

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
3rd Day

Monday, February 8, 1965

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

On the Orders of the Day:

CORRECTION IN VOTES & PROCEEDINGS

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Acting Leader of the Opposition) (Kelsey) — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call your attention to an error in the Votes and Proceedings of Friday. Under the lists of committees — in the reports of the committees — under the Committee on Agriculture the last name is WOOD. It should be WOOFF.

CORRECTION — REPORT IN THE LEADER POST — Feb. 6, 1965

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — One other thing I would like to say is also regarding a correction of a report in the Leader Post of February 6, the final edition, p. 5, c. 2. This is what they are talking about in 1941 when Mr. Patterson introduced the motion on wheat. They said the debate ended at that time automatically without the question being put and without the vote being taken. Now, that was not correct. Three votes were taken that day in connection with Premier Patterson's motion. Two of them were recorded votes and the final one was to pass the motion unanimously. After that, the house was adjourned and this, of course, is a vote too. You will find that in the Journals of Saskatchewan for February 28th, 1941.

The other thing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is also in connection with certain editions of the Leader Post. On Page 9, February 5th issue, the last edition, there is a very fine picture of you, Sir, and of our Sergeant-At-Arms. The Leader Post has placed a small advertisement right below your picture and it protrudes up into the rectangle occupied by the picture. The advertisement has the caption "Chest Congestion: and is advertising an ointment. Now, this, in my opinion, is very close, if not an insult, to you, Sir, and to this house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO VISITORS

Hon. Douglas T. McFarlane (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw your attention to two gentlemen in the speaker's gallery, the Messrs. Langley, who are the sons of a former member of this legislature and a former minister in the Liberal government of this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Mr. Allan R. Guy (Athabaska): Moved:

That a humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:
TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE ROBERT LEITH HANBIDGE

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: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would also like to offer my congratulations to the rink mentioned by the hon. member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer). I also hope that this spring they will also represent the province and when they go further, they will not only be successful in representing our province but will also win the Dominion Title. Being a curler myself, I am very pleased to see these young people today, who are representing our province, with such success. In fact, in the last few years the province of Saskatchewan has been noted both for their junior curlers and their senior curlers, both in male and female categories. We would hope that this year on the occasion of our Diamond Jubilee, that these curlers will continue to have the success that they have in the past. With the Dominion Briar in Saskatoon this year we would, I think, perhaps more than ever hope that our senior men's provincial champions, who will be selected in the next few days, will go up to Saskatoon and have overwhelming success. It would certainly be a very worthwhile effort on their behalf if they could bring the title to our province in our Diamond Jubilee. This would also be true for our ladies, our mixed curlers and our high school curlers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I rise with pride to move the Address-In-Reply to the speech from the throne, I wish to thank those responsible for this honor bestowed on the constituency of Athabaska, and on northern Saskatchewan generally. It is further evidence of the faith which our new government has in the northern part of our province. I humbly pray that 7 will be equal to the task. It is especially gratifying to have been given this honor, since this is the first Throne Speech of our new Liberal government, and it is one of which they can be justly proud. There is more hope, Mr. Speaker, promised for the people of Saskatchewan in this first speech than there was in the twenty preceding ones of the socialist administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — For the first time in twenty years, we have a speech that breathes action and progress. The verbiage, the platitudes, and the self-praise of the socialists' speeches have been replaced by a concise, clear, and direct outline of what the liberal government is prepared to do for the people of this province during the next 12 months.

This is not a speech that confuses. It was not written with that intent, as the previous socialist speeches were, but rather, this is one that enlightens our citizens to the fact that the change that they want, and the change that they voted for last April 22nd, is well under way.

I believe that the most remarkable facet of this speech is that

it has the welfare of all Saskatchewan people in its sights. In going back through past socialist Throne Speeches, one cannot help but notice they were aimed at dividing our people, instead of uniting them. The socialist philosophy of divide and conquer, pitted farmer against worker, the co-operator against the private owner, the professional against the non-professional man, and the individual against the government.

The principles of Marxism, with their class struggles and hope of eventual revolution and dictatorship permeated the thinking party opposite for 20 years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This was not surprising when one considers the backgrounds of the individuals and organizations that support and comprise the CCF-NDP movement, both past and present. It was only the continued determination and watchfulness of the Liberal opposition and similar organizations throughout the province that kept us free, and protected us from losing the democratic rights that we on this side of the house cherish. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this first Throne Speech of the new government is a clarion call for all the citizens of this province to put aside past prejudices and unite under the Liberal philosophy of freedom and equality for all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to refer to my own constituency of Athabaska for a few minutes this afternoon.

The constituency of Athabaska has waited for this honour a long time, as never before has a member from this constituency had the privilege of Moving the Address-In-Reply. The main reason for this, of course, is that during the past 20 years, only once did the people of my constituency succumb to the smooth talking promises of the socialists and return a CCF member to the legislature to represent them. In 1956, after 12 years of socialist wooing, they decided by a slim majority, to give the socialist candidate a chance to represent them in the hope some attention could be focused on their problems. But it was an action they regretted immediately, as matters became worse, instead of better. So, in 1960, with full knowledge that the next four years would see a socialist government again in power, they soundly repudiated the socialist party and once again returned a Liberal member to represent them. It was my privilege to be that member,

Last April, it was again my honour and privilege to be elected to represent the constituency of Athabaska, this time in a new Liberal government. I am truly thankful for their faith and support and will do my utmost to represent them to the best of my ability. The constituency of Athabaska is a great constituency, and one that any member would be proud to represent. It is great in size, stretching from the Alberta to the Manitoba border, from the 55th latitude to the Northwest Territories.

It is great in people — perhaps not in numbers — but in quality, and I am proud to say it is the only constituency in the province with a majority of people of Indian ancestry. It is great in history as its rivers and lakes were the pathways for early explorers and the sites of trading posts, it is great in resources potential, timber, mineral, fur, fish, tourist and human. The only aspect in which it's not great is the development of this potential over the past 20 years, It is my firm belief that the future, under a Liberal government, will see my constituency make a contribution that will be great and worthwhile to the economy, growth and development of our fair province. All I ask is that our government give the people and their resources a fair chance to contribute to our province's progress and become an equal partner with the south, rather than a poor relation to be exploited as was the policy of the past government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment to the high office of Speaker. No one will deny that your mastery of the English language and your knowledge of parliamentary procedure amply qualify you for this important position. It is also a . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — . . . pleasure to congratulate our two charming lady members, one on each side of the house, for winning election to this legislature. They have the important duty of keeping the men on their best behavior. I am pleased that our fair lady, the member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant), has been given the additional duty of Seconding the Address-In-Reply, and I am sure the city she represents will be proud of the way she carries out this important task.

To our Premier, a special tribute, on behalf of all the supporters of the Liberal party, to the man who was responsible for our victory last April — without whose devotion, fervor, dedication, and unending hard work, our victory would never have been won. His example was the spur the Liberal party needed for its candidates, workers and supporters to scale the supreme heights in support of the leader they had chosen to lead them to ultimate victory.

At the first Liberal cabinet in 20 years, congratulations on your appointment. The wisdom and foresight of our Premier is reflected in your selection. You have a tremendous responsibility in cleaning up the mess that was bequeathed to you by the preceding administration, and resurrecting a new free Saskatchewan out of the ruins of a socialist state.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — To the member for Arm River (Air Pederson) and still leader of the Conservative Party — congratulations. You are the first member of your party to be represented in the legislature for 31 years and whether or not you are a Tory remains to be seen. Past elections and by-elections have shown that Liberals are Liberals — Socialists are Socialists — but Tories are whatever seems to them to be politically expedient at any given time. They will vote socialist to defeat a Liberal and Social Credit to defeat a Socialist, and if there is nothing better, they will vote Conservative — even though their candidate will lose his deposit.

The Conservative Party in Saskatchewan (and in Ottawa as well) is the only Party with no principles, no programme and no purpose. It is even doubtful as to whether they have a leader. It will be interesting to see in the next few weeks how many times the so-called free enterprise Tory votes with the anti-free enterprise Socialists. I think we saw an example of that last Friday. But, welcome to our legislature — your victory as the only Tory MLA should assure your continued leadership of your party — and subsequently, our role as the government of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — To all other members, congratulations on your election or re-election in your respective constituency — and may you find your term of office interesting and gratifying.

I would certainly be remiss if I did not acknowledge the belated presence of the member from Hanley and the former Attorney General who won the by-election in Hanley.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — As indicated by the applause opposite, it is quite obvious that in the next six weeks or so we will hear nothing but of the success they had in Hanley. It was an ill-fated day for the people of Hanley, and I must admit the result of the by-election was a disappointment to us. It was a disappointment, not because we lost a seat in the legislature, but because we lost a man. Saskatchewan lost a man. We lost a man of honor, a man of integrity, a man of ability, and although Herb Pinder may have had a short stay in the government of Saskatchewan, he will go down in history in this province as initiating the greatest industrial development program that we have ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, Herb Pinder was a minister such as this province has been privileged to have the service of, on only too few occasions in the last 20 years. It was with deep regret that we saw the voters of Hanley constituency see fit to repudiate a man who could have done so much for a man who will do so little — for a man whose actions in the past have been criticized most severely, for a man who unwillingly got caught up in the election monstrosity he had created while Attorney General to the point where he was forced to admit he was unduly elected due to irregularities under the act and by officials he had been responsible for; and finally, by a man who defied and ignored the regulations of Saskatchewan Government Telephones and when caught, attempted to hide behind a woman's skirts, by intimating that his secretary was not qualified for her position, and when this was not accepted by the public, he further stretched his imagination by blaming the Mafia.

With the admission by the former Attorney General that he was unduly elected, the Liberal government had two alternatives. They could continue the practice of the former government of calling an election when it appeared politically expedient to do so, or they could call the election with the best interests of the Hanley constituency in mind.

Mr. Speaker, thank God, the Liberal government can face the people of Hanley and the people of this province because they chose the honorable alternative and put the interests of the people ahead of political gain. It would have been so easy for us to follow the same pattern of our predecessors and leave Hanley without a member for eight months, as the Socialists did in the constituency of Prince Albert. But we did the honorable thing, and it is on the record books of this province, that we called the fastest election after a seat became vacant, that has ever been called in the history of this province. We knew we were going into the campaign at a disadvantage. There are always actions that a new government must take when first assuming office that are not always understood by the electorate. We were still campaigning on promises since we were unable to call a session, due to the malingering of the former government, after their defeat, to put into effect some of our tax reductions and other programmes, beneficial to the people.

However, we and our candidate make no excuses for taking the honorable road and for fighting an honest campaign in spite of pressures from areas of his constituency to do otherwise. The people of Hanley spoke. We are prepared to accept their decision and we know that Herb Pinder will still continue to contribute a great deal to our province and its people in the years that lie ahead.

The year 1964 was an important one for the people of Saskatchewan, as it marked the final end of the Socialist government which had plagued them for 20 years. For four years the Socialist machine had been crumbling as they lost by-election after by-election and, except to the Socialists high up in their ivory tower, it was becoming obvious that the end was near. When the Socialists finally wake up it was too late. In spite of desperate moves to save themselves, they found they had produced too little, too late, and their empire had bankrupted itself. Still

hoping to scrape through, they made a mockery of last year's session with their haste and confusion; and then they broke precedent by calling an April election.

This was done for two reasons. First, they knew an early election when roads were at their worst would disenfranchise many farmers whose support they knew they had lost — and secondly, it would disenfranchise many of the trappers and fishermen in the northern seats, whose support they have never had.

The issues of the campaign became evident, Was Saskatchewan going to have four more years of stagnation under the Socialists? Or were we to break forth and take our rightful place as a province in the Dominion of Canada under free enterprise? Were we to support the Liberal Party with its positive program or the CCF-NDP Party campaigning on past failures?

The most important issue of the campaign, oddly enough, was raised by the former Premier of the province, T.C. Douglas, when he said:

the sole issue of the campaign was a question of leadership.

Never were truer words said.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — During the years that Tommy Douglas was Premier, Socialism was barely palatable under the thin veneer of his ready wit and humor. By making people laugh, they forgot for a while their problems and troubles brought on by a socialist state. But when his successor took over, his dull, unimaginative, stubborn approach to government, soon weighed heavy on the souls and minds of the people of Saskatchewan. They no longer laughed and they became increasingly resentful at the arrogance of a man who found it beneath his dignity to listen to 10,000 citizens gathered on the front steps of the legislative building, during the medicare crisis. Rather, he found it more practical to hide under his desk until the crowd had dispersed.

By April, 1964, they had had enough. A new image was gaining their interest. Admiration was growing for the man who brought a fresh honest approach to government — the man who had moved victorious through four legislative sessions, the man who had engineered four consecutive by-election victories for the Liberal Party, and the man who promised with their help, to lift the oppression of socialism off their backs.

Or, April 22nd, the question of leadership was resolved once and for all as the people of Saskatchewan said with their ballots "Let us move forward under the fearless, dynamic personality of W. Ross Thatcher as Premier." He has proved himself in Opposition. His stature will continue to grow as Premier. In fact, few weeks had gone by before the rest of Canada began acclaiming the progressive, businesslike approach to government of Saskatchewan's new Premier. The Financial Post reported:

Equally significant for Saskatchewan's future, is the drive of Premier Ross Thatcher to remake the image of Saskatchewan and present it as the place where government administration is friendly and hospitable to business.

The Windsor Star said, after our Premier had been East:

What Mr. Thatcher says, makes sense, and he should have the support of Canadians, wherever they may live for his forthright talk.

The Edmonton Journal, after Mr. Pederson had criticized our Premier in a speech to the Edmonton Young Conservatives:

Mr. Pederson may be surprised to hear that

there are those abroad in Canada, who view Mr. Thatcher's approach to government as long neglected, but basically sound — sound to the point of being essential to the health of a society striving for ordered freedom.

It was worth noting that the last statement in the same paragraph said that:

If Mr. Pederson's charges were serious political analysis or measured and sober criticism, they were painfully, even pathetically inadequate.

Similar to the utterances of a man who promised, during the election campaign, to build a railway across Manitoba and who later advocated the union of the three prairie provinces and no doubt similar to the many more ridiculous utterances we will hear from the Deputy Socialist Leader during the next few weeks.

In the October issue of Western Business and Industry, the editor writes:

Their task (Mr. Thatcher and Cabinet) is enormous — to bring Saskatchewan per capita into line with other western provinces, not handicapped since the war by a new deal that was no bargain. Can they do it? With some trump resource cards and the experience of proven business success at his disposal, many people think Ross Thatcher can turn the trick.

All these commendations were aptly summed up by Patrick Nicholson, a strong Conservative, when he said about our Premier, after hearing him address the Canadian Club in Toronto. He said:

I am sure I heard the first public utterance of a voice of reason which is needed in our public life today.

April 22nd, 1964 — Election Day — saw the people head for the polls in record numbers. What would their verdict be? That night we knew. They had elected 33 Liberals; 25 NDP and one lone Conservative, giving the Liberal Party a majority of seven.

April 23rd dawned fresh and clear. Freedom was once again in the air. The sighs of the oppressed were heard no more, but only the groans of those who had grown fat from Socialist favor. These groans were even heard from south of the border, where a former Provincial Treasurer, although long gone from the Saskatchewan scene — felt a cold shiver run down his spine.

The citizens of Saskatchewan could now lift their heads with the knowledge that opportunity had come again — that an individual had inherent worth, that initiative, profit and private enterprise were no longer forbidden terms, but were representative of a free way of life, where an honest days work brings an honest days pay as well as the personal satisfaction of what has been accomplished.

However, as the day wore on, a story began to unfold. A story unheard of in the annals of Canadian history. The defeated government, refused to resign. They pleaded that a seven seat majority, in a 59 member house, was not decisive enough. Somewhat different to the Conservatives in Britain who turned the government over the next day when they had lost only four seats in a 600 member house. Mr. Speaker, this denial of the process of democracy as practiced by the former premier and his government, will go down in history as the most unwarranted, uncalled for piece of chicanery ever witnessed in the democratic world.

There are only three reasons why they acted in this way. First of all, their pompous arrogance refused to admit the possibility of defeat. They were unprepared. Records of twenty years of socialist action must be destroyed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I know you would never let me infer, let alone use outright, the word 'corrupt' in this legislature. In deference to you, Sir, I shall not use that word. However, whatever the motives may have been, the next month saw members of the government, from the ministers to the office boys, destroying the evidence that would have proved to the people of this province what they suspect to be true.

The second reason for hanging on to the government was to give the ministers the opportunity to give as many contracts as possible to their friends before they were put out of office.

The third reason was to give them time to organize a spy and espionage system among their supporters in the government to disrupt and sabotage the Liberal take over.

What effect did this delay have on the province? First of all it meant that the many programs which were continued during the month that the Socialists kept office were programs the public had voted against; and on which public money was being spent when the Socialists had no moral right to spend it. Secondly, appointments were made and people were hired by a cabinet that no longer represented the people. This in itself was a blatant disregard for the principles of democracy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Thirdly, our cabinet ministers were delayed in taking over their departments to the point where it became impossible to call a fall session of the legislature to give the people the tax relief they had been looking forward to and to start implementation of our election program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — However, this is in the past, Mr. Speaker, although the unheard of indecision and delay of the former premier and his colleagues will never be forgotten, let alone forgiven, by the people of this province. History will record that one month to the day after being defeated at the polls, the ex-premier, Woodrow S. Lloyd, worried, harassed, and unable to put off the day of reckoning any longer, succumbed to the pressure of public opinion and wended his weary way to the office of the Lieutenant Governor and asked to have the remnants of his government removed from office. Hours later, a new Liberal government was sworn in to lead Saskatchewan out of the Socialist wilderness.

Since that day when the new Liberal government took over the administration of our province, they have taken determined steps to provide the stimulus and atmosphere to start our economic recovery, to halt the exodus of our people from the province, to eliminate the waste and inefficiency so prevalent in the former government and to provide the businesslike leadership we had promised during the election campaign.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the defeated socialists took just as determined steps to prevent us from carrying out our program. Their attitude has been pitiful to behold. They have forgotten completely the role of an opposition party. Their frustration, chagrin, and depressed mental attitude resulting from their election defeat have blinded them completely to their responsibilities as an opposition party. They have ignored completely the fine example set by the Liberal party in opposition. It was their constructive criticism which made the voters say, "They have been so effective an opposition, let us give them a chance in government."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Never did a government accept defeat with less grace and dignity than the socialists. They were no better than a spoiled child who had lost his candy. Of course, in many cases this was true. They had lost their soft way of life. They have been impatient, impotent, illogical and completely oblivious to the fact, which today has escaped them, that as a government they were a dismal failure and the people of the province put them out of office because they wanted a new approach to government.

This cancerous attitude has shown itself in two main areas. The lines became quickly drawn after the election when the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour held their annual convention at Moose Jaw. After showing a rudeness to the new Minister of Labour, which was ignorant and disgraceful, they passed a resolution whereby they would do everything possible to bring about the defeat of the new government. Certainly, this was a strange resolution from a supposedly responsible group representing the welfare of all their members, community, and province. Since that time they have attacked the government loudly, irresponsibly, and with little attention to the truth. Their actions are living proof that the N.D.P. is completely dominated by labor unions which have been running the party since their merger with the C.C.F. several years ago.

We would like to assure the people of Saskatchewan that the liberal government has no intention of being coerced by a power hungry group of labor leaders and politicians out to feather their own nests. The government is going to run the province, not the labor unions. In spite of the attitude of their rabble-rousing leaders, the individual member will receive fair and just treatment from the new government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I was interested in a statement made by the federation program director, Mr. Davies, who today is sitting on your left, Mr. Speaker. He told the Saskatoon Labour Council, a few weeks ago, that there are problems of communication between the leadership and rank and file members. For once, the hon. member made a true statement. But what he didn't tell the Saskatoon Council was that this problem of communication was deliberate on the part of the labor leaders. They had no desire or willingness to receive direction from the rank and file for fear they would lose their prestige and power. I would respectfully suggest to the rank and file of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, that at the present time, under the present leaders, with their attitude to our government, your organization will do very little to help you. In fact, they had their nerve, shortly after this attitude was displayed, to present a brief to the government asking for favors that even their socialist friends had continually turned down.

If you are concerned with the welfare of the province, as well as your own welfare, you can help us immeasurably by cleaning your own house. Now that you are free from the political reprisals of the N.D.P., oust your irresponsible leaders, replace them with men dedicated to the welfare of the individual rather than the power and glory of any one political party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Unions have learned in the past and they will learn in the future that their greatest progress came when they held the respect of all political parties. If you will take these steps, the leaders and politicians who have exploited you for so long, will disappear. Respect and faith in your movement will return and you will enter into a new period of achievement of your aims.

The second area of government harassment by the opposition has been in the public service. By means of half truths and deliberate misrepresentation, they have tried to spread fear and dissension throughout the public service and crown corporations. However, most people are more realistic in their approach to the role of the civil service in our system of government. They recognize, for instance, that the top positions in government must be filled with men and women whose loyalty to the party in power is beyond question. Obviously, when there is a change in government these people find themselves in the unfortunate position of implementing programs and policies based on a philosophy in which they do not believe. They have two choices, to change their philosophy or leave that position. The first is not always easy to do if they are dedicated to their philosophy, so they choose to leave their position. Men who do this are to be commended for their loyalty to their beliefs and when they leave they retain their respect of everyone concerned.

In 1944 when the CCF took over the government, we saw many examples of this. Men who believed in free enterprise had no faith in socialist programs, so they left quietly with no regrets, no hard feelings, but a strong belief in their convictions. These men did service to themselves and to their province.

In 1964 when the liberals returned to office, it was expected that the same would be true and in some cases it was. A few men in top positions resigned, quietly left, sincere in their belief that they could not carry out our policies, and secure in the knowledge that they were true to their principles and to the party which had hired them. But was that party true to them? It was not. Mr. Lloyd and his followers sacrificed the privacy of a man's own mind and brought unnecessary embarrassment to them and their families for political gain by accusations that the men had been fired by the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This is the reward that you can expect for your dedication to the Socialist cause. Then, of course, there is a small group who are political hirelings of the Socialists, and because of no qualifications for their job, must be removed. But for political reasons they attempt to draw much publicity to themselves in the hope of discrediting the government. The result being, Mr. Speaker, they only succeed in discrediting themselves. In fact, however, the number of dismissals has been small. The Liberal government has been most fair in giving all employees the opportunity to adjust to a new philosophy and administration. But a government, to be effective, must have loyal and faithful workers, and to date we are thankful and proud that the vast majority of our public employees have seen fit to give us this loyalty.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Their faith in our good intentions was shown by the fact that new contracts with the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association were completed in two days, a record for the province and far ahead of the weeks and months taken by the former administration.

Further destructive actions of the opposition have consisted of letters to the newspapers, statements by members and former cabinet ministers after each new announcement by the new government. These statements all magnify the fact that the former government is barren of thought, resistant to progress, and slaves to a philosophy that was outdated before it was born.

In spite of this continued obstruction by the NDP, Mr. Speaker, the province of Saskatchewan has seen a boom in the last six months never before witnessed in its history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Already our aims of providing a government based on the principle of private enterprise and sound business is reaching fulfillment. Already our objective of industrial and resource development is gaining momentum and our promise of major reduction will be achieved in our first budget a few weeks hence.

One cannot help but be amused by the antics of our friends opposite. For twenty years they failed to reduce taxes, failed to develop mines, failed to produce jobs for our people. Now, all of a sudden, they want us to do in twenty days what they couldn't do in twenty years. According to them, what we do today, we should have done yesterday, and what we will do tomorrow we should have done today. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that equivocation in government breeds haste in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind our friends to your left and the people of Saskatchewan, that our election platform was a four year program and that we intend to fulfill our promises steadily over the next four years. Unlike the former government we haven't made any promises which we cannot fulfill. Ours were promises based on the potential and financial strength of our economy rather than on the ability to buy votes. Thus, as the steady growth of our economy continues at an ever increasing rate, we will not only keep our promises but we will go much further in providing the relief from taxation and the increased services we all desire.

Good business government can only be achieved in an atmosphere free from waste and inefficiency. Thus the attention of the new government is focused first of all on this area of administration. It was a fertile field to begin cultivating, for if the former government excelled

in anything it was in being inefficient and in the accumulation of waste. Their programs and expenditures had no relation to the benefits to be derived by the economy as a whole, but were geared solely to the political implications they might have. Within six months of taking office, a few well aimed clips of the provincial scissors, and more than \$12,000,000 of the taxpayers money had been saved. By the time the final trimming has been done many more savings will have been achieved.

As mentioned in the throne speech, these savings will be returned to the citizens of the province in the form of tax reductions. During their twenty years in office, the Socialists had achieved the unenviable record in Saskatchewan of making this province the highest taxed province in Canada. The Saskatchewan Utopia of the Socialists was available only to those who were willing to pay five per cent more in sales tax, six per cent more income tax, and higher corporation taxes and royalties.

They worked on the assumption that the higher the taxes the more dependent an individual became on the government and thus less likely to vote against it. Their policy was to raise taxes for everybody for the benefit of a few, mostly socialists, while the liberal policy is to reduce taxes for everybody for the benefit of all.

We still cling to the belief that people can spend their own money more efficiently than the government can. Mr. Speaker, the greatest success story to date for the new liberal government has been in the field of economic development. I have not time today to outline all the developments that have occurred but it will suffice to say that never in the history of our province has so much interest been shown in the potential that we have to offer. This is due entirely to the private enterprise approach of the Liberal government. For twenty years those interested in our resources were frustrated by the restrictive policies and regulations of the socialist philosophy. Companies were not prepared to risk their capital and then have the government expropriate their properties and investment. Nor were they prepared to compete with the monopoly of government owned industry. So they waited patiently for the day that they knew would eventually come when the red light of socialism would go out and the green light of private enterprise would flash on. Our new ministers were hardly settled in their desks before being besieged by individuals and companies stampeding to be first into the new economic paradise of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — For the first time in twenty years the welcome mat was out and an atmosphere of trust and faith prevailed. Meetings with the various industries were held, regulations were overhauled, incentive programs were introduced, encouragement was given. The reaction and results have been encouraging beyond all expectations. Revenues have risen. 1964 oil and gas production reached an all time high. Exploration activity increased substantially. Five major potash and one base metal mine are coming into production and five times as many new companies were registered in the province at the beginning of 1965 than there were in 1964.

In the northern part of our province the new look is even more evident. Excitement is high, interest is at a fever pitch, and the future is bright. A major impetus to northern development came with the breaking of the timber board monopoly of our timber resources and the announcement by Anglo Rouyn that they were developing the first base metal mine in Saskatchewan on their property north of LaRonge, in my constituency, this was the same company which in 1957 was forced to halt operations after the CCF refused to assist them in providing transportation facilities and the minister of Mineral Resources intimidated them with the fact that the government might take them over should they see fit to do so.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I would like to refer briefly to an important promise that the Liberal government made during the election campaign which we are in the process of keeping. During the campaign we were the only political party to have a definite program aimed at improving the economic and social status of our people of Indian ancestry. For twenty years the CCF had used the Indian people as pawns in their political gains. They created distrust between the Indians and the federal government. They used the Indian reserves as laboratories for anthropologists and sociologists. They tried to turn treaty Indians against the Métis, and they promised assistance which never materialized. This is at an end. The Liberal government is prepared to do all in its power to

assist our Indian brothers to take their rightful place in the life of our province. Already a start has been made. Within four months of taking office, we honored our promise to hold a conference between our government and the people of Indian ancestry. Despite attempts by employees of the former government to sabotage the conference, it proved to be a success. This was followed by a federal-provincial conference where Saskatchewan made a presentation which will have far reaching effects on the future of our Indian people.

The next step in our program, as outlined in the Throne Speech, is the establishment of a branch of government whose sole aim will be to assist Indians in solving their economic and social problems.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on, comparing the progress of our new Liberal government with the stagnation of the former administration, but time does not permit. However, the content of His Honour's speech from the throne and the comparisons I have made, will show that our new government is a government of action. We have a program to implement and we intend to implement it. It is true that in the next four years this province will see many changes. That is what the people voted for last April. That is what they want. That is what they are going to get. There will be changes aimed at restoring the rich heritage of our province — changes that will provide a high standard of living to those with the initiative and desire to carve out their own destiny, changes that will allow those less fortunate than ourselves to live in dignity, and changes that will make Saskatchewan an equal partner with the rest of Canada.

As we celebrate our diamond anniversary the province of Saskatchewan stands on the threshold of a great future. Much greater than when we celebrated our golden anniversary ten years ago. Following the war, Saskatchewan was caught up in the boom of a post war economy, but unfortunately, under the Socialists, the boom soon became a bust. By 1955, when the economy had begun to level off, we had fallen far behind and our future was anything but bright as the dark clouds of a recession appeared on the horizon.

During the next few years we suffered more than any other province in Canada, due to our lack of economic development and our ever increasing rate of taxation under the Socialists. But, today, Mr. Speaker, in 1965, on our Diamond Jubilee, we can face the future with dignity and with faith, confident that our province will be able to contribute her share to the Canadian economy as we march toward our Centennial year. Let all Saskatchewan people rejoice and participate wholeheartedly in the activities of our Jubilee celebration, secure in the knowledge that our future is in the hands of a new Liberal government which is dedicated to the objective of making Saskatchewan a better place for you and me to live in.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mrs. S. Merchant):

That a humble Address be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, as follows:

TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE ROBERT LEITH HANBIDGE

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.

Mrs. S. Merchant: (Saskatoon City) — Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion and as I do I would like very much to join with the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) in his congratulations to the Cabinet, to new members within the house, and in his congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to this office. I would like to express, Mr. Speaker, my own confidence

in your ability to conduct the proceedings of this house in a just and fair manner. May I also congratulate the mover, the hon. member for Athabasca for so very ably expressing the sentiments of very many of the people in this house and of a great proportion of the population of the province of Saskatchewan.

There are very many things that as a member for a northern constituency are very close to his heart and we can understand the sympathy and understanding with which he would approach the proposition of an Indian Affairs Department with the provincial government.

There will be very many measures, Mr. Speaker, introduced for consideration that are bound to find particular favour with members from one part of the province or another. But there is no legislation or no act of government that influences one part of our province or any segment of our population without at the same time influencing, for weal or for woe, the entire population of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as a member newly elected to this house, may I express the hope for myself that I shall never lose sight of the fact that my first concern here is for the welfare of the people who constitute the whole province. On the other hand, I hope that I may be forgiven if I am just a little jealous of those things that most directly affect my own city of Saskatoon.

I feel that it is a tribute to Saskatoon, that as its representative here, I should second this motion today. On my own part, I feel it a very great honor to represent Saskatoon here and Mr. Speaker, I should add that it is a great deal of satisfaction that I represent it on this side of the house.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — As a member for Saskatoon, I am representative of people of varying political persuasions — of widely differing economic backgrounds and economic aspirations — and I am representative of interests as widely divergent within that one city as you would find across the entire province. I hope that I can serve all those interests well — but all of Saskatoon has one interest in common. We hold common cause for the development of our city in whatever way that may be, whether it be educationally, economically, culturally, whether it is in its recreational facilities — in whatever ways will make a better life for the citizens of Saskatoon. Saskatoon also recognizes that its future is inexorably bound to the future of the province. If Saskatchewan prospers, so do we, and at the moment we, in the city of Saskatoon, bid fair to be in fact the potash capital of the world, with all that that will mean to the city of Saskatoon and more important, to its people. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to thank the people of Saskatoon for the opportunity that they have given me to sit in this house, to serve the province and to speak in their behalf.

I would also like to express my gratitude today to the premier for the honor that he paid Saskatoon in choosing me for this task today. Mr. Speaker, may I express something of my own personal esteem for the leader of my party. It has been a party long devoted to the interest of the individual within the society, and the premier is a man dedicated to that principle which is a fundamental of responsible government. The highest tribute that I can pay is to say that I see in the premier a man who feels a deep and sincere responsibility to the people not for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — This is a kind of dedication that preserves the hard won freedom that can find its self in peril under other philosophies. This is a man, Mr. Speaker, whom I am proud to own as a leader and as a Liberal, delighted to call him Mr. Premier.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, the program of legislation that we have heard outlined, is one designed as a fulfillment of our commitment to the elector as well as a program to set the province again on the class of development. In this year, our jubilee, it is time, I think, to reflect on how far we have come in those 60 years. It is a time to pay tribute to

those men and women who came from every part of the globe to make here the kind of lives that were denied them in the land of their origin.

I think it is time to pay tribute to the men and women who guided the province during those 60 years and in fairness I include in that tribute some of those members who sit opposite. I am not one of those people who feel that the last 20 years have been entirely unproductive, but I am one of those people who regret very much that they have not been as productive as they could and should have been. As we mark the jubilee, I think I may be forgiven, Mr. Speaker, if I point to the fact that of the first 40 very crucial years, 35 were years under Liberal guidance and so it is a great source of satisfaction to be a part of a government that will restore to Saskatchewan, the reputation that it once held around the world as a land of opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Much of what this government offered for the development of the province is accomplished by the very fact of the change. Long before there was many opportunities for a session and an actual legislation, we began to see the results of that change. It has been our contention that it is not the function of government to legislate industrial development and in fact the legislation that produced so many ill-famed and long deformed government industries, proved beyond a doubt that industry cannot be legislated. We have held that it is the function of government to create an atmosphere to foster development, a climate in which industry can flourish and from which benefits will flow. These are the job opportunities that we were talking about that Saskatchewan lacked and in Saskatoon in particular, we begin to know already the benefits that can flow from industrial development. We look forward to a payroll in Saskatoon of 1500 in one potash mine alone, the new Cominco development at Delisle. No one in this province can fail to know what has happened since the change of government. I do not intend to recount here the kind and manner of industry that have located here or the amounts of investments that have been made in this province since April. I would point out that the investment is being made in a potential that had lain for 20 years behind what has come to be known across the country as a straw curtain and the change of government has swept aside that straw curtain, the results are common knowledge. The development that is taking place is inextricably bound with the commitments that this government made with regard to tax reduction. We are, in this session, making a start on the tax relief which we are so sorely in need of and we are able to do so and will be able to continue because of increasing revenues from economic development. There were dire predictions that tax reductions could only result from a decrease in services. There were those who felt that these allegations that came from the members opposite were nothing but pre-election political propaganda. Well I never thought that they were, I think that it was their sincere belief. I think that the Socialists see government as a vast employer of as many people as possible, as a great agency for the collection of taxes and at the same time a huge dispensary of every kind of services from the cradle to the grave. They seem to regard government as the source and end of existence, and so according to their lights, I think that they sincerely believe that tax reductions must mean decreased services. They didn't seem to see the common sense, Mr. Speaker, in letting someone else share the cost of services that must not only be continued, but must increase and this is precisely and simply what is happening. We are able to broaden the base for revenue so that the cost of services to the people of the province will no longer continue to come entirely out of peoples own pockets and so we will welcome the news of tax reduction the more, knowing for sure that it is not resulted of decreased services, but that it is coupled with increased services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — We are this year proposing more money for the university than any government in the history of the province. There will be increased grants for capital costs to ensure adequate buildings and facilities, but there will be increases for operating costs as well which will be reflected in part by the educational standards that our university is able to maintain. We will be proposing also increased spending on highways. There are parts of this province which are virtually unserved by highway communication and others where highway services is totally inadequate in terms of needs.

Practically every department of government is involved in

plans for increased services in spite of tax reductions. The Department of Welfare is building a new women's jail which is something that has been asked for, and asked for, and asked for, in this province. The department is now doing it, and they will be replacing inadequate facilities at Dale's House for the care of children who come under their protection.

The Department of Health is involved in increased facilities all over the province. It is true, I think, Mr. Speaker, in every department that there will be increases in services with the single exception, Mr. Speaker, of the Department of Information.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words at this time about the matter of services. Over the last 20 years, there has been an increasing tendency to persuade the people that government service is a personal thing. There has been an over-emphasis in talking about government service on matters of health and of welfare. There almost appears to have been a deliberate attempt to create a personal feeling of dependence on government. I suppose that again this may arise from a philosophy of the function of government, but whatever its source, I feel that it produces a most unhealthy relationship between government and people.

To illustrate, Mr. Speaker, it has been announced in the public press by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) that the opposition will have three main concerns in this house and I have forgotten the phrase, but they all had to do with health. There has been already much talk of health in this province, and I must give credit where credit is due, to the members opposite who first talked about a comprehensive medical care program but I think I must also give credit where it is surely due, to the doctors of this province who at the Saskatoon agreement, took the idea and put it into acceptable and workable form and in fact, gave us the medical care plan under which we now operate. I think we must also give credit to the present Minister of Health, (Mr. Steuart) who, since taking office, has spent many long hours in a way that was not open to the former government because of their attitude, and has been able to take a good deal of the rancor and the bitterness out of the medical care situation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — There has been so much talk about health, that if we continue, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a population of hypochondriacs on our hands. We have a good medical care plan that will need and will get expansion in due course, but in the meantime in the name of heaven, let us get on to talking about something else.

There has been a good deal of talk about health, but there has been entirely too much talk about fear of ill health. One is inclined to think that the fear that the opposition talks about is fear of quite another kind. I am reminded of the fear of some over-protective mothers, because in telling a child to hold tightly to her hand for fear it will fall, the real fear is not for the child, but that the child will discover that it can walk alone. She needs of course to stand by if he stumbles, but she cannot in conscience actually encourage the utter dependence of the child upon her, just to satisfy her own need to be needed.

I cannot help feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are tired of being told what to fear. We are ready, I think to stand on our own two feet and to turn on the lights and find that there is no boogy man after all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Health, after all, is one of many services for which the government accepts responsibility, and the program that the government proposes, indicates a very careful balance of the total public welfare. It is not designed in the interest of anyone economic or occupational group to the detriment of another. It is not designed to serve only particular parts of the province, it is not designed to serve the political purposes of the government, and above all, Mr. Speaker, it is not designed as a carbon copy of government program elsewhere. Saskatchewan has had enough, we think, of following patterns from Sweden or New Zealand or where ever else. We are Saskatchewan people, and this is Saskatchewan. Our problems are uniquely our own, and the government has set about coping with these problems in our own way. We have to approach them in a way that will serve the purpose of the people who live here and who

have built this province, who have invested their lives in Saskatchewan, and who would like very much to see their children and their grandchildren able to continue to live here and enjoy the fruit of their labors.

In this very connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the proposals of the government to give special attention to the youth of the province, who are our greatest asset and who until now, sadly enough, have been one of our greatest exports.

Youth, of course, within the population, profits from a general well being in the province, but because they are a special group within our society, they are a group with special needs that must be met. To paraphrase Mark Twain, Mr. Speaker, "youth is something that everybody talks about and nobody does anything about". We as the government intend to do something about them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — It just isn't good enough to divide life into two parts. The early part for which the educational institutions are responsible and then to thrust youth willingly by whatever means, whether by accident or by design into adult life. It just doesn't happen that way. A life is never that black and white. Youth in the course of their development is subject to many influences and they are in need of many more influences that never contact them. Education will of course always remain the most important influence on young people, but I would hope that any agency of government set up to serve youth would be designed to serve it simply because it is young and at a special stage off their development, and I would hope that out of such an agency, would come a greater liaison between and control over all those forces to which the young are subject because they are young. It should infringe in no way on education but it should extend, in a formal way, the areas of interrelationship between youth as it is educated and youth as it lives in a community and enters adult life. It should be an acknowledgement that government has a responsibility that goes beyond education. Not in ways, Mr. Speaker, that prolong adolescence, but in ways that assist the transition to adulthood. Something that I hope will receive particular attention is the problem that youth faces in entering the labor force. There have been extended opportunities for technical education and advances in trades training courses, but in spite of this, the fact remains that too many of our young people are entering the labor force without a skill of any kind and this at a time when the demand for unskilled labor is decreasing alarmingly. It seems to me that a department of youth should devote itself to this problem above all. In a way that is concerned for the problems that youth faces, rather than the problem as it concerns labor in its general sense. Here is an area that calls, I know, for a great deal of co-operation between education and labor. More perhaps than exists anywhere on this continent. The additional technical institutes that are to be built in the province will be perhaps a first opportunity to be sure that they are planned, not perhaps in a way that they were planned two or three years ago when the original technical institutes went up, because we live in an age where times change so quickly that two or three years makes planning out-moded. This is an area that should get attention from a department of youth and immediately.

There are other fields in which the department of youth must be concerned, and I would like to at least touch on that area that unfortunately strikes very many young people, because not all young people are fortunate enough to grow up without running afoul of the law. When a young man does, he finds himself dealing with a variety of agencies, and each of them is equipped to deal with him because he is an offender, but none of them is equipped to deal specifically with and for him because he is young. No one denies that the problem of delinquency is increasing and any department of youth that will serve its purpose, must be concerned with the causes and the prevention as well as with the rehabilitation of the young offender. These are not small problems, Mr. Speaker, but if a department of youth will serve the purpose that it is designed to serve, it must be prepared to tackle the big ones. I envisage the department of youth as a source of assistance and co-ordination for community groups who already conduct programs for young people. Public spirited citizens all across this province are working and sometimes against great odds to provide recreational facilities.

There is help of course from government branches but it is not always in the way that permits the local control that is necessary along with the financial assistance that is required, and any department of

youth that will do its job, must be prepared to co-operate with community groups in the ways that best suit local needs, not in the ways that suit departmental patterns. An area that surely must have a good deal of attention, is amateur sports, because we have had so many service clubs and local organizations or individuals who are willing to undertake this under their direction. We have had, I think, reasonably adequate attention to teen sports, though always, I think, under hardship, because funds and facilities are always inadequate and it is often due to the doggedness and determination of groups across the province that sports exist at all. But the state in this province of individual sports for young people in which they can participate is pathetic. There is, Mr. Speaker, no shortage of people who would willingly give their time as coaches in, for instance, track and field sports, in tennis, in swimming, in skiing, in anyone of the sports that make up so much of international competition and all of these, Mr. Speaker, are sports in which people can participate who are not in the normal sense athletic.

There are people ready to work with young people, but we simply have no facilities for these sports, and it is important that these young people have an opportunity to engage in sports in which they can participate. Not everyone can play the competitive team sports but everyone can enjoy individual sports according to their physical capacity.

Then there is another problem in Saskatchewan. There are those top athletes in these sports who are enticed out of the province by university scholarships, and very often by the level of competition that they can find in other places and which they must have, in order to improve. There are potential medalists who have left Saskatchewan simply because we did not give them the opportunity that we should have done for athletics. Almost worse than all of these, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that opportunities for participation in sports should not only be by way of the university. Unfortunately, this is largely true, and the university people themselves are conscious of it. They do not want it this way. Youth in any occupation must have a means of training and of competition in sports of all kinds, and if a department of youth is to serve athletics and I believe that it must, then it must promote sports for young people in every walk of life. The young man who is a brick layer or a mechanic needs the same opportunity exactly as a budding engineer or a physicist. There must be initiation of a whole new approach to this problem. We live at a time when hours of work are shorter, when actual jobs are increasingly less difficult physically. I feel that we have an obligation to lead the way in making sports available to all young people. I can see a department of youth making this possible through government co-operation with communities or by making it possible for the schools and universities to co-operate with local bodies. In whatever ways it may be accomplished, it must be done, because we in Saskatchewan are very far behind.

There are many fields in which department of youth must take action, not the least of these is in the arts. Music, whether for groups or individuals, painting, sculpture, theatre arts, all of these have been initiated and supported by community groups and individuals with a minimum of government assistance. It is a welcome thought that there are proposals for increased grants to cultural activities and to the arts in general, because there has been serious limitation for the lack of funds. I hope that there will be particular emphasis on the performing arts as a responsibility of the department of youth and that some of these increased funds will be earmarked for investment in our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I may have dwelt at too great length on what are essentially my own aspirations for the new department of youth. It is in fact not yet formed, and we have no way of knowing what form it may take. I have referred to it as a department and yet I have no way of knowing where it will fall within the administrative structure. What I do know, is that attention to youth is long over due and it is my pleasure to be associated with the government that at long last accepts the responsibility for initiating some action in this area.

As I speak, I didn't expect to have any interruption from my own side of the house. As I speak of departments, I would like briefly to comment on changes that we will be asked to make in one of the existing departments of government. There will be a motion to change the name of the Department of Industry and Information to the Department of Industry. This, Mr. Speaker, goes much deeper than a name, because it strikes to the heart of the difference between this government and the last. No one who lived in this province needs to be reminded that there was more emphasis on information than on industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Sometimes looking back one wondered if the information releases were not on a rotating file, because I think of the regularity with which that one about the pulp mill kept coming out.

We were never quite sure, though we will be from now on, whether the information side of the department actually ever was taken into the confidence of the industry side of the department. An information office is a necessity, of course. There is a place for one. Interested people must be apprised of government programs, and there must be an information service to carry on departmental services. An information office is necessary for publicity outside and inside the province, regarding facilities for industry and tourism. I think we will see an expansion of this in an effort to bring more tourists to the province of Saskatchewan. However, there is no place for an information service devoted to selling the political philosophy of a government to the people it governs. Both parties will now have to do that job out of party funds, we as well as the CCF.

We are putting the emphasis on industry in that department and with the kind of development that this has already produced, Saskatchewan people won't have to be told how happy we are, we will know it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — I am sure that the people of the province will approve, not the change of name, but the change of function that it indicates. Mr. Speaker, as the legislation we have heard outlined in the Speech from the Throne unfolds, we will find basic in all, I think, a respect for the principle of local control. There has been an alarming tendency toward centralization of powers in all governments of recent years, but it has been more marked in Saskatchewan than elsewhere. And it has been cause for real concern that provincial government becomes stronger and stronger at the expense of municipal governments, of local boards and ultimately of the individual man and woman. There are many changes in the legislation that will come before us that are designed specifically for this end, but I think perhaps the proposal regarding the sale of crown land is one of the best examples of government withdrawing what can become a very heavy hand in every part of rural Saskatchewan. We are dedicated to a belief in a minimum of government intervention, and the sale of the million acres of land presently leased by people in every corner of this province, is a vital step in this direction. This kind of government tentacle that reaches into the personal existence and livelihood of farmers across the province cannot avoid becoming a political football, and we intend to end once and for all, the temptations to influence that crown lands have presented. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the crown lands are not the property of the government of the day. They are the property of the people of this province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — . . . and we intend to honor the right of ownership in the most equitable way that can be devised, we have as a party in opposition pressed for the sale of crown land, in government we intend to accomplish it.

There will be another measure introduced into this house, that I feel particularly exemplifies the principle of local control that has been so much in jeopardy and that is a measure regarding retail store hours. It is a denial of individual and of local rights for us in this house to legislate over matters that are of local concern and that are different in every locality. With this legislation, we will be returning to the proper authorities, the municipal government, the right to control their own hours of store closing, and their decisions in this matter will not all be alike. The city of Saskatoon may have very different regulations than the city of Prince Albert or Regina, but these cities have asked for the right to make different regulations and we believe that it is their right to do so, in the light of local circumstances. Within each city, and I know this is true in my own city of Saskatoon, there will be people who will have very different views, and all of them for very good reasons, and they, I know, will be making these views known to their city councils. Some of them, I know, will regret that the blanket coverage

of the present legislation is withdrawn, but all of them I am sure will recognize that we cannot pick and choose those areas in which we will ask to be over-governed and those areas in which we want to govern ourselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — We serve the interests of local self-government in giving these cities control over their own affairs.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that during the life of this government, there could be an element of local control over Geriatric centres. The whole circumstance in which the provincial Geriatric centre exists is, I know, an extremely complicated one, but their existence alongside the non-profit nursing home creates inequities between the person who is a patient in one or the other. It is not always the patient whose need is greatest, who is in the provincially operated and relatively free provincial Geriatric centres. But whether or not the change in the administrative structure regarding such centres would solve that problem would be a question that I hope might get some attention. It is true that local control of some kind would increase interest and concern for conditions generally within these centres. In its own concern for the standard of care in nursing homes, the government will be introducing a bill designed to control these standards.

We are all of us very conscious of the scarcity of homes for the care of the elderly and the chronically ill. The very scarcity places those who are in need of such care at the mercy in some cases of substandard conditions. Steps should have been taken long ago to protect the elderly and the chronically ill who are in this circumstance and this is a measure that I am sure will find support from all sides of the house. In view of the scarcity of facilities, encouragement in the building and operation of nursing homes is also long overdue. I mean real encouragement. It is not enough that government should merely assist when asked. This is an area of responsibility where government must take the initiative. We need an active program of encouragement for local or religious groups who with government help can supply a crying need in nursing homes in this province. More provincial geriatric centres for terminal care are not the answer. They could not begin to catch up on the backlog, much less supply the needs for the future. We intend as the government to see that there is adequate provision for care, particularly of the elderly in a way that will guard the highest standards and also in a way that will preserve local control and in a way particularly, that will not penalize patients who are not in the provincial centres.

Mr. Speaker, there are many pressing questions with which this house will be asked to deal, ranging all the way from matters of wide public policies to matters that concern more limited groups. I am glad to see attention given to the injustice that has existed regarding the pensions of teachers long retired. To these men and women Saskatchewan owes a great deal because they remained in their classrooms through the depressed years when salaries were low and not always certain. They retired at the rate of pension that now 10 and 20 years later is impossible to live on.

The present-day teachers have seen this injustice and through their federation have assessed themselves a portion of their own salary to try to alleviate the injustice. It is in fact not the present day teachers responsibility. It is a government responsibility because it is a debt that the people of Saskatchewan owe to these devoted teachers of another day. I am very proud to be associated with a government that will accept that responsibility, we intend to correct and improve the situation of these retired teachers by bringing their pensions up to a living standard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, there are many things about which I would like to speak, but as a member for Saskatoon, I have particular interest in the changes in The Election Act. It is a strange thing that people don't really pay very much attention to legislation if it does not seem at the time to affect them directly. This is the case with The Election Act in which we in Saskatoon found ourselves enmeshed, perhaps a little more than would happen in any other constituency because for some unexplained reason we were designated a five member seat. It is possible that the act may work in smaller constituencies although the number of constit-

uencies that are still in doubt would lead one to believe that the act as it stands now wouldn't even work effectively in a rotten borough. But the fact is that the act has not been reviewed thoroughly for many, many years and meantime there have been added complicating factors like absentee votes, like advanced polling, over which there is very little check. It has become a most complicated act and an act that out of its own provisions would, in a city like Saskatoon with a population over 100,000, have denied us the recourse to the provisions of the act. I don't think I need to go into intricacies that make the act an unworkable one, I think the fact is that there is very little defence for it on any grounds. As a matter of fact, the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is on public record as demanding a change in the act, but this only after he himself found himself entangled in its complexities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Strangely enough, as Attorney General, he was responsible for the present act, which only goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, in my mind that not only people at large pay too little attention to the legislation as it happens but that sometimes ministers themselves are not sufficiently interested until it affects them personally.

The people have been in some measure, responsible when things like this happen. Our democratic system gives us the means of checking and we are inclined to leave it to government to do, but when people abdicate their rights to hold the rein on governments, then it scents to me that it puts the onus on people in government to guard them more carefully.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — They have accepted responsibility of public affairs and with it the obligation to guard the public interest. The election, of all the processes in a democratic system, is probably the most valuable. We will be insuring safeguards for people's votes with the changes that we purpose in this Election Act.

In the speech from the throne, Mr. Speaker, we have also heard reference to the Johnson Commission. The Commission was asked to eliminate waste that can grow up if government and people are both alike, not very watchful. Obvious waste they have found and waste that will be watched very carefully as time goes on, but there are ways in which administration can grow complex that are much more subtle and much more dangerous than economic waste. Inevitably there must be boards and branches of government empowered to deal with given sets of circumstances but I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan has far outstripped any other government in this matter. In fact, I know that some of the members opposite have expressed concern but only since leaving office. They have echoed the concern of the opposition of years gone by at the amount and the scope of power that is delegated by government to boards of various kinds. They have expressed concern that these powers should properly be within the jurisdiction of the courts. I cannot help feeling that perhaps this might be an area needing inquiry by a body such as the Johnson Commission, or some other specifically appointed for the purpose. In matters directly related to departments of government, Mr. Speaker, we have watched a great super structure of bureaucracy grow, that I feel denies in many ways, the principle of responsibility under which people think that we live. There are endless branches and division and committees of government departments that might bear review by such a commission. Some of the existing branches of government have long since lost sight of their original purposes of existence and have moved over into other areas of service sometimes already served by other branches of government and as well as overlap in service. There is, in some cases, conflict of service and at the same time there are often whole programs of endeavour never undertaken. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there are branches of government that have never even had their function decided much less their area of endeavor delineated, yet they exist and they add much more to the bureaucracy of the government than they ever could hope to do to the service of the people who pay the bill. We are committed on this side of the house and as a party to the ideal of a minimum of government intervention and I think we have a real responsibility to examine very carefully just how big government needs to be and whether in fact being big, makes it necessarily better and it must be better, Mr. Speaker.

This house might give some consideration to a very real danger

that I feel exists and of which I think the people of Saskatchewan are very, very, conscious. If we must look in this province to the establishment of the office of an Ombudsman for the protection of the peoples' rights, then surely we should be looking to controlling the growth of a bureaucracy that creates the necessity for an Ombudsman.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I find myself back at the point which I began, which I hope will not suggest to any gentleman here that women are guilty of circular thinking, but we are all of us here representatives of the people of this province and our deliberations here must be directed, not by party politics, not by the welfare of one group or another in society, not by one area over another on a partisan basis, but towards the general welfare of the province itself which is our whole responsibility.

As we celebrate our jubilee, would it not be a good idea to adopt the attitudes of the people who settled this province. Of late years, it seems to me that we have lost our courage, we have lived in the shadow of a world depression that was compounded by a drought on the prairies, and ever since we have been looking fearfully over our shoulders and in fear of what has been. We have not looked ahead and made haste towards what might have been. If the people who flocked to this province had been terrorized by the lives that they left behind them, they would never under the sun have seen the wonderful opportunities that this country offered. Without their courage and confidence, we would not now be here, and Mr. Speaker, we stand again on the same kind of threshold that they did not fear to cross those 60 or more years ago. I cannot think that their kind of people no longer live in this province. I cannot think that we will turn aside in fear from this second chance. If we continue to live in fear of a depression that happened 35 years ago and that we survived, and that we left behind, we cannot have confidence, and confidence is going to be the main ingredient now as it was then in the development of the province. We are charged with guiding this province in new directions and we have heard here in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, a program of legislation designed to that end, and I think I need hardly add that I take great pleasure in seconding and supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) (Acting Leader of the Opposition) — It is my pleasure to take part in this debate at this time, and I regret very much indeed that my leader, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Biggar, (Mr. Lloyd) is not here to take his part at this time instead of me, and I certainly hope and I think all members of the house will agree with me, that we wish for him a very speedy recovery and return to this legislature . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — . . . where he has had a great deal of experience and certainly has made a great contribution.

I want to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the high office of Speaker, and I want to say in my opinion this office is extremely important in this legislature. If we are going to have a good legislature, and any member sitting on any side of the house can say this, it is extremely important that we have the office which you occupy, Sir, conducted well. That does not mean that you are responsible, Sir, for all of the behaviour of this legislature. You must also have co-operation from the members in the legislature and I hope you will get that. I do want to say that no one more sincerely has good wishes for your success, Sir, in doing an excellent job in your high office as Speaker of this legislature. I wish you well.

I want to congratulate all members of the legislature who have been elected, and to remind us that it is not a light thing to be elected a representative of the people of this legislature. It is something that we should take very seriously, very honestly, and certainly with a good deal of humility.

I want especially to congratulate the new members that we have in this legislature, quite a number of new members, many of whom I have

not become acquainted with yet. I would like to say to them, that the work of being a member of the legislature is sometimes onerous. Sometimes you will think it is a nuisance. Sometimes maybe, you will wish it would go away and leave you, but always I think you will find it interesting because you are dealing with people, either here in the legislature or in your constituency and throughout the province. People still are the main concern and the main interest of all of us, I don't know of course how long the new members or for that matter any of us will last in the legislature. That is another question but certainly while we are here, I hope that all of us will do our best to serve well the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to offer some very special congratulations to the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). I want to comment later on some of the remarks made by the member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) in regard to Hanley. These battles in the political arena take a lot of work, sometimes quite a bit of courage. They are not easy and the member for Hanley, (Mr. Walker) has come through this battle victorious. I'm very glad he is here and I'm sure he is too.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — He will do an excellent job as a member of the opposition as he did an excellent job as the Attorney General of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — If I might be pardoned for a personal remark, I would like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am enjoying a bit of a thrill and a bit of pride in the fact that I do have my son here in this legislature as a member with me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — It was published in the local paper that this was the first time it had happened, and I just want to correct that. This isn't the first time it has happened in the province of Saskatchewan. The first time was in 1944, when the member for Melfort, Mr. Valleau, the first Minister of Social Welfare, and his son Delmar, representative of the Armed Forces, were elected. So we did have a father and son combination on a previous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, this is our Diamond Jubilee year and we can, I think, make this a wonderful year. The Diamond Jubilee banquet held on January 30th and the province day on January 31st, I think was a wonderfully good idea and certainly a great many people in the province of Saskatchewan took part in these activities and it gave the year a good kickoff. It was a wonderful thing that His Excellency The Governor General came and spoke to us on that occasion and I think that his words were certainly words of wisdom, and that we can pay a great deal of attention in our behavior if we are interested and I am sure we are all interested in maintaining Canada as a country. It was good to have greetings from the Prime Minister of Canada and nearly all provincial Premiers, but we did not have a word at the banquet from the Premier of Saskatchewan. He was away some place. Where was he? I heard he was down visiting his Goldwaterish friends across the border. I think that probably as he has a little more experience in this job that he has undertaken, he will realize that probably he has enough to keep him busy at home without trying to run the affairs of the United States of America or to help Mr. Goldwater.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — That's just a small point. Now I come to the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), and the hon. member is an educated man . . . Oh yes, he is, he has a certificate to teach school anyway. Now maybe that isn't educated, I don't know, but I always thought it was. I once had a certificate that enabled me to teach school.

Mr. Guy: — They were hard . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Yes, they were hard up in those days, that's right and the member has had four years experience in this house but I'm sorry

to say to the new members, don't fall into the habits he has. If you look up citation 149 in Dr. Beauchesne's edition, you will find that it is not permitted to refer to a member by name, but when the hon. member (Hr. Guy) was saying some very unkind things about my seatmate, the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Lloyd) who is not in his seat, he didn't even have the grace or the propriety to recognize him as the Leader of the Opposition, but called him by name. This wasn't a slip of the tongue or an accident either, because he was reading a written speech, and it says in the book too it is prohibited to read from a written previously prepared speech, and, Mr. Speaker, I am justified in having very serious doubts as to who wrote that speech. I don't know whether he wrote it or not.

Mr. Guy: — I did.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Then, Mr. Speaker, he should be ashamed of it, I didn't think I would get him to confess here. Now, Mr. Speaker, when he was speaking about the Hanley by-election, he spoke about how prompt they were in calling this by-election. Well of course you know, they had nothing to lose, they had lost the election on the recount. They were out, the man was gone, and if they wanted to fill this gap in the legislature or in the government, why shouldn't they call a quick election? In fact it was told to me that the Premier said, "we wouldn't have called this election unless we were sure we could win it." So the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) wants to make a virtue out of a necessity. Let me tell you something that happened before, because the Liberal party in Saskatchewan has never been hurried about calling by-elections unless they thought it was in their interest. Back in 1943, on February 18th, the member for Redberry died. The session of the legislature opened on February 23rd and four days later Redberry had no representative. In the session of 1943, Redberry had no representative. It had no representative in the session of 1944. For two sessions the people of Redberry didn't have a chance to elect a member. We had a legislature for six years when we had the Liberals in power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — If there is any group of people, any political party that shouldn't brag about their democratic practices, it is the Liberal party. The member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy) seemed to take a great deal of pleasure in lecturing the Leader of the Conservative party, the member for Arm River, (Mr. Pederson). As far as I am concerned that's up to him if he wants to do that, that's fine with me. I want to compliment the member for Arm River, (Mr. Pederson) and the Conservative party on their success in electing a member. They've worked and tried hard for a long time and I want to point out to my hon. friends opposite, that the Conservative party has had some tough luck. They have had the tough luck to get elected when the Liberal governments in both Saskatchewan and Canada had brought this province and this country right into a depression and dumped them there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Alright, alright, that was tough going, what a difference is the situation we have today, taking over this province when it's booming. Now the Conservatives also have had some other tough luck, and my hon. friend over here on the left won't agree with me on this, but I think they've had tough luck in leadership and I agree with my French Canadian friends that they had better get a new leader. I don't think this chap is much good for them. But he isn't alone, the Conservative party isn't alone in that. The Liberal party in Canada could do very well with a new leader too. A leader who could keep his people on the straight and narrow and behaving themselves a little bit.

I wonder how many people sitting opposite looked at "This Hour has Seven Days" last night. You missed it if you didn't see it — about all the 'Guys and Guys'. It was a wonderful show. Of course, the Liberal party in Saskatchewan has never been too fortunate in its leaders either. They had quite a few changes. They had the one that was defeated in 1944, and another one and another one, and this one. I don't know how long he will last. By anyway, he may be around for a little while. Now, I just

want to make one other comment or two, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), concerning the Anglo-Rouyn mine. The fact of the matter is not that this mine had to shut down or cease operations. They came in here when we had a CCF government, They got the property and put down a shaft. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in exploration. This didn't look like they were afraid of investing. They were hoping to find an ore body that would make a mine. They found a small ore body — about 2,500,000 tons of low grade copper — the price was too low. It didn't make an economic proposition so they left it, and under the regulations provided by the government of Saskatchewan, they were able to hold that land.

They came to us a couple of years ago - to us, the government — and they said, "The price of copper has gone up. It looks like we'll be able to mine that copper at LaRonge". They said, "One thing is the question of transportation to a smelter because there isn't enough of it there to warrant building a smelter." We said, "Well, when you make up your mind that it is economic and you want to get the transportation problem taken care of, come back to us and we'll be right there, because there is nothing we would like better than to see a mine at LaRonge."

When the Member for Athabaska (Mr. Guy), suggests that they were threatened with expropriation, he is telling something that I think he knows isn't true.

Mr. Guy: — You threatened . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — They were never threatened. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that my friends over here bring the Hon. Robert Winters here to Saskatchewan again and let him...

Mr. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) — Read . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Let him appear before this Legislature. Let us question him to find out what is the truth.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, we . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — This mine was going ahead not because of a change of government but because of a change of economics, because of the increased price of copper. Now, I'm glad to see it mined but, remember it isn't a big one.

Mr. Thatcher: — Four hundred . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — We've had far bigger. We've had, in the past, far bigger mines than this in northern Saskatchewan - base metal mines. Our part of the mine at Flin Flon was ten times as big as this one — more than ten times as big. That mine at Flin Flon has been in operation for over thirty years and 80 per cent of that mine is in Saskatchewan. These people, Mr. Speaker, still say, "Saskatchewan's first base metal mine". Either they want to misrepresent the facts or else they just don't know any better.

My special compliments to the lady Member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) on her maiden speech in the Legislature. Once upon a time I presumed to tell a lady that I admired her for her intellect and I nearly got slapped. In seconding the motion, she did a good job, as good as anybody could do, with the material she had to work on, but she certainly did have some funny statements. She said, "A Liberal government would restore to Saskatchewan the reputation it had around the world". What reputation did it have? The reputation for being the poorest place in Canada — the worst roads in Canada — no highways. People travelling across Canada said, "When you get to Manitoba go south into the States and miss Saskatchewan. Don't take a chance on the roads". She talked about the Cominco Development at Delisle. The Cominco people took the land up while there was a CCF government — the potash land. All of these potash companies had to go ahead with their potash development and even this government couldn't have stopped them.

When the lady said that we have so much talk about health that if we continue it we'll have a nation of hypochondriacs on our hands — I don't think anybody that would say that, ever was in the position that

many thousands of people of Saskatchewan have been in, where the getting of health services was a matter of life and death. Most people in Saskatchewan know the facts about this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I've said enough for this afternoon and I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE — CONCURRENCE IN REPORT

Hon. J.W. Gardiner: (Melville) — moved:

That the Report of the Select Special Committee appointed to prepare lists of the Members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this Assembly, be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make the motion that this assembly concur in the composition of our Select Standing Committees, I would like to first say a few words with regard to Committee work and also with regard to the Select Special Committee that was appointed to undertake the job of selection of Committees for this House.

I would like to say, as one of the Members who has spent some years in the house, that committee work, I believe, is one of the most interesting and rewarding parts of the work of a Member of this legislature. I think quite often the public is probably led astray by the fact that they hear very little in our daily broadcasts from the Legislature and some people get the idea that that is the major part of the work of Members in this house. Whereas, I think any of us that have spent time in the Legislature realize that the important part of our work, much of it, takes place in committees of this house. Within the last year a few of the Members have had the opportunity of sitting in the committee which considered the activities of one of the committees of the house and I think in so doing felt and realized that the committees should be constituted in such a way as to make them a more important part of the work of this Legislative Assembly. Members who were on that Committee will recall the suggestion that the particular committee we were considering should be cut in numbers. By so doing the work of that committee would, they felt, from the evidence that was given to them, become more effective.

When the members of the Select Committee met to discuss the formation of committees of the house at this time, I believe, some of the Members of the Committee felt that the larger committees of the house should be reduced in number in order to bring about more effective work of the larger committees of the Legislature. On top of this, we have the job of trying to work up a reasonable committee in every regard, including the question of numbers and representative of the various groups in the Legislature. I think it is very difficult for us to go back very far and try to get a true picture in figures as to how committees should be established because of the fact that membership of the house changes and has changed over the years to such a great extent. I think any of us realize that when there are only five members in the Opposition it's very hard, as there has been on two occasions in the history of the province, it would be very hard to work out a proper percentage of representation for committees. So you can go down through the history of the Legislative Assembly and you would find it very difficult to work out proper numbers or probably a proper history of the establishment of the committees in this Legislature.

I think probably the best example that we have and the one that should be used on this occasion, is the one which we have in the few years that we have immediately come through, and I believe that the majority of the members of the committee felt that using the yardstick probably in the last house, and particularly in the last year or two of the last Legislature, we would probably come up with a better picture of how the committees should be formed. So I think that the figures that have been arrived at of the special committees have been based largely on the experience of the last few years in this Legislature and I think probably, I could also add to that, a time when the numbers were perhaps somewhat in relation to what they are in the house at the present time — a little closer together than they have been at other times — and that is the period from 1948 to 1952. We find that the Legislature at that time decided that the government of the day should have a slightly higher ratio in

proportion to the Opposition than their numbers would indicate. So we find that in the sessions from 1948 to 1952 that the Government of the day did take a slightly increased percentage over the members that they have representing them on the government side of the house.

Then we come to the last session in 1964, when we find that the same circumstances existed with regard to the formulation of committees. We find that, by and large, and particularly in the larger committees of the house, that the government of the day took anywhere from two to four per cent higher than the percentage of membership in the Legislature. So in committee, the committee decided by majority vote that the committees should be organized pretty well on this basis, providing the government, with a slightly higher percentage of members on the committee than they actually enjoyed in the house. We find, for example, when we go through the committees, Agriculture, which is the first one I will take, in the last house had 13 members from the government side of the house, 7 from the Opposition. In the present house, it is suggested in the Resolution that is before you that the government have 14 members on the committee, the official Opposition nine members and the representative from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) be included on that committee as a tenth member. In other words, 14 government representatives and 10 representing the Opposition.

The other committees that are made up of 24 members which include Education, Law Amendments and Delegated Powers, Municipal Law, are all formed on the same basis of membership — 14 from the Government side of the House and 10 from the Opposition.

Then we get down to the Library Committee which in the last house had a membership of 10 from the Government and 5 from the Opposition we find that this time there will be 10 from the Government side of the house, 6 from the official Opposition and one being the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), making a proportion of 10 Government members to 7 for the Opposition.

Then we go to private bills where the total number which is recommended is 26, we find that there will be 15 representing the Government, ten the official Opposition, and once again, the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), — making a ratio of 15 Government Members to 11 Opposition Members.

On the Privileges and Elections Committee — there will be 22 members made up of 13 Government members, which will be the same as in the last Legislature, eight representing the official Opposition and one again, the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), making a total of 13 government members on the Committee, nine from the Opposition - whereas in the last Legislature there were 13 Government and seven representing the Opposition.

Then we come to our two major committees - the Committee of Public Accounts and Printing and the Committee on Crown Corporations where there was a majority wish of the Committee to have smaller committees in each case than has been followed in the past. In the last Legislature there were 24 Government members, 12 members representing the Opposition side of the house. The present recommendations state that there should be 18 representatives on the government side of the house, 12 of the official Opposition and one, the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), making a ratio of 18 to 13 instead of 24 to 12 as existed in the last Legislature.

Then we find on the Standing Orders Committee, the ratio is to be the same as in the last Legislature, six to the Government, the same as last time, three for the official Opposition, and one representing the member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson).

On the Radio Broadcasting of Selected Proceedings, a total of four Government Members, two for the Official Opposition and one again, represented by the Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson), making a total of four Government Members and three Opposition, compared to four for the Government and two for the Opposition in the last Legislature.

I believe that the Committee took very seriously their work in drawing up the committees for the consideration of this house. I believe that it has been done in a very fair manner, taking into account experiences of the past in the formulation of our committees. I think that most hon. members would agree that in relationship to the position of the government in the house, and I'm not here criticizing the action of any previous government in taking a larger percentage because I think this is

only fair, because I think all hon. members will admit that the Cabinet Ministers in any government may not find it possible at all times to attend meetings of the committees. Therefore, it would place the government at a disadvantage at any time with three or four members on the committee and maybe having to have those members absent from the committee on government business at the time the committee was meeting. This might be a circumstance which would be impossible for the government to overcome on particular dates and so I think it is only fair that the government, at any time, whether it was the last one or this one, should be given the consideration of a slightly higher proportion of membership on committees than is enjoyed by the Opposition.

So Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to move that the report of the Select Special Committee appointed to prepare lists of the members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this assembly be now concurred.

The question being put, Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet to speak to that question. I'm sorry that your eye didn't catch me. I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that I was.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm sorry that I didn't see the hon. member. I'll try and be a little more careful next time but I'm afraid the vote has been taken, and I have no alternative but to declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yea — 30

Thatcher	Howes	McFarlane
Boldt	Cameron	Steuart
Heald	Guy	Merchant (Mrs.)
Loken	MacDougall	Gardiner
Coderre	McIsaac	Trapp
Cuelenaere	MacDonald (Milestone)	Gallagher
Breker	Leith	Bjarnason
Romuld	Weatherald	MacLennan
Larochelle	Asbell	Hooker
Radloff	Coupland	Pedersen

Nay — 24

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Cooper (Mrs.)	Wood
Nollet	Walker	Blakeney
Davies	Thibault	Willis
Whelan	Nicholson	Kramer
Dewhurst	Michayluk	Smishek
Link	Baker	Wooff
Snyder	Broten	Larson
Robbins	Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)	Pepper

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Prince Albert) Moved: That this house do now adjourn.
Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yea — 29

Thatcher	MacDougall	Bjarnason
Howes	Gardiner	Romuld
McFarlane	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	McIsaac	MacLennan
Cameron	Trapp	Larochelle
Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	Hooker
Guy	Gallagher	Radloff

Merchant (Mrs.)
Loken
Heald

Breker
Leith
Cuelenaere

Coupland
Asbell

Nays — 25
Messieurs

Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Nollet
Davies
Whelan
Dewhurst
Link
Snyder
Robbins
Pedersen

Cooper (Mrs.)
Walker
Thibault
Nicholson
Michayluk
Baker
Brotan
Brockelbank (Saskatoon City)

Wood
Blakeney
Willis
Kramer
Smishek
Wooff
Larson
Pepper

The assembly adjourned at 5:03 o'clock.