

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
31st Day

Friday, March 21, 1952

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

SECOND READING

SASKATCHEWAN MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

Bill No. 69 – An Act to provide for the establishment of Saskatchewan Municipal Advisory Commission.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Prince Albert): — In rising to give second reading to this Bill I do so feeling confident that this makes provisions for one, if not the, most important recommendations in the Jacobs-Britnell-Cronkite report on Provincial-Municipal relations. In part 10 of the recommendations of the commission that I have just mentioned it states:

“Your Committee is of the opinion that provision should be made for the establishment of a municipal advisory commission in the Department of Municipal Affairs. Your committee attaches little significance to the name, but the functions of the body should include general research in municipal matters, studies in taxation, advice to particular municipalities and recommendations to the government as to the payment of grants if and when such grants should be necessary. Your committee wishes to emphasize that such a commission should be headed by men of ability and knowledge. They should be competent to direct the work of the research secretary and to make decisions. It is suggested that the commission itself might well be a body of three, as to whether all three should be permanent civil servants, your committee is not prepared to make a recommendation.”

Several other paragraphs dealing with recommendations have a bearing on the particular functions of an advisory commission set up in the Department of Municipal Affairs for the sole purposes of service to municipalities and for the Provincial Government and the relationship between municipalities and the Provincial Government.

In looking over the agenda of resolutions introduced and considered at the 47th Annual Convention of the rural Municipal Associations we find that they deal largely with the recommendations contained in the report. From page 7 to page 12 inclusive, it deals exclusively

March 21, 1952

with the recommendations of the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report. And on page 12 of the recommendations submitted to the Annual Convention of the Rural Municipal Associations, there is rather a lengthy and a very interesting resolution. A resolution that was endorsed at all of the district meetings of that Association held last summer and it has to do with the question of municipal roads and asked that the Provincial Government make provisions for an extensive study of municipal roads in relation to present day needs.

Those of us who have gone over the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report in some detail will recognize that the provisions of Bill 69 are such that they would carry out the field work suggested for such a commission. Section 3 states that municipality means a city, town, village or rural municipality.

I know this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is very conscious of rural municipal governments and their problems and I might draw to the attention of this Assembly that we have many towns in the Province of Saskatchewan; we have a good many villages in the province whereby their municipal governments are experiencing some difficulty in meeting the wishes of their ratepayers within the field of municipal government. There is the odd city in our province that is also meeting with difficulties. However, in the main, the cities are so staffed that they themselves can reasonably take care of their municipal problems — of the economics of municipal administration — within the framework of their own municipality and their own employees.

Section 3:

“There shall be a Commission to be called a Saskatchewan Municipal Advisory Commission consisting of not less than three or more than five members who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.”

The Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report states that the Commission should be headed by men of ability and knowledge. And in speaking to the rural Municipal Convention held in Saskatoon recently, I mentioned that the rural municipal governments would be well and ably represented on such a Commission.

Section 6:

“In the performance of the duty and exercise of powers imposed or conferred upon the Commission by or pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall be responsible to the Minister.”

During the course of the conferences held last summer we learned that it would be the wish of rural municipal governments that they have direct access to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or to the members of the Privy Council. We thought it advisable to state in this Bill that the Commission shall be responsible to the Minister and of course, in turn,

the Minister responsible to the municipal governments and to the people at large.

Section 7 — Clause (a)

“Inquire into any matter referred to it by the Minister for investigations.”

Now we do visualize that rural municipal governments, village governments and town governments in particular will be referring, from time to time, matters to the Minister asking that consideration be given to these matters by the Commission. In other words, we try to visualize this Commission as men of knowledge and ability in that particular field of work, being assigned from time to time studies that might originate through the rural municipal associations, might originate through the urban municipal associations. We feel that such a commission would be an excellent position to build and maintain relationships in fields of responsibility as between the provincial government and the municipal government.

Section 8 — Clause (a)

“Conduct research in municipal matters.”

I think we can safely say, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the Province of Saskatchewan is concerned, we have become of age; we are pretty well grown up at the present time and there are matters of vital importance in the relationship between the province and the municipalities; questions of vital importance between the relationships of the Federal Government, Provincial Government and municipalities, that will require a considerable amount of research. This was recognized in their report referred to and provisions are made as one of the powers of the Commission for study in research in municipal matters.

(b) “To consult with and make recommendations to municipal authorities on any matter relating to municipal administrations.”

We feel that Section (b) of Section 8 is rather an important clause in building and maintaining relationships and giving to the municipal government the advantage of qualified men in the research, consultant fields and on the Commission.

Clause (c) of the same Section:

“Examine the problems of obtaining additional sources of revenue for municipalities.”

It is true that rural municipalities' field of taxation is quite limited; and during the conferences last summer the question arose from time to time “Would it not be possible to give some study to the broadening of the taxation base for municipalities.” We have made provision here for a study of that question in the Bill that is before the House.

March 21, 1952

Clause 8, Section (f):

“Inquire into any matter which, in the opinion of the Commission, is pertinent to the problem of strengthening municipal institutions as efficient governing units.”

That is very important. It is quite possible to visualize a condition whereby municipal governments may not have at their disposal the tools to do the job which has been assigned to them. There is also the question under that particular section of the division of responsibility as between the province and the municipalities and in studying the question of the division of responsibility between the province and the municipalities we must not lose sight of the need or give serious consideration to a redistribution of the wealth of the Dominion of Canada which brings into focus relationship between the Dominion, the provinces and the municipalities.

I have no hesitation in saying that such a commission will find a very broad and a very useful field of service to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and to the municipal governments which are represented by the people. This is a very short concise Bill; there are no very contentious clauses and, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving second reading to Bill 69, an Act to provide for the establishment of the Saskatchewan Municipal Advisory Commission.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I have not had any time to look at this Bill. We are sitting morning, afternoon and night in this House and I think that many bills here might have been better off if we had time to study them and see what is really in the Bill, Therefore, the remarks that I am going to make this afternoon will be very brief; but I just happened to sit down and look at this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill that is supposed to implement the recommendation of the Britnell-Jacobs-Cronkite Commission. I cannot help but notice, Mr. Speaker, that what is proposed in this Bill is just another government board to be set up by the Government and I am astounded that a bill of this kind, which has been so much talked about, so much heralded all over the province to bring some sort of a voice in the municipal matter by the people themselves and the municipal organizations. This Bill provides to set up another Government Commission or government board. It says:

Section 3:

“There shall be a Commission to be called a Saskatchewan Municipal Advisory Commission consisting of not less than three nor more than five members who shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council.”

Well, if we need another planning board for the municipalities, here we get it. Why in the name of common sense, Mr. Speaker, should not the appointment and the personnel of this Commission be picked by the municipalities and the government-appointed chairman of the Commission. In the cities and the towns and the villages and the rural municipalities — we have got over 300 of them — haven't we got brains and ability there, that are qualified to pick the members of that Commission that are going to deal with their business affairs? Who is better fitted? Who is better fitted to do that than the municipalities — the men, many, many hundreds of them — who have spent practically a lifetime in municipal work in serving their people. They know the problems. Who knows the problems of the rural municipalities better than the men who conducted that convention in Saskatoon a week or ten days ago? I think that it is preposterous that this Government can take such high-handed action; because I think it is wrong in principle; it is absolutely unjustified; and it is an insult to the municipal men of high calibre that we have in the Province of Saskatchewan today.

Now then, this Bill goes much farther than that, Mr. Speaker. It says that it is a very concise and compact — I think the Minister said that before he sat down. It certainly is and there is more contained in this Bill than anybody thinks, by looking at it quickly. It says here:

“The Commission shall inquire into any matter referred to it by the Minister for investigation.”

That is all that is in the Bill. This is a government board or Commission set up to keep the Government from the trouble they are in with the municipalities and to try to find some way out whereby they are going to be able to function. But it is purely Government Bill. Before the Government appoints a Commission the municipalities have nothing to say about it. They can only do what the Minister tells them to do.

“The Commission shall inquire into any matter referred to it by the Minister for investigation.”

Well, Section 6:

“In the performance of the duty and exercise of powers imposed or conferred upon the Commission by or pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall be responsible to the Minister.”

I just read that now to reinforce what I have already said that

“The Commission shall inquire into any matter referred to it by the Minister for investigation.”

I am astounded that after all this money has been spent to find out what really is wrong with the municipalities; after going over this whole province last year, like the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, holding meetings, asking these men who control the affairs of the municipalities

March 21, 1952

what they wanted, what was wrong with the situation, asking for suggestions and remedies. Now they come in with a Bill like this. Once more it is a statement of speech that transfers the business control of the country into the hands of the Minister, into the hands of the Government. That means nothing else. If it does mean anything else, then I do not understand what is in this Bill. Because, after all, this Minister appoints the Board and they have no alternative to do anything else but do what the Minister tells them to do. Let me read the section again:

“In the performance of the duty and exercise of powers imposed or conferred upon the Commission by or pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall be responsible to the Minister.”

“The Commission shall inquire into any matter referred to it by the Minister for investigation.”

Well, that is all the duties of the Board. And this is just the sort of thing that they might do. But it certainly is this. The Minister is the one that appoints them; the Minister is the one that tells them what to do and the Government has the appointment of this Commission and it is a very simple matter to appoint the men to get the report that they want. I am going to say so, because it has been done in the past. The certain actions this Government has taken — and it can be done again. They are looking for a way out to keep themselves from the mess they are in now where the Public Revenue Tax is involved in relation to the municipalities. And here is a way out to get the right parties in the Commission to come through with a report which will, or they hope will, let them out and let them off the hook. That, Mr. Speaker, is my comment on this very briefly.

I have had no time to look it up or study the matter except I can read what is on it and the meaning of that is very, very clear to anyone that understands it at all. I have been in municipal work for many years, Mr. Speaker; I have been in there for about 23 years and I know a little bit about what municipal work is. I say to you that this Commission is a farce the way it is put into this Bill and the way it is going to work out. Let the municipalities, both urban and rural, appoint four members of that Commission, or two members, and the government-appointed chairman. Then you have something that you can go back to the people and say, “Here, we are running our own business. We, who have the responsibility have also the responsibility of finding a solution.” I plead with the Government to take that step and do the right thing with these municipalities in the Province of Saskatchewan, who find themselves in very great difficulties in many, many cases.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) made me want to say a few words in regard to the motion to give this Bill, to establish a Saskatchewan Municipal Advisory Commission, second reading.

I was rather amused when I heard the hon. member for Arm River talk about the municipalities appointing four members to this Board and the Government appointing the Chairman. It is a funny thing but nobody ever heard the hon. member for Arm River recommend that the farmers of western Canada appoint all of the members of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Government at Ottawa appoint the chairman. The hon. member . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Just a minute . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member might as well sit down in his seat.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker —

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — But it is one thing when the hon. member for Arm River is making recommendations to the Government at Ottawa and quite another thing when he is making recommendations to the Government here in Regina; and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, too, there is a tremendous difference between the attitude of the member for Arm River towards the municipalities now and his attitude when he sat on this side of the House.

Mr. Danielson: — Not a bit, I always . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — All the Liberal Government which he supported had for the municipalities was the Whip — that is all. They did not give them any attention. They would not do anything about the seed-grain debts. They would not consider any of their problems at all. All they did was cancel a lot of their assets, their taxes, so that the last people . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That is silly.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . that should get righteously indignant about treatment of the municipalities are the people who sat on this side of the House before 1944 — the Liberal Government.

In addition, the member for Arm River of course, does not know what he is talking about when he said that the municipalities will have nothing to say about it. The Advisory Commission is a device which will give to the municipalities a greater chance than they have ever had before to have something to say about it and I have no doubt that when the members of this Commission are appointed that the municipalities will have something to say about the personnel too. It will be mutually agreed upon . . .

March 21, 1952

Mr. Danielson: — Where is it in the Bill?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I admit, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a Liberal Government on this side of the House today, we would not get that unless we had it down in black and white. This Government does not treat the municipalities like that. This Government confers with the municipalities and takes them into our confidence on a partnership basis. I want to say that I think this is one of the finest forward steps for the Province of Saskatchewan and the Municipalities of Saskatchewan to have appointed a body of experienced and capable people who will give their time and attention to the direct problems of municipalities, not on an individual municipality basis, but through those general problems that affect many of the municipalities, both urban and rural throughout the Province of Saskatchewan.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to vote in support of the motion.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to think a good deal the same on this Bill as Mr. Danielson does, to the effect that we have not had any time to think this thing over, or study the Bill and I do believe it is something that will be of great importance to the municipalities, something in which they will be greatly interested, whether it will be good or bad, we do not know, but we want some time to think this thing over. It looks to me, the way this Bill is worded that one of the principal things it will do is put more power in the hands of the Minister than he now has. That this board that will be created will be responsible to the Minister and nobody else they way the Act reads to me. And any recommendation coming from this Board, would perhaps be acted upon by the Minister, without much consultation with the municipalities concerned at all. There are a great many things that you can read into this Bill — a good many ideas could come out of it.

Municipalities, especially rural municipalities, or municipal councils, are very jealous of the powers they now hold and they would not want to take a chance that may infringe on those powers. They cannot help but liken themselves perhaps to the school trustees in the local school districts now where they are in the larger school unit — they are just chore boys for the units — they have nothing whatever to say about the administration of the schools or anything else. And municipal councils and counsellors through this country, I am sure, do not want to be reduced to that status. I am not going to say any more on that today, Mr. Speaker, but I would like leave to adjourn the debate.

SECOND READING

THE CANCER CONTROL ACT

Bill No. 74 — an Act to amend the Cancer Control Act, 1944

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Gull Lake): — Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 74, an Act to amend the Cancer Control Act, I would like to proffer a few observations, if I may, before introducing the motion to give it second reading.

I had occasion once before this session to mention the Cancer Control Act and some of its history. I think it might not be amiss to repeat some of the things today that I said at that time in order that the history be clearly understood by members of the House.

We all know the Cancer Control Act, of course, was brought into effect in the days of the regime of the Anderson Government in the early thirties, at which time cancer services were provided for the people; but of course they paid for those services. There was a reason for that, Mr. Speaker. People were beginning to become aware of the fact that cancer was a great killer. Not only did people suffer from it, but it killed a great many people; and only today ranks second to heart trouble as a killer among people. So I think a great deal of honour is to be bestowed upon those who introduced the Cancer Control Act and also to those who continued it after it was introduced, when they assumed office on this side. So the Cancer Control Act continued operating as it had been started in the thirties until March 31, 1944. During that time the history of cancer services indicate that a great many people who may suspect or fear cancer were, because of the cost involved, reluctant sometimes to come and get attention and there was a good deal of request on the part of the public to have cancer services provided free to the patient who required it. Now, don't get me wrong, somebody over there, when I say "free" — not free, but free at the time required to the person who needs it. In other words, without cost to him or herself when they need that service. This was recognized by the Liberal Government who sat over here, elected in 1938. They knew this should be done. There was a great public clamour for it. That same government overstayed its welcome by one year beyond its legal right from 1943 to 1944, and then, as an eleventh hour confession of its sin for having failed to introduce free cancer services, did pass an act on April 1st, 1944, in the dying days of its regime over here, to provide free cancer services.

Now, we hear — and I know the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) would probably get up and say they introduced it — and intended to give it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to argue that they had no intention of putting it into effect unless they were re-elected, which they were not. Now my argument for that is this. You do not pass a Bill today, have it given assent by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor tomorrow and then have everything happen. To provide cancer services you

March 21, 1952

must have regulations. Regulations must be provided to prepare for the necessary services by hospitals, by pathologist and by cancer surgeons. And you do not just pass an Act and have every cancer surgeon suddenly know tomorrow morning what his part in the scheme is going to be. You must negotiate with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the same as we have always done in the things we require from them. We must get agreement from them so that they know what is required, so that you know, the Government knows what they can give — what the costs are going to be — and all the rest of it. These preparations were not made, Mr. Speaker, either prior to the passing of the Act on April 1, 1944, nor was any attempt made to have those regulations drawn up and those negotiations carried out between April 1st, 1944, and the date of proclamation May 1, 1944, nor between that day and the date they were finally defeated in the election of that year. These are important things for the public to know, Mr. Speaker.

So the free cancer services were actually put into operation by the Government over here on this side — the C.C.F. Government. Regulations were passed — they got into action right away. Negotiations were started. Regulations were prepared and were ready for putting into effect of November, 1944, and made retro-active to the date of proclamation of the Act, May 1st, 1944. It was not until the following February that final agreement was reached with the College and others for the provisions of the services to cancer sufferers.

Now, you can see, Mr. Speaker, by that, that it took from the day this Government was elected until November to get the regulations drawn up and until the following February to get agreement with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, how necessary it should have been for the Liberal Government to have had those negotiations and prepared those regulations when they contemplated passing the Act. I claim, Mr. Speaker, they only passed that Act as an election promise, as I say, an eleventh-hour confession because they were fearing they were going to be defeated after six years of government.

Mr. R.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Is that why you introduced all these things in the last month?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Who asked that question? I was not looking at the time.

Hon. Member (Government): — The Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Was it the Leader of the Opposition, or my little friend from . . .; that is fine. I am glad it was the Leader that asked that because the Leader of the Opposition has been in politics longer than I have, Mr. Speaker, much longer. He knows the game much better than I do. He has been everything in politics progressive. Pro-monetary reforms, pro-a follower of Jerry McGear and Mr. Slaught from Rosthern down to Ottawa and back here to Saskatchewan. He ought to know what subterfuges and so on the Liberal Party would use in order to save its neck when an election time comes along. I would not know. At the present time I am saying these things because I want the public to understand who actually made provision for them to have the free cancer services that they are getting at this particular time.

Now those negotiations were completed. Regulations were drawn up and from that time until March 31st, 1950, no one who visited the cancer clinic was charged anything whatsoever. I want to review a little bit more, if I may, Mr. Speaker, because this is important for everybody to remember — that when the drive to protect the public against cancer and to get the public aware of the dangers of cancer and what should be done, was taking place in this province in the early years of the war, it was customary for the people who were promoting the educational process to come to a town and advertise a meeting, which was right — and to gather all of us to go into some large meeting place in that particular town or city where we could hear the message and almost invariably — I attended a number of these meetings, Mr. Speaker — and almost invariably the speaker would startle his audience by saying “One out of each eight of you here tonight will die of cancer.” It was important for him to do that in order to bring home to everyone of us very clearly the great danger that there was in cancer and, because of that, as I say, the results of the things I have been describing had the effect of convincing a great many people that any suspicion of cancer would be taken care of.

General practitioners in the country, who may have suspected that a patient may have cancer, knowing that the economic barrier had been removed, after this Government removed it, made it possible to get free treatment, directed the patient to the cancer clinics. The result is that we found that a great many cases were coming and that those that could be cured were being cured; those that could be relieved, or life prolonged, or suffering abated, were given that type of treatment.

In March, 1950, it was considered that the public were well aware of the dangers. Therefore, we thought that anybody, who was directed to a cancer clinic and under diagnosis at the cancer clinic was discovered not to have cancer, would not be unwilling to pay some little share of the cost of giving that diagnostic service. So the \$10 fee was started on April 1, 1950, to provide the patients, who were discovered not to have cancer, would make a payment of \$10.

Mr. Danielson: — Restored the old charge.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I did not get the comment, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — Restored the old charge.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — No, no, the old charge had been applicable to everybody. This is applicable to those who have been discovered not to have cancer. A very distinct difference, my friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson). I do not suppose you can get the distinction; however, I hope that you can, Mr. Speaker, and others here in the room. In the old days under the Conservative — which I am not complaining of — and the old Liberal regimes, \$10 was charged to everybody, cancer patient or not, who went to the clinic, at least. Under the regulations that we put into effect on April 1, 1950, only those who were diagnosed as not cancerous paid the \$10 fee. Can my friend get that clearly through his head?

March 21, 1952

Now then, a difficulty has arisen, as frequently does arise in these things. The cancer programme is administered by the cancer commission and we find now that the Commission have some doubts as to their rights to make this charge of \$10 because in 1948, an amendment was introduced to the act described as a cancer patient — one actually suffering with cancer. Consequently, those who have come to the clinics, since the \$10 fee was put on in April, 1950, the Cancer Commission have doubted their right to charge that patient the \$10. We still intend to charge it, but in this amendment here today it makes provision for the Cancer clinic to adjust their regulations so that there will be no shadow of a doubt about their right to charge that \$10 and also to pay on behalf of that patient, who may turn out not have cancer, whatever the necessary medical, hospital or surgical bills are required to convalesce and cure that patient after he or she may have undergone certain surgical procedures in the diagnostic days of discovering whether they were cancer patients or not.

So this amendment here, Mr. Speaker, is to make regulations governing the provision of diagnostic services to a person suspected by a physician of being afflicted with cancer, and who is or has been for a period of at least six months, immediately prior to actual admission to a clinic, a resident of Saskatchewan and prescribing the charges to be made to such person therefore, when it is found that he is not afflicted with cancer.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would not have entered into this debate at all if it had not been for the attempt made by the Minister to purposely fail to explain that the idea is to save costs, by cutting down the provisions for free cancer treatment in Saskatchewan.

It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that this proposal is made to amend the Cancer Control Act of 1944. The Cancer Control Act of 1944 was an Act that was passed while the Patterson Government was in office. It was Chapter 78 of the Statutes of 1944; it was assented to on April 1st, 1944. The Act actually provided that all cancer patients who were resident and had been resident in Saskatchewan for a period of at least six months, immediately prior to making application for admission to a cancer clinic, shall be entitled to care and treatment at the expense of the province. In other words, while the Liberal Government was in office in this Province, it was enacted into law that persons who in effect were residents of Saskatchewan for at least six months prior to making application for treatment, were entitled to care and treatment at the expense of the Province. Under this law, if they applied for treatment at a clinic they were entitled to free cancer treatment. If they were admitted to a clinic they were entitled to free treatment — under a law passed by the Liberals — and this very Act, this very Act we are amending today, was passed under a Liberal Government.

Let there be no mistake about that. Under the Liberal Government it was provided that persons who had lived six months in the Province, and were residents, should be provided with free cancer clinic treatment. This amendment provides that, if it is found out after they apply that they actually have not got cancer, then they have to pay this fee. So the purpose of this Bill is to give the present Government the right to exact that fee, which they did not have the right to do under the legislation passed by the Liberals.

Now then, actually, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), although probably under the legislation passed under the Liberal Government, this Government did not have the right to collect this fee, they have been actually collecting it, and now they feel they had better cover their actions by amending the law passed under the Liberal Government.

Now, is it not an amazing thing that we have opposite us people who have been going around the Province, claiming that they introduced free treatment of cancer; that they now actually introduce a Bill amending the law passed under a Liberal Government, which provides that there shall be free treatment for cancer, and for free treatment for those applying for admission to clinics — that they are applying for amendments to that law, to cut down the rights which were provided under a Liberal Government.

How could you, Mr. Speaker, have a more definite proof that the sort of thing that the C.C.F. have been going around the Province claiming, that they were entitled to credit for inaugurating free treatment of cancer — could you have a more complete proof than this Bill that that claim is totally untrue? When they are actually operating today under the statute passed under the Liberal Government; and today they come in and ask that it be amended, in order to cut down the rights which were given under that statute.

Now something has been said that the Liberal Government did not intend going ahead with it. The fact is they made it the law of the land; they made it the law of the province; and they voted, according to an answer made by this Government and filed in this Legislature. They put in the estimates to cover the work of this cancer Commission; they put in the estimates — \$76,760. Now, I would like to know what more could be done besides providing for setting up a Commission, providing that people should be entitled to free treatment and putting a vote in the estimates to cover the cost.

Just because all of the steps had not been taken to provide for the operation of this system, before the Government was defeated in the election, which came not long after, does not prove a thing, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, it has been brought to my attention that the Patterson Government put in the 1943-44 estimates \$76,760 and in the 1944-45 estimates \$215,000 for cancer treatment — according to the last Liberal budget.

So there is the answer to these claims made by the hon. members opposite, and I am sure that we must be obliged to them for bringing forward proof that the claim which they have made repeatedly around the

March 21, 1952

Province, that they inaugurated this plan, is incorrect by now bringing in an amendment to the Bill under which they are operating today; and which, of course, is found in the Statutes which were passed under the Patterson Government, the last Liberal administration.

Actually, what we are asked to do is to cut down the right of people to have their costs, in connection with these clinics, paid for if it turns out that they have not got cancer.

Now it may be that the present Government felt this was a wise thing to do — to deter people going into the cancer clinic without just cause. I have always had doubts about that, because they do not get into the cancer clinics without being referred by a doctor; and it may be some detriment to people who might fear they have cancer, to know that if they go and take an examination and it is found out that they have not got cancer, that they will have to pay this fee. It seems to me that this may have been a retrograde step, Mr. Speaker. It would be much better to spend this extra money and be sure that we do not discourage people from going and getting an examination, than to make them pay when it is found out they have not got cancer. There may be many people who feel that they have not got cancer, but still go and get examined and find that they have it. Surely the idea of conferring this right to free examination and free treatment was to make sure that anybody who might be referred by a doctor for examination would not hold back from getting that examination.

Today this Government is introducing a deterrent by providing if it is found out they have not got cancer, they have to pay the fee, and that is cutting down on a right conferred by legislation, under the last Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker.

Premier T.C. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one knows better than the Leader of the Opposition that there is a great deal of difference between passing legislation and providing a service. It is true that the Liberal Government — as my colleague, the Minister of Public Health, has pointed out — introduced and passed the Act for Cancer Control on April 1st, 1944. That Act came into effect on May 1st, 1944. But how serious were they about really giving the service which the Act purported to provide? When I became Minister of Public Health on the 10th of July I was amazed to find that no regulations had been passed — that no arrangements had been made to pay the bills — that no schedule or tariff of fees had been entered into with the doctors of the Province — that the doctors knew nothing about giving that service, or whether they were going to be paid, or how they were going to be paid. No arrangements whatsoever had been made. The figures which have been quoted by the Leader of the Opposition are probably the best proof that they were not seriously intending to give the service, provided in the very legislation which they had passed. As he said, they provided \$76,760 in the estimates; \$76,000 to do a job of providing free cancer care for the people of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, was he serious about that? Had they ever canvassed the situation? Had they sat down with the doctors and hospital officials and got some idea of how many cancer patients there would be? They knew from the Cancer Commission which had been operating, what the incidence of cancer

was likely to be; the number of cases they would likely have; the number of days they would likely be in hospital; the number of cases that would be surgical; and the number that would require radium treatment. They knew all that, and yet they provided only \$76,000. The very fact that the next year we had to put in \$215,000 — or three times as much — to give that service indicates, of course, that \$76,000 was totally inadequate; and the fact that we are now providing in this year's estimates \$684,000 — about nine times as much — is very good evidence of the fact that they were not taking the thing seriously at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure most hon. members will have seen the question asked by Mr. Howe, the member for Kelvington, which was answered in the House on Thursday, February 28. The question was "How much was paid by the Cancer Commission for hospitalization of cancer cases prior to July 10, 1944?" The answer was nil. They had paid nothing. When we came into office they had paid nothing whatsoever on behalf of either cancer surgery or of cancer hospitalization.

Now, with reference to this matter of charging a fee for those whom the clinic finds are not suffering from Cancer. Mr. Speaker, this is a Cancer Control programme. It is a programme to provide free care, free surgery and free hospitalization, for those who actually have cancer. As hon. members know, there are many people who go through the clinic and find that they do not have cancer. When you consider they are given a complete diagnosis, which may cost several hundreds of dollars, it is surely not too much to suggest that they pay a nominal fee of \$10 for the diagnosis which they have received. This clinic is set up primarily to provide treatment and care and diagnosis for those who have cancer. I think the Minister is wise in not wanting the clinics used for general diagnosis. If patients were sent in for just general diagnosis, because their doctor did not know what was the matter with them, the clinic could become so filled with patients wanting a general diagnosis, that those who really have cancer would be on the waiting list and might have to wait until such time as their malady would have reached a very serious stage.

For that reason the clinic tries to devote itself exclusively to those who do suffer from cancer. If some who have not got cancer get into the clinic, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard of a single person who has gone through the clinic and found that they do not have cancer objecting to pay a \$10 fee. This is not restricting a service. The service to cancer patients and those suffering from cancer, is provided just as much now as it ever was. Complete, free care is provided for all persons who actually do suffer from cancer.

My attention has just been drawn to the estimates. I understood the Leader of the Opposition to say \$76,000 was the estimate in 1944-45. The estimate in 1943-44 was \$76,000 and 1944-45 it was \$215,000. I did not understand my friend clearly and am glad I was corrected on that point. But that does not alter the main situation, Mr. Speaker. In the first place no provision had been made for paying any bills and when this Government took office not a single cancer-surgery bill had been paid. Not only had they not been paid, but no arrangements had been made to pay them and no tariff of fees had been set up. As my friend described it, it was a death-bed repentance on the part of the Liberal party who passed an Act

March 21, 1952

without any of the machinery which could give the services they promised to give under that Act. No amount of wiggling around will alter the fact that the people of this Province never had completely free cancer care until this Government took office.

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I never saw the Premier labour so hard trying to make out a bad case. He has got all his wires crossed for one thing.

Mr. Speaker, in 1944 Dr. Uhrich introduced the free Cancer Treatment Bill. It was one of the things which was a crowning achievement of Dr. Uhrich. It was just an order-in-parliament up to that date, and it was the last Session he took in this House. As a matter of fact, he retired from public life at the end of that Session; was not even a candidate in the coming election. He did that.

In 1943-44, which fiscal year ended at that time on April 30, 1944, Mr. Speaker — that year we voted \$76,760 for cancer clinic treatment. That means that was all we needed at that time. That was the same service as Dr. Anderson and the Co-operative Government introduced into this Province before 1934. That means that the clinic was free except for the \$10 nominal fee. I went through the Cancer Clinic myself, Mr. Speaker, and I know something about this thing. Now then, during the 'thirties, if we had had one-quarter of the money that this Government has spent, there would have been free cancer treatment many years before there was. We spent \$56 million in one year, Mr. Speaker, to keep the livestock and the people alive, and the schools running in this Province, in 1937-38. They can talk about millions of dollars for Crown Corporations and all that; but we had to spend to keep this country functioning, to keep the people alive and from freezing to death, \$56 million at that time.

Now then, I said we voted \$76,760 for cancer clinics — not for treatment. In the budget of 1944-45, which fiscal year ended April 30, 1944, we voted \$215,000 for cancer clinics and treatment, for the 1944-45 fiscal year. That was \$138,000 more than what we had voted the year before, and there is no use of these fellows there trying to twist and turn, and squirm and squiggle out of this thing. The facts are there. The printed documents of this Saskatchewan Legislature testify clearly to what we have done. There is no use arguing about these things and I see it plainly. They set about explaining the circumstances and pretend something which they know is not so.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I know it is so.

Mr. Danielson: — Then keep your mouth shut!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I know it is so, and I do not propose to keep my mouth shut, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — You were not there at the time.

Hon. Member (Government): — That is why we needed the Budget Bureau.

Mr. Danielson: — We had better go to the Budget Bureau and get statistics, to dig this thing up for you. Now then, let us move on.

In this budget of 1944-45, Mr. Speaker, there was another item, and that was \$10,000. (The Premier has reduced it over this whole country to \$5,000, but it was \$10,000), to set up the Health Insurance Commission. That was to start that Commission on its way to setting up the plan for hospitalization in this Province of Saskatchewan. That is what it was for; but there was \$138,000 increase for the free Cancer services for that fiscal year, 1944-45.

And the Bill says that the Bill shall come into effect on the 1st day of May. Then the election came on. The Hospital Board were advised, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the hospital bills were concerned they would be taken care of by the Government of Saskatchewan. I know an instance in my own municipality, where a man's wife was in here for the treatment of cancer. He came to me and said to me, "Why does this thing not come to me as it should do?" I asked him what happened, and he said: "The hospitals are all right, but they have no agreement to pay for the doctor bill." He was right there. I came down and talked to Dr. Uhrich myself — took my friend and came down and talked to Dr. Uhrich — because I was just as interested, Mr. Speaker, as any man in this Province. I did everything I could to bring about this free Cancer Service. With Dr. Uhrich's assistance we did everything we could so far as being able to come to an agreement with the Medical Association of this Province, in regard to payment for services which had been rendered. He said, "So far, we have not been able to do this." He said (these are Dr. Uhrich's words and I have every respect for that gentleman): "They point out to us that some of our best men are at the war and we hesitate to tie ourselves up in this hard and fast agreement until some of these men come back." That is what Dr. Uhrich said to me. So there we are. But so far as the hospital is concerned, these bills were to be paid. The election came on. The Premier made reference to the statement that the election had driven us into the issue at the tenth of June . . .

Opposition Member: — The fifteenth.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that is about one month and 10 days or about 40 days. No, I do not think so. Well, all right then, we will make it one month and 15 days.

Now then, that is the situation. And in the hurdy-gurdy of election time — I do not blame anybody, because this Government represents the half of what the Liberals were in that respect — and I am going to show that in a minute, in regard to getting things in order so that we can function too. But that is the fact so far as the money is concerned. Now then, what are the facts so far as the quantity of money voted? Well, Mr. Speaker, the best evidence I can give you is if you take the present Provincial Treasurer's Budget Speech which he delivered in the Session of 1945-46. He adds \$76,000 to the \$215,000 — that is the increased amount over and above the \$215,000 we voted for the previous year, 1944-45.

But the best Mr. Speaker, is this: that the amount of money which we voted in our budget for these services are as near correct, I think, as anybody could do it. It is a fact there are no supplementaries of any

March 21, 1952

kind voted by this Government in the first budget introduced by them for 1945-46. And if you look at this Budget Speech it says on page 14, and I will tell the hon. member from Gull Lake (Hon. Mr. Bentley) I do not know whether he paid any attention to the speech or not, I do not know — it does not make any difference anyhow. He says he does not know anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, no, he didn't.

Mr. Danielson: — There is the fact — right here in this printed document of this House. They are not any stump speeches, or any rousing speech you go out and make on the street corners or any place else. There are the facts. Now then, in money — \$215,000 was voted for 1944-45, and they did not even put one dollar into the supplementary estimate at the next Session, in order to cover any deficit or over-payments due to that estimate. Now then, let me go a little further — I think you should read up on some of these things. On November 4, 1944, this Government called a special Session, because they were elected on the 15th of June, for the 10th of July. On the 4th day of November, Dr. Sigerist, that famous man that the C.C.F. imported from the United States (and they tried to get a report from him to condemn everything we had in the Province), because he had not . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but my hon. friend cannot impute motives to me. We did not bring Dr. Sigerist in to find fault with anything in the Province. We brought him into the Province to help us map out a health programme. He mapped out an excellent health programme. We have been putting it into effect ever since, and the people like it.

Hon. Member (Government): — The Liberals don't!

Mr. Danielson: — Anything the C.C.F. can do to cast suspicion on us, they are all for it. There is no monopoly of wanting to help the people in any reasonable project, but the despicable thing is when a Party is trying to build up its political fortunes at the expense of the people.

Social Services, Mr. Speaker, has nothing to do with Socialist problems — not a thing — because every province in Canada has social services and some of them more than we have here. There is only one Government or one Province that has a Socialist Government. But on the 4th day of November, Dr. Sigerist handed his report to this Government. What did it say? Well, Dr. Sigerist simply tells the Government (I am very sorry I have not got the report here; I have already given it four times on the floor of this House); he simply said that there was no doubt about the intentions of the Act that payment should be made for surgical and medical services, but up to date this has not been done — and that is not from the 1st of May to the 10th of July. It had taken from July 10th to November 4th; you had July, August, September, October and into November and he sits over here and looks at us and accuses us of dilly-dallying, of doing nothing, when he had four months and he had not done anything, had not paid any doctor bills then. He had not paid one of them. He might have paid some hospital bill, I do not know. This went

on a long time — whether they paid for the hospital bill or not, but the hospital sure would lose for five months. He knows that whichever hospital was concerned, the Liberal Government was ready to pay the bill when I went to present it.

Now then, if it took this Government four months after they came into power with 12 Cabinet Ministers, full of vim and vigour, and full of other things — well, I do not think there is any particular guilt attached to the old Government, Mr. Speaker, when they were unable to pay any bill in one and a half months. That is the history of the whole thing. The money was voted, the Act was put into operation, and it was working. The money was voted, there was plenty to take care of it. There was no supplementary estimate, and the Provincial Treasurer says on Page 14 of the annual budget speech in the 1945 session that this amount is in addition to what was voted last year. Immediately I started to look at the estimates for the supplementary, which indicates clearly that the amount we voted, namely \$215, 000 for 1944-45 fiscal year was enough, Mr. Speaker, to pay the charges for cancer treatment that year.

Of course, things have increased; everything has increased; and will probably go higher yet. Nobody can blame the Government for that. But to come in here and try to persist and persist in making statements which they know is not true. The documents of this House are here for everybody to read.

I am going to support the second reading of this Bill because, after all, he's back-tracking now. He evidently had a change of heart, Mr. Speaker, because, about a year and a half or two years ago (I am not just sure, but it was in 1950, if I remember correctly), they slapped a \$10 charge on anyone who did not have cancer, in spite of the fact that no person could go into the cancer clinic and be examined and find out what is wrong with them, without he is sent there by his physician, or his doctor; and, certainly to goodness, for anyone that goes into that clinic and is put there and kept there by his doctor, there is a very strong suspicion on the doctor's part that it might be possible that he is suffering from cancer. I say to you, and I have said it all along — last year I said it, this year — a few weeks ago — that the charges should never have been put on the patient who has to go to the Cancer Clinic.

Now then, he is going to right things after he has done the wrong thing for two years. He has a change of heart, and maybe if he lives long enough he may be all right. Let me tell you this; he came here to try to put something over, and in doing so he is taking the Act that we put into effect, which we voted money to operate under and now he is changing it back. What he did two years ago was to put through an Order-in-Council regulations (they amount to the same thing) whereby a person who went to the Cancer Clinic and did not have a cancer had to pay the \$10 fee. There has never been an amendment to the Act. He has operated under an Order-in-council, or regulation, or whatever he calls it — I do not know. I am not criticizing him for doing so, because I can understand that the Minister in his job sometimes will find it necessary; but at the same time, I say now that he is doing the right thing —

March 21, 1952

he is taking the trouble to amend the Act. I just wonder if that was not a great opportunity to look forward to — to come up on the floor of this House and once he gets demonstrating (as he tried to do two or three weeks ago on the floor of this House) that this story that he has just been telling is true, which it has been proven time and time again is not true.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to inform the House that the mover of the motion is about to exercise his privilege to close the debate. Anyone wishing to speak in this debate must do so now.

Hon. Mr. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Opposition that the people of this Province are not interested in the death-bed repentance of the Liberals in 1944. They had some forty years in which to do something in this field and nothing had been done. But frankly, the thing that did concern me in the hon. member for Arm River's (Mr. Danielson) talk just now was the fact that he made the statement that the Liberals in power prior to 1944, during the years of the thirties, had paid for education in this Province. They did no such thing, Mr. Speaker. Education in this Province during those years was provided by half-starved teachers who stuck by their job year after year and they got very little help indeed from the Liberals of those days.

Mr. Speaker: — You must stay within the purview . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — All right, I am coming to that.

Mr. Speaker: — I did not hear that the member for Arm River made any reference to education. If he did you are entitled to a reply.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I am agreed with that ruling. I do not propose to let these gentlemen opposite kid the people of this Province that it was they who paid for education back in the 'thirties.

In 1938, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that the larger units of school administration act was placed . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No, no. Order! Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — All right, I am coming to my point.

Mr. Speaker: — If you are replying to something that was said, if you are staying within the purview of the debate of the second reading of this Bill . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, my point is this, that legislation does not mean putting into operation of any policy in this Province, as far as the gentlemen opposite are concerned. Now I wish to make my point. May I proceed?

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — My point is this. In 1938 I was secretary of the Teachers Federation back in those days — and in 1938 the Liberal Government put the larger unit of school administration on the statute books of this Province and for six years, from 1938 until the time they were kicked out of office in 1944, they had not done a thing with respect to implementing that legislation.

So, again I state, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province are not impressed with any legislation that these people put on the statute books of this Province. Indeed the cause of their failure to do anything in the interests of the people of this Province for a period of 35 years is the reason why they were kicked out of office in 1944 — and that is where they are going to stay — on the outside!

(Closing Debate)

Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House much longer, but there are one or two observations I will have to make which will be a repetition of what I said before.

Both the Leader of the Opposition and now the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) repeated the same old story they have been repeating for some time which has a large grain of truth in it, which I never denied, Mr. Speaker. I have said every time I mentioned it that the Liberal Government did pass the Act to provide free treatment. I have agreed with that and they did eventually proclaim it. The Act was assented to on the first of April, 1944; it was to come into operation on proclamation; it was proclaimed . . .

Mr. Danielson: — On 1st of May.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Just a minute, I will do the talking now, Mr. Speaker. I am saying exactly that and I do not need the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) to tell me what to say. The Act was to come into effect on proclamation; it was proclaimed on May 2, 1944, to be effective on May 1st . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Just the one day.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . during the Liberal Government's regime. I have never denied those facts. What I have stated is (1) (which is important) That if they had been so anxious to do this, they would have passed that Act after five years of Liberal Government instead of after six years. They could have passed it after four years instead of six. They could have passed it any time from 1938 on. Now the members used as an excuse that in the days of the 'thirties they had to spend \$56 million to keep people alive. We know that. Somebody spent a lot of money because on the 1st day of January, 1938, nearly half the people of Saskatchewan were drawing some form of relief because

March 21, 1952

we had in this Province, and we had in Ottawa Liberal Governments that did not have the imagination or the courage to use their power to finance other things which they had financed since that time, to finance public works to take people off the street and off the boxcars and put them to work at some public project. They could have had hospitals built for a quarter of the cost they are costing today. They could have had bridges built and highways built and black-topped. They did not have the courage for that so they went out and borrowed money abjectly to pay these bills for relief and left it for this Government to clean up the mess.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I have admitted that our good Liberal friends, fearing that they were about to meet their demise, did have an eleventh-hour repentance, repented of their sins of commission on the 6th year of their over-stayed leave here in the province and passed an Act — I have never denied it — they passed it and I will repeat it again, assented to on April 1, 1944, proclaimed on May 2 and to be effective on May 1st. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says the hospitals were notified that the bills would be paid. They may have been — there is no record in my office of it. The College of Physicians and Surgeons will tell you that there has been no attempt made to approach them at any time . . .

Mr. Danielson: — They never will.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — They have already told us.

Mr. Danielson: — Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, yes.

Mr. Danielson: — My word is just as good as yours.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Oh, no, it isn't. No, it isn't. You were never Minister of Public Health. But a Minister of Public Health has talked to them and they have told him.

Mr. Danielson: — You were out running the Wheat Pool.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, I have been a citizen of this Province nearly all of my adult life and I expect that I am nearly as old as our friend over there. I don't know how old he is, but I will be 61 very soon, so I am not any child and I have been here quite a while. The fact that I was not in politics does not alter the fact that I knew what was going on in this Province. The fact that I knew what was going on is exemplified by the fact that I am in politics today and did my best to get them out of here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have admitted all the things up to that point.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Except for voting the money.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Sure, they voted some money; but, Mr. Speaker, they had made no provision to make any use of that money. Mr. Speaker, there is no use laughing at things that are historical fact. They had made no provision whatsoever to see that the pathological services, that the hospital services, and the surgical services would be provided.

Now, the member says — and I am sorry that we have to bring in somebody else that is not here, because I have a high regard for Dr. Uhrich — I think that he wanted to do this years ago. The member says in a discussion with Dr. Uhrich, Dr. Uhrich said that because the doctors were in war services and other places they were not available to provide those services . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — That is what he said.

Mr. Danielson: — Point of privilege. I said that Dr. Uhrich told me that they had approached the Medical Association for an agreement and he said they had hesitated because they did not feel they should commit themselves in view of the fact that most of their best men were overseas in war services. Keep the record straight.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, that is fine, Mr. Speaker, I will accept that correction. I do not want to argue against something — or rather argue about something that is not stated by a member — I want to know what he said, and if that is what he said, that is fine.

I am claiming that the College was not approached in the first place — officially approached. I would not be a bit surprised if Dr. Uhrich had conversation with them. I would believe him if he said that. And if the hon. member for Arm River says he said that I will believe that the Hon. Dr. Uhrich did try to talk to them, but he made no official approach. There was no attempt made to initiate negotiations.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, if the College were asked about it and the reply was that they did not like to enter into an agreement because too many physicians were out of the province in war services and so on, which I believe is what you said — the member for Arm River said — I want to point this out. This Government established an agreement in February of 1945; the war was still on; the war was not over in Europe until May 8th, 1945. There was no change in the Doctor situation. What I am saying is that if the Liberals — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to blame some former Minister of Health — I am saying the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government, had they been sincere and determined to introduce free cancer services as would be indicated by their Act that they passed in 1944, they would have made provision for the Act to be operative when it came into force and they did not do it. They made no provision whatsoever.

Mr. Danielson: — We provided the money.

March 21, 1952

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes, he speaks about the \$138,000 increase in the estimates for that year. Was it \$138,000? Anyway it was \$138,000 odd increase. He speaks of that. Mr. Speaker, having made no provision for all these things to take place it is not any wonder that when you consider the length of time from July when this Government took office, back to May 1st, when the Act actually came into force, no provision made until the regulations were drawn up in November; and no arrangements made for medical and surgical services until the following February. It is not any wonder that that money was not expended.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, why did it take you so long?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — He says “Why did it take us so long” — well, it took them six years from 1938 in one period of time, from one election to another, to even get the Act on the books and then they say “Why did it take so long for this Government to complete the job?” Mr. Speaker, sometimes it takes months to get agreements. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. Minister permit a question? Do I understand him to say it took this Government from July to November to get these regulations in force and he condemns the Liberals because they did not get it into force in the matter of six weeks? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — No, Mr. Speaker. I have never condemned them for not getting the regulations and agreements between May 1st, when the Act came into operation, and election day. I have blamed them for not doing it prior to the bringing in of the Act — months and months before.

Mr. Loptson: — You previously said so.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Well, I am saying that now. Can the hon. member for Saltcoats get it through his head? You should have done it before. You cannot legislate people into cancer programmes. You have got to make the preparations first. This Government would not think . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You are correcting the Premier then.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I am not correcting the Premier. The Premier knows this story better than you do.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, then, you are correcting yourself.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I am not correcting myself, I am telling exactly what I told before. Mr. Speaker, no Government with any sense of responsibility, that knows that they are going to try and provide an overall service for a large group of people in the medical field or any other field — particularly the medical field — would undertake to bring in an Act and put it into operation without first seeing if they

would be able to get the service that would be required to make the Act operate. I say, Mr. Speaker, they did not intend to do it. It was a last minute thought to pass that Act. A final admission, as I say, that they were guilty of a sin of omission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have been trying to say that I have not told the truth. I have told the truth. I have recited this exactly as it took place. I have admitted that the Liberals passed the Act, but I again say, Mr. Speaker, that history shows beyond all shadow of a doubt . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Who voted the money?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . the Act was assented to on April 1, 1944 . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What a suitable day.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . proclaimed on May 2, 1944, to be operative on May 1st, 1944, with no provision made for the Act to work. They went out and built a railroad and they had not any idea of what kind of an engine or a train they were going to put on the railroad, but they rushed the railroad through at the last minute to try and get the public to support them and get an election. I claim that all that was done under that Act has been done by this Government, and if they had not passed the Act this Government would have passed it at the special Session of 1944.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.