

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

Tuesday, March 28, 1961.

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

On the Orders of the Day:

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call your attention to a group of Grade VIII students from Strathcona School, with their teacher, Miss Maxine Laidlaw, and I'm sure you will all like to welcome them here, and hope they have a pleasant and profitable visit to our Legislature.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Premier. Could he tell the House if there is much more legislation to be brought down at this Session, or are we getting near the end of it?

Premier Douglas: — I looked at the report this morning. I think with the exception of one Bill from the Department of Municipal Affairs, all of the other legislation is either before the Legislature, in the hands of the printers, or just finished by the law officers. I would think that insofar as the House is concerned, the House probably has at the moment all the legislation, except half a dozen smaller Bills.

Mr. Thatcher: — Might I direct one more question to the Premier? I've been asked by my associates to find out, if possible what the Government's plans are for the Easter recess.

Premier Douglas: — Yes. I asked the Whip to confer with the Whip for the Opposition, and I understand there's been a mutual

March 28, 1961

agreement, and if this is the consensus of opinion, I would be very glad to bring in a motion tomorrow. The suggestion was that we might adjourn at 5:30 on Thursday, reassemble at 2:30 on Monday, and then start, if everybody is agreeable, morning sittings on Tuesday. We could always waive this if we found the committee work wasn't finished, but I understand that the Law Amendments Committee is meeting tomorrow morning, and the Crown Corporations and Public Accounts are going to try to wind up on Thursday morning. If that transpires, then we'll be through with committee work, and we could start sitting mornings on Tuesday. If the committee work doesn't get cleaned up, then we could agree not to sit some evening, and let the committee wind up in the evening.

I thought also, if the Members were agreeable, I would put in the motion, and if it isn't agreeable, we can always strike it out after it gets before the House, that if we start the morning sittings on Tuesday, we'd sit through Wednesday night and Saturdays until we were finished, if that were agreeable.

Mr. Thatcher: — I may say, Mr. Premier, that that would certainly be agreeable with this group, as far as I know. Will we sitting this Wednesday night or were there no plans?

Premier Douglas: — No, there were no plans to sit tomorrow night.

Mr. Thatcher: — I see.

Premier Douglas: — The reason for that, I understand that the gentlemen opposite had some important visitors and I understood that they would probably have some function on tomorrow night.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, No. Not in Regina.

RE: SHOWING OF FILM

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to inform the hon. Members there will be a showing of a film in Room 267 at 6:30 this evening. This film was taken in connection with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association general conference in Australia in 1959.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Guy regarding Uranium City.

Hon J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):

The motion was moved on March 14th and I want to thank the Members of the Assembly for their tolerance in allowing me to delay debating it further until this time.

The hon. Member for Athabasca said that perhaps the Government is not fully aware of the desperate financial circumstances of Uranium City. Well, I would like to assure him and all Members of the Legislature that certainly the Government is aware of the situation that exists. We, on more than one occasion, had conferences with representatives of different groups from Uranium City. We have also a very decided monetary interest in the area, a very substantial investment. And, all through its history the Government has paid a good deal of attention to the development of and the welfare of this new mining community. Up to the present time there has been paid out in loans to the area, by way of purchase of debentures of the area and general expenses of Government, over \$3 3/4 million. There is also a continuing cost of giving the various Government services in that area, which will amount to an annual cost of someplace around \$350,000 dollars a year.

Now, I believe a return tabled in the Legislature contained information about the revenue from the area. Well of course the only new revenue, because of the development of the area, is the revenue from mineral resources, and up to the present time, the revenue to the province from royalties, rents and fees connected with mining has been about \$6 million. Now it is true that that is a greater amount than the total amount which the province has invested or spent in the area, but Members should not lose sight of the fact that resources of the province, wherever they may be found, are not and never have been considered to be the particular possession of that part of the province, but as a property belonging to all of the province, and of course it would be ridiculous to take any other stand. For example, I wouldn't like to encourage the hon. Member from Cumberland Constituency to argue that all of the revenue from the Flin Flon area should be spent in that

March 28, 1961

area or in his Constituency. That area has been a good area for bringing revenue to the province. Nor would I like to encourage the hon. Members from Cannington and Souris-Estevan to argue that all of the revenue that came from the oil in that corner of the province should be spent there, and I think they are the kind of fair-minded people who wouldn't argue for it either.

Mr. McCarthy: — We would like our share.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — The principle of resources being developed in the province is that those resources and the revenue from them belong to all of the province — it's a part of the general fund of the province, and the expenditures are made then on the basis of the best interests of the different parts of the province, looking at the whole picture. We cannot consider the question of revenue and expenditure on a localized basis.

The royalty expected to come from uranium mining in the coming fiscal year will likely be about one-half as much as received this year. Our estimates show \$800,000 expected in the coming year, so that the revenues to the Government from the area are going to decline. I don't think there is any way we can escape that.

The hon. Member stated — I hope I quote him correctly — “that the Ontario Government had cancelled or would cancel all of the debts of Elliott Lake.” I took the trouble to find out what was happening in Ontario in regard to Elliott Lake and I find that information is not correct. The fact is that for the last three years Ontario has given an interest-bearing loan to cover deficits in the operation of the municipality of Elliott Lake. In other words, the province has picked up the tab for a certain amount, has loaned the money to the municipality, and it is an interest-bearing loan. The proposal which Ontario has now is that for the 1961 deficit, they will loan the amount of the deficit, without interest, but to be repayable in 1965, 1966, and 1967. That, Mr. Speaker, is a great deal different from the idea of cancelling all of the debts of the municipality.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to state that I did not make the statement that they had or that they were going to, but rather, through a newspaper report, that it had been considered.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think this is a correction which could

be made at the end of the speech.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to quote the hon. Member wrongly but I certainly gathered from his words, and I believe I looked at the text too, and it looked to me as if he was at least inferring that Ontario was going to cancel the debts, because he went on in his speech to say,

“perhaps that would be too much to expect the province of Saskatchewan to do, but probably, Saskatchewan could cancel that part of the debt owing to the province, rather than take care of all of it.”

So, I think there was a suggestion there all right, but anyway, that is pretty well beside the point. But, I do want to emphasize that we are aware of the situation and are keeping in touch with it.

The motion is termed in rather pessimistic language and the situation there is somewhat pessimistic. I guess it is true that the economy has been sagging. The community has to some extent been shrinking. This is not an uncommon event for a mining community. Mines are developed. Some of the very good ones, very lucky ones, have quite a long term of life, but a great many of them, in the history of Canada, have had a relatively short term of life, but I think it would be interesting to look at the situation and ask why this community, so early in its life begins to have a sagging economy. I would point out that the Federal Government, when it made the agreements with the United States for the supplying of uranium to the United States, made those agreements on the basis of a five-year term — five years of firm sales of uranium in the United States. Everybody knows that you cannot build a secure and lasting community on the basis of a five-year term. A mining community cannot safely be established on the basis of a five-year life, and I think there is certainly some responsibility to be laid at the door of the Federal Government, for agreeing to those contracts on so short a term. Sure, there were options, but the options were no security and the options are not going to be picked up. That market will have shortly disappeared. And, this was all started because of a national emergency, because of a national need, and I think we should not forget that the nation should be willing to accept some of the responsibility for hardships and troubles encountered because of the putting into effect of a national policy.

March 28, 1961

Now it is true that the large mining companies, certainly, and I think most of the small ones who actually got into production have fared fairly well. The small ones were able to sell out their interests in contracts for the supplying of uranium and collect either all of the profit that they would have made had they continued to operate, or certainly a very substantial part of it, when they sold out. And I want to, a little later, give some information to show that these mining companies have done all right. The municipality and the Provincial Government, and the residents of the area are the people who have been left holding the bag, and the people who are coming out all right are the Federal Government and the mining companies. And, so I think that the hon. Member, when he framed this resolution might have kept some of the other people who have been engaged in the area, in mind.

Recently, we had news about another £24 million contract for supplying of uranium to Great Britain, to take effect in 1963 to 1966. In Ottawa, they've been having a bit of fun with this lately. This supposed contract came into effect when we had a Liberal Government in Ottawa, but nobody apparently knew about it, not even the Leader of the Opposition, until this broke loose a few days ago. But I'm afraid we can't get too excited about it, because on the news this morning, I heard the statement of the Prime Minister to the effect that there never was a contract, that there only was a letter of intent and that there had been some continued negotiations carried on towards modifying this letter of intent. I'm very sorry that this, but what appeared to be some promise, is not apparently going to turn out as well as we expected, but if there is a contract of £24 million, or any other sum for Canadian producers, I certainly hope that Uranium City will get its fair share of that production. And I would suggest to my hon. friends, if any of them have any influence with the hon. Lester Pearson — I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition has any influence with him or not — they suggest to him that he shouldn't put on too much pressure to hog all of it for Elliott Lake. That's in Mr. Pearson's Constituency. So, anything we do get, I do hope it is a fair share that comes to Saskatchewan producers.

Mr. McCarthy: — I thought you said we weren't going to get it.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — I don't know whether we're going to get it or not. This

is the slipshod kind of a way that the former Liberal Government was doing business and the Conservative Government continued to do business after that. That's why we don't know.

During recent years there has been some very good work done by the Mines Department at Ottawa, in research into other uses of uranium. Research of course is a long-term job, and it may not bring any solution of a problem for some years. There is one aspect of this research which holds at least a little bit of hope for some improvement, but again, I can't say and I doubt if anyone else can say just how quick that relief will come. This is in the use of uranium as an alloy with steel. It has the effect of making steel much more shock-resistant. It does not get tired. It doesn't get fatigue. It would be useful in moving parts of machinery, like axles; in steel parts which were subject to vibration, which under the natural course of events, become brittle and break off. But how soon that will come, I don't know. But certainly, every encouragement should be given to carry on further research.

The hon. Member mentioned that Gunnar Mining Limited had expressed desire to secede from the municipality. I have had discussions with Gunnar and it is true that they would like to secede from the municipality, and I suppose that Eldorado might also develop a desire to secede from the municipality.

Mr. Thatcher: — There's quite a difference though. Eldorado is joined up.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — No, Eldorado is not joined up — it's four or five miles away from Uranium City.

Mr. Thatcher: — There's a highway . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — But, they could put up the same argument. Now, consideration has been given and further consideration will be given to any proposals suggested by Gunnar, but if they are going to be seriously considered or accepted, they will have to be reasonable proposals and I certainly would not consent to any favours for a strong and successful company to let them out of responsibility at the expense of the people of Uranium City.

March 28, 1961

This company has been quite successful. Their balance sheet at December 31st, 1959 showed a total accumulated surplus of \$31½ million. Their net profit in 1969 was \$8,951,000, so that I don't think they have too much right to cry, in this case.

We have also made representations to the Federal Government. Last July, with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I was at Ottawa with representatives from Uranium City, and we made representations there on behalf of the home owners and businessmen of Uranium City — that the home owners who, because of the national policy, the national need, went in there on a short-term basis and were going to lose, should get some compensation from the nation, and we suggested something for the businessmen too. We suggested that the Federal Government should consider a substantial grant to reduce the capital debt of the municipality. The total capital debt of the municipality stands at about \$3,750,000, of which pretty near half is owed to the Provincial Government, and the rest is divided up among the mining companies and a few private holders. As a matter of fact I gave you the wrong figure, Mr. Speaker, which I'd like to correct. The capital debt, \$2,900,000, not \$3,750,000, and over half of that, \$1,500,000 is owing to the Government of Saskatchewan, the balance to mining companies and to private holders of debentures. And, we suggested that the grant to assist in the liquidation of that debt would be of value. We also made a suggestion at that time that if the Federal Government were willing to increase the ceiling on the roads to resources program, so that it would be possible within that ceiling to complete a road to Uranium City, the Government would be willing to commence construction at the Uranium City area. The Federal Government did not see fit to increase that program of roads to resources which would enable the road to be completed, and with the relatively small amount which is left available, it would be foolish to break it off on the extension of roads in the south, and start another short road in the far north.

Thus, we have not only been aware of the situation, we have been doing something about it too, and I think we will likely continue to do something about it.

But I have no objection to the motion itself, because as I stated, it sets out the things that we have been doing, and problems of the area will in the future get the most careful consideration, the most sympathetic treatment, and when special assistance is necessary, I feel sure that it will be given. But I do want to move an amendment to the

motion. I want to move that the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words: —

“and further, this Assembly recommends to the Federal Government that Eldorado Mining and Refining Limited be requested to undertake an active exploration program for minerals which could be processed in their plant near Uranium City.”

Now, I think this request in the amendment does make some good sense. This amendment is seconded by the hon. Mr. Lloyd.

Eldorado is a Crown Corporation. It is a very successful Crown Corporation. The Government of Canada has . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think it would be in order to put the amendment . . .

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — I just want to continue then debating it.

Mr. Speaker: — I have some thoughts as to whether nor not this amendment should be admissible. It's something along the line of an amendment we had here not too long ago respecting the provincial responsibilities, in regard to a motion which was directed to the Federal Government. We have here some other responsibilities of the Federal Government in regard to a motion which was directed primarily to the Provincial Government. I am wondering if I could have some expressions of opinion in regard to this.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Could I just say this, Mr. Speaker, that if in your wisdom you find this out of order as an amendment, I think you would be quite within your powers in separating it and putting it on the Order Paper as a substantive motion. It would stand by itself, but personally, I think the amendment is in order. May I carry on with the debate?

Mr. Speaker: — Are there further opinions in regard to this? I don't think it's quite in order that we should discuss an amendment that we finally rule out of order. Are there any further expressions of opinion in regard to this on the Opposition side, to the admissibility of the amendment only?

March 28, 1961

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure whether it's in order or whether it isn't in order. I don't think we'd take any exception to it, whichever way you rule it. I'd like to speak on it if it is in order.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before your Honour makes any final decision, I'd just like to submit one thought, and that is that the first phrase in the resolution sets out the purpose of the resolution, to my mind; it says: —

“That this Assembly, concerned with the present difficulties of the Municipal Corporation of Uranium City”,

That's the main purpose of the resolution — to set out the difficulties which confront the Municipal Corporation of Uranium City, and it then proceeds to suggest one of the things which might be done. It seems to me they could be added to indefinitely without breaking with the principle which was laid down in the motion itself, because the motion itself simply said that this Legislature is concerned about conditions in Uranium City, and then proceeds to suggest something which might be done about it, and I think it's in no way a conflict, nor does it in any way violate the basic purpose of the motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Although it is a rule that we cannot regard as an amendment, one which can stand on its own feet as a substantive motion, I think that the Premier has raised a very good point here. The subject of this motion is concerning the present difficulties of the Municipal Corporation of Uranium City and this amendment is definitely relevant to that subject. It is another aspect of how this can be helped out. I think it in order that we rule this motion in order, at this time, and the hon. Minister may continue.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just saying that Eldorado is quite a successful Crown Corporation. The investment of the Government of Canada in this Corporation at the end of December, 1958 was just over \$6½ million. Now it has not gone up much more than that to date. This Corporation has returned to the Federal Government, in income tax and profits a total of \$31.7 millions. — The profits in 1957: just over \$5 million; in 1958: \$4,649,000; and in 1959 the profits were \$4,134,000. Besides this \$31.7 million which has been turned over to the

Government in income tax or dividends, or profits, whatever you'd like to call them, the company has also made provision for depreciation of over \$30 millions, so that the company has been quite successful. Now, it is true that not all of that profit has been made through the operations in the Province of Saskatchewan. Some of it was made at Great Bear Lake, some of it was made the Port Hope Refinery in Ontario, but I would point out that this profit was not made out of the uranium which Eldorado purchased from other producers and sold. That operation was carried on without profit. Therefore it is correct to say that a very substantial part of this profit was made in the Province of Saskatchewan.

And I think it is a fair proposition, Mr. Speaker, that every profitable mining company owes some of its profits to exploration. That is, they should put back into exploration some of those profits, and to be fair they should have put it back into the same jurisdiction as where they made those profits.

Eldorado Mining and Refining was carrying on an exploration program in the Great Bear Lake area, because a year or more ago they shut down their mill there. They had an exploration program started — they're not just exploring for uranium — they were exploring for any valuable minerals that could be produced. Recently the Federal Government ordered them to discontinue their exploration program in the Northwest Territories. It wasn't because the area was crowded, there's all kinds of room there for exploration. But I think it would be a fair thing for them to do some explorations in Saskatchewan, and if this company can do exploration, they can get a deduction from their net profit, before calculation of their royalties, if they do that exploration here in Saskatchewan which should be an added incentive.

This mill, of course, to handle other kinds of minerals, might need some modifications, but the general principle of smelting and refining of metals is largely the same. And it is quite likely that any good deposit of ore that might be found within fifty miles of Uranium City, could be processed in the mill near Uranium City. Now there may be some objection, particularly among my Conservative friends, about allowing a Crown Corporation to explore, which might mean that it would continue to develop as a bit of public ownership in the mining industry. But, as my Liberal friends started this Crown Corporation and made a success of it, I am sure they would not be opposed to seeing that Corporation go on and continue to be a success.

March 28, 1961

But I would like to point out this. They're much more interested in seeing something done in the way of exploration with the hope of getting mines that will continue the life of the community, and I wonder just how they're going to handle it. But if the company did go ahead, did explore, did find some good deposits, there are plenty of ways in which they could dispose of it — dispose of their mill if that's the way they feel about it. I think it would be a mistake. I think this very successful Crown Corporation should be kept, but they certainly could let private interests develop an area that they found, and private interests would be very happy to buy such a prospect from them, at a pretty fair price. But, in any case, some of the huge surplus made by Eldorado should be put back into exploration in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I do hope that all Members will support this amendment.

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to say that I don't set myself up as any expert on the uranium industry. The extent of my knowledge is a visit, two or three, to Uranium City. Nevertheless, I don't think that the resolution which the Minister has just moved is a practical one. I think it's just one more way that the Government has of passing the buck onto the federal authorities.

In effect, the Minister of Mineral Resources, this afternoon is saying to the Member for Athabasca — “We're not going to do anything for Uranium City.”

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — I didn't say that.

Mr. Thatcher: — Sure, you said it in effect.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I didn't.

Mr. Thatcher: — So, we're saying, why don't the federal authorities do something? Well now, Mr. Speaker, I think we've seen too much of that kind of thing in the last few months while I've been sitting here.

Now just take a look at this resolution. The Minister is asking the Federal Government “to undertake an active exploration program for minerals which could be processed in their plant near Uranium City”. He suggested that other minerals than uranium could be processed. I asked one of the managers of

that plant last summer, that same question, "Can you process anything else but uranium up here?" He told me at that time, "No". Well certainly there's no use of them going up there spending sums exploring for more uranium, because they can't sell what they've got. They've got huge deposits of uranium that they can't sell at the present time, so why would they go out exploring for more of it? I don't think that this is a practical resolution, in any way. Although this group has no particular objection, I suppose, going along with it, we don't think though it's going to be effective in helping the people of Uranium City.

Now, what are the hard facts today? The hard facts in this northern area are simply this. Hundreds of men and women recently have lost their jobs up there. Many of them have had to give up their homes, move out of the community. The municipality up there is in real financial difficulty. The same is true of the people in the Blind River area. But in spite of what the Minister says, the Ontario Government is recognizing the problem and is prepared to go in with some kind of tax assistance to help those people in the Blind River area. And, that's all that this particular resolution is asking the Government of Saskatchewan to do. Let's not just pass the buck to Ottawa. Let's do something in this Legislature to help these people. We have the power to do it, and I think we should do it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of this debate.

The debate on motion of Mr. Thatcher was adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thibault regarding driver education.

Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to take too much of the time of the House with regard to my remarks on the motion proposed by Mr. Thibault, the Member for Kinistino, because I think that all hon. Members will find it possible to support the intent of this motion which asks that the Government give consideration to further encouragement and assistance to a comprehensive program of driver education.

March 28, 1961

I do have, however, Mr. Speaker, a few observations that I would like to make on this motion and a few comments with respect to some of the material introduced by the mover and consequent speakers with regard to the motion.

The mover did not attempt in any way to spell out just what was meant by a comprehensive program of driver education, but in subsequent remarks by the Member for Cumberland, some mention was made of introducing more driver education into our schools under the auspices of school authorities. In fact, I think, if I heard him correctly, he mentioned driver education during school hours or after school hours. With regard to that particular theme of the debate I, as a teacher, have some reservations. I think all hon. Members will recognize that with the introduction of more and more centralization in our schools and the use of school buses, probably the work that can be done under the supervision of our schools, outside of actual school hours — 9:00 to 4:00 in the larger urban centres and 9:00 to 3:30 in the rural centres, is becoming more difficult. The good bulk of the students are transported to school, arriving shortly before 9:00 in the morning, and are taken home from the school at 3:30 or 4:00 o'clock. A good many of the activities which we as teachers used to be able to supervise have now pretty well disappeared, because of course, if we are to keep the buses running on schedule, we cannot interfere with those schedules.

While I recognize that the bulk of the driver training now taking place is an after-hours and a Saturday activity, this type of activity, I think lends itself primarily to the larger urban centres, where the bulk of the students can be reached as easily on a Saturday as they can during the week-day. So that is the one reservation that I wanted to inject into the debate, Mr. Speaker. It is a fact that I do believe the majority of our public schools are concerned with the academic progress of young people. If there was a suggestion that driver education be injected into the actual time-table, I emphasize, if there was that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, since I was not able to read a transcript of the debate, I do feel that we must proceed with a good deal of caution, because I believe our schools are being subjected to more and more activities, activities which are to some degree cutting down on the amount of time that is being spent in academic work. After all, in my opinion, our high schools today are not here to prepare young people for any particular category or profession so much as they are there to give students the general background of knowledge and skill which will enable them to go forth from the high schools into institutions of higher learning.

I do feel that to try and bring driver education in as part of the actual academic curriculum does present a problem that we should be concerned about. In referring to the press report of the statements made already in connection with the motion, there is the statement that schools are for academic and vocational training. Well, here again I do believe that in our larger urban centres, we do have schools for both vocational and academic training, but in a good majority of our schools, we have no provisions made as yet for vocational training. Also, according to the press report, Mr. Thibault proposed introducing academic driver education into the primary grades, going on to practical training at the age of fifteen or sixteen, where students would drive with temporary licenses, and the granting of permanent licenses at age seventeen.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with teachers saying something about driving practices in school, even during primary grades. I think we do it now to some degree with respect to safety regarding bicycles, and so on. I think it is a good thing, but I think it should only be incidental to the main purpose of our public schools in pursuing the teaching of academic knowledge.

I was interested in the editorial comment of the January issue of the "Teachers' Bulletin", to which I think the hon. Member for Cumberland had reference, and they too inject a note of caution into this matter of driver education. When they say, first, that it is virtually impossible for any school system to adopt a program of driver education which appears to be successful in another centre. In other words, they suggest that each school may handle it in a different way. But they go on to say that it is our contention that driver education and training should be strictly extra-curricular. They mention the fact that staffs, facilities, and time allotments of most schools are taxed by the regular curricular load, and that there is constant pressure to add extras to that load. And further, that boards and teachers and other educational personnel should be in close consultation when considering the addition of any extra-curricular projects. And finally, that each demand of this nature should be considered on its merits and on the impact on the entire community.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, while speaking in support of the motion, I do feel that we must carefully assess the role that our public, elementary, and high schools are playing with regard to modern education today, and I believe

March 28, 1961

we must at all times keep before us the fact that they are primarily here to give a thorough academic course, or an academic course of studies to our students in preparation for future vocational or university training, and that as much as possible we leave as an extra-curricular, or shall we say a Saturday and after school hours program, this area of driver education.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to support the motion.

The debate was on motion of Mr. Thurston adjourned.

**MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN THE REPORT OF THE SELECT SPECIAL
COMMITTEE ON SERVICES REQUIRED BY MEMBERS**

Cliff H. Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, the motion that I am moving this afternoon, seconded by Mr. Meakes is:

“That the Report of the Select Special Committee on Services required by Members be now concurred in”.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in moving concurrence in this report, there are a few remarks that I would like to make. At the first meeting of the committee, of which we held six, an agenda was drawn up dealing with points such as space for Private Members, privileges of the Members, and particularly postal, express and freight service that you and your office wanted direction on, and also the present arrangement for the accommodation of and the payment of a grant to the Leader of the Opposition.

These, Mr. Speaker, I think, were the main points which the Assembly wanted us to study and to report on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in turning to the report itself, your committee recommends first that space be made available for Private Members in between Sessions. I want to say in this regard that I think I could speak for all the Private Members on this side and also for the Opposition, that the space made available for Members during the Sessions has been

satisfactory, and I think it has placed the Members in a better position to carry out their duties as a Member. But the committee felt that the duties of Members do not necessarily cease when the House prorogues. Many Members have occasion to come and meet with the Government and bring in delegations, and felt it was advisable that a room be set up for the Government Members, and also a room for Opposition Members, for their use in between Sessions, and a telephone to be placed in the room, for local calls. We know when we come in with delegations that we may have to meet various departments and it's not very nice for us to have to run around looking for a phone. So that, we're recommending that a phone be placed in the rooms for the convenience of the Members.

The second point that the committee reports on is the matter of postage and express charges. I think members will know that while this House is in Session all we have to do is to write our letters, leave them on our desks, or take them into the Assembly Office, and the postage is taken care of by the Assembly Office. Dealing with express and freight, Members will know that during the Session we have many reports, and they make a sizeable bundle. It's not fair to ask Members, particularly those who come in by train or bus, to try to take them home that way. Or, it may not be convenient for Members even to take them home in their own car, so that we are recommending that the Assembly Office bundle these up for the Members and look after the express or the freight. Now, we're certainly not meaning by this that Members can indulge in a shopping spree and buy a fridge or a stove or a bicycle, or anything of that nature, and expect the express or freight to be paid, but this recommendation is dealing with the work of the Members directly.

The third point deals with the acoustics in the House. Now, there has been considerable complaint from Members on both sides of the House, particularly those that are a little hard of hearing, that the acoustics are not too good. On the instruction of the committee, the Clerk of the Assembly, had, as an experiment, placed the loud-speakers on each end of the press gallery, and I'm sure that the Clerk would appreciate comments from Members to see if this has helped in their hearing, and if not, I am sure that he will investigate further to see what can be done in that regard.

Now the fourth recommendation deals with the present arrangement for the accommodation of and the payment of

March 28, 1961

a grant to the Office of the Leader of the Opposition. On the first part, I gathered in the committee, that the Leader of the Opposition was quite satisfied with the office accommodation provided to him by the Government. And as a Private Member, the second request dealing with the grant, this is entirely a new procedure. It has been adopted as a policy in this province of granting to the Leader of the Opposition an additional grant to carry out his responsibilities. Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that many taxpayers in the province are going to object to the Government paying this grant, but I myself, Mr. Speaker, can go out and defend the paying of this grant because I realize that the Leader of the Opposition has duties, more so than Private Members. It may be debatable to the amount, but I know that I can go out to my Constituency and justify the paying of this grant.

The fifth proposal and recommendation is of the supplying to the Leader of the Opposition with engraved letters. Now Members know, Private Members, that while the House is in Session we are supplied with stationery, and at the close of Session and in between Sessions, we are supplied with a reasonable amount of stationery that we may need for our service and use as a Member. But the committee felt that the office of the Leader of the Opposition was in a little different category, and therefore, we are recommending that the Assembly Office supply his office with engraved letterheads and envelopes, and that's raising him to somewhat the same status as a Cabinet Minister, in this regard.

The final recommendation of the committee states that all requests should be made to the Assembly Office. We felt that that was a better procedure, rather than Private Members coming in, particularly in between Sessions, and going to the Minister of Public Works, or some other Cabinet Minister directly. We felt that it was a better way, to take up any requests with you, Mr. Speaker, or in your absence, the Clerk of the Assembly, and thus they would avoid any unnecessary delays or confusion that might occur.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just very briefly run over the recommendations and the reasons for those recommendations, as I see it, therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Meakes, "That the Report of the Select Special Committee on Services required by Members be now concurred in."

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, I want to say initially that the

Opposition is not too happy about this report. On the other hand, on the grounds that a half loaf is better than none, we have little alternative but to go along with it. Point 1, 2 and 3, I think, are improvements. But I think there is still a case which can be made for further assistance to the office of the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. Member for Lumsden, who just spoke, has suggested that some taxpayers might object to financial assistance being given to the Leader of the Opposition. I want to emphasize again this money isn't coming to the Leader of the Opposition; it's coming to the office of the Leader of the Opposition and any facilities which are provided will be used by all eighteen M.L.A.s in this group.

The Whip of this party and myself sat at the first number of meetings, of the special committee, and we felt that most of the members of the committee were pretty reasonable. We thought that perhaps the Minister of Mineral Resources was a little narrow-minded — I'm sure he won't mind me saying that. We couldn't seem to get it through his head, the reasons why we feel we need improved facilities. He kept going back to 1942 or 1943 when he was Leader of the Opposition. He would say, "Why when I was Leader of the Opposition the Liberals would just toss me out in the hall when the Session was over." Well if that was so it was most regrettable, but I'm sure the Minister wouldn't blame us for that. But things have changed a lot since 1944. The whole business of Government has become infinitely more complex.

I recently checked over the amount of money that was being spent in 1943-44, by the Government of Saskatchewan. I find that in the particular year \$29¾ millions were spent — gross revenue accounts — plus about \$1 million extra on relief, and one-third of a million dollars on capital or a total of just roughly \$31 million in the year that hon. friend the Minister was speaking about.

What expenditures are going to be made this year by Government? One-hundred and forty-seven and a half million of budgetary revenue, \$12½ million hospitalization tax, \$12½ million of federal hospitalization grant, \$2½ million of federal health grant, a total in those accounts of roughly \$175 million.

In other words just in that ordinary account we have about five times more than we had in the year the Minister was speaking about. On top of that, in Saskatchewan we have a very unique situation. We have the Crown Corporations.

March 28, 1961

According to the Provincial Treasurer's last financial report, the taxpayers of this province now have \$383 million invested in Crown Corporations. And as nearly as I can estimate this year, with what they are going to borrow, what the Power Corporation and the Telephone companies are going to borrow, they're going to spend roughly \$128 million. That means that the ordinary expenditures of Government, which I mentioned, plus the Crown Corporations, this year about \$300 million will be spent by hon. Members on that side of the House. Then in addition, the Industrial Development Office has been set up which can guarantee loans of up to \$15 million. In addition, the Government can loan under the Farm Improvement Act, they can guarantee loans, as I understand it, up to about \$10 million. In other words we're asked on the Opposition side today, to effectively criticize expenditures of roughly \$300 million. The Government is the largest business by far in this province.

I admit I've only been around here a few months, but I say there is something pretty strange when we can have a Government where the civil service has reached 6,723, where when you add the Crown Corporations the Government has 12,820 employees, and yet they refuse to give the Opposition even two people on a year-'round basis. We say that in order to our job effectively, we say that to go through the hundreds of pages of public accounts, in order to go through the many reports of the Crown Corporations, in order to examine the estimates intelligently, we must have some technical help. How can hon. Members on that side of the House have fifteen Cabinet Ministers, one of the largest Cabinets in all of Canada, each with his own staff preparing government work, and at the same time tell the Opposition that in order to scrutinize all these expenditures they are only entitled to enough money to hire one secretary and then have about \$100 left over.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was good enough to give us the office which we now have, and we do appreciate the fact that he's done it. I think if it was up to the Premier we wouldn't be having this trouble. Our trouble is that maybe he's having a little trouble with some of his back-bench Members like the Minister for Mineral Resources — or I guess he's a front-bench Member. I say it cannot be justified for the Government to have 6,723 civil servants and refuse the Opposition only two.

If we're to do the kind of job we want to do, or we need to do, we must have help. I say we could save the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars if we had proper

research and technical help, therefore I feel this is a very important matter. I can tell the House that since we opened our office we've spent on an average of \$1,200 - \$1,400 a month. Some of that maybe has been on political work, I don't deny that, but the majority of it has not been for political work. And I think that even now we have not got an adequate staff. I say that hon. Members on the Government side today are asking the Opposition to do a job with their hands tied behind their backs. I think regardless of politics there are not many people in this province who would not agree that the Opposition should be given the kind of help that they need in the months ahead.

However, as I said when I commenced, Mr. Speaker, we think the principle now has been established \$500 per month is better than nothing, not much but a little, and so we are going to go along with the principle in hope that the Minister of Natural Resources' heart may become a little warmer in a few months, or the Premier's. Perhaps in the fall or a little later we're going to come back again and ask that this amount be increased. I say again, in the six or eight months that I have been in this office, I am absolutely convinced that to do an intelligent job of criticizing estimates and public accounts, there must be assistance provided to the Opposition.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):

Mr. Speaker, after the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition I think I should have a few things to say on this question.

It was on March 2nd, that the order was passed by the Legislature saying "That a Select Special Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Speaker, be appointed to consider the services required by Members, such committee to consist of Messrs. Brockelbank, Davies, Meakes, Thurston, Thatcher and Horsman."

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, could we get a little more power behind the speech.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — All right, I'll give the hon. Member some more power.

As my friend the member for Lumsden said, the committee

March 28, 1961

had six meetings and the first meeting was occupied with building an agenda. One of the important items we had on that agenda was a summary of the services which are presently available to Members. Another very important item was the method of communication between Members and the Legislative Assembly Office and the Department of Public Works, which was also dealt with in the report. There were various items then dealing with other points and finally this item the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

I think this review of the services that are already supplied, brought to us some interesting information. It reminded us, Mr. Speaker, of some of the things that we have been taking for granted, the provision of the material on our desks, the Bills, the Order Paper, the Votes and Proceedings, the Debates, that are taken down and re-produced, the sessional papers, the answers to questions that are provided. There are a very great many services supplied by your office.

The office accommodation for Members during the Session this year, has I think, been very acceptable. The Government Members have a lounge and the Whip's office and three other offices. The Opposition Members have a lounge. The Leader of the Opposition has two offices and they have three others, and there was general satisfaction expressed in this regard. These offices are furnished with desks, telephone and including during the Session long distance service. There have been more secretaries, more stenographical help engaged during this Session than previously, with three stenographers for the Private Members on each side of the House. That too I think has been quite satisfactory. And already the stationery supplied to Private Members has been mentioned. All of these things I think met with satisfaction.

I'm very much in favor of the recommendation that one room be kept available for Private Members on each side in between Sessions. If a Member comes in and brings a delegation they will have someplace where they can go to sit down to talk things over. There is a desk there, and a typewriter, and if he's handy with the typewriter he may want to type out some notes or a letter or something like that, and telephone for local calls. He will have an office to sit in and can call people in the city.

When we came to the discussion of the item respecting the office of the Leader of the Opposition, we got into more differences of opinion, and I don't think that it was because my

heart is hard, Mr. Speaker, that I took the stand I did. It has already been mentioned that commencing last fall the Leader of the Opposition was supplied with two offices, furnished with chairs, desk, filing cabinet, typewriters and telephone, and the long-distance calls were to be paid by the Leader of the Opposition, and he was given an allowance for office expenses to pay for a secretary, stationery supplies and long-distance calls. This allowance was \$500 per month, or \$6,000 per year.

The Leader of the Opposition stated they had been spending \$1,200 to \$1,400 a month. He reported that long-distance calls ran up as \$300 a month. I took the trouble to investigate what the long-distance calls were for some Ministers' offices, and I found that in one whole year the Provincial Treasurer's office had long-distance calls of \$592, and my own office in one whole year was \$371, and we don't spare the long-distance when it's considered to be necessary. You can do a lot of long-distance calls inside of Saskatchewan and outside of Saskatchewan on a few hundred dollars per year.

Mr. Thatcher: — Of course the Minister would agree that we were paying for the calls. We paid for the calls that month they were \$300, the Government didn't.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — No I wasn't suggesting that the Government paid for them, but I am suggesting that that's a pretty heavy telephone bill.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well that's up to us.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — I know, but you're working it pretty hard. We managed to get along a lot more efficiently than you did. I would suggest that you maybe get an expert in to advise you on whether you're using the telephone too much.

Mr. Thatcher: — Will you help pay for it?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — You're running the bills too high. Maybe your administration isn't very good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition actually

March 28, 1961

has two jobs and it's because of the fact that he has two jobs that the problem arises. He has the job of being Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and the job of being the Leader of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan.

Now, everyone would admit that it would be quite impracticable to draw any exact line to show where one job ends and the other begins, and because of that this system of paying a grant, a fixed sum per month, which is by some means estimated to be a reasonable amount, for the office of the Leader of the Opposition, that system is essential. You'd be in constant trouble I think if you put it on any other basis. And that is why the committee recommended that this arrangement continue without any change during the fiscal year 1961-62. I made this motion in the committee and it was at this point that the Leader of the Opposition left the committee and insisted that the other Opposition Member of the committee go with him. We were very sorry to see them leave, we would have liked them to have stayed in the committee even though we disagreed, and continue with the discussion. Then after that the committee recommended the supplying of letterheads and second sheets and envelopes to the Leader of the Opposition's office.

Now the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that I was always going back to the time when I was Leader of the Opposition, and that is true. I made quite a few remarks about that. But I would point out also that on a number of occasions he went down to Ottawa, I understand that he was a Member of Parliament in the C.C.F. group down there at one time, and he was talking about — isn't that a nasty word — the services at Ottawa which are a bit of a different thing. But I've had experiences as Leader of the Opposition and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is at least some evidence that I did the job passably well; we became the Government. Now I will grant you I had a much easier job because I had a Government to attack that was very vulnerable, they just weren't doing anything. They were easy to attack.

Mr. Thatcher: — You didn't have any patronage like we had to fight I'll admit.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — The civil service at that, particularly the highway inspectors and the local improvement district inspectors, were the back-bone of the political machine in Saskatchewan, whether the Leader of the Opposition knows it or not.

Mr. Thatcher: — I've seen them both.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — And I found letters going out from an administrative office in Regina, giving instructions to an L.I.D. officer out in the country, to get over and look after a couple of polls over in the North Battleford Constituency. I know what was there and the Leader of the Opposition can go on screaming about things, and I don't know whether he knows or not, but I think he does but there are some things he would like to forget.

Mr. Thatcher: — They were just amateurs to what you've got.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Of course, that was one of the things that made that Government easy to attack.

Mr. Thatcher: — That's what makes it easy to attack you too.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Well if he's got such an easy job he doesn't need any help then. I was going to suggest that he has a much more difficult job because he has to attack a Government of action and accomplishment. We have done things here in the Province of Saskatchewan that the people of this province appreciate. His job is not so easy as mine was, and besides . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — The steel mill deal and things like that we've got to look into.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, besides the business of government is getting larger and more complex. But I want to tell you also that there has been a great deal of change in the way reports and papers are presented in the House over the last fifteen years. I'm not going to go over a lot of details on this, but I want to give you some of them. Take for example the estimates, in 1938-39, the estimates for agriculture occupied thirteen lines in the book. In 1961-62 they occupied sixty-nine lines in the book, this is without taking the totals, just the lines with the items in them. In 1938-39, the estimates for Resources occupied five lines in the book . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — You're making a good case for us.

March 28, 1961

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . now the estimates for Resources occupies seventy-five lines. There is a great deal more break-down, a great deal more detail given in the papers themselves . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — With the more money you're spending, why shouldn't there be?

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and there should be, I'm not arguing against it, it's right. And never in my experience in this Legislature was so much information available to the Members in the Legislature because of the way in which the estimates are prepared. We couldn't get that kind of information before. You could put on a barn-storming show, but still you couldn't get the information because they didn't have it broken down. We have a book on the report of the telephone corporation and all there appeared was one or two lines with a single amount of money of \$1½ million or \$2 or \$2½ million — no break-down whatsoever. The Crown Corporation reports that are presented to this Legislature are in detail, and besides, with considerable written information. Now this is the kind of information that is necessary if Members are going to do a reasonable job of watching the affairs of the province and criticizing where criticism is necessary. In fact, a great deal of the job of research and analysis has already been done in the material that is supplied to the Members. Now the job of the Leader of the Opposition and his Members is to make something of it, and that's where they are finding difficulty. If there's something wrong with these things they're going to be awfully busy looking to try to find something that is worthwhile bringing up.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that a dozen research economists would do the Leader of the Opposition any good, as long as they were working at research.

Mr. Thatcher: — Just try us with one.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — But of course if they were busy doing the job that he and his Members ought to be doing, working on political propaganda and that sort of thing, well maybe that's what he would like them to be doing.

Mr. Thatcher: — That's what your Ministers are doing.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — He actually has more

information — the Members in the Opposition now have more information than they know what to do with. I will admit that the Leader of the Opposition is working hard at this job, and considering the difficulties, it is a difficult job attacking the Government . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — It's not difficult.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . I would say he is doing fairly well.

Now, a research director, or a person called a research director, of course could do a lot of work for the Liberal Party as propagandist and organizer. And that brings me to what may be the real question, this question of establishing a Liberal Party head office in this building, paid for by the poor taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh nonsense, nonsense.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. Leader of the Opposition says it's nonsense, but there's plenty of evidence as to what is taking place. The "Saskatchewan Liberal" of February 1st, has on the front page a little box ad, it says "Your dollars urgently needed to help win Turtleford for Liberalism, send a subscription to Mrs. M. Totten, Saskatchewan Liberal Association, Regina." Where was Mrs. Totten? In Room 257.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh no she's at her office downtown.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, there is an office downtown is there! Well Mr. Speaker it's in the telephone book, but the telephone of the Saskatchewan Liberal Headquarters at 315 McCallum-Hill Bldg., has been discontinued, and the telephone information girl gives the information that there is no listing for the Saskatchewan Liberal Association.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well you go over to Westman Chambers and you'll find it. You go over to Westman Chambers and you'll find it.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — There is in the telephone book, The Regina Liberal Association, but we're not

March 28, 1961

talking about Regina we're talking about Saskatchewan, at 210 Westman Bldg., and the telephone number is L.A. 7-5629. But I've been having that number rung for some time and there's no answer.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well go and ring it right now.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — And I am informed that there's no staff there, that there's an office with a couple of tables in it and that's all there is to it. It is quite evident that there is an attempt to move the head office of the Liberal Party into this building, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I must object to that statement.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friend has no right to object.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Thatcher: — Yes this is a deliberate falsehood. We have a girl down at 210 Westman Chambers
...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — That's not a point of order.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well you're not going to get away with that statement.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Join the Liberal Association, the last remains of the Saskatchewan Liberal Association. The Saskatchewan Liberal Association has already apparently become defunct; they haven't even got a telephone number in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Thatcher: — We're doing alright don't worry about us.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Alright, if you are doing alright quit grumbling about it. It's what he should do, Mr. Speaker.

I would also point out that letters have gone out on

Saskatchewan Liberal Association letterheads with the date line and address on them “257 Legislative Buildings, Regina.”

Mr. Thatcher: — You bet they have because you fellows cut off my stationery. What else are we going to do?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — The minute I was the Leader of the Opposition you cut off our stationery. You give it with one hand and take it away with the other.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — And we gave him \$500 to pay for his secretary and office supplies.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Member is making a speech here.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well I can't let him make such gross inaccuracies.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — That wasn't an inaccuracy; there is every evidence to point to the fact that this is being made the head office of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, and I don't think the Parliament Buildings were built for that purpose.

Now the C.C.F. maintains its party headquarters downtown. If we're going to maintain an office for the Liberal Party why we should be able to move the C.C.F. in and the Social Crediters and the Conservatives in here into this building too. But I think we'd better keep our office downtown and let the Liberal Party do the same thing.

Mr. Thatcher: — That's what we're doing.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — When I was Leader of the Opposition — and we're going to see that you do it too — when I was Leader of the Opposition I got a sessional indemnity of \$2,000, I got a salary of \$2,500, a total of \$4,500. I had one office during the Session, the little office over here, and a stenographer, during the Sessions, and right after the Session that arrangement

March 28, 1961

was finished. Now the Leader of the Opposition receives an sessional indemnity of \$4,800, more than I got altogether, and \$1,600 of it is tax free. He gets a salary of \$5,000, and a grant for office expenses for the office of the Leader of the Opposition of \$6,000, making a total of \$15,800, compared with my \$4,500, and of course he incidentally, because of his service with the C.C.F. group in Ottawa, draws a pension from Ottawa too which I don't begrudge him at all. Now the Leader of the Opposition also has not just an office during the Session, but two offices the year around. And I can say this, that I would have certainly been very happy had I had half the money and half the office space when I was Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition is getting a fair break at this time, and I don't think he has any complaint and I feel sure that the people of this province will be convinced that he is getting fair treatment and I'm going to support the motion.

The question being put it was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS — ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION RE AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker regarding constitutional amendment, and the proposed amendment by Mrs. Batten;

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, our group went over this particular amendment this morning. Some of us had read it for the first time and we find it completely satisfactory now and so we're willing to go along with it. And if you wish to hold a vote now it's agreeable with us.

The question being put on the amendment, it was agreed to.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:00 p.m.