

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Sixteenth Legislature**  
**3rd Day**

**Monday, February 19, 1968.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day.

**QUESTIONS**

**REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION**

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I want to ask the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) a question. We were informed on March 18, 1966, about a committee of the University, Government, and School Trustees. This was launching a study into the future needs of higher education. We were informed on July 26, 1967, that this report was just about ready. Can the Minister tell us whether this report has been received, and if so, is it the intention of the Government to make it available?

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — The Report has been received, Mr. Speaker. Whether or not it will be made public will be announced sometime later on during the course of the session.

**COPIES OF THE FRAZIER REPORT**

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):** — Before the Orders of the Day I want to ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) if he could give us an indication of when we may be receiving copies of the Frazier Report, as we understand the Government has had this for some months at this time. We wonder when we might be receiving a copy of this Report.

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, it will be tabled very shortly.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have been late, but before the Orders of the Day, I should like to draw to the attention of your Honour and of the other Hon. Members of this House, members of the grade seven classes of two schools that are present as visitors in the Legislature today. I am proud to say that both schools are, both literally and figuratively, right from the heart of Saskatoon's Riversdale. In the east gallery I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, three classes of grade seven students of King George school. Those of you who are familiar with Saskatoon will know that King George school is one of the very early schools. It has history dating back to about 1910, I am told, and perhaps even earlier. Accompanying the groups are teachers namely, Mrs. Sims, Mrs. Lockhart, Mr. Welch and Mr. Kudryk. In the west gallery, behind me, Mr. Speaker, are two classes of grade seven students from Pleasant Hill school. This is a school that has been

operating since 1928 in Saskatoon. Accompanying them are Mr. W. Schmidt and Mr. G. Rathgaber. Mr. Speaker, both schools will, I am sure, find the visit very informative, and I hope that they will be able to learn something of democracy really in action, watching the Members this afternoon. I am sure that all Members will join me in wishing the students well and a very safe journey home.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the Members the fact that there are also students from the Elrose constituency visiting us today. Students from the Beechy school have made the very long trip in from the Beechy district to be with us today; they are going to see the initiation of the debate on the Speech from the Throne. They will listen to some very interesting speeches, and I am sure that they will appreciate and come to know and respect the Legislature more as it operates, by having visited us today. I want to express me welcome to them, Mr. Speaker, and also the welcome of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

**Mr. D.A. McPherson (Regina South West)** moved, seconded by Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):

That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor as Follows:

TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE ROBERT LEITH HANDBIDGE, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Saskatchewan, May it Please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, of the Province of Saskatchewan, in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious Speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present Session.

He said: First, Mr. Speaker, before I start, I would like on behalf of the Legislature to congratulate you on being elected Speaker of this House. This is the highest office in this Legislature. I think that it speaks well for the job you have performed over the past years that every Member joins with me in congratulating you on being elected Speaker again.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, may I express my thanks to the Government for the honor bestowed upon myself and also on the constituency of Regina South West.

The constituency is a large are on the west side of Regina bounded on the north by the CPR tracks and on the south by 25th Avenue. The eastern boundary is the west side of Albert Street and the western boundary is the city limits of Regina. I am indeed proud, Mr. Speaker, of Regina South West. In the last election over 85 per cent of the people turned out to vote.

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

This is a very large percentage, as everyone would agree, and this shows the interest there is in Provincial affairs.

On Thursday last, Mr. Speaker, we all had the privilege of witnessing the ceremonies officially opening the Legislature. The Speech from the Throne, read by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, gave this Assembly a preview of the legislation we will be asked to consider. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Lieutenant Governor for the fine manner in which he presented the Speech from the Throne.

I would also like to say to His Honour, The Hon. Lieutenant Governor, how happy the people of Saskatchewan are that he has been appointed for another term.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — The Lieutenant Governor and his good wife have contributed a great deal to this Province and they are widely known in every community in Saskatchewan, and, I might add, loved by all.

Mr. Speaker, there is something that many Members of this Legislature are probably not aware of and I would like to bring it out at this time. In regard to the Lieutenant Governor, he is a former guard of the Saskatchewan Roughrider team, in the early 1900s. He performed well and last year we gave him a life membership in the club. I think it speaks well for this gentleman, as he certainly is interested in sports and interested in everything that goes on in this Province of ours.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, clearly indicates that this Government is interested in one thing, and one thing alone, and that is to build a better Saskatchewan.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on different aspects of the Throne Speech. The first I would like to deal with is industry, which is so important to this Province. Total production figures for 1967 fell as a result of lower agricultural output, but industrial growth continued. Resource development, an expanding power grid and a healthy construction industry have continued to provide a sound base for rising totals in the non-agricultural section of the economy. The weak points on the industrial front in 1967 were production of crude oil, which registered a decline due to market conditions and some forms of manufacturing. Contributing factors in the latter area were a number of work stoppages and over-production of certain commodities in other parts of the country. These conditions are considered temporary, Mr. Speaker, and it is expected that 1968 will see an upturn in both areas. Activity in other areas was at a pitch sufficient not only to counteract the negative influence of falling totals in oil and manufacturing, but resulted in an advance of \$26 million in gross value. In 1968, Mr. Speaker, we expect to have another increase in gross value of non-agricultural commodity production, which at this time should reach \$1,680 million.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — The drop in agricultural

production was reflected in a drop in person income for 1967, but an average crop in 1968, coupled with a rise in the non-farm component, should set a new high in personal income, some \$2,099,000,000. Population and labor force should also show increases and the number of unemployed should not be more than 1.3 per cent of the labor force in 1968.

I would like to spend a few moments in speaking about oil and gas. Early in the 1950s the potential of the oil industry became apparent. During the 15 years that followed it emerged as the most significant factor in the economy, outside of agriculture. Production has increased from 2 million barrels in 1952, Mr. Speaker, to more than 92 million barrels last year, approximately 30 per cent of the oil produced in Canada. Production of petroleum is expected to remain at about the same level in 1968, 1,100 wells producing 92 million barrels with a dollar value of \$209 million. Natural gas production should be up \$100,000 in 1968 with substantial increases in the following years. By 1970, 80 new wells will have been drilled in the Hatton gas field immediately adjacent to the Horsham area.

The potash industry, Mr. Speaker, one of our most important industries, continued to expand in 1967 and this expansion will continue into 1968. It is expected that 4 million tons of potash will be mined in 1968 with a value of \$104 million. However, potash means more to Saskatchewan than production. For example, in 1968, the IMC twin-shaft operation in Esterhazy will generate \$4.8 million in royalty payments and taxes to the Government, \$45 million for rail services and supplies and \$60 million to help Canada's balance of payments. The company employs 1,400 people who will earn \$9 million in wages, while 7,000 people of a service personnel variety will derive indirect employment through the operation.

By 1975, Mr. Speaker, after 13 years of production, the potash industry in Saskatchewan is expected to represent an investment of around \$750 million, will employ 7,000 directly with an annual payroll of \$40 million and will sustain a population of about 35,000 people. Committed and actual investment in Canada's potash mines and mills now is in the order of \$650 million, and production capacity, when projects currently under development are completed, will be approximately 12 million tons per year. At the end of 1967, Mr. Speaker, 52 companies held potash dispositions, and total acreage under disposition amounted to 5,548,000 acres.

Another development of the potash industry was the decision by Lynbar Mining to establish a pilot plant using solution mining techniques. And I think, Mr. Speaker, there is a very significant factor in this; a barter agreement – unique in Canada – has been arranged with the Government of Poland whereby plant machinery and equipment supplied by Poland will be paid for in potash by this company.

Regarding metallic minerals, 1967 saw a rekindling of interest in uranium in Saskatchewan and we expect 2 million pounds to be mined this year. Gunnar Mining limited, which abandoned operations in 1964, will undertake and extend an exploration program. Eldorado Mining and Refining, a Crown corporation, has undertaken an extended exploration program. A new mine will be opened with shaft sinking to commence early this year. Productions of copper and zinc will also be up in 1968.

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

I would just like to say a few words about helium, Mr. Speaker. Canadian Helium Limited, Canada's only helium-producing plant, has completed installation of facilities to triple capacity to 36 million cubic feet annually.

As for manufacturing, Mr. Speaker, factory shipments in Saskatchewan in 1967 were down slightly. However, there was a great deal of activity in manufacturing in the province and this should be reflected in about a five per cent increase in 1968. Total value should approximate \$467 million in the new year. Saskatchewan's first pulp mill, now under construction at a cost of \$65 million in Prince Albert, should be in production by mid-1968, Mr. Speaker, and should help to propel the manufacturing industry in Saskatchewan to a position of much greater significance.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Now for agriculture, Mr. Speaker, Because of the poor crop, agricultural net income was down to \$383 million in 1967 from \$623 million in 1966. Fluctuations in output are common in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, because of wide variations in rainfall and the dominant position of agriculture in the economy. This again points out the need for farm diversification in Saskatchewan and this is something that we must all take a real hard look at. Prices for both cattle and pigs for the past year held very firm, but the increase in the number of cattle in Saskatchewan was minimal, and the increase in the number of hogs was up slightly, 15 per cent. I personally believe that this is not good enough. The outlook for 1968 is good, the moisture conditions are good, and we should have an average crop. But if the crop is poor as in 1967, net income will be down and down again for what follows. We cannot stress too strongly the need for farm diversification, Mr. Speaker, as this is the only way the farmer can protect himself and the Provincial economy.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Premier for the remarkable job he has done these past three years as Provincial Treasurer.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — I would like to also congratulate the Members of Cabinet for the fine job they have performed in handling the affairs of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — At a time when every other Province in the nation and the Federal Government have been increasing taxes at an alarming rate, the Province of Saskatchewan, under the guidance of Ross Thatcher, has been able to not only balance the Budget but reduce overall tax levels.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — I would personally like to commend him for his approach to government. I think that anyone who approaches government financing in a business-like way should be commended. Money only comes from one source — the taxpayers' pockets — and the

government which fools itself by deficit financing is really fooling one person and that is the people of this province. That is the folly the Hon. Members opposite seem to have, Mr. Speaker, who after 20 years of Socialist experiment had driven the per capita debt of the Province to one of the highest in the nation. Not only did the Premier manage to reduce taxes, balance the Budget and maintain the economic growth of our province, but – and I point this out very plainly, Mr. Speaker – he managed to clean up the mess of 20 years of Socialist mismanagement.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier and former Provincial Treasurer managed to reduce the per capita debt of our Province. This is something that is so important. Since World War II, Governments all over Canada, indeed in most parts of the world, have been spending money at a fantastic rate, often with disregard for the ability of those who have to repay and the ability of the taxpayers to pay for it. Most of these huge government deficits have been accumulated in the name of the welfare state. We have witnessed the coming of big government. We have asked government to solve any problems and almost every problem which our society has encountered.

I continue to be alarmed, Mr. Speaker, by the creeping Socialism within our nation. I am concerned at the chipping away at individual freedom by the bureaucrats within this country. The people of Saskatchewan have learned from bitter experience the effects of Socialism.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — And the people of Britain are today finding out what Socialism really means. This false philosophy has brought once proud and mighty Britain to her knees. To support Socialistic schemes, many of which Opposition Member sin this House are asking Canadians to adopt today, the Labour Government of England has been forced to levy higher and higher taxes. The Socialists told the people that the Government could do more for them than they could do for themselves. What they really meant was they could do more to them.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Actually, Mr. Speaker, it didn't take the British long to find out that the more they owned collectively, the less they had as individuals. They came to own the Bank of England, but each one ended up with less coal. They came to own the railroads, but couldn't get train reservations for their holidays. The Socialist promise of fair shares for all actually turned out to mean less shares for all. Poverty was not abolished, it was distributed. Bureaucrats were brought up, and the majority of people were brought down. If the British experience has illustrated anything, it has shown us again that a managed Socialistic economy just simply won't work.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Despite the vast amount of evidence available to

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

prove the falseness of such philosophies, the Socialist—minded members of our community envisage the welfare state as the one institution through which they may exercise power and authority over the nation's affairs. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that the Socialist loves humanity but hates people. The Socialist expresses impatience for a better society through only one channel – government action. He sees only one bottle of pills on the shelf, aspirin made in Ottawa or by a Provincial Government. He prescribes it for all social ailments. This, Mr. Speaker, is not the attitude adopted by the Saskatchewan Liberals. Saskatchewan Liberals, Mr. Speaker, want to see a free society free in a sense that every man is the architect of his own ambitions. We also want, and with equal fervor, a good society, a humane, responsible society in which helping hands reach out to people in distress, in which common needs are met freely and fully. As a frontier people – and we are only a little more than one man's lifetime removed from such a situation – we developed a healthy system of interdependence and a genius for solving common problems. People joined together, Mr. Speaker, in many combinations to found schools, churches, opera houses, co-ops, hospitals, to build bridges and railroads, to help the less fortunate amongst us. As people saw needs, they more often than not promoted schemes to meet these needs, and they did it better than it had ever been done before.

We are free, Mr. Speaker, because we limited the power of the Government. We prospered because we were free. We laid the foundation for a good society because our prosperity yielded surplus energy which we put directly to work to meet human needs. We did not need much government, and because we didn't, we stayed uniquely free. We limited government, Mr. Speaker, not only because we knew its limitations and wanted it limited, but because we left little for it to do. Public business became everybody's urgent business. However, Mr. Speaker, the part of the system least understood, then as now, was the network of non-governmental institutions which served public needs. These institutions do not leave an easy trace for historians to follow. They did not depend on noisy political debate for approval. Civil servants were not required to keep complex and detailed records of what these non-governmental institutions did. It was the non-governmental institutions which took on almost any public job and became the principal way we got things done.

For years, Mr. Speaker, the leading colleges and universities were created by people working through their churches. Hospitals were built through community effort and many of them blossomed into today's major system of independent institutions. Citizens acting on their own took the heavy load. Local, provincial and federal governments picked up what was left. Mr. Speaker, I would identify this forgotten sector of society who assumed this responsibility themselves as the independent sector. There is no other word which so clearly expresses its unique, intrepid character as well as the word independent.

A young French aristocrat who visited America in the 1830s discovered, analyzed and described best the importance of the independent sector. Generations of scholars have been forced to either argue with his conclusions or accept them. They cannot ignore him, Mr. Speaker, Few have improved on his work. This young Frenchman saw the American impulse to act independently on the public business as the most remarkable trait. He marvelled not so much at their economic success and their

political machinery as he did at their tendency to handle public business directly and spontaneously. He wrote, Mr. Speaker, that their associations – his word for independent institutions – were the key to a social system that he deeply admired. He saw the vigor, ingenuity, and enterprises of these associations. He sensed the boundless potential of their work. It was thus, Mr. Speaker, that this most acute observer of our past saw and recognized the immense power of good inherent in a society wherein its people maintained three separate sectors: the commercial sector, Mr. Speaker, a carefully limited or public sector, and the most important of all, a vigorous and unique independent sector. But, Mr. Speaker, since the Great Depression, many people and especially the Socialists have come to believe that the independent sector's usefulness has ended. People talk only of the public and private sectors. This habit is almost as pronounced among conservative Socialists as it is among liberal Socialists. And it seriously limits the vision and action of both.

Businessmen, Mr. Speaker, speak of the free enterprise system as if it were a total description of our way of life. We organize our commercial sector, by and large, on free enterprise principles, but free enterprise isn't an all-purpose social system. Attempting to make it so is to push beyond the limits. This then becomes an open invitation to governments to step in and do whatever business cannot or will not do.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we have so quietly and effectively dropped the independent sector from important public discussion. The loss is more fundamental and far-reaching than many people realize. It tends to dam the well-spring of social initiative. Probably more than 90 per cent of the money we spend for welfare now flows through government; less than 10 per cent through the independent sector. How long has it been since a general hospital in the Province of Saskatchewan or any other hospital received a large gift from anyone in their wills or any other manner? We are making ourselves wards of the government, wards of the state and people don't leave gifts once they are in this type of organization. Why, Mr. Speaker, is the importance of this vital and vast potential so rapidly declining? Why do we ignore the potentially great and growing strength of the independent sector when we form public policy? The answer is simple, Mr. Speaker. The independent sector is becoming unreliable. It performs unevenly. Its once brilliant achievement stands in stark contrast to more recent miserable failures, and it has developed a stubborn backwardness.

The commercial sector, Mr. Speaker, has led the way into radically new technology, new markets, and new forms of organization. The government sector has, by a more recent surge, grown enormously in size and scope. The latter has even become the largest single customer for computers. Mr. Speaker, the independent sector has not been able to keep pace. It has stumbled blindly into the twentieth century. It has failed to grasp the new demands placed upon it to develop new methods with which to meet these demands. We have let the independent sector lapse because we have become obsessed with the power of the public sector. Such practices live on, Mr. Speaker. Naturally the independent sector loses ground when it attempts to use cracker-barrel methods on space-age problems. It has been drugged with the overdose of Socialism. We must now work to revitalize the independent sector within our society and help it



**Monday, February 19, 1968**

to kick off the effects of the drug. One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker. The Socialists within our society will never harness this tremendous force, nor will they recognize there is an independent sector. They are too occupied and concerned with centralizing all power in the hands of governments and bureaucrats.

Can we rehabilitate the independent sector, Mr. Speaker? Will it once again become a vibrant force and a major factor in meeting the challenges of today and accepting social responsibility? I believe it will because the Saskatchewan Liberals, Mr. Speaker, are beginning to understand there is this important independent sector lying dormant within all our society. We are beginning to understand why it is that we were not able to adjust to the new world in which we all live.

I was delighted, Mr. Speaker, to hear of the recent decision by the Government of Saskatchewan to ask the independent sector to furnish the new auditorium. This group of businessmen in the city have taken on and are working hard at raising the funds to furnish the whole new concept of the auditorium. The Premier of Saskatchewan could have used the taxpayers' money to furnish the auditorium, but he chose to call on the independent sector, Mr. Speaker, and I heartily congratulate him for doing so.

Things are being done in the city of Regina. Just the other day, the Queen City Kinsman Club presented a gift of \$112,000 to the YWCA for a new swimming pool. These are the things that the independent sector can do. It was also heartening to hear that the University of Saskatchewan was undertaking a campaign to raise \$11 million through private subscription for a building fund. These are two outstanding examples which illustrate that the spirit of the independent sector is still very much alive despite 20 years of Socialist government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — When, Mr. Speaker, the curtain that has strangely hidden the independent sector from the public eye is pushed back, one surprise follows another. You notice dozens of agencies that serve you daily. The sector's dimensions are fantastic; its raw strength is also fantastic. People who have come to think of government as the only source of welfare suddenly discover some amazing facts. Sometimes the independent sector shows itself boldly and professionally, as when the Associated Commercial Travellers started a campaign that has virtually stamped out TB in Saskatchewan. Or consider the Lions' Clubs with their tremendous work in regard to the blind people; or the Rotarians with their work, Easter Seal and the March of Dimes, to assist another independent sector organization, the Council for Crippled Children and Adults. Organizations working within the independent sector are legion. Sometimes independent action is impulsive, as, when the city of Winnipeg was flooded in 1950, millions of dollars poured in from all parts of the continent to help these poor people out; or when thousands of Americans mailed over \$600,000 to the widow of the Dallas Patrolman, H.D. Tippit. It was moved with a soul-stirring magnificence again, Mr. Speaker, as when Dr. Tom Dooley hurriedly raised money to finish his hospital in the jungle before cancer drained away his life. Scores of United Appeals and Community Chests collect and dispense millions of

dollars each year for the health and welfare organizations. This is another example, Mr. Speaker. And I'm particularly proud of the Community Chest and the Regina United Appeal. In Regina, I was chairman of the committee that organized the Regina United Appeal. They have had nine successive years of going over the top, and of these nine years have been the first city in Canada eight times. That is another great record.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McPherson:** — Consider the tremendous contribution made by the Senate and the Council of the University of Saskatchewan. I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to consider the contributions of the members of the Trustees Association, of our municipalities. These people have worked long and hard. I would like you also to consider the work of the Hospital Boards throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. These are the people that work under the independent sector.

This list is endless, Mr. Speaker. These are tremendous raw resources. It is hard to imagine a task too great for them. The potential of the independent sector has, if anything, grown at a faster rate than the commercial sector's strength. Modern day technology and our conquest of toil greatly multiply the leisure time we can use for public service that enriches public life.

If fully mobilized, Mr. Speaker, I believe the independent sector could: first, put to work everyone who is willing and able to work; secondly, wipe out poverty; thirdly, solve the farm problem; fourthly, provide everyone with good medical care; fifthly, stop juvenile crime; sixth, renew our towns and cities, and turn slums into human communities; seventh, provide the opportunity for retirement benefits for all; eighth, replace hundreds of Government regulations with more effective codes of conduct, vigorously enforced by each profession and an alert press; ninth, handle the nation's total scientific research effort; tenth, turn our foreign policy into a world crusade for human welfare and personal dignity; eleventh, lever a wider distribution of stock ownership; twelfth, stop air and water pollution; thirteenth, Mr. Speaker, provide every person with the opportunity to secure the education he needs, wants and can profit by; fourteenth, provide cultural and recreational outlets for everyone who wants them; and fifteenth, wipe out racial discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the independent sector has the power to do these formidable things. But curiously, as its strength has increased we have given it less and less to do. At the same time we have assigned more and more common tasks to government. Today, Mr. Speaker, we must face the fact that there is a radical change in the nature of our public problems. And Saskatchewan Liberals do recognize this fact, Mr. Speaker. Air pollution did not disturb people when there were no cars and few factories. There was no need of rural electrification when there was no electricity. With the mounting agenda of problems so large and complex it is easy for the Socialists to sell the idea that only government, the largest single force in sight, is capable of handling the situation. But, when it comes time, Mr. Speaker, to deliver the goods, they fail at this high time very miserably.

Today, chronic unemployment infects many areas of our country. We face a large and growing problem of juvenile delinquency.

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

Thousands of people willing and able to work can't find jobs to match their skills. Other thousands have learned to live in a way satisfactory to themselves on social welfare and are content to live off the public purse while working no more than a bar minimum. We discriminate against certain ethnic groups of people, thereby conditioning them to expect little of themselves. Our schools need more classrooms and more teachers. Many of our rivers have become sewers. We need more parks, the lungs of our citified society. There is an urgent need to restore the age-old cores of our towns, Mr. Speaker, and small villages. Our children receive dirty and obscene pictures through the mails. Helpless, lonely old people whose savings have been eroded because of political action, which has deflated the original value of their money, stare at empty walls in dreary rooming-houses and look through dirty windows upon a society which pays them to waste in silence. The hope of the bureaucrats is that these people will not remember that they had been legally robbed in the first place by a Socialistic state-welfare system.

On the face of these awesome problems confronting governments today, I implore the Members of this Legislature and all the Legislatures in Canada to enlist the support of the independent sector.

Government has become too big. We are giving it too much to do and much of what it has attempted to do has been proven to be a dismal failure. It has failed to solve the problems facing our farmers. It has failed in its attempts to abolish poverty. Many of the poverty programs which have been tried in this country are a fiasco, as has been pointed out by a recent study conducted by the Economic Council of Canada. They state, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

From the hundreds of projects listed in the ARDA catalogue it would not be difficult to pick many in which the taxpayer pays \$1 so that a farmer somewhere in a fringe area can make, say, 50 cents.

Many of the new programs to help people have become nothing more than a haven for bureaucrats. Even in the Province of Saskatchewan, despite the 1964 freeze on the Civil Service, we have registered increases in the number of Government employees in the public service. In the ten-year period, Mr. Speaker, commencing January 31, 1957 to January 31, 1967, the total establishment of the Government of Saskatchewan increased from 5,605 to 7,822. I have chosen this period because it includes a period of both NDP and Liberal administration. I am not blaming either Government for this increase but rather I am using it to illustrate the rather dramatic increase in the number of public servants. Consider, Mr. Speaker, the number of employees employed by the Department of Welfare in this ten-year period that I spoke about before. Despite one of the most prosperous periods in the history of our province, the establishment in the Department of Welfare rose from 717 in 1957 to 1,142 in 1967. This represents an increase, as you all know, of 60 per cent.

And consider the Department of Health, whose establishment increased from 2,033 in 1957 to 3,018 in 1967, or the Department of Education which increased from 285 in 1957 to more than 600 in 1967. This latter figure has more than doubled, and yet I would doubt very much if the number of children who are being educated in our province has also increased. It is figures like these, Mr. Speaker, that make me wonder how many do-gooders

and how much welfare statism the taxpayers of our province can support. If the situation here is to be considered bad, I would like you to take a look at the one in Ottawa and I would construe it as a nightmare.

Government has crept into almost every area of human endeavor. Governmental interference has distorted many of the traditional checks and balances within our economy. For example, Mr. Speaker, Government regulations and laws have come between employers and employees who are attempting to bargain. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few personal words about labor relations and labor's stake in our private enterprise system. The right to strike, the right of employers and employees to disagree is in essence a guarantee of the freedoms which we cherish. But, Mr. Speaker, possession of such rights does not mean the licence to use them irresponsibly. The more powerful an individual or group is, whether a labor union or a corporation, the greater must be the care taken to refrain from actions that would interfere with the common good. Unless that lesson is learned, Mr. Speaker, we may deprive ourselves of the kind of society we prefer. No country can afford the luxury of too much struggle between labor and management. The country does not belong to labor nor does it belong to management. It belongs, Mr. Speaker, to the people. It has not been set aside as a private battleground. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the public is about fed up with an increasing conflict between labor and management. Labor and industry must give some evidence of capacity for self-regulation in the public interest. Failing such evidence the rising tide of public demand for public regulation will not be withheld much longer. Labor and management can both control the extent to which the government may enter labor relations and business by eliminating their own differences and solving their own problems. To the extent that this problem is solved by the parties concerned, they will be better off and more secure. Labor, like management, Mr. Speaker, is writing its own ticket for the future. A fine balance, Mr. Speaker, must be struck between the wages and the hours on the one side and prices and profits on the other. Upset the balance and the groundwork has been laid for an economic depression. Where these factors are controlled and managed by government, labor is not free, neither is management. When government enters labor relations and business, a multitude of laws come into being. We must not depend too much on laws, Mr. Speaker. Each law invariably brings on another law. Voltaire once remarked: "A multitude of laws in a country is like a number of physicians, a sign of weakness and sickness." Laws, Mr. Speaker, take labor relations out of the plants where they belong and place them in the hands of the politicians and the courts. Issues become political, legalistic, instead of realistic. Industrial peace will never be found until the fear, suspicion, distrust, and politics are eliminated from the scene. Labor should, Mr. Speaker, assume responsibility but not through compulsion. Moral instead of legal responsibility will be more respected by industry, the public and the workers themselves. Government should stick to conciliation and stop there and permit labor and management to practise free bargaining. Neither side can ever hope to bargain freely when they are hamstrung by laws binding one side or the other to certain predetermined procedures and conditions. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such a situation exists today at both Provincial and Federal levels. And it is getting worse instead of better.

In the war between conflicting boards and authorities,

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

labor's problems become the football of political careerists. Government paternalism weakens the labor movement. The rich contribution which responsible organized labor can bring to our economy will not be achieved in the atmosphere of an administration which may be full of favors today and hostility tomorrow, for either labor or industry. Old-time labor leader, Sam Gompers, said, Mr. Speaker: "Look upon all progress as insecure which was not achieved through the rigor of union self-reliance." The favors which the politicians confer are too often the bait for the hidden and barbed hook of government control. Under such a system, trade union leadership becomes the rubber stamp of a political regime.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that responsible labor union leaders, as well as management, should sincerely concern themselves and jointly request the elimination of all restrictive labor legislation, regardless of which group it favors. Let labor legislation be limited to simple fundamentals designed to protect individuals and the public against property damage, injury, loss of life, fraud and such other actions which may infringe upon human rights and the laws of the land. Not until this is done, Mr. Speaker, will there be any meaningful and actual free bargaining. It is preposterous, Mr. Speaker, to claim bargaining between two parties is free, when a third party, government, is sitting on the shoulders of the bargaining teams, pointing out that one or the other has certain privileges not available to the other.

Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity I feel it is time government withdrew from not only the field of labor relations but from many of the other tasks that we as Legislators have assigned to it. We have given away many of the powers which are rightfully ours, as representatives of the people, to the bureaucrats of this country. This we have done in the name of the welfare state.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is up. It is my pleasure to move, seconded by Mr. Forsyth from Saskatoon (Nutana South) that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South):** — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate you, Sir, on your re-election to the high position which you occupy with such distinction.

In rising to second the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, may I first thank the Premier for giving this honor to me and to the constituency which I represent, the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South.

As the first Member to be elected to the Legislature from our brand new riding, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity, and I know that my constituents at home as well as those who are seated in the gallery share my feelings.

Saskatoon Nutana South is made up of several residential areas and, except for those who are employed in its convenient shopping centres, very few of my constituents make their living within its boundaries. For this reason, I feel that the Member from Nutana South must show a keen and continuing interest

in the growth and prosperity of the entire city of Saskatoon. This I have promised to do during my term in office and this I will do, to the best of my capabilities. However, as the fastest growing city in this province and despite the efforts of a dedicated city council led by a full-time mayor, we do have some growing pains and these problems will from time to time require both sympathy and the assistance of this Government, an attitude which I am happy to say has been the keynote of our relationship with this Government since 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — The people of Saskatoon can see on every hand tangible proof of this relationship in the ever-expanding campus of the University, in the ultra-modern highway developments of our city, in the enormous industrial expansion which is taking place all around and inside our city. We take particular pleasure in contemplating the creation of the new recreation area in the Blackstrap Valley. And we Saskatonians also take a great deal of pride in our fine Centennial auditorium which will be officially opened on April 1.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — We are particularly proud of the extent to which this magnificent addition to the community has been financed from our own resources.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — At the same time, however, we do gratefully acknowledge and appreciate the continuing assistance of the Government.

While speaking of my favorite city, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the pride which its citizens take in the appointment of Clarence Estey, the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre, to the position of Minister of Municipal Affairs. You recall that Mr. Estey's father represented our city, and served this Province and this Legislature with distinction as a Member and a Minister of the Government of his day, just as he later served the people of the entire country of Canada as a member of the Supreme Court. To follow in the footsteps of such an illustrious parent is not easy, but those of us who have lived and worked with Clarence Estey for many years have no hesitation in predicting for him a distinguished career in the service of his fellow citizens.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — I cannot leave the subject of my home city, Mr. Speaker, without an expression of regret that Mrs. Sally Merchant, the charming lady who represented Saskatoon on this side of the House in the last Legislature, has chosen to retire from public life. That feeling of regret, however, is offset to a certain extent by the satisfaction which comes from knowing that Saskatoon will continue to have capable representation in the person of my neighbor, Jeff Charlebois, Member for City Park-University

...

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

**Mr. Forsyth:** — . . . as well as from the two personable young Members from Riversdale and Mayfair who unfortunately at the moment are facing in the wrong direction.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — May I also offer my sincere congratulations to the Member for Athabasca, Allan Guy, and to the Member for Pelly, Ross Barrie, on their elevation to the Cabinet. We should all be grateful that men of this calibre are available to fill these key positions.

Since the Speech from the Throne contains many references to our educational system, and since all of us recognize the importance of education, I would like to direct a few remarks to some basic educational problems which I believe to be worthy of the interest and the concern of this Legislature. There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, that the community at large is going to play a role of ever-increasing importance in moulding the lives of our children. In so saying, it is not my intention to minimize the importance of the influences of the home, the church, or the small neighborhood group. We must, however, face the facts that there is a twentieth century revolution in communication and transportation. People and ideas have achieved an entirely new mobility in our century.

In the modern setting even a quiet evening at home is very apt to turn out to be a journey via the TV tube to some exotic land of adventure. With the increase in the number of families where both parents are employed outside the home, and with the proliferation of activities made possible by improved transportation and large communities, we are tending to make the school the guardian of our children for most of their waking hours. Some of us may not like this trend. Some of us may want to deny that it exists. I submit that it is a fact of life. And I ask if our schools are fully equipped for the task which modern society is demanding of them. In my experience, we too often expect the teacher to be all things to all people. Without advocating any narrow specialization, it is permissible to ask if a top-notch classroom person is necessarily an adequate leader of youth on the gymnasium floor, on the social scene, and in music, drama, and in the myriad other tasks which he is asked to perform.

A somewhat similar situation can be seen in connection with adult activities. The facilities which we provide so abundantly in our modern school buildings are of a sort which makes these buildings excellent centres for community activities of a cultural, athletic and social nature. But too often we have overlooked a facility which is at least as important – the human factor of leadership.

There is an immense pool of knowledge and ability in our society which is not always put in use, a group which has been referred to by the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) as the independent section. This is a group which is not always taken into account in the organization of educational activities. I don't think we can afford to overlook these resources. Part-time instructors and volunteer leaders can play a vital role in the operation of a truly community-centred school. Their efforts may not always come in neat and tidy bundles, but I am

sure that the professionally trained educator needs their help. I suggest that the community-oriented school of the future may well have on its staff a person or persons whose primary function will be to assist in organizing and mobilizing community resources for social, recreational and cultural activities of all age levels.

We can be as nostalgic as we like about the old one-room school house, but we must admit that it had its shortcomings as an educational institution. High on the list of its strong points, however, was the wide range of services which it offered to its community. We would do well to remember this when we draw up organization charts to meet the challenges of the future. I am confident that in this matter our Government will continue to furnish the kind of practical leadership which it has shown in instituting the lighted school house program, and the Saskatchewan Youth Agency.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the peace and quiet of a well-deserved period in opposition might have provided our Socialist friends with the opportunity for constructive thinking on the problems of education in this province. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, even under the rule of their modern Moses, three years in the wilderness was not sufficient for the task. Now we must be prepared to wait for the fulfilment of their full quota of 40 years of wandering before the tablets are unveiled.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — What has come out of the depths of their despair are documents such as this one which was distributed to the faithful during the last election campaign. It starts out by stating, without reservation, and I quote:

The full education program of the CCF is as follows . . .

And there follows a list of 21 points, more than half of which are already established policy, and the remainder of which have little or no bearing on the basic decisions that require our attention. It strikes me that their hierarchy, their inner council, might have felt that a change in the alphabet from CCF to NDP was as big an educational innovation as their party members could absorb in one year!

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — One of the fundamental decisions to which I refer, Mr. Speaker, concerns the question of providing equal educational facilities for every section of this province. Facts of history and tradition may be harsh, but they are made by men and they can be re-interpreted by men. Facts of geography present a different challenge. We can alter their appearance and we can endure the inconveniences which they cause, but by and large we cannot change them. We can only adapt to them. And adapt we must if our society is to flourish. Just as we have learned to build our homes to withstand the blizzards and the cloudbursts of our prairie climate, so we must build our educational edifice to meet the strains which rural spaces and urban



**Monday, February 19, 1968**

crowding will impose upon it.

In spite of the boundless faith which all of us have in the future of Saskatchewan, we must face the fact that our geography presents us with problems too large to permit us to squander any of our financial and human resources. Certainly it would be pleasant to contemplate the establishment of every possible educational facility in every area of this province. But since this is not feasible, let us provide equal quality of education in every region, admitting that equal quantity is beyond our present capability.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that certain principles of education are the same in all parts of the country, probably in all parts of the world. However, the methods of administering systems of education may vary greatly from place to place. If these methods are not adapted to the regions which they serve, they may distort and even destroy the very principles to which they are dedicated. What I am suggesting is a basic flexibility in our pattern of education that will take into account the differing backgrounds of our people, and yet will unite us all insofar as essential knowledge is concerned.

Our Indian and Metis population is a case in point. Surely they deserve more than a watered down version of a conventional curriculum. We must be prepared to offer them a program based on their present situation, yet geared to their ultimate needs as citizens of the wider world. I noted with the greatest of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, the Government's intention, as described in the Speech from the Throne, to take further steps in the direction of bringing our native population into the mainstream of Canadian society. It is not possible to leave this point without one or two additional remarks. I am sure that even our Socialist friends must feel a bit of a twinge of conscience when they talk so piously of social justice. How much social justice did they extend to the Indian and Metis population during their too long term of office? Job placement, vocational training, academic upgrading? It took a Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, to get these programs going, and to give Saskatchewan's Indian and Metis people a new faith in their own capabilities.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Mr. Speaker, the flexibility to which I referred a moment or two ago can be applied also to the relatively small but very important segment of our population for whom French is the mother tongue. French language instruction is most desirable as long as it enriches our culture and does not cause artificial barriers to be erected in our communities. The objectives clearly stated by the Government in this field will, I am confident, bring about precisely the enrichment of which I speak. It should be made clear that there is no element of compulsion in the program for French-language education. No one will be compelled to speak French. It will be recalled, however, that the proposals our Government put forward at the recent Constitutional Conference in Ottawa simply dealt with the availability of French-language instruction in some schools of this province.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Quebec has been pressing certain demands in recent years. One of these is the

insistence that French-speaking citizens outside Quebec receive the same language rights as do English-speaking citizens in Quebec. I do not believe that this is an unreasonable request. At the same time, I do not believe that it is wise to establish a third public school system in this province. It is, therefore, being proposed that French language be permitted as a language of instruction in the schools of certain areas where the number of French-speaking students makes such a program feasible. It may be possible to accommodate French-speaking students in rooms which are presently in existence in some schools in these areas. Others may require new facilities. These details will have to be worked out in the future, but I am convinced that we are moving in the right direction.

We have another example of this flexible approach in the bilingual college which has been announced by the Regina campus of the University of Saskatchewan, and for which I congratulate the administration of the University. As I understand the program, credit courses in a number of subjects will be taught. However, English-speaking students enrolled at the College will take a minimum of 40 per cent of their instruction in French. Likewise, French-speaking students will take at least 40 per cent of their classes in English. This to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is the best kind of flexibility in education. No compulsion is involved, no artificial barriers are erected. Best of all, the program is not imported or super-imposed. It is a program that fits naturally into the life of our university, and the needs of our province and our country.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we in Saskatchewan have sometimes been too prone to import the mechanics of our education system from other places. Presumably the truth is the same in Toronto as it is in Turtleford. But the methods used in presenting it may differ somewhat in these two areas. Perhaps the five-day school week based on attendance from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. is not the ideal timetable for all parts of our province. Is the 200-day school year or for that matter the seven-month university year really suited to Saskatchewan students in 1968? If we make full use of modern radio and television, audio-visual aids, do we really have to centralize all of the academic classes in our rural high schools? Is it not possible that some university credit classes can be taught effectively in our larger high schools? I suggest that while we have much to learn from others, we should eventually seek made-in-Saskatchewan answers to some of these made-in-Saskatchewan problems. The research and the constructive thinking that will provide the answers must come from a co-operative effort on the part of the University, teachers and trustee organizations, and the Government. As this Government continues to give top priority to education and the needs of education, I am sure that it will also give the necessary leadership.

In thinking about educational problems, I return time and time again to a consideration of the facts of urbanization. We in Saskatchewan are feeling, perhaps a bit later than other parts of Canada, but we are feeling the effects of the mid-twentieth century exodus from the farms to the cities. Thanks to the industry and the intelligence of our farmers and aided by the brilliance of our research workers, the productivity of Saskatchewan's land continues to increase, as does the stability of our agriculture. I think, Mr. Speaker, of a wide variety of Liberal programs designed to achieve both of these objectives. At every opportunity, this Government has extended assistance

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

and encouragement to farmers wishing to diversify.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — It has assisted projects such as the Soil Testing Laboratory at the University of Saskatoon — projects which are of immeasurable benefit to farmers in their drive to increase productivity. All of this has made Saskatchewan one of the bright spots in the emerging global struggle to provide food for a world whose population is doubling itself every few years. We have been intelligent enough to achieve this greater production by superior methods and with fewer and fewer agricultural workers. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are also intelligent enough to meet the challenge of the social change which has accompanied the resultant shift in population.

According to figures published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, in the 20 years between 1946 and 1966, the urban population of Saskatchewan rose from 208,000 to 468,000. At the same time the farm population declined from 443,000 to 279,000. Non-farm rural population, that is persons living in centres with populations with less than 1,000 people, rose slightly during the same period. The net result really means that we have less than 50 per cent of our people now living in rural areas. With these statistics before us, Mr. Speaker, and with strong evidence that this trend will continue, we cannot afford to be complacent. This Legislature bears a heavy responsibility to make wise provisions for the needs of our emerging social structure. It seems that urbanization is here to stay, and we might better learn to live with it, and try to overcome its tendency to depersonalize our relationships, one with the other. Under the leadership of a Government which has brought us out of the Socialist muddle into a new era of self-confidence, I am sure we will be equal to the task.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — In some circles, the words “planning” and “centralization” seem to have taken on a nasty sort of meaning. Under the aegis of our Honourable Friends of the other side of the House, it is not difficult to understand how this could happen. In a Socialist regime, the plan is the important thing, and the plan exists for its own sake. The people, for whom they express such noble concern, must be moulded, bent and squeezed to fit the plan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — We in the Liberal party are a bit more modest in our protestations of nobility. We do not profess to know what is best for all of the people all of the time. We adapt our plans to fit the changing needs of people. Our faith in free enterprise and the common sense of the individual is the expression of our philosophy of government, the philosophy that government should do for people only what they cannot do for themselves.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — A Liberal party will never hesitate to allocate a

major portion of tax revenue to education. The estimates for the current fiscal year show Provincial Government expenditures for education at an all-time high of \$91 million. This represents some 30 per cent of the total Budget, and is the largest sum spent by any Department. Our Government asks our citizens for this kind of money because we know they believe that investment in education makes good sense. They know there is a direct and a favorable relationship between years of training and the earning power of an individual. They also are aware of the intangible benefits of education, the benefits which lead to a richer and a more rewarding life in an increasingly complex world. This year, as in the past, our Government will give massive financial support to our educational institutions, but we cannot afford waste or inefficiency. As has already been made clear, the bills for education will be scrutinized as carefully as any others.

In this connection, a peculiar attitude has become evident in some circles, an attitude which suggests that it doesn't really matter what the program costs so long as it bears the sacred label of education. Those who take this attitude often imply that educational costs should not be questions by mere laymen. There is an oft-quoted saying that "Education is too important to be left in the hands of the educators." This I accept only with reservations. But I do question any suggestion that educators have an exclusive right to determine the long-range goals of our educational system, or the methods of administration to be used in our schools and universities.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — During the past few months, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government has had the courage to make abundantly clear its concern with the rising cost of government at all levels. Without backing down one bit from our belief in the top priority of education, the Premier and the Members of his Cabinet have insisted that we take a long, hard look at all Provincial Government expenditures, and the cost of education has not been an exception. I sense that some Members of the Opposition are champing at the bit as they put on their holier-than-thou harness, and prepare to gallop off in all directions attacking a Government which has dared to commit that gravest of political sins – it has dared to put principle above popularity.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Mr. Speaker, we have dared to suggest that a university budget, which includes an expenditure of almost \$30 for every man, woman and child in the province, should receive thorough and responsible scrutiny. We have dared to suggest that teachers' salaries, which account for some 56 per cent of all monies expended for the operation of our elementary and secondary schools, might possibly be negotiated in a more efficient manner. We have dared to let the taxpayer know that financial chaos can be the only result of any fuzzy-minded policy that allows expenditures on social services to outstrip the productivity of our province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Mr. Speaker, if this kind of honesty with the

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

taxpayer is some kind of crime, all of us on this side plead guilty and we do so with pride.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — For these efforts to provide honest and realistic leadership, we expect to be criticized. However, let us remember that in the long run public support in Saskatchewan is gained by adherence to truth and logic. Our people showed last October that they will not be taken in by wild and irresponsible promises of free services and give-away programs. Adherence to sound principles seldom brings dramatic results, but efficient government eventually brings its own rewards. We Liberals are dedicated and we are dedicated deeply to this kind of good government.

The Speech from the Throne reflects the thinking of a Government that is prepared to give responsible leadership. We live in tumultuous times, and the economic adjustments which have shaken the financial centres of the world have given us reason to pause and to assess our own situation. Saskatchewan is in a strong economic position, and we want to keep it that way. Only a few days ago, the Provincial Treasurer's review of our economy for 1967 disclosed some highly interesting facts. In a year in which, as you remember, the rains did not come, agricultural production plunged. The wheat crop declined 37 per cent from the figure of the preceding year. Overall agricultural output went down more than 18 per cent. And yet, the net value of production was still more than 13 per cent above the average for the five-year period from 1962 to 1966.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Forsyth:** — Non-agricultural production is expected to reach an all-time record of \$888 million. Obviously the Liberal Government's drive for a truly diversified economy is paying off. We were able to withstand the shock of a below-average crop. The blow was absorbed, our economy remained on an even keel. Without the emergence of a new industrial climate in the last few years, Mr. Speaker, this could not have happened. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we can be confident of the future. With the tremendous productive capacity of our lands, our forests and mines, we are the envy of many less fortunate areas of the world. Let us, then, be humble in our strength, and grateful for the blessings of our island of peace in a world where strife is all too evident. We in this Legislature can best give evidence of our gratitude by governing ourselves wisely, well, with tolerance and foresight.

Under the leadership of a Premier as courageous as the Hon. Ross Thatcher, we have the kind of government in which we can place our trust. Because this is so, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion so ably presented by my colleague from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), and through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members for their courteous attention.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to join in the kind words that have been said by previous speakers about almost everybody in the House. This is a new group of Members following the October election which brings to us a number of new faces as well as a number of those who have been here before. Let me

congratulate all those who are here and particularly those who are here for the first time. I hope that the new Members will find in it the satisfaction and sometimes the excitement without too many of the frustrations which those of us who have been here longer have learned to appreciate and have learned to make use of. May I also join in congratulations to you, Sir, in your re-election as Speaker. I noticed that when on Thursday, the Premier and the Attorney General, I believe it was, went to bring you from your seat, you didn't struggle too hard. Consequently I presume we haven't given you too bad a time over the last several years and we hope you continue to enjoy your seat in that particular position. I join also in the congratulations to the new Members of the Cabinet. This is not to say I don't regret some of the Premier's choices, perhaps, but it is always a challenge to be moved to that position and sincerely we do congratulate them.

I was interested in the comments which the seconder of the motion, the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) made about the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey). I did have the opportunity of knowing his father when he was a Member of this House and a Member of the Cabinet. He was Minister of Education during the period when I was president of the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation and certainly I can recall a great many opportunities when we discussed to mutual satisfaction the problems of education in the province.

Certainly all of us on this side will want to most heartily congratulate the Lieutenant Governor, the Hon. Mr. Hanbidge on his re-appointment as our Lieutenant Governor. He is a particularly appropriate person to be Lieutenant Governor in Saskatchewan. We have learned to appreciate him and respect him and enjoy him. We wish him many years of continued activity in that particular post.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, we've had the mover and the seconder to the motion this afternoon. They have spoken with the usual pride in the achievements of their party as a Government and the usual conviction, which they will not expect us to share, that the achievements can be even greater in the years to come. I listened with considerable appreciation to many of the comments of the Member who has just taken his seat as he seconded the motion. He talked about education which is a subject I enjoy listening about. He wandered a bit, I thought, when he got into the topic of mayors of respective cities. As I recall his reference it was that Saskatoon had a full-time mayor, that is, after he gets finished with these directorships on various corporations which must be quite time consuming.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — His suggestion that Regina doesn't have a full-time mayor is also correct. We have a mayor who is at least time-and-a-half, all of it in the business of the public at one level or the other and many Regina people have appreciated this.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I would have liked him to

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

have said a bit more about education and such things as relationship of governments with university and governments with teachers' organizations. I would have liked him to have said a little bit more about the great courage of the Government and its eventual backing down on almost everything it has proposed, but that he failed to mention.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I do want to take the opportunity to speak to and to speak about the comments of the junior Member from Regina, the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) who moved the motion. I have a particular right to do this, Mr. Speaker, because after all, I'm one of his constituents, and so I have the right here in the House and the opportunity in the House to confront my Member from day to day. Having said that I am one of his constituents, I want to assure the House that I really didn't, I hope, help to elect him. I thought I was right at that time and . . .

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone):** - Yes, you did, you sure did.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I thought I was right in not helping him at that time, and I'm sure after listening today that I was right in not helping him at that time.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Me. Lloyd:** — I listened with rather unusual amazement to the philosophy spelled out by the Member, I have to admit if that's the philosophy of the new Saskatchewan, if that's the philosophy of this splinter group of Canadian politics which holds the Government here, then it's even more archaic than what I really thought it was. I listened to him suggest that he thought we should go back to the days when charity was the concern of private organizations, when private organizations ought to do the job of running hospitals. He said the independent sector could solve almost every problem under the face of the sun. Solve the problems of agriculture? That maybe explains the silence of some of my friends opposite about some of the real problems of agriculture. That they could solve the problems of health care! That probably tells why they never did really support the Federal Government's intention to bring in Medicare on a comprehensive Canadian basis. So he went on and on. The independent sector was prepared to take over everything from foreign policy to stopping pollution of the water and the air. These must come as amazing to one even such as the Premier holding his political beliefs.

But some of the more surprising things, Mr. Speaker, must surely have been in a few of the statistics that he used or referred to. I thought I heard him say, for example, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Government had reduced the public debt in Saskatchewan. Yet if one looks at the facts and figures about this, we can find according to the Government's White Paper that the funded debt was about \$595 million on March 31, 1964.

It has grown to \$704 million on March 31, 1967; that's not particularly a reduction.

I thought I heard him boast a bit also about decreasing taxation by my friends opposite. And yet if one looks at the financial statement issued by the Government, I find that in the year ending March 31, 1964, the total taxes at that time from Provincial sources were \$102 million. Mr. Speaker, even in the course of the last several months, this Government has increased charges on the people which are going to bring it in from \$2 to \$3 million more than the charges for the same services a year ago. A few months ago the Premier was very angry when the Minister of Finance at Ottawa, put, for example, some new tax on liquor. Yet when he adjusted the prices for Saskatchewan people, he didn't take just the increase for the Federal Minister of Finance at Ottawa. He took the opportunity to add a little bit more to it in hopes to get a million or a million and a half for the Province of it as well.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — This is the sort of decrease in taxation which we have experienced under the present Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks this afternoon about some of the statements in the Speech from the Throne document which, I agree, His Honour read so very effectively on Thursday afternoon. For example, we are told of, and the junior Member for Regina (Mr. McPherson) when he was moving the Resolution this afternoon emphasized, the continued industrial growth at a high rate in Saskatchewan. And yet you know this afternoon we had left on our desks the monthly oil and gas report of the Department of Mineral Resources and I noted that drilling activity in 1967 was down as compared with 1966. I noted that the daily average crude oil production in 1967 was down as compared with 1966. The Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) said that it's down because of market conditions. I'd be interested to know what he would blame it on if we had been the Government. He wouldn't have thought it was marketing conditions. At that time he would have said it was down due to the influence of the Government.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the Government's own White Paper, which was published only in December, 1967, you will find there that every indicator that is mentioned, noted a slow-down in the rate of growth during 1967. Those are the Government's own figures which it has put before the people of the province. The Speech from the Throne points out that more industries came into production and work is progressing on others. I could have added of course that some industries have shut down during the year and some moved away and a number which were announced as being certain last year, didn't come at all.

There has been relatively full employment throughout the province. The Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) spoke I think, in terms of not more than one per cent in 1968. As a matter of fact in the month of January, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, unemployment in Saskatchewan was at some four per cent of our labor force during the first month of 1968.

We are told in the Speech from the Throne that it's tight money and high interest rates which have caused a number of



**Monday, February 19, 1968**

industries to postpone their development and expansion. Now prior to the October election, we were told that it was the fear of the CCF Government that was causing these industries to wait.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — After the election they found a new excuse. Now it's tight money and high interest rates under the fact of a Liberal Government that's causing this slowing down.

We're going "to continue to press on for the widening of our economic base." We heard much about how resource development has helped to relieve the load of taxation in the Province. But we point out that in 1964-64, our revenue from resources for the Provincial Government was 16 per cent of the total of our Provincial revenue. In 1967-68, the percentage of our total Provincial revenue coming from resource revenues had dropped to 14.6 per cent.

The Speech from the Throne tells us that the past year was "one of the driest in the history of our province." Surely, Mr. Speaker, that's no excuse for making the Speech from the Throne also the driest in the history of our Province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — "The Crop Insurance program is going to be expanded substantially." So it should be. Why all the delay? As long as three years ago, the Federal Government took the necessary steps to make it possible to expand very rapidly and to cover almost the complete province since that time. It hasn't been done.

"My Government continues to believe that our young people are the Province's most valuable resource." They must believe they are really valuable. When the University fees are increased by about \$1,250,000 a year, they are that much more valuable to the Provincial Government in helping them finance their operations. Accordingly they say we are going to approve "further increases in spending for education at all levels." At what time during the last 20 or 25 years hadn't every Provincial Government in every Province in Canada approved each year further increases in spending for education.

They are going to continue to provide increased funds for "the rapid expansion of the two campuses of the University of Saskatchewan." Well I hope they do provide some increased funds out of the Provincial Government revenues. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the current year the amount of money, as grants from Provincial money, to the University of Saskatchewan is less than it was the year before. And we hope not to have a repetition of that. "Rapid expansion on the campus of the University." Certainly this is needed and badly needed. The program for building is going to add at the University campus in Saskatoon a new Veterinary Building sometime in the fall of 1968. In the fall of 1969, there will be a new Education Building. In the meantime there will be two new crops of high school students and some extension in courses to be taken care of. Rapid expansion of the University campus in Regina is now badly crowded. News reports last fall, news reports this spring tell us of

students being turned away because of lack of space, and yet the present building program doesn't provide any new space on the Regina campus until September, 1970. In the meantime we will have to provide for the high school classes of 1968-70. Nothing until 1970. If one looks at the provision for student housing, the picture, I submit, is even more serious than that. In 1966 the Premier announced that the Provincial Government would spend \$700,000 to begin construction of the student housing complex on the Regina campus. That was in December, 1966. "The Government will provide \$700,000 to begin construction of student housing." The only thing he didn't tell us was when it would provide it. But he went on to suggest that it was going to be provided in the Estimates of that year. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that according to present plans there will be no space on the Regina campus for student housing until sometime in 1973 or 1974. That's five years from now and even that project isn't full approved as yet. Now I hope, then, that this rapid expansion which is being promised is something somewhat more rapid than the facts at the moment indicate.

We are going to approve expenditures, we are told, for more vocational and technical facilities, and so we should. Two years ago we were told in this Legislature that 800 persons wanting to take some vocational or technical education were turned away because there wasn't any room for them. Last year the Government refused to tell us how many were turned away during that time. We hope perhaps it is prepared to tell us this year so we can judge how adequate its plans for continued expansion are.

We have a section on French-language schools. Seven lines in the Speech from the Throne about possible changes in Federal-Provincial relationships. Three of them are taken up with saying: "Me and my Ministers went to a party," or, pardon me, "went to a conference in Ottawa awhile ago." The others simply tell us something is going to be done about making instruction in French language more effective and more useful. This I may say, Mr. Speaker, we will welcome. We'll be interested to know just what the Government's plans are in this respect.

We are going to have some further recommendations implemented with respect to the Regional Library. We are going to have one new Regional Library opened, one new library opened which has been ready to open its doors for almost a year now, except that the Provincial Government hasn't been willing to pay the grant to make it possible to open.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — How many did you open?

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Well, in spite of some opposition from some people, we opened one, expanded it so that it was very much larger and laid the ground work in every area in this province for the present extension.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The problem, Mr. Speaker, with the Provincial Treasurer is that he relies on his imagination for his jokes . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — And you were the Minister.

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . and he also relies on his imagination for his facts.

Mr. Speaker, we can proceed down through this desultory document and find occasionally a few things which are interesting and certainly which we'll support. I'm glad to see the proposal to give the citizens of Indian ancestry a greater voice in the administration of the schools. I take it this means that they'll be given a chance to elect members to school boards under certain circumstances which certainly will be approved by those on this side of the House.

When we get into the sections with respect to health, then we find that we are likely to be faced with the deterrent fees on certain Government programs. I would hope that before the Government proceeds with putting deterrent fees on hospitalization or medicare that it will at least investigate carefully the results of deterrent fees, as they have been applied in the Swift Current Health Region for sometime in the past. I hope it will investigate the results this may have had on the extent of hospitalization. I hope it will investigate the extent which deterrent fees may have had on necessary follow-up care of patients.

We are going to have a Commission on Alcoholism which sounds like a good move. Later on its says we are going to take steps to help guarantee that the Commission has regular clients.

We have a section in the Speech from the Throne with regard to the Frazier Commission. It spends three lines saying that a report has been asked for; it takes two lines saying that the report has been made; and it takes another line and a half to say that we'll get some indication of a recommendation that is to be implemented. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go through the entire speech in this same type of fashion. There are as I say some things that we welcome. However, it must be recorded as being an unsatisfactory statement of Government program, one which shows that the Government is neither equipped nor prepared to deal with the real problems of the people of Saskatchewan today.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I indicated a minute ago that there were some seven lines in this Speech devoted to possible changes in Canada's constitution and relationship between Provinces. As a matter of fact there are more lines in the Speech devoted to extending liquor legislation than to Saskatchewan's position on amending the Constitution. I thought that the Speech might have made known, as I hope the Ministers when they speak will make known, better than they have done at the moment, some of Saskatchewan's proposals on the projected studies and projected meetings with respect to changing the Constitution.

I want to spend a few minutes this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in talking about constitutional change from the point of view of those of us on this side of the House. Surely the aim of the changes in the Constitution is to develop a Canadian nation better able to make its own decisions. The aim is to give us a nation with order and affairs regulated so we get maximum economic development. The aim is to do everything we can to provide a fair and just distribution of that development.

The Constitution, Mr. Speaker, needs to be understood by the people of the country. It after all belongs to the people, not just to governments. It is well to mention, I think, that the broadcasts by radio and the broadcasts by television of the November Confederation for Tomorrow Conference in Toronto and of the recent Federal-Provincial Conference performed a great public service. We hope that this sort of service can be repeated in the future. Those of us who watched these from afar would have been better able to understand, if we'd had some advance information on the Government's proposals ahead of time.

Public opinion on this matter is very important. Public opinion, which is informed and consequently supporting changes because it is informed, is of paramount importance for this particular change. I think, Mr. Speaker, that many of us in Canada have underestimated the real dangers of some regrettable division within Canada. I think there is a graver danger in division than most of us have at least been prepared to admit. There is a great danger that we may weaken the competence of the Federal Government to deal with the economic developments and the equalizing opportunity which can be the most powerful of all unifying forces. I'm happy that the Premier has expressed some sentiments of this kind on occasion as well. We in Saskatchewan have a big stake in clarifying and maintaining the Federal powers that are necessary to do the Canadian job which is before us.

In 1963, speaking for Saskatchewan at that time, I expressed some concern that there were those in Canada who would quite happily see the Federal Government left with the responsibility for the Armed Forces, the Post Office and little else. This would be obviously bad for Canada. But this danger of diffusing the force too much is not, I submit, as is frequently attributed, confined entirely to influence from Quebec. There are powerful Provinces in Canada besides Quebec, Provinces who have enough economic and political strength who can be persuasive in diverting the necessary financial and legal competency from the working grasp of the Federal Government.

So I want to urge on the Government, Mr. Speaker, that everything possible be done to give maximum public information about its proposals and about its thinking in this respect. Some of the information which the public is going to get is going to be communicated by Opposition parties. As a result, if this question is going to be understood and accepted, there is a strong case for maximum information being made available to the Opposition. There is, I suggest, a case for an Opposition role in consideration of the Province's position. It has been noted that, at the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference, representatives of some Opposition parties were invited and present. It has been noted that at the Federal-Provincial Conference on the Constitution, the Federal Government included some Opposition party representatives in those who were present. May I take this opportunity of urging the adoption of a similar procedure by the Saskatchewan Government with respect to future discussions.

The Speech from the Throne, as I mentioned a minute ago, does say that we are going to provide for some added and better opportunities to learn the French language. We welcome the Government's statement of intention in this regard. I hope that it will not be restricted entirely to the few communities in the B & B Report. I hope that, in the larger cities, for example, where we have a considerable number of people who are interested

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

in learning the French language, opportunities can be provided there as well. While welcoming this position on the part of the Government, I want to regret some of the disparagement which one must read into recent remarks of the Premier. He is reported as having said in Hamilton that we need "more French in Saskatchewan like we need a hole in the head." And he didn't say another hold in the head, that was the statement made by my friend, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) awhile back when he was talking about something else. I regret the reported explanation of the Premier that the main reason we are doing this is only to please or to pacify Quebec, although I'm sure he agrees, certainly most of us would agree, that there is much more to the case than that. The case is one of recognition of the contribution to understanding within Canada which can be achieved as a result of more of us understanding this language. The case is recognition of the great mobility and the need for mobility of Canadian people across Canada. While there can be benefit and extension with respect to opportunities to learn the French language, I think also we can benefit educationally from opportunities to learn the languages of some of our other ethnic groups as well.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — While admitting and urging this extension, I think that we need to be warned that there is some danger in assuming that extension of the use of the French language by itself cures as many problems as sometimes claimed. When I listen to some people, I get the impression that they think that, if all of us would wake up tomorrow morning speaking French fluently, all the problems of Canadian unity would be solved. That I submit is a dangerous over-simplification.

In this respect I think we should realize that we have lost something in Saskatchewan, because the Saskatchewan Committee on Biculturalism never had a chance to complete its work and its report. This is a committee that was established in 1963. It was made up of such people as Dr. Abramson of the University of Saskatchewan, Mr. Bellegarde, representative and active in the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, Mr. Marcotte with the French-speaking radio in Saskatoon, Mr. Stratyachuck, the Field Services Director of the Wheat Pool, Mrs. L'Heureux, a French teacher in Saskatchewan schools, Miss Russell, who was with the YWCA, Chairman Mr. B. Melvin of Co-op Insurance Services, and it included also Dr. Fred Anderson of the University of Saskatchewan. After the 19645 election, I think it is unfortunate that their committee was allowed to fade away. It was given no opportunity to complete its work and to report. The public information, which would have come as they completed their work, would have given a much better base for understanding and action now. One of the terms of reference of that committee, I recall was this: "To consider the contribution which ethnic groups can make to the cultural enrichment of the Province of Saskatchewan." There are many who wish this committee could have finished its work and report.

May I on behalf of our group, Mr. Speaker, urge the Saskatchewan Government to support the Federal Government's proposal enshrining a Charter of Human Rights in our Constitution. Saskatchewan people, I am sure, will have had some justifiable pride at frequent references made during the Conference on the Constitution to the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights. That was a document which became law as far back as 1947. This Charter of Human

Rights is something which I think we ought to strive for with considerable determination and enthusiasm. A Charter of Human Rights is surely a basic core of Canadian standards which have been achieved by Canadian people. A nation, Mr. Speaker, is after all much more than a geographic blob on a map surrounded by some lines. A nation is a people who have achieved for all some very real certainties. It is a people who have agreed to seek other desirable standards which will be available for all. Among the most important and distinctive of certainties which we have achieved is that of some basic human rights available for all Canadian people. And having done so we should display them and assure them as part of our nation's Constitution. They are, after all, a part of the Canadian symbol. We should proclaim them, as other countries do, to Canadians and all the world. These are things that we have built and these are things we will maintain.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Finally, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Constitution and its changes, may I remark briefly on the need for a better distribution of powers as between Canada and the Provinces. This, and I know the Government is aware of it, needs examination and needs some rearrangement. We need a common Canadian definition for equal opportunity. This definition should have comparable meaning to those who live on the rock-bound coast of Newfoundland, to those who live in the metropolitan centres of Toronto and Montreal, or to those who live on the wind-swept Canadian Prairies. But to make this real and realizable, the Canadian Government must have the legal and physical power to act and make the definition meaningful. There is, and this was voiced frequently at the Conference, I know, a great and unfortunate disparity between regions of Canada. This disparity won't disappear just by happenstance, by the free flow of economic power about which the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) spoke this afternoon. This free flow of economic power along artificial channels, determined by the marketplace, will increase the disparity rather than reduce it. There are many ways in which only the Federal Government can act for Canadians.

There are a number of changes in powers which Saskatchewan people have long felt necessary. We are interested, for example, in marketing legislation and its ineffectiveness to date. There is a great grey area and a very cumbersome procedure about making marketing legislation work. We are interested in a national transportation policy. We have some national rules with respect to railways but today more and more of our goods move on highways and move by pipelines. We are interested in improving or in preventing more fraudulent transactions of securities. The standard of service for Saskatchewan Indians has been stated as one which, if it is going to be made good, awaits a transfer of authority from Federal to Provincial Governments. Housing needs, when we particularly consider the mobility of people in Canada, are no longer as much a local or a Provincial responsibility as previously considered. Certainly in the field of higher education about which the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) spoke today, in the field of higher education and research there is an all-Canadian job here. This is a job which transcends Provincial boundaries. This is a job which is too big for many individual Provinces. We have got to find arrangements for Canadian investment on a Canadian basis for some of our post-graduate education and our expanding research. The whole matter of the use and the protection of water is one which has become of

**Monday, February 19, 1968**

increasing importance to the people of Canada. I think we are conscious here in Saskatchewan that this can't be done by one Province and we are going to have some kind of regional organization. The best theory of water use and prevention is that we should look at the whole stream. We can't regard provincial boundaries as fully and as adequately as we have done. These are some of the changes with respect to power which we hope the Government will be advancing and have success in its negotiations with the Federal Government and the Government of Canada. I would have gone on, Mr. Speaker, under some circumstances and added one more. That is in regard to changes respecting the reform of the Senate, if I thought it was possible to reform an institution of that kind, but I shall spare the House remarks of that type on this occasion.

Finally, I want to emphasize again the need for public discussion and understanding. Let more of us know what the Constitution means. Let more of us have a chance to find out what the changes are going to mean in terms in the everyday lives of the Canadian people. Some of this public discussion is a job of government. Some of it is the job of political parties. Certainly adult education groups and extension agencies can well be urged to devote more time and energy to seeing that people know what is going on in regard to the Constitution. Certainly the College of Law at the university can make a real contribution and certainly those people in television and radio and newspapers can be asked and helped to see that more people know more about matters of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to have a considerable amount more to say about the Speech from the Throne and what wasn't in it, tomorrow. May I ask at this time the right to adjourn the Debate?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:42 o'clock p.m.