

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 17, 1956

The House met at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

MESSAGE OF REGRET

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us regret that, yesterday afternoon, the wife of the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, Mr. Wellbelove, our Deputy Speaker, was taken to the hospital seriously ill.

I know that I am expressing the feelings of all the members of the House when I extend to him our sympathy at Mrs. Wellbelove's illness, and express our deep and sincere hope for her very speedy recovery.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 16, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that with the time of my disposal, I must dispense with the ordinary amenities due the previous speakers other than the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Their speeches showed that a great deal of care, time and effort had been put into their compilation, and I wish to commend them very much for that effort. The context of their speeches was such, Mr. Speaker, that when they had finished, it brought to mind that young man who had arrived at a new boarding house, wishing to make an impression upon his landlady, and who said, at the evening meal: "My, that was good hash" — "How do you make such good hash?" The reply was: "I do not make hash; it accumulates."

The Government of Saskatchewan, in its overwhelming strength, has seen fit to accord the members of the Opposition 180 minutes of radio time out of a total of 720 minutes on the air — barely over a fraction of one-quarter of the time. This, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the 11 members sitting in Opposition represent almost a little better than 40 per cent of the electors of our province. This arbitrary division of the radio time is in itself a very effective form of closure imposed upon the members of the Opposition, and to make this closure more effective, the Government has also seen fit to so arrange the order of the speakers, that almost without exception members of the Opposition must take the first 35 or 40 minutes of the debating period of the day.

February 17, 1956

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. That is not correct. I looked over the speaking arrangements for next week, and I see that on one day the Government member takes the first, and the next day the Opposition takes the first. If my friends do not find that satisfactory, it can easily be arranged between the Whips or the radio committee.

Mr. Speaker: — Maybe I should make a remark here, as Chairman of the committee. Your statements are not correct.

Mr. Dunfield: — Mr. Speaker, I said almost without exception, and that arrangement the Premier has just mentioned occurs only once in the next two weeks.

Some Govt. Member: — Poor baby!

Mr. Dunfield: — That means that members on the Government side of the House, speaking on most occasions during the latter period of the air time, may carry on for the rest of the afternoon if they so wish, and thereby get their ideas to the public through the press.

Some Govt. Member: — What press?

Mr. Dunfield: — Last Wednesday the Premier spoke very movingly of (among other things), the freedom of speech, but when it applies to members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that political expediency makes short shrift of this freedom of ours. This arrogant attitude of the Government is but a part, apparently a part of a long determined effort on the part of the Government to throttle open and free discussion of public questions in this Chamber, and in the committee rooms. Time after time, Mr. Speaker, we have asked questions regarding certain Crown Corporations, and the very bland answer has been: "It would not be in the interests of the public to disclose such information."

When people ask me, as they have, and no doubt they have asked every member of the Opposition, why do the members of the Opposition not take a more active part in the discussions of this House, my answer, Mr. Speaker, can only be: "Ask the Government that question." But to read in Hansard and public press the volume of speeches that come out of the Federal House, one would think that there must be at least 100 C.C.F. members in the House of Commons.

Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose): — The others are not there.

Mr. Dunfield: — Simply because, Mr. Speaker, there they allow members of the Opposition to speak at the ratio of one member for each member of the Government, because in the House of Commons the Federal Government in Ottawa is not the least bit disturbed about having their affairs discussed at length.

Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg): — What about radio?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Dunfield: — Now, Mr. Speaker, although I had prepared a speech for delivery in this debate, after listening to the attack in the Premier's

speech the other day, in which he made a most vicious, prolonged attack upon the Leader of the Opposition, I decided that my speech would sound much better if I gave it to a Sunday School class, or something of that order. So I had to change it at a minute's notice, and I thought it only right that those of us on this side should have the opportunity of commenting, at least to some extent, on the Premier's discussion the other day.

Now, I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that there is nobody whom I enjoy listening to more than I do the Premier of Saskatchewan. When he is in a mellow and retrospective mood, his words are charming, kindly and full of optimism and wisdom; and when I hear the sound of his voice, my heart is filled with kindness towards all men – even the C.C.F.! My mind is filled with a spiritual good, but when the Leader of the Government rises in his place as the Premier of this province, determined to flay the hides off of the Opposition, and particularly that of the Opposition Leader, he is a very different person indeed. But even then I enjoy listening to him, because of his mastery of the English language, and his complete mastery of all the arts or oratory.

When the other day, the Premier rose in his seat and after complimenting the previous speakers, and then complimenting the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, said – and after saying that, Mr. Speaker, I just quivered with expectancy. I know it's a wonder some of the hon. members opposite didn't say I shook like a jelly-fish. However, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite sure without the personality, the skill, and the oratory of the Premier of this province, that the C.C.F. Party would come apart at the seams, and notwithstanding the able administrators he has with him, would not be able to put it together again.

It is rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that a number of people whom I met prior to the Premier's speech with one accord told me just about what was going to be in that speech. They said it would be composed of two main themes; first, there would be a prolonged and vicious attack on the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan – the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, with the full intention of destroying him in the public mind as quickly as that could be done. Those tactics have been very successful in the past, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure you their effectiveness has gone forever, as long as we have the present leader of our party.

The second part of that speech, I was told, would be that the Premier would ride that trusty old horse, attack on the Federal Government. Strange to say, when his speech was reported in the press the next day, the headlines read: 'Douglas Attacks McDonald and Hon. Friends'. And a quick analysis of that speech, Mr. Speaker, shows that almost three-quarters of the Premier's speaking time was spent in a wicked attack on the Leader of the Opposition – an attack that I believe was filled with misstatements and false conclusions, about which I shall deal in a few moments. But what was most notable in the speech, Mr. Speaker, was the complete absence of any constructive suggestion on the part of the Premier about what this Government would do in the coming year to try to solve the difficulties and problems that face us today in Saskatchewan.

I would like to deal with a few of the points which the Premier made in his speech, and all the quotations I am going to use are from the same paper, the Regina 'Leader-Post, of February 16th, so I need not mention

that in each case. The first one I would like to touch upon, Mr. Speaker, is this – The Premier said: “And I am amazed at the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition who said that in 12 years this Government had done absolutely nothing to relieve the burden of the municipalities.” Now, you can take that in different ways, Mr. Speaker. If you are in debt today and you reduce that debt over a period of time, but you accumulate further debt and you wind up \$2.00 in the hole over and above what you started with, you certainly haven’t done very much about it.

I would like to say here, Mr. Speaker, this Government speaks so often about reducing the debt of this province. I remember the darkest days in the history of our province when because of 10 years of world-wide economic depression, and eight years of drought, the economy of our province reached its lowest point. The men administering our affairs in those days in both Liberal and Conservative Governments, had to mortgage the future that they might in that day supply food and clothing to nearly one-half the population of Saskatchewan; that they could supply feed, seed and repairs for a great number of the farmers in this province, who, because of succeeding drought years, had eventually exhausted their cash resources; but for the good of this province, had not exhausted those greater resources of courage and strength that had brought them through these years of depression.

Under those conditions the governments of the day did the only thing they could do; they borrowed enormous sums of money, and even had to back the great Wheat Pool of Saskatchewan which was on the verge of bankruptcy. The Anderson Government of that day endorsed the Pool liabilities for some \$14 million so that the debt of this province rose alarmingly. But of that debt, though it had reached \$214 million in 1944, this Government, when it tells about reducing the debt, never says a word of the nearly \$44 million that was cancelled by the Federal Government; of the monies that have been repaid by the Wheat Pool, of the monies that have been repaid by the Saskatchewan Co-operatives, and by the millions of dollars in advance repaid by farmers on their seed loans, amounting to a total of over \$70 million.

The Premier also mentions that among the crushing burdens was the \$72 million seed grain and relief debts, many of which were paid, not by the Government, but by the farmers of this province. Mr. Douglas said: “The Liberals, Conservatives and the C.C.F. did something about it – the Liberals put them on, but we took them off.” And again he says this: “This Government removed the two-mill Public Revenue Tax.” I well remember that the Government did that; we can give them credit for it; it was only after four years of intense campaigning on the part of the Liberal Opposition, and in the last days of the Legislature they removed that tax. But the strange thing about it, Mr. Speaker, (and this is really a gem!) they returned to the municipalities that tax on one hand, and took it away from them with the other, which is quite common practice in the policies of this Government.

May I read here, and this is a report of the Department of Highways and Transportation for the fiscal year ending 1954; in computing the amount of special grants that will be given to the municipalities, this is what was done, Mr. Speaker. It was found that the total tax levied in 1952 was approximately three and a half times the total amount of the equalized grants for this year, and the following formula was used to determine the 1953 market road grant: 1952 grant multiplied by $3\frac{1}{2}$, less the public revenue for 1952 equals the 1953 grant.

Premier Douglas: — The sum total of the grant was the same.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — No, it wasn't.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Dunfield: — You know, Mr. Speaker, when I hear of how the Government has reduced these debts, I think of the town in which I live, in which the tax rate is such today that we say we no longer own our property; we are merely buying it back every 12 years, and when the sewer and water is installed, as we hope it will be in the near future, and we'll take a chance on the higher costs, we will be buying our property over 10 years. Taxation has reached the point where, as a short time ago my wife said: "My goodness, I wish you would straighten up; you're getting an awful hump on your back." I said: "My dear, that isn't a hump on my back — that's simply the load of taxation I'm carrying that makes me look that way."

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Looks more like fat to me!

Mr. Dunfield: — Then again we find another extract from the speech, Mr. Speaker, which says: "When the C.C.F. took office in 1944, almost all the burden of social welfare rested on the municipalities. Today the province assumes almost 80 per cent of the cost of social aid and benefits." Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier thinks that we are so naïve that we fail to realize this province, were it not for the assistance received from Ottawa, is and has for years been bankrupt? Perhaps the money we derive from Ottawa is well deserved, to which we have a right, but on the revenues of this province our public affairs could not be sustained for six months of the year. During the year ending April 30th, 1954, according to the records of this Government, the Dominion of Canada paid to the Government and the people of this province over \$70 million in cold cash. Over \$20 million was paid to the people of this province directly, in old-age pensions paid by the Federal Government, and not by this Government, as is so often told by party workers of this Government. I actually had one elderly person tell me, or try to argue with me, that they obtained that pension from the provincial government. I said, "No, I think you're mistaken." "No", they said, and showed me an envelope coming from Regina. Of course, it comes from Regina — a Federal office in Regina!

In addition to that \$20 million paid to those over 70 years of age, in that same year there was paid directly to the people of Saskatchewan over \$20 million in family allowances, and some \$3 million was paid to the province for distribution as they saw fit for various other social programmes. In addition to that there was paid to the Government of Saskatchewan a subsidy of \$26,907,000, and the purpose of this subsidy was to assist the provinces in paying for health and social services which are provincial government responsibilities. And this Government says they took the load of social welfare off the backs of the municipalities.

Again I quote from the Premier's speech: "The Premier noted that Mr. McDonald had said he had promised in 1944 to take on the provinces' constitutional responsibility for education." Here is the answer the Premier gives to that: (for sheer brilliant evasiveness it is hard to beat). This is what the Premier said: "What is our constitutional responsibility for education? It is to provide grants and aid schools so that areas that ordinarily cannot afford proper educational facilities will be able to have them, so that all

February 17, 1956

sections of our province get an equal opportunity for education.” That is the interpretation the Premier puts upon it today, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the promise he made to the people before he was elected to power. He made promises, as did many others, that never in the world have been fulfilled. Even if they partly fulfill them, or fulfill them to the utmost capacity of the province, we would not criticize.

This is what the Premier actually said in 1943, February 16th:

“The first thing which a C.C.F. Government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the provincial government. There has been a tendency on the part of the provincial governments to pass the buck to the municipalities, and local school boards from obtaining educational facilities. The time has now come when we must recognize that Canada’s constitution places the responsibility for teaching squarely on the provincial governments, and it cannot be passed on to any other today.”

That is quite a difference between the actual statements and the interpretation, Mr. Speaker.

Again the Premier criticizes the Federal Government for not immediately putting up the money for the Saskatchewan Dam. Mr. Speaker, I do not know a great deal about the Saskatchewan Dam, nor what effect it will have upon the total economy of this province, living in the far part of the north. But I know perfectly well that if it is in the best interests of all the province, and this province intends to put up \$85 million towards the building of that dam, then I am for it. I have heard a number of people say: “Well, what good is it going to be to me?” Long ago, Mr. Speaker, I learned in business, and before that, in the early days of our community life, that I as an individual, and all others, that anything each of us could do to improve our neighbours’ situation automatically improved our own, and on that basis I would certainly support any effort, and all efforts towards the development of the Saskatchewan Dam. But the Premier says this:

“If the Federal Government contributes to the Canso Causeway, with which I agree, it contributes toward the St. Lawrence Seaway, with which I agree, and now it offers to contribute \$85 million towards construction of the unprofitable section of the natural gas pipeline through northern Ontario. But the Federal Government says it could not contribute \$65 million for the Saskatchewan River Dam at the present time, or spread over several years.”

Going back into our Canadian history, Mr. Speaker, in 1870 and 1871, the proposed province of British Columbia would only come into confederation on the assurance that there would be a transcontinental railway built to the west coast. There were, in our government at Ottawa, at that time, other men too of small vision, who said it was utterly impossible – the cost is too great. It was to pass through exactly the same area through which this proposed gas pipeline is going, and which will be the responsibility of the Federal Government. That area at that time was thought to be of very

little value, and which has now proved to be a pot of gold, as did the western prairies.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the gas line is in the interests of Canada as a whole, and I wonder if the Premier would oppose that simply because it is not in the interests of Saskatchewan. In considering the needs of the Dominion as a whole, every province is making demands on our Federal Government. I know perfectly well, and feel sure that the Prime Minister of Canada would like to deal with them all, but they must come in the order of their value to the Dominion as a whole. Living in Saskatchewan, I doubt very much whether the need for the dam in Saskatchewan is as great as the need for a gasline to Ontario.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, that's wonderful.

Mr. Dunfield: — . . . or is as great as the need for the St. Lawrence Waterway, or as great as the need for the Canso Causeway.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — You're getting yourself on record now.

Premier Douglas: — Good, it's nice to have said it; that's what we wanted!

Mr. Dunfield: — And of course we hear spokesmen in this Government (in this particular speech, the Premier did not bring it to our attention again — I expected he would), but we have heard so much criticism by the members of the Government regarding the Liberal stand on electrification — that a Liberal Government would bring the power to the farmers' door without cost. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that the C.C.F. Party speakers here say that that is impossible. Apparently there is a division of opinion between the C.C.F. Party in Saskatchewan and the C.C.F. Party in Alberta, for I noticed an item in the 'Leader-Post' in June last year, reporting a speech of Elmer Roper given in Stettler, Alberta, several days before in which he said this, Mr. Speaker:

“That if elected to power in Alberta, a C.C.F. government would extend electrification to every part of the province where feasible, without cost to the farmers.”

Some Govt Member: — Good old Liberal policy!

Mr. Dunfield: — I think the Socialist coating on Elmer is wearing very thin, and he would look quite well on this side of the House.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — He'd improve the looks all right.

Mr. Dunfield: — Again I quote what the Premier said. The Premier also rapped Mr. McDonald for a speech he made to business clubs in Toronto, in which he said that investors hesitate to enter Saskatchewan while a C.C.F. Government is in power. Mr. Douglas said it was all right for Mr. McDonald to talk like that in Saskatchewan, where people could weigh his statements against the facts. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1954, speaking in the Throne Speech Debate in this House, I produced for your edification a copy of the 'Toronto Star', a paper distributed widely over the Dominion of Canada, in which there was an article written by paid writers of this Government

February 17, 1956

outlining the miraculous accomplishments of the C.C.F. Government in relation to the Green Lake Metis settlement. There wasn't a single truthful statement in that, Mr. Speaker, and yet that was sent all over the Dominion of Canada, and I felt compelled to point out some of the inaccuracies. That was all right for a C.C.F. spokesman to do, Mr. Speaker.

It seems to me I recall in past elections in western Canada and as far east as Ontario, too, that men high in this Government took part in these elections in these other provinces. One of the things I well remember, and which can easily be authenticated is that they go to these provinces, particularly B.C. where the people of B.C. were paying \$45 a year for hospitalization, and spokesmen for this Government pointed to them with the finger of scorn and said, "Why, in Saskatchewan we give the people complete hospitalization for \$30, at that time.

In the following session of 1953, Mr. Speaker, I rose in this House and pointed out that I, that year alone, had paid almost \$100 for hospitalization. I didn't object to it; I said if the Premier said we have to pay \$100, I will say it is all right, because it is a good plan – an excellent plan, but in the last few years Public Accounts show that the total cost of hospitalization in this province was \$19½ million, and that all the monies received through the Hospital Services Plan amounted to \$6½ million – exactly one-third; that another \$5½ million was obtained through the one per cent hospitalization tax, and the balance was obtained from the general funds of the province which you and I have paid into through countless new taxes, and increases of various other taxes, so that if the hospitalization costs \$19½ million and the services plan only brought in one-third of it, hospitalization on the basis of per family, cost the people of Saskatchewan \$120 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I am only half through with what I would like to say, but my time is limited. I am going to jump over some of it and bring up a most important point. I read in the press the other day that the Premier said: "We have great need in Saskatchewan for private industries, with their many and accompanying secondary industries," and never was a truer word spoken, Mr. Speaker. But private industries are based on primary products, and two of the most common products used in primary industry are forest products and gas, and some of the factors that determine whether or not primary industries will invest here the great sums of money necessary in fixed assets, is our political climate, and a political climate in which some of their raw products and principal raw resources, are under monopoly control of the Government, does not make for a climate politically satisfactory to the investment of large sums of money.

I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that we had in our province a primary industry – in fact, we used to have a number of primary industries, but they are now lost to our province because of the policies of this Government. I have here extracts from the Regina 'Leader-Post' of February 6th, entitled: 'Lumber Town Walking Last Mile to Oblivion'. I shall read only a small part of it . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Who wrote it?

Mr. Dunfield: — It is immaterial who wrote it – the context is true. I could write it myself – or you, you could write it too.

“Within a month the big sawmill of The Pas Lumber Company, backbone of the community for the past 26 years, will be idle, and many of its 250 employees out of work, or uprooted from familiar surrounds.

“The firm announced recently that it was moving its mill to Prince George, B.C., because no more private timber is available here. Negotiations with the Saskatchewan Government for timber erecting large remaining stands, broke down last spring, and the Company looked elsewhere for its timber.”

And a little further down it says:

“The company, a pioneer of 26 years, has cut approximately 315 million board feet in that time, as well as providing employment to an average working crew of 200,000.”

Last year in this House I asked whether in the negotiations with the Anglo-Canadian Pulp Company, this Government had agreed to give them a long-term timber berth, and the answer was ‘Yes’, but they would not apparently accord such a privilege to this Company here. We have plywood mills, and box factories, private factories, who if they are to remain in existence, must have the opportunity of obtaining their materials at rock bottom prices right from the forest, but that is utterly impossible under the socialized system we have for our timber resources today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying this, that I believe in all governments there is a distinct and accepted field for Crown Corporations. As in the case of public utilities, or where there is need for public service for which there is neither capital (private), nor experience, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when a government goes into direct competition with its own citizens, and by their actions destroys the citizens way of life, they have destroyed one of the greatest assets of a people – the private initiative of their citizens. That is what is happening today in the monopoly of the forest resources of our province. Many, many people have left our province who used to find employment in our forests. Just before I left Meadow Lake, one of the garage men said to me: “Well, I had a nice plum handed to me today. The Credit Corporation handed me four large units – trucking united that had been used up until that time in the hauling of lumber to be delivered to the Timber Board.” This for which (and I think he hauled for about 105 miles) he obtained \$9.00 a thousand board feet. It was impossible to make ends meet.

I don’t know when the true story of the Timber Board operations will be told, Mr. Speaker, but when it is told, I can assure you that it will be one of the most tragic stories, and one of the darkest blots in the history of Saskatchewan.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Are we to take your word for it?

Mr. Dunfield: — You need not take my word for it, you need only to ask the merchants in the northern part of Saskatchewan, the garage

February 17, 1956

men and the repair men who have co-operated with these loggers in their unequalled fight to make ends meet under Timber Board contracts. You only need to ask to see their ledgers, Mr. Speaker, and there you will find in the debit column written in large, red letters a tragic story of beaten men and women . . .

Mr. Kramer: — And farmers in there?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Dunfield: — . . . such as we have never known before in the history of our province. That is Socialism in the north, Mr. Speaker. I certainly cannot support the motion.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Dunfield) complained several times during the course of his remarks about having inadequate time during which to deliver his thoughts. I think it is only fair to point out, Mr. Speaker, that he adjourned this debate yesterday afternoon; there was nothing to have prevented him from going on and speaking for at least some considerable amount of time yesterday afternoon, off the air, just as I expect to do this afternoon, off the air. The debates in this Legislature are not directed just to the people who are listening but are directed to the material before us, namely, the Speech from the Throne and the record of the Government.

He has complained, also, with regard to the division of time as between Government and Opposition speakers. This is a matter which was raised before and it was suggested at that time that it could be more properly discussed when the report of the radio committee was before the House. It is nevertheless true, Mr. Speaker, that the ratio of time works out to about three to one; actually, if one takes as a basic the membership in the House the Government could, on that basis, claim a much better proportion of time than even that.

I am not going to spend too much time in dealing with the remarks of the member for Meadow Lake in his attempt to debate the remarks of the Premier just a few days ago. The people have had chance to hear both of them, and certainly the Premier's arguments need no bolstering.

It would be in order to mention one or two things, however, which he said. For example, he referred to the reduction in the seed grain debt. He inferred that this was not a relief because of the actions of the Government — that some of this had been paid by individual farmers. The figures that the Premier gave were not that, of course; they amounted to the account of the debt taken off the backs of the municipalities and farmers as the result of action by the Provincial Government.

With regard to the removal of the Public Revenue Tax, he has evidently forgotten that the year before the Public Revenue Tax was removed it was diverted into the education fund and the whole amount of it added to education grants.

Some Opposition Members: — Ha! Ha! Ha! Ha!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The hon. members are inclined to find that humorous. They have a faculty of laughing at facts which hasn't served them in too good stead over the years. I repeat my statement — the year before the Public Revenue Tax was removed, an amount equal to the amount collected was added to education grants and after the Public Revenue Tax was removed that amount still continued to be aid as additional grants towards education in the province of Saskatchewan.

He refers again to the money from Ottawa as a subsidy. Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out on many occasions that this is not a subsidy from the Federal Government to the Provincial Government. This is a re-distribution of wealth for the greater part, wealth which originated in the province of Saskatchewan, but which was drained off into other provinces, into other parts of Canada, and taxed in those other parts and returned in part, and in part only, by this device.

It was rather interesting to hear his defence, or attempt at defence of the Federal Government's action in being willing to support the pipeline taking gas into Ontario, and at the same time not being willing to support a lesser expenditure to make available the benefits of the South Saskatchewan Dam in the province of Saskatchewan. He maintained that that was the preferable decision. In other words, Mr. Speaker, he said in fact this — that cheaper power for Ontario is more important than irrigation, cheaper power, diversification of industry to Saskatchewan. We can see again where the hon. members of the Opposition stand.

He referred again to the report which he read last year in the 'Toronto Star Weekly'. It is worthwhile to note that a statement published in the 'Toronto Star' was, according to him, quite untrue, because of the person who wrote it, but that a statement, again according to him, appearing in the 'Leader-Post' was true regardless of who wrote it. There was one point that the Premier made that he didn't mention, and that was when the Premier spoke of the advertising carried on by the Liberal Party in Alberta telling the people there how much better off people in Saskatchewan were, and that he failed to mention.

I want, to have something to say with regards to the words of the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke a few days ago in the House. One thing certainly was obvious as a result of his remarks. The price of wheat may be down, and the price of pork may be down, the price of beef may be down, but the price with the Liberal Party is willing to pay for votes is still going up. Just look at a few of the increases in this price offered in the address a few days ago. He at one point favoured, he said, extending the assistance of the Government for education, until such time as the province carried 100 per cent of the cost of education. The only party that I know of that has made a better offer than that, Mr. Speaker, is the Labour Progressive Party. I think they are proposing that the Federal Government should carry it all.

He proposed that the province could well afford to carry the entire cost of the market road grid. He proposed that they could take electricity to all the farmers for nothing, and pay back, of course, to all farmers who had paid something for that connection. And following all that they would cut the cost of electricity in one-half.

I think all one needs to say is that the people of Saskatchewan

February 17, 1956

through the years have learned that when they are buying in this kind of market they look at both quality and quantity. They will recall the last suit that they purchased from the Liberal Party, which possibly they thought they were buying cheap at the time, and discovered that they really were buying cheap. They will remember that it was a bit cold and thin, and didn't wear too well, and they will look at the present offer, and understand that the light shines through rather easily.

With regard to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, and repeated by the hon. member for Meadow Lake, concerning the stand of this movement prior to 1944, the Premier made a statement at the time. I want to say again that no intelligent person ever interpreted, or should have interpreted the C.C.F. policy in 1944 as being one of the Government paying all the costs. Now, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, I said no intelligent person. I said that to explain the lack of intelligence across the way.

Mr. McDonald: — He said it, but he didn't mean it. You can't squirm out of it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Of this I am sure. I doubt very much if any candidate of the C.C.F. ever suggested that that was the policy of the C.C.F. Party.

Mr. McDonald: — Do you want to read it?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I've read it.

Mr. McDonald: — No you haven't.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I can read, not like the hon. Leader of the Opposition who stood up and told us stories about the pictures in his book, the other day, and forget about the writing in it.

Mr. McDonald: — You're not able to tell us . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I want to add this, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of what the Leader of the Opposition said about the Liberal Party some day moving to the point where the provincial government would carry 100 per cent of the costs of education, if that day should happen, it would be a sad day for education in the province of Saskatchewan. It would be most inadvisable for any government to ever carry all of the costs of education out of the revenues of the province as such.

But regardless of what happened in 1944, the hon. members across the way forget that there have been elections since 1944; that in 1948 the people had the chance to vote, knowing our record, and re-elected us; that in 1952 they had the chance to vote, knowing our record, and re-elected us once again, with a bigger popular vote than ever. Those facts they somewhat forget.

Since, however, the whole matter of what has or hasn't happened since 1944, has been raised, it is desirable, I think, that I make some remarks about that "nothing" which has been done, according to the Leader of the Opposition. School grants have been increased since 1944 from approximately \$2¾ million to an estimated over \$11 million in the year just completed. We have added to that some assistance to the extent of \$140,000 by way of free text books, purchased and distributed in elementary schools. The contribution to the University operating grant has increased from \$550,000 to \$1,700,000. Our support of teachers' pensions has increased from roughly \$120,000 to over \$540,000. All in all, those increases alone amount to approximately \$10 million - \$10 million more than was being provided in 1944. Now, that must seem to all of us, Mr. Speaker, as a very considerable amount of nothing. When the Leader of the Opposition says that \$10 million is nothing, that, of course, explains how he proposes to do all the things he has promised to do with so little money.

Reverting to 1944 for a moment, we might have been pardoned, Mr. Speaker, for assuming that more of the job that was left to be done could be done, with less money than it has actually taken. We might have been pardoned that assumption, because the information on which we had to base our thinking, was information coming from the government of the day. Few of us at that time realized the extent of deterioration of school buildings, for example, in the province of Saskatchewan. Few of us realized that construction costs would in the ten-year period following double, and almost triple. Few of us realized the desire that there would be to pay for much of this programme out of current revenue.

We might, for example, have based our estimates on a statement made by the Government of Saskatchewan just a few years before, to the Rowell-Sirois commission. On page 279 of that submission they said this about school buildings:

"To provide normal education facilities for the work of Grades 1 to 12, would require in aid of repairs to school building \$1,500,000."

That is the only statement in the submission of financial needs for public or high school buildings, no reference to new buildings needed, no reference to replacement of existing buildings, so we might have been pardoned for thinking that it was a relatively small job. They said in the same report that:

"In addition, in aid of current teachers' salaries, another \$2 million would be needed."

Actually, over the period from 1944 to the present, school teachers' salaries have been increased from \$7 to over \$20 million, an increase of \$13 million, bringing us, I might say, Mr. Speaker, to the point where the average salary in Saskatchewan is fourth highest in the Dominion of Canada.

As has been indicated, the percentage of support has increased from approximately 20 per cent to something in the neighbourhood of 27 per cent. May I suggest it is very important that we ask ourselves the question 20 per cent of what, 27 per cent of what? If we look at it one way, the 1944 grants would amount to only 8 per cent of the present expenditures on education.

February 17, 1956

If grants had been maintained at the 1944 level, they would have taken up 8 per cent of costs. Or look at it the other way, if the 1954 grants had been applied to the 1944 costs, they would have amounted to 70 per cent of the costs at that time.

That gives you some indication of the increase in expenditures that there has been. Twenty per cent – one-fifth, Mr. Speaker, one-fifth of a pie, which was in reality only a tart, is a far different sort of contribution than over 26 per cent – over one-quarter of a pie that is a full sized pie.

And it is not only in the total amount made available for education that we can claim progress, but particularly with regard to the method of distribution of the amount. I want to take some examples to indicate how we have improved the pattern of distribution of financial assistance from the government. I take first of all the Meadow Lake unit, which admittedly is a unit of low assessment, which has had it in a pioneering situation, and which has done a remarkable amount of work in the last 10 years in the field of education.

In 1944 the school districts in what is now the unit there, spent some \$92,000 in total. They received grants of about \$40,000, or about 43 per cent at that time. In 1944, the districts in that area spent not \$92,000, but five times as much - \$460,000. They received grants, not counting grants for building purposes, of \$300,000, about seven times as much, a support of some 65 per cent. When you add building grants to those figures you get this picture – building grants in 1944 about \$3,700, about 145 per cent of the total programme. In 1955, not \$3,000 and some dollars, but about \$80,000 making up more than 80 per cent of the cost of their building programme in that year. If you take all grants as the percentage of expenditures out of current revenue you find that the provincial government support has gone to 70 per cent from 43 per cent of a very small amount to 70 per cent of an amount five times as great.

Look at it in another way – the total grants received expressed in terms of their value in mills. Grants received in 1944 in that area were worth 15 mills of taxation. Grants received in 1955 were worth 59 mills of taxation.

If one takes the Medstead unit, a similar picture can be obtained; 30 per cent in 1944; up to 67 per cent the estimate for 1955. Building grants, which will vary from year to year because of the programmes undertaken, have run around 60 per cent and 70 per cent. The value of the grant in terms of mills has gone from seven in 1944 to 45 in 1955.

Let's go to the other corner of the province, down to Maple Creek. The operational grants earned there in 1944 were roughly 30 per cent of the cost of operation. (At that time the average teacher's salary was less than \$1,000). In 1944 they increased to the point where they were 43 per cent of the operational expenditures. (Teacher's salary at that time about \$2,800). Capital grants since 1944 have varied considerably as they will have in all units, averaging possibly around 40 per cent. If you take the grants expressed as mills, in 1944 they were worth 40 mills in the Maple Creek unit, in 1955 about 16 mills.

I want to look at this improvement in distribution in this way, Mr. Speaker, these two units I have just referred to – Medstead and Maple Creek – in 1944 each received grants amounting to about 30 per cent of the operating costs, even though the assessment in the Maple Creek area was approximately twice the assessment in the Medstead area. Today, one receives approximately 40 per cent and the other close to 70 per cent.

I can bring out my point too, by referring to one of the more highly assessed units in which the picture is admittedly and deliberately quite different. Let us have a look at Milestone, a high assessed unit. The grants there in 1944 amounted to about 21 per cent of operating costs, and in 1955 to about 20 per cent of operating costs. There is quite a difference with regard to total grants paid. In 1944 they were \$37,000; in 1944 about \$72,000. There is a tremendous difference in building grants, which in 1944 amounted to \$127 and in 1944 to about \$20,000. Expressed in terms of mills the 1944 grant was worth to them 1.9 mills, the 1944 grant about 4 mills.

The same sort of examples can be drawn from the cities, and I refer to only one of the cities with a lower assessment per classroom, the city of Moose Jaw. Public School District No. 1 is in Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, and in 1944 the rate of grant for the rooms in public school district No. 1 was 90 cents a day (90 whole cents a day). In 1955 it was \$4.50 a day. For academic high school rooms it was \$3.50, it has been increased to \$5.50. For the vocational rooms it was \$3.50 and some of the vocational rooms, at least, will be receiving up to \$7.25 per day. The city of Moose Jaw has, in addition, received building grants.

I have given figures, Mr. Speaker, to indicate two things – a very considerable increase in regard to each area in the province, or in regard to the total of the prince in school grants; an increase of over \$8 million. I have given an indication, too, of the fact that the greatest amounts of this money went into the areas which had greatest need for them, a principle which was not recognized by the previous government.

I want, now, having talked of that argument presented by the Leader of the Opposition, to turn also to his reference to taxation in Saskatchewan as compared to other provinces. May I say to begin with here, that we must recognize that Saskatchewan has a more expensive proposition in education than our neighbouring provinces. That is true because of the distribution of our population. If our distribution of pupils was similar in concentration or grouping to that of Alberta, we could use 1,000 fewer teachers than we do. If it was similar to that of Manitoba we could use 800 fewer teachers, and consequently fewer classrooms, and fewer school buses, and have fewer high school problems than we actually have. In short, we have the same kind of difference in problem here as compared to Manitoba, for example, as we have in the field of power. It is possible in Manitoba to serve their farm area covering about one-third the area we have to cover in the province of Saskatchewan and that is, of course, a very substantial difference.

I want to use figures with regard to the relative tax load in 1954 in rural municipalities and local improvement districts. These are figures drawn from assessments and requisitions given in the Annual Reports of the Department of Municipal Affairs in each of the provinces.

February 17, 1956

In Manitoba average school tax rate – 24 mills; average total municipal levy including schools – 61 mills. In Alberta average school tax rate – 30 mills; average total municipal levy – 55 mills. In Saskatchewan, average school tax rate – 23 mills; average total municipal levy – 50 mills. Let me recapitulate, in Saskatchewan 23 mills, in Manitoba 24 mills, and in Alberta 30 mills for school purposes. For total municipal purposes, including schools, in Saskatchewan – 50 mills; in Alberta, 55 mills; and in the Liberal paradise of Manitoba – 61 mills. Reduce this to the average school tax per quarter-section and you get, of course, the same kind of pattern. In Manitoba for schools - \$50, for all municipal purposes, including schools - \$130. In Alberta for schools - \$60, for all municipal purposes - \$100. In Saskatchewan for schools - \$40, for all municipal purposes - \$86. Look at it again, Mr. Speaker, per quarter-section in Saskatchewan - \$40; in Manitoba \$50; in Alberta \$60. Taking the total figure, including schools, in Saskatchewan \$86; in Alberta \$100; in Manitoba \$130, per quarter-section.

Let me look further at the position with regard to total municipal tax arrears in our rural municipalities and local improvement districts. To liquidate those tax arrears in Manitoba at the end of 1954 would require a tax levy of 25 mills, in Alberta a tax levy of 30 mills, in Saskatchewan a tax levy of 20 mills. We know there are problems with regard to tax collections in this province, but 20 mills in Saskatchewan, 25 mills in Manitoba, 30 mills in Alberta to liquidate those tax arrears shows again a more favourable position in this province as compared to our neighbouring provinces, which is not in accordance with the picture the Opposition try to paint.

There was a suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition, that educational expenditures were not keeping pace with the Government revenues collected for educational purposes. Well, again, I want to refer to the last three years of the Liberal government. During those years, that is the fiscal years 1941-44, the revenues from education tax, the school lands trust fund, and the school lands were \$3,300,000 more than the expenditures of the Department of Education. If you take the last three years an opposite picture is seen, because during the last three years, the expenditures by the Department of Education have been \$4,300,000 more than the revenue from those sources to which I have referred.

There is one other way in which we can indicate the increase in support of Saskatchewan, and that is in terms of a grant per pupil of average daily attendance. I might just say that in 1944 it was \$20.17, in 1955 it would be in the neighbourhood of \$70,000, per pupil in average daily attendance.

Having said all that, I can say as I have said before, that the Government is not satisfied with that situation. The best proof that it hasn't been satisfied is, of course, in the figures that I have just given; the fact that \$4.00 in school grants will be paid this year for every \$1.00 paid when we came into office.

Mr. McDonald: — It doesn't mean a thing.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The fact is that in the Speech from the Throne there is mention of a further increase in school grants for the

present year.

Let us remember too, Mr. Speaker, that we could have paid more for school grants if we had decided to leave undone some things which we felt were important. Had we had our present tax structure and decided not to have a hospitalization programme, we could have added \$10 million to school grants, we could then have been paying 50 per cent probably of the cost of education. But few people in Saskatchewan will deny the tremendous advantage to the people, to the economy, that has resulted from the development and the operation of that magnificent, and I make no apology for using a superlative, magnificent hospitalization programme which we enjoy in this province.

One is impelled at this point to ask, to wonder at least, as to the policy of the Opposition. One gets some hint of it from reading press reports of speeches made by the Leader of that party, and to these I want to have some reference. September 27th, he is reported speaking at Fort Qu'Appelle to have said that "The Government", (this is a very important statement, I think) "should pay the same percentage of the total cost of education to all municipalities." The same percentage of the total cost of education to all municipalities. The same percentage to a unit like Milestone as to the unit in Meadow Lake, or the same percentage to Meadow Lake, as it would pay to Milestone. Equalization, according to that statement, has gone out of the window, in terms of the Liberal Party's policy toward education. He says:

"They should pay the same percentage of the total cost of education to all municipalities."

Mr. McDonald: — Who said I said that?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Pardon?

Mr. McDonald: — Who said I said that?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Well, the 'Leader-Post' said so, and your friend sitting behind you just pointed out that if it was in the 'Leader-Post', it must be true.

He went on to say this, and I am sure in this that he was misquoted. I shall give it the benefit of the doubt. "That payments to the municipalities at present range from 4½ per cent to 26 per cent."

If there is any municipality getting 4½ per cent, I would be pleased to know of it, and I am sure at that point that the Leader of the Opposition was misquoted. He said, however, "the Provincial Government should pay at least 50 per cent," and of course, again, "the same for all municipalities."

Well, moving on a few days to September 30th, speaking at Saskatoon, he quoted figures, it says here, "to show that the present Government was only paying 20 per cent of the cost of education," (he has corrected that figure since, and I thank him for the correction,) and that "if a Liberal government were elected, it would pay 50 per cent." But then on

November 9th, he is also quoted in Saskatoon as saying that, "he could make no commitment about what share a Liberal government would pay for education costs." No commitment, but on September 27th, it was 50 per cent; on November 9th, he could make no commitment, but as soon as an election date was announced, revenues would be estimated and a statement made. There are something in the neighbourhood of 30 days, I think, between the date of announcing the election and the election. In that period of time, they are going to estimate revenues and make a statement upon them. And then, of course, we have the addition to that, made just a few days ago in this House, that the policy would be to pay, eventually, up to 100 per cent. I think we are right in asking the question as to just what is the policy of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Kramer: — It depends on the brand.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — There is another way in which policy of the Government has contributed toward equality of educational opportunities, one which has cost some money, and which is properly considered as a contribution toward general educational services. I have reference to very far-reaching improvements made with regard to Teachers' Superannuation. To provide more equitable educational opportunities, it is important to consider the status of the teachers. The quality of education depends more on the teacher than on any other single factor. Possibilities of desirable superannuation are extremely important factors in attracting to and retaining the right kind of people in the teaching profession.

I want to compare the teachers who have superannuated for age and service, and are reported as such in the reports of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission 1943-44, and those in 1954-55. Those superannuating as reported in 1943-44, enjoyed an average salary for the last year in which they taught of \$1,400 per year. Those reported in 1954-55, an annual average salary for the last year of \$3,500 per year. The average pension granted in the former one was \$480 per year, at first, and there was a meeting of the Legislature that year, Mr. Speaker, and there was an election coming up, so there was a little improvement in teachers' superannuation. After the Legislature had finished at April 1st, it went up from \$480 to \$560 per year. Contrast that, even after the meeting of the Legislature, to those superannuating and covered in the last report. On the basis of a single life calculation, the average pension was \$1,700. But the teachers have a right to make a choice of plans, if they want to cover their dependents, and get certain other changes, they may reduce the amount they get. They also have the right to add to it, until they get to age 70 and take less after. So on the actual plan selected, the average up to age 70 was about \$1,750.

So there you have it from \$560 up to \$1,700. Since reference is sometimes made again to other provinces, I asked that 20 teachers pensioning for age and service have their pensions calculated as if they had superannuated in Manitoba and Alberta. The average pension of these 20 teachers under the Saskatchewan Plan was \$1,500 per year, under the Manitoba plan it would be \$760 per year — about one-half. Under the Alberta plan, \$1,400 per year. Teachers in Saskatchewan averaged \$1,500, superannuated under the Manitoba superannuation plan they would have \$760, under the Alberta plan they would have had \$1,400. The range in Saskatchewan of pensions was from \$1,040 to \$2,080; in Manitoba from \$530 to \$1,120; and in Alberta from \$360 to \$2,470. It is true that some of those would have had higher pensions had they superannuated

under Alberta, but also many of them would have had lower pensions, and the total actual average was less.

It is important, I think, Mr. Speaker, that any comparison of school taxes or school grants by themselves do not give an accurate picture. By expenditures through municipalities, and through the provincial government, people provide themselves with a variety of services. Assistance by the government in one area of service frees the resources of individuals and municipalities for other purposes. Lack of assistance by the government in one area freezes some of their resources, which cannot then be used in other ways. Individuals and municipalities, having less need to spend as much for the care of indigents, for hospitalization, for cancer treatment, for public health, for mentally ill persons, for elderly persons, have more tax-paying ability, or more personal finances, to meet other needs.

So I want to look at some comparisons in the field of health and social welfare, in order to round out the picture of just how well our people are doing. With regard to social welfare, in the province of Ontario, the municipalities there have to pay \$4.13 per capita. In the province of Alberta they pay \$1.59 per capita; in Manitoba \$1.56, but in Saskatchewan for social welfare services, 78 cents per capita. The province of Alberta pays \$9.77 per capita for social welfare programmes; the province of Saskatchewan \$9.12; the province of Manitoba \$5.55; and the province of Ontario \$5.28. So compare again a citizen in Manitoba with his neighbour in Saskatchewan. The citizen in Manitoba is paying according to figures which I gave previously twice as much for social welfare services to his municipality as his Saskatchewan neighbour. He is paying more for education services; he is paying more for general municipal services, and he is still left with more individual, financial responsibility in order to get the same standard of service.

Take the field of health. Municipalities in Alberta pay \$8.16 per capita; in Saskatchewan, \$7.31; in Ontario \$5.87; in Manitoba \$3.30. The province of Saskatchewan pays \$32.59 per capita for health services; the province of Alberta \$24.13; Ontario \$12.89, and Manitoba \$8.82. Here we put them all together and we find this: that municipalities and provincial governments combined spend according to these rates: in Saskatchewan \$39.90 per capita; in Alberta \$32.29; in Ontario \$18.75 and in Manitoba \$12.12, so that the Manitoba citizen, to get service in the field of health comparable to that which his neighbour in Saskatchewan has, will have to find another \$37 out of his personal income. He must find more for social welfare; he must find more for health services; he must find more for general municipal services, and he must find more for educational services. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the members of the Opposition could perform all the marvellous things which they pretend to be able to do, the Premier of Manitoba and particularly my friend Wally Miller, Minister of Education, would be willing to pay them highly for their services. Particularly since, according to them in Manitoba, they have already achieved the ultimate in rural electrification, is highly industrialized, and has the best of governments – that is, according to them.

Mr. Carr (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us what year those figures were quoted from?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, they are the estimates for the year 1955.

February 17, 1956

I want to say something too, about the relative rate of the tax levy for school purposes for the province of Saskatchewan. Taking school tax levy as a percentage of personal income per capita, in 1946 it took roughly two per cent of our personal income to pay our school taxes. In 1948, 1.9 per cent; in 1950 2.4 per cent, and 1952 1.8 per cent, and in 1954 3.5 per cent. The percentage is up because the income in Saskatchewan that year dropped by about \$500 per capita, partly because of poor crops, partly because of poor marketing conditions, and partly because of a drop in agricultural prices.

The percentage in 1955, if (and this is a mighty big if), the farmers could sell a reasonable quota; if they could get cash advances on a reasonable quota; if, as has been said in this House before, they could collect their last years' wages, would not be very high, and the percentage of per capita income, which would pay for those school taxes, would be still less if the farmers received a price which adequately compensated them for the cost of production.

The members of the Opposition are sometimes critical of reference made to problems by members on this side of the House – the problems of marketing and price. They say these are Federal problems. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be better to say this: the solutions needed must come from the Federal Government, but the problems are the problems of the people of Saskatchewan. What is done about them, or what isn't done about them, is going to be a very considerable determinant to what local governments and the Provincial Government can do about their responsibilities. Any provincial government, knowing the magnitude of the problems facing the people of this province, could not, with decency, be quiet about it. And any Opposition cannot, with decency and dignity, avoid the issue. It is Saskatchewan's No. 1 economic and political question at all levels, and elected members of the Legislature have a responsibility to give leadership in clarifying the thinking out of this problem.

The Liberal members try to persuade the people of Saskatchewan that if they could only get a few more school grants, or a few more miles of road, then our economic problems would be solved. They are guilty of misleading the people when they do this.

On this matter of costs and taxes, just remember this, that land taxes, municipal and school make up something like six per cent of the total cost of operating and overhead costs of our Saskatchewan farms. That was in 1953. In 1941, they made up eight per cent – a bigger proportion than they do at the moment. Machine costs, on the other hand, make up 29 per cent (for 1953) – in 1941 some 23 per cent. On taxes as a whole, let us remember this, that approximately 70 per cent of our tax dollar goes to the Federal Government; the remaining 30 cents is divided between the municipalities and the provinces. So if the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) has a lump on his back because of taxes, at least 70 per cent of it is a good, solid Liberal lump, and he ought to feel quite at home.

Premier Douglas: — What's above the hump, though?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — If taxes are the ruination, then let us look at the big tax collector who gets more than twice the amount of the municipalities and the provinces put together.

I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition isn't in his seat. He raised in this House the other day the situation of Regina College, and I shall remark on it now only because of the remarks that he made. I hadn't thought of it before, Mr. Speaker, as a political problem. Raising it as he did, I am afraid he has made it a political problem. If he had raised it as a matter of policy, but there is quite a difference between a matter of policy and a matter of politics.

This request, or suggestion, for an extension to the courses offered at Regina College came to the Government first some years ago. We referred it at that time to officers and officials of the University of Saskatchewan. We did so, because we were convinced that was the best source of advice with regard to the problem, and because we were convinced that under the law of the province, that was the proper thing to do. They in turn set up a joint committee of the Board of Governors and the Senate to study it; they met a delegation from the city of Regina. The joint committee reported to both the Senate and the Board of Governors. That report was accepted by both of those bodies. The Cabinet has subsequently met two delegations of Regina citizens to discuss it.

I would like to say, with reference to the Senate and the Board of Governors, just a word about how they are made up. The Board of Governors has 14 members. Four of them are ex officio, three from Regina, one of them, the President of the University, coming from Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if there is a person in this province, or in any Canadian province, who can be relied upon to look at this matter in an impartial and objective manner, and whose sole consideration will be one of advancing the educational interests of the youth of this province, that person is Dr. Thompson, President of the University. There are five appointed members to the Board, one come from Regina, one from Saskatoon, and three from outside those two cities. There are five elected members; two from Regina, three from Saskatoon. All in all there are then, five from Saskatoon and six from Regina, the other being from outside. I tell you that because I think it would be most unfortunate, as has been suggested from time to time, that this be considered a matter of city against city, and I trust we shall never look at it in that particular way.

With regard to the Senate, may I say only this, it has on it such people as Mr. Arthur Bater of North Battleford now, formerly from Baljennie, Mrs. Harvey Bell, North Battleford, and Dr. Novak of Yorkton; and I'm not sure, but I think Mrs. Caldwell was on the Senate when the matter was discussed. The members of the Opposition will know that it will get fair treatment at the hands of that body.

The request or the suggestion which has been made is not for an Arts and Science course, but for an Arts course. Well, let's look at the enrolment at the University. In 1954-55 some 4,401 students enrolled, 677 in the college of Arts and Science, making about 27 per cent of the enrolment. It is fair to assume, I suggest, that the wishes of the students who go from Regina to the university would be similar to the wishes of those from all of the province, so that a course in Arts and Science in Regina would serve out of every 100 students, only some 27. The others wishing Commerce, Engineering and all the other possible offerings would still have to go to Saskatoon. But that 27 per cent includes all five types of Arts and Science courses. You would have to, unless you had a lot of money and a lot of building space, exclude many of the science courses, you would exclude most of the theology

courses; you would take out probably those who wish to take Home Economics, and you would certainly have to exclude a portion of those taking the four years' Arts course – the Honours Course, as it is called.

Therefore, the number served by Arts would not be 677, but something like less than that. In other words, out of 100 Regina students, the number drops to 11 who would be serviced. Even for these, a restricted offering. The College of Arts and Science offers over 300 full, or half-time, classes – not all of these in one year, but each of them available sometime during the course when a student is in attendance. Twenty-four classes are in chemistry alone; 30 in the general field of economics, political science and sociology; 27 in English. You couldn't expect to duplicate that by one-half at Regina College, so you would have a restricted offering.

It is true that Regina students suffer some disadvantage financially, if it is necessary for them to leave home in order to get to University. So, Mr. Speaker, do all the students who come from all over the rest of the province – the students from Meadow Lake, and from Davidson, from Moosomin and from Rosthern, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, and from all over – they too, suffer a disadvantage, and the extension of the Regina College would not do anything to assist those. As a matter of fact, these extra expenditures might indeed hinder their opportunities to some extent. So this would really help only a small fraction of Regina students wishing to go to University – only a small fraction. It would curtail the opportunities for some as compared to what they might get at Saskatoon. It could even have the effect of directing a number of students into channels which they really weren't interested in, and really didn't want to go.

I would like to say just a word about the brief, a copy of which appeared in the 'Leader-Post', a copy of which I have, which is marked 'A Memorandum to Brief of a Brief to Members of the Legislature'. I comment only on one or two inaccuracies in it. It says, for example, this:

“Regina is the only city in Canada, of comparable size without degree-granting facilities.”

Mr. Speaker, one only has to travel to the city of Calgary where there are no degree-granting facilities. The University of Alberta there offers a two-year course in one college only, the College of Education. It offers, in addition, a first-year course in Commerce; in a sense a more restricted offering than is available for the residents of Regina at Regina College. The statement is made that the buildings at Regina College are presently available, and suitable for the purpose of these proposals – all ready for classes and professors to move into. Yet, reports the Dean of Regina College (1954-55) “space requirements remain our primary problem, not only in the College proper, but in the Conservatory as well. With the reclaiming of Happy Landing Apartments, some alleviation of congestion in certain areas may be realized this coming fall.” So they are pressed for space for present commitments; certainly this does not indicate that there is space for new commitments.

It has reference to the fact that Victoria College in British Columbia was given its own charter, and an annual appropriation from the government, without having to pass through the hands of the University government. I have here the Bill, the result of which Victoria College's “charter” was established. I will just read a few sections from it:

“Instruction in all branches of a liberal education, and the education of teachers as may be approved by the Senate of the University of British Columbia.

“The management, administration and control of the property subject, however, to the powers of the President, the Board of Governors, and the Senate of the University of British Columbia.

“The powers of the Council include: the power of submitting to the Minister of Education, subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the University of British Columbia, annual budgetary provisions and capital expenditures.

“The deans of the University shall be ex officio deans of their respective faculties. The regular sessions of the College shall commence and terminate on the days prescribed for the University of British Columbia.”

I think it is unfortunate that some of these arguments have been dragged into the discussion. Reference is made to the situation in Manitoba, where they have, and have had for many years, a degree-granting institution at Brandon. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Regina city residents and council wish to do what is being done in Brandon, I suppose it could be arranged. The government, or the University of Manitoba makes available to Brand College \$25,000 every year for the carrying on of that institution.

All of this is not to say that the time will not come when conditions will indicate, and financial considerations make possible, a degree-granting institution in the southern part of the province.

But it is fair, Mr. Speaker, to remind ourselves that there are other educational considerations; other educational needs, and they deserve priority. If we have extra money for university education at this time, I suggest that we can get a better deal for Regina students, and those from the rest of the province, by providing more financial assistance to make attendance at Saskatoon more possible. Regina students need not be deterred by the financial problems arising out of the cost of university courses. We have a loan fund which is making available some \$200,000 to students this year, and which will meet reasonable needs presented by students of Regina and other parts of the province. I admit that if students have to have some recourse to that they probably pile up some debt by the time they have finished their course. But, it is also true that a young man going into farming, or going into business, would probably accumulate some debt, too. I can see no reason why the debt for an engineer or a doctor is any more of a handicap, or any less worthy, than the debts of a young farmer or a young business man.

I am given to wonder at the Leader of the Opposition's rather sudden endorsement of this matter. I wonder if the Liberal Party has really tried to think it through, or whether this is just one more addition to the price of votes in the city of Regina.

Reference was made in the Throne Speech to the planning of a

February 17, 1956

technical institute. Technical schools in Saskatchewan are located at Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Regina, and they came into operating during the years 1930 and 1931.

Since 1945 we have developed in the province, under an agreement – or rather support from an agreement – with the Federal Government, some 30 centres providing composite school services, some degree of what might be called technical education. There are some other areas which have an itinerate programme, and some areas, such as Maple Creek, where they have a shop mobile which visits various places, and makes some degree of technical education available. But I think all of us know that this is not a full vocational programme. It is, to some extent, free vocational training; it is excellent vocational guidance, and it is excellent general education.

There has been activity, also, with regard to vocational agricultural education. A short course, as it is called, has been in effect at the University for a number of years, and a new building for this purpose was provided in 1949. Some of the school units are undertaking this kind of a programme. The most advanced one is Kindersley; there are also programmes at Sturgis and Kinistino. In Kindersley their agricultural adult programme has some 18 farm clubs, involving about 500 farm facilities in that area. These meet regularly for purposes of vocational education. In addition they have some 350 adults taking evening classes in some of their composite schools.

There is an apprenticeship programme in the province. For a number of years dating back to the middle 'thirties, there has been a Canadian Vocational Training programme, providing some degree of technical or trade education.

Not all of the graduates of our high schools want to go to University. Not all of the graduates of our high schools should go to University, and of course, not all of our students graduate from high school. Many of these people would like more training of a different kind. Their interests are not necessarily in the so-called professions. We need badly, Mr. Speaker, trained minds. We need also trained hands; more particularly, we need people with trained minds and trained hands.

More and more there is less and less opportunity for the unskilled labourer. The increasing industrialization in the province is providing more opportunity for skilled workers, and more need for skilled workers. From the point of view of our individual citizens, or from the point of view of the provincial economy, it is good business to provide more advanced training opportunities.

So, it seems to us that the need for advanced training, that is, technical training, is indicated. Our present technical schools are doing fine work; something additional is required. The institution of the type we are planning will not interfere with the work of existing technical schools. It should benefit and encourage the work in those schools. We have considered the possibility of some kind of a partnership in our existing technical schools, and there probably will be some activities of that kind. But in the major picture, there are many administrative problems which seem to recommend a different pattern. There would be an age group much different from that

attending our present technical schools; there would be varying academic qualifications. There is considerable doubt in my mind that the desired flexibility could be obtained by doing all of the work in conjunction with existing technical schools.

You might well raise the question as to what courses will be offered. Courses will have to be based on the employment opportunities in the province; and on the interest of potential students. Some of them will be short courses – a matter of months; others will be of one or two years duration. The planning of those courses will have to be carefully carried out in conjunction with representatives of industry and of labour.

With all of this in mind, the staff members of the Department of Education have, for several years, been studying this problem. They have visited a number of institutions in other parts of Canada and also the United States. They have placed some estimates and some plans on paper, and the Government felt that the thinking was advanced far enough that it was desirable to make an announcement at this time.

I wish to make three concluding observations with regard to this proposal, Mr. Speaker. First of all, this is not just a service for urban residents. There will be programmes in connection with what might be called the ‘industrial needs’ of our farmers. Then, too, this: every area which is, as we are, predominantly rural, must face a rather uncomfortable fact, and that is that there is not enough land to absorb the population which is produced on our farms. That is going to be increasingly true, as we have increased the size of our farms due to mechanization. Secondly, of course, not all the young people who are born on farms, and grow up on farms, want to stay on the farms, or should stay on the farms. This is as much a contribution to the rural life of the province as it is to the urban.

The second observation I wish to make is in the nature of a hope – a hope that we shall have, in order to assist with the financing of it, a new agreement with the Federal Government. I mentioned this in the House before on two occasions; the Legislature has unanimously endorsed a resolution asking for a new agreement. The situation is, at the moment, that the old one has been extended for another year. This does not make any provision for any capital money or monies for capital purposes at all. I hope that we will have a new agreement, and that it will be of sufficient amount to enable us to continue assisting the development of the composite school programme, and also the provincial technical institute.

My third observation is this: the school must be more than just a trade school. A French philosopher of education, a long time ago, made this observation: “my pupil is not, first of all, a priest or a soldier. He is, first of all, a man.” A man is much more than just a hewer of wood and a drawer of water. This must be an institution, not just a trade institution for the training of hands, but an institution for the training of people.

I want to join, Mr. Speaker, with others who have paid tribute to the Jubilee year activities. I want to add personal thanks to members of

the staff, the chairman of that committee, the members of the committee, and particularly to the community committees. May I say, too, how much I appreciated what was done by the schools, the teachers and pupils, during Jubilee year. They made a marvellous contribution in many ways. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how many of the members were able to hear the broadcast in May when it had been arranged that school children from all over the province would engage in singing songs about Saskatchewan. One could get a picture of thousands of Saskatchewan school children at the same time, singing these songs and hymns of praise of our province.

It was a most gratifying experience to have been on the committee, and to know the response which was forthcoming from the people of the province. Thousands of people got into the act, which was played across the face of Saskatchewan's landscape and Saskatchewan's history. The member from Regina, speaking yesterday, referred to many of the tangible, physical activities and records which have been left behind. I think we have been made more conscious of Saskatchewan as a real, living entity- not just a blot on the map somewhere between the Rocky Mountains and Niagara Falls. I think we are much more conscious of our history, particularly of the history of our communities. There are many people, particularly the young people in the schools, who realize now, better than before at least, that in every community in this province great people have lived and achieved great things, and great people live there now who will achieve great things in the future. We have been made more aware of our physical resources and of our human resources. Certainly we were made more aware of our destiny to play a greater part in the future of a greater Canada.

The speech of His Honour just over one week ago indicated something of that part which Saskatchewan has played, and something of the plans to move towards that greater destiny. The mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne ably elaborated. Two days ago the Premier of the province did, as he has done on so many occasions in this Legislature, and outside of it, once again put into moving and memorable words, the only philosophy which can guide us to the fulfilment of that destiny. Such a programme, Mr. Speaker, such leadership, I am proud to be associated with and I will support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 28 – An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights Act

Hon. J.W. Corman, Q.C. (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I hope no one will shudder when they see that I propose saying just a few words about this Bill. If I talk a little longer

than is my usual custom I hope I will be forgiven by reason of the fact that The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights is pretty close to my heart. Since I had the pleasure of introducing it in 1947 I think we have all taken a lot of satisfaction and a lot of pride in the fact that Saskatchewan, I believe, has taken first place on the North American continent in respect and in consideration for civil liberties and in almost a total wiping out, or total eclipse, of racial and religious discrimination.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Is there anything in it that we haven't practised before?

Hon. Mr. Corman: — I am not suggesting that.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Don't go out on a limb!

Hon. Mr. Corman: — I don't think what you said is in disagreement with my statement that this province of Saskatchewan now does stand at the top place on this continent in respect of those things.

Mr. Loptson: — It always has.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — I am not suggesting that it is altogether because of The Bill of Rights. I hope that when I have departed this political scene that I won't be remembered so much for the many mistakes and errors I have made over comics, etc., - but I believe it was the 'Leader-Post' that was generous enough to call me the father of The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, and I appreciate that and will be glad to draw it to the attention of my grand-children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House, today, proposes certain amendments to The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. The amendments are by way of deletion and they are made necessary because I will be bringing before you two new sections – The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Fair Accommodation Practices Act – which will carry, in the separate statutes, Sections 8, 11 and 12 of The Bill of Rights. Those are the sections dealing with racial and religious discrimination in respect of employment and in respect of the right to the enjoyment of the facilities of public places, such as hotels, restaurants, theatres, etc. I would like to make it abundantly clear that there is no substantive change being made in The Bill of Rights. I suggest it has stood the test of time and I think it has become the envy and the aim of every civil liberty association in Canada.

If you give Second Reading to this Bill you will only be approving, in principle, those other two Bills which I will be introducing later.

Now The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, as I have said, was passed in 1947; and while Saskatchewan was near the last of the provinces to enter Confederation, we were the first province to pass a Bill of Rights guaranteeing the fundamental freedom and outlawing racial and religious discrimination.

The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights can be broken down into two parts – Sections 1 to 7 make it illegal and an offence punishable by fine

or imprisonment to deprive any person or class of persons of the enjoyment of certain freedoms which are commonly spoken of as the 'fundamental' freedoms. Among them are freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. It might be noted here that The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights guarantee the enjoyment, under the law, of freedom of speech and freedom of expressions through the press and the radio and the arts. Perhaps I could draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that freedom of the press is guaranteed and that is true in a province in which at least 90 per cent of the daily press and the weekly press are opposed to the things for which the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation stands for. It is noteworthy that Saskatchewan is the only province that has legislation permitting the newspapers to say what they like about the Government. I don't know what I have proved by that.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — You didn't improve anything, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — And I might say, in passing, that another fundamental freedom guaranteed by The Bill of Rights is the right of any elector to demand an election at least every five year s- probably I should bring that up in this peaceful atmosphere, this afternoon, but in any event an election in Saskatchewan must now be held every five years. It doesn't say that an election cannot be held in four years, and it doesn't say that it cannot be held in the spring or in the summer or in the autumn, but it does require us to go to the country every five years.

Mr. Cameron: — Just when is it going to be held?

Premier Douglas: — It will be too soon for you fellows!

Some Hon. Member: — Ask your seatmate – he knows.

Hon. MR. Corman: — This is the first part of The Bill of Rights, guaranteeing the fundamental freedoms.

The second part of The Bill of Rights, as it stands, makes it an offence, punishable by fine and/or imprisonment to discriminate against any person or class of persons because of the race, religious creed, religion, or national origin of such person or class of persons in respect of the following activities:

By Section 8 – The right to obtain and retain employment;

By Section 9 – The right to carry on any occupation, business or enterprise under the law;

By Section 10 – The right to the ownership and enjoyment of real property;

By Section 11 – The right to the enjoyment of the accommodation and facilities of public places
– hotels, theatres, restaurants, etc.;

By Section 12 – The right to membership in professional societies, trade unions or other occupational organizations;

By Section 13 – The right to an education.

What is happening in one of the southern states could not happen in this province.

I might say penalties are provided for practising discrimination contrary to the Act – penalties by way of fine or imprisonment and the right of injunction is given.

Now, in most respects The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights stands alone in Canada; I think it can truthfully be said that everybody talks about a Bill of Rights, but Saskatchewan only has done anything worthwhile about it. I may say that our Premier, at every Dominion-Provincial conference, constitutional conference, has pressed for an amendment to the B.N.A. Act, incorporating a Bill of Rights for the whole of Canada. He has made his voice heard but he hasn't, so far, been successful; I just notice, in that connection an editorial in the 'Star Phoenix' that came to our desks this morning – I do not propose reading it all, but I would recommend it to every member of the Assembly; it reads in part as follows:

“Recently Mr. M.J. Coldwell introduced in the House of Commons a resolution proposing that consideration should be given to the inclusion in the British North America Act of a Human Rights section.”

I have noted some things here I would like to read; I won't detain you long; with the invitation I have given to you all I think you will read it yourselves, but the 'Star Phoenix' is recommending that Ottawa should move a little faster in seeing that, by way of amendments to the B.N.A. Act, a Bill of Rights is provided for the whole of Canada. I might say that the 'Star Phoenix' says, in referring to Mr. Garson, the Minister of Justice – in referring to his argument that we don't need it, that provincial legislation, for instance, and the Parliament of Canada, do observe these human liberties and freedoms. The 'Star Phoenix', I notice, says this:

“We need mention only the attempt of the Alberta government in 1937 to control the press, the attempts in some provinces to restrict the land holdings of Hutterite colonies, the Quebec 'padlock law', and Premier Duplessis' recent steps to give his Government the means of dominating the newsprint industry in the province . . .”

The 'Star Phoenix' could have added the recent Quebec legislation curtailing the freedom of religion.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan can take pride in the fact that since the passing of our Bill of Rights some other provinces – that is, three provinces – and the Dominion have paid us the compliment of copying it, of following it, to some extent. Now this is true, not in regard to the fundamental freedoms, but this is true in regard to the provisions outlawing racial and religious discrimination in employment and in the enjoyment of the facilities of public places. None of the other provisions of our Act have, so far, been followed by either the Dominion or the other provinces.

Chronologically, Mr. Speaker, this is what has happened: The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights was passed in 1947, making it an offence to discriminate in hiring and firing employees because of race, colour or religion. In 1951, Ontario passed a "Fair Employment Practices Act" based on Section 8 of our Bill of Rights. In 1953, the Dominion followed suit by passing "the Canada Fair Employment Practices Act". I might say the Federal Act applies only to employment in connection with any undertaking or business that is within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. It is not of general application; and I might point out that this deprives Federal employees working for the Government; it is not binding on the Crown. I might say here that our Bill of Rights is binding on the Crown.

Next to fall in line was Manitoba, with a Fair Employment Practices Act, in 1954, and Nova Scotia, in 1955. So we have it this way: Fair Employment Practices Legislation was passed in Saskatchewan in 1947; by Ontario in 1951; by Ottawa in 1953; by Manitoba in 1954; and by Nova Scotia in 1955. The other provinces have no such legislation.

Now so much for Fair Employment Practices. That brings us to Section 11 of The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. Since 1947 it has been an offence, Mr. Speaker, in this province, to deny anyone the right to enjoy the facilities of public places because of race, colour or religion. No other province has passed such legislation, with the exception of Ontario, where a Fair Accommodation Practices Act was passed two years ago, in 1954 – seven years after the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights.

It may be asked, Mr. Speaker, why we are asking for separate statutes when these matters were dealt with in 1947. I might point out the reason for it is principally in the interests of uniformity. The Dominion and three other provinces have followed us in one respect and Ontario in another respect and we feel that to encourage the trend, now that they have accepted the principle that we can do no less than to try to establish some uniformity in these Acts throughout Canada. So for that reason I will be submitting the two Bills that I have mentioned and because of the new statutes it is necessary to delete certain sections from The Bill of Rights.

I would, therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, Second Reading of the Bill amending The Saskatchewan Bill of Rights.

Bill No. 32 – An Act respecting the Centralized Teaching Programme for Nursing Students

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of the House are quite familiar with the Kellogg Foundation, which is one of many foundations which interest themselves in the fields of human welfare, which of course includes matters affecting health and training of individuals for participation in health services.

A few years ago the Kellogg Foundation, in discussion with the Department of Health in Saskatchewan, and other interested agencies,

suggested that they would be prepared to finance an experiment in the training of nursing students. The experiment was to be that the students who are enrolled in the various nurse-teaching hospitals in the province would attend a centralized lecture course dealing with the basic sciences and academic questions which are required in their studies and training; this course would be undertaken at a central place during the first four months after enrolment. Nine of the 11 teaching hospitals in the province undertook to support the experiment. The Kellogg Foundation put up the original amount of money for the first year, with the understanding that in succeeding years the province would enter into the field; and at the end of the three-year period an assessment of the value of the experiment would be made and if the province was agreed that it was a worthwhile programme, then the province would undertake to carry on from there on and Kellogg would withdraw.

During the experimental stages the programme was administered by a Board of Administration composed of representatives of the teaching hospitals and the other professions in the province as well as from the Department of Health. Now, however, since Kellogg has withdraw, it is necessary to establish statutory provisions for the continuation of this programme and it was deemed advisable by the Government that rather than have the programme administered by an agency of the Government itself, that the Board of Administrators would continue, but would be set up under a legal statute and this Act is designed to provide for that purpose; and will be called an Act respecting the Centralized Teaching Programme for Nursing Students. The details can be dealt with in Committee, but with those few words of explanation, I would move Second Reading of the Bill.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.