

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
32nd Day

Monday, March 24, 1952

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

CONDOLENCE

Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrobert-Kindersley): — A short time ago the Parliamentary Association was enjoying the hospitality of Ceylon. I was grieved to read that, this morning, the Premier of Ceylon met with a fatal accident, which was very unfortunate for a young Dominion like that, who was just receiving self-government under the splendid leadership he had given to his party, in Ceylon.

I notice it is suggested that Sir John Coteau LeRoy, the Vice-President of the Parliamentary Association, may be named as his successor.

I do not know if it would be in keeping for the Province to send a message of condolence. Of course, the Federal Government will be doing so.

SASKATCHEWAN FILMS IN U.S.A.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I have a matter which I would like to call to the attention of the hon. members. Last summer, when I had the opportunity of being down in the United States, I spoke to some people down there about some of the films which we produce in this Province; and, as a consequence, with the co-operation of the proper branches in this Government, we were able to send three of our films about wild life down there to be shown in Fort Atkinson and White Water, Wisconsin. They were first shown before the Union, which operates in the plant of the Creamery Package Manufacturing Company in Fort Atkinson. It is a very large company that produces milk supplies for the dairies all over the country, and they were so enthusiastic with these films that they showed them to the public and parochial schools of the city; and then they were shown in White Water to the Conservation Branch. Although those people do not have very much to conserve down there, they have a very active conservation branch, for wild life, timber and things like. This Conservation Branch in the town of Fort Atkinson, just by themselves, without their guest, number over 400 people.

I am pleased to assure the members that our films were received very enthusiastically, and I think we will get some good tourist business over the showing of those films.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member opposite for what he has just said, and what he has done. I think that is a very fine example of the type of co-operation that we do

March 24, 1952

like to receive, and I am sure that with the Government and the Opposition working together in the interests of Saskatchewan, we can do a tremendous amount to promote this Province.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 85 — An Act to amend The Larger School Units Act, 1944

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments proposed in this Bill — an Act to amend The Larger School Units Act — which I should like to comment on at this time.

One of the amendments has to do with the method of nominating the trustees of the Larger School Units. I should, perhaps, remind the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that the election of trustees in Larger Units is carried on by means of a system of delegates. The local Boards appoint delegates, who attend meetings in the sub-unit, and these delegates in turn elect the Larger School Unit trustees.

There has been, I might say, some discussion from time to time between ourselves and the Trustees' Association as to whether or not it might not be preferable to change to a system of direct election, but because of the desire of their Organization and ourselves to keep as closely as possible in connection with local trustees, we have decided, up to the present, to retain the delegate system. The Act, up to date, has provided that the nominations for the Unit trustees will be taken on the occasion of the sub-unit meeting in the Larger Unit, thus providing no opportunity for the nominees for the position to be known prior to the day of the election. This amendment, then, proposes to make an alteration in that situation. Briefly, it proposes that in every sub-unit in which there is to be an election of a trustee, the Unit secretary will notify the local Board some 15 days prior to the date of the meeting on which the election will take place. Nominations will be received by the Unit secretary. He, in turn, will notify the delegates who have been selected, to attend the election meeting, for purposes of electing a Unit trustee. The meeting, if no nominations have been received, may then proceed to nominate, or if more than 50 per cent of the delegates present decide, even if there have been nominations received, they may make additional nominations.

One other amendment makes it clear that Units may use the facilities of a Credit Union for banking purposes. Due to some restrictions in the banking laws of the Dominion, Credit Unions do not, of course, have entirely the same possibilities, or same scope of action, if you like, as do ordinary banks. An amendment, it is felt, is necessary to make it clear that if Units wish, if there is a Credit Union with the facilities in the area, then Unit may make use of the services of that Credit Union.

There is an amendment, too, making it possible for the Units to hold more than one share in the Co-operative Organization. They have previously had the right to hold one share, but due to the fact that the

patronage dividends are not always all distributed in cash, some of them are retained as share capital, and some of them found themselves holding more than one share. This amendment is just to make it legal.

It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, to notice that it is only within the last year that the Wholesale Co-operative in the Province — Federated Co-operatives — began to get interested in doing business on a wholesale basis with the Larger School Units. Units, of course, do a great deal of their business on a wholesale basis. But for the year ending October 31, 1951, the Units had purchased some \$88,700 worth of materials from the Co-operative, and received, during that year, dividends to the extent of \$7,570 on that volume of business.

The main amendment has to do, of course, with the change in the formula, which results in the increase in the equalization grant. While I have had the opportunity of mentioning that before, I think perhaps I should, on this occasion, give to the members, again, the basis of this change. Members will recall that we calculate our equalization grant in Units in this way: We take a certain programme cost, and we take a certain income cost, and if the programme cost is more than the income cost, then the equalization grant makes up the difference. The amendment introduced in 1950 provided that we would take a programme cost of \$2100 for each elementary schoolroom, and \$2200 for each high school room, and a relative amount for each conveying room. We would calculate income on the basis of grants then payable, that is, \$300 for each elementary room, and \$700 for each high school room; add to that income the tax revenue which would be produced by taxation, at the rate of 11 mills on rural assessment, and 15 mills on urban assessment.

As I say, if the programme cost so calculated was greater than the income so calculated, the equalization grant made up the difference.

The amendment which is presently before this House will make this change — we will calculate the programme cost on the basis of \$2400 per elementary schoolroom, and \$2500 per high school room. The grant income will be calculated, on the new basis, of course, of \$400 per elementary classroom, and \$700 per high school classroom. The taxation will be considered on the basis of 12 mills on rural assessment, and 16 mills on urban assessment. The reason, of course, for increasing the rate of taxation that we use for calculating the equalization grant is to give to the lower assessed Unit a higher relative proportion of the money to be added, than the higher assessed Units. This, I think, is the fourth time that it has been my pleasure to introduce increases in school grants.

It is rather interesting in that it means that, in 1952, some of our lower assessed Units such as Medstead or Meadow Lake, would receive a grant, on the average, of about \$1600 per classroom. They will, in addition, receive some consideration with regard to their building problem, which will be over and above that amount. The equalization grant paid to the Meadow Lake Unit will be, I think, at least 25 mills; to compare with that we might note that, in the Moose Jaw Unit, which is one of the more highly assessed Units, their equalization grant will be about one-half a mill. Moose Jaw is one of the group of Units which gets what we call a basic equalization grant only. The total amount of the grants,

March 24, 1952

equalization plus operational, paid to the schools in Meadow Lake, is consequently in the neighbourhood of four times the amount paid to those in the Moose Jaw Unit. I would point out, that while that difference is quite considerable, I would not pretend to the House, Mr. Speaker, that it is still not big enough to make it possible for Meadow Lake, with the same effort, to give the same services as can be given in the Moose Jaw Unit, with a comparable effort.

Equalization grants have, of course, increased in total very considerably in recent years. Referring again to the Units which I have just mentioned, the equalization grant paid to Meadow Lake schools — schools now in the Meadow Lake Unit, in 1944, were some \$13,000. In 1950, those schools received more than \$120,000, or about 9 times as much. In 1952, the equalization grants will be in the neighbourhood of \$142,000, or approximately 11 times as much. In the Medstead Unit the schools that are now in that Unit received, in 1944, in the neighbourhood of \$9,000 equalization grant. They received, in 1940, over \$100,000, or about 11 times as much; and we calculate that they will receive, in 1952, about \$111,000, or 12 times as much.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that each of these Units is operating more rooms than were being operated in 1944.

The building and repair grant, as I mentioned, will be in addition to those amounts, so that for those Units which are among our lower assessed Units, the grant from the Department will take care of from 60 to 70 per cent of their total expenditure. Once the burden of building in Units such as these is relieved, and in other Units, then of course it will be possible for them to devote more of their money and financial resources, generally, to the matter of operational costs. It is worth noting that, in the Meadow Lake Unit, they report that since 1945 they have had to build some 70 new classrooms. They are not caught up with their building programme yet. One can understand something of the difficulty in these fringe areas, when you consider that it has been necessary to undertake a building programme of that extent.

The Medstead Unit, which is a smaller Unit, has built some 23 rooms, and I would take the opportunity, since it is his last Session in the House, I understand, to congratulate the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) — in the Provincial House, not in the Federal House — who has been chairman of the Medstead Unit Board since its inception, for a very good, effective, business-like job that has been done by that Larger Unit Board.

The Turtleford School Unit, which is one of the same group — an assessment now as low — and not quite so much, perhaps, in the fringe area, has had to build some 48 classrooms as well. I have mentioned that for that building programme they have had some consideration, over and above their equalization and operational grants. Since 1945, these Units have averaged, in building and repair grants, amounts varying from \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year. In the Meadow Lake Unit, for example, from 1945-51 our building and repair grants there have totalled in the neighbourhood of \$25,000.

I want to make just a brief summary of the total grant picture, as regards equalization, and in regard to basic grants, since this amendment does affect those grants. In 1944, the total equalization grants paid amounted to something in the neighbourhood of \$270,000. In 1952, it will amount to, in the neighbourhood of \$3,500,000, which is about 12 times as much. In 1944, the basic grants for elementary classrooms ranged from 90 cents a day to \$1.50 a day. In 1952, the basic grants for elementary schools will all be \$2.00 per day — that is, an increase of \$100 a year in every case, and an increase of \$220 a year in some cases. The only other increase in grants has been with regard to those classrooms giving vocational education, where the programme is shared by the Province and the Dominion, and in those cases the grant has been increased by \$350 per classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading to the Bill — an Act to amend the Larger School Units Act.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to congratulate the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) on the very fair and excellent manner in which he has introduced second reading of this Bill to amend the Larger School Units Act, and I wish, at the outset, to join with him in congratulating the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) for the excellent job he has done as Chairman of the Medstead Larger School Unit. I think the work that has been done by my colleague, the hon. member for Meadow Lake, is a clear indication of the support that the Larger Units have received, not only from Government members, but also from Liberal members of this House. I do regret that he will not be sitting with us in this Legislature, due to pressure of business, after the next election.

The Minister of Education is introducing a welcome improvement in the equalization grants for the Larger School Units. I feel that the principle of equalization grants is a very sound one, and it is another one of these ideas which happens to have been started by a Liberal administration, and which has been continued under the C.C.F. administration for this Province.

I am quite prepared to congratulate the Minister of Education on the improvements in school grants that have been made. However, I find that these increases in school grants in the Province of Saskatchewan, in spite of the figures that have been quoted by the Minister of Education, are far from the implementation of the pledges upon which the C.C.F. were elected to office. I happen to have in my hand a copy of “The Saskatchewan Commonwealth”, an article which enunciates the C.C.F. programme for Saskatchewan, as far as education is concerned. First of all, it lists five wrongs with education — that is back in 1944. I think one of these should be drawn to the attention of this House, and I quote:

“There is vast inequality of educational opportunity as between children in city and country, and even as between children in one school district and another. This is the result, largely, of the varying amounts of money available for educational purposes.”

March 24, 1952

Then, in another section of this article it deals with “What will the C.C.F. do?” I believe it is important for the hon. members sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, to remember:

1. Provincial responsibility.

In other words, the C.C.F., back in 1944, definitely pledged themselves to accept education as a provincial financial responsibility. Here is what they say — and I am quoting from their own pledges:

“The C.C.F. Government will recognize the fact that providing educational opportunity for all children is the responsibility of the Province, and will so re-organize school administration and finance as to increase expenditure on education, improve the school plant and equipment, and raise the teacher’s salary.

“The British North America Act, which is Canada’s constitution, makes education a provincial, not a municipal or local responsibility.”

Further on, it states again:

“A C.C.F. Government will accept the responsibility laid on it by our Constitution, and take steps to provide adequate schooling for all children, irrespective of the part of the Province they happen to live in.”

I think hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, should not forget that, in 1944, they were prepared — at least they promised the people — that, if elected, they would increase school grants so as to have the Provincial Government assume a very large portion of the educational cost of this Province. And as a matter of fact, they told people throughout this Province that their promises were not to be taken in vain. I recall the then Mr. T.C. Douglas, who is now the hon. Premier of this Province, say that he did not want the C.C.F. party to make a single promise in the provincial election which his party could not, and would not, fulfil. (I am very happy to hear so much applause from the Government benches.)

Now let us have a look at the situation, today. As a result of these increased equalization grants, and also the increase in the basic grant, which the hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) explained a few minutes ago, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) stated, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of the increased school grants that would be made available to legislation this Session, local taxes would be reduced by as much 5 mills in the Larger School Units, and more in non-unit areas. That was a definite statement made on the floor of this Legislature by the Provincial Treasurer, the day he delivered his budget address.

It seems to me that that statement of the Provincial Treasurer is very doubtful. I fail to see how the proposed increase in equalization grants of this year, which will amount to approximately \$1 million, will reduce in a single school district, the tax mill levy by a single mill.

As a matter of fact, we have already had indications almost all over the Province, of increased school taxes this year. I do not care where you go. You can go down into the Swift Current Unit, and I notice by recent press reports that it is necessary for the Swift Current School Unit to increase their school tax by 2 mills. I also find, as I look at the school mill rates, in the Unit areas throughout the Province, that the school mill levy has reached, in my opinion, the saturation point. It does not matter what Unit we look at, we find such tax levies as 18 or 20 mills for our rural district, and 23 to 25 mills in the urban districts. As a matter of fact, in some of the districts we find that some of the school taxes have gone well above 30 mills. Take for instance, Sturgis Unit. We find that the rural districts, in 1951, paid 25 and 26 mills. We find in the hamlets they paid 30 mills. We find in their village districts they paid anywhere from 30 to 32 or 34 mills, and in their town districts they paid 32 mills. You find that in the Sturgis School Unit there is a school tax of as high as 34 mills.

Or, if you wish to look at other Units — let us take the Nipawin School Unit, with which I happen to be familiar. There the rural districts are paying 20 mills; the urbans were paying, last year, 25 mills; and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in one of the town districts in that Unit, the school levy has reached an all-time high of 39 mills. I wonder how our real property taxation can possibly bear that!

References have been made by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) to the Meadow Lake Unit, and you would think their school mill rate was not very high. Well, what is the situation in that Unit? We find that the rurals there, last year, were paying 24 mills, and the urbans were paying 32 mills. I wonder in which of the school districts we may expect that reduction of up to five mills in the local school levy, that the Provincial Treasurer predicted but a short time ago? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that while the present increase which the Minister of Education explained to this House, this afternoon, is a welcome increase, it is far, far from adequate, and falls far, far short of the C.C.F. promise that, if elected in 1944, the Provincial Government would assume a rightful share of the cost of education. As a matter of fact, the Province of Saskatchewan has not increased its school grants in proportion to the increases which have taken place in some of the other provinces.

For instance, in the province of British Columbia, the three years, 1946-1949, their school grants had tripled — tripled inside of three years!

Now, the business of financing education on the basis of local taxation is becoming almost an impossible problem. Right now, our local municipalities are spending approximately 50 per cent of all the total tax receipts on the business of education. I happen to have before me the figures for 1950, taken from the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs, and here is what I find. In that year the school taxes amounted to nearly \$18 million, and if you would add to that the Public Revenue tax of \$1,800,000 for that year, we find that the municipalities of this Province — that is, taking all the municipalities together — the city, town and the rural areas — we find that all together they are spending nearly \$20 million on education, and that represents approximately 50 per cent of

March 24, 1952

the total municipal revenue throughout the Province, itself.

Or, you can look at it another way. The provincial grants in the Province of Saskatchewan are less than 30 per cent of the total school costs! The grants in the Province of Saskatchewan are less than 30 per cent of the total school costs! Or, if you take it on a gross expenditure basis — take out all the money that is spent by the Department of Education, on education, including school grants and various other services which the Department provides — for every \$2 which is raised by local taxation for the business of education, the Province puts up only \$1. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that a fulfilment of that C.C.F. promise, that, if elected to office, they would assume a major portion of the cost of education in this Province?

As a matter of fact, the increase in school grants which the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) explained today, which is only a part of the total increase, which I understand will be approximately \$1,600,000 does not represent the total receipts which the Government of Saskatchewan will have by way of Public Revenue Tax, plus the increase which they hope to get in their education and hospitalization tax. Let me make this absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker. We will have an increase of receipts from the education and hospitalization tax during the coming fiscal year of approximately \$1 million. Two-thirds of that goes to education, and one-third of it goes to finance the hospitalization scheme. In other words, we hope, in this Province, to increase our education tax receipts by \$660,000. We can hope to receive from the Public Revenue Tax, which the Provincial Treasurer has promised to use to increase school grants, \$1,600,000. So the situation that we are up against is this: Either the Government of Saskatchewan is going to fail to use the increase from the education tax to increase school grants, or else they will fail to use the entire receipts they anticipate from the Public Revenue tax itself.

In the northern part of the Province, we happen to be experiencing urban growth. Take the town of Melfort itself — a town with a population of approximately 3,000 people. During the past six years we have found it necessary, as a result of our increased school enrolment, to provide an additional classroom every year, and the Provincial Government is not contributing one cent to the construction, i.e. the building grants in the town of Melfort — not one cent to the building construction of the elementary schoolrooms in the town of Melfort.

We find that same increase right across the north. We go to the town of Carrot River where they have found it necessary to add several classrooms. Go to the town of Tisdale where they find it necessary to provide increased accommodation, and we fail to see any appreciable assistance towards the construction of our school buildings in that part of the Province. As a matter of fact, in the Melfort Larger Unit itself, the local authorities are finding it necessary, this year, to increase the school tax by 2 mills for the rural districts, and 2 mills for the urban districts. In the town of Melfort itself, we find it necessary to increase the school levy, and so I say, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, that although the present proposed increase in school grants, as explained by the Minister of Education, this afternoon, is a welcome step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough, and there is an increasing feeling among the taxpayers in

this Province that we are expecting too much from the property-owners to finance education.

Therefore, it is my sincere hope — there is no use expecting it from the present C.C.F. Government, because they will be in office but a short time — that the next Liberal administration will take this problem of school finance seriously, and see that school grants are increased until all over the Province as a whole, our Provincial Government will be carrying at least 50 per cent of the over-all cost of education in the Province. I think that is possible. It is possible when you stop to think of the greatly increased provincial revenues, for at no time in the history of this Province have provincial revenues been as buoyant as they are today. At no time in the history of this Province has the Federal subsidy been as great as it will be this year, for in the coming fiscal year, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Federal subsidy will be in the neighbourhood of \$24 or \$25 million — an increase of from \$4 to \$5 million over last year's Federal subsidy.

Surely, in the name of common sense — surely, in the interests of education, the Provincial Government could have used a major portion of that increased Federal subsidy to increase school grants to such an extent that the financing of education will not be a burden on the local real property, as it is at the present time.

Naturally, we will support the second reading of this Bill, but we cannot help but feel the disappointment, and I think it is a reflection of a disappointment that will be experienced throughout the entire Province, that the Provincial Government is not assuming its rightful share of the financing of education.

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — I was not going to rise up in this particular debate, but what astounds me is that a learned member of the teaching profession, from the other side, rises and informs the House that the increase in education grants is not quite enough.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) and the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) in bringing down the budget which has increased school grants to the extent that it has. I want to point out that the increase in school grants, Mr. Speaker, this year, amounts to almost the amount that the Liberals used to spend back in 1943, and I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, that what I cannot see is when the Opposition rose on the budget debate, and continuously fought that budget to reduce it — to reduce school grants, to reduce expenditure on roads, to reduce all the expenditures of the Government, and now they rise up on an amendment, and they want a greater budget. I say, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot . . .

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would like to ask the hon. member what member on this side of the House protested against the increase in school grants, in the budget debate?

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Hear! Hear!

March 24, 1952

Mr. Kuziak: — It is all included in the budget, and if you vote against the budget, and fight against the increase of the budget, you are fighting for a decrease in educational grants.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that our budget, from 1943 to the present time, has been increased by 121 per cent. Our expenditure on education has increased by 400 per cent. Let us be reasonable about it. Now, the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) jumps over into British Columbia, and he tells us how much the grants in education have been increased in British Columbia, but there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that he overlooked — he did not tell us, that although the education grants in British Columbia were increased by some 3½ times, their budget, since 1943, has been increased by 367 per cent, or 3½ times. While British Columbia has given its regular increase of the budget to an increase in school grants, we have, from our budget — although our budget increased some 121 per cent — increased our grants or expenditure for educational purposes by over 400 per cent. I believe that is a marvelous job, and one that we should congratulate the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) for.

I will support second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The mover of the motion is about to exercise his privilege of closing the debate. If anyone wishes to speak, he must do so now.

(Closing Debate)

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words in response to the statements — or some of the statements — of the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff).

I find myself in agreement with some of his statements, as I am sure all hon. members do. I find myself amused at some of them. He said he “hoped” that a Liberal Government would take hold of this thing. Well, it is a good thing he has that kind of hope, and has some fun out of hoping, I suppose, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, the performance of Liberal Governments in the past (and I repeat the statement that that is the only sound criterion that we have to press them with) has never indicated any very considerable concern, either about the money they spent on education, or about the amount of taxes which their taxing bodies throughout the country had to provide.

Reference was made to the fine support which the Larger School Units had received from Liberal members. I am not going to say too much about that — I grant that, as I have granted before, with regard to this member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Lofts) — the provincial member. One should read the newspaper item, published just recently, with regard to the fine support we have had from the Liberal-Federal member from Meadow Lake, who has provided us with some of the choicest statements in years — and this was a recent statement which he made in the House of Commons. The hon. member for Melfort might just look around, and talk around, and think back on some of the statements which have continually been made by some of his cohorts in regard to Larger Units, and in regard to the almost total lack

of statements from any of them, indicating anything favourable to the Larger Units.

It is quite true that equalization grants were introduced in this Province by a Liberal Government. They were introduced in 1938. At that time the maximum that could be paid was some 50 cents a day, and the only school districts that could qualify were rural or village school districts, with an assessment of something less than \$100,000.

In 1944, the same group of districts did qualify to the extent of \$1.50, or in some cases, \$300 a year. One can contrast that with the fact that, in this legislation (we are talking about today, Sir), it makes possible an equalization grant, in some cases — not of \$300 a year, but of \$1,200 a year — at least four times as much, in the maximum.

In regard to total expenditures for education, I think it must be pointed out again that we will be providing the school districts of the Province with about \$3 to spend, to every \$1, that the Liberal Government provided them to spend in the last year of their office. The hon. member seems to forget this. He talks about things that were said in 1944. He seems to forget that this Government was elected here in 1944, and that after four years of office, after the electorate had the opportunity to know and to experience our Government, see our treatment of education and other problems as well, they chose to re-elect us. That is a point which the hon. member has evidently overlooked.

He made some reference to the statement of the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) and he interpreted it to suit his own ends. The inference of the Provincial Treasurer, as I got it, was this: That by virtue of this amount of money going out to school districts, it would be possible for them to operate, in some cases only, at a mill rate of 5 mills lower than they would have to operate at, had it not been for this increase in grants.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wish to quote exactly what the Provincial Treasurer stated, found on page 23 of his recent budget address:

“Department officials have calculated that as a result of these increased grants, it will be possible to reduce the local mill rate by as much as five mills in some of the Larger School Units, and by considerably more in some of the districts not included in the Units.”

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the identical words of the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — All right, Mr. Speaker, I realize this statement is in print, and it is acceptable. I think that the interpretation which most people would put on that would be that they would operate at 5 mills less than they would have operated, had it not been for the grants provided. I find, Mr. Speaker, that except for, in most cases, the Liberal politicians, most people throughout the country realize that it is

March 24, 1952

only natural that school taxes should go up. They (most people) are intelligent enough to understand this — that when the cost of everything else is going up, then one will expect school taxes to go up. Most people understand that when the cost of everything you have to have to operate a school has doubled and tripled, then it is not unnatural that school taxes should go up too. Most people understand too, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a government at Ottawa which was as interested in education as the Liberals over here would expect us to believe they are, they would, consequently, exercise some control over the price structure in this country, in which case taxes would not have had to go up nearly as much as they have.

Nobody, in 1944, could possibly, in the light of the statements of the Federal Liberal party at that time, foresee an increase in the costs of operating schools or homes, or anything else, such as we have had since that time, in the face, I say, of a positive statement and promise printed in papers all over this country, that a Federal Liberal Government was going to maintain the prices as they were at that time — the purchasing power of the dollar.

Reference has been made to British Columbia, and that was answered by my hon. friend from Canora (Mr. Kuziak). It is true that British Columbia pays a greater percentage of the cost of education than we do here. It is true that Ontario pays a greater percentage, and I think it is right to say that we can well expect them, with the sources of income and revenue that they have, to pay a greater percentage of the cost than does the Government of Saskatchewan. It is not true that our neighbouring provinces of Alberta and Manitoba pay any greater percentage than we do.

Reference was made to the fact that the Public Revenue Tax and Education Tax might provide more money than would be spent. The legislation, Mr. Speaker, provides that if more money is provided than we will spend this year, then that money goes into the education fund to be used for educational purposes. But one finds again that kind of a statement coming with some questionable sincerity from members on the opposite side of the House. Here is a group who, for years, paid not only their school grants, but every single cost of education out of the proceeds of the Education tax. Not one penny that they put into it, for some number of years, came from any source other than from the Education tax.

Mention was made of some of the building problems across the north. It is true they have had growing pains, and it is true there has been a tremendous building programme. I mentioned some of them — the Meadow Lake Unit, nearly 70 classrooms; in the Turtleford Unit — I have forgotten, but I think there are around 50 classrooms. Had it not been for years of neglect by the previous government for the inability of municipalities, school districts as they were then operating to keep up with the building programme, we would not have had, in these last seven or eight years, to undertake such a tremendous building programme.

I have to smile at the mention of Carrot River. The hon. member suggested that Carrot River had had to build their school without any help from the Provincial Government. He should enquire from the people of Carrot River as to the amount of assistance that they actually did get.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I did not say, Mr. Speaker, nor did I suggest, that the Carrot River school had to be built without assistance from the Provincial Government. I did say, however, that in the town of Melfort, we have recently built a six-room elementary school without one penny . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member said about Carrot River was that they had to build it without any appreciable assistance from the Provincial Government, and, as a matter of fact, they got very considerable assistance in the construction of that particular school.

I want to remind the members of the Legislature again with regard to this matter of tax on land. They have been accepting for some months now, the report of the Committee on municipal relations as their Bible. They have been accepting it as a lot of people accept the Bible, Mr. Speaker — they read the part that fits and do not bother reading the part that does not fit. May I again read this one paragraph:

“The allegations that the municipalities are overburdened, and that land is over-taxed has been examined with great care. It has been found that in no sense can it be said that real property in the average municipality is being over-taxed, either absolutely or relatively.”

I think Mr. Speaker, that that is all that it is necessary to say on this.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 86 — An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1942

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Again there are some points in this Bill which I should like to comment on in moving its second reading. It is a Bill to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act of 1942, and again it has been my pleasure to introduce amendments to this Act which have improved it very substantially.

I think perhaps I should go back to the beginning of Teachers' Superannuation legislation in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Teachers' Superannuation Act was first introduced in the year 1930. At that time the teachers were required to pay a contribution amounting to 4 per cent of their salary each year. They received a pension based on a certain percentage of their salary for a certain period of teaching times their years of service. The rate used with regard to the years for which they had contributed, namely, since 1930, and the rate used for their teaching service before 1930 was different.

March 24, 1952

In the year 1942 the old Act was repealed and a new Teachers' Superannuation Act was introduced. The main reason, I think, for that repeal was that there was a general feeling among the teachers of the Province, which was accepted by the government of the day, that the superannuation Act ought to put more weight on years of service, in determining the amount of the pension, than it did on salary. And so the new Act was based on what is sometimes called the "service type pension." In short, it was this: The pension was made up of at least two parts. One part was calculated by taking the number of years of service which a teacher had, and multiplying it by a certain rate — a number of dollars for each year of service. That was all paid or guaranteed by the Government.

A second part was the annuity which the teachers' contributions, with accumulated interest, would actually purchase. And a third part, which I only mention, was a partial annuity to try to make up for the years of service before 1930, when the teacher had no opportunity to develop an annuity fund.

The 1942 Act did one other thing which was, however, quite unique. It took the pensions of everybody that was on pension at that time, and reduced them. That, I say, was quite unique and I think my Liberal friends opposite ought to remember. For example, the person who, on January 1, 1942, was getting a pension of \$900 per year, woke up one morning in April to find his pension was no longer \$900 per year, but was probably \$775 per year.

I am pleased to report that the present Government has been willing to adjust that injustice since it has been elected. There are some 29 people still living who were superannuated under the old Act — that is before 1942. Except for two people who are on partial pension only, none of those people, today, receive less than \$600. All of them receive more than they received in 1944. Twenty of them are actually getting more than they got before the 1942 reduction. Eight of the others are within \$100 of what they got before their pension was reduced, in 1942; and one of them is within \$103 of that amount.

In 1944 — the last Session in which the Liberal members sat on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker — the superannuation rates were increased. A teacher, in 1944, retiring at age 60 could, for each year of service, get \$13 per year of service as a service pension. In other words, a teacher at that time, who was 60 years of age and who had taught for 35 years, would get, as a service pension, 35 times 13 — or \$455. Added to that would be the annuity which he had purchased and the partial annuity which I spoke of before.

I have been able to recommend increases in those rates, first in 1945, and again in 1950. In 1950, the pension rate was not \$13 per year of service, but \$25 per year of service. In other words, this teacher who was 60 years of age and who had taught in the Province for 35 years, would be entitled, under the amendments of 1950, to a service pension of \$875 a year. You will recall that, in 1944, a teacher under the same circumstances would get a service pension of \$455 a year.

Now, in 1952, I am recommending a further increase in that service pension, along with some other changes in the Act. We are recommending, this year, that the rate of service pension be increased to \$30 a year. In other words, a person with 35 years of service will now be entitled to a service pension of 35 times 35, or \$1,050 per year. You will recall again that, in 1944, a teacher under the same circumstances, for the service part of his pension would have received \$455 a year. In 1952, he will receive \$1,050 per year. In other words, the service pension, that part of the pension for which the Government is responsible, and the payment of which it guarantees, has more than doubled since 1944.

The amendments now before the Legislature also provide for an increased contribution on the part of the teachers. Needless to say, this has been requested by the teachers and will tend to increase the annuity part of their pension. That is, whereas previously they paid 4 per cent of their salary into the annuity portion of the pension fund, they will, from the date of this amendment, pay 5 per cent into the pension fund.

The third amendment, which I think strengthens the Act, is to make it possible for a teacher to draw his pension at a greater rate prior to the age of 70. That is introduced because of the fact, first, that he or she may need a greater amount of money to live on prior to the age of 70, due also to the fact that at age 70 they become, of course, eligible for the universal old-age pension from the Dominion Government, and doing this it makes it possible to more or less level out their income if they wish.

It may be of interest to note the increases in pensions over the years, Mr. Speaker. The Teachers' Superannuation Report — the report of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission — for the year 1943-44, notes there the rate of pension granted to teachers retiring in that year, and the increase which they got by virtue of 1944 legislation. The average pension paid to that group of teachers was \$526 per year. If you take the report on the Teachers' Superannuation Commission, just tabled in this House a short time ago, the average pension there is in the neighbourhood of \$1,100 per year. In other words, it is more than double the pension that the teachers retiring in 1943-44 received. There are several factors that account for that doubling. One of the factors is the increased service pension rate, to which I have referred. Another is, of course, the increased salary rate which has built up the amount of the annuity of the teachers. These teachers' pensions will increase with the present amendment, at the rate of \$170. That is, their pension, after this amendment comes into effect, will be on the average \$170 greater than it was before. In other words, they will then be receiving an average pension of some \$1,270 as compared with the pension rate — the average pension rate of \$526 — of those who were pensioned in 1943-44.

I would like to take just a moment, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the hope that a teacher has, with regard to retiring allowance, after teaching in Saskatchewan. May I use for example, a teacher who is 60 years of age and who has taught in the Province for 35 years. I am assuming, too, that the example is a teacher who came into the profession since 1930. In other words, one who has been contributing every year that he has taught.

March 24, 1952

With a contribution of less than \$100 a year, actually \$95 and some cents a year, that teacher will be able to purchase, at age 60, an annuity worth \$600 a year.

I should have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that while the teacher has been putting in 4 per cent, he is now going to put in 5 per cent — there is no limit to the amount they can put in. If they want to put in more they may do so. But even if they put in something less than \$100 a year, at age 60, after 35 years service, the annuity portion of their pension would be \$600. The service part of their pension would be \$1,050, so that teacher, 60 years of age, with 35 years of service, contributing less than \$100 a year, would have a pension of \$1,650. The amendment to the Act, which makes it possible for a commuting of the pension so that it is drawn in greater amounts before the age of 70, could increase that for the years prior to reaching the age of 70.

It will be noted that the service pension in this example is roughly one and two-fifths the amount of the annuity. If the teacher were going to purchase, as an annuity, this \$1,050 of service pension, he would have to put aside \$166 each year for 35 years prior to reaching the age of 60. In other words, a service pension of this amount, guaranteed by the Government, at age 60, is worth to the teacher, \$166 a year, every year for each of the 35 years.

If the teacher wishes to build up a bigger retiring allowance, he can, as I have pointed out, increase the amount of his contributions, or if his salary is high enough his contributions will be more than \$100 a year and his pension, of course, will be greater.

Perhaps I may give a second example. Take a teacher who contributed less than \$150 a year — \$143 to be exact — that would purchase, in 35 years, at age 60, an annuity of \$900 per year. The service pension would still be the same. The amount of salary does not have any effect upon the amount that the Government pays towards the pension of the teacher. The service pension would still be \$1,050, so the total pension, in that case, would be \$1,955. So you have there the example of a teacher who wants to put aside for the retiring allowance less than \$150 a year, who can look forward, at age 60, to receiving for the rest of his life a retiring allowance of almost \$2,000 — \$1,955 to be exact.

There is provision in the Act — it is not referred to by amendment at the moment — whereby a teacher can also take advantage of paying an additional amount in and having dependents covered, if the teacher happens to die before being superannuated.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other minor amendments to the Act, but I think they can well be discussed in committee.

I would therefore move second reading to Bill No. 86, an Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act of 1942.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, again I wish to congratulate the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) for the manner in which he explained the proposed changes to the Teachers' Superannuation Act. I believe that these changes which were explained to us this afternoon will be generally welcomed by teachers throughout this Province, and by those who are interested in education, generally, because a sound Teachers' Superannuation scheme is closely related to the entire problem of teacher shortage. It is absolutely essential that if we are going to have any hope of attracting to the profession, and retaining in the profession, people of a desirable calibre, that we provide them with improved economic conditions, not only by way of a better salary to act as a monetary inducement, but also by way of better retirement plans.

Although this change is a welcome one, I cannot help but feel that it falls short of the type of Teachers' Superannuation scheme which is necessary if we are going to retain, in the teaching profession in the Province of Saskatchewan, the desirable type of young man and young woman. Apparently there must be something wrong with teachers' salaries in this Province, and with the teachers' retirement scheme, if, in the last two years, more than 600 teachers left the Province. In the last two years that number did leave the Province, because apparently there was not sufficient inducement to retain them right in our own midst.

Now the Minister of Education has made much ado about what he termed 'improved conditions' in the Teachers' Superannuation scheme, but when he rises to conclude this debate, I hope he will deal with this question, Mr. Speaker: "Who, in reality, is financing the Teachers' Superannuation scheme?" "Is it the Government of Saskatchewan?" No. Although year after year we seem to approve an estimate of \$150,000 to be used for the Teachers' Superannuation fund, how much actually goes into the Teachers' Superannuation fund from the provincial treasury? I have in my hand the latest report of the Teachers' Superannuation plan which was tabled in this House — a report for the year ending June 30, 1951 — and here is what I find: That the teachers themselves, through their forfeiture fund, have largely carried their own superannuation scheme. The Minister of Education talked about the increased service pension. Let us have a look at the figures in this report. We find that for the year 1947-48, only \$47,000 came from the consolidated fund — the rest was borne by the teachers' forfeiture fund.

In 1948-49 only \$49,000 came from the provincial treasury. In 1949-50 only \$45,000 came from the provincial treasury; in 1950-51, only \$49,000 came from the provincial treasury. As a matter of fact, throughout those years, the teachers, in their forfeitures from the annuity account, have forfeited over \$700,000 — that is the total I find here — at the end of June 1951. The teachers themselves, Mr. Speaker, have contributed, through their forfeitures, over \$700,000; and the total amount paid to pensioners under Section 28, sub-section (2), and Section 42A, was \$754,000. In other words, by their forfeitures, from 1942 to 1951, the teachers have carried their own superannuation scheme with the exception of a total of \$54,000 that came from the provincial treasury. Then we hear the Minister of Education saying to members of this House that the Government has done so much

March 24, 1952

to improve the Teachers' Superannuation scheme! I have no hesitation in giving the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) credit that is due to him.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — That being the case, and that having been the case while the Liberals were in office, why did they bother to cut pensions, in 1942?

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, this is the same old type of question raised by members of the Government side. Why did not the Liberals do more — why did they not do more?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, Mr. Speaker, my question was, why did they do less?

Mr. Egnatoff: — I want to point out to the Minister of Education that as far as I am concerned, I was only elected to this Legislature in 1948, and therefore, while it is my considered opinion that the best government this Province ever had was under Liberal administration, nevertheless, as a member of this Legislature, I can only assume responsibility for the actions of my particular political party, since my election to this Legislature, and I am saying that . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Now you are repudiating!

Mr. Egnatoff: — Now the Provincial Treasurer suggests that I am repudiating. If the Provincial Treasurer would place in the hands of the people of this Province an \$8 million surplus, today, I would say more power to him — an \$8 million surplus which he started with back in 1944, after he succeeded one of the finest Provincial Treasurers to have been found anywhere in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member does not want that statement to go out — that there was an \$8 million surplus. That is not correct — there was no \$8 million surplus.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I am not in the habit of telling half-truths, making misrepresentations and innuendos, as is the Provincial Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Completely untrue, completely untrue!

Mr. Egnatoff: — But the fact does remain that when the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) did take over the treasury of this Province, he was left with a surplus by the former Provincial Treasurer of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$8 million.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And \$24 million of back debts owing, too!

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I tried to make one point crystal-clear, and that is this: With all due deference to whatever may be said by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), the teachers, themselves, through their forfeiture funds, carried more than \$700,000 of that service pension, the total of which amounted to \$754,000.

Why has the population decreased in Saskatchewan? Why has all the social security we boast about failed to attract people to Saskatchewan? The answer is that young and vigorous people do not want security provided by a welfare state. They want security provided by opportunities; they want the kind of opportunity that will let them provide their own security.

Mr. Gibbs: — They got it in the ‘thirties.

Mr. Benson: — The Government has failed to provide that opportunity, which is necessary to build a great province full of vigorous young people.

Mr. Tucker: — They want some of that oil back.

Mr. Benson: — The Government realizes this; hence the motion on the Order Paper to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the conditions in Saskatchewan. Now that the Government has admitted its failure, I wonder if something may be done about it. The government policy of tenantry is one reason why our young man leaves, and why the new immigrant shies away from Saskatchewan. He is leaving tenantry in Europe and looking for the opportunity in the new country to establish his own home. I was not in the House the other day when the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams) was talking, but I heard part of his address over the radio later that night, and I believe he said, “We do not want immigrants in Saskatchewan.”

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No — “unrestricted immigration.”

Mr. Benson: — Someone said it over the radio, and I thought it was the Minister of Labour. “We do not want immigrants in Saskatchewan because it will increase our unemployment problem” — that is what I happened to hear on the radio. Now, I believe that we do want immigration into Saskatchewan. We want more people here, and we want the industrial development in this province that will take care of those immigrants. I want to point out to you that there are millions of people in the world today that are living in over-crowded conditions who have their eyes on the great wide-open spaces in Western Canada, and we should do something about it.

I would like to refer to two problems that have arisen recently in our province — the first one is the foot-and-mouth disease. This is a very serious thing and I was very much alarmed at the attitude that was being taken by some people in regard to this particular disease. It seemed to me that there were some people in Saskatchewan who were trying to make capital out of this calamity, and I was very glad to attend that conference held here last Friday, when this problem was discussed. I might say that I left that conference, feeling that everything that could be done, was being done; and that the authorities were receiving the co-operation of everyone concerned to bring about the control of this disease. I want to repeat that after listening to the discussions there, and the attitude of the people at that conference, I was very, very pleased.

March 24, 1952

of that teacher. There is a feeling that a pension of that size would go a long way to retaining teachers in the profession, and I would appreciate it if the Minister would comment on that proposal. I believe that is a suggestion that was presented before the Government in the brief on the Teachers' Superannuation scheme not so very long ago.

Just to sum up again, Mr. Speaker, I say that we welcome any improvement in the Teachers' Superannuation scheme. I particularly welcome the fact that there is provision for a statutory increase in the teachers' contribution to the fund. Personally, I would have been quite prepared to have seen the teachers' contribution raised, not to 5 per cent, but to 6 per cent of the teachers' salary.

I also feel that the Provincial Government should be prepared to contribute a greater sum of money from the consolidated fund, to carry the teachers' Superannuation scheme, instead of having the teachers' forfeiture fund carrying such a major portion of the cost of the service pension, as I said a few moments ago.

I certainly intend to support this Bill, because it is a step even though it happens to be such a teeny, teeny step, in the right direction.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this motion. I remember, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, also the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) when a few of us sat on the other side of this House one Saturday afternoon, right at the end of the Session, in the year in which this subject was up for discussion, and the gallery up there behind us was packed full of teachers — probably the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) was up there. Probably the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) was up there too, and it was at that time a very tough struggle to get any kind of a pension at all.

I am rather amazed at the words of the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). As a matter of fact, I thought for a little while, the way he was talking about the fund, that he was not going to support the motion at all, but I am very glad that he did end his speech by saying that he would support this motion. Certainly, it is not as big a step as might be taken, but it is far from being a teeny, teeny step in the right direction.

I am going to support the motion.

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) has expressed fear over the solvency of the Superannuation fund. May I assure him for many years to come, with the C.C.F. Government on your right, Mr. Speaker, that the solvency of the fund will be well taken care of, and there will be increases from time to time for the superannuation of our

teachers. The hon. member also expressed a great deal of concern over the lowering of the purchase price of the teachers' pension dollar, and I agree with him — it has been reduced by approximately 50 per cent.

Frankly, I think this House would be justified in billing Ottawa for the loss that has been sustained by the teachers of this Province. We would be absolutely justified, because Ottawa alone is responsible for this increased cost of living.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) for presenting so clearly the case of the teachers, and the case of our Liberal party in connection with the teachers. I was rather amused to see the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) get up and say that when they were here sometime ago, the galleries were full of teachers. Well, you do not see any of them there now! Of course there are none there now, because they are out of the Province. They have gone to the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba.

I may remind the Minister of Natural Resources that it was the teachers who helped elect the C.C.F. on the C.C.F. promises. The teachers were hard-working, hearty supporters of you people, but they are not any more — I can assure you of that. There are just a few of them left who got soft jobs with you fellows, but the rank and file of the teachers is pretty well fed up with the C.C.F., and I know it, because I am a teacher.

I was also amused at the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Sturdy). He got up and assured the House that the fund will remain solvent. I do not think there are any of the teachers that would put any weight on his assurances, and I do not think they are worth very much.

It is a very happy thing for the C.C.F. that there is an Ottawa! If there was no Ottawa, I do not know what those fellows would do — anything that happens here, they say, "Let's run down to Ottawa — that is who is to blame. Ottawa. Ottawa is to blame for everything!"

Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — No, it is the Liberals at Ottawa!

Mr. Korchinski: — But the people of Saskatchewan are beginning to ask, "What is Regina doing about it?" They hear enough about Ottawa from Regina, so they are beginning to ask, "What is Regina doing?" I do not think this talk of running away to Ottawa, and hiding behind the skirts of Ottawa is going to do them any good during the next election. You will have to get up and answer for your own actions as a Provincial Government in Saskatchewan, and no amount of dodging around and calling upon Ottawa, and trying to excuse yourselves for not doing some of these things, by saying that Ottawa is to blame. I do not believe that will carry very far.

I am going to support this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

March 24, 1952

Mr. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. I would like to point out to the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) that no matter what amendment we may bring in, in connection with education, the teachers remember the past 15 or 20 years, how they lived and worked under the previous Liberal regime, and I am going to tell you that until the time comes when we have obliterated the Liberals, then the teachers are going to come back to the Province here, and will have confidence in working in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, all I want to do is to point out the difference between a bank balance and a surplus. Statements have been made in this House so often about a surplus of \$8 million. There was a bank balance of \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, but there was no surplus, and may I say that shortly before this House came into Session, that I had a bank balance of \$18 million, but that does not mean we had a surplus, this year, of \$18 million.

Now I do hope that my hon. friends will understand the difference. There is a tremendous difference between a bank balance and a surplus, and the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) has referred to that surplus of \$8 million. He did not tell us, of course, that we had bank deficit, or that we owed the bank approximately \$24 million at the same time that we had that bank balance of \$8 million on hand.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is not true, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is true. You would not know the difference, either.

(Closing Debate)

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, my first remark must be this, I think, that it must be beautiful and wonderful to be 'pure' like the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). He said this last Liberal Government was the best government we ever had; but of course, he said they did some dirty things, (and I have my own recollections of that).

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister of Education would be the last man on the Government side who would like to be guilty of misrepresentation. I certainly did not say that the Liberals did any dirty things. I made no such statement, and left no such inferences.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Now Mr. Speaker, I did not know what other meaning I can take from it, but he said: "I have not been an associate with them, so I take no responsibility for anything they did at that time." It adds up pretty well, I think.

I would remind him, Mr. Speaker, that there are . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — On a point of privilege again, the Minister of Education stated that I was not associated with the Liberals at that

time. I made no such statement. I said that I was not in the Legislature at that time, so I would request the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) that if he and I are going to get along, to adhere to the facts and to stop twisting and turning statements.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I am really shaking in my boots at this moment. The hon. member is drawing pretty fine lines, it seems to me. He said: “Of course, I cannot take any responsibility because I was not in the Legislature, for something that the Liberal Government did at that time. They are very fine fellows, but they did some things that I cannot agree with.” (Or words to that effect.)

Mr. Speaker, the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) mentioned that the galleries were not full of teachers at this time. Could it be for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers, today, trust the present Government? I was in the gallery the day the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) referred to, and I was there because, for some considerable period of time, we had been negotiating with the government of the day. I remember on that afternoon, member after member rising up in his place on this side of the House, saying what fine people the teachers were, what a wonderful profession it was, and what a grand job they were doing — “we wish we could give you more pension, but you know how it is at this time.” At that time they passed a Bill which gave a service pension at the rate of \$12 per year to the person of the age of 65. If you reduce that actually down to age 60, I suppose it comes somewhere between \$10 and \$12 — about one-third of what the present amount is.

It is quite true, as has been said, that the majority of the bills have been paid out of the money forfeited by teachers when they left the teaching profession. That again, may I say, is one of the practices established by a preceding government, which has been carried on by the present Government.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in the history of Teachers’ Superannuation fund, the Government, since 1944, has been making some annual payment into the fund. Never before did they put any money into the Teachers’ Superannuation fund at all. Since that time we have been putting some money into it, and the hon. member for Melfort should know that the Act guarantees that the Government will assume the responsibility for those pensions, and I do not think that any additional guarantee is needed.

He asked one or two questions which I am pleased to comment on. He asked, first of all, what help this was going to be to a teacher with 35 years’ service, superannuating in some four or five years time. Of course, the help it is going to be is simply \$5 more per year for each of those years of service. On the basis of 30 years’ service, that is \$150 more pension. On the basis of 35 years, I guess it is probably \$155, which again, as I say, represents approximately double the amount which they would have received, in 1944.

He raised the question of the 70 per cent, and I think it is probably desirable, Mr. Speaker, that a person look forward to a retiring

March 24, 1952

allowance of something in the neighbourhood of 70 per cent of their terminal salary. But I hold now, as I held in 1942, that the responsibility of the Government is to pay similar amounts based on the years of service that a teacher has, rather than on the salary they draw. We, I do not think, can recognize service which is paid for at \$3,000 as being necessarily worth more than service which is paid for at the rate of \$2,000.

Again, I must make the statement that the only real criterion with which we can judge the Liberal party, is not what they say, but what they did. I happen to have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a list which shows pensions paid to some 29 people who were still living and who superannuated before 1942, and pensions paid after a Liberal legislature got through with them, in 1942. Here, for example, was a pension which, on January 1, 1942, was \$552.20. Yet this group that now would have us believe that they value the teaching profession so highly, did what to that pension? They cut it from \$552 to \$513.

Here is a pension of \$365.47 — do you know what happened to it? They cut it to \$364.38. Here is one of \$484.99 and they cut it to \$454.99. Here is one at \$563.40 cut to \$522.72.

Mr. Speaker, I say in the face of those facts, and in the face of the fact that, in 1944, they were not willing to go any further in their intentions, no really sincere person is going to accept their pledges that they are going to do a lot more by way of Teachers' Superannuation than they have in the past.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.