

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
13th Day

Thursday, February 20, 1969.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, through you it is my pleasure to introduce to all Members of the Assembly, first, in the west gallery, 35 grade seven and eight students from Al Pickard school in Regina North West. Their teacher, Alice Semkoe, is with them. I understand they have a parliamentary forum at Al Pickard school. In the east gallery, also from Regina North West, 90 grade eight students from Rosemont school, their principal, Jim Young and teachers, George Achtymichuk and Peter East are with them. They too are interested in parliamentary procedures. All Members I'm sure join me in expressing the wish that their stay here with us this afternoon will be pleasant and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of this Assembly, a group of students situated in the Speaker's gallery. These students comprise a portion of grade twelve high school at Glentworth. They were brought here by their teacher, Mr. Jeff Thompson. They have travelled a good number of miles to be with us this afternoon and we certainly hope for their benefit that the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) will be in good form.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hooker: — I also know that all Members of the Assembly will join with me in wishing them a very safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. H. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I too want to welcome a fine group of young ladies from the St. Chad's school of the Qu'Appelle Diocese sponsored by the Anglican Church. They are 22 in number from grade 10. They are here with Sister Beryl who is their teacher. This school, Mr. Speaker, is one of great reputation for learning and standards. It is in the heart of my constituency, the South East seat of Regina, the largest, I repeat again, in the Province of Saskatchewan. We do welcome them this afternoon and we hope that their stay here will be most fruitful and that they will learn much about the making of the laws of our province.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 20, 1969

Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly, a group of students seated in the Speaker's gallery. These students attend Sutherland school which is located in my constituency, Saskatoon City Park-University. We sincerely hope that these students will appreciate the proceedings of the House and that they will enjoy a very pleasant and safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want also to welcome on your behalf and on behalf of the Members assembled here some 37 grade six school children from the Palliser Heights school in Moose Jaw. They are accompanied by one of their teachers, Mr. Neudorf. The school, I understand, intends to send a number of other classes down during the session and I want to take this opportunity to welcome them. I understand they are situated both in the east and in the west galleries, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that all Members will want to afford them a cordial welcome.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SASKATCHEWAN FARMERS' WHEAT PROFIT

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) in regard to an article in the Leader Post, February 18, 1969, entitled "Saskatchewan Farmers' Wheat Profit Said 4 Cents a Bushel." The person making this statement was J. F. Hickey, head of the Farm Management Branch of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister could table the figures that were used in arriving at this profit picture? It sounds like it is a little bit high to me.

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I saw the article in question and discussed it with the person who was purported to have given this information out. His whole speech was quoted out of context and I would be quite pleased to give a copy of the article to anybody that is concerned.

DISCONTINUATION OF GRANTS TOWARD SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Is the statement now being circulated to school unit offices correct that grants of 25 per cent toward the purchase of school buses are to be discontinued and if so, on what date is this to become effective?

Hon. J. C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, yes, the statement is correct and I believe the letter said, "effective as of February 15," I don't

recall exactly but whatever the letter said, stands.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Financial Critic): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on Tuesday I had not had an opportunity, in the heat of the debate which rapidly ensued after the Treasurer's Budget (Mr. Steuart), to tender my congratulations to Mr. Barnhart on his appointment as Clerk Assistant. I know all Members will, as they already have done, welcome his services in the House and extend to him every good wish of years of fruitful service to this Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I said that the Provincial Treasurer's Budget was a depressing one and even with his oratory and even with his figures, the picture he paints is a pale grey, dull picture of austerity. But some of us, Mr. Speaker, will be even sceptical of his figures. I'm a little sceptical for one thing, of his estimate of the yield from the education and health tax. To me it looks like a Liberal estimate. Some of us are sceptical on other accounts, particularly about the Government's so-called balanced Budget this year. I for one don't believe the Government's figures. I believe that the Government has lost and is losing large sums of money in its pulpwood operation and is not disclosing them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And I say that if this Government dared to tell the people the true facts, it would disclose huge losses and I'm not talking about losses measured in thousands of dollars or tens of thousands of dollars or hundreds of thousands of dollars. I say that this Government is losing millions of dollars in its pulpwood operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — This Government claims to be efficient. It claims to be good businessmen and how often it makes that claim. But it is losing money on this Crown corporation at a rate never before equalled by such business operations in Saskatchewan. And I'm asked how I know. If any one Member opposite wants to stand up and lay the figures on the table and refute my remarks, I'll welcome them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I say, Mr. Speaker, the fact that my allegation is true is given away by the fact that the Government has refused and continues to refuse to give the facts to this House and to

the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sceptical on another account. I don't believe the Government's stories about the balanced budgets in previous years. And the Government's own Estimates deny it. I know that government financing is pretty complicated, but I think it can be fairly well summed up this way: a balanced budget is when you pay as you go, a deficit budget is a buy-now-pay-later budget. And I ask Members to look at their Estimates which they got on Tuesday and look at page 26. There is an item there to pay \$650,000 for a highway that is already built, a highway built on the buy-now-pay-later plan two years ago. That's going to be a pretty expensive highway. It cost \$6.5 million to build, but to get the \$6.5 million, the Government borrowed that sum at 7 per cent interest on a 20-year term. The interest on the borrowed money will be \$9 million. So the highway won't cost \$6.5 million, no, it will be: highway \$6.5 million; interest \$9 million; total \$15.5 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And that's what we pay to put a four-lane highway out to Caron past the ranch so the Premier could take his visitors from Regina right down to the ranch on a four-lane highway.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — That's just one reason why this buy-now-pay-later plan is a bad plan for highways.

And I'm sceptical of the Government's figures for some other reasons. I'm certain that some of these estimates put in the Budget are in there for one reason and one reason only and that's for show. And I say the Government doesn't intend to spend some of the money that it put in that Budget. The technique of subterfuge is pretty well developed. The way it works is shown by the Public Accounts for the year 1968. That's the latest one we have. Suppose the Government is under some pressure because of the appalling shortage of facilities at the University. Fine. Put in a good estimate for capital building at the University, \$2 million. That doesn't mean you have to spend \$2 million. Oh, no, in this case it spends \$1.5 million and keeps back \$.5 million. Who will ever catch that tucked away on page 74 of the Public Accounts. Or suppose the Government is under pressure to provide scholarships for students. People are beginning to talk. After all in Canada every Provincial Government but Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island provides some form of bursary program for students out of its own funds. But, not this Government. What do you do when the heat is on? Well that's easy, no problem. Just put a figure in the Estimates. That's what it did, \$182,000 for student loans. Now how much of this \$182,000 did it spend last year? \$100,000? No. \$50,000? No. \$10,000? No. Answer, nil . . . on page 75 of the Public Accounts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And the Government wonders why the students have to take their case to the Prime Minister himself. The answer is not far to seek. The answer is that this Government is playing

games with the students and with the Legislature. The credibility gap is just too wide. Look at the whole list of expenditures, look at the whole list in the Public Accounts. They tell an eloquent story. Highways capital, \$6.5 million budgeted. How much spent? You guessed it, \$6.5 million. But look at item 6, Education capital, technical institute at Saskatoon, budgeted \$2.8 million, but spent, \$1.7 million – 60 per cent. A so-called saving of \$1 million while hundreds of young people in Saskatchewan don't have an opportunity for technical education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — That's what the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) called it on Tuesday. A saving. Or take mental health. Over \$700,000 of the money budgeted for mental health was not spent. And this at the very time that Dr. Frazier was saying that the mental health program was falling apart because not enough money was being spent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Indeed the Treasurer last year put in a special item in his budget - \$500,000. But all he would have had to do was take the \$700,000 that he hadn't spent and spend it. Instead, he wanted this item for show - \$500,000. He doesn't intend to spend it, he didn't spend it last year and he doesn't intend to spend it this year. Mental health is way, way down in his list of priorities.

Or take item 39. This is a vote to provide housing for people of Indian ancestry. Now how many times have we heard that story. It put in the Budget with a great flourish an amount of \$283,000. What does it spend? \$61,000 – 22 per cent on this program. And I could go on and on. There are large sums budgeted but not spent for other things. For housing projects, for old age assistance, disabled persons. In sharp contrast is the highway budget. Of all the money budgeted, 98.6 per cent was spent. Is there any wonder that this credibility gap grows and grows. Now a gaping hole in the credibility of this Government is evidenced when it talks about its economic policies.

We've heard for many years about industrial diversification and prosperity. We've heard that there are jobs going begging, that we have a low unemployment rate, indeed that we have industrial prosperity. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is true and I say, if, then we as a Province should be in excellent financial shape. In the same vein we've heard about agricultural diversification; we are no longer dependent upon field crops; we are told that the cattlemen and the hogmen are prospering under the benign leadership of the Premier. Now if these things are true, this Province should be in top financial shape. The grain crop last year was poorish but by no means a failure. In terms of bushels it was one of the bigger crops in the history of the province. In terms of grade, on the poor side. But all in all an average crop. Now, Mr. Speaker, with an average crop and with supposedly booming industrial prosperity and supposedly booming agricultural industry, except for field crops, we should be rolling in money. If this is true, how is it that we are subjected to this dreary, mark-time Budget with its air of crisis cutbacks. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Budget reeks of crisis cutbacks.

February 20, 1969

Let me give a few examples of programs which are cutback. School buildings, the grants of these are cut back; technical institute construction, cut back; park development and construction, cut back; South Saskatchewan River irrigation, cut back; community pasture program, cut back; co-operative extension work, cut back; scholarships for students, cut back; grants to Highway Safety Council, cut back; resource conservation education, cut back; nursing home maintenance grants, cut out all together; money to build new nursing homes, cut back. Mr. Speaker, this is by no means a complete list. Another thing which almost every one of these items has in common is this: that the work will have to be done sometime. It is a temporary postponement. It is just an emergency cutback. To delay this work is merely to put off the evil day with the sure knowledge that when we do do the work, when we do build those nursing homes, when we do build those schools and those technical institutes, the job will cost us more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, Mr. Speaker, only in extreme measures should a government engage in this type of stop-start budgeting. Jack rabbit starts and screeching stops are just as expensive for a government as they are in running a car.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — These methods are far more expensive and far less effective than long-term planning.

Now why, Mr. Speaker, does the Government find it necessary to cutback, to postpone, to defer, piling up trouble for next year and the year after? Why is it budgeting in this way from fright? Well the reason is not hard to find. For in spite of the talk about diversification, in spite of all the publicity releases about new industries, the Saskatchewan economy is faltering badly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Saskatchewan certainly has made some progress. But it has not surged ahead during the last five years. Far from it. Compared with the other provinces, Saskatchewan has not even held its own. It has not even kept pace with the Canadian average.

The United States is still in an economic boom. So is Canada. Indeed public figures on both sides of the border and from coast to coast spend half their time telling us about the boom and about the inflation that's coming with it and how something must be done. Now Canada has shared this North American boom. But not all of Canada has shared it equally. And just about tail-end Charlie in the boom market is Saskatchewan. Let's look at some of the indicators, the indicators that the Premier used to quote with such pride and has stopped quoting for a very good reason.

Let's look at oil production. Our increase in oil production has been this: 1963, 7 million barrels; 1964, 10 million barrels; 1965, 7 million barrels; 1966, 5 million barrels;

1967, no increase at all – 1 million barrel drop; 1968, again no increase, a further drop of 1 million barrels. The second successive year when we have had a drop in oil production. And not only in production, Mr. Speaker. Oil exploration is similarly tapering off. Compare the year ending March, 1968 with the year ending March, 1964 back in those dark days of stagnation. The number of wells drilled is down, the number of wells completed is down. Yes, Mr. Speaker, production is down for two successive years, the number of wells drilled is down, the number of wells completed is down. This is hardly a picture of a booming industry. It is a picture of failure, failure by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) and I'm sorry he is not in his seat, failure by this tired, aging and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Let's look Mr. Speaker, at hardrock mining. We have been treated this year to another barrage in the almost ceaseless campaign to convince Saskatchewan people that there is burgeoning development in the North. The Government is naturally just a little bit careful where it uses these stories. In Northern Saskatchewan the stark realities of widespread unemployment and low incomes are just a little too well known to allow the stories to be used there. You can't tell the people in La Loche or Cumberland House or Buffalo Narrows about the burgeoning prosperity in the North. But the farther south we go, the more luxurious and flamboyant the stories become. At press conferences in Regina it is the order of the day to repeat and if possible to embellish the myth of the burgeoning North. The advertising men tell us that the trick is to keep repeating your story. It doesn't matter whether it is true, just keep repeating it. And how well that lesson has been learned. How many times has it been suggested that mineral development in Northern Saskatchewan was blossoming forth after a period of stagnation? How many times has it been suggested that giant new mines are just around the corner, going to provide thousands of jobs, or at least hundreds, for our native people? How many times has it been suggested that the North is experiencing a veritable resurrection after years of deadening stagnation? Now these suggestions, Mr. Speaker, are little more than gusts of wind from the Premier's office. This is made abundantly clear by the report of the Department of Mineral Resources. In that report — I don't know whether it has been tabled in this Legislature yet but it was circulated to Members a few weeks ago — it shows just what the mineral production was in 1967-68 and in 1962-63. Mr. Speaker, as everybody knows, 1962-63 — everybody at least who reads *Tab International* and those other journals that carry the Premier's speeches, everybody knows that 1963 was in the days of stagnation. Yet hardrock mineral production in 1968 compared with 1963 was down from \$67 million to \$45 million. Down 30 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, only inflationary increases in prices of some of the minerals, particularly copper made the story look even that good. In terms of pounds and ounces produced, production was down over this period in gold, silver, copper, zinc, cadmium, selenium, tellurium, and uranium. Hardly impressive. In fact a record of failure, failure by the Minister of Mineral Resources and by this tired and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Or take manufacturing. Our performance in manufacturing

February 20, 1969

is mediocre at best. The value of manufacturing shipments in 1968 was up over 1967 by — my figure shows — less than 2 per cent. With prices increasing by 3, 4 or 5 per cent, there has been an actual decline in the volume of goods manufactured and shipped. Now what about employment in manufacturing? We remember the now buried boast about 80,000 new jobs in four years. Well, four years have come and four years have gone. The jobs are gone but they never came.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — In the four years, from July, 1964 to July, 1968, the number of people working in manufacturing has increased by 3,000, Mr. Speaker, 3,000. That is a mere fraction of the jobs which have disappeared in the relentless consolidation which is going on in the agricultural industry. And as you might expect, Mr. Speaker, that's a very much poorer performance than in other provinces in Canada. In 1966-67, manufacturing employment increased in Canada, 6.3 per cent; in Saskatchewan, 4.5 per cent. In 1967-68 in Canada, 3.8 per cent; in Saskatchewan, 2.5 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a very small manufacturing industry. A very small number of jobs would shoot up our percentage. Even yet, even with this small base, we cannot maintain the same percentage increase as the rest of Canada. Again, Mr. Speaker, five years of failure, failure by the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thatcher), failure by this tired and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, take the retail trade. Here again Saskatchewan's performance is much worse than other provinces! In 1968 the increase in retail trade over 1967 was: Canada, 6.2 per cent; Saskatchewan, .9 per cent — less than 1 per cent; and in January, 1969, if my figures are right, it's down over 1968 by a whopping 10.6 per cent. For the period from 1964 to 1968 — I've just used these figures because Members opposite will say that the 1968 year is an unfair comparison — our comparison with the other provinces is even worse. During that four-year period, retail trade increased in Canada by 30 per cent, in Alberta by 36 per cent, in Manitoba by 25 per cent and in Saskatchewan by 12 per cent. One-half of Manitoba's increase, one-third of Alberta's increase. Mr. Speaker, retail trade is a pretty good indicator of how our people are living. Not very impressive. In fact, another failure by this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Or take construction, Mr. Speaker. My figures on construction are Dominion Bureau of Statistics' figures because the latest publication put out by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), giving the financial and economic position of the Province, omits all reference to construction, as well he might. For construction in 1968 was down \$4 million compared with 1967.

An Hon. Member: — Not in Saskatoon.

Mr. Blakeney: — Maybe not in Saskatoon, maybe you have a better government up there than we have down in Regina, but . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I couldn't offer a comment on that. All I know is that throughout the province as a whole, construction was down. Construction was down in all of these constituencies represented by Members opposite.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that now that Regina has had come civic elections, much deplored by the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) a few weeks ago, I look forward to a booming time in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — . . . 110 mills!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, 110 mills, I'll come to 110 mills and just why we're paying 110 mills in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But I'll tell you one of our problems. One of our problems is that we have hundreds of construction workers who are now unemployed, unemployed by this Government who said there were jobs for all, unemployed when the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) and the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson), just in 1967 were elected on a platform of lower taxes and more jobs, both Grant and McPherson.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, last year we had our dose of lower taxes. Now this year we have our dose of unemployment, because there are 1200 construction workers who are unemployed in Regina right now, and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) won't dare deny that. I think that I've got the figures right. There are 10 construction jobs waiting to be filled.

An Hon. Member: — Still the lowest in Canada.

Mr. Blakeney: — Still the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada. We have heard that story time and time again. May I make two comments on that. One, this has been true since 1945, because of the way the figure is worked out, and two, it's true only because self-employed agricultural workers are included and there's no way to tell statistically when a farmer is unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I ask Hon. Members when they look at that Budget and see the cutbacks in school construction, the cutbacks in money for technical institutes, the slowdown in construction of parks, the slowdown in irrigation projects, whether there is very much comfort for construction workers in that Budget. The Government will no doubt try to lay the blame for its failure to provide the jobs which it promised but hasn't delivered, on Ottawa, or tight money, or inflation or the banks.

February 20, 1969

But other provinces have surmounted this difficulty. Giant construction projects continue in Alberta and in Manitoba. But not in Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan the dead weight of failure is becoming altogether too evident.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Even agriculture is not prospering as it should. Take the cattle industry. Now we've heard lots of talk about diversification. I've heard the Premier time after time tell us about how farmers are moving more and more to cattle. Well, I wish the Premier would speak to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) because the report which the Minister puts out tells me that there are fewer cattle on Saskatchewan farms in 1968 than there were in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The Premier says that our farmers are diversifying into cattle more and more. Now, I don't doubt that he's trying to do that but the Department of Agriculture says that he's failed. It says that after four years of work by the Premier there are in fact fewer cattle on Saskatchewan farms than there were four years ago.

An Hon. Member: — You need a new report . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I think not, I think I have the report with me and I'd be delighted to show it to the Minister afterwards. Mr. Speaker, cattle marketings are already down. Latest figures show that for the first 11 months of 1968, cattle marketings are down 5 per cent in Saskatchewan. And even more disturbing, Saskatchewan's performance was worse than Manitoba's and worse than Alberta's. Manitoba was down between 3 and 4 per cent and Alberta's was actually up by 9 per cent.

Let's look at hogs. No, I won't make the obvious comment, Mr. Speaker. I will say let's consider the problem of hogs. In spite of the Government's efforts by way of loans and grants and promotion, the number of hogs had increased by less than 2 per cent over four years, an average of one-half of 1 per cent a year. And hog marketings, while they were up fractionally in 1968, are up much less again than in Manitoba and Alberta. As in so many other things, this Government and this province are falling behind.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Or take sheep, and this has been a favorite of the Premier's. I won't make the comment again, Mr. Speaker. Pastures have been established, press releases have been made, but sheep numbers go down and down. In June of '64 about 153,000. June of '68 about 120,000. Down 20 per cent in four years.

It's the same dismal story in dairying, Mr. Speaker. Latest figures show that milk production is down for the first 10 months of 1968 over 1967, whereas elsewhere in Canada it's up by a whopping 90 million pounds. Saskatchewan is down 3 million,

Canada up 90 million. The latest figures from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) — and I see he's looking at his report — show that in the three years from 1964 to 1967, milk production dropped, in these three years of thriving diversification, 23 per cent, and dairy cattle numbers dropped 25 per cent.

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Up last year, '68.

Mr. Blakeney: — up in '68, he keeps those figures real dark, they haven't been published.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, Mr. Speaker, turkey production is well down in 1968 and once again down more than elsewhere in Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. We've had an almost unending succession of stories about how Saskatchewan agriculture is diversifying. We are told by Government press releases that we're no longer dependent upon field crops but the facts tell their own story of frustration and failure. Cattle numbers down. Cattle marketings down. Sheep numbers down. Hog numbers up a tiny fraction. Milk production down. Turkey production down. There just has not been a diversification of Saskatchewan agriculture. We're more dependent on field crops today than we were five years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Another story of failure and this time failure by the Minister of Agriculture. Failure by this tired and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Or take population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Somebody took them, yes. During the decade from 1951 to 1961, in the depths of this so-called 'stagnation,' the population increased by an average of about 9,500 a year. But during the five years of Liberal Government, the population increased less than half that figure. There's been a real flight of young people from Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, I just happen to have the latest news from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in their daily bulletin of February 18th, which is yesterday. And it notes a drop in population for Saskatchewan from October 1st, 1968 to January 1st, 1969, a drop of 1,000 people. No other province had a drop. Saskatchewan is big number one again. Two other provinces stayed still. They were Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick but that's explainable. They, too, have Liberal Governments.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there has been a real flight of young people from this province, and with this Government conscientiously

February 20, 1969

pursuing policies designed to alienate our young people, not only New Democratic young people, Tory young people, Liberal young people and New Democratic young people — we can expect a further flight of some of our best brains.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Government must spend large sums to recruit teachers and other professional people abroad. At the rate it is alienating not only our so-called 'fringe' young people — they'll be against any government and good luck to them in that — but the good solid teachers, and the good solid students — at the rate this Government is alienating them, we're going to have to spend more money than there is in this Budget to bring people into Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, this isn't hurting the good students and the good teachers very much. They can look after themselves. They can go to Manitoba or Alberta or British Columbia. I've no worry about them. But it will bother Saskatchewan because they are leaving and leaving in unprecedented numbers. It is we who will be the poorer; poorer in purse and poorer in spirit. This is a sad failure for which we will pay dearly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, faced with this declining economic picture, the Government has acted, or perhaps I should say, reacted in two distinct ways: It has been paralyzed with inactivity in the face of a serious problem facing our province — the damp grain crisis. It is afraid to do anything that might cost money, and second, it has slashed expenditures on some vital programs and in this process has shown and shown all too clearly where its priorities lie.

Let's look first at this damp grain crisis. Now this crisis isn't the greatest crisis to hit Western agriculture. It does not compare with the one-two punch of drought and depression of the 1930s. Nor is it of such fundamental long-term importance as the ever tightening cost-price-no-market squeeze which threatens to strangle our grain economy. Let's admit that. Let's keep our sense of proportion. But it certainly does compare, Mr. Speaker, this crisis certainly does compare in seriousness with any crisis of an immediate nature which has hit Saskatchewan since 1945. It's just as serious as the fodder shortage in the drought of 1961. Yet what has the Government done? Has it acted vigorously as the Government of that day did to deal with that crisis? That Government gave help, cash on the barrelhead help, to farmers to bring in fodder from Alberta, to bring it in from Manitoba, to bring fodder from northern Saskatchewan down to the south. There was an awareness. There was action and there was cash.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Or, Mr. Speaker, take the crisis when the 1959 crop lay under the snow. Once again there was awareness. There was action and there was cash. Cash to the tune of \$6 million. But what has this Government done? What has the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) done? He's held meetings. Oh, yes,

he's held meetings. Yes, and he's issued press releases. He's even offered help in installing dryers. But conspicuously, so far as the Government is concerned there has been no awareness, no action, and no cash.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now doubtless the Government feels that its finances are in such poor shape that it can spend nothing to meet this crisis. But this is short-sighted folly. If government action could save, say 10 million bushels of grains, and I think this is a very modest figure, it would mean \$10 or \$15 million more for our economy. The Government would probably recover close to \$1 million of that in taxes of one kind or another, sales taxes, gasoline taxes, other taxes, without even considering possible savings in assistance payments and other special payments. Because make no mistake about it, there is a shortage of cash in some parts of rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — There will be trouble this year in collecting municipal taxes. There will be trouble for merchants, trouble for fuel dealers, trouble for machinery agents. Last fall the Government should have acted to bring dryers into this province and to set them up where they were needed. By the Government's own admission, the dryers which are here are in the wrong places, or else they're not being used. I don't know whether it's true or not, but I read in the Hansard for the House of Commons for January 31st that there are a lot of dryers to be had in Ontario, that some in fact have been moved to the Lakehead and that many more are available. And I want to quote some remarks from the Member for Huron, which is an Ontario riding, Mr. R.E. McKinley, and he says:

There are in Huron County alone, which is part of my constituency, 40 or 50 dryers available. They could be ready on short notice to be moved and be set up outside the terminals in Vancouver.

That was his idea then.

in order to dry the grain. All we need is someone to co-ordinate such a program and tell the people running the terminals in Vancouver, if they've never encountered this situation before, how to do the job. We could provide a great deal of assistance in this respect if we were invited to do so by those responsible.

Now, whether or not Mr. McKinley's idea of taking dryers to Vancouver is feasible, I don't know, but I think he makes clear what the Government doesn't deny, that there are dryers readily available. Now the Government says that they're not needed. We on this side of the House say they are. We say there's every reason to believe that dryers are needed. We say that it's better in any case to be safe than sorry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But this Government feels otherwise. It feels that

it cannot spend money on drying grain even in this crisis. It's a sad day for Saskatchewan when the financial affairs of this province are in such a shape that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) can't spend money to meet a crisis in our primary industry, agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It's an admission of bad management by him and by the Government. It's another indication of the incompetence of this tired and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I said that the failure of its economic policies has caused this Government to react in two ways. We've seen that it stands seemingly paralyzed with inactivity in the face of the damp grain crisis.

Now let's look at how it sets its spending priorities, in particular, let's look at where it made its cuts, where its priorities lie. This Government is fond of saying that it gives top priority to education, and I suppose that in one sense of the word that's true. In Saskatchewan the greatest public enterprise is our educational system. But that's equally true in every other province of Canada. It's equally true in almost every country of the world.

Simply to say that we spend a lot of money on education is not to say very much. After all, we're all human, we live in a scientific and technological age. This is a truism. But it means that we must spend a great deal of our wealth, of our time and our effort in passing on to the next generations the ever-growing body of knowledge. Knowledge is power, power to control the universe, power to shape the forces of nature. There can be no turning back in our commitments and our obligations to fit our young people to live and to grow in such a world, and to contribute to the world growth and betterment. This is perhaps the greatest obligation that any society has to its young people. I'm sure that we on both sides of the House accept this burden and this challenge. But some accept it with more grace and more sincerity than others. Some are ready to act, to open the new world to our children and to our younger brothers and sisters. Others prefer to talk about education and act in other fields.

How does this Liberal Government in Saskatchewan rate in discharging its responsibilities to our young people? Let's compare Saskatchewan's record with the other provinces, large and small, rich and poor. I looked at the latest available material from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and they show just where the priorities of this Government lie. This is a bulletin put out in December by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which listed the estimated spendings for the year ending March, 1969, for all of the provinces of Canada. Unfortunately, the figures for British Columbia were not available so I must quote only the nine provinces. It's estimated that our Provincial Government would spend in Saskatchewan \$349 million. Of this spending, education would account for \$110 million, health and welfare \$100 million, roads \$71 million. As a percentage of total spending, Saskatchewan spends on education 31.6 per cent, on health and welfare 28.9 per cent, on roads 20.5 per cent.

Now how do these figures compare with the other provinces? Comparing Saskatchewan with the other eight provinces, again leaving out British Columbia, here are what the figures show:

In spending on highways, roads and bridges, Saskatchewan is No. 1 measured by the percent of the Budget spent. Of all the provinces reporting, Saskatchewan spends more of its total Budget on roads than any other province. This is clear enough, top priority for roads.

Now, let's look at education. In spending on education, of the nine provinces, Saskatchewan is not No. 1, it's No. 6. The percentage of the Budget spent on education in Saskatchewan is 6 down the list, behind Manitoba, Alberta, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and ahead of Newfoundland, Quebec and Prince Edward Island. And even more surprising, Mr. Speaker, measured on a per capita basis — how much we spend for each citizen in the province — Saskatchewan is not even No. 6, it's No. 7. Indeed No. 8. Only Prince Edward Island spends less per person on education than does the Saskatchewan Government. It's really almost unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of New Brunswick or the Government of Nova Scotia, or even of Newfoundland — and each of these is a relatively impoverished province — spends more per person on education than does this Liberal Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But, Mr. Speaker, that's what the figures show and I refer Hon. Members to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics weekly bulletin dated December 13th, 1968. Rather than being No. 1 priority compared with other provinces of Canada, education is far, far down on this Government's list of priorities.

The Budget presented to us by the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on Tuesday, continues this downgrading of education. School grants are increased by only \$2.4 million or less than 3½ per cent. The whole Budget shows an increase of twice that amount or 7 per cent. So school grants get an increase of less than half of the overall increase. This can only mean and will mean that the brunt of increase in education costs will be borne by the local taxpayers. And then we'll have these 110 mills, which the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) talked about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says in his Budget that operating grants will be, and I'm going to use his words here, "\$62.3 million, up \$4.4 million." Now, do we believe that? Well, last year he told us in his Budget, and I quote from page 23 of his printed Budget: "We propose to increase operating grants by \$2.7 million to a total of \$60.3 million." I want you to check those figures. Last year they were going to be \$60.3 million. This year, he's going to bring them up to \$62.3 million. Now, by my schoolboy arithmetic, the difference between \$60.3 million and \$62.3 million is \$2 million, but not to the Provincial Treasurer. To him the difference between 60.3 and 62.3 is 4.4.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 20, 1969

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, with the Provincial Treasurer I really can't say that he's seeing double, but I can say that he's trying too hard to put the best face on a bad Budget, a Budget which does far too little for schools.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says that this increase from \$60.3 million to \$62.3 million — and I'll call that \$2 million, if I may — is a reasonable increase and will allow school boards to hold the line. But this is simply not true. This year, because of the area bargaining legislation, school boards will have to pay not only their 1969 salaries but part of their 1968 salaries as well. This is going to mean extra pressure this year. And that's not all. Because there are teachers now grouped, grouped in one bargaining unit who were in many bargaining units before, there's bound to be expense to school boards in ironing out some of the discrepancies which have grown up over the years.

Indeed when the Teachers' Salary Legislation was before this House last year, I remember the eloquent speech made by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald), the Minister of Welfare, along this very line. He said there were inequities. He said that some teachers with the same qualifications were paid less than others, and that these lower paid teachers deserved equal salaries. All well and good, Mr. Speaker, but where is the money to come from? Certainly not from this Budget.

This Budget provides no money to do the job that the Minister of Welfare pleaded so eloquently for last year. Perhaps he expects the local taxpayer to bear the full brunt of this evening-up process as well as the regular salaries for 1969, and as well as part of the salaries for 1968. Or perhaps he expects the higher paid teachers to take a salary cut in the face of soaring costs of living.

Just consider the problem facing school boards. Even a 4 per cent increase in salaries would cost \$3 million. And this makes no provision for back pay, no provision for more teachers, no provision for higher qualified teachers, no provision for evening-out discrepancies, no provision for giving a little extra help to separate school districts or other districts. How can the boards possibly operate on an increase in grants of \$2 million? Certainly it provides nothing for extra buses which the Minister has just announced the boards are going to have to pay out of their own funds. On all of these matters, the Budget is silent. The money provided is hopelessly inadequate. And this is the smallest increase, percentage-wise, in school grants this year, a year of extra pressures, pressures created by soaring living costs; pressures created by the new salary legislation; pressures created by sharpened competition from other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, this wholly inadequate increase comes not as a single sacrifice to be borne, but as the latest in a succession of grossly inadequate budgets for school purposes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Year after year school grants

have been pitifully low. Year after year, the burden of meeting increasing school costs has been shifted to the local ratepayers. Year after year, the amount of total school costs which have had to be met from local taxes has gone up and up. Members opposite say, oh. I would like them to look at the Minister's report from the Department of Education. It tells us that in 1963 the amount that the local people had to pay for their schools was \$46 million; in 1964, \$49 million; 1965, \$53 million; 1966, \$57 million; and 1967, \$65 million. \$65 million, that is almost \$70 for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan for local school taxes. Not only that, but since this Government took power that figure has gone up by \$20 million or very nearly \$25 per capita. This burden has fallen particularly hard on farm land, this, Mr. Speaker, by a Government that campaigned on a promise that it would and I quote: "Greatly reduce taxes on farm land and property."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Just another broken promise. The results are exactly what you would expect them to be. Mill rates for school purposes everywhere are skyrocketing. Let's look at the Yorkton unit: 1965, 35 mills; 1968 up to 45 mills — 10 mills in three years. For the Melville unit: 1965, 34 mills; 1968, 45 mills — up 11 mills in three years. Those are rather moderate. Let's look at Yorkton city: 1964, 47 mills; 1967, 67 mills — 20 mills in three years. Or the town of Lemberg: 1964, 28 mills; 1967, 50 mills — 22 mills in three years. Those, I think, are rather more impressive than average but there are lots of 10 mill ones; Melfort town 10 mills, R.M. of Maple Creek 8 mills, and on and on. 10 mills, 8 mills, 9 mills, 11 mills, are the order of the day.

In one year, 1967, and I use that because the 1968 figures are not available, mill rates for school purposes increased an average of 2 mills in cities, 3 mills in towns, 3 mills in villages, 3 mills in rural municipalities. Those are averages and as I say many, many places have very much higher increases.

In the face of mill rate hikes like these, year after year, the homeowner grant is a pretty pale palliative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — For almost all of our farmers and indeed almost everybody who lives in a town or city the homeowner grant has been eaten up and eaten up several times over. I know that I wish that I could pay the same school taxes that I did when this Liberal Government came into power. It can have its homeowner grant and it can have it twice and I would be money ahead.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, this piling on of education costs on the back of the local ratepayers has not only hurt the ratepayers, it has hurt our educational system.

Trustees know that there is a limit to school taxes even if the Government opposite doesn't appear to know. They have very naturally felt that they had to hold the line and hold it hard.

Teachers, on the other hand, are faced with ever-rising costs of living caused partly, as the Provincial Treasurer (Mr.

Steuart) freely admits, by the incompetence of the Ottawa Liberals in managing their financial affairs. The teachers see other professions, lawyers, doctors, dentists and, yes, politicians earn increased incomes. They naturally think that it is only fair for them to get an increase in salary. This has produced tensions between teachers and trustees greater than at any time for 25 years. It has caused educational standards to slip, more crowded classrooms, "improving the teacher-pupil ratio" is what the Premier calls it, less individual attention, skimping on libraries, delays in getting needed facilities. And of course the chief sufferers are the students. It is they who are being short-changed by this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — No one can fairly blame the trustees. No one can fairly blame the teachers. This Government which has systematically starved the school boards and is doing it again this year must bear the blame. It is the Government that has decided that education is of such trifling priority that it will allow all other provinces but Prince Edward Island to pass us by. It is the Government that condemns our young people to a poorer start in life. It is the Government that thus betrays what is perhaps the deepest wish of the Saskatchewan people, that our young people have every opportunity to grow and develop and to make this, our province, grow and develop too.

To this wish of giving the young people the start they deserve this Liberal Government says No. It says no to teachers, no to trustees, no to parents, no to ratepayers and above all, no to students. Mr. Speaker, these people will remember.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The University, too, has been short-changed by this Government.

Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Oh, come on!

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh, come on! I am glad to hear the Hon. Member . . . It may well be that the University of Saskatoon has not been short-changed. I regret to say that I am not as familiar with the University of Saskatoon as I am at Regina, and I venture to suggest that the Member from Saskatoon City Park is not familiar with the Regina campus, as he is with the one at Saskatoon. And neither of us makes any apology for that. All I can tell him is that the Regina campus particularly suffers from a shortage of buildings, shortage of classroom space, shortage of cafeteria space, a shortage such as I have never seen at any other campus in Canada. Now, I haven't travelled that widely but I have been on several campuses and I have seen nothing like it in Canada.

The story of the tragic cutbacks in building plans in 1964-65 which produced this crisis is too well known to be repeated. I see very little evidence that the follies of the past are being remedied by this Budget. Now we don't have any capital budget for the University. It seems to me that from the information which we have on hand that there will be very little progress

made in relieving the desperately crowded conditions that now exist.

This short-changing of education comes at a time when the Federal Government is making very real efforts to help the provinces with rising education costs. For this problem is not confined to Saskatchewan. As I have said, the Saskatchewan Government spends less per capita on education than any province in Canada except Prince Edward Island. This year the Government opposite is receiving in grants from the Federal Government for post-secondary education — and this is all set out in page 51 of the Treasurer's Budget Speech — \$23 million. That sum of money for post-secondary education is almost enough to cover 100 per cent of the operating grant by this Government to the University, both at Regina and Saskatoon. The Federal Government has done its part to meet these rising costs of better education for young Canadians. It is the Provincial Liberal Government which has failed to meet the challenge.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It is the Provincial Liberal Government that has failed to grasp the over-riding importance of educational opportunities for all. It is the Provincial Liberal Government that has failed the young people of Saskatchewan. It is a tired, ailing and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I represent Regina city and I represent Regina Centre, a good constituency in that good city. Regina has six Members in this House, some on the Government side and some on this side. But a look at the Budget convinces me that this Government hardly knows that Regina exists, except as a place to tax. What, Mr. Speaker, is in this Budget for Regina? Very, very little. Let me point out some things which the budget should have said. How about police protection? Regina citizens pay for police and fire protection about \$4 million a year. That is just about \$25 for every man, woman and child in the city. This is well over twice as much per person as people pay elsewhere in Saskatchewan. The cost is higher because in a place like LaRonge or Gravelbourg, maybe even Estevan, the Provincial Government pays part of the cost of police protection. But not in Regina!

There is an increase in the Budget this year for police protection in LaRonge, Gravelbourg and maybe even Estevan, but nothing for Regina. I don't know how long this inequity has prevailed. All I can say is that it is unfair. It is time it was changed. Regina citizens deserve and should get some money for police protection. The Budget should have provided this and it did not.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing that I would like to mention that I did when I was Treasurer, I provided 75 cents per person for health grants in Regina and since this Liberal Government has been in power that figure has been raised to the magnificent sum of \$1 in five years. In two years I raised it 75 cents, in five years these people have managed 25 cents.

When the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was elected —

February 20, 1969

and I want to talk a little bit about nursing homes and I want to talk about geriatric centres — I am sorry that the Minister of Health is not here — because when he was elected in 1964 he was elected on this promise and I quote from his own personal platform:

“The Liberal candidates pledge (pledge, Mr. Speaker) immediate provision of a 600-bed geriatric centre.”

Now five years have passed. Do we have geriatric centre? No! Has it been started? No! And he is not even trying now. He has failed to keep his pledge. He has failed the citizens of Regina. And what is more, if I understand the Budget right, operating grants for our present homes like Mutchmore Lodge, Qu'Appelle House, Santa Maria Hostel and hostels like this all across the province are going to be cut, not increased, not even held, but cut, Mr. Speaker.

While I am mentioning elderly people I would like to appeal once again to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) or the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) to find some money other than from the meagre cheques of some of our most needy citizens of Saskatchewan. I refer to people who get assistance under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

We all know that there is an old age security pension paid to everyone over 66. That's the \$75 a month pension which is now up to \$78. We know, too, that some of our senior citizens qualify for an additional amount of the Federal Government called Guaranteed Income Supplement. This goes up to a maximum of about \$31 a month. We know also that some of our most needy people and our most deserving people get assistance from the Provincial Government under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. Everybody knows that people on pensions are particularly hard hit by increase of the cost of living.

Some years ago, the Federal Government recognized this and it provided that as the cost of living went up, it would put a cost of living bonus on the Old Age Security Pension and on the Guaranteed Income Supplement. The Old Age Security Pension used to be \$75 and it is up to \$78 - \$3 cost of living bonus. Guaranteed Income Supplement used to be \$30, now \$31.20 - \$1.20 is the cost of living bonus. Now that is the Federal Government. Now what did the Provincial Government do to some of our most deserving senior citizens who get Provincial Public Assistance? I wish it were nothing, Mr. Speaker. As the cost of living increases, does the Provincial Government increase the grants under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan? It does not. Does it leave them alone? It does not. As the cost of living goes up this Government actually cuts the assistance which goes to our senior citizens of the most needy kind,

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — cuts the Provincial payments by the amount of the Federal cost of living bonus. When the cost of living goes up every old age pensioner in Saskatchewan gets more money, everyone except the most needy, except the old age pensioner who is getting assistance from the Saskatchewan Government. His assistance payment is cut so that the pensioner himself must bear the full brunt of the rise in the cost of living. Now I have had this put to me by constituent after constituent and I know the

argument of the Department of Welfare that they are working on a ceiling and they can't move the ceiling. But I simply don't believe the argument which says that it could not build into the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan a cost of living escalator the same that has been built into the Federal Plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Surely the Provincial Government is not so hard up that it must finance itself out of the cost of living bonuses of our most needy senior citizens. This is a shocking situation which can be put right and I say in the name of decency and humanity should be put right by this Budget. I appeal to the Ministers who are sitting opposite me now to see whether this change can't be made.

A word or two about day-care centres for children. Regina citizens would like to see some action by the Government to provide some day-care centres for the children of mothers who are forced to work to support themselves and their families.

I want to say something about education in our city. The citizens of Regina are looking for leadership in this field. They want to see school grants which will stop the spiralling mill rates. They are convinced that our boards of education are doing everything they can, and still Regina ratepayers are faced with another hike in mill rates. Regina people want to see more action on technical education. There are thousands of young people in our city who either graduate from high school or leave school and who are not going on to university. What are they to do? There is no technical institute and apparently none in sight. The budget for technical institute construction has been cut. There is not even an organized program to bus these students to the Technical Institute at Moose Jaw, and I have suggested this time and time again. Why isn't this done? It isn't done because there is no room at Moose Jaw. The Technical Institute at Moose Jaw very nearly fell under the Liberal meat-axe and there is no room at the Institute. Nor is there one penny earmarked in this Budget either to build an institute in Regina or to expand the Moose Jaw Institute.

There is no community college and apparently the Government has no plans for one. Ontario has 18 or 20 of them. Alberta has a number. British Columbia has a number but Saskatchewan has none. The people of Regina believe that this Government is failing the young people of this city.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about this Base Hospital, this South Saskatchewan Base Hospital. I particularly regret that the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) has other commitments and is unable to be here today, because the people of Regina want some action on the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital, not money put from one bank account into another, but action. Five years ago the present Minister of Health promised that hospital. For five years he has failed to act. He says he is planning. For five years! The atom bomb was planned, constructed and used in five years. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is still planning. Expo '67 was conceived, built and performed in five years. The very islands on which Expo sat

February 20, 1969

upon were built in those five years. In five years Mayor Drapeau moved a million tons of earth, and in five years the Minister hasn't moved a pound.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — In five years, Drapeau built architectural masterpieces, and in five years the Minister hasn't built a tool shed. In five years Drapeau organized a staff of thousands able to speak dozens of languages, able to cater to 100,000 people, able to cater to princes and potentates and presidents. Yes, indeed. Now in these five years how many of a staff has the Minister assembled? Is it one or is it two?

Mr. D. G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Tell us how long it took Henry to build the auditorium.

Mr. Blakeney: — I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Regina are going to be impressed with these arguments about whether or not Mayor Drapeau is in difficulties or whether or not Expo was a financial success when we come to deciding whether or not this Minister who promised the hospital five years ago should be doing something.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have a son and he was born just about the time that the Minister was making this promise. He is five years old now. Now this son has a new little sister and she is four months old. All I want to say is that that I'd rather hoped that this daughter would be born in this new hospital.

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — In the meantime Cy has had four!

Mr. Blakeney: — I had hoped to have a child born in this hospital. Yes, but I want to tell the Minister that I don't know about the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) but for some of us time is running out.

Hon. C. P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Do you want any help?

Mr. Blakeney: — Well I appreciate the kind offer of assistance from Members opposite. But all I want to say is this, that, if the Minister doesn't move any faster in the future than he did in the past, it will not be my children who will be born in that hospital, it will be my grandchildren.

Five years ago he promised a hospital. He has not built that hospital. He has failed and he has failed the people of Southern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — With this record, Mr. Speaker,

this record on education and on geriatric centres and on the base hospital, is it any wonder that the citizens of Regina feel that this Government is a tired, ailing and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, it is not only the young people that this Government is short-changing. It is not only the mentally ill that this Government is short-changing and it is not only the elderly that it is short-changing. It is short-changing the ordinary citizen as well. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) talks about a Budget which will control the rising cost of living. Does he control the rising cost of living by having local taxes on your house and my house go up \$20 or \$30 this year, as go up they will?

Mr. MacDonald: — It is Henry that . .

Mr. Blakeney: — It is not Henry. I am at pains to announce that you cannot blame this on our local governments. It is entirely wrong to suggest that our local Mayor and local council are responsible for the school mill rates. I know that Members opposite would like to put the blame on Henry or on the school board or wherever else they can find someone to put it on. They like to put it on the Mayor of Saskatoon even though he happens to be one of their cohorts. But unfortunately the truth is too well known to too many people that there is only one place that this blame resides, and it resides on this tired, this ailing and this failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Treasurer thinks that he is controlling the cost of living by piling deterrent fees on those who are sick and least able to pay. As his contribution this year, I wonder if he thinks that he is controlling the rising cost of living by making a person who has had a stroke pay for his own physiotherapy treatments, as he says from now on is going to happen. I know that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) tells us that this will help the man get better. But I know that not even the Minister of Health believes that sort of nonsense. Does the Provincial Treasurer think that it is controlling the cost of living by cutting out the maintenance grants for our nursing homes, so that the people who need nursing care and their families who keep them in those homes are going to have to pay more and more. The Provincial Treasurer has a very funny way of controlling the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, what can we glean from a look at some of the other Budget items. Well, after correcting for the many moves of branches from one department to another, I found that two departments had taken some of the severest cuts, the Department of Labour and the Department of Co-operation. Co-operative extension work was sharply cut back, three less men. The Department of Labour lost some of its already overworked staff in enforcing labor standards and in doing other such work — three less men. Contrast this with the Department of Highways which has 15 more men. Or contrast this with the extra money for the Photographic and Art Services attached to the Premier's office. These cuts of the Department of Labour and the Department of

February 20, 1969

Co-operation, while not big in dollars, speak volumes as to just where this Government's priorities lie.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Streamlining the operations.

Mr. Blakeney: — The Minister says streamlining the operations. May I say to him, why didn't he do it five years ago?

Mr. Coderre: — It took me five years to try and find the mess . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — The Minister was unable to find the car. He is equally unable to find the mess after five years! I must remind the Minister, I just told him we had a four month old daughter, we can find a mess in a lot less time than that!

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about mental health. Mr. Speaker, I have raised the problem of mental health again and again in this Legislature and I make no apology for doing so. In the past our efforts on this side of the House and the efforts of citizen groups from all corners of the Province, and finally the tragic consequences of the Government's folly have forced the Government to re-examine its program. We had the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. It supported many of our earlier criticisms. Early last year we had the report of Dr. Frazier. With the report of Dr. Frazier, it was no longer possible to deny that the mental health program was a shambles and near collapse. The reason for this failure is not hard to find. The program had been starved for money. In the last three years of CCF Government, budget increases had been 5 per cent, 8 per cent and 8 per cent. That is an average of 7 per cent. In the first three years of Liberal Government budget increases had been the first year an actual cut of 1 per cent, the next year 5 per cent and 3 per cent. An average increase of 2 per cent. Mr. Speaker, these cuts in spending took place at the very time when other provinces and states were catching up with Saskatchewan, and were bidding hard for our key staff who had international reputations. The result is what could have been expected by any reasonable person, but evidently was not expected by the Government opposite. Key people left. Those who remained were overworked and discouraged and they too left and the crisis was upon us. It may not be generally known that the Director of Psychiatric Services for the State of New York and several of his key staff were with our Department at that time and were being enticed away by the bids from the State of New York. That was some of our competition, and we met it by actually cutting the Budget.

The gaping holes in our program were exposed by Dr. Frazier. His report showed that the primary aim of the Liberal program was to save money and to that end the interests of patients and the public would be sacrificed. Last year I reviewed this sorry mess in detail and gave the position of those of us on this side of the House. I am going to quote a little bit of the statement I gave. I am going to just quote the minimum program which I felt and which we on this side of the House felt ought to be done in order to meet the urgent demands outlined in the Frazier report. Quote:

We call upon the Minister to waste no time in acting so that, when this House meets next year, he can report to this House minimum progress as follows: 1. All or substantially all vacancies for psychiatrists filled. We recognize that these cannot all have specialists' qualifications. 2. Major progress in filling other vacancies. 3. An increase in the number of community supervisory workers so that there will be at least one qualified staff person for each 60 patients in the community placement. A ratio of one to sixty. Dr. Frazier recommended a one to fifty and we would like to see one to fifty if it is possible, but we want to see one to sixty for sure in the next year. 4. The Prince Albert Centre staffed and in operation. 5. A general tightening up in the administration. 6. Enforcement of licensing standards for approved homes.

This is a minimum program. We recognize that the Minister is facing a crisis and he must first do a salvage job. We ask him to act at least to meet the minimum program as set out. If he can do more, fine. But we say this, as strongly as it is possible for us to say, to the Minister and to the Government, act on this program in the interests of the patients and the public alike. Act on this program.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we asked last year. The full facts are not before us, but from the facts that are available it seems clear that the Minister has failed, failed even to meet this minimum program. There are still vacancies. There is still a grave shortage of community supervisory workers. I don't believe the one to sixty ratio has been reached, let alone the one to fifty recommended by Dr. Frazier.

The Prince Albert Centre is not fully staffed and in operation, notwithstanding the assurances we had last year that it would be. Supervision of approved homes and nursing homes is far from adequate. Indeed, many of the most glaring problems are still with us. Savage and senseless crimes are still being committed and former mental patients stand accused. Instances of inadequate supervision of patients in the community are still all too frequent. The number of nursing homes who have staff with psychiatric training is still next to nil. Trained psychiatrists of long standing continue to leave.

There may have been progress; the Minister will report to us in due course. But if there was, there was nothing like the minimum that Dr. Frazier said was needed to save this program.

All the evidence, Mr. Speaker, points to the fact that the Government is simply not willing to pay the price. With the Liberal Government of the 1960s it's just like the Liberal Government of the 1940s. Mental health is way, way down on their list of priorities.

Last year we said we would withhold our censure. We can do it no longer. The Minister of Health has failed to deal with the serious problem revealed by the Frazier Report. He has failed because for too long mental health has been starved for funds. It merely continues the failures of the past. It is one more place where this Government has failed to meet the challenge, failed to keep faith with the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 20, 1969

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to make any extensive remarks on the estates tax proposal, but I do want to say two or three things about it.

First, I cannot see how grants to persons who inherit million dollar estates can be justified while deterrent fees are being collected from old age pensioners and young couples with large families.

Second, I cannot see why grants should be paid to people who inherit a million dollars and who may live in California, or France or the Bahamas, while there is a pressing need to keep that grant money right here in Saskatchewan to build market roads, or nursing homes or parks.

Third, I cannot see how Saskatchewan will keep any large estates in this Province that might otherwise move out, if as will likely happen, other provinces follow suit with the tax rebate. If this is true, then all of us will be in the same position that we were in before, except the man who got the grant. He'll have the money, and except the taxpayers, they'll be short the money. There may be some reasonable justification to pay out large grants to people who have inherited a million dollars when there are other pressing public needs. If there is such a justification, it was not in the Budget Speech, nor have I heard it in this House.

Mr. Speaker, standing back, what is the overall impression of this Budget, the overall impression of the Budget and of the Government which presented it? It is an impression of an old and battered ship, leaking at the seams, with a captain who really isn't steering any more, and a crew who are spending all their time just keeping this leaky craft afloat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I have been wondering, Mr. Speaker, who is going to leave this leaky craft first. Is it going to be the Attorney General (Mr. Heald)? He is soon on his way. Is it going to be the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant)? Or is it going to be the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie)? Or is it going to be the Premier himself? The rumor has it that all these people would like to get out before there is even more evidence of their failure.

An Hon. Member: — There's a couple over here!

Mr. Blakeney: — The Budget with its clear admissions of failure . .

An Hon. Member: — Every farmer knows it . .

Mr. Blakeney: — . . I'm sure that, if they were thinking about it before then and after this Budget they will be long gone, they will be sped on their way!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — You know, the Premier used to talk about how well things were going, about the new industries, about the rising population,

about the more jobs. We remember those flamboyant speeches of old. He is out getting another industry. I guess this will be like the Volkswagon plant, or the heavy water plant, asbestos pipe plant or one of the others.

You remember, Mr. Speaker, these flamboyant press releases, these flamboyant speeches of old. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he still makes these very speeches, when he is down in Los Angeles or down in New Orleans. Yes . . . I imagine in New Orleans at this time of year the speech would be part of the Mardi Gras celebrations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We used to get a good deal of information by watching the Premier. He has a face that lights up like a barometer of his political fortunes — not unlike the weather tower on top of a local hotel. Sometimes it lights up and then we know that things are going well with the Government. Sometimes it clouds over and then we know that things are not going well with the Government. We haven't seen many favorable portents lately. All the indicators have been for stormy weather. Things aren't going well. He doesn't say this, he doesn't need to say it. Everybody knows it. He is thrashing around, as all Members opposite are thrashing around for someone to blame it on. They are looking for a villain, somebody, just anybody, whom the public can be stirred up against to make them forget the dismal showing of these Saskatchewan Liberals. We have had a procession of people in the role of scapegoat, of dirty dog. It is the labor unions today, though just how they are hindering our manufacturing industry is never explained. Or else it is the teachers — their demands are outrageous, or else it is the students — they are Communists, they are anarchists. George Wallace used the same technique, the only difference he accented anarchists differently. Or it is outside agitators, always of course unnamed and unspecified. It is those Liberals at Ottawa; they're taxing too much and they are spending too much. Or, alternatively they are spending too little and they are not sending us enough. Everyone is the villain, everyone is out of step but the Members opposite; everyone is out of step but our Ross.

But the people of Saskatchewan won't buy that. They won't accept these excuses for the poor performance of the Saskatchewan economy. They know that things haven't changed very much in five or six years. They know that five or six years ago the economy was performing well. They know that the labor unions and the students and the teachers and the Government at Ottawa are much the same. The only thing that has changed is that in Saskatchewan we have the Thatcher Liberals. To the Premier I say this. If he wants to go to the Senate with any of the tattered shreds of his reputation left, he had better leave now. No government and no premier can stand much of the glaring evidence of failure that this Budget shows.

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — They'll take anything in the Senate.

Mr. Blakeney: — What general conclusions can fairly be drawn from a review of this Budget? I think there are three.

February 20, 1969

First, the Government's economic policies have failed. It has failed to keep Saskatchewan abreast with the rest of Canada in industrial growth and with the rest of Canada in employment. It has failed to make any real progress in diversifying our economy, and particularly in diversifying agriculture. As a result, even with last year's savage increases of \$35 million, this Government's revenues are too small and it is in a financial bind.

Second, when this Government is in a financial bind, as it is, it fails to give sound management. It turns to policies of short-term expediency rather than sensible planning. It adopts emergency cutbacks which only delay the real decision and forces wasteful and expensive remedies in later years. This year's Budget is just such a Budget.

Third, because the Government's economic policies have failed, because its management has failed, it must pass on the burden of its failure to local taxpayers in another gigantic tax shift. This is a failure to assume the rightful role of a provincial government. It is a failure of integrity and fair dealing with local governments.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is an admission of failure, it exudes the heavy air of failure, failure by this Government, a failure of its economic policies, a failure in its management, a failure in its integrity. This Budget is the handiwork of a tired, ailing and failing Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is not only the handiwork of a tired, ailing and failing Government, but it is the handiwork of a Government that is on the way out!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The people have repudiated it! They said that as clearly as they could during the Federal election. I invite all Hon. Members, as I am sure they have, to look at the Liberal vote totals in any of their constituencies.

An Hon. Member: — Kelvington!

Mr. Blakeney: — They'll say it again in Kelvington when this Government dares to call that election.

They'll say it loud and clear. And they'll say it at the next Provincial election with a great triumphant roar. This Government and its Budget are not supported by the voters. Mr. Speaker, this Government and its Budget should not be supported by this House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd):

That all the words after "That" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

this Assembly regrets that the Budget presented fails to offer any solution for Saskatchewan's sagging economy, fails to provide any longer range plans for provincial

development and shifts to local ratepayers the burden of rising school costs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House in the Budget Debate with a great deal of enthusiasm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heggie: — One cannot help but be enthusiastic about the 1969 Budget brought down by the Provincial Treasurer on Tuesday. Like the Speech from the Throne there is hardly a proposal which the Opposition can honestly disagree with. The Opposition's Financial Critic says it is a panic budget. It does not provide for planning for the long term. Let me assure the NDP Financial Critic that he must lack perception in depth if he fails to see this Government's long range plan for the future of this Province.

The Financial Critic this year held his remarks to one hour and forty minutes compared with two hours and 20 minutes last year. He wasn't nearly as sarcastic and as caustic this year; he seemed to lack the conviction that he exuded in last year's criticism of the Budget. He embellishes his statements with well placed and educated phrases to cover up the hollowness of his allegations. I think that as a colleague of mine in my profession, I can be allowed to say that he takes a pretty poor set of facts and tries to build it into a case. I would say that he has failed on every count.

The Financial Critic says that there is nothing going on in the northern part of our Province. He says that this Government has failed in the North. I ask him to go north if he hasn't been there, and if he has been there, he must have been there with his eyes shut, because there is plenty going in the northern part of Saskatchewan today. Has he been up and seen the pulp mill in operation? Has he been up to Lac LaRonge and tried to hire an aeroplane, or engage an Indian guide because of all the exploration in the Precambrian shield and around Wollaston Lake? Has he been to Hudson Bay and gone through the McMillan and Bloedel plant that is now prospering after taking over a failing operation, run under the previous Government?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heggie: — Has he been to the Simpson Timber Company and seen what is going on there? Does he know that wages have almost doubled since this Government took office? He only needs to look at the roads, to see that there is progress compared to the progress, if you can call it that, made under the previous regime.

I would say to the Financial Critic that he get out of his ivory tower in Regina and go north and see what is taking place. He can even take a ride by NorCanAir, if he so desires.

Mr. Brockelbank: — We've already been taken for a ride.

Mr. Heggie: — The Opposition critic says

February 20, 1969

that there has been a flight of the best brains of Saskatchewan from our universities to other places, and he blames this on the policies of the Provincial Government. If the flight of the extreme left wingers, the agitators and the anarchists of Saskatchewan is true, now I say if it is true, then this province is better off by their going.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heggie: — There is all kinds of room in this province for the sensible and ambitious young people seeking higher education and this Government will back them to the limit.

This Government has provided more nursing homes in five years than the other Government did in all the time that it was in power. Last year we put on extra taxes and the Opposition cried. This year we don't put on taxes and they are still crying. Four regional libraries have been built since this Government took office, to the one built by the former CCF administration.

An Hon. Member: — Old Woody never got off his seat!

Mr. Heggie: — Referring to the Estate Tax Act which he seems to picture as a piece of pernicious legislation that is not wanted in this province, does the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) go on record against the Estate Tax Bill? I challenge him, I predict that he will stand up and be counted when the Bill goes through.

Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say about these things and others tomorrow. I beg leave at this time to adjourn debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON SENATE

Mr. J. J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) moved, seconded by Mr. McPherson (Regina South West):

That the Government give early consideration to the approval of student representation on the Senate of the University of Saskatchewan.

He said: Mr. Speaker, because the Saskatoon campus of the University of Saskatchewan is located in the constituency that I represent, and because I have resided in this area for many years, it has been my privilege to familiarize myself with the many aspects of this institution. Over the years, I have had first-hand knowledge of many of the buildings. I have enjoyed the acquaintance and still do of many members of the administration and faculty. I am pleased to say that the same applies over these years to a great many students, and this applies particularly since the time of my election to serve as a representative in this House. It has been my privilege to meet and sit down with these students and to discuss with them the things that they are

concerned about. I have done this not only with the Student Representative Council, and at times with their executive, but also with groups and individuals in the various colleges. In this way, I have become aware at first-hand of the thinking and reasoning of the students about their representation on the University Senate. I am certainly in agreement with this reasoning and sincerely hope that all the Hon. Members of this House will concur in this change in the traditional procedure in our University.

In considering this motion I think that we must first of all recognize that it calls for a change, and because of this we should examine it very carefully. Generally speaking, we should not attempt to be too hasty to introduce drastic changes. But here we have a proposal that cannot be considered as drastic in any way. On the contrary it is a change which should prove to be beneficial in many ways, particularly to the co-ordination and improvement of the academic programs of the University. There is general concern about the most useful function of a university today. There is concern within the student body, the faculty, the administration and certain sections of society outside the University. Here of course we are considering the concern of the university students. Recently we have been witnessing a new student awareness in colleges and universities across the country. The fact that the students of the University of Saskatchewan have requested representation on the Senate of the University is an excellent example of this. They have many clear thoughts that they feel would improve the function of the University and they ask to be heard as a part of an official body.

A university is not only imposing buildings, extensive libraries and modern research facilities, a university is more than a brilliant faculty. A university is primarily students because it exists primarily for the education of students, and I think we should recognize the concern of today's students about the proper function of a university. For example, there are many people, and among them many students, who are convinced that our universities should become active instruments in the production of social change in the same manner that they have been active instruments in producing technological change. Certainly, it is not necessary to elaborate here on the great benefits that have accrued to our society through the efforts placed in this direction. However, they claim that now the university forces should be concerned with the needs and behavior of individuals and of society and that research emphasis should shift from the physical world to the social world. These students — and I am speaking of the moderate reform type and not of the anarchist — do not believe that universities, as they have been traditionally organized and administered, will do or can do the things that are needed. For reasons such as these they want substantial student participation in the decision-making bodies, such as the Senate. Certainly I do not mean by my remarks that the students are suggesting that we give up our advances in technology, but I do think that students can make useful contributions to the improvement of the emotional and intellectual climate in which desirable changes can occur. For reasons such as this their membership on the University Senate is desirable. We feel too that such representation should be accorded the students because it reflects their importance to the University as a whole. It will help to establish a much better line of communication with the students, something which is obviously lacking in some areas at the present time. It offers an opportunity for the development and the

practice of responsibility. The direct student representation proposed in this motion will assist in the good government of the University and in proposing this motion we have confidence in the awareness of the students themselves that their role in their own education is more to be led than to lead, and more to listen and to learn, than to dictate. We recognize what they are asking is to be given the privilege of participation, to be able to contribute their best thinking toward better education, toward an improved University. The Province of Saskatchewan is a great province because of the great good sense of the people of Saskatchewan and our students are no exception to this. The administration of the University of Saskatchewan has always maintained a policy of confidence of the mature judgment of its students, and in moving this motion we show no less confidence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. M. McPherson (Regina South West): — Mr. Speaker, I hope you will understand the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) is a little excited today. He has been waiting since this House opened to get this Resolution before the House and has been working on his speech. It is a very important Resolution and I take a great deal of pleasure in seconding it. I have given the subject of representation on the Senate of the University by the students a great deal of thought and I feel that the majority of our students are responsible young men and women. I ask why shouldn't they have representation on the Senate of the University of Saskatchewan. They have a great deal to contribute and their personal involvement in the work of the University will offer a great improvement to a better understanding of the jobs and problems of all bodies. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, all of Regina is proud of having the University of Saskatchewan, Regina campus here. Certainly Regina is pleased to have over 4,000 students enrolled on the campus, and certainly Regina will be pleased to see responsible students on the Senate of the University of Saskatchewan. This is a trend, Mr. Speaker, that is growing year by year across the North American continent, in that students want to communicate with those who are running the universities. At the same time the students are learning responsibilities as far as all matters at university levels of administration are concerned.

I am not going to waste the time of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, or your time by speaking of the extreme activists on the campus because I feel there has been enough said. I just want to say this, Mr. Speaker, with all sincerity, I would personally hope that the good judgment of the 95 per cent of the responsible students would never see that extremists are ever put on to represent them on the Senate. The 95 per cent are good, responsible citizens and would want to see the type of person that represents them, people they are proud of. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, how pleased I am to second this Resolution. This is a great step we are taking today and I think one that we will all be proud of in years to come. I would urge all Members on both sides of the House to support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I rise first of all to indicate that

those of us on this side of the House are certainly going to support the Resolution which has just been proposed. I followed with some interest the remarks of the mover and the seconder. I am sure I can be pardoned for wondering why they might not have made those same remarks a year ago when I moved a resolution which would have put this into the act at that time. If it is to be a great step this year, as the Member (Mr. McPherson) has just said it is, I think it might have even been a greater step and a more beneficial step last year than whenever the Government gets around to doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say a fair amount on this Resolution, I agree heartily with the objectives for the University which the mover of the Resolution put before us. I, however, have to suggest that the change which is being proposed here is not adequate to do that job, I would, as a result like to offer some amendment which I hope the Members of the Government and other Members of the Legislature would consider in all sincerity, to see if we cannot between us do something even more effective than just this step here. I would, as a result, ask, Mr. Speaker, for permission to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:24 o'clock p.m.