

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
34th Day

Tuesday, April 2, 1957

The House resumed at 2.30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day:

HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw attention to a matter in my constituency with regard to Hungarian refugees working on the farms. Some of these were hired as farm help as truck drivers. Now I understand that, due to the fact they cannot read or speak English, they are not being granted drivers' licences to drive the trucks, and I would like to ask the Minister in charge what policy they have in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — I am sorry the hon. member hadn't the courtesy to advise me that he was going to raise the question, in order that I could have got the details. I have no knowledge of the instance he has referred to. If he would see me I would be very glad to look into it for him.

Mr. McFarlane: — I will do that, Mr. Minister, to see if we can arrive at some decision in this respect.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It would come under The Vehicles Act.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Moved by Mr. Davies, seconded by Mr. Stone:

“That this Assembly recommend, through the appropriate channels, to the Government of Canada such action as will assure:

- (1) That unemployment insurance benefits be established at not less than two-thirds of earnings of persons in insurable employment;
- (2) that the “waiting period” be eliminated;
- (3) that the coverage of the Unemployment Insurance Act be extended to include employee groups not now within the scope of this legislation.”

Hon. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the resolution on the

April 2, 1957

Order Paper which I shall move, I should like to show in some detail reasons for, and the importance of, the position it recommends. The resolution, as you will note, urges an improvement of the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act to an increase, first of all, in monetary benefits; the elimination of the time on the "waiting period", and the extension of the application of the Act to groups that are not now covered.

Some days ago, Mr. Speaker, I had distributed a Table One, which showed the benefit rates in effect after October 1, 1955. From this you will have seen that employees' weekly contributions range from 16 cents a week to 60 cents a week. Also shown were the weekly earning range in which those payments were made, and in the two right-hand columns, the weekly benefits for single workers, and workers with a dependant, or dependants. There is no difference in benefit because of the number of children in a family, the criterion being whether or not the person is married or single. In this table it will also be noted that the benefits for single persons range from as low as \$36 a week to a high of \$23 a week, and for persons who are married and become unemployed and collect benefits, the sum would range from \$8 weekly to \$30 weekly.

I think it is extremely important in the first instance to realize that the top figures for benefits, namely \$23 and \$30, are received by relatively few. I believe that it is the mistaken belief that the benefits — \$23 and \$30 for single and married persons respectively, apply across the board, and you will see by the table with which I provided you that this is not the case.

Perhaps if I gave you some other information it will show just what is received, or approximately what is received, by the average beneficiary in Canada on his becoming unemployed. In 1956, using figures for Canada, there was a total of 11,178,588 benefit weeks paid for a total of \$210,330,165. The average weekly payment (you can make the division of the weeks into the total amount paid) is \$18.81 a week. Now, taking the Saskatchewan example, there were 396,074 weeks paid out amounting to benefits of \$27,151,394, for an average weekly payment of \$18.33. I think it will be agreed that this is rather a low amount in consideration of the present period that we are living in, and the living costs that have to be borne by workmen, whether or not they are unemployed. The average payment in both Saskatchewan and Canada is thus less than \$19 a week. I think if you do a little arithmetic you will find this works out to about \$80 a month. I submit to the members of the House, that \$80 will not, in many instances, buy even housing accommodation for many of the workmen of this city, and the other urban areas in Saskatchewan. But this low benefit also had to provide in Canada and in Saskatchewan, for food and clothing as well as shelter in the year 1956.

I would like to point out, too, Mr. Speaker, that we are actually providing, as a Government, larger amounts in social aid in certain cases where there are a number of dependants in the family this government is paying larger amounts in social aid than are provided by this unemployment insurance payment. I think, too, that very few people realize that even in this relatively buoyant period, there is a great deal of unemployment in Canada. Last year there were for every day of the year, 311,333 persons who were out of work in Canada. The corresponding figure for Saskatchewan is

9,934 unemployed persons or almost 10,000 persons, for every day of last year. I say again, that is in a period which is regarded by all as being a pretty prosperous period.

How does this affect us as a community? How does this affect society in other ways? First of all, I will take the average weekly wage paid in industry in Canada last year, \$64.19. Then taking the number of persons who are unemployed (311,000 persons odd), and making estimates in terms of time lost and wages lost, we find some rather startling information. I worked it out. I didn't take the \$64.19 figures, this being an average of establishments of over 15 employees, which is the only information that is readily available. I took \$50 a week instead; some \$14.19 less than the average in the establishments to which I referred. Working this out on a yearly basis, it figures out to a loss in wages of \$809,465,800. That was the loss to the Canadian community because of unemployment. It may be said that this was not the loss in purchasing power, since there is a difference between the wages lost and the amount that was lost in purchasing power. If you deduct the figure of \$210,330,165 which was received last year in unemployment insurance, it would still leave you a net wage and salary loss of \$599,135,635. I think that no one will argue that this is not a great reduction in buying power, and that it is going to affect many other people in the community and not only those who are idle.

Looking at this same comparison in terms of the Saskatchewan picture, it works out to an estimated loss of \$25,828,400 for the year. Deducting the unemployment insurance benefits that were received, a net purchasing power loss to the Saskatchewan community of \$18 million was suffered.

I would like to repeat again that this is a loss not just for the unemployed, but for the whole community, and I want to make some additional remarks in that regard. First I think I should say something about the losses in production. There is not only the question of losing almost a million dollars in wages by unemployment, but there is the question of losing productivity which does not come into being because people are not at work. I don't know how much that would figure out to. Manifestly it would be much more than the nearly one billion dollars lost because of annual unemployment. I submit in any event that it must be a very large loss, one that means something to all Canadians.

I would like to say too that these losses in production and in buying power, affect not only the people in the city but affect the people in rural areas – our farming population. I know there are reverberations from time to time, (both outside and within this House) to the contrary; but I want to assure the hon. members and I shall prove it, that the farm and labour interest is, and always has been, interdependent; that the losses because of unemployment have affected adversely also the farming population of this province, and this country.

First of all, when people are not earning larger wages and salaries, they are receiving very low unemployed benefits, and buying much less in terms of agricultural products. I think this was brought sharply to the attention of the American Congress last year, when Mr. Walter Reuther

April 2, 1957

A.F. of L. – C.I.O. produced figures before the United States Department of Agriculture Joint congressional committee. These figures were not his own, but had been arrived at by a study of another Congress committee. The study was on food expenditures of U.S.A. city families. It showed that when a family was in an income class of under \$1,000 yearly in the United States, the family food expenditure was \$13.76 a week. When the income ranged from \$2,000 to \$2,999 a year, the family food expenditure weekly averaged \$22.35. When the annual income ranged from \$3,000 to \$3,999 the expenditure on food was \$28.03. I think those figures tell quite a story – that, where people are making a better living, they are purchasing twice the food quantities that the family on lower incomes buy. I submit to the members of this House that this has a direct influence on the welfare of agriculture; that this is significant information in the light of the resolution which I am moving here today.

I might say that in complete support of the conclusion that was urged by Mr. Reuther, the joint U.S.A. Congressional committee on the Economic Report, in studying low-income families and economic stability, said this – and I would like to read it, Mr. Speaker, with your permission:

“The amounts and patterns of expenditures of low-income families for food, in addition to education, improved cooking and so forth, suggests the importance of raising the income level of these families in order to provide a larger market for our prospective farm surplus. . .

There is more to this quotation, but I do not want to do more than to say that the general principle I have advanced is approved by some eminent authorities. I don't think very many members of the House will realize that over the past 20 years, there has not only been an increase in the amount of food consumed by the domestic population, but there has been a heavier per capita increase because of somewhat better conditions, and relatively more prosperity. If you compare 1935 to the year 1953, when in the earlier year there was a total of some \$1,600 millions consumed in farm products by all the people in this country, and the last year which I have mentioned when there was \$3,350 figures are constant terms. They are not inflated figures. They are “actual value” terms over this period. What actually happens is that this extra consumption has materially helped the economic situation of farmers in this country, recognizing of course that their economic conditions remain precarious in this country for other reasons. What I am suggesting is that it would have been a great deal more precarious, had it not been for a relatively (and I underline that word) high purchasing power in the Canadian population.

It means something else too, and I think I should make mention of it here, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the question which I am discussing. We often think that if we sell grain from Saskatchewan (or from the prairie provinces) on the international market, our domestic buying power has little effect on what happens to our grain sales. The belief is that, after all, our population in Canada can only consume so many tons

of cereals, and after that domestic buying power doesn't do the farm in Saskatchewan, or on the prairies, very much good. But that viewpoint, I suggest, is an erroneous viewpoint and does not recognize the fundamental facts. Indeed, here is what happens. then we sell on the international market, invariably the nations that take our cereals, our grain, demand that we in turn take their products in trade. Unless we have a comparatively high, fairly stable, domestic purchasing power, we are unable to buy from the nations to which we sell, and there follows an inevitable deterioration in our trade and our trade relationships. This is precisely the kind of thing that works against more trade with Asiatic countries. Their domestic buying power is so poor that they cannot get into genuine trade relationships with us, so that the expedient of give-away programs which in themselves are no solution to the question of exchange and trade – become the order of the day. I say that such expedients are not satisfactory, and that one of the key things for development of our trade, and for the prosperity of the prairie farmer is to assure a relatively high domestic purchasing power.

I would now like to move on to the question of how the increase that is proposed in the unemployment insurance benefits would be financed, since this question, no doubt, will arise during our discussion of the resolution. I have mentioned that the greatest contributions of employees run from 16 cents to 60 cents per week. This, of course, is matched by an equivalent employers' contribution and there is in addition a contribution from the Federal Government that roughly approximates the cost of administration, not only for unemployment insurance, but for the National Employment Service. Now, the state of the unemployment insurance fund as of March 31, 1956 (the last fiscal year for which I can get figures) shows there was a total of \$854,198,518 in the Unemployment Insurance fund. This amount was \$13 ½ million higher than the previous fiscal year reported, so there was a sizable gain last year in the size of the fund. Contributions from employers and employees in that period ending March 31, 1956, totalled \$168,481,000, approximately. the contribution from the Federal Government totalled a little better than \$31 million. I suggest to the House that, first of all, to achieve the two-thirds of income benefits which I have suggested in the resolution, the present size of the unemployment insurance fund permits of a generous increase. I think there is a tendency to treat the fund as though it were something for the distant future: that is, to provide for all emergencies of desperate unemployment which may lie ahead. I don't think that this viewpoint is valid or one that should be held by this House, nor indeed the Canadian public. I suggest that if there was unemployment of the type and extent that we knew in the 1930's, the fund could not bear the shock in any event, so that we should consider the fund rather more on a short-term basis, since it could not take care for long, of deep-going unemployment. I suggest that the size of the fund, (almost \$1 billion) permits of some increase, apart from all other arguments.

It might be necessary to increase the employees' and employers' contributions. I think frankly that this might be necessary. I think moreover that, (for most employees), such an increase would not be resented; it would be realized that this was necessary to get better benefits in case they become unemployed.

April 2, 1957

I believe, too, that, in the whole picture, the annual over last year was provided for general administration costs. A large part of that administration goes not just for unemployment insurance, but to the general National Employment Service that is for the good of the whole country.

I have, also, in framing this resolution, recommended that the “waiting period”, which is now one week, be completely eliminated. First of all, it seems to me that the weekly period imposes hardship; there is no good reason for it. When you become unemployed you are just as needful of your weekly wage as you ever were. It is necessary that there be some immediate continuing payment. It seems to me the week “waiting period” that now exists is not realistic, and is not fair. As well, benefits come from the insurance fund, and many of the claimants have paid into it since its inception, never having made a claim since the inception of the fund. Particularly because it is an insurance fund (to which the employee is making continual contributions), there is greater reason for the benefits to be paid immediately; that there should not be this waiting period that now exists.

As well, in other laws that provide compensation – Workmen’s Compensation, for example – the general tendency all across Canada is to eliminate waiting periods, and, of course, workmen’s compensation arises from laws entirely financed by the employer. Such Workmen’s Compensation provides not two-thirds payment of benefits, but in eight of the ten provinces of Canada, provides 75 per cent of earnings, and in the remaining two provinces of Canada, 70 per cent. While in all provinces it is not paid immediately, the tendency has been, in legislation of recent years, to eliminate substantially the waiting period in workmen’s compensation Acts. I say there is a parallel here with the questions we are discussing, and with unemployment insurance, which is partly paid for by the employee, there is a very good case for the waiting period to be completely eliminated.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the resolution I have suggested that there be an extended coverage of the present unemployment insurance regulations. I think some figures should be given here so that the whole picture might be seen clearly. As at August 20, 1955, it was estimated that there were 5,772,000 persons in the Canadian civilian labour force, and of these there were 4,438,00 reported as wage earners. The balance was made up of 717,000 “own-account” workers; 293,000 unpaid family workers, and 324,000 employers, making a total of 1,334,000 non-wage earners. Now, of the wage-earning class 3,345,000 (or 75 per cent of the wage earners), were covered by the provisions of unemployment insurance; but 1,093,000 wage earners were engaged in non-insurable employment. Over a million engaged in non-insurance employment! So we see that one in four workers are not covered by unemployment insurance.

Perhaps it might be of interest for the House to know who, or what classes are not covered. First of all, there are 142,000 persons in agriculture – that is, the wage-earning class in agriculture, horticulture and forestry. There are 128,000 persons in hospitals and charitable institutions not covered; 190,000 permanent federal, provincial and municipal employees not covered; 122,000 teachers; 72,000 private domestic servants;

62,000 salaried employees earning more than \$4,800 a year, and consequently beyond the scope of the Act; 23,000 workers; 20,000 insurance and real estate salesmen; 19,000 policemen and 11,000 engaged in miscellaneous employment, and part-time or seasonal work. I think these figures are sufficient to show there are large numbers of persons who don't get this valuable protection. I do not think it is a particularly good thing for those who are not covered, or for those who are covered now.

I have not requested in the resolution that all persons should be covered; I have suggested rather an extension of scope. There may be some classes that it would not be expedient at the moment to cover. I do think, though that, considering the complexion of this House in particular, all members should be in favour of a coverage of agricultural workers. It seems to me that this would be a very good thing, not only for the agricultural worker, but for the farmer. At the present time one of the main reasons why it becomes difficult (in some periods of the year, especially), for farmers to secure the labour they require, is because of the increasingly part-time nature of farm employment. I am not saying, of course, that there is not a demand where year-round requirements exist, but generally speaking, there is a very large section where farm employment is of a part-time nature; the spring-time work, and the fall harvesting operation – as they say, “six weeks in the spring, and six weeks in the fall.” I can recall, Mr. Speaker, many years ago when I was on a far, my father having a hired man who had been with the family for 10 or 12 years. He was like a member of the family. But at that time, there was almost enough work for one hired man to look after stabled horses. Everyone knows that situation has changed radically since the earlier days.

I think however, if you want to make the farm labouring population more stable, make it more available to people who want the services of farm workers – it is desirable that there be established protection in the seasonally unemployed period. I stress their coverage would accomplish something that would aid everyone in this province, both urban and country dwellers.\

I think the argument may be advanced, Mr. Speaker, that extended benefits may lead to abuse. I would like to say something about that. It is often said that in insurance of this kind, or in workmen's compensation, there is the danger of malingering. I want to say however, that the experience of the unemployment insurance bodies, the workmen's compensation bodies and similar boards and commissions, is that there is a minimum of this particular problem. Again, so far as workers affected by unemployment insurance are covered, there are very strict regulations, and it is a hardy man indeed who can get by these regulations, and get benefits to which he is not entitled. And too, a person cannot get unemployment insurance unless he is available for work; and if the work is there and he does not take the work, he does not receive unemployment insurance benefit. The present sum that is received in unemployment insurance is very small. Certainly as it stands it is more than a deterrent; it is a hardship. I think that on a “two-thirds of earnings” level, no one can argue that a worker is going to avoid work, and lose one-third of his income merely to get unemployed benefit.

I mention again the thing that I talked about a moment ago, that most people are just not made that way; they do not like to malingering

April 2, 1957

or be idle; in fact they are very unhappy if they are away from their work. I think you will find from officials who have had most to do with this sort of problem, that indeed it is not a problem at all concerning the general run of working people. The type of person who will malingering is the type of person who will malingering at any level of income, whether it is two-thirds, one-third or whatever it may be. The reason why there are people of this type is linked with a lot of psychological factors, and social maladjustments which I do not intend to attempt to elaborate on, this afternoon.

Generally speaking, and to sum up, I have tried to show in the evidence I have given to the House, that what I propose in this resolution will be of considerable assistance to all Canadians, not just those who, through no fault of their own, become unemployed. I have tried to show you the serious repercussions which occur in all population sections when unemployment occurs. I think perhaps some final comparisons might be useful in the concluding part of my talk to the members of this House.

I don't know whether hon. members are aware that during the first six months of 1956 there was more time lost because of unemployment in Canada than there was lost because of all strikes in Canada in the first 50 years of this century. In this whole 50 years there was less time lost because of strikes than was lost in the first half-year of 1956, because of unemployment. If you took an average of all time loss in Saskatchewan due to all strikes in any one of the last three years, it would be more than made up, Mr. Speaker, by time lost in just one day of unemployment, on the average, in any one of these last three years. I mention all this in its relationship to the question that we are discussing.

Like other resolutions that are being, and have been, considered by this House, this resolution tried to underwrite a general economic stability based on the philosophy that the interests of the farmer and the urban dweller are basically interdependent. I have, I think, shown that the effects of unemployment can be just as serious for the farmer as for the unemployed urban dweller. I will ask for the support of the whole Assembly in the voting on this resolution. I think that certainly there is no political question involved. It is a resolution that every member of this House can and should support. I ask you, in considering your support of this resolution, to remember the figures I quoted to you, to remember the extent of the need for the remedies this resolution advocates.

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion has covered the subject matter of the resolution so well, and also covered most of the material which I had prepared that, therefore, to use that material would be more like repetition. He has, I think, proved or shown why an increase would have an effect on the economy of the nation, and also the need for greater coverage under the Act.

I think history will prove that the trade union movement has been responsible for social legislation such as this in all countries

in the world, social legislation that has been put on the Statutes. It is true that political parties have claimed the credit for enacting such legislation, but the work has been done in promoting the ideas from the trade union movement, and that, of course, is only natural because the trade union movement is in close touch with the workers, and knows their needs and requirements.

People are inclined to think that the trade unionists are years in advance of the thinking of the ordinary mass of people. We hear or see people today shake their heads when workers speak of a 32-hour work week with the same take-home pay, and a guaranteed annual wage and a national health program for every man, woman and child. At all these things they shake their heads in amazement, and wonder what next the worker will want. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that with the coming of automation, maybe even in your lifetime many of these things will come into being.

It was quite a few decades ago that the trade union movement, through the many periods of booms and depressions – and as the depressions got longer with years, saw there was a need for some kind of an insurance for wage earners during their term of unemployment, and they promoted the idea, and the idea became so popular that in the famous Liberal convention of 1919, the Liberal party of Canada enacted as one of their platforms of their party at that time Unemployment Insurance. However, the constitutional difficulties of the B.N.A. Act was a convenient obstacle for any Liberal Government after those years to carry out this plank of their program. Until 1940, after the terrible economic catastrophe of the 1930's, the late Mackenzie King did introduce the Unemployment insurance Act as we have it today on the Statues, and, like most social legislation, it was a very cautious piece of legislation. One of the major troubles of that legislation was its meagre coverage. It included a great deal of what were considered fairly permanent employees at that time but left out a great many of the wage earners whose employment was not quite so secure.

There have been many minor amendments to the Act since 1940. A few crumbs have been brushed off the table – most of them around election years; but they have not yet approached the problem which was recommended to them at the time the Act was first enacted, and that was a wider coverage (as the mover has mentioned) and increased benefits. The mover covered this waiting-period and the increased-benefits fairly well; I think extremely well. I think the experience of the unemployment fund will show that the great majority of the workers who enjoy benefits under the Act – seasonal employees and those kind of workers who, for various reasons, never know what it is to have permanent employment, and so when they are unemployed, this waiting period of a week is a considerable hardship to them. They have never been able to get their heads above water, and the loss of income for a week means a real hardship to them. It also has an affect on approximately 50 per cent of their wages which they receive on benefits, when they do come under the Act. Therefore, we feel that two-thirds is not too much to put into the hands of these people so that they can buy some of the necessities of life. I believe in this respect, that provincial and municipal governments could approach this problem in a more realistic manner, realizing that more and more money in the hands of more and more people does help the economy in the municipality and in the province.

April 2, 1957

I want to finish up by saying that Canada today is spending billions of dollars for a defence program. I think many will agree that, in many ways, it is a waster of goods, and services – a big expense; and I think a more feasible approach to bolster the economy of this nation would be to put more purchasing power into the hands of those people who become unemployed, so that they and their families can obtain more than the necessities of life.

So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the members of this Assembly to support this motion.

(The motion was agreed to, unanimously.)

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

The Assembly resumed from Thursday March 21, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson:

“That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Government of Canada should, without encroaching on the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provinces in the matter of administration and curricula, provide increased financial aid to the various Provinces of Canada for the expansion and equalization of education opportunities in the primary, secondary and higher institutions of learning.”

and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McFarlane:

That all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

“recognizing the serious difficulties encountered by school officials in meeting the ever increasing demand for additional classrooms and in retaining qualified teachers, coupled with an ever mounting tax burden on local ratepayers, recommend to the consideration of the Government the establishment of a Committee of educationists to examine reports and recommendations as a result of research work done by Canadian School Trustees Association under the direction of Dr. LaZerte, to study suggestions concerning a foundation program for education, and to work in co-operation with other provinces in an endeavour to establish in each province, a program such as would be incorporated into a policy through which the Federal Government may make unconditional grants.”

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):—Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Qu’Appelle-Wolseley to the motion, I was discussing some of the problems which education faces in our province today.

I have divided our amendment into what I considered two portions: the first portion dealing with a general statement on problems in education, and the second portion dealing with recommendations. The amendment reads in part, as follows:

“recognizing the serious difficulties encountered by school officials in meeting the ever increasing demand for additional classrooms and in retaining qualified teachers, . . .”

That is the first problem stated in the amendment. In connection with that, more academic demands are being placed upon young people today in our province by the professions and the industries, and we are finding it increasingly difficult to meet these demands. One of the problems in this connection, I feel, is the students who for many reasons are dropping out of school before completing Grade 12, thus making it impossible for them to qualify for institutions of higher education. Out of every 100 children who began Grade 1 in 1945, a very small number will graduate from Grade 12 this June – less than 20 I am told. Of those 15 to 20 who will graduate from Grade 12 this year, only a portion of them will go on to university.

Certainly if we can sponsor any activity in education which will increase the number of high school students, completing their Grade 12 and going on to our universities, our teachers' colleges, our nursing training schools and others, then we will be assisting the call of the industries and the professions to a great extent.

Another problem in this connection today, is the fact that we still have a large number of schools where one teacher is attempting to teach several grades; a large number of smaller high schools, where the high school teacher has possibly Grade 9 to 12, or Grades 10 to 12, to cope with. As a result, in these schools it is difficult to give a diversified program to students who, for one reason or another, may not be too adept in mathematics, or science, students who possibly could go on and complete their high school if they had the advantage of such courses as woodworking or metal-working, or other crafts. I believe one of the reasons why we are losing students from high schools is the fact that in our smaller schools it is difficult to provide other than the basic academic programs.

In looking over the report tabled by the Hon. Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) for 1955-56, I thought I would make note of one or two entries. It is interesting to note the enrolment in our Saskatchewan Correspondence School this year. The work of the Correspondence School has for many years been very much appreciated in the province of Saskatchewan, in that academic and high school courses have been made available to many students who would otherwise not have had that opportunity. Yet the fact that the enrolment in the Correspondence School is increasing, I think indicates and points out to a certain degree at least, the lack of qualified teachers in our rural schools, and the necessity, in order that these schools be kept open, of acquiring less qualified people and supervisors.

Also, in the report it is interesting to note the number of high school teachers qualified in 1955-56. I note that since the certificates were changed, where we now have just the three certificates in the province,

April 2, 1957

Professions, Standard and Interim-standard Certificates, that in 1954 some 559 professional certificates were issued, in 1955, 339, and 1956, 735. However, as has been mentioned before, a number of qualified teachers left the province during the year, and the numbers have been so large that they have almost equalled in some cases the number of teachers who are becoming qualified. This year, subtracting the number coming into the program from the number that left, we have a deficit of some 300 to 400 teachers. There is no question about it then, that coupling all these things together, the difficulty in retaining our high school students throughout their high school courses, the difficulty of retaining our qualified teachers in competition with our neighbouring provinces, the necessity of closing down our rural schools because of the inability to get teachers for them, coupled with the conveyance problems which result, all point out the necessity of attempting to do more than we have been able to do in terms of education.

The second problem as stated in the amendment mentions an every-mounting tax burden on local ratepayers. I was interested to note, also, in the report on Education for 1956, the mention of the fact that the Minister of Education has appointed a Committee to study the structure and organization of teacher education in the province, with a view to analyzing the merits and the possibility of bringing teacher education under one administrative source. I believe that this has some merit, and certainly I believe, since we in our amendment recommend a Committee also to study problems of education, that in these ways we will certainly bring the problems of education to the fore, and will arrive at helpful suggestions and solutions.

Some excerpts from the Royal Commission on Rural Life, I think, point out some of the significant problems of education today, and I have just jotted down here several of them:

“Although annual school grants have thus nearly tripled since 1942, grants as a proportion of Government disbursements for education have shown a decline from the 1941 to 1945 average.”

Another excerpt from this Report:

“Although Government grants have nearly tripled since the 1940’s, the school tax paid by rural ratepayers has not been reduced.”

And a third quotation:

“Since 1942, education as a proportion of expenditures for all Government services has declined.”

Now, going on to the second portion of the amendment, the first recommendation reads as follows:

“ . . . the establishment of a Committee of educationists to examine reports and recommendations as a result of research work done by Canadian School Trustees’ Association under

the direction of Dr. LaZerte, to study suggestions concerning a foundation program for education, . . .”

I have here a brief summary of Dr. LaZerte’s Report, and although I realize, of course, that he is only one man, and that there may be disagreements with his recommendations, I thought it worthwhile, just to mention briefly some of the significant portions of his report. He makes this statement:

“In 1951-52 the average provincial grant for education equalled 35.4 per cent of cost as here defined, while real property taxes were 64.5 per cent.

And he goes on to draw this conclusion:

“In view of total current responsibilities of municipal governments, these percentages should probably be reversed.”

He goes on to state that:

“ . . . the type of schooling available to any particular child should not depend upon the wealth of the parents, the tax-paying ability of the local district, or the economic status of the province.”

And states that:

“ . . . A foundation program for education would be helpful.”

And he makes these recommendations:

“The proportion of educational costs which should be borne by provincial and municipal government respectively, depends upon the relative weight of other services provided and financed by each. And real property assessments should be equalized throughout each program and, where possible, non-paying tax-paying property should be placed on the assessment rolls.”

He ends up in this vein:

“What in summary is desirable in educational finance? The essentials are:

“the best education the province can afford to be available to all students of elementary and secondary grades;

April 2, 1957

“equal opportunities for all through approved foundation programs;

“increased provincial grants, the provinces instead of the owners of real property to be responsible, for the major share of educational costs;

“equalization of costs within each province, through equalized assessment, and a uniform provincial school tax rate, and; (finally Dr. LaZerte ends up)

“Federal aid given as equalization grants to assist provinces in maintaining minimum programs of elementary and secondary education.”

I note also that Dr. LaZerte’s report resulted from the action of the Canadian School Trustees’ Finance Research Committee, which had its origin in the province of Saskatchewan in 1950, and his report resulted from their requests. I feel, as such, that it merits the attention of all who are interested in education.

I would like to say this. I believe that to a certain extent, at least, we have some Federal aid for education now. The family allowance paid to Saskatchewan and throughout Canada by the Federal Government, I believe, have assisted education in the province to a certain degree; and I believe, from my own experience, and I am sure others will agree, that the family allowance particularly in the case of a large family, have assisted mothers in the nutritional problem with children, have assisted in clothing those children, and some, I believe, have assisted to a certain extent in keeping those children in our schools. The Federal aid which the Government in Ottawa has made available to the universities of Canada this year, I think is commendable, and is an example of how education can be assisted in our province without any loss of our autonomy as defined under the British North American Act. I believe that the setting up of the Canada Council by the Federal Government, a Council to aid in promoting culture and the arts, will assist the province of Saskatchewan as it will assist all of Canada. So then, I feel that Federal Aid, to a certain degree at least, is already a reality in Canada today.

The final portion of our amendment reads:

“ . . . and to work in co-operation with other provinces in an endeavour to establish in each province a program such as would be incorporated into a policy through which the Federal Government may make unconditional grants.”

The fact remains that, if such a form of educational assistance is to be instituted, then I believe we, as a province, should have some say in the manner in which such assistance is given. I am sure we are all very much in favour of assisting education in this province in every way that we can. I feel, therefore, that such an amendment as I have the privilege of seconding, this afternoon, would enable us to sit down and study carefully the

recommendations of such individuals as Dr. LaZerte, the reports made by the Commission on Rural Life in the Province and to take into consideration what develops from this Committee which the Minister is setting up regarding teacher education. In this manner we could acknowledge and attempt to understand better some of the underlying problems of education with which we are faced, both as teachers and as parents throughout the province; certainly a desirable thing, because I think we all will agree that education today in Saskatchewan, as it is throughout Canada, is becoming more and more of a dynamic force for progress. When we look around us, when we see the great movements that are on foot in other nations of the world for developing more engineers, more technicians, more doctors and the like, we cannot help but feel that, if Canada is to remain in the prominent position which she holds today, if she is to retain her place in the United Nations, and if she is to continue to make contributions to culture and to statesmanship throughout the world, we must continue to see that educational opportunities are given to our young people, and that they in turn then will have the opportunity of representing us in local, provincial, Dominion and world governments, and keep Canada the nation that she is today.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure, and consider it a distinct privilege, to second the amendment moved by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane).

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Before giving to the Legislature some reasons why I think it is highly desirable that the amendment as proposed be defeated and the original resolution supported, I would like to make a few comments on the remarks of the hon. member, who has just taken his seat.

May I say to begin with that I can agree substantially with many of the remarks which he has made, and, as a matter of fact, insofar as his analysis of problems and so on, are concerned, I think I can say that most of those items I have drawn to the attention of the Legislature not only during this session, but during each of the preceding sessions. He had reference, to begin with, to the problem of dropout of students. This, as I have frequently said, is certainly one of our most serious problems, and I would like to suggest to him, and to members of his party, that they could give some better support than has frequently been forthcoming from the, in regard to measures undertaken to solve those particular problems.

I have reference, for example, to the fact that one of the measures taken and one of the measures which has been to some extent effective in partially solving this problem, has been the organization of larger school units, and the result which this has had on extending opportunities to more youngsters, particularly those youngsters in our rural and smaller urban centres. If we are to retain more youngsters in high school, then certainly one reason why we are going to so retain them, is because we are going to make available to them some of these more attractive high school opportunities, of which the hon. member spoke. This will only be done, as the result of regrouping our attendance, making it possible for many youngsters who now have to attend the one-room high school which, while

April 2, 1957

it can do an adequate job for some people, frequently fails to do an effective and interesting job for many people, to make it possible for them to attend the kind of a high school which can offer a more varied program. It is quite obvious that this cannot be done by small urban centres by themselves, or by rural school districts by themselves. It is only as a result of the effective operation of larger units, and the developing of high school centres, regrouping of school population, the utilization of school buses, that this kind of opportunity can be made available in a province such as Saskatchewan, and I am glad to hear the hon. member endorse this kind of a program.

I gave in a previous debate one indication of the relative effectiveness of this program to date, and at that time I referred to the fact that, prior to the organization of units in the province, in those high schools in the areas now organized as units, high school students made up some nine percent of the total students enrolled, whereas in the most recent year for which we have any records, high school students made up not nine per cent but seventeen per cent of the total enrolment, or in other words, almost double the percentage that they had previously.

Reference has been made to the difficulty with respect to adequately and properly certified teachers in adequate numbers, and again in this, of course, I must concur, and have placed the information before this House. But may I point out again the very considerable progress which has been made, and which is frequently overlooked, and may I suggest, too, that one of the worst deterrents probably to getting more and retaining more and better teachers is the fact that all the emphasis is so frequently given to the number of study supervisors or the number of people who have left the province for other places. I think we could do much to develop the prestige of the teaching profession, and must to develop the interest of more people in the teaching profession, if we would on occasion at least, tell the story with regard to the positive side of the picture. As I pointed out just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, we have, in not so very many years, been able to more than double the number of teachers in the province who hold university degrees, much more than doubled those who had two or three years of university training; that the total percentage of our teachers with more than two years of training has increased from something like 10 per cent to approximately 50 per cent in the province at the present time. We have been successful in steadily increasing and improving the level of certification of teachers in the province, and more emphasis needs to be given to this, because frequently it is only the other side of the picture to which any reference is made.

May I also refer just for a moment to the statistics from the Royal Commission to which he had reference, because I think it must be remembered that the statistics commenting on the increase in school grants, and the percentage of Budget which was allocated to education, are now several years old and as he pointed out at the time of the Report of the Royal Commission, the school grants had increased considerably. I would point out that, today, as for this current year, they are not about three times what they were, but are something like five times what they were, compared to that period which was used. May I also point out that the total portion of the Budget of the Government for Education has increased during that period from 13 per cent to some 23 per cent as for the current year.

I would agree with, Mr. Speaker, that family allowances have been of a measurable assistance to many people in the province, but I

recall that, a few years ago, when I used exactly that same argument, an attempt was made to severely scold and criticize me by the Leader of his party for having suggested that family allowances should have anything to do with the matter of education, or defraying educational costs.

Certainly I will agree, and I am on record as stating my appreciation, and it is stated by the Government in the Speech from the Throne, of the action taken by the Federal Government with regard to assistance to universities, with regard to the assistance to cultural organizations through the Canada Council, and with the further assistance to the universities through the Canada Council, for their building program. but I would say here again, as I have said previously, that this by itself is still going to leave many universities with a very real financial problem to meet; that here in itself is one way in which I think the Federal Government must, and could, quite justfully go far beyond their present proposal of \$50 million to assist university construction costs over the next ten years. It has been pointed out at the meeting held in Ottawa last fall, a meeting called or arranged by the Carnegie Corporation of representatives of universities and provincial governments across Canada, that in that ten-year period, universities would expect to spend at least \$300 million for purposes of new construction. And as I said previously this estimate was already out-of-date by the time the conference itself was held, so that we can confidently expect new construction costs for universities across Canada to total more than \$300 million in the next ten years. The question which I raised before and raise again is whether or not the Federal contribution of \$50 million toward that, can be considered an adequate one. I raise this particularly, because of the contribution which professionally trained persons are making, and will make in even greater measure, to the development of the economy, not of each individual province alone, but of all of Canada. This is one point why I think the Federal Government must, and ought, in the interests of all of Canada, pick up a greater portion of the bill.

May I now turn, just for a few minutes, to talk about the amendment and the resolution. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a very clear-cut, concise request for recognition of the principle of Federal aid to education in the Canadian provinces. This is a principle which has been affirmed by this House on previous occasions. I think it is important that we either reaffirm or otherwise our belief in the validity of this principle, and support of the resolution does so affirm. On the other hand, the amendment so qualifies and so equivocates that by the time it is finished, the resolution as amended, would be, I submit, practically meaningless. The Government needs to know whether or not this Assembly is prepared to reaffirm the support given in previous resolutions in previous years to the principle of Federal aid. Every year, Mr. Speaker, there is the meeting in Canada of those persons interested in education, representative of the educational institutions, called the Canadian Educational Association, and every year during that convention the Ministers of Education meet and discuss various mutual problems. Almost every year which I can recall, we on that occasion meet with representatives of the Canadian School Trustees who have come to us pleading the case of Federal aid for education and asking the stand of the various governments with regard to Federal aid. I have always felt, because of the stand which the Government itself has taken, because that stand has been affirmed by vote of the Legislature in previous years,

April 2, 1957

that I can say quite definitely, insofar as the Government of the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, we believe that this was a desirable principle and that all of us ought to take part in working toward the achievement or enactment of this principle. And I would like to know just whether or not the whole Assembly supports that principle; and secondly, may I say that the people of the province, who through many of their organizations have said they support the principle, also deserve to know whether or not the members of this Legislative Assembly also support it, because many of the organizations in the province, those supporting education, such as the Teachers' Federation, such as the School Trustees' Association, such as the Home and School Association, have year after year endorsed the principle. In addition, many other organizations, some service clubs, some labour organizations, some farm organizations and municipal organizations, have also said that they endorse the principle of Federal aid to education, and I think they deserve to know without qualification or equivocation whether or not the members of this Legislature are also prepared to support that same principle. We can give that understanding to them by voting for the resolution, but if we vote for the resolution as amended, we tell them, Mr. Speaker, exactly nothing.

May I just say a word or two about the amendment as it is proposed in support of my contention that it makes the whole thing rather meaningless. It asks that there be established a committee of educationists to examine reports and recommendations as a result of research work done by the Canadian School Trustees under the direction of Dr. LaZerte. Well, to begin with, and it doesn't seem too logical that we now establish another committee to study this particular report, particularly since most of the members of the committee who worked most closely with Dr. LaZerte were made up of Saskatchewan people of the kind referred to in the amendment.

May I just take a minute, too, to have reference to the history of this Committee. It began as a result of the interest of the Saskatchewan School Trustees in Federal aid. It began as the result of their conviction that Federal aid was not only desirable but essential, if youngsters not only in Saskatchewan but across Canada were going to get a square deal, if they were going to stand with some equality before the future in this great Canadian nation. They began studying the problem, and the results of their study and the direction of their study was accepted in a subsequent year by the Canadian School Trustees' Association, with the Saskatchewan Committee remaining, sort of a core committee. I would just like to point out that this core committee, or nucleus committee, which brought forth this report which the amendment would have us establish another committee to study, was made up of the following persons: Mr. George Hindley, who was at that time president of the Canadian School Trustees' Association, and had been president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, Mr. Eamer, the secretary of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation; Mayor McAskill of Saskatoon; Mr. Hall, the chairman of the Separate School Board in Saskatoon; Mr. Hay, the chairman of the Saskatoon High School Board, now president of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association; Dr. Tait of the Department of Education; Dr. Smith, at that time dean of the College of Education at the University. Professor Toombs of the College of Education, was and remained its secretary; and Mr. Henry E. Spencer acted as treasurer of the committee. Now I submit that there is little point in establishing another committee, which would undoubtedly contain some of the same people to study the work

which they have so recently passed on to the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada.

The amendment further goes on to say that we study suggestions concerning a foundation program for education, and I would point out that the foundation program recommended by Dr. LaZerte was a foundation program made up of the combined support of the Provinces and the Federal Government. The Resolution seeks to achieve such a foundation program. And finally, that it work in committee-operation with other provinces in an endeavour to establish in each province a program such as would be incorporated into a policy through which the Federal Government may make unconditional grants. I submit that there is no need for this particular study, because in each and every province in Canada today, there is such a policy in effect which could now, without any delay, without need for any further study, be supported by just such a program.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, because there is a need I suggest to speak our minds in this Legislature, to give our opinion, as to the validity of the principle of Federal aid, I suggest that we cannot in all conscience support the amendment, but most defeat it, and support the main motion without amendment.

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — In speaking to the amendment that we brought in, in the first instance I didn't think when the Minister was going to make a serious request for Federal aid that he would use this opportunity to make a political speech which we have heard over and over and over. Secondly, I read the motion through once again, and there is nothing in that motion that says you are asking for acceptance of the principle of Federal aid. It says:

“That, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Government of Canada, should, without encroaching on the exclusive jurisdiction of the Provinces in the matter of administration and curricula, provide increased financial aid to the various Provinces of Canada for the expansion and equalization of educational opportunities in the primary, secondary and higher institutions of learning.”

In dealing with that motion, we felt that you were perhaps serious in trying to get Federal aid for education, but now I see that you are only trying to get the principle, which won't be of much value. And I believe that it was recognized in the LaZerte Report that piecemeal requests from various provincial governments throughout the Dominion will not get the aid that we are desirous of getting for education.

I believe that it is also recognized that unless we can convince the majority of the provinces of this country to support a definite program by governments and everybody else interested in getting this aid, then if they went to the Federal Government with an almost dominion-wide voice, certainly we would have more chance of getting this aid than by placing piecemeal requests from each of the individual provincial governments.

April 2, 1957

There is no need to go into a long discourse about this entire report, but I also feel that none of the recommendations, which were the result of quite a long period of study, should be by-passed and not utilized in requesting Federal aid. Certainly, we should utilize what the other people have already started, and then try and get dominion-wide support for that which has been started, and in that way perhaps we can get the aid that we are desirous of getting. I see fit to support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — I didn't intend to take part in this debate, because I thought that the amendment was clear and to the point, and was offering a constructive suggestion to the Government as to how to go about an effort of securing Federal aid to education. I was somewhat surprised at the statements made by the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) that the sole purpose of this amendment was to by-pass the whole principle of Federal aid for education. He didn't say so in so many words, but he certainly left the impression that we in the Opposition were not interested in Federal aid for education, therefore, we were opposed to the principle of the motion as it was. He said, let us call on the Legislature, let us stand up and see who supports the principle of Federal aid for education. Those are fine and glowing words and all the rest of it, but Federal aid for provincial assistance in various fields is becoming a very common occurrence today, and we had an illustrious example of that by the Minister of Public Works in the Federal House when he spoke here, of this new concept of committee-operation between the Federal Government and the provinces. He spoke about the greatness of the Trans-Canada Highway, and how this new concept was working in that regard. I understand there are discussions and negotiations going on between the Federal government and the provinces, regarding the possibility of a secondary Trans-Canada highway. The concept of sharing the tax-dollar of the Dominion, which only they can collect, with the provinces is certainly an accepted principle today.

I think that, if we are going to ask across Canada that the Federal Government carry this new concept into the field of education, it is not just necessary for us to ask that this be done. We must remember that it is the person who pays the piper calls the tune; and if we are going to ask Ottawa to contribute huge sums of money (the LaZerte Report, I think, recommends \$150 million to begin with) to the Provinces for education, then I think they will look at the whole problem along the lines suggested by the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer to the Local Conference with the local municipal governing bodies here, when they said we want to be sure that the tax-dollar is used to advantage with careful and prudent management and in an efficient manner. To say that the Dominion government should just on principle give money to the province of Saskatchewan and each of the other provinces in a lump sum, in order to assist primary and secondary and higher institutions of learning, is not presenting any concrete suggestions as to how it can be done. I want to show you here, the LaZerte Report points out that the average per pupil operating costs varied from \$63 to \$205 in 62 districts in municipalities of Manitoba. The variation of educating these children in public schools varied from \$63 to \$205 per pupil; and from \$85 per pupil to \$229 per pupil in 18 larger units in Saskatchewan. Even in the province of Saskatchewan in the larger units, the money spent

on a per-pupil basis varied from \$85 to \$229. Are we calling that equal educational opportunities, when some units are providing \$229 per pupil, and some units are providing \$85? From \$119 to \$335 was the per-pupil cost in 54 school divisions of Alberta, some spending \$335 per pupil, others \$119; and from \$100 per pupil to \$337 per pupil in 77 districts in British Columbia.

So we find, even in our own system, inequality in the amount of money spent in a per-pupil basis for the needs of educating that pupil. The study which has already been made and already submitted to this Government, shows there is no need for further study of it, according to the Minister. Perhaps there isn't. But I notice that the Minister of Education was very careful not to come out in support of the other recommendations made by this Committee, that, if we are to approach educationists from the viewpoint of Federal aid to education, one of the essential things necessary as a first step, is the implementing of a foundation program, defined in terms of the per-weighted-pupil-cost or the per-weighted classroom cost, in each province. That was one of the conditions they set down as a necessary step to Federal aid for education. And likewise, they say, each province should have a foundation program; that is, a program not identical in every respect, but a program set out that takes recognition of the teachers' qualifications. A foundation program might be defined in terms of grade offerings, staff qualifications, teachers' salaries, adequacy of school equipment or in other terms, and it says that each province should set up as a first step, a foundation program taking into consideration these things which I have read. And it says:

“Furthermore, that a foundation program will set out to guarantee to each district or unit a certain basic standard of education. And then you will have a uniform tax mill rate across the province (as I understand it), and then any district in which the needs of the cost of this foundation program is not met by the uniform tax rate, will call upon the Government to make up the difference. If you get in a district where the assessed mill rate will carry the foundation program in its entirety then that district will not qualify for these equalization grants.”

“It is to put it on a basis whereby you will have to set a standard, or a foundation program which will have a certain quality set. And then an equalization assessment, and then an equalized tax rate, and then if any district wishes to add to its program anything over and above the foundation program it is free to do so, but it will be called upon to assess the ratepayers in that particular area to supply those additional features of the program.”

And then it goes on to state:

April 2, 1957

“Once such a program has been recognized, and some provinces are working towards that end, and it has been accepted across the ten provinces, then we will get more uniformity on a per-pupil bases expenditure for education. To say that we must pay 25 per cent of the cost of educating our students in the primary schools, that 25 per cent will vary in many districts, if you are gong to have a per-pupil cost from \$83 to \$200 and some odd “(as I read before)”so the first essential is to establish this program with the costs more or less on a level where they are not varying and fluctuating from \$80 to \$339, have a uniform mill rate, establish your foundation program and the Government will come in to assist whatever is required in each particular area to meet that condition.

“Then if that has been established across Canada as a whole, you have a standard, not in uniformity of education in the subjects taught and so forth, but a foundation program with certain aims and qualities and specifications that is more or less uniform across the Dominion. Then the Dominion will give unconditional grants . . . ” (which we take from this resolution, it could be conditional grants) . . . ” depending upon the amount of money it is costing the provincial government to carry the burden of education.”

We don't think we should approach it from the viewpoint of conditional grants at all. We think they should be unconditional grants given to the Province, to spend in the manner in which they see best fitted to carry out this foundation program. Then you cannot level a finger and say that the Federal Government is invading the jurisdiction of the public schools, or the secondary and primary schools. We recognize the principle today that they can contribute funds at the university level, but we are asking them in the original motion, (as I read it) to make unconditional grants to primary rooms, secondary rooms, and higher institutions of learning, and we differ with that, in that we believe it should be an unconditional grant based on the cost to the provinces and their needs; to consider the need of each province to carry on that program which is instituted, and thus each province will share on the basis of its need to carry that particular program, and will supplement the resources of the province in carrying that out.

That is why in this amendment we asked to set up the Committee towards the viewpoint of working towards the end of setting up a foundation program and then lend our support to other provinces in trying to get a foundation program established in each of those provinces. When we have done this with the overall picture in mind, the Provinces can then approach the Federal Government on this basis of equalization of the cost in regards to the provinces, and the amount of money they have to spend for education, and ask that Government to contribute unconditionally to the Provinces a portion of their cost of carrying that particular program. We

feel, if we have done that, then we have cleared the decks of any suggestion of conditional grants dependant upon the amount of money that is being spent. You have got it then on a more stable cost per pupil of educating than with the differences of cost we find even in the larger units today, from \$83 to \$209 per pupil.

That is the program we believe is in the interest of education, and Federal participation in an educational program across the Dominion we believe this is the proper approach today. We are not recommending what type of foundation program, but we are suggesting that we travel in the direction as suggested by the results of the studies of this Committee, and they set those down as essential steps upon which we must seek a program and then apply to the Federal Government for assistance in it. All our amendment is doing is suggesting that we carry out the recommendations of the studies already completed, and go forward along the lines suggested as a result of those studies, in order that we, together with the other provinces, can put ourselves into a position where we can go to Ottawa and say that the costs are moderate, the advantages are equal; equal opportunities for these children, approximately equal costs on a per pupil basis for carrying this foundation program. Some provinces are richly endowed with resources and have additional income that other provinces haven't. Therefore, you should assist the less wealthy provinces to carry the foundation program together with those of a wealthier nature.

We think this is the logical step, and to get up and to say that we are not interested in Federal aid for education because we are suggesting that step further to see if it is possible to implement, even with modifications, the suggestions outlined in the report of the Committee which you have already set up is nonsense. Carry this into action, and then proceed with the other provinces to do likewise, and then as a joint affair go to the Federal Government and say this is our program, this is what it costs, this is what Saskatchewan needs to carry this program, this is what Alberta needs, these are what the other provinces need. We strengthen our position when we have shown that we have built the foundation for such a thing.

I think on that basis we can be assured that we have just grounds for appealing for Federal aid to education. We think that this strengthens our position and shows constructive thinking along the line of education and the need for Federal aid. If we proceed along that line, we are confident that sufficient work will be done, sufficient committee-operation between the Provinces and the Dominion Government we will have established, not only in principle, but in actuality, the contribution of the Federal Government towards education across the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was negatives by 33 votes to 17.

The motion (Mr. Thorson) was then agreed to unanimously.

April 2, 1957

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, March 21, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Bengough):

“That this Assembly:

1. reaffirms the position unanimously taken in the 1936 Session in support of the Government of Saskatchewan’s request for a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference on Marketing and Farm Income, pursuant to which the 1956 Assembly appointed a Select Special Committee in order to obtain the views and opinions of Members of the Legislature and farm and other interested organizations and persons, the Report of which Committee was made available to the Provincial Government to assist it in its representations before such Federal-Provincial Conference; and
2. strongly recommends that, in view of the continued deterioration of the agricultural industry relative to other sectors of the national economy and particularly in respect to marketing of farm products and farm income, the Government of Saskatchewan continue to press upon the Government of Canada the necessity of convening a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference which would include representatives of farm organizations.”

Mr. Fred Neibrandt (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is substantially the same as the one that was incorporated into the report of the Special Select Committee on Marketing and Farm Income, and which was unanimously adopted in this House, last year.

In speaking to this resolution, I want unreservedly to endorse the arguments that have been advanced by my colleagues, the member for Bengough (Mr. Brown) and the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). the prime purpose of convening this conference would be to face up to, and come to grips with, problems that are beyond the scope and competence of individual farmers, farm organizations, or, for that matter, the Provincial Government. It seems to me that we here in Saskatchewan, as well as others in the west, have reached a blind alley with respect to production, marketing and farm income, and the deteriorating economic position of the farmer in relation to other economic groups could well lead to a repetition of our experiences in the ‘thirties’. So it seems to me that before such an eventuality does occur, it is proper and expedient for a Federal-Provincial agricultural conference to be convened without delay.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to quote an observation in the report of the Special Select Committee on Marketing and Farm Income. I think it is pertinent to this resolution – (page 88):

“In the course of its deliberations, the committee was impressed by the frequency and tenure of the types of solutions proposed for the long-term problems of Saskatchewan agriculture. There was remarkable agreement that what was required was a comprehensive long-range national farm policy, which would attempt to integrate the production, price and distribution problems of agriculture into a more meaningful framework.”

Typical of the comments of briefs submitted by various organizations are some sentiments that pertain to this resolution, and again I want to quote from this report, on page 56. The first quotation is from the brief submitted by the Canadian Co-operative implements Ltd:

“We suggest that what is most needed is not the short-range solution for the disposition of the present surplus, but a long-range impression and a wide point of view to the whole business of marketing of wheat and all farm products.”

There is another one, from the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture:

“The inter-relationship of agriculture and non-agricultural sectors of the national economy become more complex, and as specific agricultural problems assume greater national significance, the need for integration of agricultural policy with general policy becomes greater.”

A further quotation from the brief by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union:

“We recommend the early holding of an agricultural conference, representative of Federal and Provincial Governments and farm organizations for the purpose of outlining a comprehensive plan for agricultural policy across Canada.”

The last brief that I want to cite a quotation from is the Canadian Farmer-Labour Economic Council brief, Mr. Speaker:

“One invaluable service that this Provincial Legislative Committee can perform is to give undivided support to the requests of farm and labour groups a full-scale marketing conference at the national level.”

These examples, Mr. Speaker, highlight the fact that the resolution which is before us commands the attention and concern of a cross-section of our Canadian people, both in and outside of those engaged in agriculture. It also points out the need for the convening of such a conference.

April 2, 1957

Notwithstanding an improvement in producer marketing which has taken place since last fall, a recent report of the Canadian Wheat Board states that, as late as of March 13 (last month), the Saskatchewan producers had delivered only 29 per cent of their marketable grain. The consensus of opinion, according to that report, shows that we are going to have the biggest carry-over that we have ever had, and that stock left on Saskatchewan farms at the end of the coming crop season will likely reach 100 million bushels more than we had last year.

What is even more significant and far-reaching in its implications, of course, is the steady mounting costs of goods and services which the farmer requires, and the steadily mounting costs of production. When you consider hired help, machinery, repairs, fuel, fertilizer and all the other things the farmers use, which affect the cost of everything that he produces, we find that these costs have continued to mount without a corresponding increase in income; the farmer becomes more dependent on increased sales to meet those ever-increasing costs and ever-dwindling returns. Costs today, according to "The Farm Net Income" provided by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, are two and a half times as high as the period between 1935 and 1939, and the income in the intervening years has shown very little gain. The average farmer cannot meet his operating expense and the depreciating charge, which here alone on those two items will amount to \$300 million a year.

The anti-inflationary policy now in vogue has resulted in credit restrictions with respect to the farmer; the anti-inflationary policy also went against the interests of the farmer in various other ways. For example, he has to pay high interest rates if he is fortunate enough to get credit, and high interest rates paid to the banks by the Wheat Board take away from his final payment just that much more. All these things increase production costs, and we find it increasingly difficult to successfully compete on the export market. At the present time there is little or no likelihood that there will be a compensating price increase in the export market for Canadian farm products. With this continuing trend the farmer, of course, finds himself in the untenable position of storing more and more wheat, and more and more farmers are finding it most difficult to remain solvent as the relentless problem of inflation creeps over them.

I want to read an excerpt from the Gordon Commission Report on Canada's Economic Prospects, which concludes there is more need, and not less, for the Federal Government taking a hand in the problems of the wheat farmer:

"The Government in every importing producing country, influenced by direct marketing of their products . . . It would not make sense to leave Canadian wheat farmers to their own devices."

This is from page 30 of the Preliminary Report.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this very trend demands an early consideration, and has been recognized as an already established procedure all over the world. It is evident that our greatest competitor, the United States, has assumed over the last 20 years, an ever-increasing share of the financial responsibility or financial burden of their agricultural people.

At the same time they have instituted policies which have often been against our interests in the export field. Just last week a report revealed that the United States, Argentine and Australia were under-selling Canadian wheat on the export market by 30 cents a bushel, and policies adopted by importing countries too, are going against the interests of us, as exporters. On our part it behoves us to reserves-examine our own agricultural policies in this new light and new relation and implication in this changing picture to the internal and external influences; with a view to reserves-establishing ourselves in the markets of the world in our traditional first place as the producer of the world's finest and cheapest wheat. To do this, of course, will necessitate the combined effort of all of us on a national, provincial and local level.

So accordingly, and in view of the foregoing over which the Provincial Government has no control, and in view of the trends as outlined by the farmer speaker, and as I have reviewed here briefly, the necessity for convening an agricultural Federal-Provincial Conference, including farm representatives, should become clear to all of us. I, therefore, urge all members to support this resolution.

The question being put, the motion (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) was agreed to, unanimously.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 92 – An Act to amend Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in respect to this Bill, the present situation is that where a maintenance order is obtained in the Court of Queen's Bench, it precludes the possibility of a deserted wife bringing action in the summary court or the Magistrate's court for an order for payment of maintenance. The Magistrate's court has certain sanctions at its disposal which are very difficult to apply in the Court of Queen's Bench, and it is very useful to a deserted wife, even though she may have an order for maintenance under a separation decree or a divorce decree, to have this summary means of enforcing the maintenance order payment.

It is expressly provided in this Bill that the maintenance order given by the magistrate will not supersede, or may not exceed the amount due under the order of the superior court. It just makes available to the deserted wife or child the sanctions of the summary court, in addition to those which are presently available, through the superior court.

Mr. Speaker, with that explanation, I move second reading of this Bill.

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

April 2, 1957

SECOND READING

Bill No. 94 – An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The Limitations of Actions Act is to be amended for certain limitations for bringing actions, and the periods limited are set out, depending upon the class of action involved. There is a situation in Saskatchewan, at the present moment, where some people may have a right of action in an action to set aside mineral assignments and so on, for which the limitation period may be only expired this year, and it is proposed that, in view of the intention of the Government that there may be some inquiry into some classes of these leases, it is desirable to preserve the right to bring action for the additional year, so that no one may be lulled into a sense of security by reason of an inquiry and thereby let his right of action lapse because of the expiration of the six-year limit.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

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

The Assembly then adjourned at 10:05 o'clock p.m., without question put.