

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 18, 1949

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the arguments presented to date by the opposition with regard to this motion have followed the same pattern as they have followed in other years. Nothing substantially new has yet been presented to the House. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) has made the same speech in the House as he has been making in the province for some considerable months. All in all, Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the opposition towards socialism and the socialist government seems to be more or less the same as the attitude of an old gentleman on the occasion when he first saw a steam engine. When asked what he thought of it he said: "First, the darn thing will never work." After awhile when somebody began to pull the levers and it did work, he said: "The darn thing will never stop." Substantially, that, I think, is the attitude of the opposition towards this government and its policies.

There has been an attempt, too, to explain the alliance between the Liberals and Conservatives in the province. I felt that some on the opposition benches seem to feel that we objected to that alliance. I want to say that quite the contrary is true. We welcome it as something that was inevitable and quite natural. The only thing that I think we had a time to convince the people of Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada that there is some difference between the two groups. In British Columbia, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, I think, it has been fairly well proven that basically there is no difference. So I say that we welcome the alliance between the two groups.

Likewise, the recommendations made by the opposition members have followed the same pattern as in previous years. We are told that we should spend more money on roads and on education and health, and so on, and, at the same time, we are told that we should reduce the amount of money that we are spending. They have suggested millions of dollars of extra expenditure, and suggested hundreds of dollars of reduction of our present expenditure. One member criticizes us for laying off, for good and sufficient reason, 25 or 30 men. Another member who had preceded him suggested that we dismiss some 2,300 employees. One member says . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — I did not suggest laying off some 2,000 men.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, all the hon. member said, of course, was here we could save some \$6 million by which we might do the things he was suggesting. One member also pointed out that the property tax in the province was now at a maximum, and another member suggested that here was the way of making the hospitalization cost, by putting on another eight or ten mills on the property tax. One of the members objected to the Premier's jokes. Most of them, I think, Mr. Speaker, objected to the jolts that went along with them rather than the jokes.

All in all, there has been the same attempt here and throughout the country to scare the people of the province by setting up — to use the Leader of the Opposition's term — “a straw man”; a straw man, in this case painted red, with his feet in Saskatchewan and his head somewhere in Russia.

One of the members attempted to trace for us the history of the C.C.F. party, and perhaps he may have left out some rather important features. He overlooked, I think, for example, that the C.C.F. was born and the C.C.F. grew to be the largest party in the province of Saskatchewan because of the fact that these people loved freedom more than they loved the Liberal party, so they decided to replace that Liberal party with the present party which sits on these benches.

He overlooked some significant statistics too, I think, and the members of the opposition have moved the amendment and have spoken to it, because they suggest the government has not fulfilled its promises to the people. But, in 1944, Mr. Speaker, some 211,000 people voted for the C.C.F. on the basis of that platform. In 1948, some 236,000, more than 25,000 more people voted for the C.C.F. in that year. In other words, there were more people who were satisfied with the performance of this party in its four years than were lured to its support by any promises that eventually have been made.

I think they overlooked something else that is very important too: the fact that his government, this movement, has made history in the province, made history last year in two ways. This has been said before in this debate, but it bears repeating: they made history, first of all, by defeating the combined forces of the opposition; secondly, they made history by keeping the Liberal party out of power, for the first time in the history of the province, for more than one successive term.

In all this talk about freedom, it seems to me that if there is a people any place on the face of the earth who have demonstrated more than other people their love of freedom, have demonstrated their love of life itself, those people are the people of the British Isles, who have proven that they are willing

to die for their freedom, and who have proven that they were willing to really live for that freedom. Those same people have chosen a socialist government, a government with the same philosophy which underlies the policies of this government, and, as we gravely reminded them the other day, a similar choice has been made by most of the rest of the peoples in the British Commonwealth of Nations. I thought it very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition should, in his opening remarks, pay great tribute to the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the contributions which they have made and are making in the cause of freedom. Those remarks are hardly consistent with his general attitude towards this government.

There is little that I find to rebut in the remarks that have been made so far. There has been a lot of very general discussion; there have been some remarks about my department in particular. I was somewhat amused, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) last night drool along with some of the members of the opposition party about the state of the teachers in the province of Saskatchewan. I found it most amusing when I reflected that the hon. member had once been a teacher in the province himself, but that he had left teaching in the year 1943 under a Liberal government — evidently he could not stomach it any longer under a Liberal government — left it to take up employment with an agency of the dominion government. But the most amusing part is that in 1948, under a C.C.F. government, he should see fit to return to teaching in the province of Saskatchewan. Evidently employment as a teacher in the province of Saskatchewan in 1948 was more satisfactory to him than employment with the dominion government in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Tucker: — You were amazed at that were you?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I was amazed at it after having heard the opposition member's story of how difficult and terrible things were.

An Hon. Member: — Oh it was, knowing the conditions of the teachers.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member can make a speech if he wants to.

There are, it seems to me, certain criteria of democracy which we ought to look at at this time. I should like to mention some of those criteria, placing against those criteria the record of this government of Saskatchewan. One of the first things is to do everything within their power as a provincial government, or the government in the area in which they are, to take care of

groups of people within the province who are not adequately able to take care of themselves; because the record has already been given, I do no more than mention them. I think no one in this House will disagree with the advances that have been made as a result of the actions of the government with regard to the welfare of Old Age Pensioners, those in receipt of Mothers' Allowance and Social Aid.

Once again, if I may refer to the government of Great Britain which is a socialist government — the members of the opposition are so certain that governments of that philosophy and this philosophy are not bulwarks of freedom and guardians of democracy — I can say this: in that country today we find the greatest attempt being made, probably the greatest progress being made, in taking care of people who cannot take care of themselves, that has ever been made by any government in the history of the world to date. It is evidenced in the plans which are made to see that the people are fed. It is evidenced in the action that has been taken to take care of the medical needs of the people, with the very wide-embracing social insurance programmes. I think it only well to say that when you give to people liberties and freedom of that kind, coupled with political freedom, there is no fear of their ever reverting to communism or to fascism.

One of the areas concerning which they have so much to say is the area of the northern part of this province. I should like to talk for a while about some of the communities in the north of the province. I have had the pleasure of visiting some of these communities once, and some of them more than once, in the course of my duties as Minister of Education. The other day the hon. member for one of the seats made reference to a "God-forsaken people" under the Liberal government. I would not say that the people up there were "God-forsaken" but "government forsaken". I think of two communities, one of them is called Stoney Rapids on Lake Athabaska; they had no school there for many years, and I doubt if they ever had one. There is a file in the Department of Education showing a great many letters which have been written in regard to obtaining a school there; but they never got a school there until this government came into office, when we enabled them to have a school. They had no hospital; there were no hospital facilities except those which could be reached by means of a plane, and they had no particular plane service to get to the hospital if they needed to. The people in that community today have access to a hospital right there; and they have, of course, the insurance to get to other hospitals by means of the air ambulance planes. It is interesting to note that an average of about 100 people a year have been taken out of that north country by means of the air ambulance service.

I think of another community I went to, in which they were having school in a large building which had been built as a community hall or church, I am not sure which. It was not a

satisfactory school building in any way. The teacher at that time was living in a house which the priest at that point had been good enough to provide. There was no hospital there. The good Father at that point told me that on an average 25 percent of the babies in that territory died either at birth or before they reached the age of one year. That was the freedom those people of that community had, Mr. Speaker. He said the year before there had been an epidemic of measles — a comparatively mild disease in this part of the world — and that percentage had increased very considerably.

In that community today these people have a well-built, two-room school. A hospital is under construction. I suggest that means something in addition to just having a school or hospital of no importance. It means that, for the first time, the majority of the youngsters living there are going to have the very elementary freedom of being able to learn how to read and how to write; they are going to have some chance in the world, and they are also going to have the chance to save the lives of a great many people. They had the freedom before of not going to school; they had the freedom of seeing 25 percent of their babies die before they reached the age of one year. That is the kind of freedom these gentlemen opposite brought to the northern part of this province.

The second criterion of democracy is that of the growth of people's organizations, because when dictatorships take over they address themselves, first of all, to people's organizations and to destroying those people's organizations. In this province, during the last four or five years, we have seen an unprecedented growth in some of these basic organizations. I do not want to say that the government can or should take full credit for that growth. A great deal of the credit goes to the people of the province; goes to the same people of the same province that have, in two successive elections, returned this C.C.F. socialist government to office. But there has been an unprecedented growth, and that growth has been stimulated by means of the activities of this government.

I would also refer to the growth of labour unions. Statistics will show that membership in labour unions has practically doubled since this government came into power. I could refer to an increasing growth in the strength of the teachers' organization, and organization to which, previously, the government of the day said: "You may collect such and such a membership, but you may collect no more." They did not say that to any other organization, but they did say it to the teachers' organization. One could have reference to other organizations. I repeat, one of the real bulwarks of democracy lies in this type of organization which this government has encouraged, and which has grown at a rate not known before in this province.

The third criterion of democracy is a development of administration throughout the country to make it possible for people to do more things for themselves; to make it possible for people to plan their resources, and to plan the utilization of these resources to meet their own needs. Here again I would have reference to the co-operative movement, I would have reference to school units, I would have reference to health units. Each of these organizations give people more power over their own destiny, and do enable them to organize themselves and their resources in such a way as to make it possible to meet their own needs.

The fourth criterion I would like to mention is that of the willingness of governments to have representatives of groups outside government service to act as advisers in devising policy and to implement that policy. Here again, far greater use has been made, particularly by the Departments of Health and Education, with regard to the utilization of the representatives of the organizations throughout the province. The nature of these things is assistance to groups of people not able to help themselves adequately; encouraging the growth of people's organizations outside of the government. The policy has proven itself, and has proven itself well. All these are additional reasons why this government has materially strengthened democracy in this province.

Remarks have been made with regard to the federal government, and to the assistance which the province has received because of the financial agreement signed with the federal government in 1945. Now, it is true that we did sign a financial agreement. It is also true that when we went to Ottawa to that conference we were presented with these financial terms which have subsequently been brought to fruition and, along with that, we were presented with plans for a number of things, such as financial assistance to the extent of some 60 percent of the cost of the health programme; assistance in welfare proposals, which included the paying of old age pensions to all old age pensioners over the age of 70; proposals for the extension of unemployment insurance. So I think it is fair to state that, in drawing up this financial agreement, the needs of the provinces in these other fields were not considered. It was a matter of arranging the taxation machinery of the dominion; it was not a matter of assisting the provinces in carrying out the various services which are their responsibility. The inference was made by the Leader of the Opposition that the needs of education were considered. Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, the needs of education were not considered. As a matter of fact, in all the proposals put before us, education was mentioned in one respect only; that respect was with regard to the Vocational Education Agreements which had already been signed, and which were already in operation.

May I just say with regard to that, because the accusation was made that we were not giving proper credit to the federal government: some months ago an official of the federal government came through to discuss with us our plans for vocational education and to visit some of the projects u underway. He came back in, and he was pleased with the progress. He said: "One of the things which does please me is that everywhere I go I find the people are fully conscious of the fact that this is a co-operative arrangement between the dominion and the province." They may be assured they have full credit for anything that has been done.

I think we could criticize — though this is perhaps not the time to do it — the financial agreement for another reason. That reason is: it does nothing to equalize as between provinces. It does not take into consideration the different problems which the province have to meet; does nothing to equalize and, to that extent, it does depart from the Rowell-Sirois report which, it had been previously hoped, might be implemented.

Reference was made to the fact when comparing things done in Saskatchewan in education to what British Columbia was doing. I found it again slightly amusing that the Leader of the Opposition, when he was talking about electrification would talk about Manitoba, but when he came to talk about education he took quite a jump and landed in British Columbia. I wish he had gone on with his comparison, in what would have been a fair respect, to just point out this: the minimum subsidies paid to the provinces British Columbia gets something like \$3 million more than the province of Saskatchewan. In addition to that, the province of British Columbia had, or did have — I am not certain of the statistics at the moment — but a few years ago had twice the taxable income behind every school child than the province of Saskatchewan had. They are very substantial reasons why we should hardly expect to meet British Columbia's standard in that regard.

I think there is a lot of confusion, too, with regard to the exact improvement in our position because of this new agreement. We have an agreement signed in 1945. It gave us more money than the agreement which was subsequently in force. I gave us more money to the extent mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition of some \$7 million. But there are two sides to books, and I think we have to remember that this government has undertaken obligations to the dominion government which previous governments had not undertaken. It has undertaken very considerable obligations by way of relief debts, and by way of the 1938 seed grain debts. Those debts have been lifted from individuals and from municipalities, and accepted by the province as a whole. In so doing, may I say we have increased the taxing ability of the municipality to the extent those debts have been assumed. We lifted that debt, and we agreed to pay back to the federal government substantial sums of money. But if you take the net amount, the net increase, because of the difference of the two agreements, then, in fairness, you must take off that net amount which we pay back annually to the federal government because of the other debts which we removed from individuals and municipalities. When you do that, the improvement in our position is not \$7 million, but possibly something under \$5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that the increase in the expenditures in the Department of Education alone are almost enough to equal the amount of additional money which we are obtaining from the federal government. The increase in the expenditures of one department alone is almost enough to equal that total amount if you take into consideration, as you must do, the amounts being paid back to the federal government. When added to that is the extra expense incurred by the government because of the fact the federal government has taken off the price controls, as a result of which everything we do costs us very greatly more, than we are indeed behind the situation of previous governments.

Reference has been made to the matter of family allowances and other payments made by the federal government. It is true that we receive in this province some 19 or 20 million dollars from the federal government by way of family allowances; and it is true that this is a very welcome additional to the income of a great many families in the province. But it is \$20 million. If the increase in the cost of living had been just \$25 a year per person in the province, that increase would more than wipe out the total increased advantage because of the family allowance. But the increase has been more than \$25 a year; it has been more than \$25 a month. What the federal government has done with one hand, they have allowed to be taken away by the companies that make the profits in this country in another way. The family allowance is good; as a matter of fact I think if you trace it aback you will find that the idea originated with the British Socialist-Labour party.

This cost of living increase explains again why the cost of hospitalization has gone up. It explains, in very considerable part, increased educational costs. It explains increased housing cost, and increased mental hospital cost, and so on. I think we should examine, as some of the hon. members suggested, the reason for these increased costs. I suppose they had in mind when they said — the stock argument — it was because of the demands of labour. That is usually the reply one gets from people of the kind who sit in the benches opposite.

I want to use as a basis for my discussion a report of the Bank of Canada, just recently issued, and recently analyzed in the "Financial Post" of February 5. That report analyzed the profit statistics for some 665 companies operating in Canada. The figures given are in millions of dollars. It points out that in 1939 the net operating profit of these companies was \$468 million. In 1945 it had increased to \$675 million, and in 1947 had increased to \$917 million. They had more than doubled the net operating profit in that particular period. The net income to stockholders was \$281 million in 1949, and increased to \$442 million in 1947. In 1947 profits in the form of cash dividends and undistributed income were 64 percent higher than in 1945.

The report goes on to say that, judging from interim reports, the 1948 net profit of most Canadian companies will be more than in 1947. In other words, we can expect that those companies which have increased their profits by over 60 percent in the period of two years, increased them from a point which was doing well for them before, will again increase in addition. That is part of the answer to the "Why" which the hon. members of the opposition raised a minute ago.

Mr. Tucker: — Too bad you cannot put some of those profits in the shoe factory.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — And we can thank for that the federal government at Ottawa, from which the hon. member who just spoke has so recently departed, for the removal of price controls and their lowering of income and excess profits taxes to a group that needed it less than anybody else in the Dominion of Canada.

To go on further, this report analyzes the net income of some specific groups of companies within that group. Forty-six food companies, for instance, showed in 1947 a profit of 146 percent more than in 1945; then, in 1947, a profit of 126.7 percent over 1946. That is something that all of us should think about when we go down to buy tomatoes or peas or carrots or salt. That is something that every old age pensioner should know about when they have had to pay greatly increased prices for their foodstuffs: only 126 percent profit increase in one year. In the petroleum companies — 11 of them — an increase of 131 percent in 1947 over 1945, then an increase of 117 percent in 1947 over 1946. That is something that the hon. members in the opposition should think about when they criticize this government for taking a percentage of the gasoline tax.

Mr. Tucker: — You believe in getting a profit now, according to the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — It is something that all of us should think about when we consider the cost of production in an agricultural economy such as this. We should remember that the increase in the cost of farm fuel in this last year has amounted to probably ten mills on a half-section of land in this province, which went, not to provide local services, not to provide the people of Saskatchewan with anything they got before, but went into the pockets of companies which had increased their incomes quite substantially to the extent of 117 percent in one year.

Mr. Tucker: — The cost has gone down recently.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The hon. member says it has gone down. He sat for number of years on the benches of the House of Commons and did nothing about keeping that in line.

Mr. Tucker: — You can't get production in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Well, that is your fault; but it happens to have gone up in every other province also.

An Hon. Member: — It is going down in Alberta now.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — In 1947, for 48 clothing companies, the net income was an increase of some 178 percent over 1945, and in 1947 over 1946, 113.9 percent. That, I suggest, is something that we all ought to think of every time we have to buy clothes for ourselves, or socks for the kiddies, or a new hat for the wife. The total for these 665 companies showed an increase in 1947 over 1945 of 164 percent, and 1947 over 1946 of 134 percent. That is what the members of the opposition speak of as “controlled capitalism”.

Mr. Tucker: — What did you do about it?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — In the machine companies: this group of companies who not so many years ago went to the federal government and said: “Look, gentlemen, if we cannot get more profit we are going broke.” And the federal government said: “Well I guess you are. We will allow you to increase your prices and thereby increase the cost of production on Saskatchewan farms very considerably again.” These companies had net profits of more than three times the 1939 level. When we make purchases or when we pay for services and find that costs are up 50 to 60 percent, let us put the blame where it belongs. Let us put the blame, not on provincial governments, not on the farmers, not on the ordinary labourer who is just struggling to keep his head above water; let us put the blame on big business in Canada. It has not been satisfied with a reasonable profit, but has been charging all that the traffic will bear. Let us put the blame on the federal government which has refused to maintain a system of decent profit and price control, and has so sabotaged the welfare of many of the people of Canada.

I want to turn now to the question of educational support in the province of Saskatchewan. Some of the members — one of the hon. gentlemen is not now in his seat — took the opportunity of going through the throne speech and pointing out a number of things that were not there, and a number of things that pointed out the government's faults. I would like to recommend to him, as required reading, the speech from the throne as written in this province during the years 1941, 1942, 1943 and 1944, perhaps further; but that is as far back as I would care to go. I find in all of those four years education was not mentioned; not a single word. The word did not even appear there. Agriculture was not mentioned insofar as any programme was concerned — only something about “we had a good crop” or “we expect the federal government to do that and to do that”. The Liberal party in the province holding office — I am not talking about the depression years, I am talking about the years after the depression when they were in office — thought that the condition was so good that for at least four years they did nothing about it. The last evidence of any improvement was in 1939 when an extremely small increase was made to equalization grants, an increase which gave a few districts another hundred, two hundred or maybe three hundred dollars; I don't know, I doubt if it was that much. As a matter of fact, the then Liberal Minister of Education, speaking to the Council of the Liberal party in Saskatoon in 1944, and talking about the C.C.F. educational programme, said: “Why, there's nothing to be done; we've done it all. In 1939 we finished the job.”

Mr. Tucker: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Would he tell us when that speech was made and where it may be found?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have not the exact date, but it may be found in the “Saskatchewan Liberal”, which gives the account of that particular council meeting held in 1944.

Mr. Tucker: — You have a good memory, of course.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I have a good memory because I have read it with a great deal of attention. You read it and see if it isn't there.

The hon. member asked a question the other day when he was speaking. The question was this: "Are the schools better off in this province since the C.C.F. were elected?" Well, I could bring in quite a few letters from different Boards, and give the answer from their point of view.

Mr. Danielson: — They are probably closed.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Just last week a letter came in signed by all the members of one village council and all the members of the school board which said in effect "Our government and administration definitely displayed interest in the welfare of the people and is certainly upholding their aims." I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that his percentage figures the other day were somehow incomplete. I presume he made an error in the interpretation of the figures which he had at his disposal. I would like to say, too, that the basis which he used, namely that of the percentage of total cost, is not a very valid basis. If a school district was spending \$600 a year and getting \$300 a year grant, that school district would be receiving 50 percent of its operational cost from the government. I submit that would not redound to the credit of the government if that were the situation. I think we must remember that during the period he mentioned many of the schools were still operating at more or less a depression level. During that period the minimum salary of \$700 the Liberal government had been good enough to grant, after a lot of pressure, was in effect. Let us, for example, look at the per pupil contribution over a period of years: 1943-44, \$20.22; 1944-45, \$23.40; 1945-46, \$26.68; 1946-47, \$28.74; 1947-48, \$38.60, and this year — we can only go by estimates so far — our estimate is \$40. In other words, almost doubled on the basis of per pupil support as from the last year in which the members of the position held office.

Mr. Tucker: — Have you got the figures there of the amount spent by the school districts per pupil in each year?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I am coming very near to that in just a moment. I would like to say that these figures I have given do not include any money received from the dominion government, and they do not include any money that we paid to take care of the arrears of salary which had accumulated during the period our hon. friends opposite were in power.

Mr. Tucker: — The Education Tax you promised to take off.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — It so happens this government did not promise that.

Mr. Danielson: — You sure did.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Let us look at it in another way. The year ending March, 1944 — that is the last complete fiscal year in which the Liberal government sat in these benches — their assistance to schools, according to the Public Accounts, was \$2,765,693.09. For the year to be completed in April of this year, estimated expenditures for the same purpose, assistance to schools in this province, will be over \$6 million. In other words, there is an increase in the amount of money that has been provided by the government for the operation of schools in this province of \$3,298,000, or an increase of approximately 120 percent in our support.

Somebody mentioned the other day that we might have passed on, as Manitoba did, a lot of money to the schools and municipalities. If we had waited till we had signed our agreement with the federal government then we could well have done so; but the schools in this province were getting the advantage of some of that money at least before we signed any agreement with the federal government.

Mr. Tucker: — I am sure the Minister wishes to give a clear picture of the situation, Mr. Speaker. May I ask him a further question?

Premier Douglas: — It is because he is giving too clear a picture that you are concerned.

Mr. Tucker: — I am just wishing to ask the Minister a question. He has given the figures, the amount contributed by the government to the cost of education, would he give the Assembly the figures spent by the people of the province as a whole?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is my next point. But just before I go on to that, may I point out that the extra money spent has been distributed on an equalization basis. I think that, far more important that the percentage of total expenditure, is the percentage of expenditure carried by the government in those areas which cannot well carry the load for themselves. There are many areas in this province that are now receiving 50 percent of the total cost of operation as a result of government grants, and there are areas that are receiving well in excess of 50 percent of the total cost of operation. I say that is a far more important figure than any overall percentage can be. I would like to point out that in a great many of those areas they are paying, in terms of taxes, less today than they were paying in 1944, and less today than they were paying in 1928, 20 years ago. The Leader of the Opposition has left the House as I come around to answering this particular question.

The figures I have been giving are the figures for the fiscal year of the government. The figures that I now give are for the calendar year, and are taken from the annual reports of the school districts themselves. I want again to deal with the years from 1943 on through 1948. Receipts of districts from taxes in 1943 were \$10,144,000, and the receipts from grants in 1943 were \$2,457,000. In other words, the grants were 24 percent of the

taxes levied at that time. In 1944 the comparable figures were these: from taxes, \$11,584,000 and in grants \$2,606,000. The point I want to make is that the increase in taxes paid in 1944 over 1943 under a Liberal government was almost \$1.5 million in school taxes paid at that time.

Mr. Culliton: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Are the figures you are quoting the actual collection for the tax levy for the year?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, I stated quite plainly that I am quoting receipts from taxes and receipts from grants in each of the calendar years referred to.

In 1945 the grants were 29 percent of the taxes. In 1946 the grants were 33 percent of the taxes, and in 1947 the grants were 39 percent of the taxes. It is going up all the while. This year, while we can only deal with an estimate, I think I am fairly safe to say the grants will be 45 percent of the taxes in this particular year. I would like to point out again that the greatest increase in receipts from taxes in any one year was in the last year in which the Liberal government was in office in this province.

Reference was made to teachers' salaries. Again I am sorry that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not in his seat. I am not too sure of the source of the figure that he used, and I am not too sure of the year to which he had reference. I have here a summary of the table of salaries from the Teachers' Federation into his province; and these salaries were obtained as a result of information given by teachers at Fall conventions. I find that for one certificate group of teachers, the average salary was \$1,279. For another group with a better certificate, it was \$1,406, and for another group, it was \$1,564, and so on throughout the groups. I find that the average salary of these teachers, which the hon. member the other day suggested was some \$1,200 a year, the average salary as of last fall was \$1,726. Those are not my figures; they are the figures printed in the last issue of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation Bulletin arrived at on the basis of information given at their Fall conventions. The figure used the other day was some \$1,200; the figure stated here some \$1,726. There is rather a substantial difference there.

Perhaps I might just at this moment point out too — since some of the hon. members were talking about Manitoba — that the salary of our teachers is in advance of that of Manitoba teachers, and it is particularly true in our rural one-room schools. For the last year in which we have access to reports, the salary of our teachers in rural one-room schools is higher than in Manitoba and only \$30 less than in the neighbouring province of Alberta.

There is another way in which I think we can measure teachers' salaries, and that is in the amount of money paid to teachers. In the year 1943, the teachers of this province received some \$6,436,000. In the year 1947 they received \$10,461,000 — an increase in the amount of money paid to teachers of over \$4 million, or an increase of 66 percent.

There is one other field in which considerable has been done to improve the position of teachers in the province. I refer here, only briefly, to the superannuation. In 1944 the rate of superannuation for a teacher at age 60, the rate of pension, was \$10.40 per year of service. The rate in 1948, after four or five years with this government, is not \$10.40 per year of service, but \$20 per year of service. In other words, there has been an increase in that part of the pension assumed by the pension fund of 92 percent, due to the action of this particular government. The Leader of the Opposition had some very fine sentiments to offer with regard to the teaching profession, and I agree with those sentiments; some of us almost starved on them for quite awhile too. I would like to say that the number of years I spent with the Teachers' Federation, the people who spoke out loudest in the denunciation of the government of the day were not people like myself, but people in the organization who are good supporters of the Liberal party.

Are the teachers satisfied? He said: "Ask the teachers." Well, I think I know the answer you would get if you asked the teachers: "Are the teachers satisfied?" I think they would undoubtedly say: "No, we are not satisfied", and I would be heartily ashamed of them if they were satisfied, or if they ever became satisfied. But I think they would also say this: "We are not satisfied, but we are more satisfied with the programme and the progress made by this government than we ever have been with the programme and progress of any government in the history of Saskatchewan." I am sure of that.

Mr. Tucker: — That is his opinion, of course.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — That is my opinion, and, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants to go out and ask I would be only too glad to have him do so.

Reference was made to the teacher shortage. I have never tried in this House or any place else to minimize the serious condition in this province, in Canada and in the United States, because of the shortage of properly qualified and experienced teachers. There is, at the present time, a shortage of teachers in Canada amounting to something over 6,000 teachers. There are peculiar situations in the province of Saskatchewan which makes that situation acute. I think it needs no argument to convince members here that teachers — many of them at least — are not too satisfied to stay in one-room rural schools and to live away from their homes, and so on, under somewhat isolated circumstances. They, naturally, prefer other environment. I said in this House last year and I repeat, we have more of that type of school — the one-room rural school — than the province of Manitoba and Alberta together. I repeat that, but I would add to it that we have more one-room rural schools in the province of Saskatchewan than the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia put together. That is one reason why we have a particularly difficult situation in this province.

The attempt has been made to meet the situation and keep schools open in various ways. Resort was made early in the war years to have short courses for teachers. We have continued that programme to a considerable extent, although we have never had any quite so short as some of the courses

held before, amounting in a few cases to just a few days. A year ago we decided that we would do it slightly differently. We would have our group enrolled in the Normal School and we would let one group go out until Christmas time, and we would bring them back in and let the other group go out. This year we have decided to tackle it in another way and that is to allow certain people who have had no teacher training take charge of certain schools under the supervision of the superintendent, with the assistance of the correspondence school, and to keep in the Normal School all of the students who enrolled there. We think that gives us a chance of breaking the back of this problem before too long.

I would like to give the House again the record of the number of students who have taken the complete Normal School course over a period of years. In June, 1943, some 180 of these people graduated; in 1944, 301; 1945, 333; 1946, 394; next year, 598.

There has been another very significant development in this field in the province which promises to do much, I suggest, to stabilize the teaching profession, and also which, to some extent, gives the lie to those members of the opposition who tell us what a terrible condition the teaching profession is in in this province. A few years ago, there was organized at the university an undergraduate course in education. Previously, students who had a degree from one of the other colleges might take the teacher training course. They are now accepted at the beginning of the course. We find that in 1946-47 there were some 294 people enrolled there. Here are people who went with the idea of going three or four years to university in order to get a position as a teacher. In 1947-48 that had increased to 457; in 1948-49 to 401. That is where several hundred of our actual teachers are who might otherwise be in schools in the province. They are there qualifying themselves because of the incentives of salary schedules and so on in occupying better positions. The significant part about the enrolment is that a very large number of veterans decided to take this course and I submit that if things were as rotten here as some members of the opposition have led us to believe these men would not have taken this course, and would have chosen some other occupation. It is significant to note that a majority of these people are men. I think that we can accept that; these people are going in to make the teaching profession their profession.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Do you happen to have at your fingertips a record of the number who have graduated from the university course for the same year.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, I have not those statistics with me. I could easily get them for the hon. member at some other time.

Mr. Tucker: — How many have stayed in Saskatchewan and continued to teach here?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, that again is a question the answer to which, with a great deal of searching, could be found; but we have reason to believe that a very considerable portion of them are staying here.

I want to go next to what is rather a favourite theme of the Leader of the Opposition, namely the matter of text-books in the schools of Saskatchewan. I have made remarks about this before, and I do not intend to labour or repeat those remarks again. I am convinced that I have had advice from people well-qualified to judge, and from people eminently better qualified to judge than the Leader of the Opposition, and until such time as I get different advice from those people I do not intend to take heed of his advice. I mentioned before that the book was in use for seven or eight years in a neighbouring province. I mentioned before that it was examined by the Educational Council, made up of rather prominent citizens of this province. But after the Leader of the Opposition made his first splurge in this way, it was reconsidered by them and by several members of my staff. That is about all I want to say with regard to it.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I will answer his questions, I am sure, in just a moment. He asked me some questions before which I told him I was going to answer in a few minutes, and he walked out of the House. I think he can now wait.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I was called out of the House, and I came back as soon as I could.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, text-books in this province are not chosen by the Minister of Education although the Minister of Education does and will accept responsibility for those texts. They are chosen by members of his staff, working with groups of teachers throughout the province. I want to have reference to another text in a moment which this group of teachers has recommended too. First of all, the Leader of the Opposition said this text extols communism. I want to read this one sentence from it: "Communism which would gain power through planned war has never been popular in British countries, and is of small importance politically in Canada." It extols communism.

I want to point out something else: the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition is making a political football out of this and similar items is a serious threat to academic freedom in this province. If we were to accept his advice, his criterion, throughout all the books in which he can find time to browse here or to graze there, to which he objects, then we would throw out half the books used in the teaching of contemporary history in the schools and the universities of this country. As one teacher said: "It is only a step from that to Hitler's burning of books."

I mentioned before that these books were chosen by a committee. This same committee has recently mentioned for authorization in our Grade XII course another text. It is a text called "Contemporary Canada". It was reviewed in The Leader-Post a few weeks ago and they said about it: "It would be well for every Canadian adult to have this book as a reference. It is a standard by which we can better understand the controversial issues discussed in our newspapers upon which we, through our members and Ministers,

must make a decision.” I don’t think The Leader-Post knew that it was being authorized for use in Saskatchewan or it might not have made such a good review of it. The point I want to make is to illustrate these people and the good judgment which they have. I want also to say something else about it: this book devotes some space to what it terms to be “Saskatchewan’s comprehensive health plan”. Now, the members of the opposition will object to that, and so, consequently, there is another book which we should burn. That is two of them. It mentions Russia fourteen times.

I just want to suppose for a moment that the hon. member for Rosthern had been sitting in this House before 1944, and I want to suppose that he had, at that time, the same apparent keen interest in education and the welfare of the students he now has. You would then have seen, had he been true to his professed opinions, the hon. member for Rosthern standing up holding in his hand a text used in this province, under a Liberal government, in Grade XII history. He would have read something like this, in a section which deals with Nazism and Bolshevism: “Each had been mightily constructive in certain respects. Each had rescued its people from economic chaos and blank despair.” And he would have had to have said: “Why, this text-book extols communism and extols fascism, and we must burn it.”

Mr. Tucker: — What has that to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — It has plenty to do with it. The hon. member will insist he was not in the House; he was a member of the federal parliament, the same position he was in when he started criticizing this book, and so he should have been doing the same thing then.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Certainly. It was the Grade XII text-book, written by West-Eastman, used in the schools in this province for teaching history for ten or twelve years. Now, the next text-book, Sir, that I want to mention is a text-book called “The Modern World”, also used in Grade XII, and used in connection with the subject of modern problems. It was used until a year or two ago; I think it came into use in 1934 or 1935. I am doing as the hon. member for Rosthern did, picking at random and picking out of context. This text says this in one place: “We should note also the efforts of Soviet Russia, solving the problem of nationalism. On the whole, this system seems to have worked satisfactorily.” It extols communism. It says this in another place — I can give the hon. member the pages if he wishes them, page 294: “The hopelessness of reform by constitutional means drove many reformers into revolutionary activities.” The hon. member has been telling us that it is socialism brings on these revolutions; but this text-book says: “The hopelessness of reform by constitutional means drove many reformers into revolutionary activities.” He disagrees with that, so we have to throw that one out and burn it. Then this one: “The union (speaking also of Russia from this same text used in Saskatchewan under a Liberal government for man years) consists of separate republics. Each of these republics has a great deal of local autonomy.” It says this: “In 1936 (speaking of Russia) a new constitution

was adopted. The essential changes are as follows: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, universal suffrage, 6, secret ballot, 7, an elaborate bill of rights guaranteeing freedom of speech, press, assembly and religion". Mr. Speaker, that is what a Liberal government was teaching our children in this province.

Mr. Korchinski: — Does the hon. Minister of Education know that the author of "World Congress" has changed his mind about what he has written? And so have plenty of other people about Russia?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the opportunity of being acquainted with these eminent authors; I stayed in Saskatchewan and I have not dropped around like these other two have. I do not think it makes any difference. I am not talking about what the books say, as being particularly right or wrong. I am not talking about what the books say, as being particularly right or wrong. I am pointing out that the hon. member for Rosthern, had he been doing this duty — if he feels as he now feels — should have been talking about these things ten years ago.

Mr. Tucker: — I was in the federal House then.,

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — And this was in regard to Russia: "For ordinary prisoners, model prisons have been built, and every effort is made to turn them into decent citizens." Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a greater supporter of the co-operative movement — we have heard about that. In Russia, according to this text-book, which was used in Grade XII under a Liberal government: "Co-operatives appear to be gaining more and more control of retail business in Russia and, though controlled to some extent by the state, they seem for the most part quite democratic in their organization and management." Here is one that is almost word for word with one he read the other day. Speaking of wages for Soviet workers and conditions, it says this: "Ration cards enable them to buy cheaper food. By means of social insurance they are looked after in sickness, accident and old age. In addition, many special advantages are provided such as preference in housing, special recreational facilities, and an annual two-weeks holiday with pay.

Mr. Tucker: — We know now that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — This is the one he should have read because it says: "Russia looks with unbounded hope to the future."

I suggest that that is what the hon. member should have been doing. I submit, too, that he would not have been doing it because it would not have been politically expedient for him so to do; there would not have been any political advantage in doing it.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. Minister is suggesting that when I made the statement that this book should be withdrawn from the schools, I was actuated by a political motive. You have no right to suggest . . . Well, it may be very funny . . .

Premier Douglas: — We know it is true.

Mr. Tucker: — I am suggesting to your Honour, the Minister has no right to suggest that I am not sincere in this. Surely today we know that the things some people thought five years ago about Russia are not correct, and if those things were in a book five years ago, and they are still in a book today, all the more reason why they should be withdrawn. And I ask that the Minister withdraw his insinuation against me.

Mr. Speaker: — If the Leader of the Opposition is rising to a point of order, asking that to be withdrawn, might I remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition he used exactly the same terms in his own speech.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, we have now got to the point that had the present Leader of the Opposition had his way, and had done his duty as he thinks he sees it now, he would have burned no less than four text-books. That is a pretty good statement. I say again, that attitude is one which does challenge academic freedom, and is a very serious one in this province.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to another point of order. I never suggested that the text-books should be burned. I said that this particular book should be withdrawn from the schools, which is a different matter, and I ask the hon. Minister to withdraw that allegation against me, that I was in favour of any books being burned. That is absolutely untrue and unjustified.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. Minister withdraw the statement that they should be burned?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — If I made the statement he said they should be burned, I withdraw that. I simply said that if we were to follow his advice in these things we might print them and not read them or, if we follow it logically, we would burn them because there would be no point in keeping them around.

I want to submit that what he has said about this text, and what I have said about these texts, proves nothing about the texts whatsoever. What I have said illustrates merely his lack of action previously, and some of the reasons for his apparent interest. I submit there are other portions of the text which he is more worried about than this one. I want to submit, too, that the only people in this province who have attempted to mix politics with education are the representatives of the Liberal party, and the Leader of the Opposition in particular. It has happened with regard to the organization of units; with regard to the curriculum; with regard to grants. I have here an example, in a somewhat slightly different way; a book called "Communist Threat to Canada". It is printed by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, and it has been distributed to all of the schools in Saskatchewan. That is quite all right. This is a free country. As long as I have anything to do with the Department of Education there shall be no censorship of things like this;

no objection to it. But, just to illustrate, in one constituency in this province, representatives of the Liberal party went out to the electors in June and said: "Look, see this? Here is a picture of Canada; a hammer and sickle over it. This is in your schools. This is the sort of thing which the C.C.F. government is giving to your youngsters." That is how they won votes in some parts of this province. There are hon. members there who should be able to substantiate it.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made a blanket charge. He said "some constituency in Saskatchewan". I just ask him to be straightforward enough to say what constituency in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Gladly, Mr. Speaker, When the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) was speaking the other day, he paid very high tribute to Mr. O.W. Valteau, who formerly sat on this side of the House. The information which I give you now has been given to me by that same gentleman to whom such high tribute has been paid by the hon. member for Melfort.

Mr. Tucker: — Just answer the question.

Mr. Egnatoff: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Do you mean to suggest, Sir, that such tactics were used in the Melfort constituency.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I have no way of knowing what the hon. member who is now representative there knows about it, Mr. Speaker, but, as I said, he paid very high tribute to Mr. Valteau and I concurred, and I am giving him the information of which Mr. Valteau informed me.

I want to sum up very briefly with regard to an educational programme in this way: what we have to try to do is to develop an educational programme which must include a study of the new forces at work in the world, the effect of these new forces on our inherent institutions and customs. Any programme of studies which prompts teachers to ignore or to minimize the importance of these trends and forces is not capable of meeting the needs of this critical period. I submit that the opposition is afraid of a critical study of society as it is and has been.

We have been asked by members of the opposition to support the amendment. I have given reasons why it does not seem to me that it is logical for us to support it. There is an additional reason. What the opposition say here, and what they frequently say out in the country, does not jibe with their actions when they were in the government here or their actions when they were in governments in Ottawa. Too frequently they have talked in one way and voted for action in another way. As such, their actions belie their words. They do not merit the confidence of this House or the people of this province. In short, Mr. Speaker, I say that while the voice from the opposite side of the House may occasionally sound like the voice of Jacob, the hand has too frequently been the hand of Esau. I oppose the amendment and will support the motion.

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, I do so with great pride and distinction. I might say that in 1934 I was elected as member for the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency, and again in 1938. In 1944 I was defeated, and when it was apparent that I was defeated the night of the election, I drove to Indian Head to Mr. Burgess' committee room — I have a great respect for Mr. Burgess and he and I are good friends — and there was a joyful crowd. I shook hands with him and he asked me to say a few words. I said to the people in that committee room that I submitted to the will of the people. They did not want me to represent them in the next Legislature. However, I always submit to the will of the people, and when I was winding up I said: "You know there is a brighter day coming." I said to Mr. Burgess: "I wish you all the good luck and I hope that your health and strength will enable you to represent that wonderful constituency for the next four years."

However, that constituency is made up of people from every country in the world; people who have been living there for many, many years. I think the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is the oldest constituency in the province of Saskatchewan. It was represented by Mr. Haultain for some 17 years, and it was also represented by Mr. R.S. Lake for 11 years. He was afterwards made Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Saskatchewan. Then, after Mr. Lake, Mr. Bennett was elected for three terms as Conservative member. Then things changed, and the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley was represented by a Liberal in 1934. I might say Mr. Burgess is a man I think a great deal of, who can be a credit to any district.

The situation was very peculiar in the 1948 election. The town of Sintaluta is a nice little town of 375 people. I might say that when I drew up my campaign I got every man from every poll to come in to see me and we drew up my campaign for the two months that I was out campaigning. In drawing up that campaign I could not have a night to give to my home town meetings, and therefore that meeting was eliminated. I drew up all my campaigns and I did it in a manner that was favourable to my committee. In the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, the hon. Minister of Social Welfare, Hon. J.H. Sturdy, was campaigning. I think he held four or five meetings. Mrs. Strum also held three or four meetings, and every time that the Hon. Mr. Sturdy and Mrs. Strum were there, my committee said they got bigger majorities than what they expected to. I had only two men in my constituency that spoke for me. I spoke for myself and I can conduct myself and hold meetings, I think, as good as anyone.

However, I might say the results in 1944 were very convincing to Mr. Burgess. I might also add that Mr. Burgess lives in the town of Sintaluta. He was nominated first, I was nominated second and Mr. Josephson was nominated third. All three candidates came from and lived in the town of Sintaluta. When I was out campaigning, I said somebody was going to be elected from Sintaluta; I do not know who that gentleman is going to be but he is going to be elected from Sintaluta, and that was the case. When I didn't have a meeting in Sintaluta — we all lived in the town of Sintaluta. When the ballots were counted in my home town — you know, there are lots of people that do not get a majority in their home town — my majority was 112 to

February 18, 1949

Mr. Burgess' 62. Mr. Josephson got 31. I do not think that is a very bad record. In 1943 and 1944 the people were told they would get more services and less taxes, that they would get something for nothing, and if they voted C.C.F. they would get everything for nothing.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Will the hon. gentleman inform me of the date on which Mr. Staines was nominated in 1948.

Mr. Dundas: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. That was quite in order, but that has nothing to do with this situation. I want to tell this Assembly that the Liberals can look after themselves and they know what they are doing.

In 1943 and 1944 the people were bombarded with lots of promises and told that they would be given something for nothing. However, when the 1944 election was over I came to Sintaluta and three men came to me and were very happy. I said: "Boys, you did a good job and I say good luck to you." In 1948 I had my committee rooms at Wolseley. When I came home, behold, those three men were still on the street and I went up and shook hands with them. One of them said: "How did you do it?" I said: "I told the people the truth, therefore they took my word for it." I told them in 1944 that I was not the only one that ever was defeated, but I want to tell you over there you will get defeated some of these times and very soon. Don't worry about that.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Not in Saskatoon, my friend.

Mr. Dundas: — We have had a great deal of oratory from the mover and the seconder of the speech from the throne. You know I like to give credit where credit is due, but I am against socialism and I am for free enterprise.

During the last election, the Hon. Mr. Douglas, Minister of Highways, spoke in Indian Head on behalf of Mr. Burgess. He made a statement at that meeting that the government proposed to hard-surface the road from McLean to Indian Head in the very near future. I hope he was sincere in that.

Mr. Burgess was not satisfied with the town of Indian Head having one Minister; he had one meeting with Mrs. Strum afterwards at Sintaluta and one at Indian Head. I think the Hon. Mr. Douglas, Minister of Highways, will be sincere and I hope he shall hard-surface that road very soon.

We are told that when the returns were coming in, the Premier and the rest of his Cabinet were sure shaky because they were nearly defeated. It will not be very long before the next chance, and I am sure they will know that we are around again.

There are a great many lakes in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and a great many people fishing in the area of the Fort Qu'Appelle lakes. I am told on good authority, and I think it is authentic, that all those lakes have been closed all year. They have not been opened up for

fishing in the fall of 1948. I think the people that have lived and fished there for some 50 or 60 years — the natives, the Metis — always make their living on fishing, and I am sure it is a terrible position to have those people in.

The government has been telling the people that it has not raised taxes. The people do not believe that, because the taxes went up in leaps and bounds. In 1945, they put one cent on gasoline; then in 1946 the federal government took three cents off gasoline — that was a war measure — and this government put on another two cents in 1946. That is three cents that was put on since this government came into power. It was seven cents a gallon when we were in here, and it is ten cents now. You cannot deny that. Motor licences went up, Mr. Speaker, and then they try to tell you taxes have not gone up.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That statement is not correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dundas: — Which is that?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That motor licences went up.

Mr. Dundas: — Truck licences went up, too.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is different.

Mr. Dundas: — Car licences went up, the old cars that had big wheel bases. Oh yes, I know. You cannot tell me, because I know.

In regard to highways, I would like to tell the hon. Minister of Highways that we have the worst road that there is in any country.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — It is a lot better than when the Liberals had it.

Mr. Dundas: — I hope, Mr. Douglas, that you will look after No. 2 highway, and if you come to my place I will use you decently. If you are down that way, call around.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — I am sure you would.

Mr. Dundas: — Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal was said in 1943 and 1944 when the Premier was on the hustings, that after he was elected if anyone would walk the highway, no one would ever walk the highway as long as he was Premier. Lots of them walk the highway ever since you have been elected, and in four years from now I say you and your government will walk the highway.

They say that business and people have not moved out of the province. A man came to me just before the 1948 election and said: "I've got a new tractor, new combine and a new one-way." About \$11,000 of machinery and

\$4,000 cash. He wanted to buy a farm. He went to eleven places and what did they tell him. “No, we will not sell any farm unless we get the cash, with this government. We do not know what they are going to do so, therefore, we want the cash.” A man was sent down to Winnipeg on a delegation to sell debentures on a hospital — and \$80,000 hospital and he wanted \$40,000 worth of debentures. He went to two of the biggest financial institutions in Winnipeg and asked them if they had any money to lend. They said: “Yes, where is your proposition.” He said: “At Wolseley.” “No, they said, we are not lending money with the government you have in Saskatchewan.” He went to two of them and they told him that. There is not a loan company in Saskatchewan who will lend a dollar on the land, only the federal Farm Loan Board. Not one of them will lend with the government we have in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They cannot exploit the people.

Mr. Dundas: — That is a fact, and you cannot deny it.

Premier Douglas: — The Premier said in his campaign of 1943 and 1944 if anyone was evicted off their land that he would resign. I want to say the only one that is loaning money is the federal Farm Loan Board. They are the only ones that are loaning money in Saskatchewan. All the rest of them are lending money in Alberta and Manitoba.

Premier Douglas: — They need it there.

Mr. Dundas: — Now we come to the old age pensions, and I am sure that is quite a ticklish situation in regard to the promises that were made in 1943 and 1944. The Premier went around and said he was prepared to give the old age pensioners \$50 a month and make the age limit at 65. I think that is quite right and I think that is about what they should be paying.

Premier Douglas: — Are you quoting me?

Mr. Dundas: — Yes, \$50 a month. Didn't you say that in 1943 and 1944?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, at no time did I or any person speaking for the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan say we would pay \$50 a month at 65. We did say that we were proposing to move an amendment in the federal House — which we did move — asking the federal government to pay a pension of \$50 a month at 65, and never at any time have I said the C.C.F. government, if elected in Saskatchewan, would pay \$50 a month.

Mr. Dundas: — In 1947 you paid \$5 to bring it up to \$30, and the federal government, in the fall of 1947 brought it up to \$30, you took your \$5 off during 1948, for the old age pensioner. You also reduced their medicine by 20 percent. You did that after the Alberta election, too. You should have announced that before the election, but you are too cute for that.

Then the hon. Premier said, in 1943 and 1944, that he would look after the incapacitated. Did you make any mention of that — the incapacitated that were sick and could not work?

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member is asking me a question. There is nothing in the C.C.F. programme saying that we would give any help to the incapacitated. We said we would provide social aid for them and social aid has been provided.

Mr. Dundas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there were three or four brought to the attention of that department and they said, your son can look after you, or somebody else. I think the incapacitated should be looked after by the state. I can give you the name of a person that was refused.

Premier Douglas: — I would be glad to have the name.

Mr. Dundas: — During the campaign of 1948, I told the people when I was campaigning that the C.C.F. were socialist and you could depend on it that they were going to take something away, and they did.

An Hon. Member: — What?

Mr. Dundas: — They took the box factory away from a man. They started their shoe factory and their wool factory, and they lost money on them all.

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question? Who did the government take the woollen factory from, did you say?

Mr. Dundas: — You took that from the States.

During the 1948 election I told them that they took away a certain thing from the people, but I said I am not going to stick my neck out and tell them they are going to take the land over. “No, I said, you people are intelligent enough to know what they are going to do. You have the responsibility put on you.” I think when I told the people the truth they accepted it and the C.C.F. propaganda did not go very far.

A great deal was said in 1943 and 1944 about the ‘heelers’ the Liberals had. They were sure terrible ‘heelers’.

Mr. Kuziak: — They sure were.

Mr. Dundas: — They sure have ten times more heelers now. They have a heeler for every C.C.F.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they talk about making policies that you have to do this and you have to do that. With regard to furs, you have to sell the

muskrats to the government. I saw a report the other day from the Fur Marketing Company for 12 muskrats at 94 cents apiece.

I would like to say that we have a government to the right and I might say that we on the left last year were only five and now there are 21. The five that represented the opposition in 1944 to 1948 did a great service for the people of this province. They were working under difficulties; they were criticized and they could only speak once in about 47 times. By golly, that was a lot.

However, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will give a great deal of thought to electrification. There are a great many people down our way who would like to have it extended. Some of the people on the hydro have had electrification into their premises and I think it is a wonderful thing. I hope it will be extended.

I would like to say that it was not in the best interest of everyone when I was campaigning for me to criticize my opposition. I said, on every occasion, that Mr. Burgess was a gentleman, and so was Mr. Josephson. I never criticize my opposition when I am campaigning, but I sure campaigned in 1948. I put on a good campaign or I would not have been here. One of the C.C.F. told me the other day I caught him sleeping. Oh yes, I had been 65 miles from my home town by 7 o'clock in the morning. I was going into the yard of a family that voted C.C.F. in 1944 and I met a boy and girl coming out of the gate with a tractor. The boy called me over and said: "Are you going in to see Dad and Mother?" I said: "Yes." "Well, he said, if they don't vote right me and my wife will sure kill their vote." But when I went in to see the father and mother they were sure all right. They would not promise me they would vote for me but they said they were not voting C.C.F. and I was sure tickled to death. I mentioned they told me they were not voting C.C.F. They were through. One time was enough for them down in our part of the country. They know what they want. They do not want socialism or communism or satanism. No they do not want too many "isms".

Premier Douglas: — How about Liberalism?

Mr. Dundas: — Yes, they want Liberalism and Toryism. I might say I was not the official candidate of the Conservatives and Liberals. I was nominated a Liberal but the Tories supported me. They did not have a candidate. But I have always said if you have a Liberal government and a Conservative government, you will have a stable government, but with the socialist government, you do not know what you have. They go haywire every once in a while. Quite often too.

It was said by the C.C.F. government in 1948 that they were going to take my deposit, and I said: "Who told you that?" This man said Mr. Corman and Mr. Douglas. Now, this was a C.C.F. I did not hear you say it, but he said that you said it. That would be the day when you take my deposit in that part of the country.

When the mover and the seconder spoke the other day, especially the mover, he gave a great deal of credit to the C.C.F. He has to do that or else they would week him out of the party. You know they have done that before

in other places. The Liberals never weed anyone out of the party because they are all decent and all glad to be there. The hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) and I were old friends in the early days at Indian Head. I was driving a butcher wagon and when he came to this country first he used to go around in the morning with me. I thought I would have him a Liberal all his life but he went astray. But you know, I think he is going to be a Liberal pretty soon because some of those across the floor of the House know they are going to get defeated and I think they will be crossing over the floor of the House before this Session is over.

However, I am proud to represent the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and I hope I will, on a future occasion, have some more to say this Session in regard to the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being courteous to me because I have been rambling all over and have not been sticking to the amendment, and I might say, I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. J.R. Denike (Torch River): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday while the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) was speaking he neglected to state his occupation. I heard some of my friends on this side of the House speculating as follows: "Is he a farmer?" "No, they have five farmers only; we have 16 on our side." "Is he a lawyer?" "No, he sticks his neck out too far to be a lawyer." Then I heard someone else say: "He is a teacher." I think that the Hon. Mr. Lloyd has substantiated that sufficiently.

This might be just as good a time as any to present the occupational analysis of the present Legislature. The C.C.F. has 52 percent farmers in its membership in the Legislature . . .

An Hon. Member: — I would like to ask the gentleman a question, but I don't know his name.

Mr. Speaker: — As soon as possible we will provide the members with a plan of the House so they will know the members' names. This hon. member's name is Mr. Denike from Torch River.

Mr. Buchanan: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for you to announce, for the benefit of the whole House, who the speaker is, and his constituency, until we have that?

Mr. Speaker: — If I had a chart here I might be able to do it. We will try to acquaint the members with the members speaking.

Mr. Denike: — Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should have introduced myself at the outset. I will do that in a few moments.

February 18, 1949

Farmers on the C.C.F. side of the House have 52 percent whereas the opposition have 24 percent. Workers on the C.C.F. side have 16 percent, the opposition zero. Teachers on the government side, 13 percent; opposition ten percent. Ministers of the Gospel three percent on the government side; zero on the opposition side. Business and professional: government 16 percent; opposition 62 percent. Retired: government zero, and opposition four percent.

Perhaps the wrong impression might have been given there by separating workers and teachers. I happen to have been a teacher for some 20 years, and I feel that I did a certain amount of work during that time. So it might be just as well if we grouped workers and teachers together; in which case, on the government side 29 percent are workers and on the opposition side ten percent. At the present time I am in the business group — 16 percent and 62 percent opposition, but my interests are still very much with the teacher group.

I have the honour to represent the constituency of Torch River, that territory which has gained so much fame for the production of registered seeds of all kinds. At this time I would like to pay tribute to a former member of the Legislature, Dr. Kitely of Nipawin, whose assets in debts of gratitude are countless, who has given unsparingly of his skill without hope of recompense, and whose record will fill many important pages in the history of the Nipawin district. Dr. Kitely is so well respected in his own community that I feel sure that if Dr. Kitely had been my opponent in this last election, I could easily have been defeated. I think so much of Dr. Kitely that I would have voted for him myself.

I am a proprietor of a coffee shop, an ex-teacher who was knocked out of the teaching profession through the use of unorthodox teaching methods in the schools of Prince Albert. Prince Albert, as you all know, was at one time the seat of the Prime Minister of Canada and the heart of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan. The heart, I believe, is now seated in Rosthern; the brains, I hope, are in his seat there too.

I would like to make some reference here to unorthodox methods of teaching which seem to be bearing fruit in different parts of the world. Perhaps some of you remember this article in “McLean’s Magazine”, December 1st of last year. The title of this article is “In this school the kids are boss”. The article tells of the efforts of a teacher by the name of Mr. Neil who operates a school in Summerhill, England. There are one or two quotations here that are of particular interest.

The kindergarten pupils easily learn to read by a read-and-see system of illustrated words, and the senior grades vote their own reading.

I am wondering if they would vote for “The World of Today”, or vote to have it cast out.

Mr. Neil, like myself, was at one time discharged for practising unorthodox methods of teaching. As a clerk in a dry goods store, Neil passionately fought and studied to become a teacher like his father, and it

all added up to disillusion. He realized that the servant girls he taught to read would only read serials in the weeklies. The boys he taught to count would never count more than their weekly wage. Revolting against orthodoxy, young Neil scrapped the school books and began staging classroom discussions on such topics as prisons and poverty, crime and environment, and should I add communism.

Unorthodox teaching methods have always appealed to me. I have done some experimental work along this line myself, and have had excellent success. I remember going into a school where I spent seven years. At the outset I suggested to the superintendent that I would like to try an experiment. He was very doubtful about it in the beginning because he was a superintendent of the Old School, but he told me to go ahead. At the end of seven years he provided me with such an excellent report that the school board thought that he had confused it with some other teacher's report. They asked him to re-inspect the school. His second report substantiated the first one. He knew, and I knew, that the work was being done properly and the experiment was a success, but the people in the district did not realize what I was driving at.

Unorthodox methods did not do in the city of Prince Albert, whose schools in 1945 were still operating on the educational philosophy developed in England in 1862 by a member of parliament in charge of education, who said:

If this education which had been introduced is not to be cheap, it shall be efficient, and if it is not to be efficient, it shall at least be cheap.

So he introduced a system whereby teachers' salaries became dependent upon results obtained by his pupils at examination. This system was supposed to have come to an end in 1895, but I and other teachers in the province — teachers who are really interested in the welfare of the pupils — know that it has only recently come to an end.

The Leader of the Opposition is not helping me in my search for a proper educational system when he suggests that a certain book be removed from the schools of Saskatchewan. However, I think I have discovered the real reason why he is anxious to have this book removed. He says that it is on account of its communist teachings. But there is another passage, which he read quite inadvertently and which, I think, gives the real reason: "It is impossible for a private individual to become rich." At another point a problem is presented. In New Zealand the government loans money for your home building at one percent interest. In Canada the private loan companies charge four percent and five percent interest. What is the difference in amount of interest that will be paid on a loan of \$4,000 in the two countries? We come back to the original analysis that I made of the composition of the opposition side of the Legislature, and we can understand quite well there why they would not want a government which would prevent the private individual from becoming rich.

The Leader of the Opposition has asked that books be introduced stating the truth about the Soviet Union. The teachers of Saskatchewan have

have done their best to select such books. Can he suggest a better one? The book itself carries a warning against propaganda, and sums up the purpose of education in a brief passage. It is in the schools unhampered by propaganda that the ideas of a free people are born again for future generations. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this book "The World of Today" is fit reading for school pupils, and that it harmonizes with the spirit of the educational programme in Saskatchewan today.

I am going to conclude with a warning to the opposition when they are asking us to spend large sums of money to carry out a programme which they would like to suggest. In Oregon voters voted to support a \$50 a month old age pension. It was approved in handsome style. The electorate voted two to one in favour of the allowances; but when the ballots were counted and the ballot boxes put away for another year, headaches began to set in thick and fast. Men over 65 years of age and women over 60 were supposed to be eligible for the pension. It was discovered that Oregon will have 76,060 men and 101,546 women in the eligible age groups by 1949. That means that the state is faced with the possibility of a pension bill of \$9 million per month, or \$216 million for a two-year period.

Unfortunately the voters, while approving the generous pension, did not indicate where the money was to come from. Indeed the electors voted for higher income tax exemptions on the same ballot as that approving the old age allowance. The Oregon government now finds itself with a total of \$70 million available for all state functions during the next two years, yet if only half the eligible oldsters apply for the new pension it will cost more than this amount, and the state has a few other bills to meet. The people of Oregon are probably just as mature politically and financially as the people of any other state or province for that matter, but in this particular case they have given a good example of one of the great modern illusions that the state can give something for nothing.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:55 o'clock p.m.