

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Thirteenth Legislature**  
**17th Day**

**Friday, March 8, 1957**

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed, from Wednesday, March 6, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, first I want to take the opportunity to congratulate you, sir, on your elevation to the position of Speaker of this Assembly. We feel — and I am sure I speak for everyone of us here — that it was indeed a happy choice when you were selected for that position. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we do miss in this Chamber the sense of dignity and restraint, and the forthright and businesslike manner in which you presented your Department to the Legislature, and also that beautiful Scotch brogue which you have with it. I do wish to express our appreciation of that appointment.

I want to deal of course, this afternoon, with the Budget presented by the Provincial Treasurer, last Wednesday. I notice that he has set up a complete new system with which to reveal the financial position of the Province. I think it is a move in the right direction, and I hope that, in future years the Provincial Treasurer will find that it is satisfactory enough to stay with it from year to year, and that we won't have to have innovations and changes every time we come to consider the Budget.

The innovation and the changes, of course, are so recent that we have no possibility of knowing the effect of such a change of reporting the financial condition of the Province. I don't think I should say any more about that until we have had a chance to observe the Public Accounts in the next Session, and after it has had a year's operation, to assess it.

On Wednesday, as in the past, in The Budget, of course, one of the first things it did, was to reveal the economic conditions of Canada as a whole, and of the province particularly. It is right and fitting that it should have done so, because the economic atmosphere in the Dominion has a great bearing on the economy of the province. But I think today, Governments play a more and more important role in the economy of the nation and in the province. In this regard, I think, the Provincial Treasurer neglected to complete the economic picture by including the phases of undertakings of the Government that have a direct bearing on the economy of the province. For instance, you might consider hospitalization and its field, car insurance, Crown Corporations, Power and other things, in which Governments play a vital role; and their exemptions in that field play an important part in the economy of the province as a whole.

**March 8, 1957**

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are to look at the financial position of the Province, we can't afford to overlook the phases of government expenditures and undertakings. I would like to point out to the Provincial Treasurer, at least in our thinking, that we put ourselves in a somewhat ridiculous position when we leave the impression that we can borrow huge sums of money for power and other public utilities, without in any way affecting the financial position of the Province. These are revenue-producing enterprises it is true, but we are pledging the resources of the Province as a guarantee every time we borrow money for these particular enterprises. And to say, because they are self-liquidating, and that therefore, the huge borrowings we must have in order to facilitate their expansion will never become a direct burden on the taxpayer of the Province, is, I think, a ridiculous and a dangerous principle. Once we assume the thinking that we can borrow these huge sums of money without pledging the resources of the Province, then we leave the field clear for Socialist planners and brain-trusts to have a field day, in setting up Corporations and Government enterprises. I think the Provincial Treasurer recognizes that he does pledge the financial resources of the province, because he said he budgeted by design for some \$3 million-odd of surplus, in order to take care of any of the deficits or difficulties of some of these Corporations.

Now, when you do that, you are asking the taxpayer, through the revenues of the Province, to stand behind and to guarantee losses of these Corporations, either through the Treasury, or, if need be, through increased charges for car insurance and other features. Certainly, we can accept no other principle than that the taxpayers must stand behind these Corporations.

Now, I know that the Hospitalization is not a Crown Corporation. It was not set up with that intention in mind at all. It was set up in order to render a service to the people. But I want to use it as an illustration to show how there are factors involved, which develop later, which are not evident at the time that a corporation or business enterprise may be set up.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, when the Hospitalization was set up, it was thought at the time that the personal tax would carry the scheme. We found we were in error, and we had to increase the personal tax. Then we had to put on a 1 per cent sales tax. Still we found that we had to come back to the Treasury in order to carry the Hospitalization scheme. You have consistently raised the personal tax, at least every four years, and you have dipped into the Treasury more and more each year, until today the Provincial Treasury is called upon to put up some \$13 million to finance the Hospitalization scheme in this province. I don't say that the Legislature isn't doing it willingly; but I use this as an example.

The same is true of others as with Hospitalization. Many factors creep in that the greatest study could not at the time foresee the future of the Hospitalization scheme; neither can they foresee the future of a business undertaking in power or gas, or Crown Corporations, at the time they are set up. I use that to illustrate that we must at all times

bear in mind that it is the financial resources of the Province that are pledged every time we borrow money to establish these enterprises; and it is the resources of the people of the province that must come to their assistance, when they experience a difficult day.

I want to spike here, first, any rumour that the Liberals, because of this statement, are opposed to the extending of Power or Telephones, or other services. We have never voiced any protest against the Provincial Treasurer going to New York to borrow millions of dollars for Power and Telephones. What we have opposed is the idea of trying to kind the people into believing that borrowing these huge sums has no effect on the debt or financial position of the Province. In fact, we are very happy the debt or financial position of the Province. In fact, we are very happy that the Provincial Treasurer can go to the United States and borrow money. The Provincial Treasurer stated that the market in Canada is very restricted. It is restricted, I think, because there isn't sufficient money available in Canada for the call of all this development that is going on in Canada and the demands that are made on this market. The United States, on the other hand, is in a very fortunate position. She has sufficient money to take care of her own needs, and she has huge sums of money to make available for foreign investment. And it is, I think we might say, because of our accessibility to these huge sums of money in the United States, that we have been able to develop our economy at all, that we have been able to expand power and telephones, and other services for our people. I think everyone will agree with that.

I am surprised and amazed however, in view of the success we have had in the Province of Saskatchewan in borrowing huge sums of money on the American market, that the C.C.F. in Ottawa should put up the cry that we should have 'no truck nor trade with the Yankees.' American money is dominating our whole economy is the cry of the counterparts of this Government in Ottawa. They said we are fast becoming a 'satellite of Uncle Sam.' So, they said, the day has arrived when we must put a halt to the domination of foreign capital in this nation. Our Cabinet Ministers are not of that view, as is evident from the Winnipeg Convention, when such a motion was sponsored there. The present Minister of Mineral Resources, jumped to his feet, and according to press clippings, he had this to say. The Minister of Mineral Resources said:

"Don't do that. Don't pass this resolution condemning this American capital and this foreign domination. Because, he said, it is political dynamite in the province of Saskatchewan. This embarrasses us in our efforts to secure American money in Saskatchewan."

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — What are you quoting from?

**Mr. Cameron:** — The stand taken here in this province . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Would the hon. member permit a question please: What are you quoting from?

**March 8, 1957**

**Mr. Cameron:** — I said a press clipping.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, well, that is a pretty broad answer.

**Mr. Cameron:** — A press clipping what you said down there.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — A press clipping? From what paper and what date, please?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I don't intend to answer that, sir.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Good.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition):** — Do you deny it 'Brock'?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to report something else in connection with this ill will towards American capital in the Dominion of Canada. You will recall that Mr. Douglas, our Premier, in speaking at a C.C.F. Convention in Regina, according to press reports again (and I am neither going to give the paper nor the date) said:

“Canada is completely dominated by profiteering principles.”

And he went on about the 'quick buck artists', and he went on to say:

“There is no economic salvation for people like us without a planned economy.”

I thought the Premier was reverting back to his first philosophy. Then a week later, he had a Conference with the industrialists in order to arrange with them to get a better understanding of the possibilities of industrial development in the province of Saskatchewan. It was a good undertaking to do so; but what I marvelled at was some of his statements to these industrialists, who have money to invest, at that particular Conference. He said:

“But I want you to believe me when I say, I am more interested in seeing this province go forward. Go out and bring in your outside capital; go to the United States, anywhere, and bring in your money. We must have outside capital.”

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — That's an about-face, eh?

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — Better go and talk to Coldwell.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to turn to the Budget in its review of agriculture in the past year, and its outlook for 1957. Speaking for the outlook for 1957, I think, I should like to correct an impression left by the Provincial Treasurer as regards the prospects for the sale of wheat in 1957. I took the quotation from the Budget, in which he said, and I am quoting:

“World trade in wheat and flour has expanded since mid-1956 to levels higher than any since the war.”

Then he said:

“ . . . Canada exports have shown some increase. Canadian wheat and flour exports in 1956-57 crop year now appear to be waning.”

I wanted to check on that statement, because I thought it would add to the apprehension of the farmers, and our agricultural industry generally, if that impression went out from this House. So I went back to see what the President of our own Wheat Pool, Mr. Wesson, had to say on the prospects for grain exports in 1957, and he said . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — What date?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I beg your pardon.

**Premier Douglas:** — Have you the date?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think it was December 31, 1956, and I think it was in the 'Western Producer', but I am not too sure of that. I want to quote what he said in his review:

“Exports for the current year 1956 were 340 million bushels, one of the highest export figures on record, and it is approximately the same amount Canada sold in 1953, and only 48 million less than the all-time record established in 1952.”

And then, he went on to say:

“ . . . 'Canadian farmers have reason to be grateful to the Canadian Wheat Board for withstanding the pressure to cut wheat prices. The Wheat Board policies have resulted in very large sales and prices which are fair to the consumer,' Mr. Wesson said.”

Then, he turned to the outlook for 1957, and he continued:

“The outlook for wheat exports in 1957 continued to be good. Grain farmers can look forward to continuing good markets.”

That was the viewpoint of the President of the Wheat Pool.

Then, I checked to see what other thinking was, and I checked on the Current Review of Agricultural Conditions in Canada, and its outlook for 1957, and if you will turn there to page 20 in this report of the statistics of Canada, you will find this is said:

**March 8, 1957**

“A factor which may have a significant bearing on supplies next crop year is the soil bank program now underway in the United States. The program is designed, among other things, to quickly reduce production of wheat, cotton, corn and flax. But (it says) world exports of wheat and flour in 1956-57, the next crop year, can be expected to remain at near record levels.”

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — What crop year?

**Mr. Cameron:** — This crop year. Well, I thought I had better put that on the record, because I thought that the Provincial Treasurer was just a little too pessimistic, either by design or by foresight, or rather forgetfulness, to point out that the prospects for the next crop year are very, very bright.

I want to talk further about agriculture. The Provincial Treasurer had this to say in summing up agriculture:

“I am going to stress agriculture so much, because we hear so much about agriculture in the province today. Agricultural production in the past year was close to record levels.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was happy when I read that, and heard the Provincial Treasurer state it so, because to me it was an assurance that the men and women engaged in agriculture are hard-working and industrious people, and, in spite of the fact that farm folks are experiencing trying times, they are by careful tillage and good management producing not only grain, but beef and pork and dairy products to meet the ever-increasing demands of the Canadian market. I am happy too, because it gives the lie to so many disparaging remarks made about our farm men and women. We have been told that farmers are inefficient. We have been told that farm women are inefficient . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Who said it?

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . that farm women should be taught how to pan good farm meals. I was listening to a radio broadcast some time in December – I haven't the script, but I copied down at the time my impressions of the broadcast. It was in 'Citizen's Forum'; there was a series on. This one had as its panel, I think, the President of the Farm Union, a farmer from Ontario, and two economists from the province in the employ of this Government, and they were discussing farm problems. During the course of the discussion on farm problems, one economist said:

“I'm going to stick my neck out and say something you farmers will not like. We are not getting the most out of farm production. The farmers are inefficient.”

The other economist in the course of the series in effect said this. He said:

“We should have social planning. The consumer

should be brought to realize that the farmer needs an outlet for his produce at fair prices and the farmer should realize he cannot expect the consumer to pay too much.

“So if we had efficient farmers producing more at cheaper prices, they could make more money and the prices would be cheaper to the consumer.”

**Mr. McDonald:** — Socialism and rheumatism.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then, in order to bring this about, he said:

“In order to bring this about, it will mean a host of farm experts coming around to show the farmer how to become more efficient.”

I wondered what type of farm expert this would be who would teach the farmers how to become more efficient. A little later on I picked up a clipping of the ‘Western Producer’, and there were letters to the Open Forum, and there was one letter in the Open Forum that was dealing with farm experts. I am not coming to quote it all; it’s a long one. It was in the issue of December 13, 1956, and this man had this to say:

“After I returned from the services I was employed as a civil servant with the present Government. Most of my family and myself have been with the CCF since its formation.”

Then he went on to speak of some of the disappointments in the department which are not relevant here; but he came on to this thing of experts advising farmers, and he said:

“More recently another (that’s one of the experts) who is paid for his supposedly superior knowledge of things agricultural, while judging specimens at a small town fair, gave a first price on an exhibit of quack grass which had been entered as a joke as western rye.”

These are the farm experts who are going to teach the farmers how to farm more efficiently.

Then, the Provincial Treasurer in his review of agriculture, said:

“ . . . The farm cash income increased eight per cent over 1955. Total farm cash income was \$597 million, up 24 per cent over 1955.”

Then, I assessed this with an article that the Provincial Treasurer had written in the ‘Western Retailer’ December 13 issue, 1956. In that issue he was replying to statements that had been made by the former C.C.F. M.P., Mr. Ross Thatcher, and in his article in reply, he said:

**March 8, 1957**

“In the period 1951-55 inclusive, the average farm in Saskatchewan has realized a cash farm income of \$5,389.”

That is a strange contrast to the backbenchers who have been jumping up and down that the farmers got only \$900 to \$1,000 to \$1,100.

“In other words (he said) the average farmer in 1951-55, during that four-year period averaged over \$5,000 per farm.”

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Gross or net?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to say this . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — He doesn't know the difference.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . I want to ask these people, why don't you tell the same story out in the country you tell in here?

**Mr. McDonald:** — They wouldn't dare.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Can you imagine a C.C.F. going out in the country and telling the farmers: “You're not so bad off. In spite of your inefficiency, your cash income for the past five years has been over \$5,000.” But instead they tell this story in the country: “We've lost our markets. We've no exports for beef, for pork, for dairy products.” They don't say the reason we have no export markets for beef and pork is simply that our opposite is increasing and the standard of living is rising, until the greatest bulk (if not all) of our pork and beef is consumed within the Dominion of Canada. Would they assume that we should deny our own consumers this pork and beef in order that we might export it on the export markets of the world? Is that what they are advocating?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sit down!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I am coming to you, Mr. Minister; I'm coming to you. I will give you something to answer in just a minute.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I heard the same ones from 'Jimmy' Gardiner.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now, Hazen Argue, the M.P. for Assiniboia, the other day, was raising a cry in the House of Commons about the price of eggs. He said the farmers are getting between 10 to 15 cents per dozen for eggs. Hazen Argue made that statement, 10 to 15 cents per dozen, when he knows, or should have known, that eggs in the province of Saskatchewan, last year averaged 32 cents per dozen to the farmers.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Nonsense again. Pure undisguised nonsense!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now the Minister of Agriculture says that's nonsense.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Correct.



**Mr. Cameron:** — You don't believe it? You don't believe it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — No. Far otherwise, my friend.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well, my good friend, I don't believe it either.

**Some Hon. Member:** — You sure bit on that one.

**Mr. Cameron:** — But I am going, Mr. Minister of Agriculture, to have to embarrass you, because I am going to hold up the Department of Agriculture's Report for 1956, as tabled in this House, and on the fly-leaf there is a great picture of the Hon. I.C. Nollet. This is his Report, and he says in the course of this Report — I will give you the page, page 51, speaking of eggs, the Minister said:

“Farm eggs sold off the farm in 1955 was 29,502,000 or 29 ½ million dozen eggs the farmers sold in 1955.”

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That's two years ago.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then he has a table showing the estimated cash income from the sale of farm products, and then he says; “Eggs — 1955 the farmers received \$9,900,000.” Now you divide this approximately \$10 million by 29 ½ million dozen eggs, and the Minister says it's 32 cents a dozen! Why doesn't he tell that out in the country? Here is the Report tabled in the Legislature telling the farmers “you're not so bad off, you received 32 cents a dozen for your eggs” . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — In 1955.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . and then you go out and say they are receiving 10 cents a dozen.

Now, we talk about the farmers and the plight of agriculture, and the depressed conditions of agriculture of this province. I have heard C.C.F. spokesmen go out and say that we are worse off than we were in the 'thirties', in spite of the Provincial Treasurer telling them that they got \$5,000 cash income per farm. I want to ask you this — who kept faith with the farmers? What has this Government done for agriculture? Who is the farmer's friend? Well, let me quote — I am going to tell you something of the Veterans' Land Act:

“The purpose of the Federal Government in setting up the Veterans' Land Act was to assist discharged members of the armed forces to become owners of farms. Financial assistance in part of grants and part in loans was given, and the rate of interest was 3 ½ per cent.”

You will notice this is a cheaper rate of interest than even the province can borrow money at today. Grants and loans under this Act totalled \$40 million to the veterans. So successful have the veterans been under this Act that the Royal Commission on Agriculture, in its study of the problems of agriculture, recommends that this pattern be followed in regard to credit for agricultural purposes.

**March 8, 1957**

Then we have the Canadian Farm Loan Board, which was set up as a system for long-term mortgage credit to Canadian farmers. \$30 million has been loaned to Saskatchewan farmers under this Act.

Then we have the Farm Improvement Loans Act. That Act was set up by Ottawa in 1944. It was set up to assist farmers to improve their farms and to purchase machinery. How successful has that Act been? Well, every man who is selling farm machinery, every agent of farm machinery in the province, can tell you that every time he has a prospect for the sale of a machine and the prospect hasn't sufficient money to pay cash, he takes him to the bank, and he obtains the money from the bank under the Farm Improvement Loans Act. Now I want to give you some conception of what benefit this Act has been to Saskatchewan farmers.

The farmers of Saskatchewan under this Act have purchased 65,000 tractors, 35,000 combines, 27,000 farm trucks, \$35 million of other farm equipment. These were put on to the Saskatchewan farms and they are there because of the Farm Improvement Loans Act.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Tell us how many repossessions?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Are you opposed to it?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I am coming to repossessions, and I ask you again who is assisting the farmer in Saskatchewan? I few years back we asked this Government to make available to junior farmers in particular, through some sort of credit bureau, assistance in financing themselves and establishing themselves in farming, and we pleaded with them to do it, to assist in other fields that service which is being rendered by these agencies of the Federal Government of which I have just spoken. We said at the time, you can loan money to people in other industries; you can loan money to people to buy theatres; you can loan money to cement plants, why can't you loan money to young farmers? And I think we know why, because the Provincial Treasurer some few years ago in Committee, when we asked him that question, "Why don't you take some of this revenue and put it up in a fund to assist farmers?" replied, "We can't do that because the risk is too great."

Now, I ask you, who has faith in the Saskatchewan farmers? It is this very thought I think that permeates all their thinking – this thought of the inefficiency of the farmers, and their untrustworthiness – that caused the same Government to abolish the Farm Loans Board set up years ago, upon reaching office. I think it is this same lack of faith that is causing them to persistently refuse to consider setting up a farm bureau for young junior farmers in Saskatchewan.

I want to show you what other Provinces are doing. They are covered by the Farm Improvement Act, they are covered by the Farm Loans Act; but they say "to supplement that work, we are going to do something on our own;" and they did. I want to tell you what Ontario has done. Ontario has a Conservative Government, but that doesn't matter. If they have proven something to be successful, there is no reason why a Socialist Government should not adopt the same, unless there is a difference in the philosophy. It has a loaning institution they call the Ontario Junior

Farm Establishment Loan Corporation. It was set up purposely for young farmers ages 21 to 35. They can borrow up to \$15,000 for a term of 20 years at four per cent interest.

The Province of Quebec has a Farm Credit Bureau, apart from the field that the Federal Government is in, and it is designed, too, for farm boys, particularly for a son, desiring to settle on a farm, whose father is supplying the rolling stock or machinery and such, or is giving the son a certain amount of cash. Either he can branch out on his own, assisting in the operation of the machinery, interchanging with its use with his dad, or he can receive some funds from his father to help him get established. The bureau puts up 75 per cent of the real value of the farm. Now, under this plan, if a young farmer can muster or borrow from his dad \$2,500, he can purchase a \$10,000 farm. Long-term payments were set up at 2 ½ per cent interest. I wonder why we can't in this province set up a credit arrangement to assist our young farmers 21 to 35 to establish themselves on the farm? Mr. Speaker, there is no reason under the world, except the stubborn opposition of this Government to do anything to assist our farmers in Saskatchewan. Again I ask who is the friend to the farmer?

I want to quote the Premier at his Industrial Development Conference, when he had these industrialists again in conference, asking them to bring forth their capital, whether it is American or what it is, to help us to develop our industries in this province. He said to those people in that conference, speaking of the loss of farm population – and this is taken from the Report of the Conference itself:

“This loss of farm population is nothing to be deplored. If we require less people on the land to produce the same amount of food, it simply means we have those people available as labourers. Therefore, we should not **cay** about going back.”

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is the crux of the whole thing. This is the reason why this Government has refused to consider setting up a credit bureau of any nature to assist young farmers. The Provincial Treasurer says: “The risk is too great.” The Premier says: “We shouldn't deplore this condition. The more that leave the farms, the more there is available for labourers. We shouldn't cry about going back.” And yet they will go out into the country and play upon the problems which the farmers of Saskatchewan are facing, simply, I think, in most cases, for cheap political advantage, knowing full well that they have no intention of doing anything on their own to assist in any way to alleviate these conditions existing on the farms in Saskatchewan today.

A great deal is said about the cost-price squeeze, and I want to say this. Everything which adds to the farmer's cost of production, adds to the cost-price squeeze. The farmers, the merchants, the businessman, can be squeezed from the bottom up just as effectively as from the bottom down, and it doesn't matter if you put your hand in a vise, whether the pressure is applied from the bottom, or whether the pressure is applied from the top, injury and pain will result. Such things as taxes, licences, insurance and the cost of doing business, play a great role in this cost-price squeeze.

**March 8, 1957**

Let's look now at this cost-price squeeze as it applies to the people of the province today. I want to show you the school and municipal taxes, that is, the municipal taxes for school purposes from 1944 to 1955. In 1944, municipal taxes for school purposes were \$9,930,000. In 1955, those same taxes to support our schools had crept up to over \$28 ½ million. And percentage-wise, in the cities the taxes are up 183 per cent, in towns 337 per cent, villages 186, and rural municipalities 182 per cent. Since 1944, school taxes are up from approximately \$10 million to \$29 million – up \$19 million. These school taxes are increasing at the alarming rate of approximately \$2 million per year, and will continue to do so.

Let's look at municipal taxes for all purposes – for municipal purposes and for schools. In 1944, the total levy of municipal taxes was \$23,745,000. By 1955, they had risen to \$59,181,000 and the same thing percentage-wise. In cities, the municipal taxes for all purposes are up 166 per cent, in the towns 261, in the villages 161, and in the R.M.s 134. It is no wonder that these urban people in the small centres of Saskatchewan, the small towns and villages, are complaining about taxes, because when you look at charts, they are paying more in proportion than either the cities or the rural municipalities. The R.M.s have a per capital tax burden of \$85.00. That's an average for the province. Looking in the Report, I found that the R.M.s in my constituency have a per capita burden much higher than the average of \$85.00 Happyland Rural Municipality has a burden of \$98; Clintworth, \$198 per capita, and the people of the R.M. of Enterprise, in which I reside, are called upon to pay \$108 per capita. That municipality is called upon to levy for school and municipal purposes \$108 for every man, woman and child within the boundaries of that municipality, and others have \$198 for every man, woman and child. And then you tell us taxes are not a factor in the cost-price squeeze.

What are these taxes doing? Let us look for a moment at the arrears of municipal taxes. Arrears are accumulating, Mr. Speaker, at an alarming rate. In 1950, the arrears of municipal taxes was \$21 million, and in 1955 it had crept up to \$29 million. Arrears in 1955 were over \$6 million above what they were in 1955 . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Compare that to Liberal Manitoba.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Estimated arrears in 1956 of municipal taxes has reached the staggering total of \$35 million. And let me point out that in two more years, if these arrears of municipal taxes continue to creep up at the rate at which they are going, by 1959 we will have a burden of arrears of taxes that will exceed the taxes in the depression years 1931.

How are the schools faring? Look at a picture of your larger school unit. I asked a question in the Legislature, and it is in the 'Votes and Proceedings'. I ask it each year. I asked, what are the arrears of school taxes in each of the larger school units as at December 31, 1955.

These arrears at last December according to the report tabled by the Minister of Education in this House stood at \$9,890,000 – up \$2,300,000 over what they were in 1954. Indications are that when the complete returns are in for December 31, 1956, arrears of taxes in the larger units will have skyrocketed to almost \$12 million.

We can get a clearer picture not only in totals, but when we look at the individual school unit. A cross-section of the unit – I'm only going to give a few to illustrate. 1950 – Mr. Speaker, if you'll notice, I am not going back to 1944; I am only going back the past five years to 1950. Unit 4, in 1950, had \$112,000 of arrears of taxes; in 1955, period from \$64,000 to \$292,000; No. 52, arrears of taxes of \$234,000; School Unit No. 61, \$497,000. And you say this has nothing to do with the cost-price squeeze.

Not only are we plagued with ever-mounting taxes, piling up of arrears, but our schools are faced with a crisis of a loss of teacher. They are draining the best-qualified teachers out of the province. More of our children are being subjected to study under supervisors who are not qualified at all for the classrooms, and the teachers with the higher-class certificates are leaving the province in order to seek greener pastures in some other place. The teachers leaving Saskatchewan in 1956 number approximately 600. The highest group is the professional certificate class. 115 teachers are teaching classrooms for which they are not qualified, and we have 40 more supervisors in our classrooms today than we had last year. Enrolment in our teachers' colleges is down; our best-qualified teachers are leaving the province and our children, more and more of them, are taking instruction under supervisors. Yet we talk about assistance for education, and the budget allots \$4.4 millions increase for education.

Mr. Speaker, this increase is only a pittance. If we are to do anything to meet the problem of keeping our teachers in the classrooms, and assisting in any way to stop this spiral increase in taxes, then it is necessary not only to raise the grant to 35 per cent, but to raise them at least to the minimum of 50 per cent of the cost of operating our classrooms.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — We have said that for years. You must put your grants to schools on a basis where they will pay 50 per cent at least of the cost of operating our classrooms, if you are to have any effect on the crisis that is facing education in the province of Saskatchewan today.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, so many of these people don't seem to be aware of the seriousness of the situation of education in the province today.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You don't know what to do about it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I'll tell you what the Minister is doing about it . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You've just got one solution. We've listened to it for 10 years now.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . He sits and contemplates and meditates on the philosophy of Dewey and lets the whole system crumble around him.

**March 8, 1957**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Did it take you all day yesterday to write that?

**Some Opposition Member:** — Oh be quiet!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Municipalities were called upon to raise \$59 million of property taxes in 1955; for the same year the province had a total revenue of \$82 ½ million, but of this \$29 ½ million came from Ottawa. So our junior governments – our municipalities – are called upon, by means of property tax only, to raise a greater sum of money for their services of the province.

**Some Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — When we talk about sharing Dominion revenues with the province, as I said before, don't forget the sole purpose behind the Dominion Federal sharing of the tax dollar was to assist the Province to pass on some of that to the local governing bodies, in order that they may be assisted, too, in their responsibilities.

**Some Opposition Member:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — We advocated that the time is here and it is urgent that we call a provincial-municipal conference with the purpose of arranging some way, some plan, of passing on these increased revenues from Ottawa down into the hands of the local governing bodies. We were pleased when we saw the Government had arranged such a conference. But we were disappointed in the results, because at this conference, if you assess the situation, the whole tenor of the conference was to say to the municipal men, "We will give you some assistance to carry you over this particular period, but that in itself will not solve anything. If we are to look at the field of local relationships with the Provincial Government, then we must first attempt to put the local governments on a basis in which they have an efficient basis of operation." They said, in effect, that practically five out of every six municipalities in the province today must go by the board, and we must enlarge these municipalities, because, they said, the present set-up is inefficient. And yet someone expressed the philosophy that we must go forward in this new concept. Someone said we must bring the municipal councillors to the point of view where they are prepared to take this step, and if necessary, we would work towards getting younger men as the municipal councillors, with this new concept in mind.

I thought that was a great contribution to the older municipal men who had spent years in devoted service to their local communities, and to operating their schools and their municipalities. Mr. Speaker, I spent 10 years in the classroom, and I have served 10 years, and am still serving, on the council of my municipality, and I was elected as trustee to the first larger unit board established in my constituency. Now some C.C.F. brain trust, wants to tell me and other men who have served years as councillors or trustees, that we must be replaced to make room for this new concept. These trustees, these councillors, who have given years of their devoted service to the ratepayers must be very pleased to know that they, too, are on the way to the glue factory.

The Provincial Treasurer had some suggestions to make to the municipal conference. He said this, in effect: "We know your problems are pressing, we know you are in desperate need of new sources of revenue;" and then he suggested some ways in which the municipalities might go home and raise more funds, because the Provincial Treasurer is quite an accomplished man at extracting taxes. So he said to the municipal men "This is my personal opinion but I am offering my personal suggestions from my experiences." Then he said, "You could raise funds other than by property taxes. You are complaining because your only field of taxes today is on property." He said: "There are other ways of raising taxes for the municipalities. Put on an amusement tax. Put on a poll tax. Charge each head of the municipality a certain amount. Put on a sales tax within the municipality. Add to the licence fees on your motor vehicles." He says, "Perhaps you could charge charitable services." And then he said, "You could put taxes on farm buildings. You could tax farm machinery. You could tax farm trucks. You could tax personal effects in the home." Now, those rural people will be pleased to know the Provincial Treasurer is suggesting, as a means of increased revenue, that they put a tax on the tractor and the combine and the cultivator and the rest of the machinery, in order that the municipalities may raise money.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Pure imagination.

**Mr. Cameron:** — He says, "You may put taxes on personal possessions; for furniture, your personal car — any of the personal possessions. You are free to go and put a tax on it." He says, "You could put a frontage tax on all farms that are beside the highway. Why? Those people are privileged to live beside a good improved road; therefore they should have a special tax put on them." All those people who live adjacent to the grid road system and the Trans-Canada highway and the other highways in the province of Saskatchewan will be pleased to know that the Provincial Treasurer suggests that they should pay a frontage tax because they live beside the grid system or the highway.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You're having an hallucination.

**Mr. Cameron:** — He said, "You can even raise taxes on land. Put on some more if you wish." Now, these were some of the concrete suggestions that were advanced by the Provincial Treasurer to assist the rural municipalities and the urban centres to raise more funds. I was pleased, however, when the Provincial Treasurer announced that he was taking from the School Lands Fund \$15 millions to put up as a revolving fund to assist municipalities in need of capital. He said he had set aside \$15 million in the School Lands Fund as a revolving fund for the purchase of debentures of those needy local governments. I said I was pleased to see that, and I have reason to be pleased. I am pleased that he, at least, has seen fit to act on the suggestion that I made in my budget speech two years ago.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It has been in operation three years.

**Mr. Cameron:** — In the budget debate in the 1955 session, I suggested that a fund be set aside from which municipalities could borrow for self-liquidating projects such as sewer and water.

**March 8, 1957**

**Mr. McDonald:** — They were two years too late.

**Mr. Cameron:** — What was the Provincial Treasurer's response to me then? He ridiculed the suggestion. He said, "We have the School Lands Fund of \$24 million. Would the hon. member suggest we take this money out and loan it to municipalities? I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to show you just how utterly absurd and ridiculous a proposition it is. It just cannot be done." I am glad that, during the past two years, someone has led him to believe that it can be done, after the ridicule I have received for suggesting the very thing that the Provincial Treasurer is doing now.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They were just two years late.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to point out another thing in the budget. Speaking about it, the Provincial Treasurer says: "Mining, forestry, electric power, construction and manufacturing all witnessed further concrete gains in 1956." I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a rather loose appraisal. Some of these have; but to include them all is being rather loose in assessing the production of those industries. I want to take forest products. In an answer in the 'Votes and Proceedings' of February 27, regarding lumber production, we note that, in 1955, production of lumber dropped eight million board feet measure; in 1956, it dropped a further 2¾ million, and the production of lumber in Saskatchewan has dropped from 169 ½ million board feet measure in the fiscal year 1943-44 to 68½ million in 1955-56 – 100 million less board feet of lumber was produced in 1955-56 than when this Government came to office. The value of forest production in 1955-56 is down over \$1½ million from the previous year. I don't know how the Provincial Treasurer is assessing these "concrete gains". If he is assessing them in reverse, they certainly are making a concrete gain in that direction.

He said mining has made concrete gains in 1956, and in 'Votes and Proceedings' – the official record of the House – of February 21, 1957, we asked a question regarding the production of base metals. The answer given shows that base metal production for 1955-56 is down 1½ million pounds below the 1954-55 figures. In 1955-56, production of base metals was 19 million pounds less than in 1943-44, when this Government came into office. This again is a "concrete gain" in reverse. Gold, silver and other metals all follow the same downward trend.

The Provincial Treasurer in his Budget Address said: "We have made a tremendous gain in population. We have stopped the downward trend, and now we are increasing at a good, satisfactory rate." I want to deal with population for a minute, because I think it is essential that, if we are to consider the progress of the province, we cannot always consider it in dollars and cents; we must consider the political and economic atmosphere. We must services whether we are retaining the people within the province, and whether our political and economic atmosphere is encouraging other immigrants to come into the province.

From the period of the last 10-year census – 1944-55 – Saskatchewan's population has increased by 56,000, Manitoba's by 112,000, and Alberta's by 258,000. We get some conception of the importance of the increase in population when we see how it reacts on our representation in



the House of Commons. Before 1952, Saskatchewan had 20 members elected to the House of Commons; that is, we were entitled to 20 members in the House of Commons. The 1952 redistribution reduced it and now we are only entitled to 17. Now 1956 indicates that it will be down to 14 M.P.s. Manitoba returned the same number of M.P.s in the House of Commons they had in 1952; Alberta's representation is increased by one more; they now can send 18 instead of 17. Saskatchewan loses three, from 17 down to 14; from 20 to 17 to 14.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Progress!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Based on the population statistics of the province, we drop in numbers of M.P.s from Saskatchewan in the Dominion House, from 20 down to 14. We are weakening our voice for Saskatchewan in Ottawa by this slow growth in population in the province. If we had had the same population increase as Manitoba, we would not only have retained our voice in the House of Commons in Ottawa, but we would have gained under the new tax rental agreements in Ottawa, but we would have gained under the new tax rental agreements between the Federal Government and the Province. Apart from that which takes care of equalization and the fiscal need, there is another clause which bases the contribution in addition on the basis of population. I think it is approximately \$39 or \$40 per capita. If the Provincial Treasurer is anxious to get revenue, I'm going to show him the greatest and cheapest source from which he can get it. If we had had the population growth, not as Alberta has had, but even as Manitoba (another prairie province) had had since 1945, we would have had a population of 940,000 people. Our tax rental agreement would be up not be \$3.5 million, but it would be \$5.7 million more. In respect to population, every time we lose a citizen from Saskatchewan, and every time we neglect to bring an immigrant in, we are losing \$40 per year from Ottawa, and for everyone we bring in and everyone we retain is bringing us in \$40 per cent revenue under the tax rental agreement. That is one of the greatest sources of funds. I say increase the population; create a political and an economic climate that would cause our young people to stay home, and that brings immigrants into the province to build up the population, and we'll get not \$3.5 million, but \$5.7 million more. A million and a half per year — revenues that we could have had which we have neglected to capture.

Speaking of immigration, we thought it was possible, when the people of Hungary, these freedom-loving people who had dared to raise by bare hands alone opposition to the iron heel of Russia, and were trampled down as a result of it, were called upon to flee to other nations, that we might not only do the humane thing but at the same time increase our population. The Federal Government said, "We shall do this. We will pay the passage of these immigrants over. We will arrange with the Provinces to take a certain number, each province to take what they think they can." Then, in order that the Provinces will not have to assume any financial part of it, or will have to use their revenues in order to take care of these refugees, they said, "We will assist the Provinces so that they will have no liability for hospitals, or doctors or medical care. We will assume the total responsibility, so that they will not be a charge on the province. We will pay \$3 per day," (I think it was) "for reception centres during

**March 8, 1957**

the time they are being processed, and classified into the type of work they would like to go into, and being distributed and sent out over the Province.” And they said further, “If it is necessary to place these people in private homes, then we will pay the costs of keeping them here.” That is the policy being followed, and I think we have never had a greater opportunity of inducing immigrants to the province, and increasing our population.

We see these immigrant refugees going to other provinces – to Manitoba, to Alberta, to Ontario and other places; but they are becoming more and more hesitant to come into the province of Saskatchewan. That is evident when there is a further time interval between each trainload of refugees, and less of them on it. Why are these people hesitant to come into the province of Saskatchewan? What is wrong, now that we haven't any financial responsibility. I think the answer lies in this. These people are tradesmen. They are the tradesmen classes. They are university students, welders, mechanics, carpenters and all of the trades, and they are not particularly suited to farming. They don't like to go on to the farms because it is not their sphere of life; they don't know farming. So they are looking for opportunities in employment where we have industries, where we have a booming economy, where there is ready placement to go into the particular field of activity for which they are trained. Then in assessing the different provinces, they are of the opinion, it would see, that there isn't the opportunity of placement in the province of Saskatchewan, because we haven't the industrial activities that Manitoba and Alberta and our other sister provinces have. Therefore, they are going into the other provinces . . .

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Hear about Calgary?

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . because there are positions there made available for them. Yes, I've heard about Calgary. Three to four to five people.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Twenty.

**Mr. Cameron:** — All right. Twenty, out of all the immigrants that they have got into that province doesn't prove a thing.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare):** — We've had none of that here.

**Mr. Cameron:** — No, there's none of that here, Mr. Speaker, because there are no trains bringing them in.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — Oh yes, there are.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You can certainly avoid a problem; if you don't bring the people in to create any problem. You can sure keep away from it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Stick to the truth, Mister.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is supporting evidence of the statement we have been making in this

Legislature and out in the country that while we are making gains industrially, and private enterprise is beginning to coming into the province (and we welcome it), we are not progressing in our industrial developments and in our manufacturing at the rate that the other provinces are, and therefore we are losing out. We have lost since 1943-44 some 125,000 of our natural increases in population; we are lagging behind on the immigration; our population is not making the same gains as the populations of our neighbouring provinces. While we have industrial progress within the province; in comparison to the industrial progress made in our sister provinces we are falling far behind and are becoming poorer each day, in comparison to what is going on in our neighbouring provinces.

I think that immigration policy could have been a great assistance to us in that we had no responsibility, no expense on our part. The field was there, everything provided for; and yet we cannot get this increase in population; we cannot retain the boys and girls that have been born and raised in this province; we cannot retain our teachers for our schools. These are problems that are seriously affecting the whole economy of the province of Saskatchewan and the Provincial Treasurer in his budget has failed to realize the direction in which we should travel to meet these problems. This budget has failed to provide any policy or program to make our rich mineral areas of the north accessible. That is evident from the drop in production of forestry, minerals and base metals of the north. They have failed to evolve any program which would give any assistance whatever in alleviating the conditions that are facing the agricultural industry in the province.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — They have failed utterly to provide sufficient funds or leadership to solve the crisis of education as we have it in the province of Saskatchewan, and they have failed to provide an economic and political atmosphere that would induce our boys and girls to remain here, and to induce immigrants to come in and add to the population. And in those things they have failed because they have not taken recognitions of the crying needs of the people of the province. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion.

**Mr. John J. Harrop (Athabaska):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

### REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), seconded by the Hon. Mr. Fines:

“That a Select Special Committee be appointed to consider with Mr. Speaker the Standing Orders and procedures of this Assembly for the purpose of suggesting any changes therein which may be desirable to assure the more expeditious dispatch of public business, with instructions that it have

**March 8, 1957**

power to send for persons and papers, and to report from time to time its findings and recommendations to the Assembly.

The said Committee to consist of the following members: Messrs. Brown (Bengough), Danielson, Davies, Fines, Gardiner, Horsman, Howe, Nicholson, Thorson, Walker and Willis (Elrose).

**Premier Douglas:** —Mr. Speaker, in discussing the matter of the apportionment of radio time, I think there were expressions from various parts of the House to the effect that the Standing Orders of this House were probably in need of some revision, partly because of the fact that radio time sometimes does mean a change in the procedure of the House, but more particularly because, in recent years, the Federal Parliament of Canada has made very far-reaching and fundamental changes in the procedure of the House of Commons. I think all of us who have looked at the report of the Committee in Ottawa, and of the changes which have been made in their Standing Orders as a result of the recommendations of that Committee, have felt that sooner or later we probably ought to take a look at our Standing Orders. Therefore, I have placed on this Order Paper, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, this Resolution to have a Committee set up to examine our Standing Orders and to make recommendations back to the Legislature.

I would like to make this appeal to the members that if and when such a Committee is set up, that not only the members of the Committee as such, but that all of us, if possible, sit in on the meetings of this Committee. I think it is important that we all become familiar with the traditions and the procedures upon which our rules are built, and that we all understand more fully why certain procedures are adopted, and why certain rules apply. Then when the recommendations of the Committee come before the House, they will not come to us fresh, but we will have listened to some of the discussion and listened to some of the representations that have been made to the Committee, and be in a better position to make a sound and valid judgment. So I do hope that, while this is going to be referred to a Committee, as many of us as can, would sit in on the Committee meetings. I think it will be interesting. It is many decades since our Standing Orders have been revised; it may be many decades before they are revised again. Therefore it is a pretty fundamental thing, and I think as many of us as possible should acquaint ourselves with the matters which will be before the Committee. I think however that there will be no disagreement in any part of the House with the advisability of looking over the Standing Orders and having recommendations brought back to the House.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at any length on the resolution, but I just wanted to concur in what the Premier has said here this afternoon. Prior to the motion appearing on the Orders of the Day, I discussed this problem with our clerk, with the Premier, with the Provincial Treasurer, and with many members who sit on this side of the House, and we all seem to feel that, by changing our procedure somewhat, we could probably move along some of the work that takes place in this House, and in other matters we could probably spend a

good deal more time on. I have in mind the Estimates that, as a rule are brought into the House rather late, at least in the latter half of the Session; and in my opinion it is doubtful if we have done the work on the Estimates that we should have done in the past few years.

All I want to say is that we on this side of the House are more than pleased to see this Committee set up, and I too hope that not only those members who are on the Committee will attend the Committee meetings, because it seems to me that all of us could learn a great deal by sitting in on this Committee, and studying the rules and procedure of this House. So I too hope that all members who can possibly attend the meetings of this Committee will do so.

(Motion agreed to)

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 49 – An Act to incorporate the University of Saskatchewan Foundation**

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, for several years now a group of citizens who are friends of the University have been considering the advisability of a move of this kind, and this year, after approval by the Board of Governors, the suggestion is advanced to the Legislature in the form of this Bill.

Briefly it provides for a Foundation which will be empowered to accept gifts of money or other goods, on behalf of the University. It is true that the University already has the power to accept such gifts itself. There is a feeling that a separate and independent corporation of this kind may be in a position to encourage citizens of the province to make gifts placed in the control of this corporation, and, as a result, make beneficial use of this for the assistance of students, or the assistance of worthwhile University projects. I think the matter can be discussed adequately in Committee of the Whole.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move Second Reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next Sitting.)

### **Bill No. 50 – An Act respecting the Department of Travel and Information**

**Hon. R. Brown (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think much need be said on second reading of this Bill. That it is intended to do, of course, is to establish a Department

**March 8, 1957**

of Travel and Information to take over the duties and responsibilities which presently fall to the old Bureau of Publications. The duties of the Bureau, of course, have been added to during the last few years, and the work which they are undertaking at the present time is going beyond their capacity to contend with it. The Bill particularly is designed to provide the type of organization which will be required to give greater emphasis to the promotion of the tourist industry in the province, and to take care of the job which needs to be done in regard to development of our parks.

I think the spirit of the Bill is pretty well summed up under Item (6) in the objects and responsibilities of the Department. That statement follows:

“The Department shall be responsible for promoting the development of the tourist industry, and the use of provincial parks in recreational areas of the province, and for providing such informational service and materials as may be deemed requisite for the purpose of publicizing and illustrating the various services provided by any agency, or for the purpose of promoting the social, cultural and economic development of the province.”

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in this day and age any business concern of any account certainly has an adequate sales agency at its disposal. What this will do then, will be to set up in Saskatchewan a ‘sales agency’ for the province of Saskatchewan. I think the remainder may well be discussed in Committee, and I would, therefore, move second reading of Bill No. 50.

(Motion agreed to and Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole at next sitting.)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:20 o’clock p.m.