

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Twelfth Legislature
12th Day

Friday, February 27, 1953

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 26, 1953, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mrs. Cooper for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

Mr. WM. S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, continuing my remarks when I adjourned the debate last evening, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my many friends in Lumsden constituency for their very generous support in the recent provincial election. I believe it is customary to do this. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that strong pressure was exerted on Lumsden constituency in order that the dignity of this Legislature might be enhanced by the election of a Conservative member. A large majority over both the two old Parties in Lumsden constituency indicates that, possibly, the people are well satisfied not only with the dignity of the House, but with the record of the C.C.F. Government and its leader, the Hon. T.C. Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, as I adjourned the debate, last evening, I was making some reference to trade with Britain, and I would like to make a few more remarks in that regard. I was speaking of trade with Britain, and I would like to quote Dr. Hope, economist and secretary of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, speaking at the annual convention at Victoria, recently, when he said:

“There is little hope of reviving trade with Britain for many years to come.”

Dr. Hope could be correct if the present Government at Ottawa refuses to lower protective tariffs and endeavour to stimulate a greater flow of goods from Great Britain into Canada. The members of the House of Commons for Ontario and Quebec (Liberals and Conservatives alike) are both generally opposed to the reduction of tariffs because of the big corporation and various other types of industries and monopolies who demand protection and invariably get it.

Back in 1950, the C.C.F. group at Ottawa moved an amendment in the budget debate which called for a reduction in tariffs sufficient to encourage an increase in imports from the United Kingdom and other countries. I am quoting from Hansard, page 1439. When the vote was taken, 169 Liberals and all the Conservatives voted against this amendment, while it was supported by the 19 C.C.F. and Social Credit members. It is important to remember that in this vote, 8 Liberal members from Saskatchewan suddenly remembered they had another engagement and were absent from the House while 6 voted against it, including Dr. McCusker of Regina and the Conservative member for Lake Centre.

February 27, 1953

There was a further resolution on tariffs, more or less on a point of order, introduced in 1949, and I am quoting from Hansard, page 2366. The resolution, by the way, was introduced by Mr. Hazen Argue, the C.C.F. member for Assiniboia, and it had to do with the great need of removing the trade barriers against British goods, which was very much emphasized in a speech by the Hon. Premier recently, in this province, when he said:

“That Canada should remove all tariff and other trade barriers which now prevent potential customers from selling good on our market.

“That nations should be enabled to earn Canadian dollars with which to buy our surplus Canadian foodstuffs.”

I might say that in the vote that was taken on Mr. Argue’s motion, it was voted against by a solid block of Liberals and Conservatives. The Conservative Party in Canada, usually strong protectionists (out of Office) in western Canada at least are making a very strong bid for office in the coming election of the Federal House, urging the removal of trade barriers to increase our trade with Britain. But we have the past record of the Conservative Party and Saskatchewan farmers are not forgetting the record of Mr. Meighen and Mr. Bennett in regard to trade tariff barriers.

The Liberal Party, when out of office, were always talking lower tariffs, but at the present time, in office, we do not hear much about it except just before elections. But strangely enough, this coming Federal election we hear very little about lower tariffs. Even Mr. Abbott’s recent budget reveals little evidence of any lowering of tariff barriers to encourage trade with Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, information has been gathered from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and other research workers in the field of agricultural prices, and they have made statements regarding the purchasing power of wheat, and I am quoting from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and I believe it is substantially correct:

“\$1.00 today has no greater purchasing power than 44 cents had in the period from 1935 to 1939. If the farmer is to have the same purchasing power for a bushel of wheat as he had in 1935 to 1939 he would have to have \$2.17 per bushel net for wheat. However, we must remember that the farmer’s purchasing power derived from wheat particularly has been very definitely above 1935 to 1939 period because of the bountiful crops of recent years. The average production of wheat in Canada 1935-39 was about 312 million bushels annually; 1947-52 annual production was 484 million bushels and this year it will be very much higher, or an increase of 55 per cent in the volume of wheat.”

I would like to ask what might happen if we should get back again to years of drought, with an average of 8 to 15 bushels per acre, as we did in the ‘thirties or the ‘forties, at the present high costs of production. The Farmers’ Union issued a statement, in 1952, on the prices of what farmers buy and what farmers sell. I have checked with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I think the figures are fairly accurate and I am going to quote, with your permission, as follows:

“Farm production costs went up 139 points since 1939; machine prices up from 70 to 100 per cent; fertilizers up from \$61 per

ton to \$108, today; binder twine up 255 points since 1945; building material up 160 points since 1945, while freight rates went up 85 per cent in four or five years and are still going up. The cost of living went up from 100 in 1939 to 189 in 1952.

“Going down, the farmers’ prices went down 54 points during six months in 1952; wheat prices went down 17 per cent in the last five months; hog prices down 20 per cent; egg prices down to 20 to 25 cents a dozen and even less; cattle prices went down from 33 to 40 per cent, in 1952.”

The farmers’ share of the national income, Mr. Speaker, quoting from the same figures, went down from 17 per cent to 10.3 per cent and even with the rising costs of farmers’ wheat, the wheat is lower in price today than it was in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, all farmers in Saskatchewan are not wealthy by any stretch of imagination, and I would like to give some figures with regard to this. It may be that there are a goodly number in the average income class. The Canadian census shows actual income from all agricultural production in 1950, and of the 112,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, some 6,000 had a total farm production income of less than \$250 each. I presume that, of those 6,000 some must have been engaged in some sideline as well. Some 33,000 had received from the gross value of their products less than \$2,500; 21,000 had a gross farm income of less than \$3,750. Only 3,100 farmers in Saskatchewan =, actually had an income or sold farm products of \$10,000 or over. That was in 1950, and is taken from the census statistics of 1951.

Mr. Speaker, with the greatly increased costs in the last five years, every farmer should have a good idea of his yearly net returns of his farming operations by consulting his income tax. The comparison of income tax paid by Saskatchewan farmers and farmers of other provinces, particularly the province of Quebec, is interesting. However, the income tax gives considerable information on the farmers’ financial position as well, but it is also a read puzzle how these assessments are made and carried out. Saskatchewan and Quebec have almost identically the same number of farmers – 109,000 farmers, approximately. In Saskatchewan, in 1949, something over 20,000 farmers paid an income tax of \$6,647,000 or an average of \$331 per farmer, while in Quebec, in that same year, \$51,000 in taxes were collected from some 200 farmers, or an average of \$255 per farmer.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan, in 1950, 11,000 farmers paid \$3,467,000, while in Quebec 360 paid \$50,000, and I will state here, quite frankly, that I have no doubt in the world that the farmers in Quebec are quite as honest as the farmers in Saskatchewan. But just at this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the way the assessors work in Saskatchewan and in Quebec. In Saskatchewan, in 1949, there were 74 income tax assessors; over 20,000 farmers paid tax. There was thus an average of one assessor to every 271 farmers. In Quebec, that same year, there were 23 income tax assessors, but they could only find 200 farmers out of some 30,000 that were supposed to be assessed. Some 200 paid the tax; thus only 9 farmers for each assessor could be found in one whole year. They collected \$2,216 each of which, with their expenses, meant that for every dollar they collected, it cost the Government over \$2 to pay the cost of collection. There is no doubt, in my opinion (and I am not blaming the farmers in the least) that there is great laxity, for some reason, in the collection of income tax from the farmers in some provinces.

February 27, 1953

Another problem facing the western farmer is the domestic price of wheat; and I know this is a very familiar subject to all the farmers on both sides of the House. The recent convention of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, and the Wheat pool and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and all the other farm organizations were all agreed that the western wheat farmer should not be called upon to subsidize the consumer of bread in Canada, and he has been doing this for many, many years.

The opinion of the farm organizations in Canada is well summed up in a resolution passed at the last Saskatchewan Wheat Pool "Convention, which you are no doubt all aware of and I quote:

"That a domestic price for wheat should be established, which would be subject to adjustment from time to time in accordance with changes in the domestic economy as shown by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics Index that covers commodities and services used by farmers, and also farm living costs."

It has been stated, I believe, by Mr. Wesson, President of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, that an increase of 52 ½ cents per bushel in the price of wheat adds only one cent actually, to the price of a loaf of bread. The farmer actually gets 2-2/3 cents out of every 16-cent loaf of bread. I might quote a further reference of Mr. Percy Wright of Melfort, in the House of Commons, speaking of the millers, said – I quote from Hansard, page 309, 1952:

"The price paid to farmers for their wheat by the millers is based on the price of grain sold under an International Wheat Agreement in United States dollars. At the present time, this means that the miller is actually purchasing wheat from \$1.72 to \$1.74 per bushel in Canadian money. This policy has resulted in a loss of millions of dollars to western wheat farmers."

Because of the fluctuation of United States dollars, it is costing Britain more for the wheat she purchases under the International Wheat Agreement. The Saskatchewan farmer is actually receiving less, and yet the British people are paying more for the grain than they were paying previously, because the price paid by the British was fixed on the basis of United States dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few minutes to something nearer home, and say a few words about the automobile insurance. I say it still remains the most adequate and the lowest costing insurance anywhere in North America or in the world. It is only a matter of time, even now, that every province in the Dominion will be forcing every automobile owner to purchase insurance. Mr. Ralph Hilliard, who is president of the All-Canada Insurance Federation, in a recent address in Vancouver, at their convention, said that insurance companies have lost over \$6 million in 1951 and probably over \$7 million in 1952. He said the present

rate schedule is far too low to meet the sharp increases in claims cost, and automobile insurance would be raised at least from 10 to 20 per cent in this coming year.

Under Saskatchewan Auto Insurance rate, the owners of automobiles get much more protection with the suggested new rates – from \$5 to \$20 – than they can get in any other province in Canada at three or four times that cost.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of highways seem to dominate the picture this year in debates in this House, and particularly the members from northern areas. I seem to have all the roads down here in Lumsden constituency, which surrounds the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina. The cities of Moose Jaw and Regina have a combined population of over 100,000 people. I am not pleading for Regina or Moose Jaw, but to a very large extent they are the main marketing, distribution and shopping centres of perhaps one-quarter to one-third of south Saskatchewan, and the natural trend of traffic is from the border, and from city to city. The roads are built, probably, to link up from the border Regina, jurisdiction, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, and not overlooking the cities of Weyburn and Estevan.

I would like to congratulate the Minister of Highways on his ambitious five-year programme. Just a word about the 'blacktop'. When we came into office in 1944, I believe there were 130 miles of blacktop, most of it in my constituency, and 60 miles of it in the province, at least, had to be rebuilt within the first one or two years. Mr. Speaker, I believe there will be 900 miles of blacktop highways at the end of this present year, and by the end of the proposed five-year plan, we hope to have 2,000 miles of blacktop highway in the province. But I am not asking for highways. I want the members on this side of the House to remember that, especially all the speakers who have preceded me. In fact we have members on both sides of the House pleading for highways.

I was telling the Minister of Highways, recently, that I did not want any highways, this year, or any kind of roads; but I have the feeling that I am going to get some, because I understand the Trans-Canada is going to be completed from Regina to McLean – I just cannot help myself.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not time to say anything about the Air Ambulance or Saskatchewan Government Airways, which are doing such remarkable work in the north. Saskatchewan Government Airways travelled 3 ¼ million miles, last year, which is roughly the equivalent of 130 times around the world, a tremendous factor in the development of the north.

Mr. Speaker, power is something I am familiar with, like the member for Cannington. The constituency of Lumsden has received many miles of power lines since 1948. Throughout the Province of Saskatchewan 4,000 farms were electrified in 1952, making a total of 12,000 to date. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation expects to electrify over 40,000 farms by 1957, and all the towns and villages and also 10,000 urban customers. Saskatchewan Power Corporation has reduced costs of power. Twenty-eight years ago, I paid \$9.00 for 54-kilowatt hours. Today you can use the same amount of power for a minimum of \$5.00; just half the cost. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is to supply power

February 27, 1953

at the lowest cost possible, and I feel sure most of the people in this province are well satisfied with the great beginning that has been made in power by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a few statements regarding something that I have been interested in for years, and that is the World Food and Agricultural Organization, usually known as F.A.O. A report recently said that there is now a normal consumption of food in many parts of the world where there was little or none during the war. In spite of that, the food situation in many countries in the world is at a very low pre-war level. The world population has increased 13 per cent in the intervening years since 1936, or at the rate of some 20 millions per year, so that, although production is greater, there are more millions of people to be fed each day and there is less land that can be used for food purposes. In North America, and particularly in Western Canada there are large surpluses of wheat. I would like to quote from a statement made by the Rev. H.A. Mutchmore, Secretary of the Board of Social Service, United Church of Canada, and which I believe would be supported by all the other religious bodies in Canada. I quote:

“The Board of Social Service should do its share to create a more generous policy of technical aid to backward peoples of the world, and larger food supplies to famine areas, and more progressive steps toward a fair deal for the depressed peoples of the far East and Africa.”

Dr. Burton S. Kerstead, Professor of Economics at McGill University, made a recent statement at the Canadian Federation of Agriculture at Victoria, when he urged the sending of \$150 million worth of wheat to India and East Asia, over the next five-year period. He said:

“This would be enough to remove from India the ever-present threat of starvation of her people. Prairie wheat producers should not be asked to provide this wheat at their own cost. It should be a charge on all Canadians.”

Mr. Speaker, this would fill a desperate need. It would be deeply appreciated by the great nation of India and by the far East and I believe the Canadian people would likewise appreciate any such action by the present Government at Ottawa.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, in Canada recently we observed a Brotherhood Week, and I believe I could do no better than to quote from a prayer offered by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, former president of the United States, on behalf of the United Nations, on Flag Day, June 14, 1942:

“Grant us brotherhood, not only for this day but for all our years, a brotherhood not of words but of acts and deeds. We are all of us children of earth. Grant us that simple knowledge. If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed; if they are hungry, we hunger; if their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure.”

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

Hon. Woodrow S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — May I, at the outset, Mr. Speaker, join with the other members on this side of the House who have expressed their congratulations to you on your well-deserved re-election to the position of Speaker of this Assembly. May I also join with members on both sides of the House who have expressed congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to Speech from the Throne. They did indeed a very excellent piece of work. I suppose that I may be pardoned for feeling a bit of special pleasure with regard to their performance, because both of them came from the ranks of those people we call school teachers, and it is good to have them with us.

I should like, first of all, to address some remarks with regard to the address made by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke earlier in this debate. As you recall, he proceeded to give reasons why, in his opinion, the present Government was re-elected and his Party was not elected to Government in this province. The main reason which he suggested was, of course, that we were re-elected because of the Federal policies of the Liberal Party. As the Premier commented when he spoke, it was not being very complimentary to the people of Saskatchewan to suggest that they were so easily fooled. May I suggest that it was even less complimentary to the members of the Opposition who sat with him in the last House. It seemed to me a very considerable indictment of himself and of his fellow M.L.A.s of his political Party, and even of the press and the radio, that the people, in his opinion, were so unaware of what they were voting on.

Now, of course, we on this side of the House would admit that the rather blundering ineptitude of the Federal Liberal Party in handling the affairs of western Canada is certainly no handicap when it comes to a provincial election. But if, in spite of the terrific failures on the part of this Government which he claimed, the record of the Federal Liberal Party is so bad as to ensure the results of June, 1952, then certainly, small wonder that the Leader of the Opposition is returning to the Federal field to try to save what is left of it there! It reminds me a little bit of the old story of Peter and the dyke. You will recall the story, Mr. Speaker, of the little boy rushing up to put his finger in the hole to keep the water from coming through. I think somebody ought to tell the Leader of the Opposition, however, that that incident took place a very long time ago indeed.

There are, of course, much more important, much more basic, reasons than those which he gave as to why the Government was re-elected in 1952. The biggest reason is that the people of Saskatchewan did not accept the statements of the Opposition with regard to the performance of this Party and, moreover, they did not accept the statements of the Opposition with regard to what they proposed to do for the people of the province. Certainly, it was not due to any lack of promises dangled before the people that the Opposition did not succeed in being elected. They would, they assured the people do everything that we had done, but, of course, they would do it better, cheaper, bigger, quicker. It was indeed the big economy-size package at a reduced rate. But the people of Saskatchewan, very wise as they are and very experienced as they are, looked at the premium which went along with that big economy-size package. They were not too convinced. They were not convinced because they had seen the same play before with too many of the same actors, Mr. Speaker, and they knew what the epilogue to that particular play was.

February 27, 1953

There was, of course, the main reason for the re-election of the Government and that was the programme which was carried out over a period of eight years in this province, and the effect that that programme had on the lives of thousands of people of Saskatchewan. It did mean to them better roads, more power, better opportunities for health and for education, better welfare services, better agricultural leadership. And they were sure, because of that programme, that by re-electing the Government they had better hopes for security in the future, and better opportunities for health, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

But, it seems to me that there is an even bigger reason which I doubt very much if the Opposition would ever understand, and that reason is this: It is the extent to which thousands of people in Saskatchewan realize that they have a part in government under this Party. It is not enough for people just to be governed, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that they also have an opportunity to play a part in the actual governing. And they play that part in Saskatchewan under this Party. They play it because of the basic organization of the Co-operation Commonwealth Federation movement. The Saskatchewan people are more than ever convinced today that the only safe kind of democratic government is when that government is in the hands of a movement that is owned, controlled and financed by the people themselves. The people know that they have a chance to play a part in government because of the very extensive consultations which this Government has had, and will continue to have, with organizations all over the province. They know it is true because of the opportunity of organizations and individuals to participate in many advisory committees with regard to many activities of the Government. The whole fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan have tasted democracy in government and they like it.

There were one or two contradictions in the words of the Leader of the Opposition which I think should be referred to. He had – and certainly members on this side of the House will agree heartily with him – great praise for the action of the governments of Britain and India in establishing India as a free nation inside of the Commonwealth of Nations. Certainly, I say, we would agree with that. Several years ago in this Legislature, I made the statement that that action insofar as the peace and welfare of the world is concerned was worth more than scores of battalions of men, atomic bombs, and millions of dollars in armaments. But then from that the Leader of the Opposition went to move an amendment to the Address in which he attempted to score this Government because of its socialist philosophies and principles. Of course, he overlooked entirely, in taking those two moves, the very vital fact that the action in regard to India and Burma was the product and the application of Socialist philosophy on the part of the leaders of both of those great nations. We maintain here that the continuance of that kind of thinking and that kind of action is going to bring peace and sanity into this greatly troubled and fear-stricken world. All in all it seemed to me that the Leader of the Opposition (who, I regret, is not in his seat) finished his address the other day more or less as he finished the election campaign. He was a bit out of patience with the people of the province, and most distinctly and definitely he was, of course, out of office.

Following that in the debate the three new members of the Opposition from the northern constituencies spoke. I know that I voice the opinion of all of the members on this side of the House when I say that those addresses were enjoyed and appreciated. They spoke with pride, a very pardonable pride, of their constituencies. They spoke with sincerity and with moderation in regard to the needs of those constituencies. I listened carefully to the description, particularly of the member from Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) and the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) with regard to the productivity of those areas which they represent. I listened, too, to their appeal for better roads and better services generally. I could not help, however, but be struck by the thought that, in areas which are so productive but which cannot provide good enough services for themselves, then there must be only one answer to that and that answer, of course, is that the people are not receiving enough for the goods that they do produce in relation to their costs of production. And I submit to them, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one governmental body in Canada that can correct the injustice of that situation, and that government is the Federal Government of Canada which has been overwhelmingly dominated by members of the Liberal Party.

That favourable impression created by the three new members from northern Saskatchewan must I imagine, however, have been somewhat dissipated by the performance in the House of two of the older members, yesterday. I regret that I was not here yesterday. I had to be absent in the city of Saskatoon on business of the Department; but I was able to read the paper, this morning, and talk with some people who were here. I would imagine that the performance of yesterday must have constituted a bit of a shock for the new members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. I do suggest that what happened yesterday is another reason, and a convincing reason, as to why more members of the Opposition were not re-elected in June of 1952.

Now, according to this morning's 'Leader-Post' the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), who spoke, was quite happy about the selling price of cattle for instance. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but it may be that the member for Cannington has a faculty or a facility in the handling of the male portion of the cattle industry that gives him an advantage over other farmers in the province. He persisted, I noted too, in trying to persuade the people that constructive criticism from members of this side of the House with regard to wheat marketing was injurious to the Wheat Board. Well, that type of talk, of course, does not worry us over here. The stand, and the belief, of the C.C.F. with regard to orderly marketing of products is too well known for that to have any effect whatsoever. And, likewise, the people of Canada will join with us in believing that democratic institutions grow and improve as a result of constructive criticism on the part of those who have earned the right to criticism by their past record.

Furthermore, I think it should be said that most of the criticism that has come forth from this side of the House has been of prices and other conditions around the marketing and the production problems of farmers. It seems to be correct to point out that the price of wheat is not established by the Wheat Board, but rather by the Parliament of Canada. It seems also correct to point out that the conditions for determining the effectiveness of our marketing, our trade policies, our tariff barriers or lack of them, are determined not by the Wheat Board but by the Parliament of Canada. Then he

went on again, according to the paper and made the statement that “farmers could grow grain cheaper than ever before”. Well, now...

Mr. McCarthy: — I did not say farmers could grow grain cheaper than ever before. I said they could cultivate their land cheaper, and harvest their crops cheaper.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I am only quoting what the paper happens to say in regard to what he said. It seems to me — the inference is the same — that that statement comes rather strangely from the Opposition. You will remember, Sir, a few years ago in this House, there was a discussion in regard to the payment to Saskatchewan farmers under the five-year pool, and the Leader of the Opposition attributed the fact that there was not a greater payment on that pool to a statement made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. They pointed out that the Minister of Municipal Affairs had made the statement that Britain had made an overpayment already, and that was reported to the Prime Minister of Great Britain and others and so they said to Mr. Howe, “Now, you cannot have any more money”. That statement was, I believe, repeated again yesterday, and yet we have at this time, Mr. Speaker, when the representatives of nations concerned with trading in wheat are meeting in Washington to discuss the International Wheat Agreement, to discuss minimum prices and ceiling prices, a member of the Opposition saying, or implying, that the farmers can grow grain cheaper now than ever before.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, he is misquoting me. I said they could cultivate an acre of land...

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the inference is the same. But imagine the effect, Mr. Speaker, on those worthy gentlemen down in Washington; imagine their reaction, this morning, opening up their morning newspapers and seeing this statement in the paper by a member of the Saskatchewan Legislature! Following the same kind of reasoning that they tried to apply a few years ago, these hon. gentlemen must have said, “Oh, these Saskatchewan farmers, the Canadian farmers, do not need any more money for wheat. Let us make the price even still lower”. But, on second thought, of course, they cannot be too familiar with who all the people are, and they noticed the name McCarthy, and they might have thought it was Joseph McCarthy or they might even have said and more likely have said, “It is not even Joseph McCarthy; it is Charlie McCarthy”, because they would remember, back when the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner in this province a few years ago, pointed out that farmers could produce wheat at 35 cents a bushel.

At this point the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), who I again regret, is not in his seat, must have shook his hoary locks and girded up his frame and entered the fray as well. And he started out on something of the same kind of merry-go-round that he has started in previous years in this House. I notice that, first of all, he had criticism for the construction of the Boys’ School. He said that the Government could have used for this purpose the Moosomin gaol. I suppose that could have been done, but I suggest that, if it had been done, you would have been destining over the years, hundreds of boys to periodical existence in a building which is dungeon-like by comparison with what such boys need. You would have removed an effective part of the treatment for these unfortunate minor citizens. These, after all, Mr. Speaker, are boys whom society has failed. Society owes them something. At the very least from a selfish point of view, society woe itself something in the field of trying

to rehabilitate these boys into useful and productive citizens. It is true that money could have been saved if this school had not been built. It is true that it could have been used for the very worthwhile purpose of building houses. May I suggest that, if that had been done, that same action could have resulted in loosing on the community destructive power in the form of maladjusted citizens. It seems to me that the very least that members of the Opposition can do (and this they have never done) is to examine not just the cost of the Boys' School, but to examine also the earnings of the operation of that institution in terms of rehabilitated boys. This, Mr. Speaker, they have never done, and I say that it illustrates the fundamental difference between the groups who sit on your right and who sit on your left. It raises also this very fundamental question as to whether our standards are to be based entirely on money standards or on human values.

If I may, just at this moment, Mr. Speaker, interject and read to the House the statement from the record which the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) made yesterday. He said this, and I quote from the record:

“You can put a bushel of wheat in your granary cheaper than you ever could in the history of this province.”

That is reasonably clear.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, I do not object to him quoting me. I said that; but in fairness to everybody, let him read it all. I said that with a combine...the harvesting operation is what I was talking about...

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — That is the statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: — But I was talking about the harvesting operations, the actual operation of harvest.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The member for Saltcoats then went on (according to the newspaper again, Mr. Speaker) to explain some of the lack of purchases by the United Kingdom on the fact that the prices of our products are too high. That, of course, raises some questions. Does he mean, for example, that the farmers are receiving too much for their wheat? And when you link that statement with the statement which I have just read, that you can put a bushel of wheat in your granary cheaper than you ever could in the history of this province; when you link it with the other statement about the satisfactory price of cattle, then one begins to wonder about the stand of the Liberal Party with regard to farm prices.

Then, of course, he went on and tended to blame part of these costs at least on the fact that salaries for the people who labour are too high. The only inference that one can get is that he thinks that labour is getting too much. And that, of course, Mr. Speaker, is an old trick. It is one which divides the community when the community needs to be united, and it is somewhat worn out and somewhat inept when one appreciates the costs which labour has to pay for the things that it needs to supply its basic needs today. It comes again rather oddly free the Opposition who, just last year, if I remember it correctly, made quite a point of criticizing the Government on one occasion because wages of labour in Saskatchewan were not high enough. The member from Saltcoats, of course, entirely omitted to mention

February 27, 1953

the real and the basic reasons for increased production costs. Such things as large and excessive profits; such things as the zooming-up of freight rates; such things as unfavourable tariff tolls and the application of dumping duties, went entirely unmentioned.

Then it seemed to me, from my reading of this morning's paper, that he descended furthest into the pit and exemplified the best reasons for the non-election of his Party when he began to attack the Premier and reverted to his old attempt to link the C.C.F. with Communism. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan needs no defence from me or from anyone else. His complete and adequate defence lies in the fact that he is known and loved by thousands of people from coast to coast of this great country. With regard to the hon. member's charge of communism, members of the House and people throughout the province will remember that, last year, it was the Wheat Pool that, according to him, was linked with and started by Communists. It seems to me that if there is a man in Saskatchewan who would be Senator McCarthy if he could, that man is the sitting member from the constituency of Saltcoats.

He is reported as quoting from an address made by the Premier in this House in 1947, and I have that address here as it is printed in the Journals of the Legislative Assembly for that particular year. I want to read one statement which the Premier made at that time which was not quoted, I understand, yesterday. In this address the Premier was directing his remarks to Mr. Embury, who was then a member of this Legislature and who, on one occasion you will remember, Sir, said, "I came into this House a Tory and when I leave I expect to continue being a Tory", but who, in the by-election at Gravelbourg and during the provincial election, this last year was most active and anxious to have my hon. friends across the way elected as the Government of this province. May I suggest that that probably constitutes another reason why they were not elected. This is the statement of the Premier which I want to read and which was not read yesterday:

"The only difference between my hon. friend and myself as far as being opposed to the Communist party is concerned, may I tell him, is that I know why I am opposed to the Communist party".

The remark would have applied, I imagine, equally well yesterday.

Now, then, the hon. member went on to read some of the statements that the Premier made at that time, and you can find them, and I recommend them as excellent reading, on pages 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and so on in that particular copy of the Journal. I interpret from my reading of the paper again that the hon. member purported to quote the Premier as saying:

"In all other factors they (that is the Communist party and the C.C.F.) are the same".

Mr. Speaker, that statement, of course, or any inference that could be taken as such, does not appear in the Journals of that particular year.

I think the important thing we realize about an address

of that type is that an unjustified and unauthenticated attack of that kind must be construed as an attempt to lead a retreat from reason. The C.C.F. will, on occasion, agree with what communists say and with what Communist governments do. We will also, on occasion, agree with what Conservatives say and what they do. And we will, on occasion, agree with what Liberals say and with what Liberal governments do, but that makes us neither Communist, Conservative nor Liberal, I assure you. The danger and the disservice of that kind of an address, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, that that kind of talk can result in frightening some people into silence when they should not be so frightened. It can result in stopping some people from thinking. It seems to me to be an attempt to accomplish a mental blackout; that is malicious and deserves nothing but condemnation from thinking people.

I want to talk for a while with regard to some of the problems and progress in the field of education and I must say, at the outset, with all the sincerity and emphasis which I can use, that the greatest central problem facing education in Saskatchewan and throughout Canada, today, is the shortage of teachers. We continue to enjoy some improvements in the certification of that group of teachers who have certificates, but we do find ourselves faced with the fact that we have some 630 study supervisors in the province, which is an increase over last year. So the position with regard to the lack of qualified teachers remains disappointing and unsatisfactory.

I could make that same statement, Mr. Speaker, in any province in Canada and probably in almost every state in the Union of the United States of America. I could make the same statement, too, with regard to the shortage of qualified personnel in the field of health and also in other fields. It seems to me that that shortage is part of the price which society is paying for its present great stress on material things. Much of that stress is, of course, necessary, in order to produce material things which are in turn necessary. But it is a part of the price which we pay. I want to suggest, too, that in my opinion it is an unfortunate way of balancing our needs and our resources. I think, too, it is a part of the price we pay for the lack of overall national planning and the consequent lack of diversion of a fair share of surplus and available income into the most desirable channels. And, I must add that it is a price that those of us who are responsible for education pay for not doing a good enough job and a convincing enough job.

It is difficult, as a matter of fact it is impossible, to get from our files up-to-date statistics with regard to teachers' salaries in this province and in other provinces. I do, however, have at hand a survey made by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation at their Fall convention in 1952. I would like to quote from that some figures so as to give to the Assembly some indication of the salary position of our teachers in the province. Their results indicated the position of some 4,360 teachers in school units and superintendencies. This does not include the cities, nor does it include the study supervisors in those areas. It shows that about one-third of that group had what we call an interim first-class certificate. That is they had complete grade XII, one year of normal school plus leading up to two years of experience. About another one-third had a permanent first-class certificate; that is they had the qualifications I mentioned before, plus three University classes, plus at least two years of satisfactory teaching experience. About 848 of the group, or

about 20 per cent, had a certificate better than a permanent first-class; in general that is, they had one year of normal school plus from one to four years of University. The average salary of these 4,360 teachers was \$2,234 per year. In this group there were 719 village and town teachers whose average salary was \$2,460. It will be noted that the average salary of this group is a bit higher than the average salary of the rural teachers. I want to add that the reason for that is not that there is a different salary schedule applicable, because one of the things which the larger Unit Boards has done is to apply the same salary schedule for urban and rural positions and that, of course, is proper. But it is true, and natural I suppose, that the teachers with more experience and with better training are frequently attracted to the villages and towns. On the other hand, the rural teaches paid from \$35 to \$55 a month for board, averaging about \$45. The village teachers paid \$40 to \$60, probably averaging about \$50 a month. So the rural teachers did enjoy some advantage with regard to that part of their cost. I should add that of some 1,125 city teaches, the average was \$3,067.

One other set of facts which can be adduced from the report has to do with the salaries paid in Unit areas and non-Unit areas. I was interested to take the salaries of the eleven areas in the province which, at the beginning of the 1952 Fall term, were not organized as Units and to compare those salaries with the average salary in a neighbouring Unit. I may say here, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking now of the salaries for rural teachers alone. In every case the average salary of the rural teacher in the Unit was higher than the average salary in the non-Unit area which joined it on one side or the other. The set of figures also show that the average increase in salaries of rural teachers in 1952, that is their salaries in the Fall as compared with the salaries paid in the June 1952, was this: the average rural teacher salary increased by \$283; the average increase in the town and village non-city urban teacher was \$143, and the average increase in the city salaries was \$332. Of this group of 5,855 teachers, the average increase then, as compared to the first term of 1952, was approximately \$22 per month, so that would cost for this group- in the neighbourhood of \$1,400,000. Not all of the teachers were there. Another 1,000 teachers, shall we say, if they got the same increase would get another \$260,000.

The point I want to make is that the total increase in the salary bill was approximately equal to the increase in grants made available by this Legislature as from the first of January, 1952. The increase in the grants then, it seems, was in general on the average passed on to the teachers, and I am sure that members of the Assembly will be appreciative of the action of school boards in that regard. The increase in salaries was paid for, on the average, by the increase in grants. We should remember, however, that the increase in salaries was for a part of 1952 only; consequently the school districts had some assistance during 1952 for money for other purposes.

Then I turn to a report of the Canadian Educational Association, Report No. 61, for some comparisons of the rural teacher in the various provinces. Figures for British Columbia were not available at this time. For Alberta they were as follows: \$2,348; for Saskatchewan, \$2,150; for Manitoba, \$1,900. I would like to point out, as I have before, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has, of course, more rural teachers than Manitoba and Alberta put together.

If you want the others: — Ontario, \$2,271; New Brunswick, \$1,060; Nova Scotia, \$1,384.

Now, because of the proximity of the province of Alberta, and because of the salaries they pay, they are, of course, our chief competitor with regard to teachers. The competition is not so much, I may say, on salaries of the beginning teachers as it is with regard to those who have more experience and more training. May I also point out that salaries do not tell the whole story, and so I want to make some reference to the superannuation that is available and that has been earned by teachers in the various provinces. In this comparable year, the lowest superannuation paid in Saskatchewan was \$908. I should have pointed out that these cases do not include disability cases who could retire earlier, at a lower age, with less years of service, nor do they include special cases. Of those qualifying under age and service, the lowest payment was \$908, the highest was \$2,364, and the average, \$1,368. In British Columbia, which is sometimes looked upon as the 'Mecca' for teachers, the lowest was \$461, the highest, \$2,079, and the average, \$1,044. In Alberta, with which we have just compared in salaries, the lowest was \$307, the highest, \$2,328, and there was no figure for the average.

In the City of Winnipeg, which has a system separate and distinct from the rest of the province of Manitoba, the lowest was \$533, the highest, \$1,149. I do not know exactly what the figures were for the rest of that province but I do know that their service pension is based on \$15 a year of service for their women teachers, and \$17.28 for their men teachers, whereas ours is based on \$30 — twice as much as for their women teachers, at the age of 60.

In general, I would add that the conditions of retirement in Saskatchewan are less stringent than in those other provinces; so that it can be said that our pensions which, in general, teachers can earn in Saskatchewan are better than in the other provinces. I want to add, Mr. Speaker, that I sincerely hope that we have not finished with the improvement of the pension plan for teachers, because it is one of the most effective ways by which we can guarantee stability in the teaching profession, and that is all-important.

May I add, too, that not all of the story is told by looking at just salaries and pension rates, because teachers are citizens of each province as well. I think it can be fairly stated that the teacher who drives a car could lose a considerable amount of the salary gain which he might have in Alberta, as a result of his insurance for that car, and I take it, Mr. Speaker, that we are now all agreed that we are in favour of this type of insurance. If he has to go to the hospital (and I take it we are all agreed that we have a good hospitalization plan in Saskatchewan), he could lose a lot more of any advantage which he might earn in terms of better salary, over a period of years. So that, in general, while we may fall behind in salaries, we are catching up; there is a more generous pension likely available at retirement age, and when you look at all these together, all important factors, the financial advantages of teaching, even in Alberta, begin to narrow very appreciably. May I add that, if there is an advantage in going there, it is not necessarily because of greater grants from the Government; it is rather because of higher taxes on land.

February 27, 1953

I would like to quote just a few figures which I have obtained from the Department of Municipal Affairs, which indicate the average mill rates applicable in the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, for the year 1951. The average in rural municipalities in Alberta was 22.7; in Manitoba it was 23.9; in Saskatchewan it was 17.4. In the villages it was 23 in Alberta; 25.7 in Manitoba; 22.8 in Saskatchewan. In towns, it was 23.9 in Alberta; 25.6 in Manitoba; 27.8 in Saskatchewan. Only in the towns was the average higher in Saskatchewan. The average tax per quarter-section of land in the rural municipalities of Alberta – those were school tax rates I have been giving, Mr. Speaker; the average school tax per quarter-section of land in the rural municipalities of Alberta, was \$45; in Manitoba, \$50; in Saskatchewan, \$30.64.

There is, Mr. Speaker, one advantage that Alberta has to offer, and that is the teacher has a greater chance of getting a position in an urban or a graded school. The reason for that is simply that they had a programme of larger units there for ten years before we had it here in Saskatchewan.

Now, having indicated something of the major and comparative level of government support, I want to state again, that personally I am not satisfied. I do not feel that we are doing all that we should or all that we can or all that we will. I am convinced that the Government, and members of the Legislature on this side of the House, agree that they, too, are not satisfied. I am also convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest hope for improvement lies with the continuation of the present Government and its comprehensive programme, and I am convinced that the people of Saskatchewan, in June of 1952, knowing our record and our attitude, were likewise convinced. We should, however, look very carefully at the remedies which are available, and which are necessary, in order to take care of this problem of a shortage of teaches. First of all, it would have to be admitted that we must be prepared to pay better salaries; we must be willing to provide the finances necessary to do that. I want to urge, too, that we must continue the movement of developing larger attendance areas, or centralized school services – whatever you want to call them.

May I say just a few words as to advantages of that programme, which is frequently misunderstood and frequently misconstrued – and I am sorry, at this point, that the member from Arm River, who is one of the chief offenders in this regard, is not in his seat. First of all, it makes available a more effective use of teachers. In one of our Units, which has effected quite a degree of centralization programme, they, in 1945, were using one teacher for each 14 pupils; they are now using one teacher for each group of 21 pupils. May I add that the average enrolment per rural school in that Unit, is still about 8 per teacher. The centralized school of several rooms does provide a better school situation. It cannot be emphasized too much, I think, that the school which has only four or five or six or seven youngsters in it, does not provide a good educational situation. Youngsters need to be associated, in work and in play, with others of their same age and grade level. They need to have the opportunity of doing things together, be it work or be it play, and, as I say, it is not a good educational situation where the enrolment is too small.

We will, of course, have many situations in which it is impossible to do anything about that for some time, in Saskatchewan. When you set up a bus route to bring rural public school students into a central point, you do, of course, also make it possible for high school students from those same districts to attend high school without having to go away from home and board, without incurring those costs, or getting away from the supervision of the home; and they are still available for some work on the farm, and that is all very desirable and is one way in which we can give a much better break to our rural students. It makes possible, too, the building up of a more attractive position for the teachers. They are less isolated under those circumstances; there is the opportunity for more specialization; they have better tools to use, and they have more professional contacts; consequently, you get better recruitment and retention of teachers.

During the year 1952, 178 additional large attendance areas of the type I have been talking about, were established. It is estimated (just as one figure, Mr. Speaker,) that, as a result of that establishment, we used some 260 teachers less than we would have had to use, otherwise. Most of the centralization is in urban centres, though some of it is in rural centres. I would like, at this moment, to pay a bit of a tribute to the municipal councils who, in nearly every case, have been most co-operative in developing, as best they can, the kind of road system that makes this type of centralization of school pupils possible.

I would like to add, too, that this is one of the answers to helping to keep people on the farm. At zone meetings in some eight centres in the province, of trustees, this Fall, I asked this question at each one of them: "Has your centralization programme had any effect in making it possible for people to stay on the farm?" – and from some groups I got answers saying "Yes, it has." And from some groups they said this: "Not only has it done that, but it has made it possible for some people, who had moved into town, to move back onto the farm."

We are going to have to improve living conditions for teachers. One of our big problems is to get a greater percentage of students completing their Grade 12. Again the conveyance programme, the financial assistance available to students, the composite highway school, is going to help in that regard. While I do not want to labour the point, at this time, I do want to restate my belief that Federal aid for education, the acceptance by the Federal Government of a share of the responsibility for financing education, is essential in the Dominion of Canada.

There is one very important thing which all of us can play a part in, Mr. Speaker – it is not just a job for the Department or for teachers or for school boards; it is something for all the citizens who are interested, and that is, we can do something better than we have done to establish in the minds of young people the rewards of teaching. I do not mean by that to sell them a 'bill of goods'. I think there are genuine rewards which, too often, our young people are not aware of. I have talked a bit about the financial situation, and I know it does not stand, by comparison, with what they can get in many other lines, particularly in the short run; but I do not think it suffers as much by comparison in the long run as is commonly supposed, and I know we can point out to them that there is a great deal of satisfaction possible for the sincere, earnest

February 27, 1953

person in the teaching profession, the satisfaction of working with young people, and, the biggest satisfaction of all, perhaps, the opportunity of doing a really creative bit of work.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words with regard to reasons for those of us on this side of the House voting against the amendment that has been proposed, and for supporting the main motion. Those reasons are not as has already been suggested, that there is any thought, or ever has been any thought on the part of the Government, as to its plans or needs to own and operate everything in sight – the place in our thinking of the various types of ownership has already been made clear. Rather, it is economy of the emphasis which this movement places on the welfare of people – of people everywhere, of all colours and of all races, and because Saskatchewan is not an island, insulated and isolated from the rest of the world. We do not accept the belief, Mr. Speaker, that there are either individuals or groups of individuals who are un-improvably inferior to others. We are, on the other hand, convinced that the operation of monopolistic capitalism depends on keeping some individuals and some groups of individuals in a continuing position of depression and non-equality with others. We stand as we do because we believe that a man's worth is not measured by his quantitative accumulation of things, but rather by his qualities as a human being. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that man is born for co-operation and what the whole process of living is a co-operative one. Therefore, we believe that the co-operative principle of control on the basis of equality of one man one vote, one unit of control per person, should apply. And equally, we believe that the basis of control measured by wealth, or the control that an individual or a group of individuals have over the goods that man must have, should not apply. Equally, we believe that there must be an application to all the processes of living, of the co-operative principle of a man's return being based on what he puts into society to make that return possible. Mr. Speaker, we were convinced that our present economic and social system would never make those ends available. We believe with Franklin D. Roosevelt who, when speaking of the war in 1945, said this: —

“The mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubts and the fears, the ignorance and the greed, which has made this horror possible.”

And we are convinced that our philosophy, and the action which that philosophy allows and compels will produce that end, and we do not believe that end is being produced in the world today.

We believe that the best motives of human beings are human motives (if they are free to exercise them) not economic motives. And we are convinced that if economic motives are allowed, as they so frequently are, to run rampant, they can produce only that kind of intense economic struggle for existence which is part of a predatory society. We know that the fruits of that predatory society are fear, hunger, hatred and insecurity – and war.

Mr. Speaker, we will oppose the amendment. The choice of the name ‘Co-operative Commonwealth Federation’ was neither an accident nor the result of looking for a popular slogan; it was the product of the thinking of a great Canadian and world statement, J.S. Woodsworth. It describes

his understanding of the reason for the existence of this movement, and it sets forth his vision for the future of mankind. And because we accept that understanding, because it is our sincerest hope to implement that vision here in Saskatchewan and in Canada and throughout the world, we reject the amendment and will support the motion.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatives by 35 votes against 10.

The question being put on the main motion for the Address, it was agreed to, 35 to 10.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:40 p.m.