

**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan
Second Session - Twelfth Legislature
34th Day**

Tuesday, March 30, 1954

The House met at eleven o'clock a.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ALLOWANCE TO OLD-AGE PENSIONERS

Moved by Mr. Danielson, seconded by Mr. Loftson:

“That this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to increasing the supplementary allowance to recipients of the old age security and recipients of blind person's allowances to ten dollars a month and also the payment of such supplementary allowance to recipients of old age assistance and the provision of health services for recipients of old age assistance.”

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):

Mr. Speaker, this motion has been on the Order Paper for the last two weeks, and every member in the House knows what it asks for and suggests what the Government should do.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the request for an increase in the supplementary allowance paid by the Government of this province to the old people of this province is very reasonable. It is very reasonable in the respect that it only asks for an increase of \$7.50 a month over what they are paying now, making the allowance \$10 a month. If we look at the other provinces to the west of us, as we try to do most of the time when anybody is on the floor of the House . . .

Gov't Member: — Look to the east!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, we can look to the east too; we will do all that before we get through. We find that they have helped for some years now, by paying a supplement of \$10 per month; and in the last few weeks they have increased it another \$5, making \$15 supplementary to the basic pension already paid by the provinces and the Dominion Government. That is what we find.

There is no need, I think, to point out the absolute necessity for this request. I do not need to speak for the Liberal Party or the members sitting on this side of the House, because this need has been recognized by the member sitting on the treasury benches. I have here, on July 22, 1953, the Provincial Treasurer speaking at Grenfell, and he said this:

“On the matter of old-age pensions, even if \$40 was enough to live on when the plan was started, it certainly is not enough now and should be increased to \$60.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

March 30, 1954

Mr. Danielson: — I agree with the hon. gentleman, but, of course, in view of the fact that we find other provinces doing something more than this province is doing, doing twice as much as this province is doing or four times as much as they are doing now, I think we should probably look to our own house and see what we have done. What are we doing?

We know what the Dominion Government is doing. They have taken over all old people from 70 upwards; they are paying 50 per cent of the old-age assistance pension paid in the provinces all over Canada for those between 65 and 69; and that is on the basis of \$40 per month; and of that \$40 per month basic pension, the governments concerned are only contributing \$10. In 1928, when this province first started to pay an old-age pension, up towards the basic pension — from 1928 to 1931, that was Mr. Bennett and his Conservative government. So what have these people got to pride themselves on and pat themselves on the back for? We paid \$10 a month then towards the old-age pension. Today, they are paying \$10 as a basic pension and \$2.50 for supplementary, making it \$12.50.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Did my friend say that of the old-age assistance the Provincial Government is only paying \$10?

Mr. Danielson: — No, I said no such thing. I said you could go back to 1928 — today you are paying \$10 per month of the basic pension of \$40 — one-fourth.

Premier Douglas: — No, we are paying \$20 of the basic pension of \$40.

Mr. Loptson: — They pay nothing for the over 70 group and they only pay half of the 65-69 group.

Mr. Danielson: — The pension that the Dominion Government is paying is \$40 a month. Are you paying more than \$10 of that \$40?

Mr. Loptson: — They are paying nothing on the \$40.

Premier Douglas: — Is my friend speaking of the old-age security, or the old-age assistance?

Mr. Danielson: — Of the old-age assistance you are paying \$20; you are paying 50 per cent of that. But I didn't say that. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that of the basic pension, up till 1951 or 1952, when the Dominion took it over; up until 1952, the province of Saskatchewan was paying one-fourth of the pension at that time which was \$40, wasn't it? That is \$10, or one-fourth of that pension is \$10. We are dealing with the basic old-age pension, not with the old-age assistance which has come into effect in the last 18 months or two years. So don't try to confuse it. It is not the first time I have talked on this subject in this House, as you well remember.

I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has nothing to pride themselves on, because the government of the day of 1928 up until 1931, when the revenues of this province were away down to less than a quarter of what they are today, that Saskatchewan government paid \$10 per month of a \$20 pension. From 1928 until 1931, when Mr. Bennett increased the Dominion share to three-quarters or 75 per cent; and then, of course, during the years, the pension was gradually increased up to \$25, then to \$30 and finally to \$40 a month. But ever since 1931, this government, or any provincial government here, has only paid one-quarter of the share of the basic pension.

At the beginning of 1952, the Dominion Government took over the old-age pension from age 70 up and released the Provincial governments from any contribution toward that service. The provinces (some of them, not all) continued to pay a supplementary to these old-age pensioners over 70, under a means test. And, of course, I am not criticizing the means test, because it is the only fair method whereby it could be paid, because the old-age security (if you wish to call it that) from 1952 is paid to everybody, even St. Laurent and the Premier and myself and everybody else, when we get old enough. I am already old enough so I am getting \$40 a month; and so are other members sitting in this House; and they are entitled to it. But you can easily see why the means test would have to be applied because otherwise, the province of Saskatchewan would have to pay \$2.50 to every person in this province over 70 years of age, regardless of what amount of money or how much property he had . . .

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):

Don't forget the medical services.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — You will have a chance to talk on this when I get through.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):

He never does, he just talks sitting down.

Mr. Danielson: — I pointed out what the Provincial Treasurers said about the old-age pension and I fully agree. I think, in days to come, we will have some increase by the Federal Government. Nevertheless this Government is only contributing \$2.50 supplementary pension and it isn't enough. It isn't enough by any means. You have money enough in this province to put in a million-dollar museum over there to glorify the city of Regina — Saskatoon didn't get any except \$20,000; but that would go a long way to pay an increase in the old-age supplementary pension in this province to the people who need it.

I have here, on May 22, 1953, the Provincial President of the old-age pensioners in Saskatchewan, at an open meeting in the City Hall, Wednesday night:

“That the present pension in these times of inflation is no better than it was before we had it increased. She said she had been acting in the organization since its inception in 1940 and that her late husband and herself had come to Regina in 1943 and persuaded the province to raise the pension by \$1.25. With pressure brought to bear on Ottawa at that time the Federal Government soon increased its share to \$3.75, making the increase \$5.00 per month.”

That is from the president of the Old-Age Pension Association, and I have no doubt in the world that she knows what she is talking about. These arguments or testimonials coming from the old-age pensioners themselves, and from the Provincial Treasurer, are a complete confession that the pension should be \$60 and not \$40, and certainly are an indication that this government will support this resolution. I don't see how they can do anything else.

I want to say in passing, Mr. Speaker — and I am glad to do it; but I never heard a better presentation of the needs of the old people in this province than that given by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) in the

March 30, 1954

House here, a few nights ago. He spoke on the budget (I think it was), and he spoke on this topic, and I think he made as good a speech as I ever heard made in this House towards an increase in the old-age allowances or supplementary pension for the people of this province.

Now then, what are the other provinces doing? We hear a great deal about what other provinces are doing. Some of them, as I said, pay an additional pension, and some of them don't. There are no provinces in the Dominion of Canada without some arrangements, made either through their own Departments or through the municipalities, for rendering other services to old-age pensioners by way of medical services, hospitalization, dental and other services. I am not going to go into that now, but I have here authentic information; it comes right from the office of the Minister of National Health in Ottawa and it says this:

“The Public Accounts on the annual reports that we have obtained shows the following expenditures for supplementary allowances for the fiscal year 1951-52 . . .”

Note, it is not 1952-53, it is 1951-52:

“Saskatchewan spent \$412,000 on supplementary, other than blind pensions. The province of Alberta spent \$2,284,000 on supplements and from this amount the small share going to the blind pensioner is not available.”

That means that the amount of \$2,284,000 includes the amount that was spent on blind pensioners. In the Saskatchewan figure blind pensioners allowances are in addition to the amount which I mentioned.

“In British Columbia, the government spent \$2,267,000 on supplements to recipients of the old-age pensions, under the Old-Age Pensions Act of 1927; and \$721,000 to the recipients of old-age security. The recipients of old-age assistance received \$106,000. Thus British Columbia spent on supplements, other than for blind pensioners, a total of \$3,494,000. In all, the three western provinces have spent, in 1951-52, about \$6,200,000 to recipients of old-age pensions, old-age security and old-age assistance, in the form of supplementary payments.”

There is the situation: Saskatchewan spent \$412,000; Alberta spent \$2,284,000; and British Columbia spent \$2,267,000 . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member if he has the figures for Manitoba?

Mr. Danielson: — No, I haven't. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that is probably not a right answer to the question. Manitoba doesn't pay any supplement; but there is another thing that Manitoba does that has not been mentioned on the floor of this House . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question? What do the Liberal governments in eastern Canada pay? What supplementary allowance?

Mr. Danielson: — They are giving a lot of extra services to the old-age pensioners all over the Dominion of Canada. I have that in another place here, and I can read them to you.

Mr. Loptson: — That's not the point; it is what the Government is doing.

Mr. Danielson: — I would reply to this, Mr. Speaker, with the same answer that the member for Swift Current gave the other night. He said, "Talk about Manitoba — we don't give a damn about Manitoba; we live in Saskatchewan and we look after Saskatchewan." And this is the 'humanity first' government here who brag about themselves, not only in Canada, but all over, even over in old Ireland, about what they are doing. Let me point out to you, the province of Alberta, today, contributed \$25 in their share to the 65-69 group, that is the supplementary they pay. And the same with British Columbia, who pay \$15 supplementary. This province, including the allowance of \$2.50, contributed \$12.50.

I don't mind showing the House what these other provinces are doing. They can hold up Manitoba in comparison with Saskatchewan all they like; but after all, Manitoba isn't such a terrible province. They no doubt must have a fairly good government or the people there would not re-elect them every time. They have done so. So far as Manitoba is concerned they are handing to the municipalities a good sum of money in grants for these purposes whereas, in Saskatchewan, part of that money at least is spent directly from the government department. That is some of the difference.

In British Columbia, they give complete medical and surgical services, including home, office and hospital calls, by both general practitioners, specialist and consultants, diagnostic services plus common and specially authorized medicine and supplies. This service has been available since 1949 through formal agreement with the College of Physicians and Surgeons whereby the programme is administered for \$14.50 per capita. That is British Columbia. This also comes from the office of the Minister of National Health in Ottawa.

Mr. Loptson: — That was Liberal government, too.

Mr. Danielson: — "For pensioners in municipal residences, municipalities share that \$14.50 per capita by paying an amount calculated on the total municipal population of 15 cents per capita." Now that is in regard to medical services. Here now is the hospitalization:

"All benefits available to residents of British Columbia, including diagnostic services, etc., are made available to old-age pensioners and dependants by the payment of the hospital insurance premiums by the Social Welfare Branch. The Social Welfare Branch also pays full insurance charges when pensioners are actually hospitalized and dental care, extractions, without authorization . . ."

You do not need any authorization to go to a dentist to have anything done.

" . . . limited prophylactic dentistry . . ."

The Minister of Health will know more about that than I do. I am not a dentist.

March 30, 1954

“ . . . and fillings and replaced dentures upon authorization; all services on a paid-for-service basis. Optical care: refraction by certified optometrists on a pay basis. Glasses on prescription at wholesale handling costs.”

This is all British Columbia:

“Sundry services – including transportation for cancer patients and consultations, but limited orthopedic appliances are also valid.”

Now we come to Alberta:

“Medical care – identical programme to British Columbia administered by the college for \$12.50 per capita, paid on behalf of the pensioners by the province.

Hospitalization – under agreement with the Associated Hospitals of Alberta and on approval of the Director of medical services, pensioners receive standard public ward hospital services with the province paying special per diem rates.

Drugs – drugs in hospital only, with hospital assuming the cost.”

That means, I take it, that if the drugs consumed in hospital are not on the list that the hospital supplies, probably the pensioner would have to pay for it himself. It does not elaborate on that point:

“Dental care in Alberta – by contract with the province the Alberta Dental Association provides extractions and dentures only, for payment of \$3.15 per capita by the province on behalf of the pensioners. Programme more limited than in British Columbia or Saskatchewan.”

That is Alberta's dental obligation as far as the old-age pensioners are concerned.

“Optical care – eye examination by a physician covered by agreement with the College. Examination by optometrist only on recommendation of a physician and approved by the province. Glasses provided in other provinces with similar limitations on renewal.

Sundry services – limited services of a nurse, physiotherapist or chiroprapist under approval by province.

Medical care – complete medical and surgical services by general practitioner and specialist in the home, office and hospital. Hospitals are provided with complete medical and surgical care by general practitioner and specialists in the home,

office and hospital provided by agreement with the College, for the annual per capita payment of \$12.50.”

I think that is something similar to what we have in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I think it is just about the same thing.

The significant point in this programme is that, unlike British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Nova Scotia, the province administers the programme. We will get to these provinces. It will take time, but you asked for it.

This is in Alberta also:

“Hospitalization – the same public ward benefits provided for residents of Saskatchewan. They are available to old-age pensioners through an agreement whereby the Department of Public Health meets the premium payment for the pensioners. Hospital benefits are almost identical to British Columbia, except that the acute stages of certain chronic diseases are covered in Saskatchewan, whereas in British Columbia every attempt is made to discharge very shortly after the diagnosis of such condition.”

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Hear, Hear! After 60 days.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I give you credit for it. I am not afraid to read this thing; but you wouldn't read it if you had it. If you stood where I am now you would not read that. I know when you have documents, you pick out what you want to read and leave the rest of it.

Now we come to Saskatchewan – I am going to give you credit:

“Saskatchewan, like British Columbia, provided a wide range of drugs but requires the patient to pay 20 per cent of the cost, with the exception of the cost of such drugs as insulin, liver extract, which might cause undue hardship to the pensioners.

Dental care – dental care services are probably a little more expensive than in British Columbia, including fillings, extractions, complete and partial dentures and repairs to them, with the exception that Saskatchewan requires the pensioner to pay 50 per cent for cost of all replaced dentures, provided on a pay-for-service basis by agreement with the Dental Association.

Optical care in Saskatchewan – similar fee for service as British Columbia, including eye examination, refraction, prescription for glasses all included.

Sundry services – limited amount of service of special nurses, physiotherapists and chiropodists are provided on special authorization special nursing services provided by agreement with the Registered Nurses Association.”

March 30, 1954

We will go now to the next page and see what we have here. We now come to Manitoba. Manitoba is backward in this respect, as far as we see it.

Premier Douglas: — Is that all of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Danielson: — That is all of Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — Nothing about medical care?

Mr. Danielson: — I think I read that, didn't I? Surely I did.

Premier Douglas: — I heard just dental and optical; I may have . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I will go back and read it again just to make sure that the Premier didn't think I skipped over anything.

Premier Douglas: — Oh no, no!

Mr. Danielson: — Here it is:

“Medical care – complete medical and surgical services by a general practitioner and specialists in the home, office, hospital, provided by agreement with the College, for an annual per capita payment of \$12.50.”

Mr. McCarthy: — He read that before.

Mr. Danielson: — The significant point in this programme is that, unlike British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, Nova Scotia, the province administers the programme, where in the other provinces no doubt the municipalities administer the programme. But that is the first section in the Saskatchewan programme, and I read it before. Is there anything else you think I haven't read? I can go back over it.

Let us see what Manitoba is doing. No formal programme, but that province provides “limited medical, dental or optical care on a fee-for-service basis to pensioners in unorganized territories, whose budgets are less than a social assistance budget.” That means, I suppose that the province, Mr. Speaker, covers the cost in these unorganized districts by a grant from the public treasury. I can interpret it no other way:

“In municipal organized areas medical care is given on a purely discretionary basis, with the total cost borne by the municipality.”

I won't pass judgment on this before I get through with Manitoba.

“Hospitalization – hospital service to pensioners in unorganized territories on the abovementioned basis (that is by grant). In municipal areas pensioners receive hospital care if they are considered unable to pay.”

That is Manitoba's policy – a strictly limited programme.

“Since the province devised on a pro rata basis of \$300,000 annually . . .”

And by the way, Mr. Speaker, this is in 1951-52, as I said when I started out. There have been increases in this grant paid by the Government of Manitoba to the municipalities for this purpose. If I remember correctly (maybe I am wrong in this), I think it is over \$600,000 instead of the \$300,000 of two or three years ago. I will read the hospitalization again:

“Hospital services to pensioners in unorganized territories on the abovementioned basis, that is by grant. In municipal areas pensioners receive hospital care if they are considered unable to pay. A strictly limited programme.

Since the province devised upon a pro rata basis, a fund of \$300,000 annually among the municipalities for the cost of relief cases, medical assistance and child welfare expenditures; there is very limited financial participation by the provincial government in respect to municipal cases.”

Now we come to Ontario:

“Medical and surgical care – By agreement with the province, the Ontario Medical Association, through its medical welfare board, provides limited medical and surgical services in the office and home only. Certain specified minor surgery and very limited drugs provided by physicians only for \$9.95 per capita . . .”

That is what they pay the Medical Association under the agreement.

“. . . including 72 cents per capita for drugs.”

That is \$9.95 per capita for medical attention and 72 cents per capita for drugs.

“Major surgery and medical care in hospital excluded.

Hospitalization – Old-age pensioners may be admitted as indigents for public ward care under the Ontario Hospital Act.

Drugs – No drugs other than made available by the physician for ordinary home or office visit.

Dental care – No dental care is available, although approved on similar to that of public physicians’ services have been contemplated by the provincial government for at least a year.”

We now come to Quebec:

“There is no special provision for medical and hospital care for pensioners in Quebec, although free medical care is available for

March 30, 1954

dispensaries, clinics and health units. Free general hospital care under the Public Charities Act is available to any person unable to pay. The cost is shared by the province with the municipality and the institution providing the service.”

Now we go to New Brunswick:

“No medical care is available for pensioners in this province. However, old-age pensioners, like others unable to pay, may receive hospitalization on an indigent basis.”

Nova Scotia:

“Medical care since March 1950 – The province has had an agreement with the College whereby the Maritime Medical Care Incorporated (that means the doctors’ plan in the province) provided a limited medical programme similar to that of Ontario, including general practitioner care in the home and office only, with drugs provided by the physician at such location. Medical care in hospital, major surgical and all medical aid are excluded; the province pays on a pre-payment basis, a capitation rate to the College of \$9.00 a year, including administrative expenses.

Hospitalization may be provided by the municipality for residents in the same way as for other persons unable to pay.”

Prince Edward Island:

“This province, like Quebec and New Brunswick has no special care programme for pensioners; but free hospitalization is available for indigents, probably including pensioners.”

That is probably a little doubtful; the information is not fully in their hands.

“Provincial grants to general hospitals is contingent upon the provision of hospital care for indigents.”

Newfoundland:

“Pensioners are expected to pay annual payment covering medical and hospital care, but if pensioners are unable to pay the premium or where such payment would be considered a hardship, such services are provided. And any unusual medical expenses are available free. In organized municipalities in Newfoundland, needy persons including pensioners, must receive authorization from the relief officer for clinical treatment or hospitalization with the cost being met by the Department of Public Health.

In terms of formally organized health care schemes for pensioners, I believe those schemes in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta are by far the most adequate. Newfoundland might rank next, since the College Hospital programme covers a large part of the province. Probably Ontario and Nova Scotia would rank third, since formal programmes for medical care only have been established there. Manitoba can probably be classed as the remaining province where health services are provided on an indigence basis.”

That is the summing up of the whole programme.

Now we have before the House, Mr. Speaker, a clear-cut picture of what is happening . . .

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — . . . and we find the three western provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia away ahead of any other part of Canada insofar as medical and hospital care is concerned, and dental services as well. That is recognized. No person has ever denied it. Nevertheless, in view of all the fact (and the thing isn’t so unusual when you think about it) that, after all, when an old-age pensioner in this province qualifies under the means test, the hospital premium is paid by the province for that individual, and up until a year ago the cost was \$10 – now it is \$15 . . .

Mr. Loptson: — It was \$5 once.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, it was \$5 when we thought we could do something with what little money we had. That is when the Premier was very optimistic, and I am not blaming him altogether; everything has gone up. But after all, after that \$10 (now \$15) is paid, for a hospital card for the old-age pensioner, there isn’t one iota of difference between myself and the Premier when we go to the hospital, Mr. Speaker. The taxpayers of the province pay the rest.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Slander!

Mr. Danielson: — No difference at all. I am not now speaking about medical services; I am speaking about hospitalization and I wish you, who are smiling so gently over there, would get up and tell me what is the difference between you and me and the old-age pensioner, except the hospital card that you buy for the old-age pensioner. So far as going to the hospital and getting services are concerned, what is it?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there would be one difference between my friend and myself in the hospital. I think the people there would be concerned about different ends needing treatment . . .

Mr. Loptson: — There is doubt about that.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, it is very obvious what you refer to; and at the same time who would be worst affected. I think you might qualify for first place, because you would take the spotlight more than I would.

March 30, 1954

But after all, you didn't answer my question. You didn't answer it because you couldn't answer it. Outside of the hospital card that you buy for the old-age pensioners there is no difference between me and the Premier when you go to the hospital. The taxpayer pays approximately 60 or 65 per cent (or more than that) of the total cost of hospitalization.

Premier Douglas: — The taxpayer would pay it if we paid the whole hospital bill, too. So it makes no difference.

Mr. Danielson: — Sure, that's true. Only that wouldn't be worked out on a pro rata basis. After all, you know, you started this thing to let the poor fellow out; he wasn't supposed to pay so much. Ability to pay was one of the principles underlying this thing, and it has not been by any means implemented or carried out in the operation of the hospital scheme. I am not criticizing that at all; but at the same time we might remind ourselves of the promises made before this thing started. So far as medical services are concerned, we find that several provinces outside of the western provinces are giving some considerable assistance in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one that I am sure everybody will support. We should support it no matter what side of the House we sit on, because it asks for \$7.50 to be added to the supplement that is now being paid. That makes \$10, and the other provinces to the west are paying \$15. Maybe after we have no public debt in this province, as the Provincial Treasurer promises us in a few years, maybe then we will be able to assume all of the cost and increase that to \$60 per month which the Provincial Treasurer was talking about when he was taking part in the Dominion election, last summer.

So I am happy to move this resolution, seconded by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton).

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare):

Mr. Speaker, I must express my appreciation to the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) for reading a carefully prepared speech that is the most damning document against Liberal and Tory provincial governments in respect to their treatment of old-age pensioners that it is possible to conceive.

You know, Mr. Speaker, at long last the hon. member for Arm River is taking an interest in old-age pensioners.

Mr. Wooff: — He's getting old.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — But you know when the hon. member assumes the mantle of 'humanity first' he does look a bit ridiculous. I think it would be more appropriate . . .

Mr. Danielson: — That's all the argument you have.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — It would be more appropriate if he assumed the garb of the court jester in speaking of matters of this kind.

You know, Mr. Speaker, for many years, since 1929 to be exact, the hon. member sat on the government side of the House and during all those years, to my knowledge, he never opened his mouth to champion the cause of the aged in this province. This is another example of a death-bed repentance on the part of an aging Liberal, and I would point out that this resolution

comes with ill grace from the hon. member whose government as late as 1943 paid an average pension of \$18.53 per month in this province without any hospitalization, medical services, nursing home care or housing for the aged people.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister repeat that figure that we paid?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — \$18.73.

Mr. Danielson: — \$18.73.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — His government paid \$44,000 or \$44,233 in supplementary allowances in 1943-44. Well, in 1953 we paid \$592,000 with respect to old-age security, which is 11 times as much as was paid by his government, whose generosity he has been championing this morning. In 1954-55 our budget for expenditure on supplementary allowances and welfare services for aged people in this province will exceed \$6 million.

Since 1944, the Opposition, including the hon. member, has repeatedly criticized this Government for spending too much on welfare services.

Mr. Danielson: — That isn't true, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Nevertheless it is true, and the record will substantiate it.

Mr. Danielson: — That is absolutely untrue, I am telling you.

Mr. Loptson: — It's just as true as all the rest he says.

Mr. Danielson: — It is just some of the other stuff you are picking on.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Read the budget speech of your financial critic, Judge Culliton, of a year or so ago, and that is not the only example by any means. Since you have criticized this Government for spending too much on welfare services, will the hon. member propose a new tax to pay the additional \$3 million which will be required for supplementary allowance of \$10?

Mr. Loptson: — You don't need a new tax; just economize on your other expenditures.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Well, British Columbia has increased its welfare tax from 3 to 5 per cent. Will you hon. gentlemen opposite have the courage to recommend that Saskatchewan increase its Education and Hospitalization Tax to 5 per cent?

Mr. Loptson: — I'll tell you where you can save it.

Mr. Cameron: — Tell you where you can get it.

Mr. Loptson: — Sure, without getting a further tax.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Either you must raise the taxes, or you must decrease the services which are offered in the present budget. I want to know if the hon. gentlemen, or the Opposition, will point out what services which are provided in the 1954-55 budget they would cut out? Do you want to cut out grants to municipalities, to education, to health? You'll have to

make up your minds, if you want an additional \$3 million.

Mr. Danielson: — You might hold up building the museum for a year or two, and many other . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — It isn't sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to vaporize as the hon. gentleman has been doing. He must make some concrete proposal as to how this \$3 million may be raised. I do not need to remind this House or the people of this province that Saskatchewan, since 1944, has led the way in practically every field of welfare and has stimulated the interest and even the action of other provinces and the Federal Government. Saskatchewan, however, will not rest content until there is a complete welfare or security programme not only for our senior citizens, but for all needy groups in this province — for the mothers' allowances' category, child welfare, social aid, handicapped, Metis, and decent housing conditions also for our people.

What does an overall security programme for the aged involve? My hon. friends opposite do not seem to realize that the payment of a pension alone does not constitute by any means the security and welfare of the aged people of this province. Such a programme involves, first, an efficient, well-organized, professional-trained field staff, with authority to deal with the problems of the aged and a programme to make the solution of these problems possible. And that is what is being done in large measure in this province, today. Whatever the problems that confront the old-aged needy person out in the rural areas, or anywhere in this province, those problems are met and discussed and a solution worked out by a skilled social worker, and not a mere inspector appointed for political patronage reasons, as used to be the condition in this province.

Mr. Danielson: — You have 120 of them running over this province.

Mr. Cameron: — Public relations officers!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — They not only check into the requirements. I have pointed out that irrespective of the pension paid, if the welfare needs of old people are not taken care of, we fail. And so, since 1945, we have provided free hospitalization, health care for the sick, for the old-age security and blind pension groups, and nursing care homes for the chronically ill are being rapidly extended, and by means of financial assistance to municipalities and church organizations, homes for those who require it. This is an expensive programme, and in respect to individual pensioners in this province we have spent thousands — I know of one case where we spent \$9,800 in respect to one old-age pensioner. That is the value we place on the individual right and the dignity of a human being whether he be an old-age pensioner, or whether he be a judge in the land.

What are the costs of an overall welfare or security programme for aged people? Well, on the basis of 1953, the hospital costs for the pension group was \$1,865,000; health costs \$624,000, and in our estimates for nursing homes for 1954, including capital costs of the Melfort and Regina Nursing Homes, \$1,632,000. For housing grants — that is capital grants for construction and annual maintenance grants — next year, we are making provision for the expenditure of \$418,000 — a total, Mr. Speaker, of \$4,440,000 for hospitalization, health, nursing homes and housing alone. When we add \$2,033,000 for pensions and supplementary allowances, we will have an expenditure next year, on behalf of old-age pensioners and blind pensioners in this province, in excess of \$6 million.

We on this side of the House realize that the pensions presently being paid are inadequate, due largely to the unconscionably high cost of living, which pertains in Canada today. This high cost of living, as everyone knows, is due entirely to the fiscal policy of the Liberal Government at Ottawa.

Gov't Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — In 1945, that same Liberal government was elected on the promise that they would maintain the price structure, hold the line with respect to cost of living, and they did not do it. Today, we have the highest cost of living that has ever existed in the history of this country. That is how well they carried out their promise of 1945, the promise on which they were elected. Everyone knows that at the insistence of 'big business' they threw price controls to the winds so that today we have the inordinately high cost of living which makes a \$40 pension much too low. The least that Ottawa could have done would have been to relate pensions paid to the increased cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have set forth and to achieve a more realistic, equitable solution to the problem of security for the aged people and the blind, I am going to move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe):

"That all the word after 'Government' in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

- (a) An amendment to the Old-Age Security Act to provide for the payment of \$50 per month.
- (b) An amendment to the Blind Persons' Act and the Old-Age Assistance Act to provide for pensions of \$50 per month.
- (c) That the Welfare Services programme of the Government of Saskatchewan, including hospitalization, health care, nursing home care and housing for these groups continue to be expanded as rapidly as possible."

I am prepared to consider, and the people on this side of the House are prepared to consider, our responsibility with respect to our aged citizens as a joint proposition.

Speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and with respect to clause (a) requesting the Federal Government to provide for the payment of a \$50 per month pension, I wish to point out that the Federal Government amended the British North America Act to give it jurisdiction in the field of old-age security. It imposed the Old Age Security Tax of 2 per cent — you have all run across that in your tax returns; and you pay \$60 maximum. Whether your taxable income is \$3,000 or \$3,000,000, you pay the same amount. All that is necessary is an adjustment of the Old-Age Security Tax to provide this additional \$10 suggested by my hon. friend from Arm River. This would guarantee

the same pension right across Canada, irrespective of the financial position of the individual provinces.

Our senior citizens helped to build a nation – not necessarily the individual province or community; and I do feel that the pension should apply to the people of all provinces. The recession which presently exists in the Maritime Provinces would make it impossible for the provinces of the Maritimes to pay the \$10 increase in pension suggested in the resolution even if they wanted to; and if a serious recession took place in industrial Ontario and Quebec, they would not be able to pay that additional pensions to which the pensioners right across Canada are entitled. The same applies to British Columbia, which is a semi-industrial province, if a recession took place and, believe me, a recurrent drought on the prairies would have the same effect on Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Only Alberta, so long as the oil holds out, could possibly continue to pay that additional pension.

With respect to clause (b) of the amendment, I will read it:

“(b) An amendment to the Blind Persons’ Act and the Old Age Assistance Act to provide for pensions of \$50 per month.”

With respect to this amendment, Saskatchewan now shares 50-50 with Ottawa the payment of pensions to this 65-69 group. In addition to that, in 1953, which is the last year of which we have record, in addition to paying on an equal basis with Ottawa, we paid \$216,000 for this group for hospitalization for that year. Saskatchewan’s overall cost for this group now considerably exceeds that of Ottawa, and yet the Leader of the Opposition would have the people of Saskatchewan pay \$30 a month to Ottawa’s \$20 a month, besides providing all the services which we do provide in this province.

We are proceeding towards the implementation of clause (c) of this amendment as rapidly as we possibly can:

“(c) That the Welfare Services programme of the Government of Saskatchewan, including hospitalization, health, care, nursing home care and housing for these groups continue to be expanded as rapidly as possible.”

I would suggest that the passing of this resolution might have the effect of stimulating our efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few additional comments to make. The two social security departments of the government are Health and Social Welfare. I notice in Mr. Manning’s budget speech, which I read yesterday, that Alberta proposes to spend \$30,939,000 on Health and Welfare in that province during the next fiscal year. Saskatchewan, in our budget, proposes to spend \$34,110,000 and Manitoba, whose budget has already been passed, with its Liberal government, proposes to expend \$11,282,000.

Mr. Lopton: — People are healthy where the Liberals are. They don’t need it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — In other words, Saskatchewan, as far as these welfare departments are concerned, Health and Social Welfare, will spend more than oil-rich Alberta with a budget of \$204 million.

Mr. Lopton: — People are sick here of the C.C.F. government; that's why you have to do something for them.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — We will spend over \$3 million more than Alberta will spend, on the welfare of the people of this province. We will spend three times as much as the Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan — or, I should say, in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. McCarthy: — You're getting a little ahead of yourself.

Mr. Danielson: — Just a little previous, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — May I again express to the hon. member from Arm River my appreciation for his having read that amazing speech of his, this morning. I don't know of anything that would better demonstrate to the people of this province and to the Dominion of Canada the shabby treatment which old-age pensioners are receiving in provinces ruled over or wherein a Liberal or Conservative government exists.

To arrive at a clear picture one must include all phases of health and welfare for an overall security programme, and the fact remains that Saskatchewan will spend \$3 million, as I have said, more than Alberta and \$20 million more than will the province of Manitoba.

A great deal has been said about the generosity of Alberta in the field of social security. An examination reveals serious deficiencies in what may be considered as an overall security programme. Next year, as an example, according to Mr. Manning in his budget speech, \$290,800 will be expended on cancer treatment. Saskatchewan has budgeted for the expenditure of \$964,000 in order to give free cancer treatment to all people of this province. Alberta makes a boast of that; but does she do it and how can she do it on an expenditure of merely \$290,000?

According to the report of the Canadian Welfare Council at Ottawa, Alberta had 1,400 mothers on Mothers' Allowance in 1952-53; Saskatchewan had 2,414, and British Columbia, that other social Credit haven, 503; Manitoba, 700. British Columbia paid \$415,000 on Mothers' Allowances in that year; Saskatchewan paid \$1,328,000; Alberta has not a well-organized professionally-trained field staff. As a matter of fact, they are referred to as inspectors. In recent years Alberta's child welfare programme was the subject of an investigation by a Royal Commission. There are many areas in the field of social security where Alberta, with all its wealth, lags seriously behind this province.

One reason why I am most anxious to see more adequate uniform pensions right across this country is because of the recent action of the Social Credit governments of British Columbia and Alberta. It is now impossible for an old-age pensioner moving to British Columbia or Alberta to gain residence. They may live there for 20 years and still not qualify for whatever social benefits these provinces may be providing. In contrast, Mr. Speaker, any old-age pensioner coming from any part of Canada and residing in Saskatchewan for a period of only one year, can qualify for every service that we grant our own Saskatchewan old-age pensioners.

Just to make sure that no aged person in Canada, outside of the Social Credit 'heavens' of Alberta and British Columbia will every qualify, they must have been resident for three years prior to making application for

pension, you can never gain residence and be eligible for the services which those two provinces are providing. You can live in British Columbia for 20 years, as I have said. I have on my desk a letter received yesterday from an old-age pensioner who has lived nine years in British Columbia, who cannot qualify for the services which are being paid in that province because she went from Saskatchewan nine years ago to British Columbia. This is much worse, Mr. Speaker, than the poor laws of Elizabeth the First, that only required 5-years residence if you moved from one county to the other in order to gain residence and be entitled to the services of the county to which you moved.

Is this the Social Credit interpretation of the Book of Holy Writ they make such a political show of, to exclude old-age pensioners for all time from any part of Canada, except those that applied for and got their pensions in the province?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I can't understand the reasoning of the statement of the Minister. Does he mean to say that any person who moves into British Columbia can never qualify for the old-age pension? I get it that way.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No, I have repeatedly stated that a pensioner from any part of Canada moving into British Columbia cannot qualify for the welfare services granted by the province of British Columbia — the allowances, health services, hospitalization and so on. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I guess I will have to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, we speak of Canadian unity.

Mr. Danielson: — I'm speaking about the old-age pensioner.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — An I'm not speaking to you at all, sir; Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to you. We hear so much said in this country about Canadian unity and justice to our senior citizens who built this country of ours. Yet British Columbia and Alberta behind their Social Credit 'curtain' have effectively closed the borders of their province to all outside aged persons of this country. This un-Christian policy applies to Mothers' Allowances, social aid, all other welfare groups. Providence has been kind when she gave to British Columbia beauty of scenery and a mild climate, but the Social Credit Christian philosophy has effectively barred many of our Canadian citizens from these blessings which Nature or Providence showered on that province.

If you have plenty of money, you may, of course, find a welcome in the Social Credit British Columbia 'heaven', but if you haven't God help you! Now, this policy of Social Credit in British Columbia and Alberta points out the absolute need for uniform pensions across the Dominion of Canada, if we are not going to tie our aged people to the particular province in which they happen to apply for their pensions. Our senior citizens built Canada, often with privation, toil and sacrifice. They are entitled to live where they want to, within the borders of this nation, and they are entitled to receive all provincial benefits after a reasonable period of residence.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the appreciation of this House to the Church organizations and to those municipalities that are participating so wholeheartedly in our programme to provide housing for aged persons. Our Church organizations have already rendered an invaluable service

in this field. Many municipalities are in the process of organizing housing projects, and it is a matter of regret that not a single application for housing for our aged persons has been received from the constituency of Arm River, Saltcoats, Cannington or Moosomin.

Mr. Danielson: — That should be to their credit.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — The entire front row. That's evidently the extent of the interest that is being taken in a security programme for the aged people in this province.

Mr. Lopton: — You know we wouldn't get it, unless we had a C.C.F. member.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You just make an application and see how fast you get it; but first you must make the application . . .

Mr. McDonald: — If we do there's many . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, by their acts shall we ye know them. And no one knows the past and present performance of the Liberals quite so well as the people of this province. If there is a change of heart on their part (which I greatly doubt), everyone will welcome it.

We on your right, Mr. Speaker, are not satisfied that the old-age pensioners are getting their just dues, nor will be rest content until they do. We cannot salve our consciences by merely talking about it as the hon. member from Arm River does.

Mr. Danielson: — What are you reading from?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — As I told you, Mr. Speaker, this man, this hon. member, has no interest in this problem. He treats it with levity, as a matter for joking. He never did anything on behalf of the old-age pensioners in this province except the vaporizing that he gave vent to this morning in this House. As far as we on this side of the House are concerned we shall not be satisfied until the senior citizens of this province, and we hope, of all Canada, will have complete security. I move this amendment, seconded by Mr. Howe.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the proposed amendment.

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current):

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be very long on what I have to say about the matter we are dealing with now. I think hon. members know just how I feel about the old-age situation not only in our province or in Canada, but all over the world. It seems to me that we are continually badgering and baiting each other, as I have heard today in this House, when possibly some members change their minds as regards different things they wish to talk about.

I heard considerable today about where are we going to get this money. I think, Mr. Speaker, I pointed that out the other night. I have to admit that the Government of this province have done a lot of good work as far as old-age people are concerned. I believe I am speaking the truth when I say that this Government was the first government in the Dominion of Canada

March 30, 1954

to possibly increase old-age pensions and give a supplementary allowance. True, we gave health and hospital services with it, but I do not think we can do anything too much for our old-age people, Mr. Speaker. And that is the reason why, when I saw the motion of the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) on the Order Paper, I thought it was good. I certainly thought it was good.

We have heard the Minister of Social Welfare submitting a resolution to the Federal Government for increases all across the board and all across Canada. Mr. Speaker, we have been doing that for years; asking the Federal Government, not only in this province, but our members down in Ottawa have been doing the very same thing. We haven't got very far on that matter, and I thought with the resolution that the hon. member from Arm River brought in, that it would do something in this province immediately for our old-age citizens.

As members have said, we have a lot to thank our old-age citizens for. They have pioneered this country; they have worked hard and they have helped to give a lot of the privileges which we receive today. We all know that the old-age pensions as set up today is inadequate. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you know, that there are some of our old-age pensioners in this province who are barely existing, after they have paid expenses out of the miserable allowances they are getting.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking now from a socialist fundamental viewpoint. As far as I am concerned, the human being comes first; the human being definitely comes first. Our movement started from the bottom, and that is the only reason why the force of necessity brought in Socialism as we know it today – just like the forces of necessity brought in the C.C.F. movement in Canada and in this province.

Mr. Loptson: — Too bad for the province.

Mr. Gibbs: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that some of our old-age people are barely getting enough to exist on. When we see old-age people living on \$40 and \$42.50 a month, and I know some who, after they have paid their expenses, have only \$6 and \$8 to live on in this province. I think it would be a good thing if we could give now – not next year or the year after but immediately – a part or some of the revenue we are deriving from natural resources in oil and mineral wealth.

My hon. friend, said, "Where are we going to get \$3 million from?" That was the hon. Minister . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No, I didn't say that.

Mr. Gibbs: — Didn't you? What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I asked the Opposition to tell us.

Mr. Danielson: — You certainly asked me, and I told you where you could get \$1 million – from this museum.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well I think there is one avenue that we could tap in order to give more to the old-age pensioners of this province. I know that we require roads, I know that we require various other expansions; but to my mind, Mr. Speaker, and I will have to be convinced otherwise, I still

think some of this new wealth that is being found in the province of Saskatchewan can be turned back to give the old-age pensioners a little more than they are getting at the present time.

We must bear in mind that these old people are not going to be with us very long. They are 'over the hill' now; and there are a lot of them dying off year after year. Youth has to get the benefit of the expansion of anything that goes on in this province in the future. There is nowhere else it can go. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is my firm determination that something should be done with the new accrued wealth that we are receiving in the province of Saskatchewan through natural resources – and I do not mean do it next year or the year after; I think something should be done immediately.

I am serious about this problem, Mr. Speaker. I am not just speaking for speaking's sake; and I think if we can, as this motion reads, give them something now.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You are not speaking on the motion.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, you spoke on both the motion and the amendment, why can't I?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gibbs: — If you can speak on it, surely I can.

Mr. Speaker: — You are speaking on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Go ahead, you're doing fine.

Mr. Gibbs: — Well, it doesn't matter whether I am doing fine or not, I am going to speak it anyway. And it says:

“To give consideration to increasing the supplementary allowance to recipients of old age security and recipients of blind person's allowances to ten dollars a month and also the payment of such supplementary allowance to recipients of old age assistance and the provision of health services for recipients of old age assistance.”

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What about the amendment?

Mr. Gibbs: — I think that is a good resolution. I might be in the minority, but I still think so; and I think it is just asking for what I was trying to get the other day, only I didn't mention the amount. I don't know whether our Government could possibly find that amount of \$10. I think, if we honestly try, we could. What would the other provinces think then? I know that speakers bring in all provinces across the Dominion and speak of what they are doing, what they have done and what they have or haven't done, as far as the old-age people of this province are concerned. I am concerned with what this province is going to do, and I am giving all credit – as I said at the outset, I think there is a great deal of credit coming to the C.C.F. Government of the province of Saskatchewan for what they have done in the past; and I hope that we will get more credit for what we are going to do in the future.

I believe it would be an outstanding thing if our Government could immediately set in motion some increase for our old-age pensioners in this

province. I know a lot of those old people would get a great deal of comfort and happiness from a little more remuneration, because as long as we are going to live under the monetary system, then there is no yardstick as far as I am concerned. If we have to live under the monetary system, then those old-age people, who only get that miserable pittance, have got to pay for their bread and butter as much as I have to pay for mine, or you for yours, or anybody else. So as far as the monetary system goes, under which we live, there is no yardstick. The idea is to try and better the conditions of those who are in a poorer bracket than ourselves, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking true Socialism, when I say that.

I have heard people talk about money and their millions and their billions; but this is the point, as far as I am concerned: You take all the millionaires and all the rich and wealthy people of the world today, yet when a country is going to war, or we are in jeopardy of losing our privileges and freedom and rights and country, you line those millionaires up with all their wealth, with all their monetary power, and just put a tommygun there and ask them if they will hand over their millions or would they rather save their lives. You would get the answer pretty quick: "Take all I've got, but save my miserable life," – because they know they can come back and make more.

I want to say that I am going to get behind and fight for these people, these old venerable pioneers who are receiving the old-age pension today. I only hope and trust that our Government can give those people a little bit more than they are receiving today, and I think it would set a pattern for the rest of Canada. We would probably be able to bring, or at least infuse, some of our socialistic and C.C.F. policies in other provinces that have not got the government that Saskatchewan has got. I know that, if we do these things, that would be one method of increasing our prestige not only in Canada but throughout the world.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I think at the present time, this resolution is down my alley. I admit the amendment speaks of 'across the board'; but we have been asking that for years and they have never done anything. I think this resolution of the hon. member from Arm River just happens to hit me right in the right spot; and if we can do something immediately for these people, then I think I will have to support that motion.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, there is a question I want to ask.

Mr. Speaker: — Are you speaking on the motion?

Mr. Lopton: — No, he is on the amendment. He can speak on the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: — The amendment supplants the motion. Mr. Speaker. There is nothing left to the original motion if the amendment carries. And if I speak now, I do not see how I can speak to this amendment without speaking to the motion at the same time. I don't see how I can do it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I think that has been the practice in the House . . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . . as the Minister of Social Welfare did when he spoke, in the latter part of his speech. Therefore, am I at liberty to speak in general about the problem that we are facing, or that this motion involves?

Mr. Speaker: — It has been the custom to bring them both together, yes.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the time is getting close to 12 o'clock and I just want to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I might say that you could close the debate on the motion as amended, if the amendment passes.

Mr. Danielson: — My intention, Mr. Speaker, is simply that, if I am permitted, I want to speak now and then when I get through I am through, I don't want to speak any more, no matter what the rules of the House are, because there is nothing to speak to. If the amendment passes it will supplant the motion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Go ahead!

Mr. Danielson: — First of all, I want to call your attention to many statements that the Minister of Social Welfare made. He, of course, bitterly attacked me personally. That is not a new thing on the floor of this House, but I cannot see why they should do it. I feel very kindly toward my friend, the senior member from Saskatoon; but he attacked me very bitterly, personally. Well, I can stand that. It is a good deal of satisfaction to me, Mr. Speaker, because when they do that I know I have hit the spot. If I haven't, they laugh at me; but if I hit the spot, then they jump up over there all the time.

He said that the average pension, in 1943, was \$18.73, and that is correct; but it was all pension, Mr. Speaker, paid in this province, just the same as paid any place else. It was all that we were duty-bound to pay under a Dominion-Provincial agreement which covered the old-age pension at that time. If he had taken 1944, Mr. Speaker, he would find that the pension had risen to \$23.80 on the average.

He pointed out that British Columbia has increased its welfare tax from three to five per cent. That is correct. But he didn't tell you that they removed the taxes for hospitalization. They did that, but he didn't tell you that. The difference between the Minister of Social Welfare and myself is this: I didn't read my speech. I just read the document which came from Ottawa, from the Minister of National Health. What I read was not mine, Mr. Speaker; it came right from the nation's capitol, from the Hon. Paul Martin's office, and covered every province in the Dominion of Canada. That is what I read. I didn't read my speech, and if I did I would be just like the Minister of Social Welfare. He tried to read his speech, but then he takes a look at somebody, loses his place, and he is all lost. He and I are just the same that way. I can talk to anybody when I stand and look at his face, but looking down at something printed — I have to have it right before my face if I am going to read it.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You're quite an authority!

Mr. Danielson: — You can call me anything you like. I confess, as far as I am concerned. But it is just as I said: you would not read the things that I read. I gave you full credit. Every province in Canada was read out to this House, details of the services which they gave, which are true and correct; but you didn't do that. You said that British Columbia had increased the sales tax two per cent; but you didn't tell of the corresponding out in the hospitalization tax. You were dishonest in that respect; and that is political dishonesty . . .

March 30, 1954

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I would ask the member to withdraw that.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I can withdraw that statement. It doesn't make a bit of difference, because he did it anyway.

Mr. Speaker: — No, no, the hon. member must withdraw without reservations.

Mr. Danielson: — I believe every person inside this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! You withdraw the statement?

Mr. Danielson: — I will withdraw the statement. But every person sitting in this House, no matter where he sits, I give him credit for having the brains to see through the subterfuge.

He said something in regard to Liberal promises and all that sort of thing — we will deal with some of that later; and with the Liberal record and the C.C.F. record. Well, I am not so sure. There might be some debate when we get into that part of it, whether we are all blameless or not — whether all the fault, and all the omissions and all the transgressions are on one side of the political calendar. I am not so sure that they are; but we will leave that until we feel a little more like getting into a scrap when we get back.

The member for Swift Current said exactly what he said the other night, and what I said. This resolution asks that something be done now! I agree with the Minister of Social Welfare; I could gladly vote for that, and if the amendment carries I am going to vote for it and so will every man on this side of the House, because it is an alternative; but it isn't what we want.

This resolution, as the member for Swift Current says, is that we want something now. I could read you a letter here, but I am not going to read it because if I read a letter in this House I am supposed to table it. But I have given this recipient of the old-age pension my word that I would not make the name public. And I can read you this, but I am not going to, as I said, because I would have to table the letter. But it shows what some of these people actually face and what they think about the thing, and the treatment (don't misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker) — the treatment she got was no doubt according to the rules of the Department. I am not accusing them of anything other than that; but nevertheless, the treatment she got was very, very harsh. But there is one thing about this and it is that we should try to do something now. If we cannot make it \$7.50 in addition to what we have, and what we have asked for in this resolution, make it \$2.50 and make it \$5.00. I would be glad to see you do that.

Mr. Loptson: — They want to pay \$5 in co-operation with the Federal, so why don't they pay the \$5 straight?

Mr. Danielson: — I don't see why they shouldn't.

Mr. Loptson: — They want to squirm out of it, that's all.

Mr. Danielson: — That is what they should do; and I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister and the Government think over this matter seriously,

by all means let us approach the Federal Government; let us ask them to go a step farther. Exactly what my friend, the Minister of Social Welfare has asked for; I am in favor of that. Nevertheless what is going to be done in Ottawa will not be done this year; and it may not be done next year.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You are right there.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, and you would be in exactly the same position if you were there.

Mr. Loptson: — It would all go to the provinces if you were there.

Mr. Danielson: — It would all have to go to the provinces to be agreed to.

Mr. Loptson: — Just the same as now, it all goes to the Federal.

Mr. Danielson: — If you are going to increase the basic pension, it would have to go to the different provinces.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — No, no!

Mr. Danielson: — Don't tell me that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Certainly you are wrong.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — No, I am not wrong. But the supplementary — it is a matter for the individual provinces to make a large or small or medium grant or whatever they like; that lies absolutely with the provinces themselves. So, the member for Swift Current is absolutely correct when he said he wanted something now, and then let us go after the fellows in Ottawa and see what they will do. They haven't come through.

Some Hon. Member: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — They are a national government; there are 276 members in that House, and there are only about 13 or 14 from Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Only about 23 that are any good.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — That's all right.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The Liberals down there . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I will have something to say about that later on. Mr. Speaker, with your consent, I will adjourn the debate until after lunch.

Premier Douglas: — Call it one o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: — The House will recess until 3 o'clock.

March 30, 1954

3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned for lunch I was dealing with some of the statements made by the Minister of Social Welfare, and I was to show this House how he was off the track, as usual, and many things were not according to the actual facts.

He made one or two statements I will take up — I just happened to think about them. He mentioned Arm River and Saltcoats and, I believe if I am not mistaken, that he was discussing housing, or aid for housing. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Housing for aged people.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that is all right; that is what we are dealing with — aged people. He said he had never had one application from Arm River. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is the greatest compliment I have ever had in this House — to represent a constituency that has gone through ten years of C.C.F. rule and never asked them for anything. That is a record, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — You are satisfied!

Mr. Danielson: — And he had 110 people over the province asking for applications, and he could not find one from Arm River. I am rather proud of that. I am speaking merely for myself, not for the member from Saltcoats. So thanks very much for the compliment, Mr. Minister. I know it was unintentional, but nevertheless it is welcome.

He said another thing — and of course, as usual, he had to attack the Federal Government for certain things they had done or had not done, it didn't make much difference whether they had done it or not. If they had done it, it was wrong; and if they hadn't done it, why they should have done it. That was in regard to price control.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he was speaking of price control. The war came along and drastic measures had to be taken. The effort of this nation as a whole was directed toward one thing and that was to contribute our part to victory. Canada, like other nations who were involved in that struggle, did that very thing; but there was another thing that went with price control, Mr. Speaker, which is bound to go with price control any time, and that was control of wages and salaries. These two go together . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Aw, phooey!

Mr. Danielson: — Did the hon. Minister mention that? Oh no! All these years since price controls have been done away with, he has to harp back and criticize the Government of Canada for removing price control; but the demand for the removal of wage control coming from the Labour unions of this country, the bosom friends of the hon. Minister. I am not criticizing the Labour unions . . .

Some Gov't Members: — Oh no!

Mr. Danielson: — . . . because if I do, I would leave myself as a farmer open to criticism, because our products were probably subject to move price control than anything in the country. I remember the farmers' organization, represented by the Pool and the Canadian Council of Agriculture,

saying, “We never asked for price control.” They never did either. But we had to take it with the rest and surely we didn’t raise any complaints, or offer any criticism of the government for doing that. But the Minister over here – he throws all the blame on the Government because the price control was removed.

That was one thing that had to be removed, Mr. Speaker, because if that had not been done you would have had strikes all over this country demanding higher wages and I think that would have been justified. But why not be fair? Even when we talk politics we should let a glimmer of reason get into our discussions.

I admit there are always two sides to every problem, and there are two sides to the problem of price control. Anyone who tells you that you can enforce price control without enforcing control over wages and salaries, well he doesn’t – well, I wouldn’t say that of anybody here, because I would certainly credit any man who sits any place in this House with having more brains and understanding than that. So, the minister made much out of nothing – only, again, as I said, telling half the story and leaving it at that, thinking that the impression would go abroad and would stick in the minds of some people and prejudice them politically. That was his whole object; nothing else.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Could I ask the hon. gentleman a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Danielson: — Certainly, we have lots of time.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Was it not a part of the platform of the Liberal Party, prior to the 1945 election, that they would maintain price controls and prevent inflation in the country?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, so long as the war was on.

Premier Douglas: — Oh no, the war was over.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh yes! And I say today that if it had not been for insistent demand of the labour forces in Canada that price control might have gone on for some time longer than it did.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, no!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, labour speaks for itself . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — . . . and there isn’t a person in this House who doesn’t know that I am telling the truth.

Premier Douglas: — No, here is one that doesn’t.

Mr. Danielson: — All right, laugh all you like.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You know better than that.

Mr. Danielson: — Go back to Hansard, and listen to Mr. Gillies; go back to Hansard and read the reports in the debates of the House of Commons.

March 30, 1954

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Mr. Speaker, may I . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is not answering any questions.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all right. I think perhaps Canada has done a better job, on the whole, of controlling inflation than any country that was involved in the war. You know what happened in Great Britain. The Labour government started something there that absolutely drove them out of power. We are not going to discuss that. The Minister will use the same argument in trying to win political prejudice for himself and his Party next time he speaks.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us go back to what we were talking about, namely, old-age pensioners.

Mr. Gibson: — That would be a good idea.

Mr. Danielson: — I am sure this would never have come up if it hadn't been for the Minister of Social Welfare. This pension business is one which has been operating in Saskatchewan and in Canada as a whole since 1928; and I think I am telling a fact when I say that Saskatchewan, if not the first was one of the first provinces in the Dominion to take advantage of the 1927 legislation which was passed by the Dominion government at that time, and to implement provincially their part of the old-age pension legislation. I think Saskatchewan was at the least the second province to do that, if that has anything to do with it.

We had from then on, up until 1931, a \$20 pension; \$10, as I said this morning, was paid by the Provincial Government and \$10 by the Federal Government, subject to a means test. Then there was some increase in the pension authorized in 1943, when the pension was increased to \$25 per month — one-half paid by the Provincial and one-half by the Federal Government. Then in 1931 or 1932 — I think it was the 1932 Session, when we had a Conservative government in the Federal House, Mr. Bennett introduced an amendment which took over the responsibility for two-thirds of the pension as a charge on the federal treasury; and that has been maintained ever since, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Seventy-five per cent, wasn't it? Not two-thirds.

Mr. Danielson: — You are right. Then, when this Government came in, on the 10th of July, 1944, we had a special Session in the fall of 1944. Then in the first regular Session of this Government, in the Speech from the Throne of February 20, 1945, there was a paragraph which says this, on page 7:

“Consideration is being given to the matter of paying a cost-of-living bonus to old-age and blind pensioners. This, if we decide to pay it, will amount to an additional \$5 per month in each case.”

That was in the Speech from the Throne, February 20, 1945. Well, it was a very generous thing at that time, a generous promise — or I would say, according to the Speech from the Throne, it is something more than a promise. I am not blaming the Premier that he did not live up to that promise,

because he came fresh from the country and for two or three years he had done nothing else but make promises; and you know, when you make more and more of them they get cheaper and cheaper. But when he did put this promise into effect of \$5 a month, he cut it down to \$3. That \$3 a month was paid by this Government up until 1947 – I think I am correct. In the Budget Speech of the Session of 1947, the Provincial Treasurer said this:

“This province is preparing to raise the maximum pension payable to old-age and blind pensioners to \$30 per month, effective April 1, 1947.”

Now that was the promise, and, as far as the Provincial Treasurer providing the money for that extra \$5, Mr. Speaker, he carried out that promise. He did provide that money . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — That was the year before the election.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, that is true, too. I didn't think about that. But what happened?

Mr. Lopton: — It's very important.

Mr. Danielson: — On April 1, 1947, this supplementary pension of \$3 per month which had been paid since 1945 up to that time, was increased to \$5 per month. During the 1947 Session of the Federal Parliament, the Liberal government of that day increased the basic pension from \$25 to \$30 per month. That means that they raised the pension by \$5 per month. That was the basic pension – we are not now speaking of supplementaries at all. That was the basic pension increase. During the period from April 1, 1947 (the date upon which the \$5 increase stated by the Provincial Treasurer in his Budget Speech was to begin operating) to August 31, 1947, the C.C.F. Government paid their one-quarter share of the basic \$25 per month pension. That was \$6.25 per month, and they paid the supplementary pension of \$5, or a total of \$11.25 per month, and they paid the supplementary pension of \$4, or a total of \$11.25 per month. That was the payment, through supplementary and the basic pension from April 1, 1947 to September 1, 1947, or to the end of August. They paid their share of the basic pension, plus \$5 a month supplementary pension, as the Provincial Treasurer promised in his budget speech, and made a provision that the money be voted for that expenditure. Now that is four months, isn't it?

Then, on September 1st, the Federal Government passed a Federal Act increasing the pension, as I just stated. They proclaimed that Act operative and they made it retroactive to May 1st, 1947.

Now something happened that is very interesting. Let me again repeat that this Government had paid their full share of the basic pension of the increase to \$30 per month. When the Government of Canada put in operation the retroactive payments to May 1st, they handed that bulk of money over to the provincial governments, and what took place then? This Government who have criticized the Liberal record so severely, this morning; and said there is nothing in Canada that can compare with the record of the Liberal government and they stuck it in their own pocket. That payment came to this Government to be distributed to the old-age pensioners of Saskatchewan for the previous four months. They took that; and that amount of money, Mr. Speaker, amounted to \$675,000 . . .

March 30, 1954

Mr. Loptson: — Shame, shame, stealing from the old-age pensioners!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I can show you a letter here from the Hon. Paul Martin . . .

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):

Read it.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, sir. I will read it before I sit down. You asked for it, and now you can have it!

Mr. Erb: — Read it all.

Mr. Danielson: — But, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He is reading his speech all over.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . \$675,000 was the total amount, but Mr. Valteau, the Minister of Social Welfare at that time, got up on the floor of the House and said that figure was not correct. Immediately I knew what he meant — it was incorrect in this respect, that the \$675,000 sum was figured on the basis of all pensioners in Saskatchewan at that time drawing a full pension; but we had the means test at that time, and he said the net amount, after applying the means test, would be \$614,000 and I have his own word for it. He said it on the floor of this House.

That is the history of this Government. They took that \$614,000, according to the Minister's own statement at that time, from the old-age and blind pensioners of the province of Saskatchewan and stuffed it down in their own pocket — the Provincial Treasurer's pocket, which is a big one, and anything that goes in there hardly ever comes back out. There is a scowl on his face every time he has to admit that.

Mr. Loptson: — It withers away in his pocket.

Mr. Danielson: — That is the history of the old-age pension in this province by this Government. They are the last group in the world that should ever stand up and criticize anybody else. That is an act that is on record not only here but in Ottawa. The Minister at the time admitted it; and then he went to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. He went down there to talk to his friends, the C.C.F. members, because they were hollering for more pension. He went there to quieten them down a little bit so they wouldn't draw attention to that situation in this Province. And there is an article written in the 'Maclean's' magazine on that trip by the Hon. Mr. Valteau. I have that here, too, if anybody would like to read it. But that is so. The Dominion Government made the increase retroactive, and that money was held back by the Provincial Government, money that should have been paid to the pensioners of Saskatchewan for four months. That amounts to about \$15 per pensioner, for four months — every old-age pensioner in Saskatchewan.

Surely the Minister of Social Welfare, had he known anything about this (and I think he does, or perhaps he has forgotten about it), would not have spoken this morning as he did; because when I introduced this resolution this morning, Mr. Speaker, I refrained from all this stuff, but I had my ammunition with me, just in case. Just as soon as he got up, he was bitter, he

was wicked, he could have bitten nails over there; and he was personal. He said everything he could say, without being prohibited by the rules of the House, which are very loose sometimes.

That is one of the things this Government has done: They took the money and recouped themselves, money that had been promised in the budget speech, that had been voted by this House as an expense for that purpose. There is much more that could be said with regard to the old-age pensioners as far as this Government is concerned; but I think I have said enough to . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Too much.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . indicate to you that people who live in glass houses should never throw any rocks around. You should know enough to keep away from that.

Gov't Member: — Did you read the letter?

Mr. Danielson: — Someone says he would like to hear what the Hon. Paul Martin had to say about this thing. He asked for this thing and I shall oblige by reading the letter to him.

Mr. Kramer: — Did he say anything about the 1919 health scheme?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I quote: December 30, 1947 – and these are the facts:

“Prior to the advent to power of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan in June, 1944, the Liberal government was paying an average old-age pension amounting to \$23.08 a month, or very nearly the maximum payable at that time under the Old Age Pensions Act and the Federal wartime Order-in-Council which raised the maximum pension payable in any one case to \$25.00 monthly.

The Federal Order-in-Council referred to, which was passed on August 10, 1943, and which raised the basic pension from \$20.00 to \$25.00 a month, made it possible for the Saskatchewan Government to replace the \$1.25 provincial supplemental allowance which they had been paying at their own expense since July 1st, 1943, with the larger supplemental pension of \$5.00 per month paid jointly at the expense of the Federal and Provincial governments. This \$5.00 supplemental pension went into effect on September 1st, 1943, and took the place of the provincial supplemental allowance of \$1.25 monthly in almost all cases. In those cases, however, which for some reason did not qualify for the larger Dominion-Provincial supplemental pension, the Liberal government in Saskatchewan continued its provincial supplemental allowance of up to \$1.25 a month.

March 30, 1954

Yet with these facts available to him, Premier Douglas makes repeatedly the statement that at the time his Party came into power in Saskatchewan average old-age pension payments amounted to only \$17.25 monthly.

Let us see now what the C.C.F. did when they came into office.”

Premier Douglas: — What is my friend quoting from?

Mr. Danielson: — This is Paul Martin’s letter.

Premier Douglas: — Oh! Isn’t that smart?

Mr. Loptson: — It is an official document.

Mr. Danielson: — Is that the way you want people to take you, if you write a letter? I have good reason to believe that is the way they should take it, but not in this case, because . . .

Premier Douglas: — To whom is the letter addressed?

Mr. Danielson: — . . . every word in this letter is a matter of record in the Parliament of Canada and in this House as well.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask to whom the letter is addressed?

Mr. Danielson: — It is addressed to one of the good Liberals in Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — Is my friend prepared to table the letter?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Is my friend prepared to table the letter?

Mr. Danielson: — I have read all this, this morning; it came right from the office of the National Health and Welfare in Ottawa – the same as this. Anybody can write down there and get the truth about the operations of the Old-Age Pensions Act.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As my hon. friend said this morning, when a member quotes from a letter, of course, he usually tables it. Will my friend table this letter from which he is now quoting?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I said I have a private letter here from an old-age pensioner including a letter from the Social Welfare Department dated May 4, 1953.

Premier Douglas: — I am not asking you to table that.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member now is quoting from a letter that is not a private letter, I understand.

Mr. Danielson: — What did you want – a copy? If you do, you can have it.

Premier Douglas: — No, I would like it tabled in the House. You table it.

Mr. Danielson: — No, I will give you a copy of it.

Premier Douglas: — No, I don't want a copy; I want it tabled.

Mr. Danielson: — No, no, I won't.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of what the hon. member wants. The rules of the House say that if you quote from a document, you must be prepared to table it. Now if my hon. friend is going to quote from a letter from the Hon. Paul Martin, then I suggest that, if he is going to quote from that letter, he must table it.

Mr. Danielson: — I will take all responsibility for reading it.

Premier Douglas: — No, the rules of the House say nothing about that.

Mr. Danielson: — It was written December 30, 1947 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the hon. member will acknowledge that there is a difference between those two letters: One you accept the responsibility for, but the other I think is a letter that should be tabled.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh no, Mr. Speaker, just a moment. I did not accept responsibility in this matter; I said I wouldn't read it because it was a private letter.

Mr. Speaker: — So that you had no responsibility.

Mr. Danielson: — This is the one I accept responsibility for. If the Premier wants a copy he can certainly get it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in a copy; I am interested in the rules of the House. The rules of the House say that, if a member, either on the Government side or on the Opposition side, quotes a letter which purports to be from a public man, and particularly a Minister of the Crown in the Federal government, he cannot quote from such a letter without tabling it. All I am asking is, will my hon. friend table the letter. It is not a matter of him accepting responsibility. He can accept the responsibility for a private letter to himself, and, therefore, under the rules of the House, he doesn't have to table it; but this is a public letter, Mr. Speaker, and I urge that it be tabled.

Mr. Danielson: — As a matter of fact, this is a private letter, and a certain individual gave me this copy of it.

Premier Douglas: — It is not a private letter to the hon. member, that is the difference.

Mr. Speaker: — According to the member's own statement, it is not a private letter.

Mr. Danielson: — It is a private letter to an individual. I said it was to one of the best Liberals in Saskatchewan, and he gave me a copy of it. I have seen the original of it.

March 30, 1954

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House I must insist that the letter be tabled if the hon. member is going to quote from it. It is not a private letter to him, and that is the only condition under which a member can refuse to table a letter. If it is a private letter to him, a personal letter to him, he can refuse to table it; but if the hon. member is going to quote from it I insist on . . .

Mr. Danielson: — All right, I will table this letter on the condition that it be returned to me.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. If the hon. member will sit down. He has broken all the rules of the House . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I said I would, and I had the floor . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Premier is up on a point of order and his point of order is . . .

Mr. Danielson: — He's always up on his feet.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I rule that the point of order that the Premier has risen on is well taken, and if you are quoting from that letter then it should be tabled.

Mr. Danielson: — But when the letter is tabled I get it back, do I, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You can get another copy.

Mr. Danielson: — All right, you can have this letter. There is nothing in there; I read every bit of it on the floor of this House before. But I am certainly going to read it all now, Mr. Speaker. You bet I am going to read it all.

Premier Douglas: — You are going to table it, too.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, sure he will table it.

Mr. Speaker: — I understand the hon. member has agreed to table the letter.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, and I am going to take a copy of this letter. Now I am going to start to read this letter again, and I am going to start more to the front than I did before.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Let's take it as read.

Mr. Danielson: — I quote:

“My attention has been drawn to recent newspaper reports in the daily press in Saskatchewan, quoting Premier Douglas as having made statements with respect to old-age pensions paid by the previous Liberal regime in that province, which are wholly incorrect . . .”

Everybody knows that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

Mr. Danielson:

“The correct facts and figures are available to Premier Douglas . . .”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will you state your point of order.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I think the hon. member said he was going to read from the commencement of the letter. He obviously did not, or he would have read the address on the head of the letter.

Mr. McCarthy: — He’s giving you the whole works now, and you don’t like it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That counts a whole lot — the address.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh no — how simple can you be, boy?

Mr. Lopton: — He hasn’t grown up yet.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I’ve had a lot of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will the hon. member proceed.

Mr. Danielson: — Sure. I have lots of time, be patient. Do you think we can’t go till Saturday night?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I don’t care.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We’re not going any place.

Premier Douglas: — You’ll be going home for the weekend anyway, so it won’t matter.

Mr. Danielson: — It doesn’t make any difference to me. I am going up to get some applications from the Minister of Social Welfare.

“My attention has been drawn to recent newspaper reports in the daily press in Saskatchewan, quoting Premier Douglas as having made statements with respect to old-age pensions which are wholly incorrect. The correct facts and figures are available to Premier Douglas, either by reference to periodic reports on old-age pensions which appear in the ‘Labour Gazette’, or by reference to his own departmental officials. If Premier Douglas were to take the trouble to check the accuracy of his statements with either of these two sources, he would soon find that he is making allegations which are not in accordance with the facts. I can only conclude from his failure to do so and from his constant repetition to incorrect figures that he is not anxious to have the correct information placed before the public, and I am therefore asking you

if you would be good enough to take whatever steps you may consider to be necessary to acquaint the public of Saskatchewan with the true facts of the situation.

Prior to the advent to power of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan in June, 1944, the Liberal government was paying an average old-age pension amounting to \$23.08 a month, under the Old Age Pensions Act and the Federal wartime Order-in-Council which raised the maximum pension payable in any one case to \$25.00 monthly.

The Federal Order-in-Council referred to, which was passed on August 10, 1943, and which raised the basic pension from \$20.00 to \$25.00 a month, made it possible for the Saskatchewan Government to replace the \$1.25 provincial supplemental allowance which they had been paying at their own expense since July 1st, 1943, and took the place of the provincial supplemental allowance of \$1.25 monthly in almost all cases. In those cases, however, which for some reason did not qualify for the larger Dominion-Provincial supplemental pension, the Liberal government in Saskatchewan continued its provincial supplemental allowance of up to \$1.25 a month.

Yet with these facts available to him, Premier Douglas makes repeatedly the statement that at the time his Party came into power in Saskatchewan the average old-age pension payments amounted to only \$17.25 monthly.

Let us see now what the C.C.F. did when they came into office.

For the quarter ended June 30, 1945, after the C.C.F. had been in power for a whole year in Saskatchewan, the figures show that the average old age pension had risen slightly to \$24.63 per month, or a rise of \$1.55 monthly as compared with the quarter ended June 30, 1944, the last quarter for which the Liberal government was in power.

But even this slight increase was more apparent than real, because it was due to the fact that it was just on the eve of the C.C.F. government coming into power that the Federal government passed an Order-in-Council increasing the income ceiling for old age pensioners from \$365.00 to \$425.00 annually. This made it possible for the C.C.F. government, on coming into power, to absorb the provincial supplement of \$1.25 a month, which the Liberal government had still

been continuing in some cases, into the amount of the pension itself, thus making it jointly shareable by the Dominion and the province. The higher income ceilings authorized by this second Federal Order-in-Council account for the slight increase in the average pension paid during the first year that the C.C.F. government was in office. The only effect of this transfer from the supplemental allowance to slightly higher old-age pension payments was to transfer 75 per cent of the cost involved to the Federal government, rather than to pay it entirely out of provincial funds. For almost a year, therefore, after the C.C.F. government came into power, it is fair to say that the position of the old-age pensioners in Saskatchewan remained essentially unchanged, except for the slight advantage accruing to them as a result of the Federal Order-in-Council.

Finally, in May, 1945, the C.C.F. government introduced a provincial supplemental allowance of \$3.00 a month paid from its own funds. It also introduced its medical services scheme for old-age pensioners in the earlier part of this same year. It was not the first government in Canada, however, to introduce such a program for old-age pensioners, because both British Columbia and Ontario had had a medical services scheme for old-age pensioners in effect since about 1942.

With these adjustments made in 1945, the situation with respect to old-age pensioners in Saskatchewan then remained essentially unchanged until April, 1947, by which time the average old-age pension paid in Saskatchewan was actually a few cents less than it was almost two years earlier when the \$3.00 monthly provincial supplement was originally introduced.

In April, 1947, the Saskatchewan government, having been advised of the Federal government's intentions with respect to amendments to the Old Age Pensions Act, increased its provincial supplemental allowance from \$3.00 to \$5.00 a month. This meant that the provincial contribution for both pension and supplement together was raised from \$9.25 a month per pensioner to \$11.25 per month. Prior to the middle of 1945, the provincial contribution, both under the C.C.F. government and under the previous Liberal government, had been \$6.25 per month per pensioner. All these figures take account of the fact that the province received reimbursement from the Federal government of 75 per cent of the amount paid out under the Old Age Pensions Act itself, but bears the entire cost of any provincial supplements to the old-age pensions that may be paid."

That means that the Provincial Government bears that cost, Mr. Speaker.

March 30, 1954

“When the amendments to the Old Age Pensions Act were passed by the Federal Government on July 1st of this year, they provided for an old-age pension of \$30.00 a month (of which the Dominion would contribute \$22.50 a month), and left the provinces free to pay as much in the way of old-age pension as they wished to do. Had the C.C.F. government, under this legislation, done no more than it had set out to do in April of this year, it would have maintained its contribution of \$11.25 monthly per pensioner and this, added to the Federal contribution of \$22.50 per month per pensioner, would have amounted to a combined pension of \$33.75 per month per pensioner.

The C.C.F. government did not maintain its contribution however. As soon as the Federal Act was proclaimed in September of this year and the Agreement signed between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion government, the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan promptly reduced its contribution from \$11.25 a month to \$7.50 a month per pensioner . . .”

Just what I said a few minutes ago! I am going to read that section again, Mr. Speaker.

“The C.C.F. government did not maintain its contribution however. As soon as the Federal Act was proclaimed in September of this year and the Agreement signed between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion government, the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan promptly reduced its contribution from \$11.25 a month to \$7.50 a month per pensioner, thus depriving old-age pensioners in Saskatchewan of the entire increase that the Federal government . . .”

They reduced it from \$11.25 a month to \$7.50 a month!

“ . . . thus depriving old-age pensioners in Saskatchewan of the entire increase that the Federal government had made possible through its amending legislation.”

That is just what I stated a few moments ago.

“The effect of this latest move on the part of the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan is that the Government pockets the entire increase of \$3.75 per month per pensioner which the Federal government had intended as a means of improving the position of the pensioners themselves. The Saskatchewan government claims that by this action it will save an estimated \$675,000 per year at the expense of the old-age pensioners of the province. Not only that, but the C.C.F. government, in taking

advantage of the more generous Federal terms of contribution under the amending Old Age Pensions Act, abolished, in September, the provision it had made in April for a \$5.00 supplemental allowance retroactively to May 1st, 1957. In other words, the \$5.00 supplemental allowance which the Saskatchewan government announced in April of this year was paid at provincial expense for exactly one month.”

That is just exactly what I said – one month.

“All the provincial supplemental allowances which have been paid by the Saskatchewan government since May 1, 1947, will now be claimed back from the Dominion to the extent of 75 per cent of the total cost involved under the terms of the Federal amending legislation which makes the old-age pension amendments retroactive to May 1, 1957.

These facts, I think you will agree, speak for themselves. They give a clear picture of the extent to which the C.C.F. government has given aid to old-age pensioners at their own expense and . . .”

That is a very significant word, Mr. Speaker:

“The give a clear picture of the extent to which the C.C.F. government has given aid to old-age pensioners at their own expense and the extent to which they have endeavoured to claim credit for the more generous measures of assistance which have been made possible through the efforts of the Federal government.

I trust you will be able to devise an appropriate method of getting correct information across to the people of Saskatchewan so that they will be under no misapprehension on the point that the improvement in the lot of old-age pensioners throughout Saskatchewan, as throughout Canada, has been due to the action taken by the Federal government, rather than to anything that the present Provincial Government in Saskatchewan has been able to accomplish at its own expense and on its own initiative.

Yours sincerely,

PAUL MARTIN.”

Here is the letter, and Mr. Speaker, I want your assurance that I get a copy of this letter.

Mr. Speaker: — That is agreed.

Mr. Danielson: — There are a few notes on this letter, but they can make anything they like out of it.

March 30, 1954

Mr. Erb: — You apparently didn't get the information across very well.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I think we got more than you wanted us to get across.

Mr. Loptson: — You got some facts the Premier didn't like to hear.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up any more of the time of this House . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, go on!

Mr. Danielson: — I have lots more material I could use. I could speak here for another hour without exhausting my material, and show the Minister of Social Welfare how totally wrong he is, and how far he is off the track when he gets up to speak on a topic like this. But I am not going to do that.

I am going to vote against this amendment, because, as the member for Swift Current said, I am heartily in favour of trying to do something now. However, if this amendment is carried, then I am going to vote for the motion. I am going to vote for anything I can get. It isn't what I want, and it is not what the members on this side of the House want; but we are going to support that because it is aiming at something that might be done sometime in the future that would be for the benefit of the old people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to follow the garrulous meanderings we have listened to for nearly an hour.

Mr. Loptson: — You heard a lot of truth.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — An hour and forty minutes.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a certain type of squid fish that, whenever it is being pursued and in danger of being captured . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, give us a new one!

Premier Douglas: — . . . it secretes a black inky substance in order to confuse those who are pursuing it. We watched a very good example of that in the two speeches made by the member for Arm River. His long reading of reams of material supplied to him by Paul Martin, this letter to Mr. Tucker for political campaign purposes . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You asked for it.

Premier Douglas: — . . . are all part of the same attempt to confuse the issue.

Mr. Danielson: — You confused the issue.

Premier Douglas: — Whenever you begin to tickle my hon. friend he begins to make a funny sound.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He's been making one all day.

Premier Douglas: — You can always tell when you get close to the sensitive spot because he begins to squeal. If you want to confuse the points that are clear, Mr. Speaker, the first one is: there is a Liberal provincial government in Canada paying any supplementary allowance at all to the old-age people.

Mr. Loptson: — They are paying the pension over 70 . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to talk, let him get on his feet and talk.

Mr. Loptson: — I was just correcting you.

Premier Douglas: — I notice he keeps out of this debate.

Mr. McDonald: — So far.

Premier Douglas: — The only difference between him and the member for Arm River is that when he doesn't know anything about a subject he keeps quiet; but the member for Arm River gets up and displays the fact. But they both have about the same amount of knowledge on this subject. I say that not a single Liberal provincial administration in Canada pays a supplementary allowance to old-age pensioners. Can any of the gentlemen over there get up and deny it?

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

Premier Douglas: — I am just pointing out some of the things you are trying to conceal.

I want to point out the second thing they want to conceal — that the document read, this morning, from Mr. Martin's office indicates that there is not a single Liberal provincial administration in Canada that gives a complete programme of health services to its old people and to its blind people. No one! And these are the men who get up here and profess to be so concerned about the old people; yet every Liberal administration in Canada has a record . . .

Mr. Loptson: — What kind of government was there in British Columbia?

Premier Douglas: — . . . with reference to the old people of this country that is far below the standard of services being supplied to the old people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Loptson: — There would be another one, if there was a Liberal government over there now.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — The Leader of the Opposition should either get up and make a speech or keep quiet. He seems to be congenitally incapable of doing either.

Mr. Speaker, actions in the long run speak louder than words.

March 30, 1954

Mr. Danielson: — You said it.

Mr. Loptson: — Correct.

Premier Douglas: — This government has demonstrated by its actions its concern for the old-age pensioners. We haven't done like the gentlemen opposite — starved them and neglected them while in office, and the surround them with our verbal concern when we are in opposition.

Mr. McDonald: — You're starving them now.

Premier Douglas: — Within six months of taking office, this Government set up the first complete medical, hospital, dental, optical and drug services for old-age pensioners, mothers' allowance cases and blind pensioners. It was the very first government in Canada to do so. The gentlemen opposite did not do anything about it. They didn't provide them with any health services at all.

We cannot measure all of the services to old-age pensioners just by looking at the pension, although as I have said, in terms of what we are giving in supplementary allowance, we exceed any Liberal provincial government in Canada. We have to take into consideration what other services we give to those people in terms of nursing care, in terms of housing accommodation, and in terms of prolonged hospital care for acute and prolonged cases. These services have been provided in this province on a scale not equalled by any other government in Canada.

It is rather interesting that in 'Maclean's' magazine there is a very good article on the life of a man who made a great contribution to the province of Saskatchewan. I refer to Dr. Sam Laycock. The author of this article, Mr. Allan Phillips, has this to say: . . .

Did the member for Cannington say, "who paid him." I say that is a contemptible remark coming from a very contemptible person. The gentlemen opposite cannot conceive of anyone paying tribute to a man like Sam Laycock unless they were paid for it.

Mr. McCarthy: — It's been done before.

Premier Douglas: — It shows the mentality of the gentlemen opposite. They cannot conceive of anyone paying tribute to a man unless they get paid for it. When I hear people who think that someone else always gets paid I know that is the kind of person who would take pay to do that kind of thing, providing anyone was foolish enough to pay him for anything he could write. It would certainly be cheating if he got any money.

In this article, talking about Dr. Laycock, the author said:

"He has faced the personal problems squarely and with courage. He suffers from gall bladder trouble and arthritis of the spine. Characteristically, he has surveyed all the nursing homes in Canada and decided that Saskatchewan will give him the best care in the days when he can no longer look after himself."

Security is not only in terms of pension, but also in terms of nursing homes, hospital care, dental care and medical care, for people who have to have insulin day after day, for people who need certain kinds of drugs, for people who need glasses, for people who need homes because they are not able to care for themselves in their own homes or haven't got homes, and for people who need housing accommodation or hostel accommodation. It is that kind of service, and only that kind of service in the final analysis, that will give our people security in their old age.

It is a mistake to equate security for old people only with the matter of a pension. A pension is important, as I shall show in a few moments; but there is a much bigger question, and to loose sight of that bigger question is to neglect what is the important aspect. In some cases, giving people \$50, \$60 or \$70 a month will not meet their problem. If a man has arthritis, or has had a stroke, or needs to be in a nursing home where he can be cared for, fed and looked after day in and day out, month in and month out, for years on end, \$60 or \$70 a month is not going to meet his problem. We have to do something more for him. Or take a couple who are not able to look after themselves. They may not need to be in a nursing home, but they may need to be in some place where there is central feeding and where they can have a little room of their own. Unless we can provide those facilities and services, merely talking about 'upping' the old-age pension is not going to provide them with proper social security.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the member for Arm River has done his very best to confuse the whole picture with reference to old-age pensions. The point we have to keep in mind throughout all this discussion is that, if we are ever going to have proper health services and, eventually, proper social welfare services, and eventually proper health services in Canada, there has to be some clear-cut recognition of the respective responsibilities of respective levels of government.

The Liberal Party, both federally and provincially (Mr. Martin, the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare is a past-master at it) has been trying to blur that line as much as possible. One of the things we must stand firm on is that the line of demarcation between provincial and federal responsibility shall be maintained and kept clear. When we had a Federal-Provincial conference in 1951, we sat down with the federal authorities to discuss this whole business of looking after old people. We tried then to make the line of demarcation between federal and provincial responsibility. What was the Federal Government going to do? Well, first of all, they said that they were prepared to accept responsibility for those 70 years of age and over. They went so far as to ask the provincial governments to agree to an amendment to the British North America Act giving them sole jurisdiction with reference to those 70 years of age and over. We agreed to this. Mr. Speaker, they are not giving people 70 years and over \$40 a month. They are collecting it from every wage-earner, and out of everyone's salary or income. Every corporation, when it pays its corporation tax, pays 2 per cent into a fund to pay on this \$40 a month. The Federal Government asked for that jurisdiction; they got the power to collect the tax, and they pay that monthly allowance of \$40 a month.

Having accepted that responsibility, we thought that they should also accept the responsibility for looking after these people in other regards such as their health services, their housing and their nursing care. But they said, "No, no! That is the Provincial Governments' responsibility. The provincial governments can look after them in that respect. We will look after them insofar as the pension is concerned."

March 30, 1954

When we discussed the group 65 to 70 years of age the Federal Government said, "We are prepared to pay 50 per cent of a pension providing the provinces pay the other 50 per cent." (Before this, you will remember, we only paid 25 per cent and the Federal Government paid 75 per cent.) On this group they said, "We will go on a fifty-fifty basis." Again we thought they should make some contribution to help with nursing care, dental care, optometrical care and drugs; but they said, "No, that is a provincial responsibility." And that is a responsibility the provinces have had to assume.

My friend gets up and suggests that we should pay an additional supplementary allowance. We pay, it is true, \$2.50. Because we had been paying it before, we carried it on. When any member gets up and suggests that we pay a supplementary allowance to that group 70 years and over it means that we are simply supplementing what is acknowledged to be a federal responsibility. The Federal Government collects the tax and pays the pension. Under the British North America Act, it is their sole responsibility. Why should we step up and say, "You are not doing well enough here; we insist on paying another \$10 a month?"

Mr. Speaker, I am not denying for a moment that the people 70 and over need more than \$40 a month. But if they are going to get another \$1 a month as this amendment suggests they should, we say that the Federal Government, who collects the tax, should pay that \$10 a month. If we had enough money to pay another \$10 a month, I will tell the members where it should go. That extra \$10 a month, if we had it, ought to go to the people for whom we are responsible – the people 65 to 70, who do not get any medical care. We give them a hospital card, but we have not yet been able to give them medical, dental or optometrical care, and drugs. We want to do that, and we want to do it as quickly as possible. If we have that extra money we should be looking after our own responsibility, not insisting on looking after Ottawa's responsibility.

Gov't Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Our resolution suggests that we try to keep the line of demarcation clearly cut. It says to the Federal Government, in effect, "We think \$40 a month is inadequate, but since this is your field, you raise it to \$50. As for those 65 to 70 (a field which we occupy jointly) if you will agree to raise it to \$50, we will agree to pay our share of \$50 a month."

The member for Arm River, this morning, tried to skate all around that by saying, "Oh well, the Federal Government cannot do that because they would have to get the consent of all the provinces." Mr. Speaker, that is too ridiculous for even the member for Arm River; . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — . . . because, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. That was not what I said at all. I said that before the Ottawa government could increase the basic pension – I was speaking of the pension as it was before they took it over; the basic pension for 65 to 70; and the Premier is doing just what he used to do – mixing it up to try to distort the whole meaning of what anybody else says.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — He, over there, is having a very hard job of it, this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member has taken his point of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Arm River has mixed it up far beyond my power to add or detract. He had it so mixed up that nobody knew whether he was coming or going; but I am saying this, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You know, all right.

Premier Douglas: — . . .that the Federal Government can easily alter the basic pension for the group from 65 to 70; they do not need to consult the provinces. All they need to do is amend the legislation to provide that the Federal Government will pay 50 per cent of a pension or those 65 to 70 up to a maximum of \$50 a month. If some provinces only want to pay 50 per cent of \$40 a month, that is their business. We are saying, in this amendment, that the Saskatchewan Government is prepared to start, the moment Ottawa agrees. We will pay our share of 50 per cent of a \$50 a month pension.

My opposition friends are pleading with the wrong people. All they have to do is to persuade Mr. Martin. They seem to be able to carry on a correspondence with him. We have had a letter read to us today, written by him to Mr. Tucker. All they have to do is to ask Mr. Martin, at this session of Parliament., to extend the maximum pension paid to those 65 to 70 to \$50 a month. If they will do that, the Saskatchewan Government is prepared to pay 50 per cent of that pension.

But they don't do that! No, the member for Arm River says: "Let's not bother Ottawa; let's change it here; let's increase the supplementary here, and then we can talk to Ottawa afterwards." Mr. Speaker, do you know what Ottawa will say, if we do that? Mr. Martin will say, "Why should I raise the pension. It is true that we are only paying \$40, but the provinces are paying another \$10, and that makes \$50; and \$50 a month is a pretty good pension." All the provinces will do by raising their supplementary allowances is to give Ottawa an excuse to postpone increasing its pension. That is all they will do.

Mr. Loptson: — Is that what Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario are doing?

Premier Douglas: — Ontario isn't paying a \$10 supplementary allowance; but Alberta and British Columbia are, on a means test basis. There isn't any doubt in my mind that Mr. Martin is going to use the supplementary allowance paid by Alberta and British Columbia as an excuse for not raising the pension. And, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Such a lame excuse.

Premier Douglas: — . . . the same thing is true with those 65 to 70. If we pay a supplementary allowance to those people . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You can't get out that easy.

Premier Douglas: — . . . instead of waiting for the Federal Government to raise the maximum, what will happen? We will be paying \$30 and

March 30, 1954

the Federal Government will be paying \$20. Instead of being on the fifty-fifty basis that we agreed upon in 1951, we will be on a sixty-forty basis.

Mr. Danielson: — What silly reasoning.

Premier Douglas: — When we need to raise the pension again, we will be asked to raise it another \$10 and we will be paying \$40 and they will be paying \$20.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if there is going to be any continuation of a clear demarcation of the responsibility between the federal and the provincial governments, we must stick to the agreement we made in 1951. If Ottawa will raise the pension for those over 70, that is their responsibility. We will continue to do what we promised to do and that is to give those people health services and take care of those insofar as nursing care and housing, etc., is concerned. We will continue our responsibility for those 65 to 70. If Ottawa will raise the pension we will make our contribution to that increase, but we insist that it stay on a fifty-fifty basis. As we are able, we will provide health services for that group 65 to 70. That is our responsibility and that we are prepared to accept.

The strange thing about the Liberal members is that whenever something needs to be done, instead of turning to the Federal Government who have several hundred million dollars of a surplus and who are collecting a 2 per cent tax to look after these people and saying, "All right, you carry your share of the load," they turn to the Provincial Government here and say, "Here, you take the whole thing!" That is exactly what they have been trying to do here.

Mr. Danielson: — Silly!

Premier Douglas: — They are asking us to put the supplementary allowance for people who are a federal responsibility and to pay \$10 for those 65 to 70. They don't ask the Federal Government to put up anything, although the Federal Government pledged itself to pay 50 per cent.

Why did the member for Arm River, when he moved this resolution, ask that we pay \$10 to those 65 to 70? Why doesn't he ask the Federal Government to pay half of that \$10 increase? Is it because he knows the Federal Government are not prepared to do it? Or does he want to change the basis of fifty-fifty to sixty-forty?

Mr. Danielson: — What a silly thing to say!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — It's silly? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this province will know how silly it is. The member for Arm River said he is going to vote against this amendment.

Mr. Lopton: — We'll tell the people, too.

Premier Douglas: — He said he is going to vote against this amendment and I presume the Opposition are going to vote against it. I am prepared to tell the people of this province that the Opposition is voting against the Federal Government assuming his full responsibility for those 70

and over, and against increasing the pension to the people who are entitled to an increase in pension, and that these gentlemen opposite are opposed to the Federal Government, the Saskatchewan Government and any other provincial government wanting to increase the pension for those who are 65 to 70, by \$10 a month. That is what they are saying. They are not prepared to ask Ottawa to continue to maintain this fifty-fifty relationship. And of course, referring to the third part of the amendment, they are not prepared to support the idea that we continue to extend the ancillary services to old people, which are just as important as the pension.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this province will understand that, when Ottawa, sitting down in conference, assumed certain responsibility with reference to old-age pensioners, we have a right to expect that they will honour the commitments which they made. If the amount of pensions paid are no longer adequate, then the increase ought not to fall only on our partner to the agreement, but ought to fall on both partners to the agreement. We have indicated our willingness, as one of the partners, to assume an increased responsibility. The gentlemen, by voting against this amendment, are indicating that they do not think Ottawa ought to accept its share of that additional responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this amendment before we take a vote on it; and I would like to say these words for the purpose, if possible, of getting the hon. members opposite to vote for this amendment. Because I believe . . .

Mr. Lopton: — Hopeless.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . that they must recognize that it is in the best interests of Saskatchewan that we make a united appeal to the Federal Government to increase the pension to \$50 a month. There is no difference of opinion in this House that the people need that amount of pension — \$50 a month; and I think the thing to do is to make it unanimous and request the Federal Government to put these amendments into effect.

I was elected to this House back in 1938 and for six years I attended the sessions of this House with the hon. member for Arm River, and some of the other members who are now with me on this side of the House. I remember, back about 1943, after we had been there for five years — incidentally, we didn't have an election for six years that time, — the policy of the Liberal government of that day in regard to social welfare and pensions was generally recognized throughout the province as a pretty poor and niggardly affair. So, in 1943, the then Premier of the province, the Hon. Mr. Patterson, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Staines (who we see once in a while) moved, "That a Special Committee be appointed to inquire into social welfare legislation of Saskatchewan . . . Practical measures of further social security and health services, etc. . . . Means by which the costs of such services may be raised." I would like you to remember that particular sentence, Mr. Speaker, — "Means by which the costs of such services may be raised." Who was on the Special Committee? I turn over and I find that the Chairman was Mr. Hogarth, and the member of Arm River was a member of this Committee . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You're sure?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe), the member for Humboldt (Hon. Mr. Burton) and myself were also members of the Committee, together with a number of others.

March 30, 1954

That motion by the Premier of that day was debated in this House, the question being the setting up of a Committee to inquire into these things and after debate the motion was agreed to unanimously. In other words, the hon. member for Arm River and I agreed that a Committee should be set up to study these matters. The Committee met and then we come to April 12, 1943, and on motion of Mr. Hogarth, seconded by Mr. Johnston (that isn't you, Sir), it was ordered that the first report of the Select Special Committee on Social Welfare be now concurred in; and the report of the Chairman of the Committee was accepted in this House. In other words, the report of the Committee was agreed to unanimously.

Then I turn, in the Journals of 1943, and we have that report. It was the first report of the Committee, and I want you to remember again, Mr. Speaker, that particular point where the terms of reference of the Committee said: "The means by which the costs of such services may be raised." And we come to the report of the Committee. I shall not read it all, but I want to read some of the extracts that refer to pensions:

"Your Committee finds there is an urgent need of (a) immediate additional assistance to the aged and the blind."

Then it goes on to say:

"Your Committee therefore recommends to the consideration of the Government (1) that an immediate increase in pensions to the aged and the blind be granted."

And now what is the difference from that opinion? If we recognize that it is necessary, today, we certainly could not deny that it was necessary then.

We come now to the question of how they were going to take care of the costs. And this is what the hon. member for Arm River agreed to in the Committee:

"Your Committee would urge that the strongest possible pressure be brought to bear upon the Government of Canada to make adequate the pensions payable to the aged and blind, without delay."

Mr. Danielson: — Sure, I told you that.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Liberal Party arranged to have that Committee appointed in 1943 for the purpose of preparing an election manifesto, to go to the people of this province on the question of social welfare. But, Mr. Carl Stewart, the friend of the Liberals, came along with a Bill to extend the life of the Legislature, conveniently, and it was supported by the Liberals; and so they found they weren't going to have an election in 1943 and . . .

Mr. Danielson: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. repeated three times a week that it would be a crime to have an election in 1943.

Some Gov't Members: — Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. member has raised the

question, I would like to refer him to the Third Reading of Bill No. 13 of the Session of 1943, if I can put my finger on that in the Journals –

Mr. Danielson: — Take it as read.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — This is too good to take as read. My hon. friend asked for it. It is the Bill extending the life of the Legislature and I want to show the hon. member – it is on Third Reading of the Bill:

“Moved by Mr. Stewart: That Bill No. 13 – an Act to extend the Duration of the present Legislative Assembly, be now read a third time.

A debate arising, in amendment thereto, it was moved by Mr. Brockelbank, seconded by Mr. Hantleman that the word ‘now’ be struck out and the words ‘this day six months’ added at the end of the question.

The debate continuing, the question being put on the said amendment, it was negatived on the following division: . . .”

Mr. Danielson: — You wouldn’t have done that in 1942, would you?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Burton, Mr. Howe, myself and the other C.C.F. members voted for the amendment, which was a six-month’s hoist for the Bill; and I find Mr. Danielson listed with the ones for an extension of his own political life. That will settle that argument, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, when it was found there was no need to have an election in 1943, the Legislature decided that they would have a Committee continuing between the Session of 1943 and the Session of 1944 on this question of social welfare; and so a Committee did continue. Then when the 1944 Legislature met, the Special Select Committee of the Legislature on Social Welfare, etc., was reconstituted and the work of this intervening committee was referred to it, together with certain other motions. I have in my hand now the final report of the Select Special Committee, which was tabled in the House in 1944, on Thursday, March 30 – that is just exactly ten years ago today, isn’t it?

And here is one recommendation:

We come now to the question of how they were going to take care of the costs. And this is what the hon. member for Arm River agreed to in the Committee:

“That the Assembly go on record as favouring a general scheme of social security on a national basis and requests the Provincial Government to make representations in that behalf to the Federal Government.”

It is a different story altogether from what they have today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — There is nothing wrong with that at all.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Nothing wrong with it?

Mr. Danielson: — Not at all.

March 30, 1954

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It is entirely in line with the amendment which is before the House at this moment, and I am asking my hon. friend to support the amendment because it is in line with this . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Did you hear what I said?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and because it is right.

“The Committee recommends that the Federal Government be requested to set up a commission to inquire into . . .”

Now I imagine that was stepping around it all right, but it was the Federal Government they were asking to do things; and again:

“That pending the establishment of a contributory scheme of superannuation, the Assembly requests the Government to urge upon the Federal and other provincial governments that the pension for old-age and blind pensioners be increased . . .”

Nowhere did that Committee ever suggest to the government of that day that there should be a supplementary allowance.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — They were paying \$18 a month.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Nowhere, as far as I know, did they even suggest that they supply health services to the old-age pensioners. They asked the Federal Government to pay the pension; and today, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can unanimously ask the Federal Government to increase the pension.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make my position clear. This amendment should be clear to everyone in this House. It has been brought in here in order to throw this motion practically out of the House, or nullify it.

The hon. members opposite know very well that it is not likely that the Federal Government is going to change their Act at the request of one province in the Dominion, because they do not figure that one out of 10 provinces is enough for them to justify changing the Act . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Doesn't the Federal Liberal Party believe in increasing it?

Mr. Loptson: — They believe in democracy; they do not believe in dictatorship. They believe in a general majority request before they go and take action.

Premier Douglas: — Aren't there enough Liberal members in Ottawa to change it without . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Liberal members? That is a silly thing for a Premier to say. Can you imagine that? The Premier says that the Liberal members in Ottawa are going to control all the provinces in Canada – is that what he means?

Premier Douglas: — They can change the Act.

Mr. Loptson: — If they change the Act then they should have requests from the majority of the provinces in Canada. All hon. members know that, and when you pass this amendment here, you are just throwing it out the window, that is what you are going to do. I would like to see some action. If my hon. friends are prepared to pay the extra \$2.50 that they would have to pay if this amendment was acted upon – you are paying \$2.50 now, do you propose to pay an extra \$5 in case that went through? Or do you just mean to add \$2.50 to the present \$2.50 that you are paying?

Premier Douglas: — My friend is confused. On the pension which we share with Ottawa, there is no supplementary at the present time.

Mr. Loptson: — Quite so.

Premier Douglas: — So, if Ottawa would raise the pension from \$40 to \$50, that would be a \$10 increase of which we would pay half.

Mr. Loptson: — And all you would be increasing your contribution by would be \$2.50, because you are paying \$2.50 now.

Premier Douglas: — No, there is no supplementary being paid now, to those between 65 and 70.

Mr. Loptson: — But this doesn't particularly refer to the group between 65 and 70. It refers to those who need it, on a means test, whether they are over 70, or over 65; as I understand the motion. It doesn't single out those between 65 and 70.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege. I think this should be made clear, Mr. Speaker: For the group 70 years and over, we are, by the resolution, required to pay an additional \$7.50.

Mr. Loptson: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — For the group between 65 and 69, we are required, by the original resolution, to pay \$10 a month; and for the blind we are required to pay an additional \$7.50 a month.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes. And you don't want to do that; but you say you are prepared to pay another \$5 – is that correct? That is what the Premier said. I understood that you were only prepared to pay \$2.50, that is, in addition to what you are paying now. Now the Premier says that you are prepared to pay another \$5 – that makes \$7.50.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I am prepared to compromise, and reduce it to what these hon. members are prepared to pay an extra \$5 I would say the logical thing to do is to amend this resolution and bring it down to \$7.50 instead of \$10; and let us have action. If you won't do that, then it is my privilege, and I am going to vote against the amendment for the simple reason that it means the shelving of the whole thing. On the other hand, I will vote for the motion as amended, just on the same basis as my hon. friend said – even knowing that it doesn't mean anything.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was agreed to, on division, by 32 votes against 10.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to unanimously.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Moved by Mr. Kohaly, seconded by Mr. MacNutt:

“That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan the withdrawal of the Government Insurance Office, effective April 1, 1955, from the field of Automobile Insurance insofar as it concerns provisions as to collision, fire and theft; and that a comparable adjustment in the rates of premiums be established correctly reflecting the cost of providing public liability protection as it now exists and property damage on the basis of \$100 deductible.”

Mr. Robert Kohaly (Souris-Estevan):

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I found myself unable to take part in the debate that has just closed, mostly because I had very little knowledge about the political events over the past ten years in the province of Saskatchewan. However, there is one matter that I think has occurred over the last few years which I am very interested in, and of which I have some slight knowledge. That is this question of automobile insurance. You will recall that, on the first occasion I had an opportunity to speak in this House, I took that opportunity to discuss some things that I thought were not proper in the field of the automobile insurance, and as this is possibly the last occasion on which I will have an opportunity to debate formally, I want to discuss this matter of automobile insurance once again.

I have taken some care in wording the resolution in order not to find myself in difficulty on the question of the wording. I also am aware of the statement of the Minister in charge of this particular branch, that certain steps are taken each year on in the months of December and January (which is well known to be before the period that we meet in this House), in connection with this automobile insurance. Therefore I thought it necessary to put it on the Order Paper in the form of a resolution.

I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am asking for the consideration of this Government to this policy. I am not asking that we immediately get out of the field in its entirety, but that certain steps be taken as of the 1st of April in 1955. I am asking not that the entire Automobile Insurance scheme should be scrapped, because I am not doing that. I have found in my slight experience (not in this House) that it is often better to narrow your field and hope to contain your debate on that narrow field. I find that sometimes, even when on a narrow field, in this House, we find ourselves on a much wider field. But I am hoping, once again, that by narrowing the field, we can come to some decision, and I have narrowed the field not to the entire sphere of the Automobile Insurance, but to the question of collision, fire and theft in the first instance. I have not taken in public liability or property damage.

I suppose, if debate continues, it will be belaboured from one side to the other, and the discussions will involve property damage and public liability. However, I am dealing only with the portion of the Automobile Insurance concerning collision, fire and theft insofar as withdrawing those protections from the Act.

The second part is that then, having once withdrawn those three groups, the remaining privileges or benefits be put on a proper business basis. That is to say that the benefits insofar as public liability and property damage are concerned (there are the other two coming in now) be charged for at a proper rate. That is the whole basis of the resolution. I propose not to discuss it at any great length except to point out to you that this is something of interest to all of the people of our province who are involved with automobiles.

It is universal, not only from that point of view, but from the fact that it is compulsory to those who have automobiles and who present themselves for licence. Therefore, it is even more important that we, as the representatives of all these people, discuss it and discuss it now, so that it can be put into effect in the years to come. I submit that, if you remove the provisions as to collision, fire and theft and put the rates on a proper basis insofar as the provisions of public liability and property damage are concerned, you can run it on a good business basis.

I have read the reports of certain committees who came to the province of Saskatchewan from outside of our borders, and they made certain statements, and the press made certain comments and have done so continuously. I do not propose to refer to any of these commissions or boards or groups who came to this province and reviewed the system. I am particularly interested as it is today, and as an individual who is charged with a portion of the responsibility of watching such things as this. I am not going to read those reports; they are better known to many of the members of the House than they are to me.

I am submitting that, if we do these things that I am asking here, you could put it onto a good business basis. We are not going to find it creating profits of a million dollars (shall we say) in any given period of time, and then at the next stage find losses of a million dollars. That is not the way to run a business. You run a business on a sound, business basis. You look it over, find out what you can provide for how much, and then you start to run it: not a million 'in the hole' and then a million profit in alternate periods of time.

That is what seems to have happened in connection with the Insurance business and I submit that, if we can take out the non-social benefits (and here can be no argument for collision, fire and theft being social) this insurance scheme will work. It will work well and work for the benefit of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We will leave in there some of the things that should be there, that is to say, the social protection. But take out those things which are only private, and nothing else.

There can be no argument that public liability and property damage are spheres where social legislation, if you wish, should be enacted. No argument about that at all. It is certainly true that those people in the province of Saskatchewan who are driving automobiles should be required to reimburse anyone who they injure through their fault and negligence and, goodness knows, there are enough people being injured either personally, or their families, or their property, and we should certainly see that those people have insurance so that at least the survivors, who are at no fault whatsoever, will have some financial compensation. I believe that the public liability and the property damage provisions are good legislation. Those who brought them in should be commended for bringing them in at that time, and for continuing to have them there. I hope they will continue to keep them there until they have some good reasons, unknown to me today, why they should take them out.

Those two items should stay in there, but what about the other three? They never should have been there in the first place if it was intended to be social legislation. Collision has nothing possibly to do with anybody except the individual driver himself. I don't think the argument can possibly be stretched to include anyone else except the individual driver himself. If I take my car and I want to roll it on a curve through negligence or lack of ability, that's my problem, as far as the money is concerned. It is strictly my problem, and I am going to have to fix that car up or take it to the junk yard and be without an automobile until such time as I am able to provide another for myself. I don't think that any argument can possibly be stretched to say that you should have to pay for any portion of that vehicle of mine, none whatsoever. If that is the case, then it cannot possibly be a social problem and one for social legislation.

Fire and theft are not large incidents, I submit in the insurance scheme. It is not a regular thing for an automobile to burn. They do burn; we have had losses. I don't say there is no such thing happening; we do encounter it, but it is highly unusual. When it does happen, it is the responsibility of the person who owns the vehicle, or who has custody of the vehicle who is the registered holder of the certificate.

On the collision, I submit that in most accidents you have collision damage and property damage. Those are the two items that are primarily involved. We received some information in this House in Committee that, by increasing the deductible under the property damage, there was some hope that approximately a half million dollars would be saved. Therefore, I assume that the collision saving from \$100 to \$200 deductible will be about the same – a saving of half a million dollars. In addition to that, if you strike out collision altogether, you must have some saving in excess of half a million dollars, because there is that other hundred dollars gone. I feel that on that basis alone, taking out collision would put it on a fairly even average basis where it will just about pay for itself.

I don't think there is any suggestion that the Automobile Insurance, being compulsory, should be there for a profit purpose. I don't think it is there for that purpose, and, therefore, if you took the collision out, just on sound business basis, it would indicate that the scheme would break even, because it went in the hole some \$400,000 (if memory serves me right) during the last year, and with a saving of something in excess of \$500,000 you must break even on it, assuming that all other factors were equal in ensuing years.

I realize that public liability – and I am admitting here and now and I hope I am not faced with the argument on public liability, that it should not be there; I believe it should be there. We certainly have to protect those people who are walking and driving on our streets, from irresponsible drivers. There is no arguing that, and the only way we can be sure that they are responsible is by insisting that, when they purchase the right to drive a motor vehicle, they also purchase protection for me, the other driver, or me, the pedestrian on the street. The public liability protection is good, is being administered fairly, and is providing the protection which the people of the province require and should have. I don't believe that anyone can say I am opposed to public liability protection from that statement, or from any other statement I have ever made. I believe it must remain in, and should continue there until such time as we find a better way of protecting the innocent on the highways.

Property damage is something that can happen to me through no fault of my own. I could have property damage as I stand here today speaking in this

House by someone bashing into my motor vehicle parked in front of the buildings. That is no responsibility of mine; but I have a right as a citizen of this province to see that the man who did that compensates me for that damage caused by his negligence. I have that right, and that is a social problem, and I agree that it should have been there. It is there; it should continue there, and I don't think anyone should say that I am against property damage, because I am not. I am in favour of that remaining there, and I will certainly vote, if the opportunity is ever accorded me, to keep it there; or, if it is taken out, to put it back there. It should remain. I feel that the people of our province who are not acquainted with the methods of legislation and 'big business' want it there, and that it is our duty to see that it stays there.

The collision – I must come back to it for a moment – is a most expensive thing. Our Provincial Treasurer has told us that the cost of replacement of the high-priced parts of motor vehicles today has risen tremendously, and I agree. We realize that. I realize that they are putting more and more parts on these motor vehicles which can be broken easier, and that that cost is driving up the total cost to the insurance plan. We also are aware that there are increasing numbers of motor vehicles driving an increasing number of hours and miles on our highways, and that will drive up the total cost. But one of the greatest reasons for an increase and the amount of dollars it is costing us is a combination of the bright lights on these brand new lovely cars, together with a driver who is all 'lit up'. When those two factors join, then you have a new claim by way of collision damage against your accident fund. That is one of the problems. That is that man's problem who wants to get all lit up. Let him get lit up and the next day let him pay up. Don't divide the cost with me and with the next man in this province. Let him pay the cost and pay it all; it is fair that he should. Then he will remember the next time when he gets lit up he will stay out of an automobile and not be expecting me to handle part of his damages.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the question of rates as compared with the rates in private competing companies. I think the rates are getting quite close to each other. The rate at one time was very low in this province. Experience dictated that it was necessary to put it up, and with that I have no quarrel except that it cuts just to a point (and that point is today) where the people of this province feel that it is no longer of the value that it was intended to have. It is no longer of that value because of this unnecessary weight that we have been dragging along, and the rates can be properly adjusted so that the people of this province will be prepared to accept, and thankfully, the rates and premiums that will only be necessary when those parts of the scheme are done away with that we should not have in there at all.

This Automobile Accident Insurance Act has certainly done one thing and that is, it has shown some of the private companies who made, I think, unwarranted profits from automobile insurance in years gone by, that they must get their rates down to a proper level. They have brought them down, and they are competing, and they are providing services that we require. I think that this will be a lesson to them that they must not attempt to collect more than is fair and proper for their services.

That purpose of the Automobile Accident Insurance has been served and there is no reason, on that basis, to continue with the protection in the Act which is not fit and proper on the social basis. The increased rates and the decreased benefits have almost destroyed the Act in the eyes of the average citizen, and after all that is where the Act must finally receive its sanction. You can legislate all you want and say you must take it, but sooner or later,

if it is something that the people will not generally accept, you are going to have to accept their decision and we might just as well do it now, because there is a tremendous body of opinion forming against this. It is not good, and it is up to us to make the necessary changes. That is what I am asking this Government at this time to do.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, concerning present coverage to the old automobile owner; that is, the owner of an automobile which is not a new one. Various members have indicated that the old automobile owner has no protection; others say he has protection if he is killed or injured or if he kills or injures someone else. Both arguments are correct. The fact remains, however, that the man who owns a motor vehicle which through depreciation has deteriorated in value has, with the \$200 deductible clause collision and property damage both, nothing left whatsoever. I can envisage, through my own experience, a citizen of this province who was a policy holder making a claim where he could be told, "We admit your vehicle is a total wreck, but there will be no payment out to you because, through depreciation, there is no value left over and above the deductible provision." Not impossible by a long way. As you drive up and down these roads you will see cars approach you which will not possibly qualify for a \$200 deductible if they were destroyed.

So the Act is not doing that for which it was possibly intended, and that was to protect the average person and his property in case of damage being done. There are many who are on the road today who are not financially responsible and, as far as the property damage is concerned, the deductible must be brought down so that I, through no fault of my own, do not lose too much. Right now I am going to lose \$200. I am going to lose \$200 each and every time someone who is judgment-proof runs into my motor vehicle. I cannot collect that; it's impossible; he hasn't got anything. I can get a judgment against him; I can take him to court. All that will happen is that the Highway Traffic Board will say, "You will not have an operator's licence; we'll take away your certificate of registration until you do pay the judgment,; and so he makes an application to the Court – as we have had – that he pays \$2 a month for the period of time that it will take him to pay off the \$200 or \$300 that is involved.

When do I get my money? Well, I repair my own car, and yet I have protection, supposedly, and so has he. Everybody has protection in Saskatchewan; but what is the quality of the protection, Mr. Speaker? I am asking that, if you make the changes that I am suggesting here, you will have protection in the province of Saskatchewan, and it will be a good quality, and we can be proud of it, and we can afford to pay it, and we will pay it and we will be happy and fortunate to have it – but not the way it is now. There is nothing wrong with certain parts of it, but it is just not properly fashioned at this particular stage. I submit there have been some suggestions that the question of negligence will arise and so on. Negligence always arises in automobile accidents, with the exception of cases where someone rams into a telephone pole all by himself. But whenever you have more than one individual involved, you have a question of negligence right off the bat, and it is a difficult question.

Now there is going to be litigation; there has been litigation ever since we had the \$100 deductible in there, because if I feel that I was not the one at fault, then I am going to sue the other fellow if he is not going to be judgment-proof. I will sue him, and that is litigation. But now you have got it up to \$200. I have got to sue him for the first \$200 and that, Sir, is litigation, and I might point out that there is a considerable difference between the cost of litigation in the \$100-bracket and in the \$200-bracket.

The \$100-bracket is not nearly as expensive; there is a system provided in our courts where it is a small debts procedure. But the \$200 is the same as a \$1,200 claim; it goes to the District Court for trial. And that is where it is now. I have to sue that man in the District Court with the accompanying cost, the accompanying litigation that we have heard so much about, to decide the question of negligence. There are going to be lots of them and that isn't a good thing. That is one of the reasons why I have put on the last line of my resolution that the property damage be placed on the basis of \$100-deductible. It could possibly be reduced below that if circumstances warrant it in the future.

There is one thing I am suggesting that is becoming increasingly obvious, and that is that you take out the collision and leave in the property damage. There is another good reason for that. It is highly unusual for any one organization to act for the two clients who are involved in the an automobile accident. But in the province of Saskatchewan when you have collision and property damage both in your plan, as you have here today, then when there is a collision between two vehicles, you have the same organization acting for both men, the question of negligence does not enter at all. I can be the negligent one and receive full payment for my damage under today's provisions and the innocent party receives the same thing for his vehicle. Now, there is no question of proper driving at all. It is just 'were you injured – to the extent of how many dollars?' and we pay it less \$100 or \$200 deductible, as the case may be. It is a highly unusual situation and it is not a healthy one.

Usually in provinces other than our own there are more than one insurance company involved and each insurance company attempts to keep its particular loss down to a minimum. But there is no possibility of that in the province of Saskatchewan because it is the same insurance company acting for both parties who have experienced loss. That is another reason (not too strong) why we should get rid of one or the other, and it is obvious that the one that should go is the collision, for reasons that I have given earlier.

I propose to take no longer, Mr. Speaker, except to draw to your attention that it seems that each sponsor of a resolution in this House, assuming that those on the same side will support it, implores those opposite to vote for the resolution and make it unanimous. I have also found that such a request meets with only limited success, and so I am not going to ask that everyone support this. I am asking you only to do one thing – just to read the 9 or 10 lines that are involved here, see whether you believe that they should be done, see whether you can support it and if you feel, in conjunction with those people who from day to day express their opinions to you in your own constituencies whether or not these things should be done, then, if so, support it. If you find that this is not the wish of the people of your area, then the only thing you can do is not support it. And with that I am satisfied.

I propose to support the resolution, of course. I feel that it is a good suggestion. I feel that it is free from politics. I feel that there are many people in our province who wish this. I feel that it is something that has to come sooner or later, and I think that it deserves the support of those who will just look at the wording of the resolution. The words that are there have no hidden meaning; there is no 'political trickery' intended, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing except the 10 lines that are there, and the intent that has been expressed today. And with that, I propose to move, seconded by Mr. MacNutt, the resolution as it stands on the Order Paper.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words. I was very glad to get the assurance from the hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) that there was no 'hidden meaning' and no 'political trickery' in this resolution. He started out, this afternoon, by telling us that he had taken some care in the wording of this resolution so as not to be in any difficulty. I am going to suggest to him that he will have to take a great deal more care in future in wording his resolutions unless we can attribute to him that there is political trickery as the motive behind it.

May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution on the Order Paper has nothing whatsoever to do with the arguments that have been advanced by the speaker, this afternoon. He has been talking about proposed amendments to The Saskatchewan Government Automobile Insurance Act. That is what he has been talking about, but I cannot find in the resolution any reference whatsoever to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. I find here that the hon. gentleman is recommending the consideration of the Government of the province for the withdrawal of the Government Insurance Office, effective April 1, 1955, from the field of automobile insurance insofar as it concerns provisions as to collision, fire and theft.

In other words, if that resolution carried, we would be out of business. We would not be able to sell a single dollar's worth of collision insurance, fire insurance and theft insurance in the insurance office. I am sure my hon. friend doesn't mean that, but that is what his resolution says. He is asking the government to withdraw from the field of automobile insurance in these three fields.

May I point out that, last year, over the counter we sold a total of private passenger package policies of \$845,000; farm trucks, \$107,000; standard policies in Saskatchewan, \$423,000 and other automobile insurance, making a total of \$1,767,000 sold over the counter and by mail during the last year. And now the hon. gentleman in this resolution proposes that we withdraw completely from the field of automobile insurance insofar as collision, fire and theft is concerned. So, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he was not very careful in drafting his resolution, and I think he will be the first to agree that he was not very careful at all, but could certainly be accused of gross carelessness in this particular instance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I am not going to debate the resolution. I am going to debate what the hon. member had in mind, what he intended and along the lines that he spoke, this afternoon. May I submit to him that probably the easiest way to have got at this would have been to bring a Bill into the House to delete those sections from the Act. At any time, he has it within his power to bring a Bill in to delete the sections pertaining to collision, and to fire and theft and, of course, the Bill need not be effective until April 1, 1955. He could have accomplished his purpose just as well in that way.

The hon. member pointed out that it is not fair to compel people to take out collision insurance, to take out fire insurance, to take out theft insurance. Earlier this afternoon we were talking about old-age pensions. I might argue that it is unfair that I should have to pay to the Dominion Government 2 per cent not only on my income tax, but on my sales tax on everything I buy, in order to make provision for an old-age pension of \$40 per month. I may object to that on the grounds that I will look after my own security. I might object, Mr. Speaker, to paying unemployment insurance, if I am a workman. I might object on the grounds that I will take a chance on that, and will be

prepared to look after myself when I am unemployed. I might object, if I were a farmer, to paying the one per cent on my wheat under P.F.A.A., on the grounds that I never get crop failures, and if I do get crop failures that I can look after them myself. But these are all things that are today the law of this country. They are not provincial law; every one of them is Federal law compelling people to pay something for a protection for the individual whether or not he believes he wants it or needs it.

When we introduced this Bill in 1946, I remember the criticism at the time that went up all over the country. I want to congratulate my hon. friend for the very fair statement he made in connection with his resolution, this afternoon. I am glad that he now agrees that the public liability and property damage sections are fair. He did not say anything about the accident, but I take it that he believes that that is fair too, because he isn't suggesting it should be removed. But I remember in 1946 when this bill was introduced – and I have here a quotation from the 'Leader-Post' of February 27th. What did they say at that time? This 'Leader-Post' that now says, "The principle of automobile insurance is fine. The original principle is wonderful. Public liability is excellent; property damage too, but we cannot go along with collision insurance, fire insurance and theft insurance." What did the 'Leader-Post' say in 1946? They said this:

"The Douglas Government can call it social insurance, accident insurance or simple compensation from now till doomsday, but to the motorist who will be compelled to pay the shot, the new Automobile Accident Insurance Bill now before the Legislature can hardly be regarded as otherwise than a straight boost in taxation. Only the motorist is being called upon to pay. To the rest of the population it is lollipops for free."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the 'Leader-Post' in 1946. Yet, today, the 'Leader-Post' is right behind it. The same is true of the former member for Moosomin who said it was the 'greatest hoax every perpetrated upon the people of this province', and the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who said that he was against it, and that 80 per cent of the people (or was it 90 per cent of the people?) of this province were against it, too. Today, these people are all saying that this was a fine thing as it was originally introduced.

Why did we put the 'collision' into it in 1947? Well, I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. It was because there was such a demand throughout the length and breadth of this province that we couldn't do anything but put it into effect. I am going to tell you something else: If we took it out on April 1, 1955, there would be such a demand on the part of the general public that we would be forced to be back into it inside of a year. Why do I say that? Because, if we got out of the field of collision insurance and left it to the companies to sell insurance to those who wanted to take it, we would have the same situation as exists in other provinces.

My hon. friend says that private companies today are charging lower rates; they have been cutting their rates down. Mr. Speaker, when I see the rates that are being charged by the private companies, I wonder. For example, today we find – you can take an old 1952 car if you like. Today with our package policy it costs \$52 for coverage. Today the Underwriters' Association charge for that same protection in the rural areas of the province \$115.80 and in the cities \$131.55

I cannot agree with my hon. friend when he says the rates are very close today. I could give him a great many rates. I have rates here, for example the Wawanesa, which is a very popular company and which has been quoted from time to time in this House. I could show you, for example, there – \$150 deductible, where they start right off in the cities with a rate of \$33 and you cannot use that car for business purposes unless you pay an additional 70 per cent. You cannot use it if you have a young fellow under 25 years of age in the family, unless you are prepared to pay an additional 50 per cent, and you cannot have more than two drivers unless you are prepared to add 10 per cent for each of the additional drivers. You cannot get it either, Mr. Speaker, if you have had any accident in the last three years, and you must have had at least one year's driving experience. When you take those rates and compare them with ours, you will see just how expensive it would be.

I again must object to the statement that was made again today in referring to the old cars. The hon. member said that the owner of the old vehicle that you often see when you are driving on the road has nothing left whatsoever because of the \$200 deductible. I want again to point out that every one of those people have the benefits of the accident plan, and those benefits are just as important to them as to the person with the very latest model car. They have the benefits of the public liability of \$10,000 to \$20,000. They have the benefits of the property damage up to \$2,000. They do have those benefits the same as everyone else. My hon. friend says that those people have nothing left whatsoever and yet, in this resolution, he is trying to do the very same thing for all the rest of the motorists of this province. He is trying to put them in the position where they will have nothing left whatsoever unless they go out and insure their car privately.

He said the Act is not doing what it was intended to do. I want to disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. I think the Act is doing what it was intended to do. When the Act was designed originally in 1947, it was designed to provide collision insurance with \$100 deductible. We are now in the year 1954. The \$100 deductible today has been raised to \$200; but, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the value of the \$100 in 1947 was not a great deal different from the value of the \$100 today. In other words, the person is today still getting a great deal more protection than they were getting in 1947 in many respects, because in 1947 the maximum amount of his claim on a new car would be probably \$1,800 or \$2,000, whereas today that self-same car cost in the neighbourhood of \$3,000; the person is actually getting more protection today than he was in 1947.

I think the hon. member for Souris-Estevan unwittingly put his finger right on the nut of the whole thing in his closing remarks when he talked about negligence and pointed out that negligence always arises in an automobile accident. It always arises; there is no question about that. It is particularly true when there is more than one car involved. Where there is one car and a fellow goes around a corner too fast, of course, that is negligence on his own part; but whenever two cars get involved in an accident, there is negligence on the part of one or the other of the drivers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we did not have collision insurance, but were just going to have a few of our people insured, let us look back at the record we had in 1944. At that time I made a survey and found that one car out of seven in this province was insured; fifteen per cent of the people was all that carried insurance at that time. Now, if we go back to another condition of that kind and we do not have all cars insured for collision, then we are going to have a lawsuit in connection with every accident that occurs on the highways.

If I were a lawyer I, too, would want to see the collision taken out and have it on the basis of the public liability an property damage. The lawyers would have a field day; they would have a field day. In every accident you would have to get the parties together to try to get the proof as to which one was going to be responsible in order that they could collect from the other party under the public liability section or under the property damage section, as the case may be. Here today the matter of responsibility is not as important, although I grant you, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to be twice as important this year as it was last year, because of the \$200 deductible instead of the \$10 deductible.

I would like to say that today we are placing more of the responsibility upon the persons involved in the accident – the drunken driver, for example, that was spoken of, who takes his car out and gets it smashed up. He today is going to have to accept the responsibility for the first \$200 to his own vehicle and, if he smashes into another car, then of course he will be responsible for the first \$200 there, so that he is having to accept \$400 of responsibility today. If, of course, he has property damage with only \$100 deductible, or no deductible, then the drunken driver would get off scot-free. He would be able to have the insurance office pay the claim for him, if he was charged with being responsible for the other fellow's damages. Then, of course, if there was not deductible, he wouldn't have to pay anything. If there is \$100 deductible, he would only have to pay \$100, whereas today he must pay \$200. So, at least to that degree, we are making the drunken driver, the careless, reckless driver, pay a great deal more.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to agree with my hon. friend in one statement and that is that collision charge is costly. It is costly; there is no question about it. Since the Act went into effect in 1946 we have paid out in benefits \$16 million (that is, within \$5,000 of \$16 million), and of that \$16 million, \$10,773,000 has been paid out on collision claims. But if we had not had collision, I want to assure the members of this House that we would have paid out a great deal more in the public liability and property damage sections. As it is we have only paid out \$611,000 compared with \$10,773,000. But if we did not have collision and retained the property damage, instead of that being \$611,000 it would be many, many times that amount. We would not be saved the full amount of what we are paying out today in collision claims. A great deal of that would be paid under the other category.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because the people of this province have, on two occasions since collision insurance was put into effect, had an opportunity to tell what they think of it and have endorsed it overwhelmingly, and because the people want that insurance, as far as I am concerned I must vote against this motion. While we have had some difficulties and have had to increase our rates, yet I am happy to be able to announce to the members of this House, today, that for the last three months in a row we have been able to reduce the number of accidents on our highways, and that is having a very fine effect in the Insurance Office. I am confident that this increase in rates will stop and the reverse trend will be true very shortly. I am just optimistic enough to believe that we are going to be able to do something even next year, certainly in two years; but I hope we will be able to do something next year to get these rates back again.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is really no need to delay the debate. I know that, at this time of the day, members get tired of the sound of one person's voice. They have already listened to one voice for 105 minutes today, and

March 30, 1954

I don't want to weigh the people that way. So I do hope that the members will reject this motion and will keep the Government Insurance Office intact. I hope my friend realizes the implication of what I have said about the wording of this motion, that this has nothing to do with The Automobile Accident Insurance Act; it is simply to drive the Insurance Office out of the whole field of automobile insurance.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I believe that the point of the hon. Provincial Treasurer is well taken, that it was not the intention of the mover that the Insurance Office should go out of the insurance business altogether on collision insurance or fire insurance. For that reason, if he would like to proceed with the motion, it might be well if he held it up and redrafted it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I think we know what he meant though.

Mr. Loptson: — How do you know what he meant? He did not mean that you would go out of the writing of insurance policies, but that you would withdraw from the compulsory feature.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. All the member needs to do is if someone would move to insert the word 'compulsory' before 'automobile insurance' — "from the field of 'compulsory' automobile insurance" insofar as it concerns provisions as to collision, fire and theft. If the word 'compulsory' were put in there it would convey what is meant by the hon. member. If it could be amended.

Mr. Loptson: — We would have to adjourn the debate until that is corrected.

Premier Douglas: — That can be moved by anyone who wants to move it.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, but I mean it would have to be prepared and it would be held up for that purpose. Would it be in order?

Mr. Speaker: — Finish the question.

Mr. Loptson: — Would it be in order to adjourn the debate?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no!

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, I'll move the amendment then; that the word 'compulsory' be inserted in the motion so that it will. . .

Premier Douglas: — At the beginning of the fourth line before the word 'Automobile' . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, I think, Mr. Speaker, if we put after 'provisions' — 'from the field of automobile insurance insofar as it concerns provisions in The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.'

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to move the amendment as suggested by the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Wait a minute. Order! Let's get his thing in order. Who will second the amendment? The Clerk is making it out.

Mr. McDonald: — There is just one question I wanted to ask, Mr. Speaker, and that is that it would only apply to the compulsory . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — There is no such thing as compulsory insurance. We talk about it, but it is The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. That is the official name of it.

Mr. McDonald: — If you insert it, as you suggested, Mr. Minister, then that is going to cover all automobile insurance.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, as concerns provisions in The Automobile Accident Insurance Act as to collision, fire and theft.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that we are not suggesting the amendment. Even if it is amended, I propose to vote against it. We are just trying to have the resolution say what the mover wanted it to say.

Mr. Speaker: — Have I any amendments before me?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The motion was introduced to the House, and the mover of the motion has said nothing of his intentions.

Mr. McCarthy: — I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Lopton:

That the following words be inserted after the word "provisions" in the fourth line:

"in The Automobile Accident Insurance Act."

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before you put the question I want to point out that those of us on this side who want to see the motion amended so as to convey the meaning which I understand the mover had in mind when he drafted it, will have to vote for this amendment. I should like to put it clearly on the record so that as far as I am concerned, the voting for this amendment does not mean that I intend to support the motion as amended or that I am in favour of the amendment for any other purpose than correcting that motion to bring it into line with the views expressed by the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly).

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The mover of the motion has not indicated yet as to whether or not his intentions are as stated in the amendment and that is why we are directing this motion.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Minister of Agriculture's point is well taken. Was the intention the hon. mover of the motion had, the interpretation as given by the Minister? Was that his interpretation or was it as it was in the original?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, after a motion has been duly moved and placed on the Order Paper, it is the property of the House. Any member in this House can get up and make any amendment he likes to it, so long as it

March 30, 1954

relates to the business of the House. I don't think the Minister of Agriculture has any point at all.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We're just putting words in the hon. member's mouth.

Mr. McDonald: — He can vote against it.

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment has been moved and properly seconded, and it is now signed. The debate is now on the amendment.

Mr. Dewhurst (Wadena):

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very amusing when this motion is amended to see what hon. members opposite will do. When we had this Automobile Accident Insurance Act before this House in Committee, a motion was moved that would do this thing in part — not wait till next year, you could do it this year; and all the members opposite voted against it when they had the chance to do what this is asking for when amended. So it should be most amusing to see what they will do, Mr. Speaker. Personally, I would not support the motion in its original form or as amended.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was negatived by voice vote.

The question being put on the main motion, it was negatived on recorded division by 34 votes against 11.

EDUCATION POLICY MOTION

Moved by Mr. McDonald and seconded by Mr. Loftson:

“That this Assembly recommends that the Government give consideration to the immediate implementation of the C.C.F. platform for financing education as laid down in a broadcast by the Rev. T.C. Douglas and reported in the Saskatchewan Commonwealth of March 10, 1943, page 8, as follows:

The first thing which a C.C.F. Government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility for the Provincial Government. There has been a tendency on the part of the Provincial Government to ‘pass the buck’ to the municipalities and local school boards for maintaining our educational facilities. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the Provincial Government and it cannot be passed to any other body.”

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin):

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but this is a very short and brief motion asking the Government who sit in the Chamber today to fulfill a promise which they made to the people of this province when they were but a political party. I think probably we can dispose of it by 6 o'clock.

My purpose in moving the motion, Mr. Speaker, is to find out if the Government of the day still believes in the promises which they made to the people of this province when they were seeking office prior to 1944. If they do still believe in this particular promise, then I would like to know when they intend to fulfill the promise as made at that time.

I think it has been pointed out earlier in this House that the present Government of this province are paying approximately 20 per cent of the total cost of education and that is approximately the same percentage that has been paid down through the years by the different governments who sat in this province. I believe there are other provincial governments throughout Canada who are paying as high as 50 per cent of the total cost of education. I think it is rather interesting to note that from the budget address which was delivered in this House sometime ago, we can see that approximately 17 per cent of the total budget is being spent for educational purposes, which is less than one per cent more than was spent by the previous Liberal government in 1944.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the promise which is contained in this motion was a good one and that is that the educational system of this province ought to be financed from the general revenues of the province and not be financed, as it is today, from grants from the general revenue and some revenue from the Education Tax and some from the municipal mill rate. It seems to be the opinion of many people who sit on the opposite side of this House today, that we are heading into a recession. That being the case, I think it is fairly obvious that two forms of revenue which we are using today for educational purposes, namely, the Education Tax and municipal tax for schools, will drop, and it is only a day or two ago that the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) told us the trouble they were having in this area in collecting the municipal taxes. If we are entering into a recession probably the difficulty they are having in that area will spread to many areas of the province, which means that, if municipalities are unable to collect their taxes, probably our school system is going to be one of the first services to suffer the results of a recession in this province.

I think it is only fair to state that, if we enter into a recession, the revenues from the Education and Hospitalization Tax are going to drop, and there again that is going to cause less money to come into the hands of the schools throughout our province. Probably they are going to be faced with less money in the future and consequently be unable to carry on with the work that they are attempting to do today. That is why I stated that I think our school system ought to be financed in its entirety from the general revenues as promised and suggested in this motion. Therefore I wish to move this motion.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, this is a promise made by this Party when they were seeking office, the Party which later became and is now the Government of this province. I don't think that the motion needs to be amended by any side of the House. I am only asking: do the C.C.F. Party and this Government still believe in this? If so, when do they intend to implement the promises of that day?

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that such a resolution from the other side of the House would suggest what any government should do in this province, after the record which they left in 1944 in the field of education.

March 30, 1954

Mr. Loptson: — That has nothing to do with the promises you made.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): —

Sometimes I wonder why we have been having what you might call in economics, a ‘wet cycle’, for the party over there have shed more crocodile tears than any party in the history of this Canada of ours. I feel quite sure, and I make this forecast, that we shall have a long cycle of wet weather in this province, which will continue as long as they are shedding crocodile tears. In the motion it is ‘pass the buck to the municipalities’. Now, Mr. Speaker, they want to cry on the shoulders of the municipalities!

Mr. McDonald: — It’s your promise, not ours.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — They didn’t cry very much in this province . . .

Mr. McDonald: — It’s your baby!

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

. . . for the teachers who were receiving \$275 – and weren’t being paid; when they gave the teachers notes that we had to honour for several years after we entered office. Certainly, they didn’t do a thing, and since that time of 1944 we have had two provincial elections. We submitted our educational programmes to the people of this province, and they have been endorsed; and a former Minister of Education of that day has taken part in two elections and has been defeated both times, in fact he lost his deposit.

That should indicate to my friends across the way that, when they talk about education and begin crying about the municipalities in regard to education, their crocodile tears will have little impression on the people of this province.

Mr. McCarthy: — They are not our tears, they are yours.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — During their term of office they gave education such a back eye that we have not been able, in ten years, to build the confidence there should be in the teaching profession.

Mr. Loptson: — You’ve survived pretty good.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — And I am going to survive, and the teachers in this province are going to survive, with a C.C.F. Government in this province.

Now we come along in 1953 and they say ‘you should implement the promise you made for education’. I have never heard in my life, after two elections, any statement ever made by any political party that did more towards driving the teachers out of this province than statements which have been made by the Liberal Party members. Now they come back here and start crying, not on the teachers’ shoulders, but on the municipalities’.

I am going to tell you what this Government has done . . .

Mr. Loptson: — It’s about time you did.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Well, you know what your record is. It was a disgrace to see the schools open under the meagre salaries the

Liberals paid. That is your record and you know it!

Mr. Danielson: — The average, in those years, according to the record was \$1,100 a year.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for Arm River as long as I could, this afternoon. he takes ten times more time than any member in this House to talk, and he hasn't even made a speech when he is through – and then he interferes with everyone else. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to make a speech after me, he can follow me.

They ask, "What have we done?" All right, I will give you some figures then.

Mr. Lopton: — I wouldn't read them.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

I will tell you what has been done to help the students in this province by way of assistance. Out of a total of \$942,000, since 1944, the Dominion has contributed around \$200,000 – or in other words, we have paid, for student aid, over \$700,000. Oh, the member for Arm River laughs now. It doesn't mean anything . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Certainly doesn't; doesn't do any good.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

. . .because we give the students the opportunity, if they have the ability, to go on through our University, whereas they let them 'ride the rods' during the period that they were in this House.

I cannot help wondering that a gentleman as old as you should smile over the situation of our young men and our young students in the 'thirties going up and down this country with their grade 12's in their hands – and are the people who are saying, "What have you done?" "What are you going to do?" That is their record. Education is the last thing that the Liberal Party should speak of in this province.

Mr. McDonald: — He's all worked up.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Well, now, what have we built? At our University – they had all the years to build something there. We have already started a Medical College where every Saskatchewan boy or girl who is enrolled there completes his course in this province. What were we up against before? Twenty-four students! No matter how many went in for the first year of medicine, we could only accommodate 24, when they completed their second year medicine, that were acceptable to the other Universities, with the result that, during the years, we have had a crying need of young doctors in this province. This year we are being able to take this class right through our whole medical school. We have assumed the cost, and I am proud that we are able, within 10 years, to provide those facilities to our young people who can now go to our Medical College and complete their course in this province. And within a few months we will have our hospital facilities – one of the finest hospitals across western Canada. We have done those things in the field of education and for the betterment of our society; whether it is in medical science, it is still in the educational field.

March 30, 1954

When we came into power there was a Larger Unit Act. How many units were established in this province? Well, you could guess – zero.

Mr. Loptson: — There'll be a lot of them unestablished pretty soon, too.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Leader of the Opposition has made that statement. I have been waiting for it for a long time. We have had the feeling on this side that that was the Liberal philosophy in regard to larger units, and we are certainly proud, this afternoon, to put you on record as saying 'because they are going to be dissolved'.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If they don't increase the grant they are paying now there is going to be a lot of them undone. They'll go 'broke' if you don't increase the grants.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't need to modify his statement. We know, because we had the Larger Unit Act prior to 1944 for two years on the statute books, and there was not one larger unit established in this province. What is the record today? Fifty-six out of sixty – a fine record in less than 10 years! And, moreover, when some of these units were established . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Compulsion!

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

. . . some of our friends went out of their way and tried to prevent the establishment of the units. Let us get this on record . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Arbitrary action. Whose records?

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

What have we done in regard to helping the building programme where we have given grants to these units? what did we find in regard to equipment, to the schools, in 1944? A whole building programme left at our doorstep; nothing done. Did the Liberals make any grants? Oh, they said they couldn't make grants because there was a war. But they had a long time before the war. What did they do? Same old game – 'pass the buck' on. And that is in the resolution; that phrase is a favoured one with my friends across the way.

Mr. McDonald: — It's your phrase and you're using it.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

We have given grants to the units and to the schools in the non-units to aid them in the building programme and, on the basis of the larger units, we recognize the wealthier parts must help the poorer parts, because the child that unfortunately happens to be born and raised on the farm that has low assessments has the same rights as the child that is raised on the high assessed land in this province – and that is our philosophy on this side of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see it is three minutes to six. Would you call it 6 o'clock?

(After recess)

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was discussing the motion moved by the member for Moosomin, and I would like to correct one statement that was made, that the school grants in this province were about 20 per cent of school costs. In 1952 they were 41 per cent; the government grants were 41 per cent of the school taxes paid in 1952.

Now just at six o'clock I had said (and I repeat) that it is going to take more than a 10-year period to build confidence in the teaching profession to get teachers and to be able to recruit personnel in the teaching ranks after the personnel had been so shabbily treated in the preceding period. We have had the suggestion that, if we opened another normal school in Regina, it would solve the problem. At the present time in the city of Moose Jaw there are only six pupils from the city of Moose Jaw attending Teachers' College there. So you will have to have something better than simply a teachers' college to build confidence, and I suggest that by what this Government has done, by giving the teachers the right that is given to other groups in our society, the right to negotiate, the right to have salary schedules and collective bargaining with their employers in this province, will gradually restore confidence in the teaching profession.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell at any great length tonight; you have had motions all afternoon. but this Government has increased school grants three times above what they were when this Government came into office. This government has organized larger units to bring a more equitable distribution of educational costs and opportunities in this province, and I agree with the principle that some of the less fortunate areas in this province should be helped with their educational costs. In the budget address the Minister of Education spoke about the grants to certain areas in the North that were helped, and I think that is a good principle and I heartily agree with it.

We have given loans to school districts. We have given moneys for schools who are unable to buy school debentures on the open market. We have established our Student Aid Fund to help those students with financial assistance and we have greatly expanded our facilities at the University. This year we will spend \$145,000 for textbooks, readers and authorized texts from Grade 1 to 8. And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale), the following amendment:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

"approves and urges further extension of, the policy of the Provincial Government which has resulted in:

- (a) greatly increased school grants, largely on an equalization basis, now amounting to \$10 million annually, thereby assuming greater provincial responsibility for education;
- (b) the organization of larger school units thereby more equitably distributing educational costs and opportunities;
- (c) provision for building grants, loans and the purchase of school district and school unit debentures;

March 30, 1954

(d) the establishment of a Student Aid Fund which makes available financial assistance to enable deserving students to continue education at University, Teachers College or Schools of Nursing;

(e) greatly expanded facilities at the University of Saskatchewan;

(f) the provision of \$145,380 in 1954-55 for School Readers and authorized texts (Gr. 1 to VIII);

and further that this Assembly urge that the Provincial Government continue to urge the Federal Government to provide, in the interests of Canada, financial assistance for education.”

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):

Mr. Speaker, just before you put the question, there is an allusion to a Student Aid Fund and it says:

“(d) the establishment of a Student Aid Fund which makes available financial assistance to enable deserving students to continue education at University, Teachers College or Schools of Nursing.”

Well, that is hardly factual, because it wasn’t an establishment – it is a continuation of a Student Aid Fund.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, no!

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, all right, the Provincial Treasurer says I am wrong. He said I was wrong once before when I made that statement, but I still say there was a Student Aid Fund set up in 1942 or 1943. All right, the Provincial Treasurer says I am wrong . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You spent the money.

Mr. McCarthy: — . . .but I want to point out that, if you take your Journals for 1942-43, you will find that there were 358 students made use of that fund, and the amount spent was \$42,213. That is shown on page 130 in Public Accounts in 1943-44.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to get this straight. the hon. member said “Journals 1942-43” – now, does he mean Public Accounts?

Mr. McCarthy: — I’m sorry – there is an allusion to Journals a little later on. Yes, Public Accounts, 1942-43, page 130. In 1943-44, 561 students were assisted and the amount spent was \$41,800.34, and you will find that on page 139 of Public Accounts for that year. In 1944-45, there was amount voted – but this Government, of course, handled that, and they spent \$34,649. The amount that was available for that purpose at that time

was about twice that, speaking from memory. They continued on in 1945-46, 1946-47, and 1947-48; but to say that it had been established by this Government is not according to facts. There was this difference between the Student Aid Fund and as it is presently administered and the Student Aid Fund that was administered at that time. Part of the earlier aid was a grant and part of it was a loan; this is purely a loan.

Some statements have been made in this House about the Student Aid Fund, and it has been said that they could get any amount they wanted out of it. I made the statement, when I was speaking (and I was only doing it from memory at that time) that \$300 was, I thought, the maximum. I was mistaken in that statement to a certain extent and I was right to a certain extent. I remember seeing the letter where \$300 was mentioned, but I think what they said in that letter (I have checked it up) was that the \$300 was the average amount being paid at that time – and you had to sign this ‘relief’ form, I call it. But I have checked up on the matter and I see what is happening this year. We have got 195 students taking advantage of that Student Aid Fund, but the great majority of our students come in the class of around \$400. Actually is it less than \$400, because when you say \$425 that means \$350 they have actually received in cash, because the other \$75 is taken up by the tuition fees and they are still a debt on the student. The great majority of them come on that less than \$400, and I am all in favour of it. I am not criticizing it; I think it is a good thing. I was started by a Liberal government, carried on by a Liberal government under better conditions and better terms than it is at the present time, in my opinion; but it is still a good thing.

I think, personally, they would be much better if they would revert to the Liberal policy of making part of it in grants, but I still want to see it carried on; but I don’t like to see anybody get up and say they established it when that is not the factual case.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but in view of the statements just made I feel I must. The hon. gentleman is denying that a Student Aid Fund was established by this Government.

Mr. McCarthy: — No, I’m not denying it; I just said you carried it on.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that there was no fund while the Liberal Party was in power. There was an annual vote, one-half of which was paid by the Dominion Government, but there was no fund until the statutes of 1949. I have hear a copy of my Budget Address in 1949 announcing it. I also have here, in 1950, a statement in which I stated: . . .

Mr. Loftson: — That doesn’t prove anything.

Hon. Mr. Fines: —

“This time I draw the attention of the hon. members to an item of \$115,000 in supplementary estimates, this to provide for scholarships and loans for worthy students.”

You will notice it is \$115,000, Mr. Speaker.

“A fund of one million dollars, as provided for in the 1949 legislation was set up at the beginning of the fiscal year. However, it was felt by the trustees of the fund, and concurred

March 30, 1954

in by the Government, that the fund should have a full year to operate without any funds being drawn from it. Hence the decision to provide by special award an amount sufficient to provide all loans and scholarships for the current year. It is anticipated that the amount of the fund at the beginning of the next fiscal year will be approximately \$1,100,000."

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should be just a little bit more careful with his words, for when he says that the fund was set up by the previous administration, it is not correct. There was no fund set up until it was done by the present Government in 1949, and there is a fund of over a million dollars which will be there in perpetuity, a permanent fund, the interest of which will be used for making loans together with the repayments; a revolving fund.

I think that the hon. member for Cannington is not trying to mislead the House, but I think that he just does not know the difference between a vote of the Legislature and a fund. But there is no question about it. The previous administration did make certain amounts available, one-half of which was paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. Loptson: — It is all the same.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And now, today, we are making these loans and scholarships available through the Student Aid Fund. There is a fund for the first time.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I submit that the member for Cannington was right when he said that a fund was set up or a grant was provided . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, you're wrong.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and the Provincial Treasurer was misleading this House when he said there wasn't any.

Premier Douglas: — That's not a point of order.

Mr. Loptson: — Whether it is set up as a fund or voted annually doesn't make any difference. It comes out of the taxpayer.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):

It makes a lot of difference.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education):

May I add just a few words with regard to the discussion of this resolution. The Provincial Treasurer has made some of the remarks which I might have made with regard to the remarks of the member for Cannington just now. I would like to try to clear up on additional point with him.

He has again this evening (as on previous occasions) got up and attempted to insist that the maximum amount which anybody could get out of this fund was, he said, \$300. I tried to correct him on that before, and he

wouldn't believe me at that time; he has said this evening, I think, \$400. Now I would admit, Mr. Speaker, that looking at the figures that he has and doing a little bit of arithmetic, you find that the average for that particular group of students was somewhere between \$300 and \$400.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I did not say that was the maximum. I said I had been mistaken before, but I found the average was about that.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Well, I hope that perhaps we have got that point cleared up between the hon. member and myself; but I only wanted to say in regard to it, that there are Arts students who get very much in excess of \$300 or \$400. There is one way in which we are limited to \$400. By the terms of the agreement which we have with the Federal Government, insofar as spending the amount of money which they make available to us, we are limited there, and out of those joint funds the average must not exceed \$400. But the instructions to the Committee are that, if that is not sufficient, then there are provincial funds available which are to be used to add to the amount granted under the sharing plan so that, in fact the student is not denied the opportunity of going ahead because of inability of funds.

I think that it is quite right for this Government to assume credit for the establishment of that assistance on a fund basis. It is much different, as the Provincial Treasurer said, making it available on a fund basis and making it available on a year-to-year basis. There is some considerable guarantee for the future in that not only the earnings of the fund, the annual income to the fund, may be used, but there is authority in the Act to use a limited amount of the capital each year.

I have been pleased to hear at least two university presidents describe the plan of financial assistance for university students in the province of Saskatchewan as the best plan of its kind to be found in the Dominion of Canada, and I think the Government can take credit for having done that.

I want to make some remarks also with regard to some of the statistics in the province of Saskatchewan as the best plan of its kind to be found in the Dominion of Canada, and I think the Government can take credit for having done that.

I want to make some remarks also with regard to some of the statistics which were used, this afternoon, by the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald). He made the statement that the Government grants now support education to the extent of approximately 20 per cent. Well, in 1952, our support of education in that particular year, based on the amount of money that the school districts received from us and received in taxes, amounted to something like 27 per cent, when you consider the net grants paid in that year. Net grants are the grants paid after we have deducted the 4 per cent (as it was at that time) teachers' superannuation, and the Teachers' Federation fees, that being a part of the money which the school district owes to the school teachers. So we have, when we have paid them that grant, paid a part of the bill of the school district for teachers' salaries, so that the percentage using gross grants is, of course, or was in that year — in excess of 26.8 per cent. The hon. member shakes his head. He may have better sources of information and statistics than I have, but I have some reason to doubt that. But in 1952, the money received by the school districts did not, of course, reflect the increases in grants made available as from the beginning of 1952. It reflected the grant for the fall term of 1951 and the spring term of 1952.

There were rather considerable increases put into effect in the spring of 1952, so that when they received the whole year of grant on the new basis, that picture would be improved.

May I point out, too, that in 1945, calculating on the same basis, the percentage of expenditures carried by government grants at that time were in the neighbourhood of 21 per cent. Our grants, of course, have been expended on an equalization basis, so that there are some districts that get, not the 20 per cent but in the neighbourhood of 65 and 70 per cent of the total cost of their operation from government grants. As the member from Elrose remarked, our grants have increased about 300 per cent in the last 10 years.

The member from Moosomin remarked that there are some other provinces that are paying approximately 50 per cent of the cost of education through their grants. I think it is fair to say that the province of Ontario does contribute 50 per cent through her grant system, and that the province of British Columbia probably comes reasonably close to that figure. Let us remember, however, that that is not 50 per cent of the cost of operation of each and every school. Some of them get less than that and some get more than that; but on the average, it is in Ontario about 50 per cent, and in British Columbia something less than 50 per cent, but probably approaching that figure.

Certainly in the provinces that are more comparable, as to their ability to support education, to Saskatchewan, it is not 50 per cent, and the hon. members might care again to look at provinces like Manitoba or even Alberta in that regard.

The member for Moosomin also pointed out that education is getting some 17 per cent of the present budget. If I remember correctly, the Provincial Treasurer, when he was making his budget address – at least one can deduce from his figures that it is not 17 per cent but 18½ per cent of the total budget that is allocated to education. It should be pointed out, too, that there are some expenditures which are strictly educational expenditures which are made not by the Department of Education but by the Department of Public Works, expenditures such as the maintenance and caretaking of buildings such as the School for the Deaf, which is an important educational cost, or such as our Teachers' Colleges institutions which could rightly be added to the total expenditure for education.

As the mover of this amendment mentioned, it was rather revealing to hear the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition and by the member for Arm River from their seats, this afternoon, with regard to larger school units. Certainly it became increasingly clear that – I won't say the members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, but certainly I will say the 'old guard' in the Opposition are today, as they have been from the beginning, opposed to larger school units. They are opposed to them not because they see anything bad in them, or understand anything bad in them; they are opposed to them because they have been one of the instruments by means of which this Government and the people of the province have been able to effect significant educational advance. They don't like that because it reflects credit on the present Government, and so they continue to oppose it.

I would like to suggest to those two hon. members that they might consult, I think, with some members of their own Opposition here before they speak too condemningly of larger school units. I want to suggest here and now that there are many schools in many parts of this province that would hardly

have operated had it not been for the organization of school units, and I suggest that the two members to whom I have referred might discuss that situation with the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) and the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) to get something of a picture of what larger school units have meant to many of the school districts in their particular areas. I submit there are school districts in those areas that would have operated with great difficulty, if at all, if it had not been for the very considerable equalizing contribution of larger school units.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to have something to say with regard to the suggestion made by the member for Moosomin as to the carrying out of the C.C.F. policy on education as it was presented to the people of this province in 1944 in the years leading up to 1944.

The C.C.F. as a political movement during those years was faced with the responsibility of assessing the cost of improving government services on the one hand, and the possibility of financing those improvements on the other hand. Those of us at that time who were active in the C.C.F. movement were confident that it was possible to do many things. We were confident, to begin with I think, that any government that really wanted to do something about education could do so with the means they had on hand at that particular time – if they really wanted to do so. We were confident that the Liberal Party could have, had they really wanted to do so; we were confident that we could also make substantial improvements if the electorate gave us a chance, as they finally did. We were confident, too, that more finances could be available for the purpose of supporting education and other social services by means of a better management of the natural resources of the province, by means of exercising greater care that the people of Saskatchewan should get more of their share from the exploitation of those resources, and by means of just general better management of the affairs of the government of the province of Saskatchewan.

I submit that, in all of those cases, our opinions were correct; that it has been possible for a government that wanted to do so, make substantial improvements to education and other services, and it has been possible to provide more finances to make that possible.

I want to have reference to some aspects of that C.C.F. programme which probably were not referred to by the members opposite, because, I submit, in criticizing a political programme it is only fair to expect that the programme would be looked at as a whole, not looked at just as it pertained to one particular activity of the government.

I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. programme for Saskatchewan which was the booklet distributed throughout the length and breadth of Saskatchewan in 1944 and before 1944, and which discussed with the people what we proposed to do if elected, and how we proposed to make possible those things. In the comment on the suggestion that people were led to believe that everything was going to be 'free', I want to read this section, for example:

“The first thing to recognize (and this is at the top of page 17) is that everything we get, food, clothing, shelter, health, education, security, etc. is paid for by work. The only means of paying for anything, the only wealth there is comes from the labour of men and women applied to natural resources.”

And it goes on to comment on that situation in the province of Saskatchewan. And then with reference to financing the C.C.F. programme, we find this as point No. 1:

“The following ways of financing its programme will be open to a C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan. It can press for Federal aid for increased old-age pensions, education and health services. It is generally recognized now, if confederation is to continue and Canadian unity is to be realized, that there will have to be a redistribution of income between the federal and provincial governments to enable the provinces to maintain and expand essential services.”

Mr. Speaker, I think that statement is as true today as it was true in 1944, or in the years leading up to 1944. We have not, as yet, seen any real redistribution of income as between the Federal and Provincial Governments.

I know that the hon. members opposite will say – some of them say, “Ah, but look at the increased federal subsidy to the provincial governments.” May I point out to them that in 1944-45 the subsidy from the Dominion Government made available to the province of Saskatchewan, was estimated to amount to 35 per cent of the revenue of the Provincial Government for that year; 35 per cent was to come from the Federal Government. In the year 1954-55, the year which we are about to begin, it is estimated that the federal subsidy will amount to only 33 per cent of the revenue in our provincial budget. So actually, percentagewise, the percentage estimated to be available from Dominion sources is less this coming year than it was in 1944-45.

Then it could be remarked, too, that we had reason to believe at that time that more could be done for education because of the fact that the government of the day was not, and had not for several years, been actually spending the money which it had available to spend for education. It was, I take it building up a ‘cushion’. I am not now talking, Mr. Speaker, about the ‘thirties; I am talking about the early ‘forties. I remember very distinctly one occasion on which, together with two or three other representatives of Canadian teachers, I went to Ottawa to discuss this matter of educational financing with the financial people of the Federal Government. I can remember Dr. Clarke, who was at that time Deputy Finance Minister in the Federal Government, saying to us, and to me in particular, “How can you expect us to do anything about financing education in Saskatchewan, when your own government back home is piling up rather considerable surpluses in its educational funds. You can’t expect us, as a Federal Government, to do anything about it until they, at least, are doing all that they can do about it.”

In support of that statement I want to mention this; I want to compare the income which was available for several years from the Education Tax, from school lands and from the School Lands Trust Fund, with the actual expenditure for education and I find that in the year 1940-41, there was from those sources \$300,000 more available than was actually spent on education. In the next year, those sources provided \$900,000 more than was spent on education. The next year, those sources provided \$900,000 more than was spent on education. The next year, those sources provided \$1,900,000 more than was spent on education. They were ‘piling up a cushion’. Had they been willing to spend some of that money at that time, they might have developed some of the confidence

which was necessary and which the hon. member for Elrose referred to. All in all, they had, in those four years, an excess from those sources of \$4 million over and above the home expenditures of the Department of Education.

I want to contrast that, Mr. Speaker, with four years expenditure of government under the present party. Starting in 1949-50, we spent for education \$500,000 more than was available from those sources; in 1950-51, \$1,400,000 more than was available from those sources; in 1951-52, \$700,000 more; in 1952-53, \$700,000 more. In other words, in those four years we spent \$3,300,000 more than was available from those sources, whereas in the last four years of the preceding government they spent \$4 million less than was available from those particular sources. So there was some extra money available there.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that anybody might have been pardoned in the years before 1943-44 for assuming that the task of rehabilitating education in the province of Saskatchewan would not require too much money. The main financial information which we had to work with at that time in order to assess what was necessary to spend on education was a document prepared by the provincial government of the day. One should expect that it would be authentic, because it was the submission of the Saskatchewan government to the Rowell-Sirois Commission which was prepared in the middle 'thirties admittedly. But in which Commission they were not just looking at depression-time; they were looking at what they called 'normal circumstances'. On page 279 of that report they give there the amount of money which they think should have been spent in order to properly and adequately rehabilitate (the term they use) education in the province of Saskatchewan. They felt, for example, it would take a million and a half dollars to repair the school buildings. Well, Mr. Speaker, any of us who know anything about what has had to be done know how far short they were on that.

They were going to find in aid of teachers' current salaries some \$2 million. May I say the actual increase has been about \$11 million since that time. And they were going to find a few other figures which all added up to \$4,692,000; but they said of these that most of them won't be recurring; only the last two, amounting to some \$2,150,000 would be a normal sort of expenditure. So all in all, they figured that by the spending of about \$2 million in one year, it would sort of put the school plan back in its place and a few other things and then an annual increase in expenditure by (I presume) school boards and government combined – well, for another \$2 million they could have what they called an average sort of a budget.

Their estimate for an average year for education was in the neighbourhood of \$6,208,000, which is less than half of what we now spend; their estimate of the school grants needed for an average year was just over \$3 million, which is less than one-third of the school grants paid at this particular time.

Mr. Cameron: — May I ask what year those estimates were?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — This was the estimate made in the submission to the Rowell-Sirois Commission in 1937, but they are not the estimates for 1937. They are the estimates for what they called 'an average year', and I presume they were not treating the depression years as average years.

Mr. Cameron: — They weren't thinking of 1957 either.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — They said that this was necessary in order to rehabilitate the school plan and then, once you got it up there, you could spend about \$3 million in school grants and everything would be ‘hunky-dory’. They were not thinking of 1952. The resolution which was discussed this afternoon was to talking about 1952 – it was talking about 1942.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is another reason why we might have expected, in 1942, that the putting of education on an extraordinary good basis might be a relatively simple job financially. In support of that statement I want to read from a paper with which I am sure the members of the Opposition won’t disagree, although one does not see it so much anymore. It used to be very prominent; it was called the ‘Saskatchewan Liberal’. This is the issue of Thursday, January 27, 1944.

As I say, reading this as part of the estimate of the job to be done in education, one certainly could say there isn’t too much left to be done and so there isn’t too much need to be concerned about it. This is the report of an address of the Hon. Mr. Staines to the Liberal council meeting in the city of Saskatoon about that particular time. I want to mention it because he was dealing with the same subject that the member for Moosomin was dealing with this afternoon, namely, the radio address of the then Mr. Douglas, now the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. He called the educational policy an ‘educational novelty’. He had several other interesting comments of that kind to make which I shall not read, Mr. Speaker, but he did say this:

“The Liberal educational programme completely eclipses anything yet to dawn in the fumbling minds of the educational experts in the C.C.F.”

Then he went on to quote from the survey of the James Reconstruction Committee to show the post-war plans for education. It doesn’t say here whether these post-war plans were provincial or whether they were federal. Actually, of course, they were federal, but it is reported here (and I cannot suspect that this would erroneously report anything) as if it were the provincial educational programme of the Liberal Party. It says:

“In order to improve the health administration, standards of teacher training, pay of teachers, the curriculum, courses for bright and backward children, junior high schools and adult education, current expenditure of (oh, he does mention it) the Federal Government are proposed to be doubled.”

Well, “of the Federal Government are proposed to be doubled.” Mr. Speaker, they could double them and double them again and double them again and double them again, and they still would not get along too far in meeting the basic educational needs in Canada.

Then he commented on the Rev. T.C. Douglas’ radio address, and quoted from it this proposal:

“That there should be a reorganization of the financial and administrative arrangements so as to assist districts where school facilities had deteriorated.”

Notice that – “a reorganization of the financial and administrative arrangements to assist districts where school facilities had deteriorated.” This was his comment: “This had already been done by the Liberals in Saskatchewan.”

That was in 1944. Mr. Speaker, you can see how easily we might have been pardoned for going a bit astray as to the size of the educational job ahead of us, when here the then Minister of Education, speaking as late as January 1944, said that the arrangements to assist districts where school facilities had deteriorated, had already been done. And there is more of the same which could be read:

“The C.C.F. propose to bring about changes which had already been brought into effect as long as 1939 and under which expenditures have been made each year . . .”

And so on and so forth. I don’t want to labour that at any very considerable length further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, go ahead!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I do want to make one further comment at this time because again I heard the member for Arm River mumbling in his seat, this afternoon, at one point . . .

Mr. Danielson: — We’re enjoying it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — . . .with regard to closed schools, and he’s mumbling again now, Mr. Speaker. He had something to say, as he frequently has had to say in this House, about closed schools. And when he is thinking about closed schools he is thinking, I presume, of the whole programme of development of centralization of school population in the province of Saskatchewan.

I simply want in regard to that to read a report which appears in the ‘Leader-Post’ of Thursday, March 18. It is a report of the address of the president of the School Trustees’ Association to that convention at that time. I think it is important. I would hope that this kind of sentiment and this kind of programme would get the honest and sincere support of all members of the Legislature. This is the report:

“The increased centralization of the Saskatchewan school system was acclaimed, Wednesday, as the most far-reaching step yet taken by the school trustees of the province. “I am proud to see one of my fondest dreams becoming a reality in my lifetime’, George J. Hindley, of Palo, President of Saskatchewan School Trustees’ Association told some 800 delegates to the provincial convention. ‘Within the past five years the centralization programme has put 420 bus routes into operation conveying some 7,500 children with not one bus route being dropped’.”

I wanted to mention that, Mr. Speaker, because of the remarks tossed in by the member for Arm River, this afternoon. I think the extent to which

March 30, 1954

we can provide intelligent centralization of our school population in Saskatchewan is one measurement of the development of a more equitable opportunity, particularly for rural youngsters in the province of Saskatchewan.

I had expected that some of the members of the Opposition might express an opinion with regard to the amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker. Since they have not, I suppose we are right in presuming that probably they are going to support the amendment. It will be rather interesting, I suggest, if they vote against it, because, while the amendment does not express the deep satisfaction that the Government has reached the 'be-all and the end-all' of its policy with regard to education, it does say – and I would like the Legislature to note it says – that it approves and urges further extension of a policy which has resulted in those items enumerated in the amendment; increased school grants; the organization of school units; the development at the University, and other means of assistance. It also urges further that this Assembly urge the Provincial Government "to continue to urge the Federal Government to provide, in the interests of Canada, financial assistance for education."

I want to say just a word or two about this matter of Federal aid for education, because I think it is an essential step which, sooner or later, Canada must make on a rather far-reaching basis. I am sure that it can be done without any interference of the Federal Government with the prerogatives of the provinces as regards the control of education.

We had a resolution in the House not long ago, urging the renewal of the agreement under which certain funds are made available by the Federal Government for vocational educational purposes. That resolution, I am very pleased, received the support of the Opposition and was passed unanimously here. We have been able to work with the Federal Government in that programme for a number of years, and certainly no province, I suggest, could have any grievance as to any attempt on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with its prerogatives of directing its own educational programme, as a result of our experience in that particular venture. I do want to say, however, that here would be far less danger of any interference in general support for education than in a special agreement of that kind.

I have had an interest in this matter and have had some part in urging it for a number of years before I became a member of this Legislature. Back as far as 1941 and 1942, I had the responsibility of being chairman of a committee of Canadian teachers, working on the idea of federal aid for education. It is a movement which, since the idea was first publicized and since groups began to support it, has received very substantial support. It receives solid support from the teachers' organizations in this province and from the Canadian Teachers' Federation. It received solid support from the Trustees' Association of this province and from the Canadian Trustees' Association. The idea has been supported in this province by each of the two municipal associations.

I do not want to dwell on it at any length except to say that the population of Canada is a very mobile one. The people who are educated in Saskatchewan very frequently move, not just in their old age but while they are still working and producing citizens, to British Columbia and to other provinces, and there is a great interchange of people, so that actually the impact of education in one province is even in that way frequently felt in many other provinces. Whether they moved or not, I submit that the educational opportunities, or lack of opportunities, of any child of any part of Canada

ultimately has an effect on the economy of Canada as a whole. Whether a youngster lives in the wind-swept shack some place on the prairies, or whether he lives on the rocky coast of the Maritimes, he has a right to the opportunities of a Canadian citizen, and we have some reason to expect that someday, the assets of Canada will be mobilized in order to give him educational opportunities and that his opportunities will not rely on the abilities of any one particular province.

There is a great deal more that could be said, Mr. Speaker. I think I have perhaps said enough to indicate that I will support the amendment.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Hon. Minister a question? I didn't want to interrupt him when he was speaking. In connection with the Student Aid Fund that I was talking about, I was only referring to it as it applies to our teachers' colleges. Is there any Federal money in that?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, no. The Federal Government, back about 1946 or 1947, withdrew all of their support insofar as assistance to teachers was concerned, at teachers' colleges. The reference I made was that they do share in the University and the nurses.

Mr. McCarthy: — Yes, I thought I was right on it, but I wanted to be sure. This is all provincial money.

Mr. Dunfield (Meadow Lake):

Mr. Speaker, I certainly had no intention of taking part in this discussion, but since the Meadow Lake constituency was mentioned, I as its representative, would like to say something about this question. I shall have to speak from memory, extemporaneously, because I certainly had not prepared anything for this evening.

I appreciate very much the work that has been done by the larger school units, I think I shall be speaking for many people in my constituency when I say that they ask why, in view of the tremendous additional grants that have been made to the larger school unit of Meadow Lake, why, in spite of that, our taxes are rising at an alarming rate? We appreciate the greater advantages, the better equipment and greater opportunities that our educational system offers us today to what it did some years ago, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in past years, when we didn't have the beautiful schools that we have today, we still turned out a remarkably high percentage of gold-medal students. Looking back, over that record, I can see today, throughout our province and all of Canada, very many boys and girls who have attained remarkable status in the professional world from the schools as we had them then. And those were schools that we were able to support without the large grants that we have today.

Quoting from memory, our taxes in the town of Meadow Lake are, I believe, 81 mills. I think probably it is the highest-taxed town in the Dominion of Canada. A large percentage of that is due to the larger unit, and I have heard our own people say that, insofar as the town is concerned, we could carry on ourselves. I have no quarrel whatever with the larger unit; but these people do say that we no longer own our land and just pay taxes — we pay rent for it, because at our present rate of taxation, we would buy our property at its assessed value every 12 years. It does make me wonder just why those costs are rising at such an exorbitant rate.

March 30, 1954

I do not think that we have gained educational advantages in proportion to the increased costs. I am not an authority on it, but many of my friends and neighbours say that they believe that the great cost is probably attributable in part to the centralized authority, because we know that, in the days when we ran our own affairs in individual school districts, we did a great many improvements by ourselves, members of the board of trustees and so on. Today those same improvements cost probably 20 or 30 times what they did then. I know that is a fact because one of our schools burned down some 12 or 15 years ago, and rather than go through the red tape of debentures, we got together and assessed every quarter so much, and with a thousand dollars' insurance we built and replaced an even better school than we had, and we did it quickly, without any fuss and without any direction from government.

I again say that I am not opposed to larger units because I believe that the three primary aims of any government are health, education and transportation. When I look over the north country, as I have seen it for so many years, and see the money that is being spent in that north country under the Department of Natural Resources and the results that are being obtained, I feel that this Government could pay a larger share even yet to the school units and reduce a great many expenditures in the north that seem to us to be wholly unnecessary.

One of the great problems that has made necessary a larger unit in our district is the tremendous influx of inefficient people in the early days. In the area constituting the good land around Meadow Lake, we could stand even more taxes than we have today; but I will admit that there was marginal land that was taken up by a class of people, many of whom were very inefficient, who seemed to produce the largest families and thereby created a terrific school problem. We on the better lands are paying largely towards their properties. We are not greatly concerned about that – at least those who do have a real interest in education; but we do feel that, under the circumstances in Meadow Lake, we do warrant probably larger grants than are accorded the average school district in the old settled areas because we had a problem thrust upon us, not of our own choosing at all.

If the amendment brought down just now had been made as a motion by the Government in the first place, I could support it wholeheartedly, but I certainly cannot support it when I look back and remember the promises that were made by this Government. I have been interested in politics for a great many years from the standpoint of local improvement, for the improvement of our own community and district. I never did have any aspirations to go any farther. I well remember in 1944, standing on the platform in Winnipeg two days after a speaker for the C.C.F. Party had held a meeting there and had made the very promises that we read today in the main motion, and a great many others. And, following him, as I said, two days later, I stood on that platform and begged the people of my community not to be fooled by these promises, that there was nothing in the world free; that any government would give their people anything they wished providing they were prepared to pay for it. I have not forgotten those promises, Mr. Speaker, nor have I forgotten the bitterness of those days.

Shortly after this Government came into power, one of my friends came into my place of business. He was a strong supporter of the Government, and he said, "Do you remember what you said to me three years ago?" I said, "No, I don't; I talk so much I cannot remember what I said yesterday, but what did I say?" He said, "You told me three years ago the C.C.F. would come into power in the next election, and you told me to get on the bandwagon," and he said,

“Why don’t you, why didn’t you get on the bandwagon?” Well, Mr. Speaker, if he could not understand it without my explaining it to him, there was no need of my explaining it. I am not accustomed to leaving my friends in difficulties.

Therefore I feel that, though the amendment itself is good, it would have been better as a motion by the Government. But, remembering these promises made to a people who were beaten, who were discouraged and downhearted, promises made knowing they were absolutely false and could never possibly be attained, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. Wooff (Turtleford):

Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to say anything on this resolution, but my hon. friend from Meadow Lake has changed my mind a little bit.

I went through a great part of the Meadow Lake constituency in those days that the hon. member has rather glossed over as far as I am concerned. I went to areas in what is a portion of the hon. member’s constituency at the present time, into log schoolhouses with 40 and 50 children attending, and I could have carried all the equipment as far as books were concerned, out under my arm. The only maps that I ever saw – and I am telling the truth, Mr. Speaker, – were some of the Nielson’s chocolate bar maps, and if it had not been for the Neilson Chocolate Bar company putting out maps, there would not have been a map for I don’t know how many schools that I visited. I think he has tried to gloss over that period.

When he starts talking about the promises, the unfulfilled promises of this administration in the field of education, in his own constituency, on view of the conditions that existed, – those log schoolhouses without equipment, and desks that weren’t fit for youngsters to sit in; I don’t know how some of the mothers kept pants on the kids at all – I would be ashamed to stand up in the Legislature and try to create the impression that it was not too bad. I visited one school district in 1942, where the mill rate was already 44; and then he has the audacity to stand up in this Legislature and talk about the unfulfilled promises! I venture to say he cannot go in Meadow Lake constituency, today, and pick out log schoolhouses in the condition that I saw them in, in 1942. And I am not blaming the rate payers, nor the parents. It was an absolute disgrace to any administration that ever sat in this Legislature.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):

I, too, had not intended to speak, but I am getting a little bit tired of listening to one after another of the ‘old guard’ from across the way referring to what we have termed ‘the dirty ‘thirties’ – and I think that is the correct term for them, as the ‘Golden Age’. Some of these men across the way seem to harp back to that a particular period, whether it is health, education, roads or what-have-you, as the Golden Age of Saskatchewan. They would like to think that. The only way they could possibly refer to it as the Golden Age, Mr. Speaker, is as the gold age for Liberal politicians!

Mr. Loptson: — We had a Tory government then.

Mr. Kramer: — It just gets me down a little, to hear men like the hon. member from Meadow Lake, who should know better, talking about self-help and one thing and another, and how good we had it in those days. Sure, the people did well; they did well because they had intestinal fortitude to go out

and do the best they could under the circumstances that they met in those days; under the circumstances that they found when they were forced into that wilderness up there, to eke out the best living they could, to find shelter from the dust storms that beset them down in the southern part of this province. Sure they did well! Sure they had gumption enough to whittle seats and one thing and another out of the planks that they found at their disposal. But as far as doing well and making some contribution to education in those days, the Liberals were tried and found completely wanting – and that is why they are sitting in scarcer numbers than ever across the way. Mr. Speaker.

They talk about self-help. I want to refer you to one instance that I saw. It isn't in the hon. member's constituency, but it is in approximately that territory – Birch Lake, north of North Battleford about 67 miles, at present in the Turtleford constituency. It was in Meadow Lake constituency at one time. Not back in 1937 or 1938, after we had the drought, but back in 1934, people had already been forced up into that country. There were a group of families who were trying to eke out a living by working in the bush in the winter, on the fringe of the timber area. There were seven children in that lumber camp, of three young families living in one-room cabins without a floor, chinked with moss; no education available to them within miles. We had a schoolteacher with a first-class certificate cooking in that lumber camp; and I am going to tell you just how the people in that camp met that condition. The women, the mothers of those children, came in and washed dishes for the cook – that was his job, to wash dishes after the meal had been served to about 40 men; but they came in and did the odd chores and washed the dishes and did a lot of the odds and ends in that mess hall, in that cookhouse, while he took the afternoon off to give those children what meagre education he could under those conditions. That was the situation in that 'Golden Age' of Liberalism, Mr. Speaker, that we hear so much about from these people across the way. They ought to be ashamed to even try to get up and defend that situation!

I saw the hon. member for Arm River shimmying up and down this afternoon, just before we closed, like an adolescent with ants in her pants; he was referring to the 'Union Farmer', page 13, and you know he likes to refer to the 'Union Farmer', Mr. Speaker. He just couldn't wait, but apparently he hadn't read it all, as I have noticed him perusing it since; but he would have found, in there where Mr. J.N. Galonski reviewed the situation of education under a Liberal government in Manitoba. He was shaking up and down and really enjoying that situation, and he was reviewing it. I would like him to read it now, if he gets an opportunity; I challenge him – will the hon. member for Arm River, Mr. Speaker, get up and read that page 13? Will he go on and read page 14? I will read page 14 for him.

Mr. Cameron: — Let's take it as read, eh?

Mr. Kramer: — They are probably interested in how many children enrolling as grade I students reached grade XII in Manitoba, and they have, incidentally, Saskatchewan's percentage on this page as well, and also Alberta's. Out of 11 student enrolled in Grade I in Manitoba, 9 per cent reach Grade XII, and go through grade XII. In Saskatchewan, 21 per cent go through grade XII; and in Alberta, 28 per cent. In grade XI – junior matriculation – in Manitoba, 29 per cent; Saskatchewan, 32 per cent; and in Alberta, 35 per cent.

I don't know what he found so interesting in there. If he can find any more it is just one continual condemnation of the education system in

Manitoba under a Liberal government. Probably he has more to add, Mr. Speaker, but as far as I am concerned, I have nothing more to add.

Mr. Horsman (Wilkie):

Mr. Speaker, it seems that this debate is going to turn into a free-for-all here tonight, and I think that, in view of the speakers who have been on their feet, everyone in the House should participate in this debate.

In connection with the motion moved by the hon. member for Moosomin, there isn't any doubt about this promise of the C.C.F. to which he refers. There isn't any doubt but that the promise was made; no one denies that. I know that, in those days, promises were going around very freely. This was a new party just beginning to come along. They didn't know the ropes too well, and thought they could do everything; and certainly some of their promises were most elaborate, and this was one of them.

They found, after they got into power, that they could not do this, I don't blame them so much; I knew before they got into power that they could not do it and they must have known the same thing. But what does amaze me is intelligent people getting on their feet in this House, like the hon. member for Elrose, this afternoon, and going away back into the 1930s, talking about the days when schoolteachers got \$275 or \$300 a year, and at the end of the year all they could do was take a note, they couldn't even get the cash.

Why didn't the hon. member go back into the 1920s, to a period somewhat comparable to the period in which we are now – not as good a period as this but somewhere along that line? Mr. Speaker, I was Secretary of a school district for over 20 years. I came through the 1920s and the 1930s. Back in the 1920s, in our district we paid our teachers as high as \$1,500 a year, and if you want to back in the records you can find this out. I am not trying to put anything over on anyone, and I say those were times somewhat comparable to what we have now – not as good as now, but somewhere in that line. But when you get into the 1930s and compare that to the present time, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison; there is no fair comparison here whatsoever.

He talks about the young men who were working for \$5.00 a month. That is true. I will give you some of the history of our own district. When we came into the early 1930s, our district was just starting to grow up; our families were starting to get to the age where many of them should be going to high school. The people in that area could not afford to send their children to high school; they didn't have the money. They couldn't do it, and an agitation arose in that district to teach grades IX and X in the public schools. I don't need to tell any member in this House, especially the Minister of Education, what it means to load ten grades upon an ordinary teacher in a rural school and expect them to try and do a job. I was very much against it at that time. The result was that the School Board got together. Myself and another gentleman who was a former member of this House, 'Jack' Knowles (some of you probably know him) were on the School Board there together, and we decided that we would try and start a rural high school in that district; and we did that. We called the people together at the time the August school term was ready to open. We met at the school that night. The people told us to go ahead, and a week from that day we had that school open. We had a teacher hired; we fixed up the basement, which was full-size, for a high school room, and that school ran for ten years right through the worst times that this province ever saw. And I want to tell you this, too, Mr. Speaker, that we never sent a teacher away without their salary; and we never paid a teacher less than \$600 a year.

March 30, 1954

That just shows you what people can do if they get together and try to do it. We did everything possible to keep down expenses. I know they were desperate times; but when people get up in this House and say that the government never did anything in those years – we got a high school grant for that high school; I think it was \$3.50 per day, and a flat grant of \$1.50 per day, and it almost paid our teacher. That could have been duplicated in any district.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You were making a little profit on that deal.

Mr. Horsman: — The hon. member for The Battlefords said that those were golden days for the Liberal politicians. I don't think they were golden days for anyone. But they can compare the dust stories of those days to what we have now – I wonder if he blames the government for the days of the dust storms and the dry years.

Mr. Danielson: — Sure he does.

Mr. Horsman: — There is no other explanation . . .

Mr. Kramer: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I didn't blame them for the dust storms, although they might have been guilty of a few windstorms. What I did blame them for is the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Kramer: — Yes . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Sit down.

Mr. Horsman: — Reference was made, too, to the north country – the log schools chinked with moss, the cabins that people lived in built out of logs, chinked with moss, without any floors. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when we came to this country, we didn't even have a log house; we had to build out of sod, because logs were not even available out on the prairie. We built houses out of sod and we lived in them, too; we survived and we raised families, and we built up our country . . .

Mr. Kramer: — So did I.

Mr. Horsman: — We didn't sit down on the side of the road and howl for the government to come and build us a house. We made things for ourselves . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Might I ask the hon. member a question? Is he inferring that some of the new settlers in the north now sit down on the side of the road and howl for the government to build them a house?

Mr. Horsman: — No, I am not. I didn't talk about them sitting up in the north in those days. But I do talk about a lot of things in these days. One is this cry for the Government to build a \$12,000 house at 2 per cent interest and things like that. Those are things that I refer to.

Mr. Danielson: — He misfired!

Mr. Horsman: — I don't think I have any more to say, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot support this amendment.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River):

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two, in view of the fact that I was sitting in this House a few years back and you were here too, Mr. Speaker. We had a gentleman from the northeast part of Saskatchewan named Mr. Feeley – I think he came from Canora. He was the chairman of a school district up there, and he held the grand championship for cutting teachers' salaries in Saskatchewan. He had the lowest paid teacher in Saskatchewan, in his school; and he was instrumental – and it was brought out on the floor of the House . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You don't know that.

Mr. Danielson: — . . .that he cut that teacher's salary. Yes, it was brought out from the Department of Education files, so that is the record of one good C.C.F-er anyway.

Premier Douglas: — That is the most despicable excuse for an argument that I have ever heard, even from the member for Arm River.

Mr. Danielson: — Except the hon. gentleman – he is the weakest excuse of a man I have ever seen.

Premier Douglas: — The member for Arm River hasn't got an argument for himself; he can't argue with anybody here, so he picks Mr. Feeley, who is not even present in the House.

Mr. Danielson: — I can get an argument from you anyway.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — What a cowardly exhibition!

Mr. Danielson: — You had better go and get the other . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the right to speak on the main motion but will speak on the amendment now, for a few minutes.

First of all, I want to deal with certain remarks that were made by the hon. member for Elrose. He talked at great length about the difference in the amount of money that was being paid today and was paid by previous governments with regard to school grants, and he used the old superficial argument about them being away up. Mr. Speaker, on a percentage basis, the grants paid by this Government are not one penny more than were paid by any other government that ever sat in this House.

The Minister of Education attempted to follow up what the hon. member for Elrose said, and he tried to leave the impression in this House that the present Government today was paying approximately 27 per cent of the cost of education. Then he went on and he qualified that, when he said 27 per cent of net cost; but if he breaks that down to the total cost of education, the present Government, today, are paying approximately 20 per cent of the total cost of education in this province, and that is approximately the same percentage that was paid by former governments in this province.

The hon. member for Elrose went on at great length in an attempt to show to this House and the people of this province the great things that this

March 30, 1954

Government has done in regard to the improvements at our University, with regard to their medical course, the hospital that has been put there, larger units within the province, and what-have-you. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you: what has that to do with the motion that I moved in this Chamber, this afternoon? It has absolutely nothing to do with it. This afternoon, I asked this Government to fulfill a promise, or I asked them if they were prepared to stand behind that promise. Obviously they are not, or they would never have brought in this foolish amendment.

Mr. Speaker, these people have not the courage of their convictions to stand up and support the promises they made some years ago to the people of this province . . .

Premier Douglas: — You're the last person to talk about courage.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McDonald: — They can talk about the Social Credit government in Alberta coming in with a promise of \$25 a month to the people of that province; they can talk about Duplessis, in Quebec, who promised to put a washing machine in every home. No political party ever made bigger promises and broke them more consecutively than this Government that is sitting here right today — and there never were more foolish promises made than those made by the people who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker, when they were seeking office in this province.

It is obvious how ridiculous these promises were, because they haven't the courage, today, to stand up and say, "Yes, that was our promises; we believe it was a good policy and we would like, some day, to fulfill it." No, they bring in this nonsensical resolution, or amendment to the resolution, and attempt to describe the arguments that are being put forward here today.

I would also like to refer to one other thing that was said by the Minister of Education, when he spoke on this motion. He also spoke about everything under the sun except what was included in the motion — and that is that the Government of this province should carry out the promise that they made, and that is to take up the full responsibility of education. What did he say? He said that we are asking Ottawa to take part of the responsibility. Well now, what did the promise say, Mr. Speaker? It was this: "The first thing which a C.C.F. government will do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the provincial government." Does it say anything about Ottawa in that? No, nothing. The only time they started harping about Ottawa was after they got into power, or when they have to vote the money.

No, Mr. Speaker, they haven't the courage of their convictions, to stand up and say "yes" or "no" on this motion . . .

Premier Douglas: — They only have the one phrase and it goes round and round.

Mr. McDonald: — And the Premier, who was the Rev. Mr. Douglas at that time, made the statement, and I believe he made it in good faith — will he say, today, that he will support this motion? Not very likely.

Mr. Danielson: — He has no intention of it.

Mr. McDonald: — He has no intention whatsoever of supporting the motion.

Mr. Cameron: — Chicken soup and . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Political eyewash!

Mr. McDonald: — It might be political eyewash, but it is your promise, not mine. Mr. Minister of Agriculture, any time that I make a promise I have the courage to stand up and support it, now, or ten years from now, or a hundred years from now. But you haven't the courage.

There is another thing I wish to refer to. One statement that I made the Minister of Education corrected me on, and I stand corrected. When the budget was presented here by our Provincial Treasurer, a few weeks ago, it indicated that 18.5 per cent of the total budget for the coming year was being spent on education. I believe that is the correct figure; but I want to say that the last provincial budget brought down by a Liberal government paid some 17 per cent towards the cost of education. Therefore, it is less than 2 per cent over and above that it was back in 1944.

The Minister of Education also went out and made the statement that 35 per cent of the revenues of this province came from the Federal Government back in 1944, and today we are only getting some 33 per cent of our budget from the tax rental agreements with Ottawa. Well, I think that the hon. Minister ought to make a correction in his own newspaper, 'The Saskatchewan News', which was printed on Tuesday, March 9, 1954, where we have a breakdown of the estimated revenues for the year 1954-55, and are told that there will be a sum of \$27,300,000 coming from Ottawa this year, which will be 34.81 per cent of the total revenues. I think that the editors of the 'The Saskatchewan News' and the Minister of Education ought to get together.

This debate, Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago, has certainly wandered a long way from the motion . . .

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear! Who's wandering now?

Mr. McDonald: — The only reason I am wandering, Mr. Premier, is because I am answering some of the nonsensical arguments that were put out by the people on your right and your left . . .

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):

You are supposed to be speaking on the amendment.

Mr. McDonald: — I asked the members of this Assembly on both sides of the House to support me in this motion, as the only thing that this motion calls for is the Provincial Government to carry out a promise and pay the total cost of our educational system, especially our elementary education . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — How nauseating!

Mr. McDonald: — . . . out of general revenues of this province. They have attempted to point out the tremendous amount of money they have spent within our University and elsewhere, and I am certainly in agreement with that; but after all, Mr. Speaker, I think our main concern, not only in Saskatchewan, not only in Canada but throughout the world, is to provide all the children of our province or of our country with an elementary education at least; and that we should make sure that the money is made available to provide that education. Then if we can go on and provide a good high school education for as many students as possible, and a good University education

March 30, 1954

for another group that cares to take it, then I think that is fine and I will give my support to any government who will spend as much money as possible on those two very important enterprises as far as education is concerned. But as I said before, the major thing is for us to provide an equal educational opportunity for all our children, especially in the elementary grades and especially in the rural areas, bringing them up to the same standard as our children have in the towns and cities, today.

That is exactly what this promise of the C.C.F. Party asked for. That is all that I ask for, today. I think that is the first and foremost debt that any government ought to pay. I do not believe that, with your larger unit, or with any other form of education that this Government has been responsible for bringing to the people of this province, you have accomplished that. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, speaking in this House, this Session: how many 'sitters' have you got in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, or in any of the larger centres? How many? You haven't got any.

Mr. Willis (Elrose):

How many in Elrose?

Mr. McDonald: — How many have we got in Moosomin? We have lots of them. Mr. Speaker, why should we, because we live in Elrose, Moosomin, Cannington or Weyburn or any place else, have a 'sitter' in our school, when there are other people who happen to live in a more preferred position, who have fully qualified teachers and probably many of them with a degree?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that because I happen to live in a rural area, my children are as entitled to as good an education as the children of any other hon. member in this House; but that opportunity is not being made available to my children. I do not suppose it was made available to — I am not going to say you, because I imagine your children are all educated; but I can quite imagine that you have young sons or daughters out on the farm: have they the same opportunity for education for their children as they would have if they lived in the city of Regina?

Hon. Member: — Of course not.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is obvious. They have not. But if the promise that was made by this Government back when they were a political party seeking office, was fulfilled, then there is every reason to believe that equal opportunity would be available in the rural areas, comparable to the main cities of this province.

There has been considerable said here, this evening, about log schools, the dirty 'thirties, people washing dishes, and everything else . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Dust bowls.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and dust bowls, rose bowls and all other bowls; but there is nothing about that in this motion. Mr. Speaker. And when this Government, or members of this Government, bring in an amendment to a motion, it is nothing but a political dodge, because as I said, they haven't the courage of their convictions to stand up and be counted. And they, through their numerical superiority, can force through this amendment to a motion, but I will certainly oppose the amendment; but then where am I?

Premier Douglas: — That's a question . . .

Mr. McDonald: — You know the hon. gentleman reminds me of an owl on a telephone pole. Every time you throw a stone at it, it goes “Whooooo”; and that is exactly what the hon. Minister is doing, this evening; and does every day in this House. But that matters not to me; I have passed a lot of owls in my day.

The reason for bringing this in, and I am going to say it again, Mr. Speaker; they haven’t the courage to stand up and say, “No, we do not support you; we promised that, but today we cannot stand up and vote.” They have changed their minds. They were calling the tune in those days now, and now they have to play the music, and they can’t play it, Mr. Speaker. so they bring in this amendment . . .

Mr. Cameron: — They don’t even want to hear it.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and through their numerical superiority they will force this amendment through. Then we on this side of the House – at least as far as I am concerned, I am forced to vote for the motion as amended; because, Mr. Speaker, at least this is a step – but it is a might small one.

It is all right, Mr. Speaker. Let them all yap at once because it amounts to nothing anyway . . .

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: — They are like a lot of Scottish bagpipes. Now what does this amendment to the motion mean? I want to deal with it right through from (a) . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — A McDonald saying that about bagpipes!

Mr. McDonald: — There is the owl again. Clause (a) says this:

“greatly increased school grants, largely on an equalization basis, now amounting to \$10 million annually, thereby assuming greater provincial responsibility for education.”

Mr. Speaker, that isn’t so. I will admit that you are paying more money, but the total cost of education is, roughly, the same as it was ten years ago. Therefore, as far as (a) is concerned, it means nothing.

What does (b) say:

“the organization of larger school units thereby more equitably distributing educational costs and opportunities.”

Now I will agree with part of that, and that part is more equitable distribution of educational costs. As far as opportunities are concerned, I do not. As I pointed out here a few moments ago, you have your ‘sitters’ in the rural areas, and you have your university graduates in the cities. Is that equal opportunity? How many rural schools in this province – one-room schools – have a workshop for the children? How many? It is a good question, how many?

Mr. Cameron: — A poor answer though.

March 30, 1954

Mr. McDonald: — None. All right, we go on to (c):

“provision for building grants, loans and the purchase of school district and school unit debentures.”

Premier Douglas: — He'd better stay with highways.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, there was one hon. gentleman who spoke this evening and he talked about the schools being unable to buy the debentures, but as far as I know, the school units always sold the debentures, Mr. Speaker; and I do not think there is very much in clause (c).

Premier Douglas: — That is profound.

Mr. McDonald: — Clause (d):

“the establishment of a Student Aid Fund which makes available financial assistance to enable deserving students to continue education at University, Teachers' College or Schools of Nursing.”

The hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) went into this matter and, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference whether there is a fund set up to provide student aid, or whether the money is voted annually to provide the same service?

Premier Douglas: — If you don't know, 'Public Accounts' can tell you.

Mr. McDonald: — Admittedly over a long range — the Premier looks like the owl; the Premier shakes his head. Mr. Speaker, I will admit that probably the best way to approach this problem on a long-range basis is naturally to set up a goodly sum of money, invest that money at good interest rates, and you are on a more sound basis in providing . . .

Premier Douglas: — It's guaranteed.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . the fund over a period of years. Yes, I agree entirely. But when the Student Aid was first made available in this province, times were a little more difficult than they were when this sum of money was made available to be invested. I think that this Government has done the right thing, and I will give them credit for it. But I also maintain, at least I am sure that any government that might have followed the government that sat in power before the C.C.F. came into power, whether they had been Liberals, Conservatives, C.C.F.ers or whoever they were, once the money was again available, the sum would have been set aside for this purpose. But this is being used, Mr. Speaker, so that students can continue their education at University, Teachers' College, and Schools of Nursing. That is fine; I have no complaint with that, with the one exception, as I said before, and that is that our first responsibility is to make education available to all the children. Once that has been accomplished, then I say, yes, we should make every opportunity available for children to go on and better their education.

Clause (e):

“greatly expanded facilities at the University of Saskatchewan.”

I have dealt with that already. As a matter of fact, last night during Estimates, we talked about some of those buildings that are being built at our University; I am all in favour of that being done, with the one qualification again – that all the children are given an equal opportunity for education in the elementary grades, first of all.

Then we have the provision of some \$145,380 to provide for School Readers and authorized textbooks. I have no quarrel with that; it is a continuation of the policies of former governments from time immemorial in this province.

But then, in conclusion it says this:

“And further that this Assembly urge that the Provincial Government continue to urge the Federal Government to provide, in the interests of Canada, financial assistance for education.”

That is one government urging another government. Mr. Speaker, what did these people say about education when they were a political party seeking office? As I said before, they said that the first thing a C.C.F. government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the Provincial Government.

Mr. Speaker, when are they going to recognize this as a responsibility of the Provincial Government?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We always have.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, you may have recognized it, but you have done absolutely nothing about it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, no!

Mr. McDonald: — They are great artists – at fulfilling their promises.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — May I ask a question? am I to assume, now, that the members of the Opposition favour the Provincial Government assuming the full responsibility for education?

Mr. Cameron: — That is what you said, not us.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is what they are saying, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCarthy: — No, no! That’s what you said, not us.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, that is not what I am saying. All I am doing . . .

Mr. Cameron: — That is what the Rev. Mr. Douglas said in 1943.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . is repeating what you said, in your political party. This isn’t my suggestion at all. It is your own. If you don’t like it, well then you can lump it; but it is your provision, not mine.

Mr. Cameron: — Apparently they don’t like it. That is why the amendment is in.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if I am ever so foolish as to make promises such as have been made in regard to this political party who are now the government of this province, than I will be prepared to either stand or fall by those promises, and if somebody brings a motion into the House asking me to vote for or against one of my own promises, I will have the courage of my convictions to either stand up and say I was wrong, or I will vote for it. But not those people. They shilly and shally; they go to the dirty 'thirties; they go to log schoolhouses; they bring in amendments; and, as I said before, due to their numerical superiority, they are able to shove them through in this House. But they will do anything rather than face the issue.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What issue?

Mr. McDonald: — Your own issue. Not mine, but your own issue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I said before on many occasions – this is not the only one – we are forced into submission. It's okay with me if that is the way you want to do it, to amend motions, amend your own promises. That is all right with me, but I will have to support the things that are best. Maybe they are not what I asked for or what I would like to see done, but any movement to help our educational system, whether it comes from this Government or the Federal Government in Ottawa, naturally I would support it, because here in Saskatchewan we have a tremendous problem due to the sparseness of our population and the number of schools in the rural areas; and it is a problem. Therefore, if we can get help from Ottawa, and ask for it in a united voice, then I will support that. But when a party makes a promise, and then are not prepared to back that promise up and they vote it down with numerical superiority, then, I submit, we are coming to a sad state of affairs in this province.

I would like very much to have either had an answer of yes or no from this Government with regard to this proposal, but apparently they are not prepared to do that; and therefore we shall have to deal with it accordingly.

The question being put on the amendment, it was agreed to on division.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the motion as amended.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):

I want to make a few observations on the motion as amended. I would like to make myself clear because the member for Moosomin expressed the thought that he may or he may not vote for it.

I am not going to vote for it, because as I see it they simply refuse to do what they said they would do; and then they come and ask us to pat them on the back for something that they may have done. Because of that, I cannot support that kind of thing.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make myself clear. I do not want to be accused of saying I was going to vote for something that I had no intention of voting for. I said any motion, as . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the debate is being closed now, I take it?

Mr. Speaker: — Does anyone want to speak on the motion as amended? Anyone wishing to speak must do so now.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there might be a misunderstanding as to what I said in that regard, but what I said was that, in many instances, we are forced to vote for half of what we want. We ask the Provincial Government to do it and they say, “no” — they amend it and turn it down; but they amend it in such a fashion that they are asking the Federal Government probably, to co-operate with themselves, and I said I would support motions of that kind because at least it was a small step in the right direction. I said any motion with regard to education that went that far, I would support. I didn’t say ‘this motion’, because this motion is nothing but a resume of the things that this Government has not done and I could not support this motion in its entirety.

Premier Douglas: — This is what is known as the ‘double wiggle’.

Mr. McDonald: — There are parts of this motion that I could support, but I certainly could not support it as it exists today.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to on recorded division by 35 votes against 9.

BAN THE H-BOMB

Moved by Mr. Feusi, seconded by Mr. Brown (Last Mountain):

“That this Assembly go on record as deploring the race in development of weapons of war of increasing powers of devastation and of potentialities which threaten catastrophe to the human race together with disintegration not only of civilization but of large sections of the physical world;

And further that this Assembly earnestly request the Government of Canada to intensify its efforts toward agreement amongst the Great Powers and member nations of the United Nations for the abandonment of production of nuclear weapons, the outlawry of their use as implements of war or as instruments of aggression, and for the diversion of the great forces of atomic and hydrogen energy to peaceful purposes and to the promotion of a better life for all mankind.”

Mr. Feusi (Pelly):

Mr. Speaker, we have had very much levity and probably time wasted on resolutions today. I shall be as brief as I can, but I submit that this is probably the most serious of all resolutions that have been placed before this House.

Of recent days the newspapers of the world have been carrying articles, pertinent articles, that concur in portions of this resolution. In dealing with it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tie it in very closely with a part of the work of all governments at the present time, and that is civil defence. I have with me here a little booklet put out by the United States government, entitled ‘This is Civil Defence’ and they state at the very beginning, a forerunner:

“There is a defence against atomic warfare. Civil defence is a major part of it. Civil defence can cut our losses in half. Civil defence can save your life. This booklet tells you how.”

I am just wondering to what extent our civil defence programme in Canada goes towards bringing home to the people of Canada the dangers that beset the world at this time. This little booklet goes on further, and I shall just read a few of the items:

March 30, 1954

“1. A possible enemy has the weapons now to attack us.”

And I would like to refer to the ‘Reader’s Digest’ of a period not too far back, Mr. Speaker. We have in the ‘Reader’s Digest’ of March, 1954, an article wherein a representative of the United States government states – and he is referring to the potential enemies of the United States:

“What about the Russians? Representative Cole, who has more access to international subterranean information than I have says: ‘The Soviets may have within their power the capacity not only to match our own atomic efforts, but even possibly to outstrip us’.”

That is in reference to the United States booklet that a possible enemy has the weapons now to attack us.

I believe there has been too much complacency throughout the world, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to carry on a little further in this same article, where it states:

“And why has not another nation greater inventions than our own? Let us discard our American arrogance which assumes that the Russians know nothing about the atom except through spies. Let us reflect upon some facts mentioned in a current book ‘Report on the Atom’ by Gordon Dean, who until recently was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and here are those facts;

1. The first fundamental table of nature’s elements, displayed according to the weights of their atoms, was developed in 1869 by the Russian Mendeleev.
2. A marked advance in nuclear knowledge was made in 1927 through the cosmic-ray studies of the Russian Skobelzyn.
3. Europe’s first cyclotron – for smashing atoms – was built in 1937 at the Radium Institute of Moscow.
4. The ‘spontaneous’ splitting of the uranium atom – from which all atomic power is primarily derived – was discovered in 1939 by the Russians Flerov and Petrazhak.

In 1930 the Russians had 150 institutions of higher learning for producing professional specialists. In 1952 they had 900.

In 1930 there were 200,00 students in these schools. In 1952 there were 1,400,000. The Russian production of engineers is equal to that of

the United States and perhaps greater. The Russian production of the top-flight scientists – at the level of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy – is abreast of ours.

So stands the Russian scientific-engineering might. I cannot believe that the Communists who govern Russia will ever subordinate their pursuit of Communist atomic power to an international co-operative endeavor in which they would be helping to strengthen capitalistic atomic power.”

And Mr. Dean, who was head of the Atomic Energy Commission, goes on to say:

“I think that we have to oppose our inventive might to theirs. Theirs is one single governmental aggregated might. We have something – if we will use it – that is stronger; the diffused and competitive inventive might of American private industry.”

Therein lies, Mr. Speaker, the great problem of our time: two great nations, who are supposed to be giving leadership and guidance to their spheres or portions of the world, in a race of destructivity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention here, before passing on to another item, the fact that this suicidal race is probably not going to lead us anywhere but to a possible destruction of life and the hemisphere.

In the United States Health Services and Special Weapons Defence booklet (another booklet that is used in civil defence), they give in brief here, atomic warfare:

“Also, an atomic explosion releases, in addition to intense heat and light, highly penetrating invisible radiations which are damaging to living organisms.”

And there is a sub-heading here, Mr. Speaker, from the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Eighth Semi-Annual Report:

“Radiations cause damage by a process called ionization, in which the particles or rays disrupt the atoms and molecules of any substance they strike, be they air, concrete,

March 30, 1954

steel or human flesh. They cause atoms to divide into positive and negative parts called ‘ions’ and destroy the delicate electrical balance of molecules. In the human body this disruption takes place within the individual cells. A cell ordinarily recovers from light damage, but severe radiation injury can cause it to die. If enough cells are destroyed, the body receives detectable injury. If injury is severe in vital organs, a person may become ill, or, in extreme cases, may die.”

I would like again to recall the items in the newspapers of the past few weeks whereby we noted that a consignment of fish from a Japanese fishing vessel was potentially poisonous and got onto the Japanese market – very poisonous, Mr. Speaker; and they are still searching for some of the results of the consignment.

Now there occurred, in the Pacific, at the beginning of this month, an explosion and it states here, in the headline of an article from a western paper, the Winnipeg ‘Free Press’ – it is quite well written up, and I would like to read it to this House:

“U.S. blast equals 500 atom bombs.”

It also stated here that the Nagasaki bomb was the equivalent of 20,000 tons of T.N.T.:

“New York: The United States set off a thermo-nuclear explosion March 1st that was 500 times more powerful than the Hiroshima atomic bomb, it was reported today. It was this blast which burned and blistered 23 Japanese fishermen whose boat was 80 miles away. Today all the fishermen are in hospital; their hair is falling out. The U.S. is offering top-flight medical aid and a joint U.S.–Japanese inquiry is sought. When President Harry Truman announced the Hiroshima explosion in 1945, he said the explosive force of the atomic bomb was the equivalent of 20,000 tons of T.N.T. At that rate the thermo-nuclear explosion of March 1st would have been the equivalent of 10,000,000 tons of T.N.T.:

‘Time Magazine’, first to publish the estimated strength of the March 1st explosion, said:

“It surprised atomic scientists working on the project at the Marshall Island proving grounds.”

It more than surprised these scientists, Mr. Speaker.

“Radio-active showers – 28 U.S. observers and 236 island natives, thought to have been evacuated to a safe distance were showered with radio-active particles.”

The magazine said:

“None were burned, fortunately, the Atomic Energy Commission announced later. So fierce was the blast though, ‘Time’ added, that the Atomic Energy Commission reclassified its test of November 1, 1952, as a misfire. The magazine said that the March 1st blast probably sent a radio-active cloud 20 miles into the stratosphere. Both the March 1st test and the 1952 test were explosions of devices atop the tower, ‘Time’ said.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to dwell some time upon the radio-active cloud that was propelled 20 miles into the stratosphere. Before I go on to lean into this further, I would like to just read from underneath the explosion picture here, where it shows a heading:

“Worse than A-bomb. The greatest explosion the world has ever known is reported to have taken place March 1st.”

This has not been the greatest explosion known to modern man, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to draw a comparison between the greatest explosion known to modern man and the explosion that we have recently had thrown throughout the news of the world. This explosion was not an atomic explosion at all, Mr. Speaker; it occurred back less than 100 years ago, in the East Indian Ocean, among the East Indian Islands; and the heading here is: “When Krakatoa blew up.” That is in the ‘Reader’s Digest’ of March, 1946, and there are points that I am going to bring to a head to show to the Assembly here the danger that besets the world, the forces that are being freed, or that are going to get out of hand, that we should know more about.

“When Krakatoa blew up: The world was awed by the might of the blast that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki; but there was an explosion once that was incomparably greater. When the East Indies Island of Krakatoa blew up on August 27, 1883, the whole world knew about it. The noise was heard 3,000 miles away. The great waves the explosion caused in the sea reached the shores of four continents and were reported 8,000 miles away. An air wave generated by the blast travelled clear around the world, not once but several times; and where had been a mountain half a mile high, was now a hole 1,000 feet deep and miles across. Red hot debris covered an area the size of Texas to a depth of sometimes 100 feet on land. For nearly a year afterward the dust of the explosion, blown upward for 30 miles, filled the high atmosphere over almost the entire globe. Even though there were no large towns within 100 miles of the volcano, 36,000 persons lost their lives.”

Mr. Speaker, I recall an article in one of our pictorial magazines some years back, where they showed, in picture form, a very descriptive story

March 30, 1954

of Krakatoa. They mentioned that, nearly a year later, a snowfall fell upon a portion of Italy that was pink in colour and that it was some of the atmospheric clearance from the disturbance of the explosion of Krakatoa. Now had that been energized, or radio-active, it would have been felt by civilization in another part of the world a year later and caused severe loss of life.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the great nations of the world have a craze at the present time for bigger and better bombs; that if one nation can develop a bomb that will destroy 100,000 people in a day, the other one sets out to build a bomb that will destroy 200,000 in half a day.

I should like to quote for an item here in the 'Encyclopedia Britannica' in connection with the Krakatoa explosion, and here it is, Mr. Speaker:

"It was computed that the column of atoms, dust and ashes projected from the volcano shot up into the air for a height of 17 miles or more. The finer particles coming into the higher layers of the atmosphere were diffused over a large part of the surface of the earth and showed their presence by the brilliant sunrise and sunset glow effects to which they gave rise.

Within the tropics they were at first borne along by air currents at an estimated rate of about 73 miles an hour from east to west, until, within a period of six weeks, they were diffused over nearly the whole space between the latitudes 30 degrees north and 45 degrees south. Eventually they spread northwards and southwards and were carried over North and South America, Europe, Asia, South Africa and Australia.

In the old world they spread from Scandinavia to the Cape of Good Hope."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with greater atomic and hydrogen bombs that soon they will set chain reactions into effect that will have the powerful results that Krakatoa had, and will set into motion the spreading of radio-active dust that will spread all over the world; and it is foolish for individuals to be complacent about this, Mr. Speaker. This is something that is going to reach out and knock over rich and poor, prince and pauper alike. There is no one going to escape from it, and it is going to make of this world, or portions of this world, a desert and an area that will not carry life for many years to come.

I notice in some of the governments of the world at the present time – the British government, the German government – great fear that the control of the atomic bomb was getting out of hand; that sooner or later something was going to be set in motion that scientists will not be able to hold in check. And we feel that we are very close to that time.

The resolution brings to the attention of this House the dangers that beset the nations of the world, and I feel very strongly that we have two world powers that are probably equally guilty; and there is a time, now, as never before, that the smaller people, the smaller nations of the world,

should speak with one voice. There is a great reason to keep these two world powers from setting a match to world safety.

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan here happen to be fortunate, probably unfortunate. We happen to be fortunate to have within our boundaries the material that goes into the manufacture of these powerful bombs; and to me it is very strange that we have no control, insofar as the province is concerned, as to what does happen to the material that is taken out of our northern resources. I would just like to point out that sooner or later there is going to be provincial responsibility, and I appeal that there should be a voice from this House to ask that some of the genius of man be directed here to Saskatchewan, toward the use of atomic power for the betterment of the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We have the atomic energy here in its natural form in our natural resource, and there is no reason why we should not be using it in the near future for new power. I believe that water power will be an outmoded power in time to come; and Mr. Speaker, in reference also to this item on how to get atomic power fastest, they do say here:

“There are research reactors of differing designs in France, Norway, Britain and Canada . . .”

Not in western Canada though, Mr. Speaker.

“New ones are being built in Sweden and Belgium. Twelve European countries have joined to create a European Atomic Research Centre in Switzerland. Experts from 19 countries met in Norway, last year, to promote atomic peace-use knowledge.

Canada is moving toward another reactor not just for research but for power. And Britain is moving toward two reactors designed to produce enough light and power to supply a small city. The British are not going await the outcomes of tedious international political atomic debates and delays.”

Before I sit down, I just want to go to another item here by the American people on civil defence problems, and I would like to just throw out these ideas, more or less broadcast, for the good that there is in them. I believe there is much fault in all portions of the world, Mr. Speaker. There are none of them who can claim that they have followed, to the degree that they should have, a path towards peace. The very attitude of the nations toward each other is very unchristian and very uncharitable.

The item here is “Civil Defence – The Long Range View’ of atomic scientists in convention at Chicago from August and December of 1950, and Mr. Speaker, it states here:

“Although there is no defence against atomic weapons once they are exploded, surely that must lead us to stronger feelings that the politicians and the statesmen of the world will have to do a little more leading than they have in the past.”

March 30, 1954

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member what he is quoting from there?

Mr. Feusi: — As I mentioned — “Civil Defence – The Long Range View”, from a bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, a convention held in Chicago, August and September, 1950.

“Although there is no defence against atomic weapons once they are exploded, their destructive effect can be reduced by interception of the bomb carriers and civil defence, i.e. evacuation, first aid, etc.

If peace cannot be preserved by rational means, the best we can do (and that is a very poor best, Mr. Speaker) is to make our cities less attractive to atomic attack by dispersing them. Such a move would reduce the effect and the likelihood of atomic attack.

As expected, the American monopoly of the atomic bomb has ended. The Soviet Union is accumulating a stockpile of those bombs and attempts at international control have bogged down. Now we must face reality and consider reducing our vulnerability to atomic attack. While preparedness is not a guarantee against aggression, it can delay aggression. Such a delay might produce some means of preventing an atomic war.

At present there are two factors tending to preserve the peace – first, the Soviet Union is not capable of attacking American war potential as effectively as America can attack the Soviet.”

Now that is just a supposition, Mr. Speaker:

“Second, the Atlantic nations are unable to prevent western Europe from being overrun by the Soviets, a condition which restrains those who would prefer to strike at the instigator of aggression, rather than fight his stooges. However, the first factor is vanishing more rapidly than the inequality in arms strength in Europe can be overcome. The great danger is that American atomic power may be neutralized by the counter threat of Soviet atomic power, while the Soviet armed power remains unchallenged in Europe and Asia.

To overcome this danger we must not only accelerate the arming of western Europe as well as other friendly areas and increase our development of atomic power, but we must also reduce our vulnerability to atomic attack. Although we are ahead in the production of atomic weapons, the Soviet Union is far ahead of us in protective

measures. Much of the Soviet industrial power was relocated beyond the Urals during the past war . . . (dissemination of industry which we in this half of the world have not done, Mr. Speaker.)

And undoubtedly the Soviet economic planners have pressed further dispersion of chief industrial plants. Moreover Soviet citizens are well trained in a civil defence programme, while individualism will dominate the average American and Canadian in the event of disaster. In addition, the American free press and radio will make it impossible to isolate a stricken area and prevent panic from spreading.” (We will remember the Orson Welles incident.)

Five atomic bombs dropped on five of our largest cities would cause more damage than 20 atomic bombs dropped on Soviet cities. Our only long-term chance lies in matching the Soviet capacity to absorb atomic attack without terrific damage. Within a few years, the Soviet Union will have accumulated enough atomic bombs to direct simultaneous attacks against many of our vital harbours and industrial centres. To face this threat we must organize a nation-wide plan for dispersing our war industries and administrative agencies and set up an effective warning and interceptive system.”

Mr. Speaker, bigger and better bombs for defence. I cannot help but liken our present civilization to a civilization that was known as prehistoric. Very ancient history tells us of a time on this earth when the creatures, in defence against each other, developed tremendous armour, tremendous plates of bone, until eventually, Mr. Speaker, the weight of that armour destroyed the very animal that carried it, and they are extinct, today. I just call that civilization to the attention of this House, for today the weight of expenditure on war and war defences has become colossal. It is not the end or the solution to man’s problems; and with that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit this resolution, seconded by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown).

Mr. Wooff (Turtleford):

I would just like to say a word on this Mr. Speaker. It is a tremendous issue, an issue that would take a great deal more time than is at the disposal of this House at this particular stage, even by someone competent to speak on it. Yet I feel that even we as lay people cannot evade our responsibility. There is no doubt that during the H-bomb tests that has just taken place in the Pacific, calculations by the scientists were very wide of the mark. Forces were let loose that even themselves were amazed by the results.

I would also like to tell you of something I read some years ago, where a scientist described the possibilities of power development on the west coast of Central America, with a combination of tide and river power which could be developed. And I am not concerned tonight, whether that scientist’s

March 30, 1954

theory was of any use to mankind or not. What I am concerned with is with the other approach that he made. After he had discussed the possibility, he said such a project would be absolutely useless unless we found an answer to the question of war. That is the point that I am concerned with tonight, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the development of atomic power at the present time. Unless you and I along with the rest of our fellowmen, find some solution not only to the war question but to the terrible armament race that is on, we never will know atomic power for peaceful and peacetime uses.

I remember discussing the question of internationalism, or nationalism rather, with a gentleman some 25 years ago – the time between the wars, when nationalistic spirit was developing. He argued with me that nationalistic spirit was going to develop enabling to the top certain valuable nationalistic characteristics. I did not deny it, but I argued at that time that not only would it develop nationalistic characteristics, but it would finally bring us into another word war. I think, Mr. Speaker, that my argument at that time is very true today.

I am not going to endeavour to go into this question at either any length or any depth, but I just want to say that there are a lot of us who pray “Thy Kingdom come” and talk very easily about world peace. Unless we, as laymen, are going to talk world peace and are going to live for it and are going to do quite a little sacrificing for it, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that following up the experiments in the Pacific this last month, we can destroy our civilization, we can set the world back again into a period of dark ages, and not one of us can shun our responsibility.

The blast that was set off on March 1st this year, had a total destructive radius of 12 miles, compared with the one mile of the atom bomb explosions. A 12-mile radius means that there is not a city on this continent which cannot be wiped out by one solitary blast. And it is just wishful thinking if we think we are going to be the only ones who are going to use those bombs successfully. No matter whether we win or not, we are going to lose; and as one person said, over the weekend, ‘if we start if, we have had it’.

We cannot shirk our responsibilities as laymen. I believe that the laymen often see more clearly the final outcome or the necessity of doing something that the expert, who is often engrossed with the details and the difficulty, while the layman does see the horizons much clearer because the detail and the difficulty are not blinding him.

I am only endeavouring, in a very disjointed manner tonight, to try and stir up the members of this House throughout the coming year to work toward peace, to realize that there are tremendous forces of destruction that are being toyed with at the present time. I use the word ‘toyed’ purposely, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that that is really what it amounts to at the present time. I shall certainly support the motion.

Mr. Gibbs (Swift Current):

Mr. Speaker, I just want to talk for a few minutes and I concur most heartily with the speakers who have just spoken on this matter.

It brings to my mind the question – just how insane are the people of the world going to get? It seems to me that ever since I was born and probably you were born, Mr. Speaker, that we have been living in a world of nothing but devastation, wars, degradation and everything that goes with it.

when I heard my hon. friend from Pelly speaking of these powerful bombs, I recalled, and I know that some of my colleagues in this Chamber, tonight, will recall, that during the first great war (I think it was the time when Hill 60 went up) they had mined underground for some miles, both the Allies and the enemy, and Hill 60 had to go up at a certain date. Over in England, Lloyd George who I believe was the Premier at that time was told to go down to the southeast coast of England, and listen to the explosion that took place when Hill 60 toppled. We thought, at that time, that that was a wonderful, magnificent thing. High explosives were used – nitroglycerin, dynamite, cordite and all that they had. But, today, Mr. Speaker, when we read and we listen to what is going on in this ‘good old world’ of course, it makes one wonder. I think we are all about ‘daft’ when we know what will happen. When we have seen what has happened in those wars of long ago – that was peanuts to what would happen today; and we thought we were fighting wars of a great nature.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to align myself with those people of Canada and those people of the world who are on the side of peace. I don’t want to see our country, nor any other country, devastated through the terrible weapons of war. Surely we are living, or should be living in a Christian and an intelligent age, and we do not have to have wars in order to survive. We used to think, at one time, of the ‘survival of the fittest’. I wonder who in the world, when you and I and our children and people all over the world can be dissipated in no time by radio activity, or whatever they like to call it – things that we cannot even see!

You know, you don’t mind a chap hitting you between the eyes if he is in front of you, but when you cannot see what is coming, look out! It is like those whizz-bangs – you could hear them and then you would duck, but something would go on behind you, something would go off. Well, the poor devils who were there when it went off – that is where the poppies over in Flanders are growing, today.

We do not want to see that, Mr. Speaker, in our country. I never want to see war in Canada or this part of the universe or any part of the world; and that is why I think – and I am going to subscribe to what the speakers before me said – that we should, and can, live in a world of peace and security if we will only get down to some real intelligent thinking. And possibly because I know how socialism starts from poverty and destitution, we are trying to build up a system where we can live decently. I think if we studied more on socialistic lines to provide for production instead of destruction, we would have the whole thing solved; and I would recommend that every member look at this resolution. I think it is a fine resolution. We are trying to do our bit, as far as we are concerned, to outlaw this terrible thing, the hydrogen and the atomic bomb, and I hope we do it.

Mr. R. Brown (Last Mountain):

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to discuss this resolution, even though I was the seconder of it. But as I see it is getting around to about a quarter to ten, I don’t think we are going to do much more tonight, so I might as well finish the evening off.

I don’t think really there is much need to debate a resolution of this nature, and certainly I am of the opinion that the mover has done a very adequate job of covering the subject; but there are one or two observations which I would like to make.

I would like to remind the House that when we first heard about the atomic explosion in Japan which wiped out about some 60,00 people, we were of the opinion that a new era had dawned in the world. Frankly, I don't think we were too concerned about the advances which might be made as far as the destructive powers of the atom were concerned; but I recall very distinctly that we were given quite a bit of news and a lot of stories of what we could expect in this bright new world, now that our scientists had discovered the power of the atom, when it was put to work for civilian and peaceful purposes. We were led to expect great things. We were led to believe that in this bright new world, with the atomic energy which our scientists had discovered, we could expect mankind to be released from drudgery, given time to get away from the poverty and disease and labour which he had been forced to perform in past years; he was going to have time to devote his creative capacities to more suitable ends. We felt that if we could free our people from that sort of thing that possibly, with a happier and more contented life, we could expect a more peaceful world.

It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, that some small advances have been made with respect to the use of atomic power for civilian and peaceful purposes, but unfortunately, while we have made some meagre advances along those lines, we seem to have made much greater strides in developing the atom and the terrific power which it holds for destructive purposes. While we read of a power plant in the United Kingdom being set up to generate power from atomic energy, we read on the other hand, stories of development of atomic submarines and atomic cannons and better and greater and larger atomic bombs.

Recently, as the mover to this resolution has pointed out, we have been able to pick up our newspaper and read stories of the latest explosion in the Pacific which was set off by the United States. We also read stories where the people throughout the world are becoming quite concerned about what the future holds for us, if these explosions are to continue. I notice the papers are carrying stories with respect to the reaction of the people in the United Kingdom, saying that the people are beginning to develop a defeatist attitude with respect to the hydrogen and atomic bombs. They are coming the point where they are gradually saying to themselves, "What's the use, if we are going to continually faced with the fear of these atomic and hydrogen explosions, what is the use of trying to consider or worry about anything else?" Frankly, I think the mere fact that the United States and Russia, the two powers which we know of have the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, have it, is beginning to create a feeling of fear in the people throughout the world which has been unknown throughout history.

It is true that during the past we have had some fear with respect to war, but I don't think that was anywhere near the fear which is being engendered in people throughout the world today, because while we did worry in the past about our people having to go to war and the privation which our civilian population might suffer, and the manpower which we might lose by the use of the ordinary instruments of war, there is nothing to compare with the terrific forces which have been unleashed in recent years. The civilian population generally are beginning to know the fear which almost surpasses that of the ordinary soldier in the line who has fought in past wars, when they stop to think that they don't have to worry about an ordinary bomb from an aircraft, or an ordinary shell from a cannon, or some rounds from a machine gun; when they stop to think that all that has to happen is one aircraft go over and drop one very small bomb that is likely to wipe out any of our larger cities on this side of the Atlantic and lay waste a huge slice of territory and

leave anywhere from half a million to a million people dead. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time then when people throughout the world should, like Poe's story, put to their conscience the question which he did:

“Such is the world; such are we
What therefore shall we do?”

I think that applies particularly to those two great powers that we do know have the atom and the hydrogen bomb. I think it applies to our own country of Canada, and I think possibly the people and the government of this country should ask themselves not so much ‘what therefore shall we do’, but ‘what therefore can we do?’

On the face of it, some people might question if there is anything that this country of Canada can do. I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is something that this country and the people of this country can do through their government. I think that, first, we should take a quick look at the situation as it exists today with respect to atomic power. We find that we have two countries, as I have stated, the United States and the Soviet Union, continuing to complete in a stockpiling of atomic bombs and in the U.S., as we well know, the stockpiling of hydrogen bombs. The United States have been at it for quite a number of years and it has been going on in Russian since 1949.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the mere fact that they have been stockpiling these weapons has placed the United States and the Soviet Union squarely on the horns of a dilemma. The stockpile of atomic bombs is reaching, or has already reached, the point of diminishing returns. They have reached the point where neither side can profit by continuing to add to their stockpile, because in any event, each competitor has sufficient bombs to deliver a catastrophic blow. That is the situation I think we are faced with today, and I would like to suggest that we are not too unduly optimistic to hope that an agreement can be reached to cease this senseless and useless stockpiling of atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs. It seems reasonable to me that if that is the situation as it exists today, it would be reasonable to assume that much or most of the policy talk going on between these two great powers today is nothing more nor less than mere bluff. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a fair assumption. And if that is the case, a country such as Canada and the United Kingdom, the powers of the East, so-called secondary powers, have a very important part to play in deciding the issue as far as the future use of atomic energy and atomic bombs and atomic weapons are concerned. I think that if they really set their minds to it, they can work out an agreement for the control of other weapons throughout the world, and I submit that this country of ours, Canada, can and must take a decided part in working out such an agreement. I think Canada is in a very favourable position to take the lead, or give some leadership, in arranging such an agreement, because, as has been pointed out by the mover of this resolution, we in Canada do produce a fair portion of the necessary raw materials that go into the manufacture of atomic weapons. I would submit that, if we can once reach an agreement (and I am convinced that it can be reached) for the curtailment of future manufacturing and stockpiling of atomic bombs and other atomic weapons, it will not be too long before we can reach an agreement where we can dispose of the stockpiles which have already been placed in existence. Once we reach that point, I don't think it would take us too long to set our scientists to work throughout the countries of the world to devoting and harnessing the power of the atom and putting it to use for peaceful and civilian purposes.

March 30, 1954

That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason I felt called upon to second this resolution. I think that there should be no argument or no question on the part of any member of this House in supporting this resolution which asks the Government of Canada to take the lead and try to work out an agreement amongst the great powers of the world which already hold the atom weapon, and ask them to devote their productive capacity to civilian and productive purposes and I take great pleasure in supporting the motion.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

POLLUTION OF THE NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER

Moved by Mr. Kramer, seconded by the Hon. Mr. McIntosh:

“That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to take cognizance of the health hazard and inconvenience which Saskatchewan citizens living along the course of the North Saskatchewan River have suffered as a result of the pollution of this stream by an industrial firm in Alberta;

And further, urges the Government of Canada to enact the necessary legislation which will prevent the pollution of inter-provincial streams, thereby protecting the lives, safety, health and property of the people who use these waters for domestic or recreational purposes.”

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):

Mr. Speaker, I had already put my books away, but the longer I sit in this House the more I am of the opinion that what we need in this Legislature is more auctioneers. You know, being an auctioneer, I realize it is part of the job of an auctioneer not to talk too much and knock down the article before it starts to lose value. I think that probably some members of this House might benefit from the training an auctioneer receives.

The resolution I have to offer here concerns a matter that I acquainted the members of this Assembly with a short while ago, and that is, water pollution. I think you will remember how the very presence of that water in this House polluted the atmosphere the entire afternoon.

Since last fall, or you might say just about after freezeup – once the ice began to form on the river, it continually became more noticeable that there was something in the water of the North Saskatchewan River that was not just quite palatable. It was brought to the attention of the health officials of the city of Prince Albert and a few other places along the river; it was brought to the attention of Ottawa and various provincial departments and federal departments concerned. All, apparently, decided there was nothing they could do about it. The fact that the pollution took place in one province and the effect of that pollution took place in two other provinces, automatically to many of us concerned, seemed to put the matter on a national level, and we assume that the responsibility automatically would become that of the Federal Government.

Various members, the member of Parliament for The Battlefords (Mr. Campbell) and the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) brought these

things to the attention of the House at Ottawa and to that of the Hon. Paul Martin, who continually stated that the Federal Government was not competent to handle the matter and that it was the responsibility of the provincial governments. There is no way, apparently, that we can do anything about it, or our Attorney-General can do anything about a situation where the origin of the pollution takes place in another province.

We have been fortunate, after much negotiation urging the Federal Government to take part, to get the consent of the Alberta government to take action against that company, and the pollution was stopped on March 4th. They issued an ultimatum to this company to stop dumping this refuse and to turn that refuse into a pit, on approximately March 4th of this year. Then, after a short period of attempting to burn this in the pit, the disposal pipes plugged and they turned the valve back into the river.

The presumption of these people, Mr. Speaker, is almost amazing. They may have some reason to excuse themselves before the pollution took place and before they found out what the effect was, but after they knew the effect, rather than shut down their plant in Edmonton, they chose to again pollute the waters of that river. Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. Campbell and some others have pointed out that the Federal Government could take action under the Navigable Waters Protection Act, the Criminal Code and even the Fisheries Act was mentioned, and some such action is needed.

We do not propose in this motion what Act they should take action under. All we want is some leadership.

Mr. Speaker: — May I draw to the attention of the hon. member that it is getting near 11 o'clock. Does he wish to continue or to adjourn the debate? If he is not going to take very long the House may agree to stay?

Mr. Kramer: — I don't intend to take very long. I am only covering the bare facts, if I may.

Some Members: — Go ahead.

Mr. Loftson: — How long will it take?

Mr. Speaker: — You have a few minutes – the clock is a little fast.

Mr. Kramer: — Well, I'll try and be as fast as the clock. We maintain, as I pointed out, that this is an inter-provincial matter. There have been situations – I could quote them, but I shall not. I have various instances here where the Attorney-General of Canada has taken action in water pollution cases.

What we ask in this motion, Mr. Speaker, is that the Federal Government give the leadership to see to it that the people of Canada have at least as much protection as the fish of Canada; that they have protection when it comes to their health, their property. Even stock refuse to drink out of the water holes along the North Saskatchewan River, and in the case of those that are forced to drink out of it, the production in milk and so on has dropped off considerably. I could go on and on; and I think it is very evident, when we have three provinces concerned, and we cannot be vulcanized. Therefore I wish to move this motion.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.