

five in number, as may be appointed. Section 8 provides that provincial or municipal boards of health are not affected by this legislation. Of course their jurisdiction arises under section 92 of the British North America Act, and could not be interfered with by this legislation in any event.

In conclusion I should like to say that within the last two years a great British educationist said that we in the British empire should be careful about making national decisions during the war, because such decisions might be ill-judged since in a time like this no one is perfectly normal. I think this is good advice. People are beginning to wonder what has become of the war, because for the last few days it seems to have been forgotten in this chamber. The conduct of the war is primary; all these other matters are secondary. For years I have supported progressive measures in connection with public health and social affairs; in regard to pensions and hospitals, old age pensions, health insurance and many other matters. I can tell you, though, as President Roosevelt has said, that neither victory nor any kind of planning will bring about the millennium. I believe the time has come when we should relax the controls which have been adopted by Canada perhaps more than any other country in the world. We have had the regimentation of labour, controls over men, women and children under which people have been sent to gaol for offences which in days of peace would not have been regarded as offences. We have set up a great bureaucratic system, but when the war is over I hope these controls will be removed and we shall have no more of this regimentation, for in my opinion you cannot create a limited utopia in the way that has been suggested in this house during the last few days.

While I am in favour of adopting all up-to-date social measures which are adapted to our situation and circumstances, in view of the budget which was presented last night I must ask, whose taxes are to be increased? The state has no money of its own for all these utopian plans, dreams and castles in the air which are supposed to bring about a new heaven and a new earth, except that which is provided by the taxpayers. There is no use in merely shadow-boxing on these matters and setting out window-dressing and passing mere statutes and no way to carry it out, and forgetting all about the war. The Prime Minister of Great Britain gave us a warning when he spoke in the British House of Commons on March 21, 1943. He said that we must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except the politician or the official,

a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges. While I wish to support anything that is practical in the way of social changes—and dear knows we need something new for the working classes of this country—I believe some of these proposals are not practical and cannot be carried out.

I should hope that something could be done in connection with housing and fuel, because I believe those are the greatest practical health problems that we have to face. With regard to state medicine, I am in doubt as yet. Ever since the period between the two wars I have supported such measures as health and sickness insurance.

I should like to quote from the *Daily Mail* of Friday, May 12, 1944, in which it is stated that the leaders of the medical profession, including Lord Dawson of Pen, the king's physician, condemned the government's health plan on nine major points, which were as follows:

1. Doctors, as members of an expert profession, should not be subjected to non-expert direction by civil servants.
2. They object to the profession being controlled by the treasury or by the treasury outlook.
3. They oppose the "civil direction" in peace time; they do not want a doctor to be told by a civil servant where to practise.
4. The white paper calls for "a high degree of certification." This, they say, might well mean that a doctor, convinced that a patient needed a week off from work, would not dare to give a certificate because he might be questioned by a government inspector.
5. The government plan, in practice, would destroy the doctor's professional freedom and the doctor-patient relationship.
6. They oppose any attempt to introduce insidiously, by means of health centres, the idea of a state salaried service, because it would substitute for the present loyalty to patients a loyalty to the state.
7. The "health areas" into which the country is to be divided are too small and will multiply, instead of reducing, the "departmental mind."
8. Health centres should be built up slowly and be the fruit of accrued experience, and not limited, as proposed, to surgery.
9. The white paper makes no provision for training in, or practice of preventive medicine.

I have quoted from the *Daily Mail* of Friday, May 12, where Lord Dawson of Penn, the king's physician, presented his memorandum to the council of the British Medical association, condemning the government's health-for-all plan, on nine major points.

I saw a letter from one of the leading surgeons of Johns Hopkins university, namely the brilliant Doctor Thomas Cullen, who graduated from the university of Toronto and was born in that city. He pointed out that the suggested measure would not be in the