations. There is another loss, I submit, that if these shares that Dr. Shumiatcher had were auctioned off they could have been auctioned for the very least of \$15,000.

That is the tragedy, Mr. Speaker, of the handling of Saskatchewan's oil resources by the C.C.F. Government; and I think, as a result of the bungling of the handling of Saskatchewan's oil resources and the bungling of Saskatchewan's uranium resources, by the type of loans made by the Insurance Office, and all of these things, that this Government will go down in history as the worst government that Saskatchewan has ever had.

While these tremendous profits have been able to be made by a few men like Rhubbra and Shumiatcher and people who, as my hon. friend for Maple Creek said in his speech that "it pays to be friends of the government", while these tremendous profits have been able to be made by a few men, this Government has gone out and passed the Mineral Taxation Act, where the poor labouring farmer has to pay three cents an acre for the minerals that they may or may not own on their property. They pay three cents an acre for something that may never exist there; but they still have to pay that three cents in the event that development may take place some day and then, if they did not pay the three cents an acre, those minerals would be confiscated by the Government.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is an injustice that is being perpetrated upon the farmers of this province of Saskatchewan, and the half a million dollars a year that this Government takes out of the farmers of Saskatchewan by the three cents an acre tax is certainly an unjust revenue derived from an unjust tax. And I will say that we, on this side of the House, we, the Liberals of Saskatchewan, pledge ourselves to remove that tax if we should become the government after the next election.

This three cents mineral tax is a tax that has been imposed by this Government upon the farmers of Saskatchewan, and regardless of what they say, they cannot pass the blame for that tax off on a former Liberal administration. Besides that, there is the 2 million Public Revenue Tax, and I again appeal to this Government to abolish that Public Revenue Tax. We, on this side of the House, cannot say too much for the abolition of that tax. We will fight for the abolition of that tax until such time as it is done — as long as this Government is in power — and if it is not in power and we become the government, then we will abolish it.

There is ample reason for the abolition of this tax. In the Budget Speech, the Provincial Treasurer announces that he will be receiving \$19,948,000 from the Federal Government, this year, in subsidy. This is an increase, on his own statement, of \$3,848,000 over the amount that he received from the Federal Government in 1949. This \$3,848,000 is more than twice the amount that will be collected from the Public Revenue Tax in one year, or more than the amount that will be collected from that tax in two years. I say, therefore, that there is every justification for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax. When a Government is able to get \$19,948,000 from the Federal Government of Canada in subsidy, increasing it, as I said, by \$3,848,000 over what it was two years ago, then this Government owes a duty to the people of Saskatchewan to abolish the Public Revenue Tax.

This Government set up the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Commission to investigate certain things that it should do. The Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report states that the Public Revenue Tax should be abolished by this Government. It definitely states that. The Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Commission cost this province considerable money. Therefore, I submit that, if the recommendations of that Commission are not adopted, the money that the people of Saskatchewan have paid for that report made by the Britnell-Cronkite Commission is wasted. If you do not intend to follow a report for which you pay, then you have wasted the money that you have paid for that report.

Everybody in Saskatchewan, excepting, it appears, the members of this C.C.F. Government want the Public Revenue Tax abolished. All the municipal men are asking for this tax to be abolished. All the farmers of Saskatchewan are asking for this tax to be abolished. But the Government is taking no heed, and therefore, in view of the popular request of all of the people of Saskatchewan to have the Public Revenue Tax abolished. I am moving an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

That all the words appearing after the word "that" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"in view of the increased revenues of the Province, including the increased payments from the Dominion Government, this Assembly regrets that the proposed increased school grants on an equalization basis are not to be paid from such increased revenues rather than from the Public Revenue Tax."

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It regrets here that the increased school grants are not to be paid from increased revenues rather than receipts from the Public Revenue Tax. In other words, the motion which is before us suggests that the Public Revenue Tax should be abolished, and that we should not use the money for this purpose, as has been announced.

Well I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have already dealt with that question, and therefore it is, according to the rules of the House, out of order, again.

March 10, 1952

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on this question of order of this Amendment, I would like to quote to you Item 488 in Beauchesne's Second Edition:

"Whenever an order of the day has been read for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of Supply or the Committee of Ways and Means, the motion 'That the Speaker do now leave the chair' must be proposed, except in cases provided by Standing Order 28. When such motion is proposed, it shall be permissible to discuss any public matter within the powers of the Federal Parliament."

(This is written, of course, for the Federal Parliament)

". . . or to ask for the redress of any grievance, and it is not necessary to move an amendment for that purpose, provided that the discussion and the amendment, if one is moved, shall not relate to any decision of the House during the current Session, nor to any item of the estimates, nor to any resolution to be proposed to the Committee of Ways and Means, nor to any matter placed on, or whereof, notice has been given in the Order Paper."

It is on the Order Paper, Bill 49. This very subject is on the Order Paper — Bill 49 respecting the Public Revenue Tax, and the use of it, and this purely indicates, Mr. Speaker, that I would say the amendment is out of order on two counts. First, it is a repetition of a subject that has been previously dealt with during this Session, and secondly, it deals with a matter which is presently on the Order Paper. That is Rule 488.

Mr. Speaker: — It is mainly on the grounds that it is anticipating the debate that will take place on Bill 47, which is already down for second reading. I would rule the Hon. member's amendment out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I would like to say a word before you actually give your ruling. I would draw your attention first of all, to the fact that the Premier, speaking in the House on the other motion, indicated that if it were not for the suggestion that the Public Revenue Tax should be abolished, then the first part of the motion would be in order.

Hon. Members: — No! No!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I heard him, and there is no doubt that it was right — that the first part of it was in order. Now then, it is certainly going very far to suggest that, if the Government can put something on the Order Paper that deals with items in the budget, and change the law, they can thereby close off the discussion of the budget. Now, that is really something beyond anything that I ever heard before. In that way, the Government could close off all discussion of the budget, Mr. Speaker, and of course, that is practically what they are now inviting you to do.

Now then, I am glad they did not put it on the grounds that this was decided before, because that would be surely wrong, but on the grounds that it is on the Order Paper. All that is on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, is dealing with the Public Revenue Tax in one part of this province. That is all that is on the Order Paper that received second reading. If you will refer back to it, as I remember it, it refers to only a part of the province — it does not refer to all of it; and it would really be a most amazing thing if the Government could close off the debate on this budget, and the voting on the budget, by virtue of putting Bills on the Order Paper. In that way they could restrict the debate entirely.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Would the hon. gentleman tell us what part of the Province he is referring to? I cannot get the significance of his point.

Mr. Tucker: — The part to which the Speaker referred was in regard to Bill No. 49. Here is the Bill. In the northern Saskatchewan Administration, Section 3 . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is all he wanted — Section 3.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . that in one part of the province, it provides that the tax in the northern districts shall . . .

Hon. Members: — Read Section 3.

Mr. Tucker: — Section 3 provides that the proceeds of the Public Revenue Tax will be used only for expenditures incurred for education purposes. Now then, that is only carrying out the budget, and we are debating the budget now, Mr. Speaker. This is only carrying out the purposes of the budget, and we are being asked for supplies to carry out the plans these gentlemen feel that we have to pass. I think it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not have supplies, in order to appropriate the money, to carry out this Bill, the Bill will be in abeyance, and it has always been the right of Parliament to refuse to vote money even to carry out the purposes laid down in legislation, and this legislation has not been enacted yet, Mr. Speaker. This legislation still has not received the assent of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor. It has not ever passed third reading in this Legislature. Now, then, here the Provincial Treasurer made the motion that you leave the Chair, so we can go into supply in order to carry out the purposes of this Bill, when it is passed. We move an amendment to that. We regret that instead of being abolished, this money is going to be used for school purposes — we regret that. Now, does that tally? And could they then, Mr. Speaker, fail to go into supply thereby defeating it, and then the whole thing falls to the ground, and this Bill can never possibly become law.

After all, Mr. Speaker, it is a most amazing thing (I speak advisedly) that, because the Government has seen fit to get an item on the Order Paper to carry out its Programme laid down in the budget, we cannot amend the budget. I have sat in Parliament since 1935, and I would have thought that anybody on the other side of the House, or anyone else, would not have argued that, because the Government has put an item on the Order Paper, it should forbid supply being discussed, and an amendment being moved, to the House going into Committee and Supply. I submit, Mr. Speaker, and I do ask you, that, before

March 10, 1952

you make an off-hand ruling in this matter, you actually go into the matter little more carefully, because you are making a most far-reaching decision in this matter, to say that when the motion is made to provide supply, that we have not the right to make an amendment saying that that supply shall be granted, but in another different way.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you are, by doing this, preventing one of the time-honoured rights of members of Legislatures of Parliaments to refuse supply in advance. If this ruling is right, Mr. Speaker, our government would absolutely frustrate one of the fundamental rights of a legislature. It could, by putting items on the Order paper, prevent every single thing that the people are concerned about, and in having a right to discuss and preventing supply from being granted in the implementation of that programme. There can be no denying that, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing to prevent the Government from putting things on the Order Paper. They could put on the Order Paper everything covered in this budget. Then, Mr. Speaker, are you to tell us — we, representing the people of this Province, that we have not the right to get up and say that supplies shall not be spent for those purposes? Why, such a ruling is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, and I say to you . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! When the hon. Leader of the Opposition uses such language as that, about what the Speaker is doing, I think he had better withdraw that.

Mr. Tucker: — I meant it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I do not care whether you did.

Mr. Tucker: — I repeat what I said just now — that such a ruling is outrageous.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I do not attempt or hope to persuade the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to obey the rules of this House, but I am going to appeal to the hon. members opposite to try to observe some of the rules that are laid down for our guidance. I think it is most regretful that the Leader of the Opposition puts every member of his party in the position he put them last week, when clearly there was a motion proposed contrary to the rules of the House, and again today, when quite clearly contrary to the rules of the House, that he puts his members in a position where they should oppose your ruling. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have here a book called Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. This book is put here for our guidance, and what does it say? Section 448 — I want to read again the pertinent parts:

"Whenever an Order of the day has been read for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of Supply or the Committee of Ways and Means, the motion 'That the Speaker do now leave the chair' must be proposed, except in cases provided by Standing Order 28. When such motion is proposed, and so on . . .

It then goes on:

". . . provided that the discussion and the amendment, if one is moved, shall not relate to any decision of the House during the current session, not to any item of the estimates, nor to any resolution to be proposed to the Committee of Ways and Means, nor to any matter, placed on, or whereof, notice has been given in the Order Paper."

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only has it been placed on the Order Paper, but it is now a Bill in second reading. And the hon. members opposite will have the opportunity, when they come to Bill 49, to accomplish the very thing they have in mind today, of voting down that section in the Bill. They will have every opportunity to do it. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have already voted on Wednesday, February 20, on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne:

"This Assembly regrets that the measures proposed do not include the abolition of a Public Revenue Tax, or any practical plan to assist the municipalities, school boards, and other local bodies."

We have already voted on that once, and here again we have another motion which is before us at the present time in the second reading of this Bill. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is out on both counts. Let us try to run this House, Mr. Speaker, as you are doing, in accordance with the rules laid down and not by the bullying tactics of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that this amendment is out of order, and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to challenge my ruling, or wants to give any further information — but might I explain to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the motion is that I now leave the chair, the House to go into Committee of Supply. The purpose which you might have honestly in mind can be accomplished when you are in that Committee, or on the second reading of this Bill. There is no intention on my part to throttle any discussions, or for the Leader of the Opposition to follow any measure, in an orderly and parliamentary manner, to bring about his idea; but you know, and this House knows, that if this motion was carried, it would mean that this Government could not go into Supply, and the method which you are trying to use, I consider, is absolutely out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — I would like to bring to your attention something further. Actually, he points out for the hon. members opposite, this motion is made under Standing Order 49, and this provision for an amendment to the budget is over-riding right of Parliament, and a right of members of Parliament. Now, I refer you to Standing Order 49 of Beauchesne's, where it says on an amendment going into Supply; it definitely provides only one amendment to the motion which permits Mr. Speaker to leave the Chair for the House to go into the Committee of Supply or Ways and Means. This is the predominating motion passed, practically, of the whole Session. It cannot be superseded, Mr. Speaker, by

March 10, 1952

a Bill put on the Order Paper, which has not had second reading, Everything that has happened so far has happened by virtue of the will of the government of the day. We cannot prevent the government of the day from introducing a Bill, and putting it on the order sheet. It has not yet received second reading.

Now, it would be safe in stating if they could so supersede this over-riding right of Parliament as to whether to grant supplies to Her Majesty by getting up and saying: "Oh, we have got something on the Order Paper . . . "

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker (it is almost six o'clock) and I think (and I say this in all sincerity) this right on a motion on a budget to go into Supply, and the right of an Opposition to move an amendment, is such a long-established right of Opposition, and has been moved in this Legislature over and over again by previous Liberal Oppositions, and by previous C.C.F. oppositions, that it would be really, I think, too bad if you were to make a decision without taking the time to look into it.

But, if you want to make an off-hand decision on it, we will have again to respectfully disagree with your decision; but I do suggest that you take time to look into it, at any rate.

Mr. Speaker: — I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I am going to stand by my ruling. I would be very, very grateful, though, whatever happens to this ruling, if he will get in touch with the highest Parliamentary procedure authorities, either in the House of Commons at Ottawa, or in London, and if he can find that my ruling is wrong, then I would be very grateful to him. But my ruling stands that this amendment is out of order. I have taken my own information as to the rules of procedure and parliamentary procedure, and have also conferred with the Clerk, who I consider has much greater knowledge than the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The question being put by Mr. Speaker: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? It was agreed to by 30 votes against 17.

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — After seeing this performance just finished now — they used to tell us we were just like a bunch of sheep; but I have never seen any of the Opposition members vote against their leader since they have been in this House. You talk about sheep! I think we have them right over there. They have not even got the courage of their own convictions. However, seeing we have the boys all simmered down now, maybe tomorrow we will be able to get away to a good start. So I beg leave to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

(Debate Adjourned)

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE CROWN

Second Reading — Bill No. 54

Hon. J.W. Corman Q.C. (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, it seems that whenever I have a choice morsel to deal with, I get at it about 10 minutes to six, and for that reason I won't say a great deal about this. This is a Bill that could very easily lead to superlatives if I was given to them, Mr. Speaker. I am very proud that it has fallen to my lot to introduce this Bill. I think it ranks with a Saskatchewan 'Bill of Rights' which I was also privileged to bring in. This Bill assuredly does away with the necessity for a fiat before the Government of Saskatchewan is sued, it also opens the courts of this province to any litigant who wants to sue the Government for what is called in law a "tort", that is a wrong such as negligence or trespass.

I will only add that I was asked by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) if there was any retroactive features. I may say that, as the Bill is printed, in my opinion it is retroactive. That was the intention. However, I find that in Manitoba or Nova Scotia to make sure that it would not be retroactive (remember this is a uniform bill) they put in a provision that it would not be retroactive. Now, we are following Manitoba or Nova Scotia in one respect. We are bringing in a House amendment but, unlike the Government of Manitoba (I am quite sure it was) we are making our Bill retroactive beyond any doubt, even to the extent that Mr. Ivanchuk can sue the Government of Saskatchewan if he wants to; but I might point out that I do not think he wants to, or he would have applied for Petition of Rights, which we would have granted him overnight.

Just one other phase of this I want to deal with. This Act will come into force on proclamation. We have followed Great Britain; we have followed the Federal Government; we have followed Nova Scotia, and we have followed Manitoba. We will have to give sufficient time to get the Bill printed so the lawyers will know where they are at, and so that if necessary we can set up a staff to deal with any litigation. That was the reason in Nova Scotia. They waited six months. I can give the House this assurance that this Bill will be proclaimed at least while I am still holding this seat. It will be proclaimed sooner than the Bill was proclaimed in Nova Scotia. I would move second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put, the Bill was read the second time, and referred to a Committee of the whole at the next sitting.

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