

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
12th Day

Friday, February 16, 1951

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 15, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Howe for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Korchinski.

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, in rising again to continue the debate where I left off last night, I want again to refer to a portion of the speech that I did make last night, and that is in connection with His Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I want to point that out again; I believe it is very important. I have always understood His Majesty's Loyal Opposition to be one that would give constructive criticism and then offer suggestions to the Government to remedy those conditions; but in the third term that I am here, I have come to the conclusion that His Majesty's Loyal Opposition should be called a His Majesty's "disloyal" Opposition. The speeches that we have heard here in the last two to three weeks have been destructive criticisms; speeches consisting mainly of a conglomeration of contradictions and opposites. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues who have followed after him have posed themselves as the friend of the farmer, playing desperately, Mr. Speaker, for that rural vote . . .

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege: the hon. member has now seen fit twice to brand the Opposition as a "disloyal" opposition. Now I think that the men on this side know as much about loyalty as the hon. member and, coming from him, it is most out of place. I ask your Honour to ask him to withdraw that statement. It was bad enough to say it yesterday. I let it go because I think he did not know any better, but when he sees fit to repeat it today, I think your Honour should ask him definitely and categorically to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the point is well taken. I think the hon. member should withdraw that statement.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Well, I am sorry then, Mr. Speaker. Continuing on . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I first of all did not hear the hon. member withdraw it and the hon. member from Hanley said "It is true nonetheless". I ask that he be asked to withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member did not hear it. I did. He did withdraw it.

Mr. Tucker: — Then I suggest that your Honour ask the hon. member who said "It is true nonetheless" to withdraw that too.

February 16, 1951

Hon. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I was out of order. I did not have the floor. I was not speaking . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier T.C. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, the Leader of the Opposition might also withdraw his statement when he said the member from Canora needs censure. That is equally out of order. There is no sense in having one indignity heaped upon another.

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out too that when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was on the floor over here two hours and took the radio time of 1¼ hours, I did not interfere with him. The only thing I see, he is trying to kill radio time. Their actions in the past, Mr. Speaker, as well as the present, have shown plainly to the farmer where they stand, and, Mr. Speaker, I am going to touch on two points that have been brought up in this House over and over again: that is the Grain Exchange, and the Wheat Board. The hon. member from Melfort in rising and speaking on both the Grain Exchange and the Wheat Board, tried to show himself as the champion of the farmer, the champion in the interests of the Wheat Board and the enemy of the Grain Exchange; but, Mr. Speaker I have lived on the farm too, and I know that down through the years the farmers of this country have been fighting some of their enemies and I am going to name some of those enemies. One is the frost; the second the rust, the hail, drought, the Grain Exchange — and the Liberal Party.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — He forgot the grasshoppers.

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, we can not control the frost. Our agricultural scientists have brought about a wheat variety where we are today controlling the rust. The Hail Association and Hail Insurance where we are today controlling hail, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say that our Minister of Agriculture is making a wonderful job in his conservation and in controlling rot in this province, But there are three that the farmers of this country still have to fight and these are frost, the Grain Exchange and the Liberal Party.

You know every time that the hon. member from Melfort gets up as the champion of the farmer it reminds me of an old Law a number of years ago passed in Great Britain, in fact it was passed long before the Labour Party came. They passed a law where it was a criminal offence to place a mirror in a pigeon coop, and the reason for that was that the pigeon in front of the mirror would puff himself up and strut and harm himself. I would suggest to the hon. member from Melfort that there is no need of that. The farmers know the history of the Liberal Party and the champions that are represented on the opposite side.

One other issue, and that is I want to see how effective these men of the Opposition have been in the last few years and are today in the interests of the farmers of this country. We will take for example when the price of wheat was set, last fall, our leader, M.J. Coldwell, in the House of Commons brought in an amendment only suggesting to the Liberal Party in Ottawa to consider a payment of \$1.75.

And what was the action, for example, of the 14 Liberal champions that we elected last year, from the province of Saskatchewan? When that vote came up, the only ones who voted for the \$1.75 were the C.C.F. members of Parliament from Saskatchewan, the true champions of the farmer, and Diefenbaker. The rest of them opposed it, and may I say that our own member from the Mackenzie constituency and our neighbour, the member for the Yorkton constituency in the Federal House, of course, were not even in the House. I recall speaking with A.C. Stewart, the hon. member for Pelly, and myself at a farmers' meeting in the town of Canora and, of course, for about 1½ hours. A.C. Stewart kept on apologizing on behalf of his party in Ottawa, and telling the farmers that one of the reasons why they could not up the price of wheat to \$1.75 was because the Eastern members opposed that action, and he told the farmers of how the party carried on that battle. Well, Mr. Speaker, you do not carry the battle behind the wall, where he was. You carry it within the House of Commons; and if I was myself an Eastern member what attitude would I take to some of the demands of the western farmer when, for example, our own western members either voted against those things or stayed out of the House altogether?

One other point that I want to speak about, and we want to check as to where the Liberals stand, and that is trading with Great Britain. We have heard a lot about trade, and I remember that in the elections of 1945, a pamphlet was issued by the Liberals, the National Liberal Committee. They say, "Vote Liberal. More trade. 60 per cent greater export trade than in 1939. Long-term, export contracts with the United Kingdom." But what happened immediately after they were elected? We will take, for example, in July of 1949, the Government put on from 15 per cent to 22 per cent duty on textiles. That duty was put on the interests of textile manufacturers in the east and against the farmer of Western Canada. Poor Great Britain has not been able to buy the produce of Western Canada. They must pay it with dollars. In order to obtain those dollars they must be able to sell to us; but here we have them slapping on a 15 per cent to 22½ per cent duty to keep British goods out of here, which cuts down millions of dollars of revenue which the British may have with which they may buy agricultural products in Western Canada. There they show that they voted in the interests of textile industry and against the agricultural industry of Western Canada.

Now go to the auto manufacturers. The auto manufacturers in Ottawa have been lobbying now for some time and may I say, Mr. Speaker, that even the equalizing of the currency had the effect of putting on a five per cent to ten percent duty on British-made goods, especially British-made automobiles. If we are going to keep British automobiles out of this country then Great Britain must curtail her buying within Western Canada and especially the agricultural products. Now I understand that a dumping duty on British automobiles is going on, taking effect in May: another piece of legislation against the farmer of Western Canada, and I would like to read to you an article from the "Globe and Mail". I quote:

"Now that the British automobile industry has done everything that Ottawa said it must do to gain a substantial Canadian market, its Canadian customers are to be penalized for such action. Eighteen months ago Finance Minister Abbott went to great pains to tell the

February 16, 1951

British they must produce at lower cost to win a competitive position in dollar markets. Not only must prices be adjusted but Canadian taste be suited and deliveries assured. The British industry did these things even to the extent of exchanging trade information between its own competitors. It invested in mass production for export. It set up service facilities in this country. It proved to North American manufacturers that weight bulk or fancy trimmings were not always imperative in the car-buyer's eyes."

There we have the British industry doing everything that we had asked them to do, and now we are putting on a dumping duty because the American industrialists and Eastern industrialists are lobbying in Ottawa to keep all the British automobiles out of this country. The British automobiles kept out of this country will decrease again our sales of agricultural commodities. Now that is the position that the Liberal Party has taken always as far as agriculture is concerned.

Now we go on a little further. I want to take up the increased freight rates. On the increasing freight rates since they were re-elected in 1949, I believe the increase has jumped up to somewhere around 45 per cent. Well, of course, when the Liberals speak of the 41 per cent they immediately howl "Wages, wages!" Well, out of the 45 per cent there was only 4½ per cent that went to the increase of wage. So to them, on the 4½ per cent increase, they lay the total blame on the working man of this country. But we want to see the action of the Liberals in Ottawa when these things were considered, and I am going to quote to you now a good old liberal paper, the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix'. June 5, 1950:

"Where were the western Liberal members of Parliament on Friday when the debate on freight rates was heard? Only one was heard from, Dr. McCusker of Regina, and this thinly disguised attempt to evade the issue by talking about the Hudson Bay railway will fool no one. By their silence western members have passed the ball to the C.C.F. and Conservative members from Western Canada. The western Liberal members should come out of their foxholes."

That is the action of the Liberal Party in the interests of agriculture and the Saskatchewan farmer.

One other point that I want to mention is price control, and I should pick up that paper again, that "Vote Liberal". What do they say about price control there? They say, "The purchasing power of your dollars is maintained by the price ceiling under careful Liberal management". And then again they say that you will be able to buy commodities now available at 1941 prices. Well, the people of this country, the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan, know how effective their price controls were. They were re-elected in June and by October most of the controls were being thrown off. I say, Mr. Speaker, that by

throwing off the controls they gave private enterprise the power of confiscating the savings of the people of this country. I would like to point out, for example, who it was the lifting of the controls helped. Did it help the farmer whose commodity now is slipping down and down and down, and the things that he must buy continuously going up and up and up? I would like to only mention, Mr. Speaker, the profits, for example, of Massey-Harris. There is one company whom it has helped. In 1945, the profits of Massey-Harris were just \$1½ million when the controls were on. In 1949, their profits rose to over 13 million or an increase of 741 per cent. But that isn't all, Mr. Speaker. Reading 'Business and Finance', "Time Magazine" — I am sure it is not a C.C.F. paper — they talk about earnings in "Time" and I am going to quote:

"In 1950's second quarter the 22 major U.S. manufacturing industries earned \$3,200 million after taxes, 34 per cent more than in the previous quarter and 59 per cent more than in the same period of 1949."

I suppose Massey-Harris is going to have a juicier plum than even in 1949. I am sure that that is not aiding the farmer.

I would like to point out, too, to the mounting costs of war, and this is taken out of the "Free Press Prairie Farmer", August 20, 1950. Where, for example, an infantry division in the last war used to cost \$14½ million to equip, today it costs \$74,300,000 an increase greater than the total budget of the province of Saskatchewan, — and we are going to hear plenty about the budget next week, that it is too high. An air-borne division, where in the last war cost \$15 million to equip, now it is costing \$75 million; an armoured division, where in the last war cost \$30 million, now it is going to cost us \$200 million. All, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the farmer.

Leaving off there, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Premier on his address, and his very Christian-like and courageous outlook on foreign affairs. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan, as well as the people of the world, have yearned to hear such a powerful Christian plea for tolerance amongst the great powers of the world, and when speaking of the Third Force, I would like to point out that there are not only members of this side of the House and the Premier who believe in the Third Force in world affairs, but I would like to read from the "Leader-Post", February 15, and I quote:

"The British Commonwealth is the proper group to form a third force as a balance between the United States and Russia. E.D. Fulton, Progressive Conservative member of Parliament for Kamloops told."

Yes, they carry on quite a scare campaign, fear campaign throughout the province, and they think that they are going to carry it on further. Now last night we heard for example the hon. member for Redberry. Now, Mr. Speaker, comparing the two speeches, that one of the Premier with the other one of the hon. member for Redberry, one a Christian-like speech, a plea for tolerance, goodwill and peace, the other loaded with hate and venom.

Mr. L.K. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would like the member to quote words indicating where it was loaded with hate.

February 16, 1951

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak on foreign affairs like my hon. friend did for an hour and a half . . .

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Speaker: — You were using your speech to accuse other groups of non-co-operation with the government.

Mr. Korchinski: — The hon. member from Canora stated that I expressed hatred. I wanted him to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is making statements on his own authority, exactly as you did yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I want to mention again that I did not wander off in foreign affairs and speak for an hour and a half like the hon. member for Redberry. I spoke last night for a half-hour on Saskatchewan affairs. Today I touched on Federal affairs because it effects our economy and I am going right back to the province of Saskatchewan again.

I see for example, Mr. Speaker, that the expansion of Saskatchewan industrial life drives the Opposition almost to madness. It is in this phase of criticism that they are most contradictory. We have heard from the hon. members of the Opposition over and over again for the last two weeks criticizing our Crown Corporations, and they will spend, for example, the first half-hour criticizing the Crown Corporations because they are making profits, and immediately they finish that they turn around and they start criticizing the Crown Corporations because they are not making profits. I wonder what they want. I recall — we will take for example the Box Factory, and we do not hear any too much about the Box Factory any more. I remember that here a couple of years ago, all the Liberal organizers were called into the city over here and given a lecture that at every meeting they must mention the Box Factory because it had lost some money. But last year, when the Box Factory made a profit of over some \$10,000 we do not hear them any more. Now they are coming back and they are criticizing the Crown Corporations because they are making a profit. The lumbering Crown Corporation, they have criticized that over and over again, a corporation that is conserving the natural resources of this province, conserving the forests for generations to come, and at the same time making a substantial profit to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I want to quote the hon. member for The Battlefords. He made a statement in this House that if they were returned to power he is going to be in favour of throwing all the Crown Corporations, except Power and Telephones, he says, "the whole caboodle out the window".

Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of order, I did not make that statement. I said that the losers would be thrown out. I ask the Hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, it was made very plainly. In fact the Premier . . .

Mr. Maher: — Mr. Speaker, I did not make that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member wants to correct what the hon. speaker has said, it is his privilege.

Mr. Kuziak: — Well, I know definitely that the statement he made is 'throw the whole caboodle out the window'.

Mr. Maher: — No, I never made that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member on his own authority says that he did not make the statement, until it is substantiated by someone else . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Well, I will accept his contradiction.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this — that, for example, if they do think of such a thing, and I believe that they will do exactly as, for example, the Liberals have done in Ottawa, and I would like to take the example of the Crown Corporation called Canadair Limited. During the war they spent some \$21 million in the building of this Crown Corporation and then, after the war, what did they do with the Crown Corporation? They "threw the whole caboodle out the window" for \$4 million and then turned around and granted this same Corporation, now in private hands, a contract to produce \$140 million worth of items. I am afraid that if the Opposition would ever be elected in this province that that is exactly what they would do with the bulk of the Crown Corporations, which are today not only giving service to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan but are also making substantial profits.

Now continuing, we will take the Government Insurance Office. Yes I believe they would like to get rid of that, and I am going to tell you that there is going to be a lot of insurance companies right here in the city who would love to get a hold of that plum. Oh, they would love to see it go "out the window", and they would be on the other side catching it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the record of the House the other day when the hon. member for The Battlefords spoke, and I quote:

"As far as those particular plants are concerned I would throw them out the window."

Yes, the particular ones, but he mentioned Power and Telephones as the only ones that he would keep. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out over again that there would be a lot of private enterprises in this country that would like to get a hold of them; for example, the Crown Corporation in connection with lumber. I am pretty sure that the MacMillan interests of British Columbia would love to have that plum thrown out the window; he would be on the other side grabbing it.

Now we go on to Power, and this is a pet subject of the Leader of the Opposition. In connection with power he made the statement in this House and that is on the record: "What do we find? We find here

February 16, 1951

that this Government didn't do anything for years. Then it began to take some interest in this matter." Mr. Speaker, what a joke! I am going to quote some of the figures from the annual report of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, 1949. We will find in that report that the Power Corporation for years, Mr. Speaker, stood at a standstill, and that was not under a C.C.F. Government but under the Liberal administration. I would like to point out the miles of line in service in this Power Corporation in 1940 was approximately 1,250 miles. It stayed evenly for 1940, 1941, 1942 and 1943. In 1944 it started to rise, and it has risen continuously until in 1949 it is approximately 4,400 miles.

Now, how can a man in the House make such a statement referring to this Government? This Government is the only one that has shown any progress and expansion of the Power Corporation. We will take, for example, meters in service, Mr. Speaker. The meters in service, the Liberal Government in 1940 had 10,000. In 1941 it stood exactly the same spot. In 1942 it stood again at 10,000. In 1943 it rose a bit. In 1944, we took over the reins of Government and it started rising in 1945. In 1949, it is close to 60,000 meters. In other words, inside of some six years we increased the meters by five times what they had in the past, and yet the Leader of the Opposition speaking over the air says, "What do we find? We find here that this Government didn't do anything for years. Then it began to take some interest". The first portion of it he really means the Liberal Government, and then when they got interested he means the C.C.F. Government. That is the only conclusion that I could come to.

Mr. Maher: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would just like to read what I actually said in my speech when the hon. member from Canora read it a few minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Will the hon. member continue with his address.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, for the next minute or two I would like to speak again on the highways of the province. I would like to say that since we took over office, we have built and rebuilt approximately 2,700 miles of highway. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, because the Leader of the Opposition many a time jumps over into Manitoba; I would like to point out that the building of 2,700 miles of highways is greater than the whole Manitoba system put together. I would like to point, for example, to blacktop in this province. When we took over the reins of government we had 138 miles of blacktop. Now, I believe we are somewhere in the 600 mark. So is Manitoba. Yet in 1944 at the time we took over the province, Manitoba's blacktop mileage was 495 miles. We have caught up the blacktop mileage of this province to that of the record of Manitoba, and Manitoba had some in the year 1944 when Saskatchewan did not have anything. I would like to point out, too, that, for example, the Department of Highways in 1944 was one of the poorest equipped departments of highways in the Dominion of Canada. Today it is one of the best in the Dominion of Canada. I want to point out that our budget — the purchasing ability of our budget today — is not any greater than the purchasing ability of the budget the Liberals had in 1944. In 1944 they were spending the sum of \$30 million; today we are spending a sum of \$55 million, and just as I say, let us strike the millions off and speak in terms of only 30 cents and 55 cents. The article that cost, in 1944, 30 cents, I am sure that it costs, today, 55 cents. If we can today, or in the past

five years, buy 2,700 miles of highways, why didn't the Liberals buy it in their day? If we are buying electrical generating plants, poles and so on today, they should have been doing the very same thing back in 1944.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. member is not representing the situation properly. He is making this statement . . .

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Tucker: — I am correcting him as the hon. Ministers undertook to correct us, yesterday. This expenditure of generating capacity is out of capital account, and that is not included in the \$55 million.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition has had sufficient parliamentary experience to know that that is not a proper point of order.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, you permitted the Minister, yesterday, to correct one of our people. Now I am undertaking to point out that the member, in speaking of \$55 -million is not including capital expenditure.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I will allow any specific correction. As to the opinion of the purchasing power of the dollar, today, that is the speaker's own opinion.

Mr. Tucker: — That is not the correction I sought to make, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member . . .

Premier Douglas: — It is not a question of privilege. You cannot start to argue the case on a question of privilege. If anyone has been misquoted, that is a question of privilege; but a question of argument is something which my hon. friend can correct . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I called to the attention of Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I am on my feet now, who has got the floor, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Will you kindly state your point of privilege.

Mr. Tucker: — My question of privilege is this, when one of our members was speaking, a member of the Government said "I claim the right to correct a statement which is not correct." Now then, the hon. member stated that \$55 million was spent in regard to electrical generating capacity and all the rest of it, and I and pointing out that the \$55 million does not include that because that was done out of capital expenditure.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, I want to mention also the assistance to municipalities on roads. I want to point out that the Government, today, is spending, on this item, four times as much as the Liberals did back in 1944. Now I say that my time, to a great extent, has been wasted by the Opposition; my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I want to inform you that I will support the Speech from the Throne, and vote against the amendment.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, frankly I am surprised that one thing hasn't happened this afternoon. I noted, in the Press Gallery, as I sat down, a man with a beard — a very beautiful beard, if I may say so. I had expected that long before this the Member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) would rise in his seat and say: "There is the Communist I suggested was here yesterday, he has the beard of a Communist he should be thrown out." I suspect that perhaps he may do so yet.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment, first of all, on some of the comments that have been made in the debate in regard to my Department and in regard to some of the other activities of the Government. I begin by discussing the suggestion that has been made that there is an unfair distribution of school grants in the province of Saskatchewan. You will recall, Sir, that some of the statements were made last year, and you will pardon me, if they are asking the same questions, I will have to give the same answers — they are still quite valid.

I would say, first of all, that there is a case for a differential if one wants to look at what happens in other provinces; that is, in other provinces in which one finds not C.C.F. governments, but Liberal governments, or, as in the case of Manitoba, a Liberal government plus the assistance of the Conservatives, or, as in the province of Ontario, a Conservative government; and in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, where there happen to be Liberal governments. I would add, too, Mr. Speaker, that school grants, of necessity, ought to be paid, in part at least, on the basis of possible performance of the area, or the group or the organization that receives that assistance, we recognize that in other forms of government; we recognize it, for example, with regard to payments under the hospitalization plan. If a hospital has the facilities and the size and the technical staff to provide a service that is better than another hospital, then it receives a grant which is larger because of its ability to provide that superior type of service. The same argument, Mr. Speaker, is followed with regard to payments made on behalf of educational performance. And so, because of the fact that the school units can, and do, by virtue of their position, provide a better library service than the individual district can; because they can, and do, provide more assistance for high school students — dormitories facilities; because they can, and do, provide a more rational conveyance system; because they can, and do, provide such services as the helping teacher; because they can, and do, participate to a greater extent in building because of the pooling possibility, they are deserving of some differential treatment in so far as grants are concerned. And when school districts, in the province, organize so as to take advantage of these possibilities, which are not possible for individual districts, then some differential is warranted.

There is this very important point, too, that must not be overlooked and that is the fact of the equalization service carried out by the districts within the unit. In low assessed units — a unit in which the assessment might be on the average of \$50,000 per classroom, the districts with an assessment in excess of that are carrying part of the equalization load for that particular area, and that must be taken into consideration. Now having made those general remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to examine the case which the Opposition have been trying to make as to how great this differential is in Saskatchewan, or as to whether or not there actually is a differential.

The Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Tucker) and the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) also, I believe, arrived at certain figures by the very simple procedure of taking the total amount of grants and dividing it by the total number of districts concerned in each case. Now that is a very easy sort of procedure, but simple mathematic procedures don't always apply. I recall, Mr. Speaker, having heard a story of a teacher teaching a lesson in subtraction; she was impressing on the class the fact that you couldn't take 5 from 3 — or that you couldn't take 3 oranges from 4 apples, and the case was all made until a youngster in the back row put up his hand and said, "but please teacher, you can take 5 quarts of milk from the 4 teats of a cow." No, simple arithmetic doesn't always apply, unless you take into consideration all the various factors involved; and in this case this simple arithmetic fails to take into consideration two extremely important facts. One is the relative assessments, of operating districts, of the school units and of the areas outside of the school units; and secondly, it doesn't take into consideration the relative needs of the area in the units in this province, as compared to those areas which at the moment happen to be outside. I can illustrate that best by referring just briefly to the northern part of this province, because all across the northern part of the province we find school units, with the exception of one area, the area around Tisdale. That area is the low assessed area of the province, generally speaking. The area around Tisdale happens to be the highest assessed of that area, and the need in those other areas happens to have been greater than it was in the particular area around Tisdale. When you get areas, Mr. Speaker, such as Hudson Bay, where it has been necessary to build approximately one-half of the classrooms now, in five years — or such as Nipawin where it has been necessary to build approximately one-half of the classroom that they are using — new classrooms in the last 5 years, and a similar record for Meadow Lake and some of those other units, then the question of need is an extremely important one which is disregarded entirely by the Members of the Opposition when they make that particular accusation.

Now to examine one or two other aspects of the case. As I have tried to point out before you can't just use averages, you must consider the particular unit and the organization of assessment within each particular unit. I would refer, for example, to the group of districts, which happen, at the moment, to be organized within the Moose Jaw School Unit. If these districts were operating as individual districts, today, the total equalization grant paid to them, as individual districts, would be some \$4,000 a year more than the actual equalization grant that is paid to them when they are organized as a unit, as they are today. I would like to consider for a moment, to again show that this average figure can't be used, the position of a school district with an assessment of \$80,000. If that school district were operating as an individual district, it would be receiving, today, an equalization grant of \$300 per year. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal administration, as it was in 1944, that district would have been receiving \$80 a year; it now receives more than 3½ times the amount it received then. It is going to be a little bit difficult for members of the Opposition to say of that district that it isn't getting reasonable treatment. Now if that district happened to be in a unit such as Meadow Lake or Hudson Bay Junction or Medstead, the average grant paid, and consequently the grant paid on behalf of that district, would be greater than it is getting as an individual district. It would be greater because the assessment in those units is not \$80,000 per classroom, but \$50 to \$54 thousand per classroom. If that same district happened to be in a unit such as Outlook or Kerrobert or Regina East, it would be getting approximately the same equalization grant that it gets as a district outside of the unit. But if that district,

February 16, 1951

with an assessment of \$80,000 happened to be in a unit such as Moose Jaw or Milestone or Rosetown or Kindersley or Swift Current or Watrous, or any one of about 16 units in the province, the equalization grant which it would be getting would be less. In other words, as an individual district assessed at \$80,000 it gets more than it would — pardon me, it gets less, than it would get if it were in some of the low-assessed units; it gets about the same as it would get in some other units, but it is getting more than it would get if it were in about 40 per cent of the units in the province, organized today. I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition and the Members of the Opposition, that that computation on the basis of averages is entirely meaningless as a basis for showing the distribution of grants in the province.

I could look at it in still another way. Consider the value of the equalization grant that is paid to a school district, and the value of the grant paid to certain school units. Consider a school district with an assessment of \$25,000. The equalization grant paid today, to that school district, would be \$960. That, Mr. Speaker, is more than three times the amount which it would have received in 1944. It received, at that time, some \$300 — today, some \$960. If that district were to tax itself to raise the amount of money which the equalization grant provides it would have to tax itself at the rate of 38.4 mills — 38.4 mills. In the unit which gets the highest equalization grant in the province, that equalization grant is worth 23.3 mills. The maximum paid to a district outside then, is about 15 mills greater in value to the district than is the maximum equalization grant paid to any unit in the province. Or, if we take a district with an assessment of \$30,000 — it gets an equalization grant, today, of \$900. That, again, is more than 3 times what it would have obtained under the Liberal government of 1944, and that equalization grant is worth 30 mills to that district. The unit which gets the second highest equalization grant in the province — the unit of Hudson Bay — the equalization grant there is worth 21.4 mills, or almost 9 mills less than paid to this district with an assessment of \$30,000.

Then they try to argue, too, discrimination as between unit and non-unit with regard to repair and building grants, and again, Mr. Speaker, the simple division or whatever else it is they do simply over there — fails to reflect accurately the situation. May I illustrate by use of the repair grant. The basis for paying repair grants is the same in units or out of units. The basis is simply this: to qualify, the district must have an assessment of less than \$100,000, and then the basis of payment is some percentage, the same in each case, of a maximum of \$400 per classroom. The fact that in 1948-49, the average per district in the units was more than the average per district illustrates beautifully the fact that the districts out of the unit enjoyed a more favourable assessment basis than do the districts in the units.

I want, too, to say a word or two about the general progress of school units in the province. I am very happy to emphasize the statement made by the Member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) the other day. I am referring, of course, to his statement that some 24 school units in the province have, by this time, completed their 5 years and 6 months trial period. We have had petitions for votes from 2 of those districts — the Unit of Estevan and the Unit of Kindersley. In both these cases, and I am sure all Members of the House will agree, the vote has been favourable and I am sure all Members of the House will agree that that is a good result. Whether you analyze that by taking the total vote, or whether you take the total rural vote alone or the total urban vote alone, you still get a result in favour of retaining the unit. It is most interesting, I think, to note that, in Estevan for example, the rural school district with the highest

assessment in the entire unit gave a vote in favour of retaining the larger unit. It is interesting to note that while not a majority of the closed districts voted in favour of it, quite a substantial number of them voted in favour of retaining the unit. That in spite of the fact that if it were not for that unit, that high assessed district could probably operate on a mill rate of 4, 5, 6 or 7 mills less than it is doing, and those closed districts could undoubtedly operate on a mill rate less than they are doing. It is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, because it illustrates this fact, I think, that those people, together with many other people in the province, have caught the vision of what can be accomplished if we are really willing to share costs in order that we may improve opportunities for all people.

With regard to the other units in the province that have completed their 5 years and 6 months period, some of them sent in petitions which were not sufficient to qualify under the 15 per cent qualification of the Act. From 10 of them, Mr. Speaker, not a single person petitioned for a vote on the disestablishment of the unit. Now I want to say just a word or two about something that has been happening in one or two units — last year I took three or four and gave something of the story — this year I am just going to take a couple. (record off).

I want to tell you of the Weyburn Unit which gets only the minimum equalization grant of \$10,000 and have are some of the things they have been able to accomplish: Teachers' Salaries — nearly 100 per cent up; Library expenditures, in 1944 — \$300; in 1949 — \$3,000 — ten times as much; Expenditures for repairs, up 500 per cent; they employ a helping teacher; they have contributed to the construction of the cost of a technical addition to the Weyburn collegiate, and they pay high school assistance, thereby bringing, not only high school opportunities to more students, but better high school opportunities to more rural students. Their administration costs were only 3.6 per cent; they spent on new buildings and equipment, \$40,000, in 1949, as compared to less than \$10,000 spent in that area in 1945.

Something similar applies with regard to the Outlook Unit. A larger equalization grant in this case — some \$39,000. They state that teachers' salaries have been doubled. They have increased their library expenses by 500 per cent; they have decreased their debenture debt by \$36,500; repaid to the Provincial Treasury \$5,900; and repaid, on behalf of D.A.D.A, approximately \$13,000.

Mr. Tucker: — What is the number of operating classrooms?

Mr. Lloyd: — In the neighbourhood of 110.

I want to just say a word about one programme which is becoming more general with the units throughout the province, and that is the programme of high school assistance. I would like to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that whether or not a unit gives high school assistance is a matter for the unit board to decide — most of them do — a few of them don't, and the amounts that they give do vary from place to place sometimes.

In 1949 the units provided for high school assistance, spent on high school assistance some \$250,000. Now, on the basis of \$100 a year, which would be about an average, that means that at least 2,500 students in the province who had to leave home to go to high school were assisted in a way that they had never had any assistance before. Add to that the fact that they went to high

schools, and in the great majority of cases, had to pay no fees, and there is a savings of an estimated \$100,000 there for those students — for the parents of those students. So the units actually were helping out rural high school boys and girls to the extent of some \$350,000. Now added to that must be the assistance given in Units such as Kindersley, Sturgis, Arcola and so on, that operate dormitories and provide this service to rural boys and girls at a much lower cost than they could get it otherwise — a savings of probably \$10 a month. If you add that group of students, Mr. Speaker, it seems that in the neighbourhood of 27 to 28 hundred high school students are getting assistance, today, that they never got before. They are getting assistance which, in many cases, means the difference between going to high school and not going to high school and that number equals from 10 to 15 per cent of the total number of high school students that would have to leave home in order to get a high school education. Those are some of the factors that are working in order to provide a greater degree of educational opportunity, particularly for our rural students.

Now I want to say just a few words about the Broadview Unit — to give some of the happenings in that particular area. It has been mentioned before in this debate. There are, this year, from the Broadview Unit area, some 9 students attending Normal School. Like the Member from Cannington, I would like to see that doubled or maybe trebled, but the fact remains that when they are sending 9 they are sending as many as the average area in this province, regardless of whether it is in the south-eastern part of the province, or closer to one of our teacher-training institutions. I would like to correct him, too, on his statement that because the financial assistance provided by the government isn't sufficient, the units have had to go into the business of providing extra financial assistance. It is true that the Broadview Unit, and some other units, offer loans to students to go to Normal School, but Mr. Speaker, they offer those loans, not because the money isn't available from the government, but because they say to these students, "if you borrow the money from us — we will loan you the money if you will promise to come back to this area and teach for a period of 2 years", and that is perfectly all right. I have no objection to it, but I do have an objection to the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) standing up in this House saying that they have to do it because the assistance they get from the government isn't sufficient. They are two entirely different things. They do it as an incentive to get teachers back to that area and that perfectly alright.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — The statement I made is still true.

Mr. Lloyd: — I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of money that is available for financial assistance to Normal School students, in this province, is such that no student need to be barred from Normal School institutions because of inability to finance the programme — and if units want to go into the additional service so that they can recruit teachers to those areas, that is perfectly alright and we welcome that participation in the plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he spoke also of the number of study supervisors in the Broadview area, and as I have always said in this House, or any place in public, it is a serious situation. I would have wished, Mr. Speaker, that he might have used the figures for 1950 instead of for 1949. They could have been obtained by a question on the Order Paper, as the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe,) obtained the information with regard to Turtleford, because he would have found that there was a decrease of 6 in the number of study supervisors. Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation is still not good, but it is better

and I thought he might have given just a little more credit to the efforts of the Department, in that his Unit Board has improved the situation somewhat. It is time, as he said, that for some reason which I can't explain, the south-eastern part of the province does appear to have more than its share of study supervisors. It could be added, too, Mr. Speaker, that the same unit, in addition to having fewer study supervisors, has 9 more teachers with a permanent first-class certificate this year than last year, and that they have 3 more teachers with a superior first-class certificate than they had last year, and there is some other improvement in other classes of certification as well.

Now I want, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) to repeat the statement that I made last year, which he felt I should be ashamed to make, but I want to repeat it, Mr. Speaker as I said it — not as I understood him to read it. And there is quite a remarkable difference, because what I said was this: "May I say this — that a reasonably capable supervisor, with more assistance from the superintendent, with assistance from the helping teacher in those units which have helping teachers, and with the assistance, partly or completely of the correspondence school, will do a better job than many an inadequately trained student." The one Member quoted me, I think, as saying "many an inadequately trained teacher", and there is a world of difference in the two. I said "an inadequately trained student", I think, and I will stand for correction if he wants to correct me, that he said "teacher", because what I was referring to was the student who went to Normal School for maybe two or three weeks, and then went out to teach, and I still submit that the study supervisor, reasonably well chosen, with the kind of assistance which I shall relate in a moment, is in a position to do a job equally as well, if not better, than the student who has gone to Normal School for two or three weeks — or two or three days — as happened in some cases, and then goes out under the title of 'teacher'. This is what the situation was with regard to supervision and assistance to study supervisors, in that unit, last year; and I am still emphasizing, Mr. Speaker, that this doesn't take the place of a qualified teacher, but it does put these people in a position of being more than a "sitter", and I do wish that responsible Members of this legislature or other public bodies, would consider a disservice that they may be doing by attaching that term to that particular position.

Here is the situation in that unit, last year. They had a helping teacher who devoted the entire time at her disposal to assisting these 25 study supervisors — a helping teacher who devoted her entire time to assisting those study supervisors. The superintendent . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Could you tell us how often that assisting teacher, or helping teacher, if that is the term — could you tell us how many times, during the year, that that helping teacher was able to visit these girls who are out there, when they can't get there with cars?

Mr. Lloyd: — No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't the exact figures, but I do say this person, according to the report of our superintendent, was devoting full time to that job. I do know how many times the superintendent visited them. 18 of those supervisors he visited 4 times during the year; and 7 others visited 5 times, plus a visit at the end of June to discuss promotions, plus numerous short visits during the year. In addition to that these people do have the use of the correspondence courses which is an extremely valuable

guide — they have the advantage of receiving from the superintendent a monthly bulletin of direction and assistance and guidance. That, I say, adds up to a lot more than a 'sitter'. It is not taking the place, by any means, of a qualified teacher. I know that, this year, the superintendent has visited, already, up to the end of December, every study supervisor 3 times, and some of them 4 times — that they had them together for a two-day institute at the beginning of the year; they had another one in the fall; they will have another one in the spring, and they have, again, the correspondence courses, and I repeat that that kind of service is better than a teacher with two or three weeks exposure at Normal School, going out without that kind of assistance.

I want to say a word or two, also, about the teacher shortage.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Would the Minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker. Just before leaving the question of study supervisors within the Broadview Unit, I wonder if the Minister would inform the Members of this House whether or not the number of study supervisors is increasing or decreasing in the province, as a whole?

Mr. Lloyd: — In that unit it was down, and in the province, as was placed on the Order Paper just the other day, there are more employed in the province today than there was a year ago. There has been no attempt to hide that situation, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) doesn't need to appear to try to ferret it out — it has already been given this year, and I had intended to refer to it later on. As I said, I was beginning now to deal with the teacher shortage in the province, as a whole.

Along with that increase in the number of study supervisors, I can also report a decrease in the number of people with 12T and 24T and conditional certificates — there is a decrease in the number of under-qualified teachers to the extent of 178 — about 100 more study supervisors, but about 178 fewer of the other group, so that again, the total number of unqualified people in charge of our schools is less than it was the year before. There are more study supervisors, but the total number of unqualified people is less.

I want to spend some time in giving to the House some figures, and I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have to use so many figures in this address, but I think it is necessary to indicate the relative position of the three western provinces and the relative difficulties in the staffing of schools. First of all the income for a pupil of average attendance in the schools of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. May I say that these are figures which were gathered in the spring of 1950 — there may be some change as at this moment — but the change, I think, would be relative. In Manitoba, \$4,161; Alberta, \$4,985; Saskatchewan \$3,884 — the income behind each pupil of average attendance was almost \$1,000 less in Saskatchewan than it was in Alberta. But the expenditure, per pupil, in Manitoba, \$100; in Alberta, \$114; and in Saskatchewan, \$114. The important thing there, Mr. Speaker, is the effort. The effort in Manitoba was 1 out of 50; in Alberta, 1 out of 36; in Saskatchewan 1 out of 34, so that while Saskatchewan had the least income, it was making the best effort to support education. And that, Mr. Speaker, I say again, is part of the argument for suggesting that we need Federal assistance for general education in this province, and I make no apology for having mentioned it, and I want to suggest to the Hon. Member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) I think it was who mentioned this yesterday, that this is not a new cry which has been introduced since the election of this

government. Ten years ago I was chairman of the Canadian Teachers' Committee investigating and trying to work up some enthusiasm for Federal aid. Federal aid has been a part of the policy of the C.C.F. for many, many years before this group was elected.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Not the Premier's policy.

Mr. Lloyd: — May I refer, secondly, to the number of schools in these provinces. In Manitoba, 2,098 — these are not schoolrooms, they are schools. In Alberta, 2,550; in Saskatchewan, 5,200 — that gives you an idea as to the magnitude of our job in staffing our schools as compared to the other provinces. The reason, of course, is that urbanization and centralization have taken place to a greater extent in both of those other provinces.

With regard to rural schools, 30 per cent of the schools in Manitoba are rural; 33 per cent of the schools in Alberta, and 52 per cent of the schools in Saskatchewan, are rural. Evidently the policies of the Governments of Manitoba and Alberta have driven more people off the farms than the policies of the Government of Saskatchewan.

It is true, of course, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the reasons our task is more difficult, because, unfortunately it is more difficult, regardless of salary or anything else to recruit teachers for a one-room rural school. The final statistics with regard to the population of each province behind each teacher reveals that in Manitoba, the population per teacher is 165; in Alberta, it is 203; in Saskatchewan it is 122. In British Columbia, it is 211, and that means, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has fewer people to support, financially, the activities of each teacher and has fewer people from which to recruit a teacher. British Columbia can get one teacher out of every 211 people, and staff her schools, but Saskatchewan must get one person out of every 122 people in order to staff her schools. As a result of those conditions, it is much more difficult here than in our sister provinces, and I want to say this — it is serious, and it is a problem which won't be solved just by increasing salaries to teachers, although that is undoubtedly an important part of the solution, but it is a problem which involves a great many sociological and economic factors in addition to that.

Then, to recount again to the House the efforts which the present government has made in order to take care of this and other related educational problems. First of all, the matter of increased grants and other assistance to school authorities. The Member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) said, the other day, it was insignificant. Well, from 1943-44 — the last year the gentlemen over there had responsibility in the treasury benches, until 1950, the increase in school grants amounted to \$4½ million — that means \$2.60, or \$2.50 at least, for every one dollar that the preceding government provided. That is insignificant in the terms of the Member from Cannington. Add to that the building fund which has been of very considerable assistance to many districts. I would like to point this out, Mr. Speaker, that if there hadn't been such a terrific backlog of building — if our schools hadn't got in such a bad state of disrepair, our equipment and libraries hadn't been run down so badly, a lot more of that money could have gone into teachers' salaries and the situation might have been better. It would have been better, and I would like to add this, too, Mr. Speaker, that if building costs had been held at the 1941 level as was promised by the Liberal party in the advertisement read by my friend from Canora (Mr. Kuziak), then we could have had 2 buildings for every one that we now have —

February 16, 1951

at best 3 for every 2 — or a lot more of that money could have gone into teachers' salaries. The Hon. Members of the Opposition seem to deride that kind of a statement.

Secondly, assistance by virtue of making it possible for students to attend our teacher-training institutes, and I want again to repeat, that there is no reason — no financial reason — why students in this province should not attend Normal School if they are properly qualified. The Hon. Member from Cannington shakes his head — would he quote to me one example of one student who wasn't able to get the assistance that he required. Let him put it on the Order Paper, he can put a question on the Order Paper about that.

One of the very powerful incentives which has been provided for teachers to remain in the profession has been the improvements in the superannuation Act. I think perhaps there is nothing that is a greater incentive to stability than the satisfactory superannuation system. We have done, roughly, three things — we have made it, first of all, easier for people to qualify for superannuation. We have increased the rate of the service pension; in 1944 it was \$13 per year of service at age 60; it is today \$25, or almost double, and we have provided a provision for dependents. I wanted to mention that particularly because I noticed in the Liberal Platform, last fall, they were going to make provision for dependents.

The organization of larger units has, in itself, been of assistance. The organization that has done much to improve salaries, to supply salary schedules, to improve working conditions, better equipment, and tools with which to work.

We have a greatly improved and a more attractive Normal School programme — one which is essentially more interesting and more vital. The inauguration of an undergraduate course for teachers at the University and greater recognition of teachers and trustees, giving them more opportunity to present their problems and their ideas to the Department.

Now I just want to mention a word with regard to the re-opening of the Regina Normal School, since that also was mentioned the other day. Naturally we would like to have a situation in this province where we would have to re-open, or where we would have to add to our Normal facilities. I merely want to assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that at the moment it appears to us that our facilities are adequate. We would get some additional students if the Regina Normal School opened — we would get some additional students if we built a Normal School in Prince Albert and another one in Yorkton, and another one in Swift Current, and so on. It is rather interesting to note that this year, in the City of Moose Jaw, where there is a Normal School, there are only 9 students from the city of Moose Jaw in attendance, so the presence in itself, would help some, but not sufficient, I think to warrant the expense of providing that, and the deterioration, possibly, if we began to split our staff between three specific institutions.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, was, again, good enough to refer to the World of Today. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, — I recall that he raised it in 1948. I will not repeat my arguments at that time. Rather significant, I think, that he has not raised it since, until this Session. May I say this, that it is no longer a student text, for this reason. Because the

grade 9 social studies — I wish they would wait just a minute, Mr. Speaker — because the grade 9 social studies course was altered and the text no longer applies to that course, and because, also, with the completion of the revision of the social studies course for the other high school grades, the grade 9 course could be revised without destroying its effectiveness. But it remains as a required reference book in our schools. And I think it is significant that the Leader of the Opposition found no real support for his accusations that the book was subversive in character. I want, however, just to inform him and to reassure him of this, Mr. Speaker, that we shall try to continue to develop through our schools, citizens that are capable of analyzing the weakness of social institutions and economic practices, and I suggest this, that because "The World of Today" directed searching inquiries at the weaknesses of some of our social institutions and economic practices, that was really why the Leader of the Opposition opposed it.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member is undertaking to say why I did something, I think I have a right to say the reason why I did it was because it held up Russia in an untruthful way and in a very favourably light which was not justified by the —

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I was not saying why the Leader of Opposition said he opposed it, I said in my opinion that was why he opposed it.

I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that we are not content that schools should be merely a means by which the average man learns to accept meekly, and critically his own subordination. I think perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would like that kind of a school. Schools should examine the possibility and the practicality of a reorganized economic system which will provide security and abundance for the average citizen, while also guaranteeing his direct participation in the control and the operation of that economic system. Such an examination we will facilitate.

Mr. Speaker, I think this question of "The World of Today" suggest a tactic of the Liberal Party which needs to be deplored. The person finally responsible, although I take that responsibility, the person on whose advice I rely, in selection of textbooks, is the director of curricula for the province. I recall that a couple of years ago a past president of the Canadian Education Association, speaking in this province, had reference to that official as being one of the most capable men in that field in the entire Dominion of Canada. Last year, the member from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) was good enough to rise in his place and pay tribute to him as being the most able man in Saskatchewan for that position. At the same time, his leader, his seatmate and others over there have been willing to attempt, without success, to brand this man as one who would put into the schools textbooks which would pervert the ideas of the young people. They want to have it both ways. They want to bask in the aura of being good about somebody here and to take all political capital they make outside. That might be smart politics. I call it basic dishonesty.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister putting responsibility for that textbook on to this gentleman and avoiding it himself?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I stated quite clearly that I take the responsibility but that I rely on him for advice. Similar tactics in connection with Dr. George Britnell. I recall, the other day in the

February 16, 1951

House when the Leader of the Opposition praised Dr. Britnell as a man of great integrity and understanding, and I agree. I recall when the Minister of Municipal Affairs was speaking and made complimentary remarks and the Opposition benches said, "I agree". Mr. Speaker, I recall something else, I recall the Shellbrook by-election in 1945, when the Liberal Party circulated up and down the breadth of that constituency a sheet of names of people whom they branded as political hacks and one of the political hacks that they named was Dr. George Britnell.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the most serious accusation that has been made in this House this year, or the most serious objection, has been the objection raised by members of the Opposition to the right this government and the movement that we represent, to object or to criticize certain institutions. May I say this, that it is the friends of an institution who can always most safely criticize and make suggestions. And because throughout the length and breadth of Saskatchewan and Canada people know the C.C.F. as a friend of the wheat board, we can safely, without destroying the influence of that board, make suggestions as to how it might do a better job for the farmers of this province. Whether or not the same can be said for the members of the Opposition is a different story. The same thing is true with regard to international affairs. This group has consistently supported the idea of United Nations and its allied and affiliated agencies. I think the most serious, as I say, Mr. Speaker, objection raised, has been the suggestion of the Opposition that because there are difficulties in the world today, and there are great difficulties consequently there should be no difference of opinion allowed. The Opposition has said, in fact, under present conditions there must be no differences allowed, and I suggest this, that under present conditions the right to criticize and the right to differ and the right to suggest is even more important than in ordinary times. I suggest, furthermore, that the responsibility of stating criticisms and alternatives is even greater under these conditions than in so-called normal times. It is in times of stress the tendency to suppress becomes greater. The Opposition, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, would apply a moratorium to differences and lead a retreat from reason. They have strange applications of patriotism. In 1942, a Liberal Government sat where we sit now. Ordinarily there would have been an election in that year but in 1942, like a drowning man gasping for one last precious bit of air, they said, "No election, because there is a war on." In 1943 they said the same thing. In 1942 and 1943 they deprived the people of this province of the right of election. In 1951 they would deprive them the right of public discussion. It seems to me that there are some almost parallel examples to this right to criticize. During the first World War President Wilson of the United States announced his famous Fourteen Points. Those points at that time were not in accord with previously stated allied aims and I suppose that the Opposition, had that happened in this Legislature, would have said that those points should not have been stated because it would have given peace to the enemy. And yet that declaration did rally liberal people from both sides of the ocean. Or, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if some group had enunciated the principles of the Atlantic Charter before they were enunciated by Mr. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill because those were not in accord with previous statements perhaps, then the Opposition would have suggested that people ought not to talk about such dangerous things.

I want to say this about the Premier's statement. I am convinced that it will receive the applause of thousands of Saskatchewan people and thousands of people all over Canada and the United States. And I am convinced that the group from which it receives applause will include many who are not Socialists but many who would simply themselves small "L" real liberals. I was going

to read the comment of Mr. Fulton. I had thought, perhaps, that the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), after that comment would have moved to one side but then I recalled, Mr. Speaker, that last year in the Battleford by-election. I believe he kissed the Leader of the Opposition on one cheek and yesterday referred to him as "my leader", he kissed him on the other cheek, the embrace is complete and I do not expect him to move at this time.

Mr. Tucker: — He has not gone to the Social Credit Party, we are proud of him, his war record and his record in public life. We are proud of him.

Mr. Lloyd: — In further support of my statement, Mr. Speaker, that there will be many people real liberals, not necessarily socialists, support the view. I want to read just a sentence from a pamphlet called "Korea in World Politics", a pamphlet put out by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. It seems to me a tremendously significant statement. It says this:

"Because of America's sentiment against socialism, not to speak of communism (and note they separate the two), it will be difficult, perhaps impossible to rally here, sufficient support for acceptance of governments in Asia which do not conform with prevailing idea of what is right and proper for the United States."

I refer to many Saskatchewan citizens, Mr. Speaker, who would applaud the Premier's statement. I know many of those citizens and am proud to call them friend and to have them call me friend. I know they are not Communists, that they have not been Communists and they will not be Communists. They are people who have been in the fore of every worthwhile community activity. They are among the people who have worked hardest to establish in this country our co-operatives, our trade unions, our churches, our schools and other institutions. As I say, they will applaud the emphasis which the C.C.F. seeks to give, and emphasis which is, briefly this: that conflicts should be dealt with as problems to be solved rather than as political combats to be won, and on that basis peace can be found within the framework of the United Nations. We have heard again, Mr. Speaker, the statement that only by armed force can communism be contained. I am not going to deal with it at length as did the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) yesterday, and I hope that I may be even more accurate. But history, it seems to me, disproves the effectiveness of armed force in restraining communism. Out of the first World War and out of the stubbornness and the stupidity and the cruelty of Czarist Russia came communist Russia. And acting on the theory that communism could be confined in Russia and destroyed in Russia by armed force, Germany and Japan were deliberately built into great military powers, a military growth which eventually resulted in Germany, in Hitler's fascism and which was aided and abetted, favoured and financed by great vested representatives of monopoly capitalism inside that country and outside. One of these men has just recently died, another one has recently been released from jail as a war criminal. Germany was to be the armed barrier against Russian communism on the West and Japan was to be the barrier against communism on the East. The plan exploded, as we all know, and the result is modern history. Modern history which is written in the blood of tens of thousands of people of all ages and of all nationalities and illustrated by the destroyed economies of a dozen nations. Out of the First World War came communism in Russia, out of the Second World War already has come communism in half a dozen European states and part of Asia. The thesis that

armed force alone can restrain communism seems not to be supported by history. May I say this, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest deterrent, in my opinion, to communism, is not armed force, but rather the explosive force, not of the atomic bomb but of the application of the whole force of democratic ideas. It seems to me that one of the great examples of the application of that force today in modern history has been what has happened in India. May I remind the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that a free and independent India within, as the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday, the British Commonwealth of Nations, is a condition which was earned, in a large part, under the leadership of Indian socialists and granted by the British people under the leadership of British socialists. That free India, free and independent India, is worth more to us in the restraining of communism than untold battalions, ordinary bombs or atomic bombs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn again to some of the recurring requests of the Opposition for expenditures.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? Which do you regard, the Chinese People's Government or the South Koreans the aggressor in this recent dispute?

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, we can refer it to the United Nations if the hon. member wishes. I think that nobody had denied the fact that aggression does exist. We have urged that the way of handling that aggression and the non-recognition of the Chinese Government before hand was a dismal failure which had much to do with that aggression in the first place.

I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, to deal with some of the continuing requests for expenditures made continually by members opposite and which, to some extent it seems to me to indicate a sort of irresponsibility. I do not have the complete list but just these few items: the removal of the public revenue tax, which will cost in the neighbourhood of \$1,750,000; payment of taxes on Crown Corporations at \$250,000; two cents a quart subsidy on milk, \$850,000; school grants — the member from Cannington said that \$4½ million was insignificant so we will have to put in at least \$5 million; greater assistance to teachers, \$50,000; to operate the Regina Normal School, \$90,000 or \$95,000; more electricity, and take it right to the middle of the farm unit, I do not know how much, \$1,500,000 perhaps; giving us a sub-total of \$9,475,000 I think. Then we would have to add to that consideration of the fact that we are to operate power and telephones without any profit so we will have to add another million and a half to that. That gives us already in the neighbourhood of \$11 million. When we have finished with that, Mr. Speaker, we can do this: more highways, particularly for Melville and Rosthern; all-weather municipal roads; free licence plates for members of the legislature; more hospital beds; cheaper car licences; cheaper truck licences; cheaper insurance; increase the rate of salary for magistrates by \$1,000 etc., etc., etc. Mr. Speaker, the Session is only just two weeks old and the big money talk has not come yet.

I make reference also, Mr. Speaker, briefly, to the relief which has been afforded to municipalities as a result of the activities of the present government. First of all, the extra million, a quite significant amount of money, which has been provided for the assistance of school authorities to schools, has been of great assistance particularly to low assessed municipalities. The equalizing effect of the larger unit organization has been of assistance.

May I just have reference to the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Report. Speaking of the tax-rental agreement with Ottawa, the hon. members refer to this as being manna from heaven, they had this to say regarding the amount of that money and the extension or the passing it on to municipalities, and I am quoting:

"The increases in Provincial education grants introduced in 1950 might be regarded as absorbing a substantial proportion of Saskatchewan Tax Agreement benefits."

"The increase in the educational grants in 1950 might be regarded as absorbing a substantial proportion of Saskatchewan Tax Agreement benefits."

Quoting from the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Report. Secondly, assistance in the matter of roads. The extension of the Provincial highway system has been of some assistance. I think we might just make a brief comparison with Manitoba. We have some 8,000 miles of highways running through our rural municipalities, Manitoba has some 2,000 miles running through her municipalities. That is a service which our municipalities get at a cost to the government, the difference in maintenance alone of some \$1,800,000. Municipal grants or government assistance for building municipal and market roads has increased by some \$370,000, almost \$1,000 per municipality. The tremendous burden of seed grain and relief debts which we are liable to forget, which has been lifted off the municipalities, that in itself would compensate for the payment of the public revenue tax for many years. In public health and social welfare, the institution of the hospitalization plan, of the provision of medical treatment, for old age pensioners, mothers on Mothers' Allowance, these things which previously frequently the municipality had to assume. Speaking of that, the report says this:

"The expansion of provincial activities in the field of public health and welfare has relieve the municipalities of financial responsibility in considerable measure."

I want to give one example, Mr. Speaker, drawn from the Village of Perdue, a village in my own constituency, where one person who otherwise would have been a charge on the municipality has been unfortunate enough to have been in hospital constantly. If the municipality — let me say this first, Mr. Speaker, the municipality had paid the hospitalization on behalf of that person — if the municipality had had to pay the cost of that service to that one person, which they would have had to have done before the hospitalization plan, it would have cost them 11 mills of taxation to meet the cost for one person for one year to provide that service — 11 mills of taxation. That is a village municipality admittedly. If it had been in a rural municipality right around that town it still would have cost them one mill to provide for one year the service to that one person, an amount there with regard to one person equal to half the public revenue tax which they will pay. It seems surprisingly plain, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Can you tell us what the total cost of that service was, you are speaking of mills. What was the total cost of it?

Mr. Lloyd: — In the neighbourhood of \$2,000.

Mr. Tucker: — That would amount to one mill in the municipality.

February 16, 1951

Mr. Lloyd: — A municipality with an assessment of \$2 million, one mill is \$2,000. We are getting together on our mathematics.

Now then, a reference to something which it seems to me is the most oppressive load the farmers of Saskatchewan have to bear, and that is the constantly increasing load because of increases in farm machinery costs. In 1949 in this province there were 16,000 tractors sold in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: — The Minister was talking about the powers of mathematics, would he tell us how much that municipality paid in public revenue tax during that time at 2 mills on \$2 million?

Mr. Lloyd: — Figure it out, Mr. Speaker, 2 mills.

Mr. Tucker: — That is more than what you said.

Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, that is what I said, Mr. Speaker, I said it would have cost them as much as one mill, one half, I said, of what public revenue tax would have cost. Now my mathematics is O.K., the Leader of the Opposition is agreeing with me, he is coming on, if I can continue to speak and give him mathematical examples we might make a mathematician out of him as well as a lawyer. Mr. Speaker, I have some more complicated examples now. I think perhaps he is ready to advance one stage. This time, we will do multiplication in five figures instead of two. In 1949 there were 16 thousand tractors sold in the Province of Saskatchewan. The figure is taken from the magazine called "The Canadian Farm Implements Magazine". I was not able to get the 1950 figures. I know that they were somewhat less than 16,000 in 1950 but the price was somewhat greater. Now, from 1947 to 1949, Mr. Speaker, the increase in one type of tractor in Regina was \$433. That is one of the more reasonable price increases. The total increase, therefore, in the cost of those farm tractors to the farmers of Saskatchewan, from 1947 to 1949, was \$6,900,000. If we had been able to keep prices at the 1941 level, as was mentioned by the member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) there would have been a very considerable saving of much more than \$6,900,000 for Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. McDonald (Moosomin): — Would the hon. Minister permit a question? How many tractors were there sold to the farmers in 1947?

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know, but I am saying this, that (and I think it has no bearing), in 1949 these were 16,000 sold. That is the year that they bought them, that is the year in which the price was paid for them, at least they incurred the debt. The increase in cost was \$433, a total increase, then, of \$6,900,000 because of the purchase of farm tractors. In 1950 I do have the figures from the same source for combines sold in Saskatchewan, 5,829, and the increase from 1947 to 1950 on one type of a self-propelled combine was \$1,176. Now these combines would not be all self-propelled so probably the increase in cost would not be quite as great, but on that basis the total increase would again be some \$6,900,000. In other words, in increased costs of tractors in 1949 and of combines in 1950, the farmers of Saskatchewan paid \$13,800,000 more than they would have had it been possible to purchase them at 1947 prices, which could have been possible if the Liberal Party had implemented even a small part of their promise to keep the purchasing power of the dollar good.

I was able, Mr. Speaker, last year, to give figures in this House to show that if in 1948 the farmers of Saskatchewan had been able to purchase their farm machinery and repairs at 1946 prices they would have saved \$17 million, enough to have paid all of the school taxes, enough to have paid public revenue tax over many times.

Here we have two items, combines and tractors, on which they paid out \$13 million more than they might have paid just a couple of years before. The members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, sometimes talk about the great difficulties of a young farmer in getting established on land. If he had bought one tractor and one combine he would have had to have found, or gone into debt to the extent of \$6,500 if he had purchased the types I have been talking about. That amount of money, Mr. Speaker, that \$13 million would have paid for the entire provincial highway programme and had some left over. Or, it would have paid the entire cost of our hospitalization programme and had some millions left over. It would have paid the entire cost of municipal road construction programme some several times — once at least, and had \$10 million over. Or it would have been eight times as valuable to the farmers of Saskatchewan as removal of the public revenue tax. I would invite the members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, to take part in a campaign to do something to really make some real savings in real money for the farmers of this province by getting the Federal Liberal Government to keep a part of its promise with regard to prices and price control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back, and talk in smoother fields perhaps about some additional aspects — no more arithmetic, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, today — aspects or the programme of my department. I say something first of all about the extension of vocational educational opportunities under the Dominion-Provincial plan to assist in technical education. I think, Mr. Speaker, all of us can be reasonably pleased with what is happening here. There are 23 projects, what we call composite schools or extensions to technical schools, completed and in operation in the province — 23 projects. There are three dormitories that have been completed, with assistance under this plan, and in operation. There are four more projects under consideration — under construction — and there are four projects under consideration or in the planning stage. Adding those up, Mr. Speaker, it tells us this, that 25 per cent of all of the projects in Canada under this plan are in Saskatchewan. I do not mean by that, to infer that 25 per cent of the money is being spent in Saskatchewan. I am speaking of 25 per cent of the total number of projects. And that is important because it suggests this fact, that our plan here, contrary to in most if not all of the other provinces, has been to build these not just in the cities but all over the province, so that our students from the small towns and the rural parts might have access to them. These projects range in size from buildings with two rooms for shop and home economics such as you would find in the town of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, added to the present building, to large new schools with complete facilities.

Mr. Tucker: — I am glad you got something from the Federal Government.

Mr. Lloyd: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the whole project had to be approved by my department before the Federal Government would be able to pay on it. Just a little consideration, Mr. Speaker. These projects spread

from Meadow Lake in one corner of the province to Estevan in the other corner. Incidentally, a couple of other Opposition members got a little bit too, it seems. They go from Nipawin in one corner to Eastend in the other. You will find them in towns as small as Carlyle up to cities like Regina and Saskatoon. Some of them are owned by local boards, some of them are owned by local and unit boards and some of them are owned by unit boards alone. In every instance it has been most encouraging that there has been a considerable increase in enrolment. In one instance, again actually the enrolment doubled. This again is an impetus to more equitable educational opportunity, not just more people getting to high school, but getting to a better type of high school.

A report on the student loan fund — to say that since its inception on April 1, 1949, it has been assisted 583 Normal School students, 378 University students, 43 nurses, 12 library students and 1 research student, a total of 1,028. Again, I submit this, that in no other province in Canada is there such adequate financial assistance available to students who want to go on beyond the high school. I would just like to read a letter — unfortunately we have not many of these, perhaps I would be correct if I said we have only one, Mr. Speaker, but I want to read it anyway. It is from a doctor who, as a student, got assistance from this fund, it says:

"Enclosed please find a cheque for \$250 (he owed \$200), the excess being a token of my appreciation for this most valuable aid to students."

There are some auxiliary services in my department which I want to give recognition to. In 1944 there were 199 projectors in the schools of Saskatchewan. In 1949 there were 745. There has been a tremendous response on the part of school boards in this way. Radios — in 1944, 183. In 1949, 1,024. Two of our units have all their schools equipped with radios, several others have from one-third to four-fifths. From July of 1949, a little over a year ago, to July of 1950, the total number of visual aids distributed by our Visual Aids Branch increased by 52 per cent. The music programme has caught on and been growing most gratifyingly, Mr. Speaker. In 1946 our superintendents reported that only 12 per cent of the classrooms had a programme of musical activity which could be considered as anything like being adequate, but in 1949 that 12 per cent had increased to 63 per cent. I want to read a comment by Dr. Richard Johnson, who is a Professor of Music in the Faculty of Music at the University of Toronto, who has just completed a survey of music in schools in Canada and the United States, who said this, speaking of our programme and of the Director of our programme, Mr. R.J. Staples:

"I am in hearty agreement with the fundamental principles of Mr. Staples. I am happy to see that so much is being done for music in the Province of Saskatchewan and sincerely wish some of the other provinces would follow Mr. Staples' very excellent lead."

The same kind of a story could be told with regard to school libraries. I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, this group of activities. I am afraid we sometimes overlook their importance in brightening thousands of Saskatchewan youngsters.

I think, too, that I should say a word with regard to the University of Saskatchewan, because we do have in this province, in the University,

an institution of which we can be extremely proud. No other province has any reason to be prouder of its University than have we here in Saskatchewan. The total expenditure of the University, including its earning departments of book store and the University farm and so on, excluding capital, is now around the \$2,500,000 mark and as the President said in his report, that is big business. Before the war the expenditure was only about one-half of that amount. Since 1944, up to the end of this year, there was spent in capital — spent in development and buildings at the University, some \$4 million. That has supplied an addition to the engineering building which provides laboratories and classrooms and is of general use to all the colleges; a soils and dairy lab, one, I think Mr. Minister of Agriculture, of the finest in Canada, a great service to the agricultural industry; a school for agriculture, and I am sure you will not find a finer one in the Dominion of Canada. I would hope that members of the Opposition take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, when in Saskatoon to visit it, particularly the school of agriculture. I think we are all proud of it. Some extension to the power house; a building to enclose a betatron, extremely useful in research and in treatment of cancer; a new gymnasium, up until the present the only gymnasium they had was a building originally designed as a dining room; the Medical College is now complete and the University Hospital is, of course on its way. These buildings, and the type of building, I think, indicate the increasing service to the people of the province by the Universities, as they grow older, shift the emphasis of their work. A young University is probably almost entirely a teaching University, but as a University grows old, gets its roots into the problems of the province, then more and more research is entered into. That I think is good, Mr. Speaker, it is, I regret to say, more expensive, but more and more it assists in aiding with vital problems of the province. I would like to pay a most sincere tribute to the members of the Board of Governors of the University, to the President, Dr. W.P. Thompson and his staff for, I think, a most excellent job in management and direction of our University affairs.

Now to deal once again briefly with something of the economic picture of the province and the contrasts that one finds in Canada. The number of Saskatchewan farm operators was, according to the 1946 census, 125,000. The 1949 estimate of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics of the net income of these farmers was \$380 million. In the same year, Mr. Speaker, the net income of just 90 Canadian companies was \$378 million. Less than 100 industrial concerns had an income almost as great — a net income almost as great as the net income of the 125,000 farmers in Saskatchewan, and it is, Mr. Speaker, against a pattern of distribution of wealth and of ownership and the power that results from ownership of wealth like that that the C.C.F. protests. I want to quote a statement made by Mr. Jerry Voorhis, Executive Secretary of the Co-operative League of the United States of America, former United States Senator or Congressman, when he was speaking to the annual meeting of the Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan last summer. He had been speaking about monopoly, about the growing idea that monopoly is good simply because it is big, and consequently it is getting bigger and bigger. This is what he said about it; and I read it because I think we can concur:

"I do not know how it is with you in Canada, but the general point of view, (that is with regard to monopoly growth) as I have just described it, is to my mind as serious a danger to free institutions as exists today."

He says:

"If it is less serious than the threat from world communism or the danger from a war fought with atomic and hydrogen bombs — weapons, then those are the only dangers that are greater. And, furthermore, there can be no doubt that if communism has one ally in the free nations which is its most effective one, that ally is monopoly, for monopoly destroys economic opportunity for the people, it also robs them of responsibility and thus it gives a semblance of reason to the propaganda of communism which in a truly free society it could not possibly have."

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, are not unaware of forces, threats to the world situation today, but we equate with threats and ally with them the menace because of the extending and extended control of monopoly capitalism in this country and in others. We do have faith, Mr. Speaker, in the ability of man, if given a chance, to collectively solve his own problems. We believe that man has a right to expect to inherit the fullness of earth. We believe that if he is going to inherit that fullness he can neither delegate nor abdicate his responsibility as the owner of that fullness, and he must consequently increasingly organize to prevent much of that fullness being controlled by the organized few. He must organize to produce and to distribute that fullness and to do so, Mr. Speaker, he will elect more and more governments of the economic, social and political philosophy of the C.C.F. and he will build more and more co-operatives. I mention those, Mr. Speaker, not as alternatives, they are complementary — complementary for two reasons, because each: the government of this kind and the co-operatives, have a necessary sphere within which to exercise ownership and control. And secondly, because only when the framework of such government as this will the co-operatives be adequately supported and really be given the opportunity to do the job that there is to do within their own sphere. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the performance and the programme of this government clearly indicates its willingness and its ability to proceed in such a way that more of the people of our province achieve more of the fullness of the earth which rightly belongs to them.

Mr. Speaker, just in closing, I want now to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Motion. They gave the kind of reasoned and reasonable address which those of us who know them expected they would give, and we were not disappointed. I wish to congratulate them and to assure them and the House, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the Motion.

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to assure the House that I am only going to take a few minutes. Before the Minister leaves, I would like to tell him that I congratulate him on his speech this afternoon. I consider that he has raised the tone of this debate. I also want to congratulate him because he, so far, has been the only Minister who has told us anything at all about his Department. I am sorry that he didn't spend all his time in dealing with his Department, and that he didn't continue with the story of his

Department until, if necessary, 6 o'clock. I would have willingly given up my place to speak to listen to him tell us something of the Department of Education.

I want to point out, Sir, that we have been here now two weeks, and the sum total of the good of this debate, with the one exception of the Minister who has just gone out, I think is nil. What has the province benefited by the discussion that we have had here so far? The Speech from the Throne is a mere formality. It doesn't mean very much. It gave us a long history of the past and very little prediction for the future. It seemed to me, as I often think of these Speeches from the Throne, that it was a big dish of nothing. When you vote for nothing, you get nothing; when you vote against nothing, you still get nothing — but you have had the satisfaction of protesting.

We have, in this Government, two Ministers who were once employees of the Wheat Pool. They have both taken part in this debate, and when they were speaking I wondered, because they have attended many meetings of the Wheat Pool, what they would think if the Wheat Pool business was conducted on the same basis that we have, so far, conducted the business of this province. They know as well as I do that the first thing that is presented to an annual meeting of the Wheat Pool is a directors' report, and when the directors' report, which is complete, is presented, then the members, the delegates to the Wheat Pool, discuss that report phase by phase, criticize it, make suggestions, give direction to the Board, so that they will be able to carry on the business for the coming year. I suggest that that is the procedure we should follow in this Legislative Assembly. We should have a complete report from the Government so that we might spend our time discussing the affairs of this province in a constructive manner, and offer some suggestions to the Government so that they will carry on in the year ahead.

Now, during these last two weeks, we could have had at least the reports of two Ministers — two complete reports; and I believe that in the past two weeks we could have dealt with two Departments in a pretty full and adequate manner.

I want to deal with the amendment that has been moved to this debate. The amendment reads:

"but this Assembly regrets that the policy of Your Honour's Advisers in regard to the settlement of vacant Crown Land suitable for agricultural purposes is that all such land will be allocated on a 33-year lease basis with no provision for the settler ever having the right to obtain title to any such land settled on by him".

Now, according to the ancient rules by which we are guided in this Legislature, rules suitable to the days of Queen Anne, hundreds of years old, this motion is supposed to mean that this Government does not enjoy the confidence of the Legislature, and I say to you that the rule that suggests that the amendment doesn't mean what it says but means something else, is an absurd rule in any modern democratic institution. You have an amendment here which suggests that certain members are opposed to the lease system of occupying land, but according to the ancient rules, it doesn't mean that at all. We are going to vote whether or not we have confidence in the Government, and I am going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, how any

February 16, 1951

person, whether he be a member of the Legislature or not, can vote two ways on one question, at the same time.

Mr. Walker: — If you can't do it, it must be impossible Jake!

Mr. Benson: — Some day I'll deal with you, sir. You know, no person in this House, apparently is supposed to have an idea that doesn't coincide with the Party idea, one way or the other, and you must become the butt of ridicule of individuals who have only been here a couple of years. I want to tell my friend from Hanley (Mr. Walker) that I will still be here long after he has failed to be returned. I came here first in 1929, and if I had not conducted myself according to the ideas of the people who sent me here I wouldn't be here today, and I want to tell my friend that he has got to learn as a member of the Legislature, and I hope that he will not be adverse to learning.

This lease system of holding land was submitted to the province in the year 1934. I was one of the members who supported a platform that contained that use-lease system, and I know what the people decided, in Saskatchewan, in regard to that particular question. The result was, the Farmer-Labour Organization returned to this Legislature exactly five members. Naturally, because the idea was cast aside by the people of this province, it was never put in the platform of the C.C.F. I believe in the private ownership of land. The home, especially the farm home, is the basis of our whole society in this country, and especially in this province. You can't build a good community or a good country or a good province anywhere where the people who live in that province do not own and occupy their own homes and farms. There is no security, there is no stability in a land settled by tenants, and I would say to the farmers who sit in this House, the farmers, especially, who sit on this side of the House — and there are many good farmers who own their place sitting on this side of the House, and I would say to them — if they are sincere and if they are consistent in their belief that we should only allow a settlement of the balance of the land suitable for settlement in the province of Saskatchewan, on a use-lease basis, I say if they are sincere in that, then they will immediately turn their farms over to the province and take out a lease on their own land.

I think this debate has perhaps been unique in the fact that no member has yet got up and said, "I didn't intend to speak on this particular motion". This is the first time, I think, we have gone for two weeks on any subject without some member getting up and saying that, so apparently they all intended to take part, and no doubt they have done a job — a good job according to their own opinions. I want to say to them that I hope, in the future, in the near future, we can get to the point where we can get a rule established in this Legislature so that no question will ever be introduced in this House that will be considered a "want of confidence" motion unless it is moved as such and not some Bill or amendment introduced and called a want-of-confidence motion.

Mr. Speaker, I am through for this afternoon. I am going to support the amendment, and I am going to vote against the motion.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Premier Douglas: — I wonder if I might interrupt the proceeding of the House, and suggest that we might adjourn for just a moment. We have the pleasure of having with us, in the Chamber, His Excellency the Hon. Uhro Toivola and his wife.

His Excellency is the Finnish Minister to Canada. He is present with Mr. Justice Hogarth whom many of the old members of the House will know. I thought the House might like to just adjourn for a moment and have His Excellency say a word to us. He is going to be in our city for a few days and some of the members may be meeting him socially or personally, and I thought the House might care to adjourn and meet him. I move, if the Leader of the Opposition would care to second it, that we suspend proceedings for that purpose.

Mr. Tucker: — In view of the high esteem in which Finland is held throughout Canada, I would be very glad to second the Premier's motion.

Hon. Uhro Toivola: — Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great honour indeed, to have the opportunity to say a few words to this Assembly. Having been a member of parliament myself I can value this kind of institution in which the will of the people is expressed and through which the people have a chance to influence their government.

We, in Finland, share the traditions of one of the oldest democracies in the whole world. In the 14th century we took part in the election of the Kings of Sweden. During centuries we had a legislature consisting of four chambers — the nobility, the clergy, the bourgeois, and the ambassadors. Since 1906, we have only one chamber based on proportionate representation. In that House one of the greatest parties is the Social Democratic Party which feels that it shares in the ideals that are supported by the majority in this House; but more than that, I can say that these people in our parliament share in the principles and traditions of British democracy, in that our government is responsible to the House. We find this is one of the bulwarks of the freedom of the people. We have had to defend those freedoms and have paid in the toll of human lives for that independence which we still have, and I want only to say that in this House, when they learn that I have been received in this parliament in such a friendly way, they will have a feeling of gratitude towards the Saskatchewan Legislature.

May I wish you all luck in representing the will of the Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker: — Your Excellency, I would like to say, on behalf of the whole Assembly, that we appreciate your visit very much, and we can only wish you Godspeed back to your own country, and may your people retain their independence.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.50 o'clock p.m.