

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session - Sixteenth Legislature
34th Day

Tuesday, April 2, 1968.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.
On Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, a group of grade 12 students, 44 of them in all. They are from the Ursuline Academy for Girls at Bruno and with them today are two of their teachers, Sister Benedict, teacher of History, and Sister Aquinas, teacher of French and English. With them today also is their bus driver, Mr. Grunsky. The Academy for Girls at Bruno was founded by the Ursuline Sisters over 50 years ago. It has graduated many outstanding students in the fine arts of music, painting and drama. Some of its graduates have won recognition throughout the world in Europe, the United States and all parts of Canada. We hope that their visit to the Legislature today will be both educational and informative and that they enjoy their visit in Regina today. We wish them a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

COPIES OF SASKATCHEWAN HOSPITAL SERVICES' PLAN REPORT

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) or the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Printing Company, depending upon where the problem is. I wonder if the Minister of Public Health can advise us when we will get printed copies of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services' Plan Report which was tabled just over one month ago on the understanding that printed copies would be tabled as soon as they were available. It seems that a month might be enough for a printing company to publish a report.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in some cases I suppose it would be sufficient time but apparently not in this particular one. I indicated to the Hon. Member and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) last week that I was hopeful that these reports would be available towards the end of the week, but I'll check and see just when they might be delivered.

PERMIT TO DRIVE SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and possibly the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), who should be interested in this as well, about a situation developing in our area which I'm sure affects all areas of the province, according to the interpretation of the Road Ban Regulations. It appears now that school-bus drivers are being required to secure a permit to drive school buses on rural municipal roads. Because of the fact that some of these school buses operate in some three municipalities, it makes it very difficult and puts bus drivers in an impossible position, because they are the ones that must sign the permit and they are the ones that make the commitment to make any necessary road repairs. The secretary of the North Battleford Larger Unit discussed this with me on the weekend. He suggests that it may be difficult to get the drivers to go out with their buses, unless there is a ruling, across-the-board ruling, from the Government, indicating that school buses are accepted rather than having these bus drivers, in some cases having to go to three municipalities to secure a permit, if they are willing to take the chance. I have a letter here, if you wish, Sir, from the secretary of the School Bus Operators' Association, and I also have verbal submission from Mr. Ben McInnon, secretary of the North Battleford Unit. It is a bad situation and I think it should be corrected.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that this comes under the Highway Traffic Board but it may. I wonder if the Hon. Member would send the letter over to me and I'll look into it right away.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on behalf of the Department of Highways that the Highways Department is not asking for permits. The buses have free travel on our Saskatchewan highways and I would say that this would come under the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Kramer: — The permit as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, must come from the Highway Traffic Board which is under the Minister's jurisdiction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

NUMBER OF REJECTED STUDENTS IN TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr.

April 2, 1968

McIsaac). When might I get an answer to Return No. 17. This is the number of students that have been rejected because of shortage of space in our technical schools.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of those Returns is almost ready. Before the session is over we will have the Return for the Hon. Member.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 130

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre) for Return No. 130.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that this motion be amended as follows:

That the words “news media for advertising placed through” after the word “to” in the first line; and that the following words be added to the motion:

“(3) The amount of commission paid to MacLaren Advertising Company Limited by (a) each Department of the Government; (b) each Crown Corporation; and (c) any other Commission, Board or Agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

(4) The total of (a), (b), and (c) in paragraph 3 above.”

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment is designed to thwart the desire of the Motion of finding out how much was paid to MacLaren Advertising Company in whatever capacity. I’m speaking, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment. I think all of us are familiar with the general nature of the advertising business. I think all of us are familiar with the fact that as a general rule commissions are paid to advertising agencies, not by the client but by the media, and accordingly it won’t be surprising if the answer to the Motion, which comes out in respect of the amounts paid as commission to MacLaren by Departments of Government, Crown corporations or Boards or Commissions would turn out to be nil, nil, nil, thereby creating the impression that the Government was not creating income for MacLaren Advertising, when of course the facts are that, when any client places business through an advertising agency, they thereby place in the hands of the advertising agency the ability to get very substantial sums of money in commission from the media. What information the Motion seeks is the amount paid to MacLaren Advertising Company. I’m a little surprised to hear that when MacLaren places advertising, the money is actually paid not to MacLaren but to the media. This is what the amendment suggests. This is usual practice although it may well be the practice

adopted by the Government in order to obscure the amounts of money, which it in fact is making available to MacLaren or to any other advertising agency. I think that the information requested is a simple request, the amount paid to MacLaren Advertising Company. It is not going to be answered. We are now going to have an answer directed to us, indicating how much is going to be paid in commission to MacLaren and that of course is not the question asked. It seems to me that it is perfectly legitimate for a Legislature to ask how much in cash the Government is paying the MacLaren Agency. If the Government really objects to telling us how much in cash the Government is paying the MacLaren Agency, I'd like to know why it objects? I'd like to know why it objects? It seems clear that all the Government wants to tell us is what it pays to MacLaren under a heading which the Government is pleased to call commissions, but not what it pays to MacLaren under any other heading. It is very carefully saying, "We won't tell you what we pay to MacLaren."

Mr. Thatcher: — Just want to get all . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — No, that's the whole point. If the Government would agree to tell us what it pays to MacLaren we wouldn't complain . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . but it has decided it is going to tell us what it pays to MacLaren, which it, the Government, is pleased to call commission. It could be paying MacLaren any other sums of money and call it anything else it wants and it won't tell us that.

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, bunk!

Mr. Blakeney: — Not bunk at all, it's your amendment and you have decided to choose the word "commission." I ask, Mr. Speaker, what amount was paid to MacLaren. I ask what amount was paid to MacLaren and the Member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher) decides that all he wants to tell us is what is paid to MacLaren, which he is pleased to call "commission" and everything else he has struck out of the Motion. He also wants to tell us what he pays to the Leader-Post or the Watrous Manitou. I'm not interested in what he pays to the Leader-Post or the Watrous Manitou. What I asked was what he paid to MacLaren, not what he paid to MacLaren under the heading "commission" or not what he paid to MacLaren under the heading "service fees" or any other heading that suggests itself to his mind. All I'm asking is what he paid to MacLaren. That is the information he is refusing and it's no use him denying it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 2, 1968

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — . . . Something to hide?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31

Thatcher	Coderre	Weatherald
Howes	Bjarnason	Mitchell
McFarlane	MacDonald	Larochelle
Boldt	Hooker	Gardner
Cameron	Gallagher	Coupland
Steuart	MacLennan	McPherson
Heald	Heggie	Charlebois
McIsaac	Breker	Forsyth
Guy	Leith	McIvor
Loken	Radloff	Schmeiser
Grant		

NAYS — 23

Lloyd	Meakes	Brockelbank
Wooff	Berezowsky	Pepper
Kramer	Romanow	Bowerman
Willis	Smishek	Matsalla
Wood	Thibault	Messer
Blakeney	Whelan	Kwasnica
Davies	Snyder	Kowalchuk
Dewhurst	Michayluk	

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 131

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife) for Return No. 131.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, just before we vote on this I'd like to make a comment. Originally the Member for Cutknife made this a question. At the time I did not have the answer, and I asked that it be made a motion. Now my Department people tell me that, as it stands, we are unable to give the exact figures to some of his questions. We can answer a good deal of it, but it would call for a good deal of change in form. I have decided not to bring in the amendments that would be required but rather to ask the House to vote against this. I would suggest to the Member a form of a question that will give him most of what he wants here. With that I would ask that we turn this motion down.

Motion negatived.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 12 — LOUDSPEAKER IN LOUNGE OF LIBERAL MEMBERS

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that equipment to transmit proceedings of the Legislature should not be installed anywhere except in the offices under the direct control of Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lloyd: — Resolution No. 12 on the Order Paper was drafted after the events of last Friday evening. It was drafted somewhat hurriedly and under some various pressures. For whatever reason, it doesn't, I think, express as comprehensively as it ought to that which we need to do in this Legislature with respect to this matter. As a result I say at this time that one of my colleagues will be offering an amendment to the Legislature when he speaks later in the debate. The amendment, Mr. Speaker, will seek to protect some of the existing arrangements with respect to transmitting outside of the Chamber. I have particular reference to the well-established procedure of transmitting certain debates by way of radio, and I know that all of the Members would want to make sure that we protect that. The amendment will also underline the fact that the Legislature itself should on any occasion have the right to make decisions of this kind. The amendment will outline that somewhat more definitely. It will add that this will be done with the expressed consent of the Assembly acting through Mr. Speaker. The amendment also will wish to confirm a position taken by Members on both sides of the House last Friday evening. That is that we will want to confirm our consent to such installations as are in areas under the direct control of Mr. Speaker.

I have had reference, Sir, to the fact that we have been transmitting outside of the speaker for a number of years now. We have done this because of radio broadcasting of certain selected debates and procedures. It seems appropriate that we refer to the way in which that particular decision was undertaken in the first case. This began during the session of 1946 and I have here the Journals for the Legislature during that session. On opening day one finds this record. "By leave of the Assembly, the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn), seconded by the Hon. Mr. Valleau moved; That this Assembly authorize the Government to arrange for the broadcasting by radio of such proceedings of this Assembly as may be determined by a Select Special Committee" and it goes on to name the committee. I thought we should mention that in order to indicate the procedure that was followed with respect to action which we take every year to transmit outside of this Assembly.

There are, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, two main relevant facts on which the Resolution which I'm asking support for is based. There is first of all the fact of such loudspeakers, as

April 2, 1968

are referred to in the Resolution, loudspeakers which are or at least were connected as the wording of the Resolution suggests. Secondly, there is the fact that these were installed and used without consent of the Legislature. They were installed and used without reference in any way to this Legislature.

Let me review some six steps which led up to the presentation of the Resolution this morning. First, it was the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), who I believe first made public reference to the existence of this tapping of the Legislature's transcribing service. I understand that on Thursday of last week, March 28, he was speaking to a group of . . .

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — I'm certainly not aware of ever making reference in this Assembly whatsoever to a speaker being anywhere in this Legislative Building and I ask that the Hon. Member prove that I did make reference to it. If I did, I'm certainly not aware of it.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, he might know what I'm going to say. The Member for Cannington was, I believe, speaking to a group of collegiate students in the city of Regina, grade 12 collegiate students last Thursday morning. He was commenting on a question raised by the students during discussion period. I'm not saying that there was anything wrong with what the Member for Cannington said, not at all. He was commenting on a question raised by some of the students. He explained as I understand it that the Liberal MLAs could absent themselves from the Chamber and at the same time follow the proceedings in their lounge because of this tapping procedure, which made a loudspeaker service available to them in that lounge. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Member for Cannington made such a statement is clear evidence that he personally saw nothing wrong with the procedure that he described. I'm not suggesting that he did or that it was wrong for him to whatsoever. As a matter of fact, the statement itself would indicate that the propriety of this move had not even been discussed by the Members on the Government benches.

Secondly, that same day, Thursday, March 28, the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) raised the matter as a question of privilege on Orders of the Day. The matter having been referred to Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker immediately replied that he would investigate.

Thirdly, late in the afternoon of the following day, Mr. Speaker made a statement to the Legislature. He advised that on investigation he was able to confirm that the installation of a loudspeaker connection in one of the Member's lounges was and I quote: "in fact the case." Mr. Speaker expressed his concern and his disapproval in clear and unmistakable terms.

Fourthly, the final paragraph of his statement reads as follows:

I have therefore suggested that the installation be dismantled pending a decision of the House by a substantive motion.

Fifthly, Members on this side of the House considered Mr. Speaker's statement over the supper hour. In our opinion that part of Mr. Speaker's statement, which I have just read, was capable of being interpreted as an invitation or at least a suggestion that the Legislature consider such a substantive motion. In our view the matter was of such importance that the Legislature ought to establish its position by formal record at the earliest possible moment. In coming to this view we were particularly influenced by the words of Mr. Speaker when he said that "such a practice would in my opinion seriously detract from the process of parliamentary debate and tend to weaken the very foundations of parliamentary self-government."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — We were convinced that this statement of the Speaker was no statement of mere rhetoric. We were convinced that it was a statement of real conviction. It seemed to us that there was nothing of more importance for the Legislature to discuss than "the very foundations of parliamentary self-government." Accordingly, when the Legislature convened at 7:30, on behalf of my colleagues, I asked leave to introduce a motion that we adjourn our regular business in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. The reasons for that request, and the definition of that matter, was expressed in this statement which was at that time handed to Mr. Speaker. I read that statement again:

Mr. Speaker has brought to the attention of the Legislature a matter which he has described to be 'an important question of propriety.' In concluding that proceedings in the Chamber are being transmitted to 'one of the Members' Lounges' he has stated an opinion that such a practice would 'seriously detract from the process of parliamentary debate and tend to weaken the very foundation of parliamentary self-government.' Lest a dangerous precedent be set, it is important that all Members act now to expunge the dangerous implications of this action and that we do so by formal record. It is equally important that by formal record we support Mr. Speaker's wish that the matter be formally clarified.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, on Friday night I gave notice of the motion which I am now introducing. It is the importance of the situation which justifies the discussion of the Resolution at this time when there is much other material of great importance to be discussed by this Legislature. I submit that the effectiveness of this Legislature and in the end, of the Government of Saskatchewan itself, depends upon meaningful participation by elected Members. There is a basis for such participation; there are safeguards against the erosion of

April 2, 1968

such rights provided by our rules. These rules have been tested, built up and tested by many legislators in many places over a period of many years. They deserve our respect. As you yourself said, Mr. Speaker, and said very well in the recent issue of the Rural Councillor, "The laws and the rules of parliamentary procedure which we follow in Saskatchewan have been evolved over centuries and are supported by many precedents and traditions." These rules deserve our respect and our support. If we alter them, as we do and as we should do from time to time, we should do so after discussion; we should do so with reasonable deliberation.

The Resolution suggests that, in view of the circumstances I have outlined, we now make clear in the records of this Legislature our interpretation of one of these rules and that indeed we expand more specifically on some of these rules. The seriousness of what has been done and the need for guarding against repetition is well underlined by Mr. Speaker in his statement. His statement also establishes an inadequacy in our present rules to cope comprehensively with the situation in which we found ourselves. He was therefore, for example, confined to just "suggesting" that the installation be dismantled. However, in the absence of any rule to be breached, or any rule to be used to prevent the installation being used, Mr. Speaker left no doubt as to the impropriety of what has taken place. Note again this part of his statement:

Such a practice would in my opinion seriously detract from the process of parliamentary debate and tend to weaken the very foundations of parliamentary self-government.

It must be noted in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that at no time did the Premier or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) suggest that this device for listening in absentia be available to Members other than those on the Government side of the House. This in itself is an impropriety. However, I am not concerned with that at this moment. The real impropriety is that this action was not subject to decision of the Legislature. This action was not even the subject of reference to the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The Resolution which I hope can get unanimous support seeks to prevent a repetition of this impropriety, and it seeks to provide a specific rule for future guidance.

To further support the argument of importance I want to refer to some proceedings in the Canadian House of Commons. These are reported on page 2447 of Volume III of the Proceedings in 1958. The situation was this. During a discussion on Supply a Member of Parliament drew to the attention of the House that the then Prime Minister had an arrangement whereby he could while in his office listen to the proceedings in the Chamber. This produced an immediate discussion. It was

admitted by many people that there was value in such an arrangement for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister of Canada is obviously a very busy person. He had much justification for working in his office during parliamentary debate and discussion. His office is some distance removed from the Chambers. The situation in Saskatchewan is of course not comparable. The distance between the Legislature and the Liberal Members' lounge is a few feet and can be covered in a few seconds. Despite the greater justification of the Ottawa situation, despite the vast differences in circumstances, the condemnation of the action without permission of Parliament was immediate, loud and clear. I want to read, Mr. Speaker, some of the comments that were made. May I read in particular from comments made by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Pearson, who was at that time Leader of the official Opposition: Speaking of the question raised about this transcribing or transmitting of events from the Chamber without permission, Mr. Pearson had this to say on page 2447:

Surely the Hon Member has raised a very important question of privilege. He has quoted a newspaper article to the effect that, in some way, without the knowledge of the House, or without consultation with, or consent of the House, or any of its officers, somebody has done something to wire the House to the Prime Minister's office so that the Prime Minister can follow what is going on here by an electronic method. This is the first I have heard about it, but it is a very important question of privilege which should be decided.

Later on on page 2448, the discussion having continued, Mr. Pearson added these remarks:

Mr. Chairman, may I say that it is quite obvious that something has happened — whatever the reasons may be for it — that is unprecedented in parliamentary history, something that has never happened before and something which I think is extremely important. Whatever the reasons may be for it, the result is that the proceedings of this House, as they are taking place, can now be heard outside of this House. This is a new development in our parliamentary traditions and in our parliamentary history . . . I know, of course, that the Prime Minister has great responsibilities and that he cannot be in this House all the time. I know that this is a particular difficult time for him. But I also know that his predecessor, Mr. St. Laurent, had great responsibilities. He was the head of the Government in times of crisis and at that time there was no suggestion that in order to make the work a little bit easier and so that he could cover both the House and his office this should be done. . . . I remember very well indeed — and the Prime Minister must remember it also — that in one of the committees of this House a few years ago . . . in order to facilitate our work, in order to make it a little bit easier for the reporters and for the record of the committee to be circulated quickly, for one experimental meeting we

April 2, 1968

introduced some electronic device into that room . . . I remember that the Leader of the Conservative party at that time (that would be the Rt. Hon. Mr. Diefenbaker) rose in his place and attacked the Government very vigorously indeed because of this breach of parliamentary privilege.

There is much more to the debate, Mr. Speaker, but I content myself with reading in particular those references by the present Prime Minister of Canada, one of the most highly respected persons in parliamentary activities in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the matter need not be labored any further at this point. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Resolution did not produce in a more comprehensive way the kind of guidance which I think would be extremely useful for all of us in the House in the future. As I have indicated, a colleague of mine will be moving a resolution to make it more comprehensive in a more acceptable way.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this particular motion will be very brief, indeed, this morning. Initially I want to make it very clear that Members on this side of the House are quite willing to be guided by the advice of the Speaker, but we are not willing to be guided by the advice of our Socialist friends.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I have been in politics in one way or another I suppose for about 25 years. This is the silliest motion I have ever heard made in the House of Commons or the Legislature of Saskatchewan. Here is my Hon. Friend opposite saying that because Hon. Members on this side of the House had a speaker in the lounge that democracy is threatened, that there are sinister implications, that there are dangerous things which might happen. Once again we can see why the Socialist Opposition is so inept in the province. Here again they have got the wrong issue, the wrong viewpoint, at the wrong time. If my Hon. Friends opposite think the average person in Saskatchewan cares about Members having this speaker in their lounge, they are very, very much mistaken. If Mr. Speaker tells Members on this side of the House that he doesn't think that it is appropriate for us to have a loudspeaker, we won't have it. However, I can tell you we are not going to be dictated to by Hon. Members opposite. Therefore, we shall vote down each one of these three Resolutions as they are proposed.

I conclude by saying again it is the silliest motion I have ever heard in 25 years of politics.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — I feel that as a technician

I cannot sit idly by and hear this type of hogwash that's coming from across the floor at present!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We are not going to have references to 'hogwash' in this Chamber and I ask the Member to withdraw it and withdraw it now if he will, please.

Mr. Coderre: — I will withdraw it unconditionally, I'd say idle words, so they were. As I say, speaking as a technician, and I think that I am a forward-looking type of a person, I feel that I am not living in the horse-and-buggy days like my friends across the way have. They have referred to the 40s and they are referring constantly to what has happened in the past. Let's look forward. I feel that when we are living in an electronic age that we should use every piece of electronic equipment to assist us in this society and in this Legislature. In view of the fact that the galleries are public, there is no breach of security there. Anyone in the public can come into the galleries and listen to the proceedings of this House. We fortified the sound in this Legislature as it has been fortified in every Legislature in the country. We broadcast some of the proceedings based on the availability of time and money available. Some people use hearing aids. There are times when people have to leave this floor to take a 'phone call and like to keep abreast with what's going on without getting it secondhand. In your own home, the radio is piped to the various rooms of the house. Surely my Socialist friends don't want to live in the horse-and-buggy days.

An Hon. Member: — So what!

Mr. Coderre: — You say, "So what," what I am saying is this. We are living in a modern age. Don't be a bunch of old fogies. Live up. I don't think that because of the rules of the House and you can bring all the volumes you have of the past. Let's look forward. I would like to ask my young friend from Saskatoon to get up and say, "Let's look forward, let's not look back to the old rules."

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — I'll be speaking, I'll be speaking on it.

Mr. Coderre: — Let's not perpetuate this old-fashioned way. Let's move forward. Let's modernize this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Let us look forward and be up-to-date in this really wonderful electronic age.

April 2, 1968

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Let's do it with . . .

Mr. Coderre: — They did not ask for a speaker, Mr. Speaker, they didn't ask.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — What about the press? Didn't they have one?

Mr. Coderre: — They didn't ask for a speaker in their lounge. You know it's said in the good book, "Ask and ye shall receive." But you didn't ask, and you did not receive. But they are, Mr. Speaker, very childish. The Hon. Member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) says, "You've got the goodies, you can't have it anymore," rather than ask the House and say, "We would like to have a speaker." Then they would have had one.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — But you received without asking.

Mr. Coderre: — How childish, how utterly childish, Mr. Speaker, can the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) be, to waste valuable time in this House to bring such a matter in this Chamber when there are other important matters to deal with! I felt that I should not sit idly by and listen to this type of stuff when we are living in a modern age. The young Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) should get up and be modern. Now is the time, and tell these old fogies to get out of their horse and buggies. I believe what I say, Mr. Speaker, most strongly and I suggest that we avail ourselves of the most modern electronic equipment to facilitate the work of the House and give a chance for every Member of this House to be fully conversant when he unavoidably has to be out of this House. Let's move forward, Mr. Speaker. I will not support that motion.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) has indicated that he is a forward-looking person. I think all of us, when listening to his remarks, felt not only that he may have been a forward-looking person but he certainly started from a long way back. He suggested to us that we ask and it will be given unto us. Well, our request at this time is for a moment's earnest and careful consideration of this problem from the Members opposite. This is our request and I hope it will be given to us. I think that Members may feel that this is not a matter of great importance. I don't think it is going to occupy very many hours of the time of this House, but I think that it is worth some consideration. I think that any mechanical reproduction of the proceedings of any Legislature in any British Parliament in the world has been traditionally treated as a matter of privilege. It was done so in Ottawa as pointed out by my Leader, the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd).

Now may I point out to the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), the Minister of Labour, that the issue is not whether proceedings are conveyed out of the Chamber by electronic means. That is obviously not the issue. In days past this could have been the issue in the days in which he ordinarily conducts his thinking, in 1910 or 1920 or as the case may be. But as he says, we are in the electronic age and we should not hesitate to use electronic means if they are desirable. I make no apology for that. The issue is whether proceedings are being broadcast outside of the Chamber without the full knowledge and consent of the Chamber. That is the simple issue.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Every year at the commencement of the Legislature we formally pass a motion which runs something like this — it's respecting the Votes and Proceedings in the Legislature. We direct — and Members opposite all voted for it — that these proceedings be printed after having been first perused by Mr. Speaker, and that he do approve the printing thereof, and that no person except someone appointed by Mr. Speaker should presume to print the same. So what does all that say. It's archaic language but the meaning is clear: that proceedings in this Chamber are not to be reproduced except as the House may determine, acting through Mr. Speaker. That's what we say at the beginning of each session and every Member opposite voted for that. They have to ask themselves why they voted for it. Are Members opposite merely being archaic and old-fashioned, as they urge us not to be, or were they being in some sense, meaningful? Are they saying that we shouldn't reproduce these proceedings without the consent of the House? Well, I think it is a pretty sound principle that the House should control its own proceedings completely. It has all sorts of historic precedent. But I don't appeal to history, it doesn't appeal I take it to Members opposite. I suggest that any broadcast outside this Chamber should be something that this Chamber should consider and decide itself. Secondly, I say the broadcasting should be agreed to only if such broadcast will facilitate the work of the House. That seems to be pretty sensible and reasonable. By all means let's use electronic devices, but by all means let's confine their use to purposes which will assist the work of the House.

Now, in the past, we have certainly agreed to the broadcast of proceedings. We have radio broadcasts. We have decided that certain proceedings be broadcast. But we have done this deliberately, as a House. That leaves the matter fully in control of Mr. Speaker. Those broadcasts originate from the press gallery; that gallery is under the control of Mr. Speaker. He can, acting for the House, control those broadcasts; he can stop them if he wishes. He knows they are going on, they are under his control. All other Members know they are going on. All other Members know that these proceedings are broadcast, they are as a result of a conscious decision of the House. This is consistent with the position of using electronic devices

April 2, 1968

for the use of the House and we support it. Secondly, we have broadcasts to the offices of Mr. Speaker and the Clerk. These are manifestly for the advantage of the House. We in fact formally require Mr. Speaker to leave the Chamber but to be virtually on instant call. He has to engage in hundred-yard dashes from time to time. We in fact require the Clerk to leave the House because we insist that he prepare material for the next day's proceedings and this can only be done in his office. Yet we insist that he be on call, so clearly the reproduction of proceedings to the office of Mr. Speaker and the Clerk is for the benefit of the House. I think we can envisage a situation when it would be useful to have broadcasts to the galleries. I can envisage the day when we will have loudspeakers in the galleries, when we will have simultaneous translations into the French language. And it would seem to me that a reproduction of the debates to the galleries with simultaneous translations, all under the control of Mr. Speaker, would facilitate the work of the House. It seems to me that we should authorize Mr. Speaker to permit broadcasting to those areas of the Chamber which are under his direct control. But what can be said of broadcasts to the Members' lounge? What does this do for the work of the Assembly? I put this straight to Members opposite and to our own Members. What does a broadcast to the Members' lounge do for the work of the Assembly? It encourages our all too evident tendency to absenteeism as it is. We and other Legislatures have been under a great deal of public criticism because we are absent from our seats. We know that some of this criticism is ill-warranted, because we know there are many, many tasks which we as MLAs have to undertake outside the Chamber. But I think that we should be aware of the fact that the public expects us to be in our seats when we are not conducting our affairs as MLAs elsewhere in the building or elsewhere outside the building, and we should be aware of the fact that piping the proceedings to the lounge will only encourage us to be absent from the Chamber and in the lounge. I haven't heard any arguments from Members opposite that proceedings piped to the lounges do anything to facilitate the work of the House. I suggest it leaves us open to further erosion of the practices, procedures and traditions of the Assembly. I am not one who suggests that procedures should remain inviolate. Obviously they shouldn't. But I ask that before we change something we ask whether the change is going to do us some good as a legislative and deliberative body. It raises suspicions in people's minds when proceedings of the Legislature are piped outside the Chamber, without anybody's knowledge or consent. I know that Mr. McIlraith, later the Hon. George McIlraith in the Cabinet supported by Members opposite in discussing a similar situation used rather extreme language in the Hansard of July 19, 1958. I quote him not because I necessarily approve of his words but I quote him to indicate what misgivings are raised in the minds of a reasonable man when he finds that the proceedings of the House are piped to some area of which he is not aware, at times of which he is not aware. He says:

It means that it is possible, once the wire is taken

outside in that way, to have it wired or sent by long distance 'phone anywhere in the world, to have anyone brought in for the purpose of listening. Where does this thing stop? Are our caucus rooms wired? Are our private telephones tapped, or where does the matter stop?

This I am quoting from the Hon. George McIlraith. You may feel that his words were extreme. I merely point out that he was a Cabinet Minister in the Pearson Government and presumably is a man of some perspicacity, although I don't know whether that assumption is warranted. I suggest to you that these types of misgivings are raised in the minds of the people. We, as an Assembly, should insist that every broadcast of our proceedings be only on the express prior consent of Mr. Speaker acting for the House, and that no equipment for broadcasting be installed without such prior consent. I think that at this time we should confine our consent to radio broadcasts as established, to the equipment required by Mr. Speaker and the Clerk, and any equipment required in the galleries under the control of Mr. Speaker. That, I suggest, is the appropriate limits at this time.

Now the Member for Morse, the Premier (Mr. Thatcher), suggests that he will do what the Speaker directs him to do. The Speaker is not going to direct anyone to do anything. The Speaker is going to reflect the view of this Assembly, as he ought properly to do. He is not going to tell the Premier that he can't pipe these proceedings. I think it is up to us to make up our minds at what times we use and in what areas we use the electronic devices, which have been commended to us by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), and I think properly commended to us. And I think that they ought to be for the broadcasts which we as a Chamber agree to, for the use of Mr. Speaker and for the Clerk and for any use in the galleries, under the control of Mr. Speaker.

Now I looked at the motion, Mr. Speaker, and I thought that it was capable of certain ambiguities of interpretation and therefore I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) that the motion be varied so that after the word 'equipment' in line one the words will be inserted 'except with the express consent of the Assembly acting through Mr. Speaker.' And that all the words after 'anywhere' be deleted and the following words be added: 'and that this Assembly hereby confirms its consent to such installation in offices and galleries under the direct control of Mr. Speaker.' Thus, Mr. Speaker, the amendment will read:

That this Assembly is of the opinion that except with the express consent of the Assembly acting through Mr. Speaker, equipment to transmit proceedings of the Legislature, should not be installed anywhere and, that this Assembly hereby confirms its consent to such installation in offices and galleries under the direct control of Mr. Speaker.

This amendment will then say that unless the Assembly agrees,

April 2, 1968

broadcasting devices should not be approved anywhere, and that this Assembly confirms its consent to these in the offices of Mr. Speaker and the Clerk and in galleries under the control of Mr. Speaker. Now I think that is a proper and appropriate position for this House to take.

Mr. Coderre: — Before the Member sits down, would he permit a question? In the Resolution that you submit at this moment there is no legal enforcement into this. I speak as a technician again. What about the people who could be in the galleries with lapel microphones and transmitters and the like to transmit elsewhere. There you make no provisions and still it makes no difference.

Mr. Blakeney: — I think that obviously enforcement is another problem. I think that Mr. Speaker ought to prohibit in the gallery people with reproducing devices, bugging mikes or that sort of thing, in the same way that he would prohibit anyone taking stenographic notes in the gallery. I think that this is well established. No one can sit in those galleries and take stenographic notes of the proceedings. I think that Mr. Speaker would, acting by similar authority, prohibit anyone who had manifested a bugging device from recording the proceedings electronically. Enforcement is another problem. I suggest to the House that this is something which we can consider after we decided the principle.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Hon. Member a question before he takes his seat — it is really by way of a comment — whether he thinks the wording is apt to do what he really wants it to do and I refer to the words ‘that equipment to transmit proceedings in the Legislature.’ This isn’t equipment to transmit proceedings; this is equipment to receive transmissions from the Legislature. In the old days when I was a radar mechanic in the air force, I knew a little about transmitters and receivers. These pieces of equipment are receiving transmissions which originate in the Legislative Chamber and I don’t want to be too technical, but I don’t think that your words are apt. This is not equipment to transmit proceedings of the Legislature. This is not a transmitter.

Mr. Blakeney: — Our objection is not to the fact that the Members opposite may have a receiver in their lounge. Our objection is the fact that this receiver is tied to the Tannoy equipment. It is the transmitting that I am complaining about. It is the fact that the messages are being transmitted from our broadcasting system to some other receiver. Lots of people have portable radios in which they may receive the proceedings of the House.

Mr. Heald: — That’s what that is!

Mr. Blakeney: — No. If that's a radio I'd be surprised.

Mr. Heald: — It's a receiver.

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh yes, but it's a wire. It is not wireless telegraphy; it's wire.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Before I put the question on the amendment, I would draw the attention of the Members of the House to the fact and this is relevant to the question that was raised previously. The fact is that recording devices just aren't used in the galleries. At least if they are they are not supposed to be. Those are the instructions that the commissionaires and others have in regard to that. That should clarify that situation.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment and the motion. I first want to express my appreciation to the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You can't speak on the motion and the amendment. The debate is on the amendment.

Mr. Smishek: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. . . . for bringing to the attention of this Legislature that according to his information a loudspeaker or some listening device or devices were installed in the Liberal Members' lounge which pipe in the debates of this Legislature into that lounge. I also welcome the prompt action of Your Honour, for investigating and reporting on the matter as soon as this issue was brought to your attention. Mr. Speaker's investigation confirms that such listening equipment was discovered in the Liberal Members' lounge. It has also been confirmed that this equipment was installed without the knowledge of Mr. Speaker. We all know that the matter was not considered or approved by this Legislature. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, this listening equipment was installed on the direction of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). We don't know whether it was installed at the request of the Government. We do not know and have not had reports as to when this equipment was installed and what use was or is being made by the Liberal Members of the debates that are being piped into the lounge. Nor do we have a report on precisely what kind of equipment is being used, Mr. Speaker.

We know that in this age of electronics there are many varieties of machines that are being used for recording and transmitting sounds. We know that there are many forms of equipment that can and are being used in bugging, wire tapping, eavesdropping and snooping, by electronics to invade the

April 2, 1968

privacy of individuals, meetings, and gatherings of people. Privacy is a very foundation of freedom, Mr. Speaker. United States Attorney General Ramsay Clarke recently stated:

Nothing so mocks privacy as the wire tape and the electronic surveillance. They are incompatible with a free society. The late Justice Wendall Holmes of the United States Supreme Court called it 'dirty business.'

And that is what it is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you have advised this Assembly, last Friday, that you have searched the rules and are unable to find a precedent on which to base a ruling. It is significant that of all the nations who have adopted the parliamentary system of government, the matter of bugging the proceedings of the legislature or parliament has never come up. It is foreign to all the millions of people who are governed by a similar rule as we are. The Thatcher Administration scored another first. While it may not be an illegal one, it is indeed a dubious first, and an unwanted first. Parliamentary democracy remains a great experiment in the government of free men. Can it continue as a great and useful experiment when its very foundation is being uprooted? Can it gain the confidence of other people demanding freedom, when those at the head of our so-called democracy are resorting to dirty business? We only know what has been uncovered and reported so far, Mr. Speaker. What else is being bugged and recorded? There is a great deal of doubt and suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, let me elaborate. Last week the Premier announced in this House that no legislation allowing beer and wine advertising would be introduced. He is reported in the press as saying, "Only three or four Opposition Members would support such legislation." The Leader of the Opposition took exception to the Premier's press statement and told him he was presumptuous. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Premier's statement was made without any knowledge of facts. The Hon. Premier answered to Mr. Lloyd as reported in the press and let me quote:

The Premier said that he knew about as much about the NDP Caucus feelings as did Mr. Lloyd.

In the light of this statement by the Premier, how can we be sure that the privacy of the Opposition Members is not being invaded.

An Hon. Member: — Nonsense!

Mr. Smishek: — How can we be sure, Mr. Speaker, that Room 267, the Opposition caucus room is not being bugged?

Mr. Heald: — You are losing confidence!

Mr. Smishek: — How can we be sure that the Opposition lounge and the offices that we work in are not wired and the discussions that take place are not being recorded, Mr. Speaker? How can we be sure that our telephones in this building and in our homes are not being tapped, Mr. Speaker? The Premier's statement gives us cause for suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, we know that this Government has taken many direct actions to deny many freedoms, many fundamental freedoms of people. We know that they have denied the freedoms of Crown corporations and Government employees. We know that they have refused and are continuing to refuse to answer questions, asking for information which the public are interested and concerned about. Mr. Speaker, we know the violent and constant attack on the rights of wage-earners and their unions. We know the oppressive amendments to The Trade Union Act. We know the enactment of the compulsory arbitration laws, all denying the rights of people. Mr. Speaker, we know the action taken by this Government in respect of the University and its faculty, the moves to control university financing and academic freedom. Mr. Speaker, we know the actions by this Government in regard to the teachers and their rights and their attempt to deny the rights of that profession. Mr. Speaker, we have had another example this morning of the contempt that Members on the opposite side hold towards the Opposition, asking and proposing matters of interest to the public.

Mr. Speaker, who is next on the chopping block? Who else is going to be attacked? What other rights and freedoms are going to be denied? Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the matter of the University. In the last week or ten days, we have read reports and newspapers that police have been snooping and tape recording lectures without the express permission of the University. The University President has sent letters of protest to the police asking for the assurances that men were not being planted in various lecture halls.

Mr. Heald: — It's Henry's police!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we know of the statement made in Moose Jaw on December 7, by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) in regard to the University. He said that the time will come when we will have to take over academic control as well as financial control.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that the Minister of Public Works will control the University construction. One may well ask, Mr. Speaker, if there is a corollary between his views on academic freedom, his authority over university capital expenditures and the police snooping and tape recording lectures.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that this is the man who was responsible for the installation of the listening devices in the Liberal lounge room of the proceedings of this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 2, 1968

Mr. Smishek: — This is the man who is responsible for it. The planting of loudspeakers in the Government Members' lounge without the approval of this Assembly or without the approval of you, Sir, in my opinion is a serious breach of the rights of this legislature. This action cannot be condoned; it must be condemned, Mr. Speaker. These devices should immediately be dismantled as requested by you, Mr. Speaker. We need also the assurance, Mr. Speaker, that our meeting rooms, our lounge rooms and our offices and our telephones are not being bugged and that the discussions that are taking place there are not being recorded.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to support the amendment and the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to address the Chamber, maybe in French. It may help.

This is a rather serious matter. The Members on this side of the House were not aware of this piping or tapping or call it what you may, into the Liberal Members' lounge. And only by accident did we find out. I want to also point out I think there is a notice on the door "For Members only." I can recall one time when two Members of your side barged into our Members' lounge to count the numbers that were there. We didn't complain about it. Now they don't even want anybody to know what is going on in that Members' lounge. Have they all taken an oath of secrecy? I don't know. Another thing, throughout the years we've had Members on our side who have expressed doubt that our caucus room was being bugged. Now, I never agreed with them that our caucus rooms were being bugged. I could not go along with that, because I always felt that Members who get elected to the Legislature have a certain measure of dignity, a certain measure of responsibility, and they would not do such a thing as bugging a room. But now, after what we have seen — we didn't see him do it — we had the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) dig in the waste paper baskets of some of our people and then bring the stuff into the House and read it. In my home, I don't even allow one kid to read the other kid's letter without his permission. I don't even read my own children's letters unless I advise them that I would like to do so. We try to teach our youngsters this type of responsibility. What does the Member for Athabasca do? He will go into wastepaper baskets and all over the place. He will allow this type of tapping without telling us or telling the Speaker about it. I think that the Government opposite, in order to restore some of the dignities, should certainly not leave this building in charge of the Member for Athabasca.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — If you want to regain the dignity in connection with this House, this is a first must as far as I am concerned. I am not speaking for the rest of the Members. I am expressing my own opinion. I think that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) would be much better in charge of this building than allowing it in the hands of the Member for Athabasca.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — The Member for Athabasca has proven to be unworthy of being in charge of this building. As long as he will be in charge of it, I will have to share the view that there is a possibility that our caucus rooms are being bugged. This is too bad, but it took till the other day for me to change my mind. The Members opposite can bear me out that I have always said, “No, this is not true and I am prepared to hold our caucus meetings in this building.”

There is doubt in people’s minds. After what has happened there is a lot more doubt — and as a matter of fact I am beginning to doubt too.

As far as the Premier saying that he knew more about our caucus than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), I kind of think that he knows quite a bit. If they are capable of doing what they did here, in getting a speaker over there and hiding it from us, then you can only assume that they can do many more things. I am not going to keep you too long, but to me this falls in the class of Peeping Toms. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I will let the matter rest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I don’t intend to inject a great deal into this. I don’t want to deal with all of the ramifications that might be involved. I think that a bad precedent has been established for a number of reasons. I think that the Whip on the opposite side of the House in company with myself probably has a tendency to frown on the matter of transmitting the debates that are going on inside this House, some place else other than in the public galleries and the press gallery, where a privilege is accorded to the people who are making use of the transmission of that sound for a good legitimate use.

I think that it has to be generally accepted, Mr. Speaker, that our Houses of Parliament whether it’s on the Federal basis or whether it’s Provincially, have fallen into quite a degree of disrepute as far as the members of the general public are concerned over the past number of years in particular. I think that we are all somewhat apologetic and we should be rightly apologetic for the appearance that we put forward to visitors to this gallery. I think for this reason that this presents

April 2, 1968

one of the best arguments for not piping the proceedings of this gallery to Members' lounges. It encourages Members to leave the Chamber in mass as we see them do from time to time, when a discussion is taking place. Whether they have no interest in the debate or whether they do it for the purpose of showing disrespect for the Member that is speaking, I am not prepared to say. We have seen on occasion after occasion Members trooping out of this House during debates. Then all of a sudden during the past few days, when something arises in the Assembly, we have seen them rushing through the door in mass, fully aware of the debates that were taking place, because of the fact that they had been piped into the Members' room where I expect they were engaged in drinking coffee, lying horizontal or perhaps playing cribbage. I don't think that this is the way this House should be conducted, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that you with your knowledge and respect for parliamentary procedure will be inclined to agree. For the Premier to stand in his place and say that because we have raised this question, that they intend to vote the matter down — all three motions, one, two, three — is to completely disregard the wishes not of the Opposition but I think the Government has shown a lack of respect which it owes to this Assembly, in the matter that is under discussion when we are dealing with the three motions that are before us today.

I have a good deal of respect for this Assembly and I believe all Members have a responsibility to support the motions that are before us, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this motion, I do it with sadness rather than anger. Last Thursday when I heard that this Liberal Government had installed a hearing device in its lounge, it seemed to me that not only had this Legislature been desecrated but also that the whole parliamentary procedure had been smeared as well.

Eleven years ago when I came to this Chamber for the first time, I entered it with a feeling of awe and dedication. Since that time I have come to love this Legislature and come to see it not just as a Legislature but as a symbol of the struggle of the common man to be able to speak and to govern himself. Here lie the traditions of hundreds of years. Many of the procedures that we do are actually the symbols of a long struggle for self-government dating to the time of King John and his first surrender to the nobles.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that you were chosen by this Legislature and not by the Government points out the fact that you have been chosen to represent the people. I have come to respect the role of Speaker of this House and what it represents. The fact that, on the first day of the Legislature, you were pulled out of your seat and led to your present seat, tells a story that it was not an envious position at one time, but

above all that you were chosen by the people. All these things point to why you have command of this Chamber. You are the representative of the common man. This is why, for instance, that the second day of each session a motion is passed that only you may give permission to print proceedings of this House. And there is very good reason for this. You are again the Master of the House. It is the rule that no one may take notes in the galleries. Actually even the press are allowed in the press gallery with your permission. I want to make it clear that I think that they should be there. But again, I say, that you represent the power of the people and as such, you are the people.

Mr. Speaker, through all the years since 1905 there has been a long list of Speakers. All have brought dignity to this House as you have since you filled your role as Speaker. I admire you, Sir, for your statement and your decision of Friday last.

Each one of us in this Legislature was elected last October 11, by the people of our respective constituencies. Why? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is to come here to this Legislature, to speak for our people, to listen for our people, and to make decisions for our people. And, Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to this Chamber to conduct the business of this Province and not to sit in a smoke-filled room somewhere close by, where we could sit or lie down and then rush in whenever the bell rings, and collect our pay at the end of the session.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, that we were sent here to this Chamber to conduct the business of our Province. Several times this session, the Opposition could have won voice votes, if it had not been for the bell that saved the day for the Government. Naturally back benchers to your right with a speaker in their lounge didn't have to sit in their places. I say nothing, Mr. Speaker, about Members stepping out for a smoke or a cup of coffee for a few minutes. We all do that. And I see nothing wrong with it. But, Mr. Speaker, our place is in here, each in our own place attending to the business of our Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — This is why we were sent here. And this is where we should be. Mr. Speaker, I come back to the hearing device installed in the Government lounge. To me the great sin is that it was done without your permission or knowledge and without the knowledge of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, there is only one word to describe this — Government Members sneaked. What kind of Members are they? If they would do this, what would they do to their own constituents? I say that they are not to be trusted and are not worthy to represent their people. What kind of people are they who would do this to their own colleague, yourself, Sir? Surely they must hang their heads in shame even though they sit with sanctimonious grins . . .

April 2, 1968

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Now I have no intentions of allowing any ruling of mine to be dragged into parties and debates, and that's just about where you are going at the present time.

Mr. Meakes: — Okay, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I will withdraw. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the role of an elected representative is or should be of a high quality. Many times it has disturbed me to hear and read smearing remarks about politicians. So many people look on us and our profession as a dirty word. This should not be. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the actions of Members to your right of sneaking this device into their lounge, of wire tapping that brings on the attitude of the people to look disparagingly on our profession. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the role of government is important enough. Surely we are being paid enough that we will attend our work in our seats. I don't claim to have been perfect, I am a long way from being a perfect Member. We all make mistakes, I have, I know but I have tried to serve my people and I will continue to do so. Apparently my Hon. Friends across the way don't care whether they serve them or not when they don't sit in their seats.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — That's very unfair!

Mr. Meakes: — Well, okay, Mr. Attorney General. He says it's unfair — I will withdraw. Some Members I know go out on business . . .

Mr. Heald: — I'll put my record against anybody over there.

Mr. Meakes: — Okay, I agree, Mr. Attorney General and I will take this back. I know that of you and some other certain Members of this House the record has been very good, but I am talking about the groups of Members who sat out hour after hour . . .

An Hon. Member: — Look at your side!

Mr. Meakes: — There are a few questions that I want to ask. The Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) asked some of them, but I have to ask them too. I ask how many other rooms are wired in this building? I was one who didn't believe that they were. It was raised in our caucus room whether it was bugged. I agree with my Hon. Friend from Kinistino that some Members thought the caucus chambers might be wired, but if they will do this, which they did without permission, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they might do other things.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I come back to our profession. Surely the job of government deserves better dedication, better service and better people than that. Your role, Mr.

Speaker, is a difficult one. First, by tradition I know that during sessions you are more or less cut off from your colleagues so you may be impartial. To operate this House and to keep it moving smoothly you must have a great knowledge of both procedures and precedents. Yet this group of Members across the way in my opinion have betrayed you. They have not the grace and the manners and the feelings to apologize to you, then I do for them. Mr. Speaker, I say mistakes have been made and we must learn from mistakes. I feel we must make certain in this House that wire tapping is not condoned or allowed. Democracy must be defended and guarded. For the sake of those who come after, we must not allow what has happened at this session to happen again. I will be supporting the amendment and also the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — I am going to make a few observations this morning in this debate. Then I am going to ask leave to adjourn the debate because first of all, when some of the Hon. Members opposite started to speak, I thought they were being humorous, I thought they weren't being serious about this. Now that I have had the opportunity to listen to the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) — I won't mention the Member for Regina North East because we're becoming accustomed, Mr. Speaker, to these trade-union diatribes of his and this was just another one this morning — I am concerned by the remarks of the Member for Kinistino and the Member for Touchwood because I have some respect for them and they have indicated apparently in all seriousness — and I have to assume that they are serious about this — that they think maybe their caucus chambers are wired and that there is some wire tapping going on. Now that is a very serious accusation, and as Attorney General I can't allow the opportunity to go by without exploring this matter. I would say to them and I would say to all Hon. Members that, if you are making this in the form of an accusation, if you're serious about this accusation or this suggestion that any room in this Legislature, in this building, any caucus room that you use or anybody else uses, is wired or there are any electronic devices used there, then upon receipt of a written request from you, I will order the RCMP immediately starting at 1:30 o'clock p.m. to go into every room . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Put up or shut up!

Mr. Heald: — Now I want you to either say that you want this or if you don't want it, if you weren't serious in your accusation, then I think you should withdraw the accusation. I don't think it's fair to come in here and sort of toss something out in

April 2, 1968

the air and say we think our room is bugged. Then when the Attorney General offers to have the police come in, you back off. You're so very fond of doing this, the Hon. Members opposite. It's very distressing and it makes me very sad to have to listen to this debate this morning. I make no apologies for being sad, because it is costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan about \$1,200 an hour to listen to this diatribe about something that is purely political. It is upsetting and distressing for a Member to have to listen to an almost psychopathic pre-occupation with things political.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — This is all this is, Mr. Speaker. It is an attempt to try and embarrass somebody because a loudspeaker was put in the Members' lounge. That's all it is, it's a loudspeaker out there. You mean the radio proceedings of this Chamber are broadcast. They are not on now, but they've been on for the last, well during the two major debates in this House, so that we could listen if we had a radio in there. But we couldn't listen if we didn't have a radio. Now what sense is there to that? What about the Press? The press I understand had an earphone. Do my Hon. Friends think the press shouldn't have an earphone to listen to the proceedings? Is that what you are saying? This business about going back to Magna Carta, Mr. Speaker, is a pretty shabby attempt to make political capital out of something that is not serious at all, not a serious thing at all. I am getting a little bit tired, I don't mind telling you, Mr. Speaker, of the attempts of the people opposite, this schizophrenic persecution complex that they have on the other side. That's all it is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — The other day in the paper we saw a picture of two halls, one hall that was the Members of the Opposition hall where they had a little bit of plaster hanging down. Well you can't improve something, you can't renovate something until you put workers in there and do some painting. And that's what is happening. So you have two pictures. The Members of the Government went through this a few weeks ago, and we didn't call the photographers in to show that there was work being done there.

Mr. Lloyd: — Neither did we call the photographers in.

Mr. Heald: — All right, I didn't say you did.

An Hon. Member: — No, you didn't say you did, of course not!

Mr. Heald: — But I have to. My office is on the third floor and

I have to duck the painters too, but I'm delighted because it's going to be a wonderful building when it's finished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — You let it go to pieces for the 20 years you were in. You didn't renovate it. We're just keeping it up. It's a beautiful building and we think the people of this province want it kept up and want it renovated so that everybody can be proud of it. But it is the kind of thing that we get all the time, this continual whining, Mr. Speaker, about persecution, we're picking on them. It's an amazing thing. We're picking on them because we're renovating the building. We're picking on them because there is a loudspeaker, I am sure if you had asked the Minister of Public Works, he would have given you one, but that wouldn't have been nearly as much fun, as coming in here with three substantive motions and wailing about democracy and about Magna Carta and about King John and so on and so forth. This is much more fun and they hope that it will be much more political capital. With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Would the Member permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: — Question! Question of privilege?

Mr. Thibault: — I was referred to by the Attorney General on the question whether we were throwing this up for political reasons. I want to say right here and now, in my constituency I don't need this stuff to be elected. I am not using it for that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Thibault: — If you will give me time to explain . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The Member has made one speech. He can't make two.

Mr. Thibault: — No, but I'm getting to the reference that he has made and I'd like to clear that up right now.

Mr. Speaker: — What I think you will have to do is tell the Attorney General whether you want an investigation or whether you don't.

Mr. Thibault: — No, I want to clarify my

April 2, 1968

position. This is what I want to do. If the Members across the way would give me a chance to say a few words we could clarify it. When I said things about the caucus rooms, I could not agree with doubts in my Members' minds that they were bugged. But after what has transpired, I am inclined to join with them to say that I have some doubt.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I asked for leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — I asked what the Member for Saskatoon rises on, a point of order, a point of privilege, what is it? Will the Minister answer a question?

Mr. Brockelbank: — I'll try and phrase it so it's intelligent, even for you. I want to know if the Minister condoned the fact that the Members had placed in contravention to the rules of the House a speaker in that lounge.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, when I continue in this debate, and I have asked to adjourn it, I'll tell the Hon. Member whether I condone it or not. At the moment I have asked leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 13 — REQUEST FOR REMOVAL OF LOUDSPEAKERS

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):

That, if he has not already done so, the Minister of Public Works be directed to remove or cause to be removed forthwith, any equipment to transmit proceedings of the Legislature except that installed in offices directly under the control of Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution asks the Legislature to instruct the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) if he hasn't already done so to remove or cause to be removed, the equipment which transmits proceedings from this Legislature to certain other parts of this building. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the point needs to be reiterated because quite obviously some Members opposite have missed the point. That point is simply this: that it is a right of the Legislature to determine rules with respect to what happens in this Legislature. The point is that the arrangements which have transmitted proceedings from here to across the hall were made without reference to this Legislature. It is our feeling that decisions of this kind, actions of this kind should be taken only as a result of decisions of the Legislature. I have already this morning referred to the way in which we give permission to transmit proceedings by way

of radio broadcasts of certain proceedings. It was done as a result of a motion properly introduced, discussed and passed in this Legislature. Each year, we according to our rules renew that permission. We have enshrined in our Standing Orders the position of that procedure because we have a standing committee of the House to deal with it. It is our opinion that this is the way in which we ought to deal with this matter. I am not allowed to discuss the remarks which have been made in the previous debate and I presume we can anticipate the same sort of ones in this one. It is disappointing. I think that a great many people must feel very sad about it. Well here we go, Mr. Speaker, and if any evidence is needed of this willingness of some Members across there to reduce this Legislature to just a routine procedure rather than a purposeful activity, we get it in remarks of that kind.

Mr. MacDougall: — Nuts!

Mr. Lloyd: — Nuts, says the Member for Estevan. It is one of the best words he is capable of using.

Mr. Steuart: — Shame!

Mr. Lloyd: — Shame, says the Provincial Treasurer. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of the Members towards this whole procedure is disappointing, is something about which they and the people of this province ought to be downright sad. It is not important. The present Prime Minister of Canada, Leader at that time of the Federal Liberal party thought it was important just a few years ago. Why does the importance decrease because of a few thousand miles in four or five years? I would have thought at least . . .

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — On a point of order. The Speaker on Friday made a ruling that the device in the Members' lounge be taken out forthwith. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that was done and this motion is completely out of order. I don't know why he is debating this.

Mr. Lloyd: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, this House has no information that the device has been removed.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, we are telling you now.

Mr. Lloyd: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are going to tell us now then they should have told us, it seems to me, prior to this point. May I point out that one reason for the Resolution is the same Speaker's ruling which has been raised as a point of order at this time. I invite the Minister of Highways to read

April 2, 1968

that ruling. I'd be happy to invite him to think about it if I thought that it would do any good. The Speaker points out that there is no rule which he can find which enables him to make a ruling to order in that way. May I in particular draw attention of the Minister of Highways who has raised this point to the last paragraph of the Speaker's comment. That last paragraph is:

I have therefore suggested that the installation be dismantled pending a decision of the House by a substantive motion.

The Speaker was unable to rule. He suggested that action be taken pending a decision of the House by a substantive motion. That motion is now before us. And if the Members across there want to support the Speaker, they will vote for this motion now at this time.

I draw attention again . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I said once more before today that I wasn't going to allow the Chair to be dragged into political bickering and partisan conflict in this House. I gave that ruling in what I thought was the best interests of this Legislature, the best interests of all of the Members in the Legislature, the best interests of all of the people of this Province, and to preserve those principles of freedom, human dignity and human liberty and through parliamentary self-government in which I believe. If you are going to drag my ruling onto the floor of this House, and thereby bring the Chair into disrepute in the House by making it a basis for a bitter partisan discussion, I'll rule every one of your confounded three motions founded on it out of order. I don't mean maybe.

Now you just keep the Chair out of your bitter two-bit petty party conflicts. Now go ahead.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This point of order was not raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that you are completely out of order in chastising him verbally in the manner you have. The point of order was raised by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). He is the one that brought the ruling into this House under question at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now I ask the Member to take his seat. I have said what I had to say. If anybody in this House doesn't like it, you have the remedy, that is to move a substantive motion of want in confidence in your Speaker. You will then have the opportunity of debating it on that side and this side. And I will have the opportunity to defend myself and believe me, I will. That is the end of the discussion.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the end of which discussion, may I ask?

Mr. Speaker: — Not the end of your discussion on the motion, no. But the end of any discussion in regard to the ruling that I made about bringing the Chair and the ruling that I made into the political partisan conflict.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I must save my words and my feelings until some later date. I agree with you on that point. In the face of that comment I find it extremely difficult to continue with the discussion of the Resolution.

The Resolution calls, and I am not quoting your motion, Sir, it calls for what I interpret it to be, support of the statement that you made in this House. I quoted not with any intention of partisan bickering but clearly to indicate one reason why I felt that the motion was essential at this time. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the argument has been well enough made. As of this moment our position is this. There was a device installed in this Legislature which transmitted the proceedings outside of the Legislature. This device was installed without reference to the Speaker for his permission. This device was installed without reference to this Legislature. It has been intimated by the Premier and others, speaking from their seats and not in the debate, that the device has been removed. If that is the case then there is no problem since the motion is before us of them supporting the Resolution. I think that it is important that we add to the records of this House a motion of this kind. When there has been a breach of propriety by action of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) or whoever was responsible, then this Legislature should speak. This Legislature should speak to make certain that impropriety is corrected at the earliest possible moment. This is the earliest possible moment that I have had an opportunity to do this, to make certain that it is corrected, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about this Resolution. I hope that I am in order. I had spoken on the first Resolution. I know that you will tell me if I am out of order. However, today in the House, we are talking about certain electrical devices being placed in other parts of the Chambers. Hon. Members opposite charge that this Government in some way had bugged their lobby and certain other places. We have offered to bring the RCMP for a full investigation. We emphatically deny what they have said and yet the Leader of the Opposition has not taken up our challenge.

Mr. Lloyd: — May I rise on a point of order. It seems to me that the Leader of the Government is clearly discussing something on a previous debate.

April 2, 1968

Mr. Speaker: — This matter was raised in a previous debate. That is the debate just concluded by adjournment, that is by adjournment of the debate. Could I draw to your attention the motion that we are now discussing. The motion says in part as follows:

That, if he has not already done so, the Minister of Public Works be directed to remove or cause to be removed forthwith, any equipment that transmits proceedings of the Legislature.

That would include the discussion of any equipment that might be anywhere else, I could hardly rule the Premier and what he has said out of order on that basis. It seems to me that the two motions are so similar that that which can be discussed on one could almost be discussed on the other. In fact I almost thought that one or the other was out of order. But I didn't say it was and I am not going to either.

Mr. Lloyd: — Further on a point of order, if I may say so I have no objection to the Premier ranging fairly widely in discussing this Resolution. But what I think is a proper objection is that he should refer to statements made by Members on this side of the House in the previous Resolution on which discussion has been adjourned, not on the discussion on this particular Resolution on which I am as yet the only speaker.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, since the Opposition apparently lacks the courage to back their claims by asking the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) to bring in the RCMP, we shall take such action. I think that this charge is most serious. The Opposition knows full well that no bugging has taken place. However I, as head of the Government, will ask the Attorney General this afternoon to bring the RCMP into their caucus room, and see if there has been any bugging.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I am quite sure that this will show again the irresponsibility of the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). Repeatedly he used tactics of smear, trying to disparage his Opposition. We shall see whether he knows anything about this matter. The only bugging that has ever been done in this House, Mr. Speaker, was by the former Attorney General who had telephones tapped. Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment on this debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 14 — VOTE OF CENSURE

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):

That this Legislature censures the Government for having installed, or caused to be installed and/or condoned the installation of equipment to transmit proceedings of the Legislature without having first obtained the leave of the Legislature.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, we are now at the point of discussing not just the procedure which has been undertaken and which we have been discussing, but also the part which the Government in one way or another, has played with respect to this incident. May I say to begin with that this is an important matter. This is not a matter of petty political bargaining for position. I must quote or re-quote statements of those for whom I thought Members opposite would have some respect to substantiate that statement. I do want to add a statement of another Member of their party at Ottawa. One statement of his has been discussed by my colleague from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) in an earlier debate this morning. I refer to some comments by the Hon. Mr. McIlraith contained in page 531 of the Debates of the House of Commons, 1959, Volume I. Mr. McIlraith is speaking you will notice almost a year after the previous discussion. He says:

There is one other matter I want to raise. Last year a great many Members and a great many people outside this House were shocked to discover that the loudspeaker system in this House had been tapped and taken outside this Chamber.

I would have thought comments of that kind from one of the senior statesmen of the Liberal party at Ottawa might have some meaning and some effect on the Members opposite. Says Mr. McIlraith he was shocked. He says that not only was he shocked but a great many Members of the House were shocked and a great many people outside of the House were shocked to discover that the loudspeaker system in the House had been tapped and taken outside the Chamber. In the light of opinion such as that and in the light of opinion such as those I quoted from Mr. Pearson, I have no apologies to make to this House for taking up the time in discussing this thing which has happened here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I notice the readiness of the Premier, (probably we will have it repeated again) and of the Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) calling this silly hogwash and other names of that kind.

Mr. Coderre: — I haven't spoken in this debate at all, Mr. Speaker. He is referring to what I said.

Mr. Lloyd: — I am contemplating, Mr. Speaker, what the Member

April 2, 1968

is going to say and I presume he is saying. If there are any Members over there who are contemplating this kind of . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Hogwash! He had to withdraw and nobody else is going to say it again.

Mr. Lloyd: — In case other Members over there are going to use similar language and attack this one in a similar way, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the Journals of the Saskatchewan Legislature for the session of 1941. I was going to, Sir, read the opinion of the Speaker at that time. It may be that you will want to rule me out of order. That of course is your privilege. But, Mr. Speaker at that time, as recorded on page 104 and this is the record for March 28, 1941, had this to say with respect to that kind of criticism which we've had and to which I have referred.

Certain Hon. Members seem to have developed a practice, of late, of referring in somewhat sarcastic terms to the debates which take place in the House. Too frequently, Hon. Members are prefacing their remarks by allusions to the amount of time taken by other Members, and making use of such statements as "too much talk," "waste of time useless debate," "getting down to business" and so on.

It is my considered opinion that such comments are subversive of the dignity of Parliament and the prestige of this Assembly. They are also calculated to restrict privileges of the individual Member which are his by right, by precedent and by tradition, in a British Parliament

Mr. Speaker that day goes on to say and I quote:

In my opinion, also, there seems to be some confusion in the minds of some Hon. Members who are guilty of these references as to what Parliament is. I would remind Members that under our constitution, Parliament is a deliberative and legislative, not an executive and not an administrative body. As its name implies, its functions are based on that fundamental liberty which we know as "Freedom of Speech", subject to certain prescriptions laid down in Standing Orders of this Assembly and of the Canadian House of Commons.

And I'm not going to talk about the Magna Carta or other worthwhile statutes of that kind, but I think it is important we note what was said on this previous date. Mr. Speaker that day continues:

Nor is it given to any Member on the floor of the House to characterize any debate as "useless," any speech as

a “waste of time.” It is the duty of the Speaker so to conduct debate, that the irrelevant is excluded, the dilatory quashed, the obstructive prevented . . .

He goes on to say to the Members that:

I would appeal to them to co-operate with me in an effort to enhance, rather than reduce, the respect to which this Assembly is properly entitled, and to increase rather than diminish, a confidence which the people of the province repose in us as our elected representatives.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is well for us to be reminded of these comments of the Speaker in 1941.

Now returning to the motion and to the Government’s part in ordering, or allowing to continue to operate, this particular device, I submit there can be no doubt but that the breach of propriety is a very serious one. The question can be raised was it an intentional act of impropriety, or wasn’t it? I don’t really know that the answer is important in that regard. If the answer is that it wasn’t intentional, and I’m quite ready to accept that it wasn’t intentional, it raises some other questions. Some of those questions have been answered already this morning. It raises questions such as this: is this Government so insensitive to the rights of the Legislature that it would take this action without consultation? It raises the question: is this Government so careless and casual about procedure that it is prepared to thumb its nose at 150 years and more of legislative practice and legislative rules? It is, Mr. Speaker, almost inconceivable that the Government would be so insensitive, so careless or so casual. Certainly the Government cannot plead that it did not know that this device was in existence. Certainly it can hardly plead ignorance that this was in opposition to the laws or the rules of this Legislature. The Premier has had many years of experience in this House and the Federal House. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) has been in this House since 1948. He frequently comments and comments with effect on the rules. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) is one to whom we look as a guardian of the rules from the Government point of view. There are other lawyers on that side of the House, one of them a former judge. It is completely amazing that for days and for weeks such persons would observe and take part in an impropriety of this kind without acting to correct it. The second question which must be asked is this: was the Government in allowing this to continue, seeking or at least obtaining some advantage for its own Members? There can be no doubt but what they thought it was an advantage, otherwise they wouldn’t have had it done. It wasn’t offered to Members on the Opposition side of the House. The Government must at least accept some responsibility for taking advantage of this control over Public Works for the convenience of one group in this Legislature and one group only. Did the Government consult the Speaker? The answer to that is of course, No, it didn’t. I submit that it was an affront to the Speaker it should proceed without even discussing it with

April 2, 1968

him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Did the Government discuss it with knowledgeable people such as our Clerk, one who has given a great deal of time and thought to matters of this kind and the importance of them. The answer is obviously, No. The Government was so insensitive with respect to what was being done it didn't even use the resources available. Was the Government aware of what was going on? The answer of course is, Yes. In the first instance, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) issued instructions that it be done. The Premier, Deputy Premier, and House Leader and the Attorney General knew of it going on. The Premier says from his seat that they aren't ashamed of it.

Mr. Stuart: — We're proud of it!

Mr. Lloyd: — Proud of it, says the Deputy Premier. One of the most interesting things that this whole discussion has done is to help define the Liberal Government and the Liberal party in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This is a Government without either understanding or respect for parliamentary practice. This is a Government, some of my colleagues have outlined it in other debates, ready to say over and over again to this House, "You have no right to know about certain information." This is a Government which says it's proud of the fact that it has allowed the proceedings in this House to be tapped out into other parts without consultation. This is a Government which says . . .

Mr. Coderre: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that what the Hon. Member is saying is in defiance to your ruling. Your ruling has been brought down that the speakers shall be withdrawn forthwith, and he is saying that the Government is proceeding despite that. That is not so. Your ruling has been complied with, and I think it's in defiance or contrary to the decision that you have made. He is wrong in that respect, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W.S. Howes (Deputy Speaker): — Well, I'm sorry but I didn't understand the Speaker that way.

Mr. Lloyd: — I am discussing not what that which has gone on just since Friday evening, but that which went on for several weeks before that time. I would remind the Member from Gravelbourg if he wanted to read the Speaker's ruling he will find out

that the Speaker was confined to “suggesting” that it be taken out. I would remind him, secondly, that we are all on another Resolution. If anybody is out of order, it is the Member from Gravelbourg in raising a question about a Resolution which has already been disposed of for the time being. Mr. Speaker, I don’t intend to carry on at very much greater lengths, but I think it is significant that the Government has said it is proud of causing to happen and of allowing to continue to happen something which the people like the Prime Minister of Canada have felt was very, very wrong. If, Mr. Speaker, it is so proud of it, why did it take it out after the Speaker’s ruling on Friday evening? Why was it proud of it before Friday, ashamed of it now? Why did it feel it necessary to take the action which has been taken which . . .

Mr. Thatcher (Premier): — Because we respected the Speaker.

Mr. Lloyd: — Odd that it should respect him only after he had spanked!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — On this point how often have you been spanked by the rules by the Speaker?

Mr. Thatcher: — Spank you again!

Mr. Lloyd: — Odd . . . perhaps he will, I am prepared to take my spankings if they are warranted. Talk about them in the right way and in the right place, Mr. Premier. Mr. Speaker, it seems that there can be little doubt that the Government took no action to stop this transmitting. There is no doubt whatsoever that it failed to inform the Legislature as rules and procedures would have indicated. It was not interested in regularizing what was going on by discussion in the Legislature. Whether the action was intentional or not, whether it was the product of carelessness or insensitivity, matters little. It remains an act of impropriety. The Government should take responsibility for it.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, just one or two comments. I have been a Member of this House for 20 years, I must frankly say that I have never seen in my experience a debate so degenerate on such a small matter as we are discussing this morning. It is true we probably have been accustomed to a radio and radio receivers in other parts of the building, and this has led to other types of reception. The Speaker thought it wasn’t proper that this should be and it was removed. The Speaker is in control of the Legislature and every Member respects the Speaker very highly and they willingly bowed to his wishes. Not a ruling, a wish. I am

April 2, 1968

rather amazed that the Opposition should take this opportunity to bring in three Resolutions of the magnitude of these. Resolutions censuring the Government, accusations about bugging the Chambers and their rooms and even their houses. Let me say this. I have knowledge that over the years there has been such an apparatus in the press room that permits the carrying of the debates of this Chamber into the press room, not the press gallery. They knew of this, they condoned this, they sanctioned it. If it is so unholy today, why wasn't it unholy then? Where are their lily-white hands today when they condoned it in the past? With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move leave to adjourn the debate, because I have considerable more to say.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. It's been the custom of the Speaker to extend the invitation to the seconder of the motion to speak on the motion. Now the Minister of Mineral Resources has ceased the debate and he now attempts to adjourn it. Are we to ignore this extension to the person that seconded the motion?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Once more I draw the attention of House to the fact that, though on many occasions the seconder of a motion has not risen to speak after the mover of a motion has spoken, he should as a matter of courtesy be seen immediately after the mover has taken his seat, provided he himself then rises. Many times he hasn't done so and this does not preclude him from entering the debate at a later time. But when the seconder rises, immediately after the mover of the motion, it is by courtesy and custom held that he should be then seen. Now in this particular occasion I couldn't say whether he rose first or not, but the fact of the matter is that the gentleman that then occupied this Chair, who is my deputy saw, the Member for Maple Creek. The Member for Maple Creek had the floor, the Member for Maple Creek asked leave to adjourn the debate. That's the question that's now before the House and that won't preclude the Member who seconded the motion from getting into the debate later on.

Debate adjourned.

ELECTRONIC CHECK REQUESTED BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: — Before I call it 12:30, I wish to say to the House that in a previous debate today statements were made which to me bordered on charges to the effect that certain rooms in this House may have been in the parlance of today's world "bugged." Those rooms fall under the jurisdiction of the office of the Speaker. I accordingly have asked the Attorney General, who has agreed, to call for the RCMP to make a full and complete investigation of those rooms, they being the caucus room at the far end of the east hall, the Opposition Members' lounge and any other rooms which any Member might wish to indicate to me; he being in possession of the said rooms and being responsible therefor that he would wish to have investigated. I emphasize

this, a Member requesting a search must be responsible for and using the rooms. Accordingly the police will make this investigation at the request of myself and of the Attorney General. Accordingly those rooms will be closed from here on in until that investigation is completed.

The Assembly recessed until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South West): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce a group of grade eight students close to 60 in number from Arcola school in my constituency. They are here with Mr. Thompson, their principal and Mr. Sorestead, another teacher there. Arcola school is in the easterly part of my constituency. They are a very fine group of students, the sons and daughters of very fine parents in that area. I am very pleased to welcome them here this afternoon. I hope their stay will be a pleasant one and that they will gain much from the deliberations here this afternoon. With that I welcome you all on behalf of this Legislature through the Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City-Park University): — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) who represents Saskatoon Nutana Centre, I beg leave to draw to the attention of all Hon. Members the fine group of students who are presently seated in the west gallery. I hope I'm right, I think that these are the boys and girls from Victoria school in Saskatoon. They are here under the direction of Mrs. Skawski and Mr. Cupid. I am sure that all the Members wish to join me in welcoming this group to the Legislature and wish them a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SECOND READINGS

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan), moved second reading of Bill No. 80 — **An Act to amend The Lord's Day Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this Bill, I know that certain Members will oppose it on both sides of the House. However, I can only say that for many years people in this province have wanted something to do on Sundays in their leisure time. On the southern boundary of the province, many people in my constituency, particularly, drive across the international boundary to take in movie shows on a Sunday afternoon as well as other entertainment. In other provinces, shows are permitted from 2:00 p.m. until midnight. But we propose to allow shows starting, the Bill says, at

April 2, 1968

9 o'clock, but I think that there will be a House amendment to move it to 8:30, which should not normally interfere with anyone's hours of worship. Live musical performances of a non-commercial type will also be allowed on Sunday afternoons and evenings. I feel many would like us to allow shows earlier in the day, but at this time I think that we are better off to take half a loaf than none at all. I do not feel that we should legislate morality nor should we attempt to form one's conscience. If you recall in the debate on Sunday sports, Mr. Speaker, four or five years ago, some of the words of gloom that were spoken from some of the Members opposite, against that particular form of entertainment. It seems to me that they will show up again in the debate on this Bill.

I have seen many of the people who spoke against the Bill in the first place (the Sunday Sport Bill that is) at Sunday football games here in Regina and certainly at some hockey games. I would submit to the House that Sunday sport has been a great boom to the province and has certainly proved most popular. It has certainly been the salvation of junior hockey in this province. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, if some of the shows that we see in the province, of course, and all across the continent for that matter, are not any better than they have been, and if the movie houses don't clean up the type of movies that they allow in their theatres, it would not really be too much loss to the world, if they folded up entirely. But be that as it may. There are many good family shows that can be obtained by the movie people and I would hope that they will clean up their own house.

There is again not much difference in this entertainment field than some of the garbage which we see on the CBC programs on Sunday evening, and for any evening in the week for that matter. But you don't have to look at them. Again I say you don't have to go to shows on Sunday afternoon or evening. Listening to some of these hot-line radio programs when we first proposed this Bill, one came from a grandmother who said she was delighted with the idea. She goes to church on Sunday morning and she would really love the opportunity to take her grandchildren to the pictures in the afternoon. But she complained that 9:00 p.m. was too late. She would sooner see them in the afternoon. She also indicated that it would be better for many people to be sitting quietly in a picture show as opposed to out on the highway playing chicken or some other game with their cars.

A football enthusiast, who says that he loves to attend games on Sunday afternoon, play golf and one thing and another, said he thought that he would like to see shows shown in the afternoon on Sundays, so that he could let his family go to the show while he enjoys his game of golf. These are just some of the comments which came over this particular hot line.

A long-distance call on that same program came from an older farm chap who thought the idea of Sunday movies was

wonderful. He said that things are too quiet on the farm on Sunday afternoons, and he would like to be able to take the entire family to the community theatre. But here again he thought that the 9:00 p.m. movie in the evening was too late. However, in deference to many opinions which we get, we propose to allow Sunday movies at 8:30 in the evening. Although as I said, in the printed Bill, it shows 9:00 o'clock, I think we will bring in a House amendment to make it read 8:30.

The purpose of the Bill will be to permit live musical performances of a non-commercial type to be given on Sunday afternoon and evenings for the purposes of raising funds for benevolent or charitable purposes and to permit movies, for which a fee is charged, to be shown after the hour of 8:30 on the Lord's Day.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) added the remarks that he did at the latter part of his speech because he made clear to me the object of his Bill this Afternoon. He ranged rather far from the two principles of the Bill one of which as I understand it, is to have live musical entertainment on Sunday afternoons after 1:30, if provided by a non-profit organization. He hedged with a few other if's and but's. The change to provide for the showing of movies after 9:00 o'clock he now says will be an amendment now be 8:30 on Sunday evenings. I think that he is quite right when he says that we had a similar debate to this one on The Lord's Day Act several years ago, when we discussed Sunday sports. It is fair to say that if there was any gloom expressed on the Bill at that time it was expressed pretty uniformly on both sides of the House. I am sure that he would be fair enough to admit this on recollection. I think that there is a good deal to be said for some widening of activities on Sunday. We must also understand that there are a great many people in the community that are apprehensive about opening Sunday up so wide that there is finally no passive Sunday at all. It is just like another day. I think that there is something valid in that viewpoint. You will recall the common denominator eventually after some discussion in the House. There was a long discussion several years ago on the amendments that made permissive Sunday sports to the effect that these actions would not be permitted until such time as there was a plebiscite undertaken by the municipal authority.

To me there is some analogy here. It may not be as direct, but I think the analogy is still here for those who believe that there would be some harm or damage done by opening Sunday up wider than it is. It seems to me that the community should have some voice in that is being done. There is not really a great deal of difference in Sunday sports in the way a football game and a live musical entertainment could take place, let us say, in this stadium or in the open air down at the Exhibition grounds. My feeling is that there is such a scattered opinion, such a diffuse opinion on these matters in a community that, if

April 2, 1968

they are permitted, they should be permitted by an action of the local municipal council after a vote has been taken among the citizens, in the same way that the action to authorize Sunday sports was allowed in a number of communities several years ago.

I think that I have a reasonably open mind on this subject and I am sure that other Members have as well. But it does seem to me that there will be communities that do very much object to even opening up their areas for Sunday sports. If these people don't want it, it doesn't seem to me that it should be inflicted upon them by a very small minority of their citizens, so that the local vote would seem to be the most satisfactory means of satisfying all citizens.

Now this is a personal view of mine. I have not canvassed the matter amongst my colleagues but I have looked at the Bill. I think probably other Members will have opinions that may not go so far as to say that these activities be permitted even with a local plebiscite. But those are my opinions, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 48 – **An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are two remedial changes to The Land Titles Act. The first one is to permit a registrar to withdraw a registrar's caveat which has been filed under Section 153 of the Act. The Act as it is presently constituted makes provision for the filing of two types of caveats. The estate and which can be removed by the caveator or the caveatee through various procedures. The second type of caveat is one which is known and commonly described as a registrar's caveat, which prohibits transfers or dealings with the land and for which previously there was not provision for removal. Now this has inhibited the use of the registrar's caveat and registrars have been using the other type. (That is type one that I described which is really provided for a person claiming interest in a title). This new provision should regularize the position of caveats placed against titles by the registrars to protect the Crown interest. And that is the purpose of the amendment.

The second amendment has to do with Section 189. Section 189 at the present time deals with tax endorsement proceedings. And sub-section 10 thereof makes provision for the service of a notice by the municipality on persons interested in the land and goes on to make provision about the cost of service. Now the Department of Municipal Affairs has made representations to us for the deletion of the reference to costs in The Land Titles Act, as the matter is really of more concern to Municipal Affairs than to the Land Titles Branch. Provision is already made for it in The Tax Enforcement Act. The deletion of the

provision which we are proposing will remove an inconsistency between The Land Titles Act and The Tax Enforcement Act.

So those are the two changes, Mr. Speaker. They are really housekeeping changes.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 68 — **An Act to amend The Farm Security Act.**

He said: This is an amendment to The Farm Security Act which is necessary every three years. We are doing this year what we did back three years ago. The Act as it is presently constituted uses the words "1966, 1967 and 1968." We are striking those out and substituting therefor the words, "1968, 1969, and 1970." Really all it does is make the pertinent provisions of The Farm Security Act apply to this year and the next two subsequent years.

With that explanation I would move second reading. Again, this is only a housekeeping change.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is just more for information than anything and probably out of ignorance, I wonder if the Attorney General in winding up the debate on second reading just might give some explanation for the necessity for these amendments on a regular basis. I haven't been able to determine it.

Mr. Heald: — Well, the provisions of The Farm Security Act — we had this with one or two other statutes as I think my Hon. Friend mentioned at that time. I think perhaps we might well another year, look into putting it in the Act and leaving it there. But at the present time we are simply following the procedure that has been followed over the years of simply putting in the new years each time. You made the point in another debate about a similar kind of statute that perhaps, rather than updating it every two or three years with the years in question, we should look at putting it in permanently. I'll give the undertaking that we will look at this Act along with others another time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 19 — **An Act to amend The University Hospital Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill contains only one amendment.

April 2, 1968

At present the University Hospital Board consists of nine members, two of whom are stated in the Act to be the Dean of the College of Medicine and the President of the University. The Board of Governors at the University has recommended that the Act be amended so that, instead of the President of the University being an ex officio member of the University Hospital Board, the Principal of the Saskatoon Campus would be an ex officio member of the Board. The amendment contained in this Bill provides for the change.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 35 — **An Act to provide for the Disposition of Bodies and Parts thereof of Deceased Persons for Therapeutic and other Purposes.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given in recent months to organ transplants. This Bill deals with the use of bodies after death for educational purposes and the use of parts of the body after death for organ transplant purposes. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that a year ago I introduced amendments to The Anatomy Act providing for a broader basis for cadavers to be supplied to the Anatomy Department of the College of Medicine. It was stated at that time the Anatomy Department received its cadavers partly through bodies being unclaimed and partly through donations. This Bill is intended to regulate the donation of one's body for educational research or therapeutic purposes after death. It is sometimes said that there is no property in the body of a deceased person. This means that a person cannot effectively direct that his body be used for a certain purpose after death. Such requests are presently being made but these directions are not binding upon the person in charge of the body after death. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, will have the effect of making such requests or directions binding upon the next-of-kin and persons in charge of the body.

As a matter of interest I would point out that in 1967 the Anatomy Department received 14 cadavers because they were unclaimed and six cadavers by way of donations. In the current school year 1967-68, the Department of Anatomy is using 15 cadavers. As of January 15, 1968, the Department had 13 cadavers for use in the school year 1968-69. The need for cadavers varies depending upon the number of students. An increase for need is predicted in the future years because of the new dental college and additional students. An additional increase in the need would also be occasioned by an increase of medical students. Based on these factors, the Department of Anatomy has estimated that in the school year 1970-71, they will be using approximately 32 cadavers. It is evident from this projection of need, Mr. Speaker, that in the future years the supply of cadavers will have to be increased. It is hoped that this Bill will be of assistance in this regard.

The provisions concerning the donations of one's body relate not only to donations for medical educational purposes but for research and therapeutic purposes. There are many medical problems relating to the transplant of body organs. The one problem pertinent to this Bill is that it is necessary that the organ be removed almost immediately after the death of the donor. In order that an organ transplant can be carried out, various factors have to exist. For instance, the donor and the recipient have to be in the same hospital, or at any rate, in the same general location. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in a recent heart transplant case, the authorization for the removal of the organ was given by the spouse of the deceased person. In most cases it would be quite unlikely that a testamentary direction for the use of this body would have been given by any appropriate deceased person.

Section 5 of the Bill is therefore intended to regulate the authorization being given by the next-of-kin for the removal of an organ in a case of this kind. In recent years a number of kidney transplant operations have taken place at the University Hospital. It is expected that organ transplant operations will become more varied and extensive in the near future. It is intended that this Bill in general and Section 5 in particular will be of assistance in promoting these lifesaving procedures.

This Bill is in many respects an extension of The Corneal Transplants Act passed in 1962. It is quite similar to The Human Tissue Act passed in Alberta in 1967 and is virtually identical to the Ontario Human Tissue Act. The Bill concerns a subject that receives comparatively little attention. However the supply of cadavers has always been, and always will be, a most important aspect of medical attention. In addition, the availability of organs for transplant purposes is essential to the organ transplant program becoming successful for many purposes presently unexplored.

It is therefore my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill will receive this Assembly's approval since in many respects its contents are extremely important.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members will join with me in applauding the Minister in the introduction of this Bill. I think that it is in keeping with the miracles of modern medicine that we have seen in recent years in particular. Any apprehension that we might have had about the Bill, I think, is shattered when you look at the safeguards that are written into the Act. They appear to be more than adequate, Mr. Minister, and I am sure that all Members will be supporting the Bill on second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

April 2, 1968

Hon. D. F. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 36 — **An Act respecting the Sale of Agricultural Implements.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Act is entitled The Agriculture Implements Act 1968. This is a new Act. It is intended to replace The Agriculture Machinery Act 1958 as amended in 1965. Similar Acts have been in the Statutes of the Province since 1917, and while there have been many revisions over the years, many parts of the present Act are the same as in 1917 and therefore have become obsolete.

The principle contained in this new Act remains the same as before. This Act directly affects three separate segments of our economy — manufacturers, distributors, and independent implement dealers and of course, farmers. I have met several times in the past years with representatives of each of these groups and I am confident that the proposed changes will meet with the approval in principle at least by the groups concerned.

I will at this time, Mr. Speaker, provide some detail on the major changes proposed within this Bill. The title is changed to delete the words “and testing” and the word “implement” is substituted for the word “machinery” since implement is defined in the Act. Section 2 of the Bill, the definition section, has two main changes. The first is to increase the evaluation of an implement under the Act from \$100 at present to \$200. Originally I might point out the figure was \$50 and was raised to \$100 in 1958. \$200 appears more practical now.

The second change is to delete the definitions of large and small implements so that there is no such distinction in the Bill. In the present Act the distinction between large and small implements was used in five sections, namely, 21, 22, 23, 27 and 28 as follows: If a person bought a large implement and couldn't understand English, the contract had to be explained to him in his native tongue. This section is left in the Bill so that the explanation would be required regardless of the size of the implement. If a person bought a large implement, the contract was not binding until he received a copy of it signed by the vendor. This section remains in the Bill, so that this will apply regardless of the size of the implement.

Section 27 in the present Act prescribes a settlement to be made where a vendor repossessed a small implement. This section remains in the Bill so that it will now apply to repossession of any implement.

Section 28 of the present Act prescribes an arbitration procedure for establishing the value of a large implement being repossessed. This section is being deleted, entirely, as apparently it is never used, and it is considered that the limitation of The Civil Rights Act provides sufficient protection.

Bill Sections 3 and 8 include a number of minor rewordings and clarifications. The principles and the intent remain the same.

Bill Section 9, subsection 4 and 5 are additions to Section 9 of the present Act. Subsection 4 states, if the Minister advises the distributor that a certain vendor does not hold a current licence, the distributor then must not supply any implements to him. Subsection 5 provides a penalty. This addition will tighten up licensing procedures and is concurred in by the implement associations.

Bill Section 10, no change except for removal of excess wording. Bill Section 11 replaces Sections 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the present Act which require filing with the Minister annually of price lists of all implements and repairs. The new section says, "These must be filed as requested by the Minister." Bill Sections 12, 13, 14 and 15 are the same as Sections 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the present Act with minor rewording clarifications. Bill Section 16 is the same as 19 of the present Act except that it authorizes companies to add additional warranties to the Form A and B contracts in the schedule. This is done by a provision added to subsection 1. Bill Sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 are the same as Sections 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 26 and 27 of the present Act except for minor rewording and clarifications. Section 21 of the present Act is omitted as it says that Sections 22 and 23, translation of contracts and signing of the contract, apply only to large implements.

Section 28 of the present Act which refers to repossession of large implements is deleted and the only reference to repossession is in the Bill in Section 23. Bill Section 24 is the same as subsection 1, Section 29 of the present Act. Subsection 2, Section 29 of the present Act is deleted in this new Bill. Subsection 2 said that where a claim was made against a general provincial distributor on the grounds of warranties, he could add the vendor or dealer as also liable. The subsection is dropped at the suggestion of the distributors who say their dealer contracts give them full protection in this regard.

Bill Section 25 is the same as Section 30 of the present Act. Sections 31 and 32 of the present Act have been deleted from the Bill. These sections authorized vendors to claim upon a machine being used for custom work and referred to The Thresher Employees Act and Threshers Lien Act. Implement associations say that they are never used and therefore are not needed. Bill Sections 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 are almost identical to Sections 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38 of the present Act with a few minor rewordings. There is added to Section 1 of the Bill authority to make regulations concerning standards to be met by general provincial distributors. Subsection 3 is added to allow for further definition of implement in the regulations. Subsection C is added to conform with Section 9 of the

April 2, 1968

Bill. The schedule, perhaps the most significant change in this Bill, is the complete revision of the Form A and B contracts contained in this schedule. I may point out here, Mr. Speaker, that since the present Bill was printed and on the advice of the Deputy Provincial Secretary, in order to conform with the Cost of Credit Disclosure Act and to try and tidy up the Form A and Form B contracts, I will be submitting a new House amendment which we hope will tidy up those contracts at that time. The forms as presented in the Bill have been worked out to be, as I say, more functional and to provide better documentation of the transactions involved. The principles involved have remained unchanged. The more important changes in additions to the Form A contract (this is the contract for the sale of a new implement) are as follows: provision for including the addresses of the vendor and general provincial distributor; provisions made for a more complete description of new and trade-in implements and extra equipment; and contract clauses 8 to 14 include information to be given on credit transactions as I said to conform with The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act. More variation is allowed in horse-power terminology to meet modern technological advances. This has been made necessary by innovations in power transmission and drives on newer implements and increased variety of power sources and newer types of implements. An end user's certificate is added to eliminate need for separate documents. The statutory warranties are to be printed on the reverse of the contract in order to relive congestion on the front.

The more important changes to the Form B contract, (This is the contract for sale of a second-hand implement) are as follows: The format of Form B is designed to parallel the new Form A in respect of the descriptions of the implement on trade-in as well as the complete financial transactions; provision for including specific warranties on a second-hand implement are also made; warranty will vary depending on the age and condition of the implement; provision for a complete description of the implement to be traded in on the second-hand implement. This practice is common today and was not allowed in the older form. There will be some additional House amendments, Mr. Speaker, in Section 2. Legal advisors for the Wholesale Implement Association claim that under The Federal Combines Investigation Act it is unlawful for the provincial distributor or manufacturer to quote maximum retail price as required under the present wording of the Bill and under the present Bill we have also this amendment which substitutes the word "suggested" for the word "maximum" and alleviates this problem. The intent is not changed but the section will now conform to actual practice, since manufacturers invariably publish suggested retail prices or suggested list prices which are considered as maximum retail prices.

In the House amendment for Section 13 as in Section 11 the word "suggested" is substituted for the word "maximum." In the House amendment for Section 16, the words "and conditions" are added after the word "warranty" in the section to allow for some flexibility in adding features to the contract. Mr.

Speaker, with those brief remarks, I think most of the questions can be better answered in Committee. This is a new Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 38 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members will recall that in the Act the amount of the aggregate borrowing for Saskatchewan Government Telephones is limited in the Act. It is presently limited to \$150 million. The amendment changes this figure to \$175 million.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 52 — **An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment is a relatively minor amendment to The Secondary Education Act. In 1960, The School Act, The Secondary Education Act, The Larger Unit Act were amended to fix the indemnity payable to school trustees at \$15 per meeting. Last year The School Act and The Larger Unit Act were amended again to raise that indemnity from \$15 to \$20. This Act and another one that I am about to introduce were overlooked, so this amendment to The Secondary Education Act proposes to raise the indemnity to board members from \$15 to \$20. With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 52.

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Minister for doing just that. We are not particularly sure which schools would be affected, but that can be asked later. The involvement of boards in this kind of work, raising it from \$15 to \$20, is very good. Now there are a number of other questions which I think we can ask later on, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 53 — **An Act to amend The Vocational Education Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is very similar to the Bill that was just introduced, An Act to amend The Vocational Education Act, in this case here again to raise the indemnity of board members from \$15 to \$20. With these few remarks, I will move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

April 2, 1968

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 61 — **An Act to amend The Teachers' Federation Act.**

He said: This Act was originally passed in 1940 and amended at various times. The existing legislation does not provide any means by which the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation can provide on its own for benefits to teachers who may for various reasons be unable to qualify under the superannuation schemes. The purpose of these two amendments are, three amendments, to provide that the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation may have a legal basis for administering an income disability or a benefit scheme of their own, and to enable the Federation to provide such schemes for teachers who have taught less than 10 years and are perhaps unable to qualify under the Superannuation Act; secondly to permit levies on teachers for the above purposes and to permit that those levies be remitted directly by the school secretaries to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation office. The case has been up to this time, as Members I am sure are well aware, that those levies were deducted from school grants of the various units and submitted from the Government to the Federation office. This is a change from the present practice. These amendments were requested of course by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation. I have also discussed them with the School Trustees' Association. Everybody is aware of them and in support of them.

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Minister of Education in introducing this Bill. I can remember some years ago when we in the Teachers' Federation were discussing just such a plan as is allowed here or that allows the secretary of school boards to collect money for. We're all very happy on this side that this Bill is introduced. I am sure there will be no opposition to Bill 61.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 62 — **An Act to amend The School Business Association of Saskatchewan Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 62, the first legislation on this subject, The School Secretary-Treasurers' Association Act was passed in 1958. In 1967 at the last session this Act was amended to change the title of the Association to the School Business Association of Saskatchewan, and the title of the Act was changed accordingly. This year the group, the School Secretary-Treasurers' Association have come to us requesting that the name be again changed, and of course accordingly, the name of the Act also changed. It is a minor change I suggest, Mr. Speaker. It was requested by the Association and agreed to by my Department officials prior to my coming there. As I understand it, this amendment will bring the name of this

organization in line with the name given to similar organizations in other provinces.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 66 — **An Act to amend The Larger School Units Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments to this Act are designed to bring about perhaps three basic changes, firstly, to provide that elections for school unit trustees to be held on the same date and time as that fixed for the annual municipal elections; secondly, to assure that before a unit board closes a school or discontinues the teaching of certain grades in a school that there is adequate consultation between the unit board and the local board concerned; thirdly to implement a new method, to some extent a new method, of determining the assigned costs which are used in the calculation of grants.

Under existing legislation the date for the poll for the election of school unit trustees is specified as the third Wednesday in November. However, with the centralization of schools through the years, it used to be that there was a poll in every rural district. Few rural districts have operating schools. The practice has developed of holding school elections in villages and town centres. The school trustees, municipal councillors and ratepayers have suggested the advisability and desirability of holding school and municipal elections at the same time. This amendment is in keeping with these suggestions. From time to time also, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure all Members are very well aware, serious disputes have arisen between a district board and the unit board when the unit board has decided to close a school or discontinued the teaching of certain grades in a school. From the various reports of committees of enquiry, which have been established to investigate the causes of such disputes, from investigation by departmental officials, there is reason to suggest that some of these disputes are the result of misunderstandings which perhaps, in part at least, may be attributed to lack of consultation between perhaps the unit board and the local board. Such disputes often develop into very bitter controversies, again as I am sure all Members are well aware. The amendment to Section 81 is an attempt to try and minimize that possibility by setting out a consultation before the unit board decides to close a school or discontinue the teaching of a given grade or two in a school. It should be clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment in no way removes either responsibility or the power of the unit board to make decisions with respect to the closing of schools. It simply guarantees that there is consultation with the district board before proceeding.

Now to determine the assigned costs used in calculating grants to school units, under the present legislation grants

April 2, 1968

to school units are calculated by taking the percentage of the total assigned costs, costs of course which are recognized for grant purposes only rather than the actual cost, of the teachers employed and the conveyance provided. The percentage of the total assigned costs then varies of course from unit to unit depending upon their equivalent assessment per teacher. With respect to the assigned costs for teachers employed, the present legislation sets out a schedule that varies from \$4,400 to \$7,700 per teacher, depending upon certificate and grade level. The new legislation adds another factor in the determination of the assigned costs for the instructional program. In addition to a schedule of assigned costs for the teachers employed, there is recognition given for the number of pupils enrolled and with a differential in the assigned per pupil cost for elementary, academic high school, and vocational high school students. One of the reasons for making these changes, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, is to more fairly allocate the grant money. In the first place, when only the teacher factor is used, there is no recognition of the fact that some school boards have considerably higher enrolment per classroom than do other boards. In fact the present arrangements would appear perhaps to penalize such boards. The addition of a pupil factor I think will more fairly provide for the school systems with higher enrolment. There is another change which we think is desirable also, Mr. Speaker. Under the present legislation there is an assigned cost differential between elementary and high school teachers. This amendment will recognize the qualifications of teachers, in other words, the class of teacher, irrespective of the grade level that they teach. This change of course will encourage, or not penalize shall we say, boards employing highly qualified teachers in the lower level. We've worked out a number of examples with the schedule as set out in the Act, Mr. Speaker. In the Department I have a number of examples requested of me verbally from Members opposite which I will be glad to provide later this afternoon. To summarize, the new amendment recognizes both teachers and pupils in determining the assigned cost. It removes the differential between elementary and high school teachers as such. I suggest that these changes deserve the support of Members on both sides of the House.

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, we have perused this Bill very closely and I think there are certain features of it that in our words are a bit contradictory. Even Section 4 where unit boards are in one way being restricted as to the number of days or rather the number of months, advance notice is needed in order to close these schools. I think this is a very controversial section as well. I think a little bit more needs to be said about that, Mr. Speaker. I think the unit boards have really been fairly good in this respect. I know in our unit, the board has exercised very fair control on this matter. There is another matter which Mr. McIsaac did explain somewhat in some detail but not clearly enough. Because we also are trying to get some of this information that is in regard to the grant formula as it is, and it was very difficult for us to get it,

I at this time beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 54 — **An Act to amend The School Grants Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The School Grants Act are designed to do two things; to provide first for increased grants to the non-unit school boards operating less than 15 classrooms, and secondly for those school boards operating 15 classrooms or more to determine the assigned costs in the same manner, as I have just outlined in the amendments to The Larger School Units Act. I think, Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks I have just made on the previous Bill, I could only summarize and review some of the reasons why we are bringing these changes in The Larger Units Act and The School Grants Act.

When only the teacher factor is used in determining assigned costs, there is no recognition of the fact that some school boards have higher enrolment per classroom than others. The addition of a pupil factor in the determination, I think, will more fairly provide for school systems with the heavy enrolment. The differential in the per pupil assigned costs recognizes the extra per pupil cost at the high school and the vocational level, and again as I mentioned previously the removal of the grant differential between elementary and high school teachers.

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, in the light of the information which we have yet to receive for Bill 66 and will probably receive for Bill 54, I will have more to say about the grants. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 55 — **An Act to amend The School Act.**

He said: There are a number of relatively minor amendments to this Act, designed primarily to clarify the meaning and the intent and to remove a few of the inconsistencies. There are also I suggest two major amendments. The first one involves the extension of rights to Indians to living on reserves and their children attending integrated schools off the reserve. At present, those Indian parents have no opportunity for a voice in the affairs of the school district in which their children attend schools. Incidentally, I am sure Members will be interested to know that almost 5,000 Indian children now attend schools off the reserves, which is about 50 per cent of the total enrolment of the Indian children in schools. These amendments, and there are several dealing with this, will extend rights to those Indians in the following way: First, it will now be possible for a reserve to become a school district

April 2, 1968

or to be added to an existing school district. Secondly, the definition of ratepayer in the present Act will be broadened to include Indians in such districts. The effect of these changes briefly, Mr. Speaker, will be to give to our Indian people a voice in the affairs of the schools where their children are in attendance. These changes are in keeping with this Government's policy of extending opportunities for our Indian people. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, they will receive the unanimous approval of all Members of this Legislature.

The second major amendment will widen the opportunity for French to be used as a language of instruction in appropriate areas of the province to be set up under regulation. From 1931 to 1966 in this Province The School Act stated that English was the only language of instruction in our schools. French could be taught for up to one hour per day, but English still had to be the language of instruction. Now at the last session the Legislature passed an amendment to The School Act which permitted French to be used as a language of instruction for up to one hour a day. These amendments we are putting forth this session, Mr. Speaker, will remove this limitation by allowing the Lieutenant Governor in Council to designate schools in appropriate areas of the province where French may be used as the language of instruction for periods greater than one hour in a day. Any extent to which French will be used will depend of course upon individual circumstances. I might say that with the consideration in Committee of this Bill I will be able to give Members a better understanding of the regulations that are being entertained. This extension of the use of French in our schools is in keeping with developments in other parts of Canada. Among other benefits of course, Members on both sides will recognize this as action that is in the best interests of Canadian unity.

Now in addition to these two major items, Mr. Speaker, other amendments are designed: first to make possible the use of experimental schools for the carrying out of pilot projects, although here again I would point out we have no particular such project in mind at this time; to permit public and separate school boards in towns and cities to appoint their auditors as other boards under The Secondary Education Act and The Larger School Units Act now do; to make it possible for agreements to be made between separate and public school districts and between public school districts and high school districts located in cities and towns; fourthly, to give a teacher who is dismissed during the school year the right to meet the board to discuss the reasons for that dismissal; fifthly to provide for more direction to school boards by the Department of Education concerning this question of school construction. The only real authority that the Department now has in this matter is that of approving or disapproving a construction grant.

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill, An Act to amend The School Act in many parts of it and particularly the first part is very good, where it says, "In a school district that includes an

Indian reserve and who has resided in the district for a period of at least five months immediately prior to the last preceding first day of June.” Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Minister for that section whereby Indians on reservations will not only be able to attend the schools adjacent to them, but will legally make them legal entities of these districts making, it legal for them to participate freely in the running of the schools they attend. This is a problem which I am closely associated with. We have this in the Melville area, we also have this in the Melville constituency in the consolidated school district of Balcarres where three reserves have children attending. I am sure this is going to be appreciated by many of the school boards across the whole of Saskatchewan, and therefore I say we are very glad to see this kind of thing put into the Act. This is an area that the native people have asked for, participation in the integrated schools, for a long, long time. I know the school trustees have repeatedly said this. I say Mr. McIsaac, the Hon. Minister deserves credit for this.

Now there are other sections of this Bill which in our estimation are a bit controversial and because of the fact that some of this information to us isn't available, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare) moved second reading of Bill No. 58 — **An Act to amend The Old Age Assistance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of the repeal of The Old Age Assistance Act, I just want to make a few comments. First of all The Old Age Assistance Act was introduced, effective January 1, 1952, to provide for means test assistance for persons 65 to 69 years of age, at the time the former old age pension program for persons 70 and over was replaced by the Federal Old Age Security Program. The latter provides for payments regardless of means. In 1965 new regulations under The Old Age Security Act provided for a gradual reduction in the minimum age for that program, commencing January 1, 1966, until the age of 65 years is reached. As a result, 1,498 persons were transferred from Old Age Assistance to Old Age Security, effective January 1, 1966 and a smaller number each year since. With the introduction of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan in 1966 the Saskatchewan Old Age Assistance regulations were amended to provide that no further applications could be made after March 31, 1966. The circumstances of persons receiving old age assistance were also reviewed and those who qualified for at least as much assistance under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan were transferred to the new program. The minimum age for old age security is now 67 years, so that the last of the persons to whom Saskatchewan granted old age assistance in early 1966 will be transferred to Old Age Security by the end of this coming March or by the 31st which was last week. When the Canada Assistance Plan was implemented, the Federal Government advised the Provinces

April 2, 1968

of Canada that when they repealed their Old Age Assistance Act they could advise the other Provinces so that they would assume responsibility for Provincial residences formerly paid for by the Provinces. To my knowledge, all Provinces in Canada are now accepting applications under this program and are now directing all applications to their general assistance program. In other words they are doing exactly the same thing as the Province of Saskatchewan. In simple terms it means now that all Provinces will assume responsibility for Old Age Assistance cases within their boundaries. I think this is a milestone in the formation of a General Assistance Program in Saskatchewan and in Canada.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) moved second reading of Bill No. 68 — **An Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulations Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulations Act and the purpose of this Bill is to increase the pari-mutuel tax from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. We estimate the added revenue will be about \$160,000. A comparison of the pari-mutuel tax with that of other Provinces reveals that British Columbia levies the highest rate of 12 per cent; Newfoundland, 11 per cent; Manitoba, 10 per cent; Quebec has two rates, 7 per cent and 9 per cent; Ontario recently increased theirs to 7 per cent; Prince Edward Island, 10.5 per cent; Nova Scotia, 3 per cent to 5 per cent; New Brunswick has two rates, 3.5 per cent and 4 per cent. Now we've received inquiries from Class A and Class B Fairs as to the effect of the present grants to Class A and B Fairs which are based on pari-mutuel tax collections as the result of the proposed increase in the pari-mutuel tax from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will be prepared to announce the formula or basis of grants to Class A and B Fairs based on pari-mutuel tax collections in the 1968-69 fiscal year. But I can tell the House that these Fairs will not receive less money than they have received or that they are receiving at the present time, and that this new tax will put us in the position to be of more help to them in the future.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 51

Thatcher	MacLennan	Wood
Howes	Heggie	Blakeney
McFarlane	Breker	Davies
Boldt	Leith	Dewhurst
Cameron	Radloff	Meakes
Steuart	Weatherald	Berezowsky

Heald	Mitchell	Romanow
McIsaac	Larochelle	Smishek
Guy	Gardner	Thibault
Loken	Coupland	Whelan
MacDougall	Charlebois	Snyder
Grant	Forsyth	Michayluk
Coderre	McIvor	Pepper
Bjarnason	Schmeiser	Bowerman
MacDonald	Lloyd	Messer
Hooker	Kramer	Kwasnica
Gallagher	Willis	Kowalchuk

NAYS — 3

Wooff	Brockelbank	Baker
-------	-------------	-------

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 69 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance.**

He said, Mr. Speaker, most of the amendments in this Bill relate to services provided by optometrists. When the Provincial Medical Care Insurance Plan was initiated in July, 1962, refractions or the prescribing of the proper lens to be used in the pair of spectacles were excluded from the insurance services. This has meant that a significant proportion of the practice of ophthalmologists and a few general practitioners specializing in eye care and to a lesser extent, eye, ear, nose and throat specialists have been excluded from the Medical Care Insurance Plan. The Medical Care Act (Canada) provides for the Government of Canada to make payment to a Province that is operating a Provincial Medical Care Insurance Plan in accordance with the conditions set out in the Federal legislation. As all of the Members of this Assembly know, Mr. Speaker, payments by the Federal Government under this Act are to commence July 1 of this year. A Provincial Medical Care Insurance Plan is described in part in the Federal legislation as a plan for making payment for all services rendered by medical practitioners that are medically required. Sensory refractions may be provided by medical practitioners and, if medically required, it will be necessary for our Province to make payment for refractions provided by physicians after July 1 in order that we will be eligible to receive payment from the Federal Government. There are approximately 11 ophthalmologists, 9 general practitioners and 8 eye, ear, nose and throat specialists who carry out refractions as a significant part of their medical practice. There are also approximately 70 persons who are qualified optometrists in this Province. According to the records of the Medical Services Division of my Department respecting payment for health services received by Saskatchewan Assistant Plan beneficiaries, about two-thirds of the refractions received by these persons are provided by optometrists with the remaining third being provided by physicians. I think it can be reasonably assumed that more or less the same division of

April 2, 1968

volume of refractions being carried out would apply with respect to the entire population of the province. In view of the large proportion of refractions being carried out in the province by optometrists, the Government has concluded that refractions carried out by optometrists should become insured services as of July 1, 1968. The refractions constitute only one part of the practice of optometry and from the view point of the overall range of insured services will represent a small percentage of the total volume.

Section 16 of the Act contains a complex series of directions to the Commission respecting the method and channels of payment. That section is concerned particularly with payment for physician's services. The varied methods of payment are not warranted in the case of the refraction services provided by optometrists, and it is the Government's intention that payment by the Commission should be confined to payments made directly to the optometrists providing the services. It is my understanding that all of the practising optometrists intend to enter into an agreement with the Commission for the purpose of receiving payments directly from the Commission. It is therefore anticipated that the Government's intentions will be implemented with the concurrence of all practitioners.

Sections 5 and 9 of the Bill provide the authority to implement our intentions in this regard in the event that regulatory provisions appear to be indicated.

Section 8 of the Bill provides for the provision of Section 37 of the Act to be applied where services are provided by optometrists. Regulations have never been made under this section respecting negotiations to be carried out with the medical profession respecting rates of payment, and it is difficult to predict whether any such regulations will ever be made. With certain services being provided by optometrists about to become insured, it seemed to the Government that it might be desirable for Section 37 to be amended so that its provisions could be extended to apply to payment for these new insured services. Regulations may never be made under this section relating to payment for services provided by optometrists, but the amendment will authorize such regulations to be made in case it is agreed that it would be advantageous for this to be done. These provisions have been discussed fully with the officials of the Saskatchewan Optometric Association. They have advised me that these amendments are satisfactory to them.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that Section 6 of the Bill provides for the Commission to be agent for an agency or department of the Government of Canada or the Saskatchewan Anti-tuberculosis League as well as for an agency or department of the Government of Saskatchewan. It is expected that from July 1, 1968 on, war veterans' allowance recipients and Indians residing on reserves will become beneficiaries under our Medical Care Insurance Plan through the medical care premium being paid on their behalf by the Government of Canada. There could

be some administrative advantages to both Governments for any utilization fees payable in respect of these two groups of persons being paid in the first instance by the Commission with the Commission then being reimbursed by the Federal Government. Formal discussions have already been held in connection with this matter and there is some likelihood that an arrangement along this line will be worked out. The proposed amendment would authorize this arrangement.

The proposal also includes the Saskatchewan Anti-tuberculosis League. Services received under The Tuberculosis Sanatorium Hospitals' Act are not insured under The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, and the amendment may therefore not serve any practical purpose at this time. The addition of the League to this section is proposed in the event it may be an aid in assisting the Commission and the League to work more closely with each other in the future.

You will note that Section 7 of the Bill contains a provision, respecting a husband and wife, similar to a provision contained in the Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. The purpose of this amendment is merely to clarify the point that where both husband and wife are working, the husband will ordinarily be liable to pay the premium on behalf of his wife as well as himself. The fixing of the husband's legal responsibility in these cases is required for practical reasons relating to the collection of the premium.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Minister indicated, Bill No. 69 contains a set of relatively simple amendments with exception of two or three housekeeping amendments which can be discussed when the Bill is considered in Committee. The Bill in the main provides for the inclusion of limited optometric services. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the first question I should ask the Minister and the Premier, is: when will the plebiscite be held before these optometric services are included under MCIC payments? I ask that question sincerely since it was in 1967 the Liberal election program, plank No. 11 said and I quote:

Hold a plebiscite before any new welfare programs are initiated.

The Premier on numerous occasions repeated on the hustings and I quote:

There will be no further welfare programs without the approval of the electors.

He said that plebiscites will include these two questions: 1) do you want a particular program and 2) how much taxes do you want to pay to cover this program? This is a new coverage, Mr. Speaker, and there is no doubt that it will cost some money.

April 2, 1968

The people are entitled to know when the plebiscite will be held. The Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier (Mr. Thatcher), all of whom have talked about this coverage during this and previous debates, have mentioned neither of their election promises, when the electors will have a chance to vote on whether they want the program, and how much taxes will be required to pay for the coverage.

It should be noted that the Government's intention is to cover eye-care examination only, perhaps with the deterrent fee payable by the patient. The deterrent fee and the amount that will be paid to optometrists and ophthalmologists are to be determined by Government regulations. Let us be certain about one important fact, Mr. Speaker, the coverage of these services by this Government does not come along willingly. It comes about grudgingly. Coverage of optometric services has been forced upon this Government by the Government of Ottawa. In order to qualify for Federal Government grants for medical care, eye examination is a requirement. To reinforce my point, the following story appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix on July 15, 1967:

Dr. Hugh MacKenzie of Regina, National President of the Canadian Association of Optometrists said Friday Saskatchewan's medical care plan should be extended to cover vision care services.

With the national health care scheme scheduled to start next July 1, the province could draw federal assistance only if it includes all physician services under the provincial plan. Vision care or eye care services are not now provided under the plan.

In order to qualify for financial assistance, Saskatchewan is going to have to include the services.

So that we understand what the service means and what it will likely cost, the Saskatchewan Optometric Association appearing before the Advisory Planning Committee on Medical Care had this to say and I quote:

It was calculated that during the period of one year 9 per cent of the people of Saskatchewan consult optometrists for complete optometric care.

The average total charged to the patients for eye examination was \$7.60 in 1961. Assuming that the increase since then is the same as in other medical services of approximately 20 per cent, and applying the \$1.50 deterrent and recognizing the Federal cost-sharing programs, the cost to the Province for this service will be under \$350,000 a year. Perhaps we should be grateful for small mercies, Mr. Speaker. But what about including drug care and dental care now that the Federal Government agrees to pay 50 per cent cost of medicare? On an annual basis this will give Saskatchewan as of July 1, 1968 some \$14 million.

This money should be used to extend health services and not be used for building roads or to pay for the cost of propaganda emanating from the Premier's office. These are new health dollars, Mr. Speaker, and should be used for that purpose. \$14 million will pay for the cost of a comprehensive drug care plan; it will pay for a dental plan for all those up to the age of 18 and those 65 years of age and over. I pose the age limitation in regard to a dental plan because of the shortage of dentists at this time, even though I favor a comprehensive dental care plan covering the total population. This, Mr. Speaker, should be our objective. The Federal grants are sufficient to also cover eye care including the cost of eye glasses. Since the average cost of eye care in 1961 including provision of glasses cost \$26.48 per person on the average, with only 9 per cent of the people requiring optical services each year of these, many do not automatically require glasses. I realize that there have been some increases but \$14 million could provide coverage for all three additional health services that I have just mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, let me rub a little salt into the Liberal health care wounds. Let me remind them of the 1964 election promise and I quote:

A new Liberal Government will maintain medical care insurance and extend it to cover drug costs.

Note, Mr. Speaker, there was no mention of deterrent fees. The Premier is reported in the Star Phoenix of March 16, 1964, commenting on medical care he categorically stated and I quote: "In addition, drug bills will be included in the plan." Take note of the remarks of the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker — I regret he is not in his chair. Two years ago on April 29, 1966, he was then the Minister of Public Health. He was reported in the North Battleford News Optimist this way, "Health Minister Steuart forecasts a drug plan for Saskatchewan within two years." This was the statement that he made on April 29, 1966. Mr. Provincial Treasurer, your time is up, two years have gone by. Where is the drug plan? What happened to your promise?

Take note of the Premier's slippery words two months later on July 16, 1966. He is reported in the Leader-Post and I quote again:

Saskatchewan will have a drug insurance plan within the next several years. We are getting to it but I am not saying when or to what extent.

These are evasive words, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell the people of Saskatchewan when they will get a prepaid drug plan. They will get a prepaid drug plan as soon as the New Democratic party is re-elected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I feel certain they will not get a drug plan under a

April 2, 1968

Liberal Administration. Let me remind the people of another promise the Premier made in regard to drug insurance plans. The Premier is reported in the August 15, 1967 issue of the Leader-Post while speaking in Wadena and I quote:

If the Liberal Government is returned we will within one year give the people a chance to say yes or no to a free drug program and to a dental plan.

Mr. Speaker, six months have gone by since the election, and we have had no word from the Premier or from the Government Members about the vote that he promised. Since this was a firm commitment it would seem only fair that, during the Throne or the Budget debate or during second reading of this Bill, the Government would have announced its intention of when the plebiscite in regard to a prepaid drug plan and dental plan will be held. Some description of drug and dental coverage should have been given. How much will it cost? How the Government proposes to finance it? What kind of a new tax will be levied? What discussions have taken place with the professions affected? Will the public be given an opportunity to make representations to the Government? It seems only fair to get the wheels in motion, Mr. Speaker. We only have six months left before the plebiscite is held if the Liberals intend to keep their promise.

Let me suggest what the Government can do with the \$14 million it will be receiving from the Federal Government in the form of grants to finance medical care. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, the extension of services which will help those people who are most in need. Let me refer to the present Medical Care Plan. In 1967 medical care cost us \$26 million including administration, payment for scholarships, bursaries, etc. Let us provide a 5 per cent increase in the cost for 1968. Over the last five years the average costs have increased, 4.2 per cent per year. In 1967 costs were \$26,073,000. Allowing a 5 per cent increase of \$1,300,000, total expenditure for medical care in the coming year it would appear will cost \$27,373,000. Let us look at drug care. Let us immediately implement the Thompson Committee Limited Drug Plan that was recommended and is summarized on pages 112 and 113 of the Thompson Committee Report. Let me elaborate.

Program A that the Committee recommended, a complete range of drugs in hospitals, approximate cost, \$450,000; Program B, coverage for indigent persons, welfare recipients and supplemental allowance cases — cost of that coverage would be \$550,000; Program C, a province-wide program to meet costs of certain high-cost drugs, life-saving drugs, \$2.5 million for a total of \$3.5 million. Mr. Speaker, assuming that drug costs since 1961 increased 20 per cent, this would bring a total of \$4.2 million. This was the Thompson Committee three-stage recommendation. In the Province of Saskatchewan we have about 83,000 senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, I submit that these people deserve and are entitled to a comprehensive drug plan. Since many of the benefits would accrue to them from Programs A, B, and C, I have just outlined, that comprehensive coverage

for senior citizens should not run beyond \$800,000. So I propose, Mr. Speaker, that \$5 million of the \$14 million be used for the extension and implementation of this limited drug program I have just outlined.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to dental care, based on cost estimates of the Hall Commission a comprehensive dental care plan for children up to and including age 18, \$1.8 million and a limited drug program to cover those persons who are 65 years of age and over would cost approximately \$1 $\frac{3}{4}$ million. This is based on the Hall Commission estimates. A comprehensive optical-care program would cost approximately \$4 $\frac{3}{4}$ million. This is based on the Thompson Committee cost estimates and allowing a 20 per cent increase since 1961. In other words provide a 5 per cent allowance as a possible increase in case of medical care, \$1.3 million. The limited drug program I suggest, \$5 million; the limited dental care program, \$1.8 million; and comprehensive eye-care plan of approximately \$2.8 million. In total, \$10.9 million. This would leave the Provincial Government over \$3 million of the Federal Medical Care grants. None of these plans would require establishment of any deterrent fees, nor would such an extension of health services require the imposition of any new taxes. Let us do something for the people of Saskatchewan. While I propose to support the Bill that has been introduced by the Minister, I ask the Minister to bring into this House amendments to extend health services on the basis I have just recommended.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health) moved second reading of Bill No. 70 — **An Act to amend The Cancer Control Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with only two matters, both very important, the hospital utilization fee and the medical utilization fee. The provisions respecting the hospitalization utilization fee are part and parcel of the over-all plan for utilization fees becoming chargeable by hospitals. It is the Government's intention that as of April 15 the person receiving care and treatment from the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission will be subject to payment of the hospital utilization fee to the same extent as any other hospital patient.

The medical utilization fee is entirely another matter. We have absolutely no intention of requiring cancer patients receiving care and treatment under this Act to become liable to pay a medical utilization fee. The amendment in this regard is introduced only because of a provision of the Federal Medical Care Act. The Federal Act states in effect that a Provincial Medical Care Plan in order to be eligible to receive Federal financial support must provide medical services of all kinds paid for through public funds, including services for the treatment of cancer, will be included as part of our Province's plan. The

April 2, 1968

only exception will be for cases coming under the Workmen's Compensation legislation. It may be that in the application of the uniform terms and conditions the principle will require the medical utilization fee to be chargeable against all patients including cancer patients. For this reason this amendment is introduced. However, if such a fee becomes chargeable against cancer patients, this fee will be paid for entirely by the Government with no portion of it becoming payable by the patient. Payment will probably be made through the Medical Services Division of the Department of Health. The charging of such fees will not start until July 1 at the earliest. May I again repeat that so far as medical utilization fees are concerned, patients coming under The Cancer Control Act will have no liability since if such a fee becomes chargeable it will be entirely paid by the Provincial Government.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, this amendment to The Cancer Control Act represents yet another impost that this Government is heaping upon Saskatchewan people. As I understand this amendment, Mr. Speaker, cancer patients who are being treated in Saskatchewan hospitals will now be required to pay these so-called deterrent charges this Government has been attempting to introduce. Free care and treatment of cancer, Mr. Speaker, has become a time-honored tradition in our province. During the term of office of the former CCF Administration the most complete care was made available to all Saskatchewan residents if they were stricken with this dread disease. Now I find it difficult to believe, Mr. Speaker, that any Member of this House on either side can offer support to this kind of legislation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this must represent another step backward in time. Free diagnosis, treatment and care of cancer patients have become an accepted fact in Saskatchewan, and I think people will be shocked to know that a charge will now be levied against these unfortunate people if this Bill passes. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, establishes a precedent that cancer patients are no longer regarded as a special category. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should be looking forward to an expansion of services to cancer patients, rather than providing fewer services.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have argued that the Government should be taking another look at their 1964 election promise to provide some drugs as an insured service under The Medical Care Insurance Act. We suggested, for instance, that drug care for terminal cancer patients represents a logical way to begin in keeping faith with the people of Saskatchewan. We recognize fully, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of costs in providing drug care is indeed a problem. However, Mr. Speaker, this is a special category of patients that are almost always faced with staggering drug bills over which they have little or no control. This Government, Mr. Speaker, will be receiving over \$10 million from Ottawa this year and over \$14 million next year under the terms of the National Medical Care Act. I suggest to you today that to place this extra charge on cancer patients is to ignore an obligation to at least make a start on a drug program at this time. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction

of this piece of legislation is unforgivable as far as the Government is concerned. It is my honest belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is the captive of the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), I believe, Mr. Speaker, that he would find himself diametrically opposed to this kind of legislation if that were not the case. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, regard the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) as a gentleman and an able administrator. We would respect him a good deal more, if he would show some spunk and inject a little starch in his spine and let his colleagues know this kind of shabby and retrograde legislation has no place in Saskatchewan in 1968.

The word 'deterrent', Mr. Speaker, has been termed a misnomer as it applies to hospital and medical care. In the case of cancer diagnosis, cancer treatment and cancer care, I believe the argument is that much more valid. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, in which these new imposts will deter or reduce the utilization of hospital or medical services by cancer patients. This provision is merely another inroad into the provision of valuable public services that have been enjoyed by the people of Saskatchewan for many, many years. The amendments to this Cancer Control Act, Mr. Speaker, represent another backward step in Saskatchewan in 1968. It is one of the many that have been introduced over the protests of Saskatchewan people in recent months. The introduction of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, represents another attack upon the time-honored provision in the care of cancer patients. It means another financial hardship, Mr. Speaker, another charge of \$75 a month for the first month that a cancer patient is in hospital, and \$45 a month for the two consecutive months following.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is not too late for the Minister to reconsider this legislation. I suggest quite sincerely that we on this side of the House will offer public commendation to the Minister, if he will find the courage to reconsider introducing this legislation at this time. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to oppose the Act on second reading because it does represent a retrograde step and a disservice to the people of Saskatchewan. I hope that all Members and especially Members opposite will search their conscience carefully before they vote on this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I have not very much to add to what my colleague from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) has had to say about this Bill. I think in a general way most of the Members of this House have on other occasions commented perhaps more indirectly about the results that this kind of action will have in the province. To the extent that deterrents are being applied on cancer patients, prospective or actual, it is fairly easy to see what is going to happen as a result of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. Every one is familiar with the fact that we have

April 2, 1968

in this province enjoyed over a period of years the best kind of public and private action in an effort to control cancer and to ease the pain and the difficulty of those that get the disease. The whole accent is on early detection; in fact we are quite familiar again, all of us, with the constant messages that appear on television, on radio, in the printed periodicals and papers, urging people to undertake physical check-ups, to look for signs of cancer, and so forth. The point I am trying to emphasize is that it all involves seeing a doctor as early as possible, and that early prevention in a word means early cure. Prevention means seeing a doctor so the diagnosis can be just as soon as possible after there are warning signs. Now we all know that in many, many cases that this doesn't happen. But I suggest that it is far more likely to be a difficulty among people who don't have the ability to pay than the more well-to-do. These are the people, who when they may have noticed one of the early signs of cancer of which we are warned so profusely, are apt to say to themselves, "No I can't because there is a deterrent and there are costs that I will have to bear." I say that this legislation, therefore, is, as my colleague has said, retrogressive in another way; not only in that it damages the public program that we have succeeded in building up in this Province, but because it will actually tend to harm and damage a great deal of the efforts of the private organizations and the many individuals who are striving to prevent cancer, and find a cure for the disease as soon as possible. In the end the deterrents that we are discussing in this Bill will have, I think, the reverse effect to what is intended. It will result, finally, in more hospitalization, not less, in more doctor's care, not less, in spite of the other trends to the contrary that I spoke about a few minutes ago.

If early detection is the desired thing, it also means that the possibilities of cure are going to be that much greater. It means that the patient is likely to have less hospitalization, if the particular cancer from which he suffers is discovered early, and of course this means that the doctor's care will be that much less too, so that in the end it seems to me that not only does it damage the cancer program we have now in terms of the people who will in the future get benefits from it, but that it will defeat the purpose of saving money. This, of course, is the end result of the Government's policy in this Bill, by inflicting further costs because of longer stay in hospital and because of longer treatment by physicians. For all of these reasons, I think it is in more ways than one retrogressive in the extreme, and of course a backward step that should not have been taken in view of the history of this program, and in view of the kind of disease which we are treating. Remembering that in the case of no other disease in this country or North America, and I think perhaps the world, is there a more concerted effort and greater public anxiety to try and find cures and remedies, then this is certainly not the place, for psychological reasons alone, to damage a program that involves this kind of disease.

I will certainly not vote for the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion and the debate that has ensued, I would appreciate it if Members of the Opposition would quit referring to free schemes. One Hon. Member referred to the free cancer care program. He knows as well as I do that it is not free and I think it is an injustice to do to the people of this province to keep on suggesting that these programs are free, because they are not.

I am not going to suggest that I am any more or less concerned about this dread disease of cancer than anyone on the opposite side of the House. Like most in this room I have been actively engaged in work with the Cancer Society so I don't think that anyone can indicate that I lack an interest. If there is any place that I should be instilling a little starch in my spine as far as the Members on this side of the House are concerned, I say that this isn't the place. It is in caucus, and I can assure the Hon. Member that it is quite apparent that he doesn't have a pipe line to our caucus meetings, because he would be aware of the fact that I do have a little starch in my spine.

The Members of the Opposition seem to use this Bill, along with others, as a sounding board for additional health schemes. Once again, as the Hon. Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) has so ably demonstrated in the past, it is quite easy to list ways and means of spending money, but it is considerably more difficult to suggest ways and means of raising it. The trend in the United States and in Canada as well is to not segregate particular diseases and this applies to cancer, as well as others. This can be demonstrated in many ways. There has not been a hospital built for strictly cancer use or diagnosis for at least 10 years. Specialty departments for the care and handling of cancer patients are almost a thing of the past, and every day in every way it is being treated more and more like any other disease, with special emphasis on research and investigation as to the cause. The diagnostic and research work that is involved in the cancer program will not be affected in any way. I feel that there must be uniformity of treatment of people in general hospitals and that is the reason I am supporting this particular Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 29

Thatcher	Grant	Weatherald
Howes	Bjarnason	Mitchell
McFarlane	MacDonald	Larochelle
Boldt	Hooker	Gardner

April 2, 1968

Cameron
Steuart
McIsaac
Guy
Loken
MacDougall

Gallagher
MacLennan
Heggie
Breker
Leith
Radloff

Coupland
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

NAYS — 23

Lloyd
Wooff
Kramer
Willis
Wood
Blakeney
Davies
Dewhurst

Meakes
Berezowsky
Romanow
Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk

Brockelbank
Baker
Pepper
Bowerman
Messer
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) moved second reading of Bill No. 75 — **An Act to amend The Income Tax Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hope this is a tax Act that we can all support unanimously.

The Federal Government has recently passed an amendment to the Income Tax Act which is intended to accelerate payment of the corporation income tax. Where the Department of National Revenue collects the corporation income tax, it will be necessary to bring the tax payment provisions of the Provincial Income Tax Act into conformity with Federal legislation. In effect the proposed amendment will accelerate the payments of corporation income tax by some two months. As the law now stands, corporations are required to begin to pay taxes in respect to their taxation year in the fifth month of that taxation year and to complete their payments four months after the end of the year. Corporations will now be required to begin payments of tax for a taxation year in the third month of that year and to complete their estimated payments two months after the end of the year. Any further amount necessary to make up the difference between the estimated payments and the actual tax liability will fall due three months after the corporation's taxation year. The amendment also provides a schedule of payments for a transitional period involving corporation taxation years commencing after November 30, 1967 and before December 1, 1968.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 79 — **An Act respecting the University of Saskatchewan.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 79 is an Act respecting the University of Saskatchewan. During the past several years, chiefly 1961, the University, the Members I am sure on both sides are

well aware, has taken a number of important decisions, the basic purposes of which were to create the present two-campus structure. While the single university concept has been maintained with a single Board of Governors, Senate and President, an organizational structure has been gradually developed for each campus. Now each campus has its own administrative machinery headed by a Principal, assisted by administrative and academic bodies. The process of development of this new organization has been carried out under the direction of the University's administrative body with the approval of course of the Board of Governors and the Senate. Having completed studies and having adopted final plans to implement fully the two-campus single university concept, the University administration in 1967 reviewed The University Act with a view to requesting amendments which would be necessary to give effect to that structure. The result was a decision by the Board of Governors to undertake a complete review, a complete updating and a complete rewriting of The University Act. Late in 1967 a complete revision of the Act was submitted to me at that time for consideration. The Government in turn agreed substantially to most of these proposed provisions, and a Bill was prepared and finalized.

Now in this Bill there are numerous relatively minor changes from the old Act. Incidentally in this regard I have a number of changes to bring in in the form of House amendments that were suggested to us by the University officials after the Bill had come back from the printers. There are, however, several substantive amendments, some on the initiative of the University and some on the initiative of the Government. First of all, the major changes, as I mentioned, throughout the whole structure of the Act will make the Act consistent with the two-campus organizations which is now of course in effect and has been in effect. Amendments will modify the qualifications for a Chancellor and reduce his term of office, at the request again of the Board of Governors. The Bill will change the composition of the Board of Governors. It will establish a general University Council, which is new, to provide co-ordination between the two campuses in academic matters and to provide a communication link between the Council and the Senate. The investment powers of the University will be broadened in the new amendments that are introduced. Another amendment introduced by the Government, Mr. Speaker, will clarify procedures with respect to capital construction projects, specify and spell out that the tenders for new buildings are to be awarded by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). Another measure suggested again by the University is designed to provide and secure adequate control of traffic and parking on the Saskatoon campus. This has not been a problem in the Regina campus because it comes under Wascana Centre authority.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments. As I have in the past years continually opposed The University Act as it stands, I am going to oppose it once again. I will not

April 2, 1968

hold it up but I am going to make a few comments. There actually isn't too much change, but it does put in more teeth to centralize our university set-up in Saskatchewan. I have always argued for autonomy for both campuses and this will be my stand as long as I have the privilege of being in this House. I think it is important that we give each University autonomy, if we are to have some control of fiscal policy, not necessarily control but be able to compare and have both branch out systematically in the courses that they desire, and are fitting to each area. I hoped the Government of the day should have heeded this advice so that our communities would really become part of the various universities. The campus here is somewhat remote from the people, the reason being we haven't the autonomy within the southern part of the province and this city. I do not think you can have efficiency under this system. The Universities of Ontario that have 10 or 11 separate campuses seem to be functioning very well, and in speaking to the mayors of those communities they would not have it otherwise. Just as long as we continue this way the Universities are going to limp along. I suggest that there be two separate boards established with one Chancellor. All controls for this area should be handled by a board in Southern Saskatchewan with the major number coming from this city. I know the students feel they are not part of the University complex, and want to develop some pride in this campus. You can't have pride in a place or an institution without having some say in the activities and the administrative procedures. I would like to see the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) have another look at this. I realize that he didn't draw up the whole Act at this time, but I would like to know how he feels about the complete division of the two campuses. I presume his family would go to the one in Saskatoon by virtue of his location. That's fine. But southern Saskatchewan deserves something too, and I would have hoped that there would be more authority even now. If it's not going to be changed, then give the people here authority to administer the day to day activities on our campus.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to The University Act as it now exists. There is no use of me adjourning the debate because the Act is here, but I had hoped it would have been revised, dividing the two campuses.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which produces some reason for gratification. It produces some reason for regret. It also produces some reason for outright opposition of it in part. It produces some gratification because it is not nearly as bad as we were led to believe such a Bill would be a few months ago. At that time we had been told of the Government's intention to take over complete financial control. Obviously the Bill doesn't do that. It produces some regrets because it is not as good in the changes it proposes as was originally suggested. It is not as good because it fails to make provision for representation of faculty or students on governing bodies. It produces some

reason for opposition because of the additional power it does give to the Government, particularly with respect to contracts for buildings which will cost \$50,000 or over. In doing that it gives the Government some unnecessary and I submit quite useless control. This is the sort of thing which raises further questions about some of the Government's motives.

With respect to the Act there is really not too much that are changes of consequence from the present Act. The Minister has referred to the General Council. As we have two campuses these are, of course, necessary and this kind of amendment was desirable operating under this particular structure. Certainly it is not the sweeping transfer of authority from the University to Government which was threatened in the Premier's potash bill speech. I congratulate the Government for backing down that particular slippery slope. I remind it again that, had it simply done a little bit of consultation with the University ahead of time, a lot of unfortunate but real damage could have been prevented.

There are three aspects with respect to university government which I want to comment on. Mr. Speaker, since the Bill is before us. The Minister has said that they receive some submissions from the University and the Government agreed substantially. I suggest that there were some of the measures, which the University was interested in and which the Government did not agree to. First of all there is the failure to provide for faculty representation on the Board of Governors. This I submit is a serious failure. Secondly, the failure to provide for student representation on the Senate of the University. This failure, too, is to be regretted. I want to go a bit further and raise with the Minister the question of student representation on the Board of Governors and to ask him to pursue that idea during the months to follow.

The third aspect on which I want to comment in a bit more detail is that which I mentioned a minute ago. That is the compulsion in the Act whereby all contracts for buildings costing more than \$50,000 must be and I quote, "made by the Minister of Public Works."

Mr. Speaker, the searching for improved form of university administration is of course not new. It is good. Universities particularly such as ours are first of all academic institutions. But a university, particularly such as the one in Saskatchewan, is by tradition and by intent, I submit, also a great public service institution. Since it is that, the intent and the right of the public and the Government to have a share in making and influencing decisions are widely recognized. This share and influence in making decisions if properly done are good for the university. The responsibility of the Government to protect the increasing number of tax dollars committed to higher education is also recognized. The whole relationship between university and government is a very delicately balanced one. It is a relationship in which mutual confidence and respect are very essential.

April 2, 1968

This search for improved administrative forms, this search for opportunities for other groups to have a say in influencing decisions has received a great impetus on this continent in recent years. Some of the impetus for this added search has come about because of some of the very serious problems which have been faced by large universities in the United States. Members will recall the nation-wide shattering news coming out of the Berkeley campus not many years ago. Universities realize that ours are getting larger and more complex and there is increasing tension there. This search for improved administrative forms comes also out of changed attitudes on the part of students. Students have demonstrated an increasing concern for what was happening or wasn't happening for them insofar as university education is concerned. As I said in another discussion a number of days ago, young people are unwilling to continue as just consumers of pre-fabricated, pre-digested university environment.

Mr. Speaker, both this search for change and the possible shape of change were advanced in Canada by a study which began in 1964. It was completed late in 1965. It was published in 1966. It was a study which was commissioned by the Canadian Association of Teachers jointly with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. It has become popularly known as the Duff-Berdahl Report after the two commissioners. One of these commissioners came from England and one from the universities of the United States.

A number of the findings of this Duff-Berdahl Report, along with those of some other studies that have been made in recent years, are relevant to this Act. They are particularly relevant to the question of faculty representation on university boards and to the question of student representation on Senate. To a lesser extent they are relevant to the question of student representation on administrative boards.

Let me quote the recommendations of this commission with respect to faculty representation on Boards of Governors of the universities. After examining the evidence they recommend in these words:

Accordingly we recommend that charters and acts should be modified where necessary to permit the inclusion of faculty members on boards.

They have examined some of the arguments frequently used against this position which I gather have weighed heavily with the Government since it is not providing for faculty representation. They point out that it is sometimes argued that the board is the employer and the faculty is its employees. And their comment on that is this:

If the university were in fact a business corporation, this might make sense. But it is not. The normal employer and employee relationship and the normal tests of efficiency cannot apply in a university where the

profit-motive does not and ought not to exist, and where productivity is simply not measurable as between departments or individuals, or indeed at all.

They go on to examine one other argument against including faculty in boards of governors, that is the argument that faculty would then be fixing their own salaries. On this they make the following comment:

This objection is met in British universities by the rule or custom that the faculty members of Council — full members in all other respects — are not eligible to serve as members of the Council's Salaries Committee, or if there is no such committee they withdraw from the council meeting when salaries are discussed.

They state some arguments in favor of faculty representation. For example, they note that Mr. Justice Freedman, who is a well-known lawyer in Western Canada and who is also Chancellor of the University of Manitoba, recently gave support to the principle of faculty seats on boards. They point out that before Justice Freedman made that comment, he inquired from a number of British university authorities and American university presidents how they viewed the proposals. The Americans, who lack experience of the system were "dubious." The British Vice-Chancellors who are all working under the system were "unanimous in their approval." Commissioner Dr. Duff in particular who had had experience as a lecturer, vice-chancellor, professor, and member of a board at four different universities thought he ought to explain why he found the system of faculty members represented on boards as, in his words, "invaluable and indispensable." He said that "it helps the non-academic board members to understand the point of view of the academics. This is genuinely different for them, yet they and their students are the University." The Commissioners go on to point out that they had visited two or three Canadian universities in the course of gathering material for their report, universities which had arrangements to have faculty members represented on the board. They came to this conclusion:

We questioned the Boards and found that in every case they thought the Board was strengthened by the inclusion of faculty members.

May I refer to one other study that has been made in this same respect. In the Province of Quebec a few years ago there was a very searching and comprehensive study — a Royal Commission study on education — in that province. Their comments are as follows:

It would be a good thing for members of the staff to be members of the central administrative body; they could express the point of view of the staff, make certain that educational and intellectual considerations are given first place in all decisions and act as a bridge

April 2, 1968

between the executive officers and the teaching staff.

Well, there is a considerable body of evidence, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, in favor of doing that which the Government has for its own reasons whatever decided not to do. The evidence is by no means complete with those sources from which I have commented. The Canadian Association of University Teachers in its bulletin published in December of 1967 has some comment also. In this bulletin there is an article entitled "Changes in University Government in Canada in the post Duff-Berdahl Era." It evaluates, by the way, the Duff-Berdahl report and has this comment to make.

The Duff-Berdahl Commission and its Report, published in March of 1966, provided the stimulus for a thorough study of university government in Canada by all segments of the university community, a study which has resulted and continues to result in major modifications in university structures. Though this factor if not the only one contributing to the radically changed climate of opinion, the publication of the Report marks a watershed in thinking about university government in Canada.

With great regret we have to note that a proposed Saskatchewan Bill now before us leaves Saskatchewan on the wrong side of that "watershed." The Canadian Association of University Teachers points out that in the last two or three years some 15 institutions now have faculty representation on the Board of Governors. They add that this number is likely to increase in the near future. I wish that we could add Saskatchewan to the number to be included.

They mention universities such as Laval, three in Alberta, Montreal, Western Ontario, St. Dunstan's, St. Francis Xavier, Acadia, McMaster, Trent, etc. Not, I regret, Saskatchewan. The article adds this:

U.B.C., Manitoba, and a number of additional Ontario universities are preparing to revise their statutes in order to provide faculty membership on the board.

It is regrettable that we have to note that Saskatchewan has not decided to get on the right side of the watershed. I think that we have to note and regret that the Saskatchewan Government has failed to keep in step with this kind of a movement. My understanding is that the University has both agreed and requested that there be such representation. I would urge the Government to reconsider, particularly in view of the happenings of recent months, resulting in university and government dissent, it would have been advantageous for the Government, for the University and the people of this province, to have made this change at this time. I trust that the Government will take a look at it even before this Bill passes this Legislature.

We turn now secondly to the other omission. That is the failure to recognize or provide for the part which students can and should play in shaping the nature and character of

institutions of this kind. One of the great problems which society faces, Mr. Speaker, is that of keeping education at all levels — in particular at the level of the university — relevant to the days in which we live. But I think that we should learn the fact. We have been too long in learning, as I said before, that students can play a part. Students are wanting to play a part and in some places students are being allowed to play a part.

I respect the fact that the Government is paying on behalf of the public a lot of dollars. The students are paying in terms of a number of years of their life. I do think that they could make a contribution to the relevancy of our University. I think our University would be stronger and would equip us better to meet the days in which we live, if we had more opportunity for students to take in making these decisions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — As I understand it, the University authorities in various bodies were quite in favor of the idea of having students on the Senate of the University. I want to urge the Minister to think about that. I want to urge him during the months to follow to discuss with the University authorities and groups the possibility of including student representation on the Board of Governors.

Now again there is a great deal of evidence produced in recent years supporting this point of view. I want to refer to some of this evidence. I want to point to some of the witnesses in this respect who, we on this side of the House, suggest that we ought to be listening to. Just a matter of a month or so ago, the Saskatchewan School Trustees sponsored a conference in the city of Saskatoon. The topic I believe was “Trends in Education.” One of the speakers at that conference was Professor Bohrson of the Ford Foundation of New York City. His address was referred to in gratifying detail in the Star Phoenix, February 29. Because what he said is relevant to what we are talking about here, may I read some or portions from that newspaper article. Professor Bohrson stated the opinion that:

Students should be extensively involved in decisions on curriculum change, school organization and the teaching process. We,

Meaning the rest of us,

are concerned that students behave with restraint, wear short hair and long dresses, and speak with respect, he said.

The youth are concerned with a truer reality, which says that jobs, and sex and “who am I,” and Vietnam, and independence are more significant concerns than long-range objectives and phoney middle-class morality.

April 2, 1968

Educators must design ways to listen systematically to these youth who see their own world and their own problems more clearly than we.

Providing for them to have membership on the Senate of the University would be one way in which we could listen. Professor Bohrson went on to say:

We will need to turn directly and soon to those most deeply concerned, he said. We will need to listen closely to the young idealists, and the young militants, whose voice of dissent is heard now more loudly and strongly as a conscience of the schools in confused society. Schools must be shaped, moulded, formed on the concerns and needs of their constituents, he said.

Even though the militant groups are not in accord, and are sometimes in conflict, all of them will demand a voice and will be heard, one way or another.

The second source to which I go is a statement prepared by the Students Council at Carleton University not many months ago. The students there made this point:

It has been our contention, and that of many others more informed in the methods of education, that an individual learns best when he has a good measure of control over the situation in which he must learn. It is a task which the university must undertake if it is to meet its demands properly in the area of teaching.

They went on to call for “institutions to recognize the contributions to be made by students in the decision-making process of university government and so reform its structure to make such contributions most possible.”

For a third authority or witness I return to the Duff-Berdahl Report. This Report, I admit, is much less positive and decisive in this particular field. But it does say:

The subject of the relationship of students to university government is one which has only recently received serious consideration. We saw enough symptoms of student dissatisfaction with their self-perceived status as customers of the universities to know that there will be increasing demands in Canada for their elevation to partners (albeit unequal ones) in the community of scholars and students. Some variations of the Berkeley disturbances may possibly occur in Canada during the coming years.

At this point I hope that Members will note that they added:

The issue is not whether to welcome or stifle this new wave of student sentiment, but rather how to develop channels into which it can flow constructively.

They went on to give voice to confidence in Canadian students in these words:

We suggest that students will respond with unsuspected maturity when treated as adults. Certainly the quality of the student leaders whom we met, French-speaking and English-speaking alike, was most impressive and Canada has good reason to be proud of them.

The fourth authority which I want to quote is again the Royal Commission Study in the Province of Quebec which I referred to previously. It says:

University students ask to be treated as adults, and it is fitting and fortunate that this should be so. Experiences show that there is little risk in extending confidence to them and in having them sit on various committees. Many difficulties would be averted if the students felt themselves more closely associated with the administration of the various levels of the university and if they were kept informed of the difficulties and problems confronting their institution.

Fifthly, I refer again, also, Mr. Speaker, to the bulletin of The Canadian Association of University Teachers in December of 1967. They point out that a number of institutions have already provided direct student representation on the Senate "with", they say, "more following suit almost every week." And again I regret that Saskatchewan is not in that group, at least following suit. There is student representation on the University Senates in the following institutions: University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser, Victoria, Montreal, Sir George Williams, Western Ontario, Windsor, Waterloo, Edmonton and Calgary. We regret again the absence of Saskatchewan. We regret the absence of any measure in this Bill to provide student representation on Senate and I hope that the Minister will take this matter under consideration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Again I make one quotation from the Canadian Association of University Teachers which points out, it seems to me, a real warning to us. The quotation is this:

Our universities are going to need all the strength they can muster to face these new challenges. Continuing reform of internal university government so as to provide effective participation by board, administration, faculty, and students is one of the indispensable means to building this strength.

This Bill in my opinion falls short of mustering all the available strength which we have in order to give us means of improving the university situation in Saskatchewan.

April 2, 1968

The other source from which I want to quote is support given by two professors of Carleton University. They are Drs. Armstrong and Rowat of Carleton. Dr. Rowat is well known for many writings in the field of political science. They have prepared a paper which is entitled, "In support of Student Representation on Board of Governors." They make these points and I quote:

The basic justification for student representation on the Board is that a university is a community of scholars and all elements of the community should participate in its government. Since the students are the most numerous part of this community, they deserve to be directly represented on the legal constituted governing body.

Secondly, they answer the question: what could students bring to the Board? They say:

What students would bring to the Board is their topicality. They, better than anyone else, can present student opinion on a given issue. They can ensure that no Board decision is arrived at without due consideration of the student perspective. Their most important contribution would be their understanding of student opinion.

And thirdly, they refer to the experience of some British universities as told by Dr. Hare, Vice-Chancellor of one of the colleges of the University of London. Dr. Hare had recently lectured at Carleton University, and he mentioned in his lecture that students are represented on the governing body of his college and said that this works successfully. The system, they point out, also exists in other colleges and universities in Britain, Europe and the United States. There are students on governing boards as well at some Canadian Universities such as St. Michael's College at the University of Toronto, and at the University of Montreal. Drs. Rowat and Armstrong add the opinion that they are likely to become members of the Boards at several other Canadian universities within the next year or two. Again I want to ask the Minister to discuss the possibility of moves of this kind, speaking now of the students on the Boards, because I don't think this has been agreed to with university bodies. I hope that there will be moves taken to discuss it with them in the months to come.

The third part of my comments has to do with the added authority given to the Government through the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). As I said earlier there is compulsion in the Act that the Minister of Public Works is to let all building contracts in excess of \$50,000. I don't know what the Government feels it's going to gain as a result of this move. What it does of course is to invite suspicion. This is completely unavoidable. There is no question in our minds or in the minds of people generally, or in the minds of the University, with regard to the right of the Government to discuss building plans, programs, to discuss and examine building plans. There is no question even in regard to the right of the Government to rule

on standards. These I have not heard questioned. But the compulsion that contracts should be let only through and by the Minister of Public Works, this I submit should be opposed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — At the very minimum it smacks of a desire on the part of the Government to get control over the dispersal of patronage. It's "Roll out the barrel again, boys" and in this case it is the pork barrel. The Government has not tried to show any need for this. It has not demonstrated or offered or attempted any justification. The whole affair can be a cause of dissension and delay and further impairment of university-government relationships. We can't afford any further impairment of university-government relationships in this province.

What's added by it? The Minister didn't comment much about it in his original introduction. What does this move add to the ability of the Government to protect our public expenditure? I submit that it adds nothing to have the Minister of Public Works let the contract for buildings over \$50,000. It suggests in a way that we don't trust the Board and the administration staff of the University of Saskatchewan. This proposal doesn't deserve supporting. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to oppose the Bill as it stands. I do want to ask the Minister to take into consideration his comments about the value of faculty representation and student representation on the Senate. I hope that he or whoever handles the University affairs now will have some further discussion with respect to student representation on the Board of Governors as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — I fundamentally feel that this Legislature should exert as little control as it can over the affairs of the University. Rising on this point, I feel that, in the matter of student representation and possibly faculty representation on the Board of Governors, one should consider the possibility that has existed and does exist under the existing Act for the University Senate to make such representation possible without the interference of this Legislature. I refer to Section 27, subsection 2 under which any professional society and any group or organization in the province that in the opinion of the Senate contributes in a significant way to the social, economic and cultural welfare of the province may be represented in the Senate. If the University Senate wished to name the Students' Representative Council or any other group of students, I believe that it could name representation or request representation from such a group under its existing statutes. Carrying this a stage further, if the University Senate wished, it has the privilege under the section on the Board of Governors, Section 57, to elect five members to the Board of Governors. If the University Senate wished to do so it could conceivably nominate the student

April 2, 1968

who had been named to represent a student group. I believe that this is a strong possibility, it could be done and as I say it would be done at the wish of the University and not because of any legislation which was imposed upon the University.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add a very few words of support to what I consider to be one of the very finest and most logical arguments presented in support of the University as was done this afternoon by my Leader, the Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd). I particularly want to agree, Sir, with and want to lend my voice in support to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to faculty and student representation on the Senate and the Board of Governors. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that comments such as those presented by the Leader of the Opposition show in precise and in exact terms what some of the Members on this side of the Legislature have been talking about from time to time in other debates about new and positive ideas. I submit that this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition has given us an example of the type of new and positive thought that can be applied to university and educational field of activity in this regard. It's the type of comment that in my view fosters educational development and growth in keeping with the needs and the tune of the times. It's the type of statement that is in direct contrast, Mr. Speaker, with the statements that we heard in months and weeks gone by threatening the very autonomy and the freedom of students and faculty by spokesmen of the Government. I feel the Leader of the Opposition is to be commended and regretfully the Government is to be condemned for having created this mistrust and suspicion.

Now my colleague and friend from Saskatoon South (Mr. Forsyth) has mentioned the legislative provisions which would permit the Board of Governors now to allow students to be represented on the Board of Governors if they so choose. It is correct to say that such legislation in fact does exist. I'm afraid however that my friend has missed the essence of the argument that has been presented this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition. The essence of the argument is this, Sir, as I understand it and I translate it, that in today's 1968 world with automation, technology and the rapidly increasing interest of students that university students no longer look upon sitting on the Board of Governors or on the Senate of the University as a matter of privilege but as a matter of right by virtue of their entrance to the University of Saskatchewan or be it any university in the Dominion of Canada. Respectfully, the argument presented by my friend from Saskatoon South places the University's Students Representative Council or any other such body which is the voice and the spokesman from the students in the position of having to make a case to the Board of Governors before being accepted by the Board of Governors in the particular decision-making acts of the University. This is bad. This is the type of thinking which only fosters and adds impetus to the type of concern that the Leader of the Opposition was voicing this afternoon. He

didn't refer to or allude to the question of student power. In many circles, not perhaps in Saskatchewan yet, but in many circles of North America, the two words, "student power" have caused a lot of emotional and a lot of academic insight, a lot of academic soul-searching and, as I understand the remarks made by my Leader this afternoon, the feeling of the students of today, as represented in the student power movements. What they are really saying is this: We want to be a part in a very fast and rapidly changing world that is Saskatchewan, 1968, today. We want to be a part essentially in two areas.

Firstly, we would request that there be a change from the traditional, and if I may use, and I don't mean this disparagingly, old concepts of professor-student relationship. It is, if you will, Sir, a structuring of education not a uniting aspect of the teacher and the aspect of education. What the students, I think, are really saying is that we want to be, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) referred to, a part of the community of scholars where there are no such people as professors and students per se but rather a community of equals, all students, some having more education than others but all prepared to sit around the university table and have a wholesome and active exchange of the new ideas, some of the old ideas that are now besetting the issues of the day. Now the weakness of this legislation that enshrines and makes it a matter of legislative approval, let us say the implementation and the acceptance of students on a Board of Governors, doesn't move at all towards eradicating the structuring I talked about, but rather in fact formalizes and continues to formalize in the field of relationships between the university students and faculty administrative body the differences that presently exist. It may not erupt yet in the Province of Saskatchewan. But those who are in tune with the times and with the needs and the demands of the students of Saskatchewan dealing in university or any other academic institution, I am sure will wholeheartedly agree with the submission of the Leader of the Opposition and the learned authorities that he's used to back his argument that there has to be some change in this area and some change now, Sir.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Secondly, the concern by a lot of the students, as I understand them, and I'm not here now pretending to be the sole spokesman in this regard of course, has become, as I talked about in the Speech from the Throne debate, a question of automation and technology. The rapid changes of technology and automation have, and I don't think we can argue this fact, caused a great deal of social displacement. Students and young people of today are questioning the values of our society, they're questioning the institutions of society. No longer can they be placated by lecturers, by professors or by school teachers in high school or wherever they may be about the values of certain particular old institutions. They have to be proven to be worthwhile, to be functional, to be idealistic in terms of 1968.

April 2, 1968

In other words, if you will, Mr. Speaker, what I submit is one of the paramount second reasons for this sort of moving towards student participation. What the students really want is a changing and to be a part of the changing attitudes of university. That is to say, under the present rate system, when a professor lectures, the student memorizes, commits it to memory and regurgitates it back at exam time to the professor. This is not learning by discovery. It's a question of wanting to sit down, again as I said at the beginning, under this atmosphere of equality and talk about the social and the political and the old traditional institutional values of today's society. I think, Mr. Speaker, although it is somewhat off the topic, but again related to this question of whether or not the legislation is providing for this community of harmony, that this is going to be really one of the most crucial issues of 1968. Automation and technology are spectres, Sir, that are haunting the Province of Saskatchewan and indeed North America.

It seems to me that we as Legislators have one choice at this particular time. We can adopt the thinking of the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and the Government that in effect says we are not going to officially recognize the fact that the youth of today have anything concrete to offer in the relationships with their seniors and their administrators or anything concrete to offer with respect to ideas in the educational curriculum that has to be set up. If we say that, then we are of the type of student power — not that I'm against it, Sir — but the type of student power and the type of protest that the Leader of the Opposition has alerted this Chamber and the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to. Clearly we ought to provide the channels whereby these ideas can be communicated freely, can be accepted with no recrimination, can be challenged without the necessity of any form of structuring either by way of Board of Governors or academically or any other area. There should be, as I repeat and accepting the Opposition's word, this community of scholarship between students and all people of the University.

And I might add this, Sir, that it's been working in the past. When I had occasion to be on the University of Saskatchewan campus, one of the very important organizations was the Memorial Union Building. This is commonly referred to as the MUB. The MUB was the place where students could gather over a cup of coffee, talk about some of the issues of the day, relax, read, do whatever they wanted to do. It was an operation of some thousands of dollars. There was a student who was the chairman of the operation of the MUB. There was a Board composed of the faculty, a board composed of alumni representatives, a Board composed of administrative personnel from the University of Saskatoon. The student was the chairman. I recall vividly being at one meeting where the President of the University, Dr. Spinks was also present. He contributed to the discussion and certain decisions were made from time to time in a harmonious atmosphere. In other words, for those

who may raise the issue, how do we know that students can be responsible in the handling of money, it is not a new concept. The University of Saskatchewan itself has accepted it and I only cite this one example as a good concrete working example of this type of harmonious relationship. In the field of academic or in the field of social value, this question of being a part in determining their own curriculum, may I also draw to your attention, Sir, the example of W.U.S.C., World University Students. Legislators will be familiar with this term. Among other things W.U.S.C. is an organization which concerns itself with ideals, international ideals, local ideals — if you will — more of the philosophy and more of the educational aspect. Their students, administrative staff, alumni faculty, all sit down, as the Leader of the Opposition has proposed in the proposed Board of Governors under his scheme, thrash out and discuss the issues of the day, and then come to a consensus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I just conclude by saying this: I feel the youth and the students of today must be heard. We either are going to build the University of Saskatchewan where those who go to the University are going to, in harmony and equality, work toward a consensus about the new ideals and the new values of the Province of Saskatchewan, or we are going to abide by old and outdated concepts. I say this to the Government that this is not the time now to be afraid of the new ideas and young people in their thoughts in university and academic institutions. I'm pleading with the Minister of Education and his Government to show us that the events of time have not passed him by. What I'm really saying is simply this, without being too political, that the time to act is now. If they don't, regrettably, I'm afraid that the young people in the Province of Saskatchewan are going to have to say again that this Government has nothing to offer for them in this very important area of education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I pride myself that I am one of the Members of this House that has had the most recent or the second most recent experience as a full-time student at the University of Saskatchewan. I wish to make some remarks about the Act and about some of the remarks that have been made. Therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ANNOUNCEMENT

ELECTRONIC CHECK BY RCMP

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a statement with your permission. Certain insinuations were made this morning by the Hon. Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and the Hon. Member

April 2, 1968

for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) that the Government might have bugged their lobby or offices. You will recall, Sir, that you at the request of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) asked that the RCMP make a thorough check of the rooms mentioned. This was done today. The Attorney General has left for Ottawa, so they have given me the reports. The letter is from R.J. Ross, Superintendent for the Commanding Officer, "F" Division, addressed to the Hon. Attorney General:

Re: Listening Devices — Legislative Building — Regina, Saskatchewan.

At the request of the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Meldrum, four members of this Force were detailed to carry out a search of Rooms 229 and 267 on the second floor of the Legislative Building in Regina for the presence of electronic listening devices.

This search commenced at 2:15 p.m. and terminated at 4:45 p.m. this date. The two rooms in question were thoroughly searched, including all furniture, light fixtures, air vents and other equipment therein, with negative results. A check of the telephones was carried out by employees of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones, which also revealed nothing.

Mr. Speaker, far too often these insinuations and innuendos have been made in the past. Repeatedly in the last election these kind of smear tactics were used. Usually the Socialists make them when there's nobody around to check them up. But today the tables were turned. Since the RCMP, Mr. Speaker, have given the lie to their accusation, I call on the Opposition to withdraw their charges and apologize. I wish to table this letter for the records of the House, Mr. Speaker, and may I send it up to you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — In connection with the statement that has just been read from the RCMP by the Premier, the Chair orders that it be tabled as a sessional paper and printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:59 o'clock p.m.