

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
23rd Day

Thursday, March 6, 1969

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing through you and to the Members of this House, a fine group of students in one of the best areas of Saskatchewan, namely Buffalo Narrows. Mr. Speaker, they are 44 in number from grades seven to ten. They are in the Speaker's gallery and they are accompanied by their teachers, Grant Mehling, Ed Peesker, and their bus driver, Bruce Clark. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment those responsible for organizing and making this trip possible. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of these children have never been out of Buffalo Narrows, which is over 500 miles north of here. It certainly is a major undertaking. Mr. Speaker, this group left Buffalo Narrows on Monday, arrived in Saskatoon where they toured the University and the Western Development Museum there, arriving here yesterday. They are taking in the Legislature today and the Museum of Natural History and will be leaving for Buffalo Narrows tomorrow. I'm sure we all wish them a very educational and informative trip and wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you to the House a very special group of students from what I think is a very special school. This is a group of 32 students from Aden Bowman collegiate. They are seated in the top row of the Speaker's gallery and the top row of the west gallery. These students represent eight grade 12 classes at Aden Bowman and they are here with the head of the history department, Mr. Spooner and Mr. Looy. This, as I say, is a bit of a special school since all of my children have either attended or are attending it. We are very pleased to have this group with us. I'm sure that they found the program in the building interesting thus far and I'm certain that they will enjoy the proceedings of this House.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the Assembly, two groups of students from Saskatoon Mayfair constituency. The first group of 35 — and I believe both groups will be situated in the east gallery — is from Carolyn Robins school and I understand they will be accompanied by Mrs. McMillan, Miss Russel and Mr. Neher. The other group is here accompanied or visiting with another school from the constituency of Riversdale. The Mayfair school in that group is Vincent Massey school and the teachers that are accompanying the group from Vincent Massey and W.P. Bate schools are Mr. Toews and Mr. Widenmaier. I am sure it is the wish of all Members here that these students will have an interesting and educational day in the Assembly

March 6, 1969

and in Regina City and that they will have a safe journey back to Saskatoon Mayfair constituency.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — I would like to bring to the attention of you, Sir, and Members of the House a group of 28 students that my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair has referred to. I believe they are in the east gallery from W.P. Bate school in Saskatoon Riversdale. They are accompanied by Mr. Widenmaier. Just a very brief word, Mr. Speaker. W.P. Bate school is named after an individual who has taken a terrific amount of interest in the education of Saskatoon and the young people of Saskatoon. I know they've had a very interesting day thus far and I hope they have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to a group of students in the Speaker's gallery, one from each of the high schools in the Elrose constituency, Elrose, Estlin, Kyle, Dinsmore, Beechy, Birsay and Lucky Lake. They are in town for two days and are going to be visiting very important people in the Legislature and seeing some very interesting things in Regina. I want to welcome them on your behalf and wish them a happy stay in Regina and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Today or this afternoon, I would like to introduce three gentlemen who are sitting behind the Government benches. We have three Senators from the State of Montana, who are in Regina to attend a Resources Conference. They came over to the Legislature just before it commenced and they thought it would be, I don't know whether instructive or not, but interesting at least to see how our Legislature compared to their own functions. We have Senator Mills Folson of Missoula, Montana — a Republican; we have Senator Paul Boylan of Bosman, Montana — a Democrat; we have Senator Harry Northey of Missoula, Montana — a Republican. I welcome these gentlemen here. The people of Montana and the people of Saskatchewan are so similar that if you put ten of each in the same room I doubt if you could tell the difference. Relations between our Province and that State and indeed relations between Canada and the United States have always been cordial. I want to say, welcome these gentlemen, and I hope they'll come back again frequently and often.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the Premier in his welcome to our visitors from the other side of the line we call the Border. As the Premier has intimated it is not as much of a border as exists in a great many places in the world and that continues to give us a considerable amount of comfort and

satisfaction. I think I've said before, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to have visitors from the United States. For one thing it assures us that they have forgiven us for defeating them in the war of 1812 and 1814 and it gives us a chance to assure them that we don't intend to repeat the event . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . at least in the near future. Indeed it is pleasant to have the Senators from Montana with us.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to the House, a group of students from Brevoort Park school in Saskatoon, who are in the west gallery and to illustrate the interest of this school in public affairs, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is the third group from this school which we have had attending sessions during the present sittings of the Legislature. They are accompanied today by their teacher, Mr. Debert. I think on behalf of the House, I should express to Mr. Debert our appreciation of the interest which he has taken in order to bring his students to the House today. We wish them a very pleasant stop with us and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, like the old expression, "We always leave the best wine until the last," it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to Members of the Assembly, a group of students seated in the Speaker's gallery from the community of Avonlea. They are accompanied by their teachers and driver under the leadership of Mr. McKeller. I think all of us are aware in this Assembly that Avonlea is the home community or the home of the Bob Pickering rink that is at the present time curling in the Macdonald Briar, representing the Province of Saskatchewan. I'm sure that all of us in Milestone are convinced that in the remaining draws throughout the week, Mr. Pickering or Bob and his fellow curlers are going to come out on top. Avonlea is a very important and significant community in the Milestone constituency and certainly in the southern part of our Province. I certainly welcome the students here. I hope they have a very interesting and productive afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

EDUCATION WEEK

RESOLUTION — TEACH-IN ON POLLUTION

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a statement and if the Legislature would give me leave at the conclusion of it to move a motion which, if leave is granted, will be seconded by the Member from Nutana South

March 6, 1969

(Mr. Forsyth). The statement which I make and the motion which I wish to make have to do with two happenings. One is that this is Education Week in our province, a time when people are looking at our schools and visiting our schools and talking about education generally. The second is a very pleasant opportunity which some of us had on Saturday of last week. On Saturday of last week the students and teachers of Evan Hardy collegiate in Saskatoon had arranged what they called a teach-in on pollution. A number of our colleagues, Sir, from both sides of the House were able to be there and to see what was going on and to listen to some of the discussions. It was a very noteworthy happening in my opinion. It expresses, I think, many of the changes which are taking place in our schools and I thought it was of sufficient importance that we should mention it here in this Legislature. The students and obviously the teachers too had done a very commendable amount of both intensive and extensive work. It was work which evolved around not just the subject of pollution in any limited way, it was work which involved studies in science; it was work which involved writing; it was work which involved art. They had set up a number of displays to show the effects of pollution on the soil, in the air, in the water, and even pollution resulting from noise, it was expressed. I'm not going to go into too much detail at this time, but they did distribute a very large kit of material which showed something of the effort which they had gone into and some reference can be made to this later on.

Now because this is Education Week, Mr. Speaker, and because this was an event of importance, I should like to have leave of the Assembly to move the following Resolution:

That this Legislature having noted the "Teach-In On Pollution" conducted March 1, 1969 by the students and staff of Evan Hardy collegiate, Saskatoon, applauds the initiative and energy which resulted in the success of this public education project and encourages such activity in Saskatchewan schools to make education relevant and stimulating for students and to the general public.

I thought we could well recognize the work of this particular school, and I thought the Legislature would welcome an opportunity to join in in encouraging this in other schools in such worthwhile opportunities.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), seconded by the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth). The motion has not had notice, therefore, it requires leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to comment, but I think the Leader of the Opposition has given a very good description of the program that was presented at Evan Hardy collegiate last Saturday. I certainly enjoyed being there and I was thrilled by the example of a school working with the community and the work that had gone into it by the teaching staff and by the students themselves for the great example of what can be done when initiative and direction work together to produce these types of programs. I have congratulated Dr. Arn, the principal of the school and Mr. Heald who was largely responsible for the program. I certainly believe that recognition of this type of

program by the Legislature during Education Week is a very worthy thing and we should certainly agree with this Resolution.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL HONEY MONTH

Mr. F.K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of yourself and Members of the Legislature to the tin of fine Northern Blossom Nipawin honey on your desk and to the accompanying sticker stating “March is national honey month,” with the slogan “Spread it around.” Now as many of you are aware, honey is an almost complete food and is a very necessary food for many health needs and many health requirements. This year the beekeepers have decided to put on a special promotion to encourage people to use honey. Statistics indicate that about two pounds of honey are used by each person per capita per year. If this could be increased to two and one-half pounds there would no longer be any over-production of honey. In Saskatchewan there are some 46,000 colonies of bees. There are 15,000 colonies in the Nipawin area. Dr. Eva Crane, editor of Bee World published in London, England, has stated that the Nipawin district in particular is an outstanding, honey-producing area with a very high quality of product. Saskatchewan beekeepers ask for our support and the co-operation of the elected Members of the people. The beekeepers also ask for the support of all responsible people, packers, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers. I hope you will all enjoy your Hamilton packed honey and of course I ask you again to spread it around. I want to also say that I will try and find some honey for the Senators from Montana.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, seeing that indeed March is honey month and today is the launching of the recognition and that we do have this container in front of us which was at least purified in Nipawin, I want to thank the Member from Nipawin for it. However, seeing that most of the honey that goes into that district comes from the constituency which I represent — and I’m not by any means suggesting that this honey may be tainted by the political representative of that constituency — but seeing that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) also has a processing plant in his constituency, and seeing that most of the honey comes from the constituency of Kelsey which I represent, I would like to say that tomorrow you will be expecting the same two-pound container, only processed by Sasko Honey in Tisdale. As the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) said in regard to the best wine for the last, in this case it will be the best honey at the last.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) for this honey. I’m going to be a little conscious about it, mind you because I’m accustomed to the best honey in Canada, grown by Mr. Baker, or produced in a field by the Honey King of Canada for a number of years. So it is with some caution that I approach this inferior brand. I do hope too

March 6, 1969

that the Premier, when he goes abroad to the United States and other parts of the world, will spread it around and that he'll be careful of what he spreads around from now on. I suggest, Mr. Premier, that honey would be much better than the usual commodity . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter into this discussion regarding the merits of honey. First I want to thank the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who is a constituent of mine and who certainly knows where the best honey comes from. I'm sure that everyone here will appreciate some of the honey which we received from Nipawin and that which the Member for Kelsey has arranged to have here sometime within the next few days. The Member for Kelsey was telling me that this honey, which was processed in Tisdale in the honey Co-op, comes mainly from the Kelsey constituency. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be doing discredit to the people of Kelsey, but I must say that most of the honey comes from the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. There is no doubt that as long as those bees from the northeast part of the province keep on producing honey we are going to have a very good product, not only from the Tisdale Co-op but from all of those people in the northeast part of the province who produce honey. I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very glad that the Nipawin and Kelsey Members have brought this honey and arranged for the edification of the people here in the Legislature. I am sure that when they have tasted the honey from both jars, both containers, that the session will go on in an even and more harmonious manner than it has up to now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I see where I am going to have to rise in order to keep the record straight, after listening to the comments from the other side. I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the other Members in regard to the product we have here on our desks here this afternoon.

I think the thing we have missed in this whole honey promotion deal so far is the fact that a young girl from the town of Delisle will be representing Saskatchewan as Honey Queen in the Honey Queen Contest being held at Ottawa today and tomorrow. I am sure that all Members of the House would join with me in wishing her every success, and I hope that by the time the judging is over she will come back to Saskatchewan a winner of the Honey Queen Contest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — I rise on a point of order, because the Minister of Agriculture just stole my speech. I haven't got anything to give away and I haven't got anything to spread, and I don't own a bee, but I did want to proclaim to this Legislature that the Honey Queen did come from my constituency, and I appreciate the fine picture of herself and the Minister in the paper being crowned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I can't be left out, because after all the first producers of honey were in and around Prince Albert, and Prince Albert East-Cumberland produces maybe not the most honey, but I would debate that. I have tasted this honey. I am sure it has come from my constituency, it is very, very good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I crave the privilege of the House to say a few words . . . I wish to set the historical record straight in connection with the honey refinery, the Co-operative situated at Tisdale. I would draw the attention of the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) that that co-operative came from Saltcoats. Because we had been in the habit of shipping bees from the State of Alabama to the honey-producing area at Saltcoats on a co-operative basis, via the CPR in 1934 we had a shipment come up which landed in the station, and stung the agent. The station agent harangued us in no uncertain terms in good Canadian language and told us to get our bees out and to get them some other way hence forth. We did. We had organized a co-operative of which I was a chartered member, and we brought up the first importation of bees by a truck from Alabama to Canada in 1935. This was the beginning of the co-operative which subsequently was moved from Saltcoats to Yorkton and from Yorkton to Tisdale and . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — I want to thank Mr. Speaker for putting the record straight. I want to say too that the move to Tisdale from Saltcoats was very beneficial as far as honey production was concerned.

Mr. Speaker: — It was very beneficial for the people at Tisdale and they should also give us a hearty vote of thanks for the fine foundation we laid when we started it.

MOTIONS FOR HUMBLE ADDRESSES

HUMBLE ADDRESS NO. 3

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife): moved that an Humble Address (No. 3) be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Honour will cause to be laid before this Assembly:

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Education and agencies of the Federal Government regarding allocation of funds available to the province for loans under the Canada Student Loan Plan.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the House to turn down this motion that is before us. It asks for copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Education and agencies of the Federal Government. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such correspondence is privileged correspondence in itself. For this reason,

March 6, 1969

I would ask the House to turn it down. I might say that there is nothing secretive about the allocation of funds available to the provinces, and available from former press releases, different press releases throughout the year. I think the result of any correspondence, phone calls and other efforts that we have had with Ottawa have resulted in an increase from the original allocation from about \$3 million to something over \$6 million. So this aspect of the request, allocation of funds and the funds allocation, is available to all Members, but I suggest that correspondence so dealing with these matters is privileged correspondence and I would ask the motion be defeated.

Motion negatived.

MOTION FOR RETURN NO. 58

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): moved that an Order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 58 showing:

As of February 1, 1969, the number of industrial firms paying a royalty or other charge or fee for water to the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board of The Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission.

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, the way the Order is set out there appears to be a little ambiguity, so I would like to move an amendment which will provide the information that I believe the Leader of the Opposition is after here. Moved by myself and seconded by the Hon. Mr. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources):

That Return No. 58 be amended by deleting all the words after “showing” and substituting the following therefor:

For water used during the calendar year 1968, the number of industrial firms: (a) required to pay a royalty for water used to the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission; and (b) which paid other charges for water supplied by the Saskatchewan Water Supply Board.

Amendment agreed to

Motion as amended agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — SPECIAL TASK FORCE ON EDUCATIONAL AIMS

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale) moved, seconded by **Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville):**

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government the constitution of a Special Task Force on Educational Aims for the 1970s, to be composed of citizens representative of our province, to examine into all aspects of education and its present relevancy to the future needs of our society, the organization and administration of our education system, the method of financing thereof, the Provincial Department of Education and its organization, and to make recommendations thereon to the Government for immediate action.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution to be moved is based on my belief that Saskatchewan's education system is adrift. I think, Sir, it's like a runaway car on a steep downhill. The Resolution is based on my belief that we need a thorough, comprehensive study examining the very roots and foundation of our educational program. Diogenes once stated:

The foundation of every state is the education of its youth.

That doesn't seem like such a very profound statement. Yet, one must examine it with some degree of care when daily, almost, headlines in Saskatchewan and elsewhere scream of widespread unrest in education circles. For example, teachers in Prince Albert, Rosthern, Blaine Lake, Weyburn, nearly all parts of Saskatchewan are doing and saying things today which make one really wonder if the foundation of our state is all that sound. Students are in a so-called revolutionary mood. The taxpayer, I think it's fair to say, is disgruntled and disenchanted. All of this fury makes us wonder really how solid the foundation of our state in Saskatchewan really is.

Now, to me the most important aspect of this discontent is its fact, Mr. Speaker, and how we, as Legislators, in Saskatchewan are going to meet the challenge. There are of course many reasons for the discontent and the problems, but respectfully the following observations must be made in at least a partial attempt to try to analyze the cause for this controversy at the present time.

Firstly, advanced technology and readily available information have released a greater awareness of our needs by all people of this province. I think that advanced technology and automation have stimulated a relentless search for truth, particularly among many of young men and women in Saskatchewan. The rapidity of technological growth has resulted in an inability to adhere firmly to many of the ideals of the past to serve as guidelines for the future. I can share some of the difficulty in adherence to these ideals of the past. When a student of today sees actual war scenes and people dying in living color in his living room, the impact is bound to be immense. It's bound to be immediate and more important, Mr. Speaker, it's bound to invariably shake his allegiance to many of yesteryear's goals or yesteryear's philosophies. I think this is not only or exclusively limited to the students. I think this is applicable to most thinking citizens of Saskatchewan.

Through television and other modern-day communications, Saskatchewan today is able to attach itself to issues, personalities, problems of the entire world within a matter of minutes. It's truly, as Marshall McLuhan describes it, the 'global village.' And as quickly as these issues and personalities change, as they do in today's events, so too, I think, it can be said that much of Saskatchewan finds that previously thought-out solutions are no longer applicable. As I said, perhaps this feeling is most prevalent among our youth, but I, too, feel that most of our adults have secretly had their ideals tested by the effects and the forces of communications and technology. And thus faced with these constant pressures and changes — and they're going to be increasing — modern day Saskatchewan finds itself often, as has been described by a colleague of mine, on a stormy sea with no compass and few charts.

March 6, 1969

As far as youth are concerned in the field of education, I for one personally feel that their search for truth is really based on a struggle for attainment of values and ideals and goals rather than power. Adult cultural, social, religious and economic values are questioned and often rejected, as I've stated. And not unpredictably, older people view with alarm this outright rejection by young people. Older people in Saskatchewan somehow, I think, not all of them but a great deal of them, cannot fully understand why so many of our young people reject these values. Those same values, Mr. Speaker, that have held many of the older generation in good stead are now being made unacceptable today. With respect, I think the Government opposite reflects this attitude by and large of the people of Saskatchewan or some of the people. I think the Government opposite has shown an inflexibility and a rigid devotion to many of these outdated principles and concepts. But by the same token, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan know that there must be some very basic changes made in our educational system. Educators and taxpayers of Saskatchewan see this need for a change in our education system. But the Government opposite, from all that I've been able to observe in this session and last and in between sessions, clings to the good old ship's stern, saying that all is well as the ship of education floats about aimlessly. So, therefore, I think, Mr. Speaker, the first reason for discontent is the impact of modern communications and technological growth and the Government Members' opposite failure to grasp the true significance and effect of automation and technology.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, some feel that Saskatchewan's education program can also be challenged on the grounds that it is really not relevant to today's world; that it really avoids this phrase that I've used once before, 'search for truth,' that our educational system really exists solely and purely for job training. In this regard I think my remarks are applicable to all levels and all grades of education and learning. The entire structure seems to be based on the economic demands of Saskatchewan. I submit that our Province must always guard against the possibility that education objectives and methods reflect the dictates of our economic world. In other words, education is a negation of the higher ideals and purposes of education. I recognize, of course, that there is a need to train competent, highly skilled people in order to take up positions in our economic world. No one's going to quarrel with that. However, that must not be the sole reason and the sole existence for an education program in the Province. The underlying aim of education should always be to further, as has been said before, man's unending and continual search for truth regardless of the economic wishes and needs and forces of our society.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — A broad objective, I think, is to attempt to develop wisdom, understanding, sensitivity and compassion in our young people in this pursuit for truth.

Mr. Speaker, I've said before and I repeat again, that automation is yet one of the largest problems that are going

to face our society. Automation has further complicated these problems. Its future effect will be many times more than can be imagined today. If I'm correct in saying that our educational program is based primarily on job training, if I'm correct in saying that the sole result of our educational process in Saskatchewan is a student that is packaged and labelled and delivered in the mode of some businessman's image, then I think there's a legitimate question in asking how relevant our schools and education programs really are today. It's almost as if education in Saskatchewan is based on planned obsolescence. I think at some time we must take a close look at the entire program, as I said, the very roots of our educational program. We must take a look at the entire curriculum and the system to see if it is reconciled with the broad aims of education, as I've enunciated. Now, to be sure, often the student of today has a fine education in which he is trained well for a job. There can be no better training in some areas. However, sadly it's my observation that we have an educational system that by and large produces an educated automation, a man who is perhaps trained but not truly educated. At times our school system seems to be a mere adjunct to our political economy, and I think that there is much wisdom in saying that education is not relevant if this observation is true.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that the natural consequence of this is for the system to instill a wrong psychology and reason for going to school and promotion of higher learning. It's a wrong psychology that permeates the students and the taxpayers. This psychology prompts many students to go to school and pursue education only because they know that being well trained will be their avenue to take a place in the economic system with all of its monetary advantages as quickly as possible. The student sees going to school as a means of obtaining a diploma and as a means or an avenue to obtaining financial security and social respectability. To me, Mr. Speaker, this psychology is abhorrent. It breeds a complacent and smug society that Saskatchewan can ill-afford. The society that has as its educational system as first priority, the satisfaction of economic needs over spiritual and emotional development, to my mind defines its young people in terms of economic units or in terms of national productivity. To me this is debasing. So, secondly, Mr. Speaker, confusion or controversy in Saskatchewan education is caused, I think, by the feeling that many of the things taught today, in the system of today in Saskatchewan, are really irrelevant for the Saskatchewan of tomorrow.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this point, each Member must decide if these observations are in fact valid, because, I think, if Hon. Members disagree with the assumptions of the observations I've made, by and large this is a leaving-off point for the comments that I'm going to make hereafter. Obviously, as far as I'm concerned, Members will know that I think these observations are accurate and correct, and this Resolution is a result of my personal conviction that our education system is antiquated and obsolete and that the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is the driver of the horse-and-buggy school program and, to the regret of Saskatchewan, feels all the while that he's really riding a rocket.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a new definition of objectives for education in the 1970s. That is really the substance of this Resolution. We can all learn from the Ontario experience with its Task Force on Education. I refer to the Hall-Dennis

March 6, 1969

Report. That report enunciated one of the most refreshing and thoughtful critiques of Ontario's school system. The report, I think, stated best the needs of our children simply in these terms. I admit that they're a bit dramatic but I think very important. The report says this:

Each child has the right to learn, to play, to laugh, to dream, to love, to dissent, to reach upward, and to be himself. Children need to be treated as human beings; exquisite, complex and elegant in their diversity.

It's a broad statement of objectives. If our education system in Saskatchewan was geared to produce that type of a student, I think this discontent would quickly vanish and fade, and the Resolution would probably be for naught. If teachers and trustees and taxpayers in Saskatchewan could really feel that our education program was based on that type of a broad objective and goal, I am sure we wouldn't have much of the discontent and they'd all work harmoniously. However, the simple fact of the matter is that they do not feel this way. In Saskatchewan, I feel, we should launch a study now, similar to the Hall-Dennis Report, to ask these very basic questions about the 'raison d'être' of Saskatchewan's education system. Because we are primarily a rural or agriculturally-oriented society, we need this special Task Force for Saskatchewan in order to ascertain the needs of the youth of this province. Much experience and valuable information can be gained from the Hall-Dennis Report, it's true, but still all in all the peculiar circumstances of this province require, in my view, a special Task Force. Bold steps to implement new methods, new and imaginative courses should be the end result. It is my view that modern schools in Saskatchewan, in addition to being guilty of the remarks that I made earlier, the two observations, tend to be more concerned with such things as instructional performance by a teacher rather than the learning experience of the student. We must have a truly student-oriented system designed to meet the needs of the individual students.

Some matters that I think should be implemented are as follows. The curriculum should be free and optional, yet at the same time individualized to meet the needs of the student. Students should have the freedom to pick their own specialty courses at an early age and be given the opportunity to receive specialized attention and care. And may I remind Members opposite that this opportunity to receive specialized attention and care requires much more expenditure on education than this Government to this date has been willing to show thus far.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — It shows much more the need for much more spending and a carefully thought-out program of priorities in which that spending can be directed. Restrictions as to choice of specialty courses should be absolutely minimal. In other words, there should be a wide range, all of the fine arts, right down to the mechanics. There should be no grades. The learning process should be a continuum over a number of years and the course of study primarily decided by the individual students, having felt out and having decided what he or she feels is really his best or chief field of interest. And if that student, Mr. Speaker, feels that he has to take five or six years or seven years to finish a high school course in this province, he should not be

forced to comply with artificial or imposed standards as the necessity of completing a certain required curriculum within four years. Let him take it at his own pace. Let him take it at a pace that is consistent with his learning knowledge and his learning experiences. As well, Mr. Speaker, the concept of exams and the concept of failure are outdated. To imply that any young person is a failure, really, to me is an abhorrence. To imply that any young person has been unable to meet these superficial standards and, therefore also implying that he is not going to be of very much use to society, is a basic defect of our system and probably the direct result of a system requiring some form of diplomas or some form of standards or tests to make sure that that student can take his proper position and role in our economic world.

Mr. Speaker, with enough diverse institutions and enough diverse courses tailored for most of the interests of our many children, every young man and woman can be a positive contribution to our society. As Mr. Justice Hall said in his report:

Our schools expect a child to learn, to memorize, to mimic and to duplicate information which he is exposed to. He is stuffed and he is programmed.

He's like — I'm sure most of the Members in this House, who having gone to school studiously took copious notes, and what did we do with them? We committed them to memory and regurgitated them back to the teacher or the professor at exam time. The child or the student of today is a victim of learning by rote, by memory work, whereas he ought to be really a product of learning by discovery.

I think Saskatchewan's school system is the former. It stuffs and programs with a lock-step type of educational program, with a type of lack of imaginative programs for the people. Saskatchewan's education system, in my view, fails the potential, the tempo, and the level of understanding that's possible to be obtained for each and every child in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I think most educators know this. I think that, to a great measure, is the reason for the great unrest in this province right now. I think there is fear among the teacher and the taxpayer and the student that this Government opposite and the education system, for which it is charged to control and to guide, has really failed in these aspirations. I say that the greatest blame must fall on the Government opposite because, after all, the duty is on them to initiate programs of imagination with some vigor, some dynamism. And I think this Government has turned a deaf ear to the needs of the young people in our education system. It concerns itself, Mr. Speaker, with a paranoiac state of concern that repeatedly comes back and urges the people of Saskatchewan to cut back on education, to hold the line on education expenditures, flying in the face of the needs of educators and in the face of good economists.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Hours of energy are spent by the Hon. Minister and his Government Members, day to day, on day-to-day, short-term

March 6, 1969

economies on education, while the opportunity, the golden opportunity to develop an education system which will move to a better, and I submit, truer meaning of the word education, slips by the Minister's hands. The opportunity to develop mature, alert and inquisitive minds slips by the hands of this Government. I say the result is that one can conclude, as I have, our educational system is adrift. Therefore, I've presented the Resolution before us so that this Government may institute a Special Task Force on Education to re-define, perhaps in the case of the Minister and the Government, to define for the first time our long-range goals for the '70s in education. So the first reason for this proposed motion is that we should be given the opportunity to dispassionately define the new education program based on student needs for the new Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, another major area of concern to me is the status of the teacher. I'm not a teacher by profession and sometimes I very much regret it. But in my view, autonomy of the teacher should be established as a principle or almost as a rule of law as quickly as possible by this Government. I think autonomy will greatly increase the professional status of the teacher. We need to truly professionalize our teachers. In many professions, such as the medical profession, the legal profession, society has deemed that standards and criteria can be determined by that professional body or that professional society. Discipline, training courses have been left to those professions. In essence, these professional bodies are self-regulatory and they're only minimally responsible to this Legislature or to other bodies of control. This is so because our society has, presumably, the trust and confidence and the ability and the good judgment and the good sense in these professionals to best determine the course of conduct that affects their specialty. As I've stated, I think technology and the growth of technology will require a change in our educational system because teachers are going to have to be recognized as specialists in the field of education because that's exactly the position they are being forced to take. As a result, teachers should have more control over matters that concern them as professionals. Some of these matters would be matters over curriculum, almost exclusively, Mr. Minister, with student assistance, I might add, and I'm going to make an observation or two in that regard. Work load, teacher certification, many of the administrative procedures and decisions that, though subtle and unannounced, have a very profound effect on the teaching profession, many of those procedures now carried out by this Department of Education and above all a training program for teachers. By this Resolution, what we're really asking, is that a Special Task Force examine the relevancy of the Department of Education as it is presently structured, as it relates to the role of the teacher. All the matters that I have referred to briefly should, in my view, be removed from the hands of the Department, from the hands of the local school boards where this applies. And although there will always be some public duty, Mr. Speaker, on us as Legislators, because after all we're spending tax dollars — and I do not rebate or discount that responsibility — I feel the teachers of Saskatchewan should be made free and autonomous as possible in some of the spheres that I've talked about.

May I also add that by the same token the public of Saskatchewan will demand that teachers upgrade their qualifications no matter what their present individual educational standing may be. I think that this is a good demand. The Saskatchewan

Teachers' Federation must be singled out for some criticism in my view, for too long the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation has been identified only with a preoccupation to improve economic standards and conditions for its own members. I think that this is a very meritorious cause. Heaven knows they're under-paid enough after all the years of learning and training that they have to go through. The public has been somewhat reluctant to identify the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, I think, or some portions at any rate, because the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation has failed to see, I submit, to concern itself with some of the problems of research and what I'm going to refer to as 'soulful suggestions' with respect to improving the quality of education. The Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation is simply, in my view, not forcefully engaged itself enough in improving standards of education in this province, because if it did, then the case would almost be incontrovertible for putting almost total power with respect to curriculum and other matters in their hands. Comprehensive programs for improved student learning experiences should be formulated, thought out and announced and fought for by the teachers of this province. I'd like this Special Task Force to examine the soundness of legally instituting what I'm going to call the Saskatchewan College of Teachers and Professors, I mean by this, teachers and professors in the colleges of the universities so that this group would now have much of the power to make decisions that I referred to respecting education and so that there would be transfer of authority out of the hands of the Department of Education and out of the local school boards and into the hands of this professional body. In this way, I feel that teachers can be given more autonomy and will be made truly professionals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a third area of examination must be the relevancy of the local school board. My friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), will be interested in my comments in this regard. I know that he is paying his usual, keen attention.

This examination must be directly related to the present form of taxation, which I think all Members will agree places a heavy burden on the property owner. The present financial basis of education in Saskatchewan is iniquitous and about as obsolete as the education program itself. It is grossly unfair. It stifles good education. The vast number of local school boards, I am sure, has the effect of some variance as a result of local attitudes and local conditions, resulting in subtle but significant difference in our educational program. Financial conditions of an area may affect a local school board's ability to provide uniform quality education throughout the province. I say, no one should be deprived of the benefit of the best teaching personnel and the most imaginative and sensitive curriculum. And I say this happens notwithstanding equalization grants and other assistance by the Department. As the world shrinks in size, can an argument be made for the establishment of a Provincial Board of Education to look after these interests of education and the interest of the taxpayer? Now, Mr. Minister of Public Works, this is simply a question that I ask and would direct the Special Task Force to concern itself with, but I think that it is a very important area. Special attention should be given to completely renovating and revamping methods of financing education and the irrelevancy of the school board must be looked at and examined.

Mr. Speaker, a fourth area of study should be aimed at enabling students to be heard on all matters pertaining to

March 6, 1969

education. It has been said by the Federal Minister of Justice that the student is the consumer in the education program, and I think that is a very good description of them. Students today are equipped to offer excellent suggestions for the improvement of education. Educators must devise ways and means to listen to the youth who often, Mr. Minister of Education, see their own world and their own problems more clearly than the Department of Education, the Government opposite and most of the Members in this House.

Recently, Professor Bohrson of the Ford Foundation of New York, in Saskatoon at the Saskatchewan Trustees' meeting, said this, that educators will need to turn directly to those who are most deeply concerned with education, namely, the student. This statement, I think, is most significant and should catch the attention of the Members present. He said and I quote:

Schools must be shaped, moulded and formed on the concerns of and the needs of their constituents.

The Duff-Berdahl Report talked of present student unrest in these terms:

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

Mr. Speaker, students will respond with maturity once they are treated maturely. Once the students of Saskatchewan are stopped being picked on by the Members of the Government opposite, they will respond with maturity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Once the students of this province are stopped being the political footballs of the Minister of Public Works, the Premier and his Cabinet, then they will respond to maturity. Therefore, it is my view that all students should have a voice on all of the decision-making bodies. This level of decision-making, I think, should start in high school and, of course, I think the case is incontrovertible for the Senate and the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan. After all the modern day teacher must be a democrat. He guides the student only, placing the student always at the centre of all of the teacher's educational activities and decisions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, fifthly, it is high time this Government recognizes the principle of universal accessibility to education at all levels. The Government Members opposite fly in the face of the best economic opinion of Canada when it continually refuses to make education universal. I, personally, was most appalled to hear the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) say the other day, as reported in the press, that he was going to propose interest rates on student loans. This, after a year when there was controversy and difficulty in obtaining student loans, and the Minister of Education knows that full well. This, at a time when a financial barrier and a financial barrier as to education should be removed rather than imposed upon the students.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Removed, Mr. Speaker, in the full knowledge that the more skilled and the more learned people a province has, the richer the people of Saskatchewan are going to be economically and otherwise in the long run. This Government has failed to recognize this. It goes against the best economists. It goes against the youth of its own party. It is out of step with all of Saskatchewan, all of Canada in its continued persistence in maintaining some form of a means test for educational opportunities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Not only does it make good economic sense to make universal accessibility of education a rule of this Government, but may I say, Mr. Speaker, that it will be the fulfilment of an important democratic and social principle of the basic right to education of each and every child in this province.

May I also add, although I haven't got the personal experience in this area, I am told by many citizens who come to me and ask about our supposedly free schools in elementary and secondary school, why you have to pay for so many of the expenses. This is an area that has to be looked at as well.

As I have said before, a person's right to go to school at any level, kindergarten, right up to university, should not be based on how much he has in his pocket, but how much he has got in his head.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — This Special Task Force on education would be asked, Mr. Minister of Education, to study this problem in an independent way to see, if in fact, my economics are correct, to see, if in fact, my enunciation of the democratic principle is accurate and make a recommendation as it sees fit. I am sure that it will support the contention that I have enunciated.

Sixthly, Mr. Speaker, the Government's Education Department should be placed under close scrutiny. I do not feel that the organization of that Department enables decisions to be made by the Minister fully in the best interest of the needs of modern education. As I have stated, it is my view that many of the present functions of the Department may be removed and transferred from the Department of Education to teachers or some such other regulatory bodies I have already talked about. I am not going to belabor this point other than in the proposed motion. Members will see that there is called for there a thorough study and review of the Department of Education and particularly its organization thereof, in order to see if it is up-to-date in the 1970s.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another matter. The Minister of Education is doing a great disservice to this province when he continually hints at, in fact I would submit, talks of raising the teacher-pupil ratio in Saskatchewan. I can say, Mr. Minister, that it is patent nonsense to talk of increasing the number of students per classroom, when all educational authorities, including the Hall-Dennis Report, talk about individualized and child-centred attention being needed. How in the world can you get individualized and child-centred education when you are going to increase the number of students that are in the charge of any particular teacher. It flies right in the face of the

March 6, 1969

basic needs and demands of education. How in the world does the Minister of Education propose to improve the quality of education or justify that his Department has got its priorities on education straightened out, when at the same time he talks about teachers being able to do a better job in terms of teaching more students now? Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that a reduction of the teacher-pupil ratio is not based on some view that we are going to make the load of the teacher a little bit lighter, or the arguments that teachers only work 200 days a year and have a large holiday, and that they only work four or five hours, and all these other specious implications, when one tries to ask for the increase in teacher-pupil ratio. It is not based on that. I sometimes think that the Minister of Education and the Department of Education and this Government view the success of its education program purely in terms of fatuous statistics on how many students can be taught by one teacher, on some crazy businessman's logic that the more students that you have in a classroom, the more successful that teacher must be, or the more efficient that educational system must be.

The simple fact of the matter is that with a higher pupil-teacher ratio we are going against the interests of good education. We cannot determine our educational needs in terms of dollars. I can tell the Minister that in my view good education demands that this ratio be lowered at best, maintained at worst, because it is common knowledge that teachers can only do the proper job in the light of today's demands and such Reports as the Hall-Dennis Commission, only can do his best when he can personalize his teaching. The Special Task Force, I think, should look into this matter and make a recommendation to the people of Saskatchewan.

I want to say one other thing to the Minister. I have received a number of letters and correspondence and I am prepared to show them in private or even table them in this House, from parent-teacher associations, home and school clubs and teachers who have felt that this announcement by the Minister has been singularly one of the most dangerous announcements made in this sitting of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, eighthly, the Minister must realize that financial assistance to local school boards as presently structured is inadequate. Much has already been said about this in the Budget Debate and elsewhere and I am not going to repeat. I am sure that the Minister has received representations on his Government's inadequacy in this regard because I know I have the carbon copies of letters that have been addressed to him. I think there should be a dramatic increase in these grants to local school boards. This Special Task Force would be charged to review this entire pattern.

Mr. Speaker, I have only talked about eight areas of concern and some of the views that I personally think ought to be adopted with respect to education. All Members here know that there are many other areas of vital importance that only a Special Task Force dispassionately and over a long period of time can determine. The problem of education is far too wide to be dealt with comprehensively in one speech. That is not my purpose. It is mainly to make the argument out for the acceptance of a Special Task Force.

I do not feel that this Government knows where it is going in the field of education, because if it did know where it was

going, this dissatisfaction would not be rampant. If this Government knew where it was going, it would not have introduced The Teacher Salary Agreements Act for last year. It would not have created, by the introduction of that Act, the problems and the unrest that I referred to at the beginning of my speech.

May I also say to the Minister, that to my knowledge, in the year and a half or the two years that it has been my pleasure to be a Member of this House, I know of no study undertaken by this Government that has involved the public and the educators of this province, that even remotely begins to scratch the surface of analyzing the deep-seated concepts of education and testing their validity. I can also tell the Minister that all he has to do is circulate around the teachers to know that this is a sort of a seething problem, that is bubbling underneath the educational surface, and is going to explode one of these days. Lest the Minister of Education talk about the Gathercole-Nicks Report on Division Three, I want to say that the interim report to my mind was superficial and disappointing. I know that the gentlemen involved are educators with proven concern and proven ability for our school systems. That can't be taken away, but regrettably the report tendered last year is not in keeping with the type of commission I speak of. If the Government attempts to rely on it, then it only confirms our concern that it really approaches this problem of education for the '70s in a piecemeal, patchwork fashion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a Special Task Force, as I have envisaged here, would be comprised of leading educators and leading citizens of this province. It should be representative of farm organizations, labor organizations, professional organizations, and, yes, even businessmen too. I urge the Members to adopt and support this Resolution, so that Saskatchewan may get on with the job of modernizing our school systems along the basic philosophy of student-centred education. The effect of automation on future education must be given special consideration.

So to sum up, Mr. Speaker, I call on the Members to approve this Resolution, so that after deliberations, teacher autonomy may be established, students given a voice on all facets of education, educational opportunity examined and approved, the relevancy of local school boards thoroughly reviewed, special attention given to revamping the entire financial mode of paying for our education system, aimed at alleviating the burden of the local property owner and also determining the problem of the teacher-pupil ratio and other related areas that I have briefly touched on. All this and more is needed, if Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister of Education, is going to be a vital and vibrant province of opportunity for our youth.

It has been said that man through learning shall find tranquillity. Maybe that is why we don't have such a tranquil House. He shall discover truth and I think personally, Mr. Speaker, that Members could do nothing more significant in this session of the Legislature than to vote for a look in cold blood at the validity of our entire traditional education system. I urge all Members to support the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 6, 1969

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks that have been well presented to this Assembly by the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot and will not support many of the comments that he has made, many of the solutions that he has made. On some of them I agree with him, but there are many of them which he seeks to give credibility to in this Assembly which are being proposed by a certain group of students in high schools, universities and a certain number of teachers.

These ideas to me are ideas which are purely idealistic. They will not accept the fact of how our human nature is. They propose a system in which no one passes or fails, a system in which it would be great, as it is an idealistic proposal, which would be wonderful if we, as people, would actually operate in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Riversdale gives credibility and seeks to give credibility to the ideas that are being proposed that we should have less and less regimentation in our school system. He suggests that students, Mr. Speaker, should not have examinations and yet he well knows, as I well know, precisely how much work many students would actually do if we had such a system in our universities or schools today. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, there are few people, if any, that have gone to university and are not familiar with the cramming tactics, with the pressure that the students are put under to work toward passing their grades. It is certainly only human nature, Mr. Speaker, that without any pressure, without any standards, that we would slack in our efforts to obtain the best learning possible. This, I know, is being proposed by a group of people today, but it does not recognize the facts as they actually are. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that to receive an education and obtain an education it requires a great deal of hard work. A number of people like to say and think that there is a method of receiving an education without working hard, but there isn't. Neither should there be. It is simply good hard work that has given most people an education. I, for one, would not like to see the day come when this was not required.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go onto the proposal of curriculum changes. He suggests that students should have a wide variety of subjects to be able to pick from. He defies the fact that many of our senior personnel and many of our senior people have spent many, many years at determining what is our best curriculum that is available to the students who are in the process of learning. Surely the years of experience that have been put in by these people are much more adequate than a student who is in his 16th or 17th year or even his 20th year. Surely the years of experience that these people have put in as to what would be the most beneficial for many young people cannot be disregarded and should not be thrown away and be left to the young and inexperienced themselves.

Often, Mr. Speaker, I have known many people who, while attending school, have left out subjects like mathematics. When they have had a choice they have left out subjects such as French, and they have continued on in school much to their later regret. Others, as we all know, have been forced to take these subjects and later in their life, when they become 22 or 23, are very gratified that they did not have that choice to leave out French. They are becoming prepared for what their life work is. They

are much more in a position to be able to determine what their life work is at a later age. It is exceptionally difficult for a young person who is 15, 16 or 17 to know what he may want to do later in his life. Again, Mr. Speaker, I could not accept the proposal that students are in the best position to be able to determine what these subject would be. It is true that some consultation with them is beneficial, but to put them in a position that they themselves would have the power to determine many of these matter, I think, would be a great disregard for the facts.

He suggests that universal accessibility is one of our great problems today as far as education is concerned. I think, Mr. Speaker, that again he disregards many of the basic facts. Universal accessibility does not begin with those students who are going to university. Universal accessibility begins when you start in grade one, Mr. Speaker. It starts if you want to go back to the first day that you were born because your sociological background will have an impact. Today our priorities are necessary. Our priorities are greatly needed to be placed on the young people or they will never graduate out of grade 12. We have thousands of young people in the North, as the Premier said previously when speaking on the new Department of Indian Affairs, thousands of these young people today who do not even attend school let alone have the opportunity to possibly ever go to university. This is where our funds should be going. We need to upgrade our system to the point that at least every young person that is capable of graduating out of school has the change to go to university at a later time. It is certainly desirable and we hope that some day in the near future that it may be possible to abolish all fees to go to university.

But today our priorities must be placed on the many thousands of young people that will never ever have that opportunity to attend university. There are thousands of young people today that need assistance in being able to obtain technical training courses. We cannot forget these young people. They are every bit as important as those that may potentially go to university.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am disturbed about all of the great noise and the tension that many university students receive. Why it disturbs me is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, because, in my own opinion and in the opinion of many other people, these are one of the most fortunate groups of people that we have in our society today. They are fortunate because they have the basic intelligence of being able to go to university in the first place. There are many people born that do not have this basic ability and in that sense they are possibly less fortunate. The university student is becoming a very coddled individual in many respects, and it is the politicians and the ability of some students in university that are more or less bringing this about. I say that they are fortunate because, Mr. Speaker, when they obtain their university degree, statistics show that they will earn approximately \$100,000 more in their lifetime than will the people who do not have university degrees. And yet we spend great amounts of time discussing whether they should be able to go for free or not. These young people are badly in need of accepting their responsibilities and standing up and saying that we are a group of fortunate people. There are many people less fortunate than us, and it is time that we started doing something to help them instead of hollering to the rest of the world about everything that they need.

March 6, 1969

It would be a fine day for many people who are less fortunate, when our young people in universities stand up and say that we are lucky. We are lucky that we have the intelligence to be here. We are lucky that the state is providing such an institution that we have now. We are fortunate because some day in all likelihood we will make a much better living than will most other people in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that there is no conceivable way at this time that I can see that would be justified in reducing university fees to the point that there was no fee for the student to pay himself. This is certainly not done for any other young man or young woman starting into business, or for any young person that has to invest a capital in a small farm or business. This is certainly not done for the great multitude of young people that are taking technical trades, electricians, plumbers, carpenters. They are not being given everything in their trade to start with without putting up a certain amount of financial means themselves. Why should we, Mr. Speaker, select one particular group to say that this is the select few that should benefit in our society?

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude by saying that I think the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has merit in some of the points that he has made. But I, Mr. Speaker, will not accept that our system should degenerate to the point — and I use the word degenerate — that we shall throw all of our experience of many years out the window by saying the young people should now run the education system, simply because there's a great clamor by a few of them that they should do so.

True there is room for consultation. I would not accept the fact that we should eliminate our system of examinations. There is no harm in making a person work to prove to the rest of the community that he is capable of doing that work. There is no harm in putting a little pressure on him to pass an examination in mathematics or in history. One of the great things that he learns is to work under pressure, because once he comes into the rest of the world everyone doesn't say, "We are going to make it easy for you." This is part of the educational process. I once picked up a book a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, and it said that "Education was the ability of a person to make his mind lie down or roll over like a dog." I accept this definition. It is a very simple one but I think one which is quite adequate. The grading system is still the basis for our professional societies. It is the basis that proves whether you would be good enough to be a basic engineer or a basic chemist or even a basic history teacher. It is still the basis that proves whether you can be a pharmacist or a medical doctor or a dentist. So, Mr. Speaker, many of the very, very liberal ideas that are being presented are worthy of discussion. But I think that we should be very, very careful before we jump head-over-heels in accepting too many of them. We are looking for ways and means of doing things easier today. But let's not throw out all the standards that have been set over the years. Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that there is no easy way to receive an education except hard work. I think it is time that many of the young people and many of the teachers that are proposing the opening-up with so many of these new ideas accept this and that we proceed in much the same manner that we have done in the past with room for lots of improvements as I'm sure the Education Department is doing a good job in bringing about.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that I would not support many of the proposals that the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has presented and therefore would not support his motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I really had no intentions of speaking in this debate until I listened to the latter part of the remarks of the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). I'm a lot older than the Hon. Member for Cannington but listening to him I couldn't help but think that his views sounded like a man of 70 or 80 years of age expounding the philosophy of an 18th century education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Really the only point I wanted to speak about when I rose was to point out to the Hon. Member from Cannington that this motion moved by my hon. friend, the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and the views that the Hon. Member expressed was not talking for certain — he said these were personal views — he thought that this was something that should be looked at. He didn't even say that he believed all these things but he thought that these were relevant problems that a Task Force should be looking at. I say again that really the only reason I rose was to express these and to reiterate the statement of the Hon. Member for Riversdale and to again say that many of the views expressed by my hon. friend from Cannington, I still say, are 18th century.

I'm certainly going to support the Motion.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 6 — PROVINCIAL HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West) moved, seconded by Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):

That this Assembly recommend to the consideration of the Government the establishment of a Provincial Housing and Urban Development Authority, to:

- (a) provide housing for low income groups;
- (b) develop a financial program to make money for housing available at reasonable rates;
- (c) establish the long-term and short-term housing needs of rural and urban people in Saskatchewan;
- (d) study ways and means to lower construction costs;
- (e) project long-term regional planning and land acquisition for urban development and home-building.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calls for a Provincial Housing and Urban Development Authority because there is an urgent need to tackle the housing problems of Saskatchewan on an organized basis. Properly staff and financed, the Authority could

March 6, 1969

provide homes for those who are in need of homes, establish financial procedures for building housing and in short, establish home-building as a social necessity and as an industry. Mr. Speaker, our attempts thus far to provide shelter people can afford has been limited by high-interest rates, high land costs, old-fashioned construction techniques, 11 per cent sales tax, outmoded building codes and an overall lack of housing information for prospective home builders. At the end of last month, many Regina residents without leases had their rent increased. Tenants are trapped because they cannot afford to build or to buy a home. Young couples with children are frustrated by the high-cost of living plus our failure to supply an answer to their predicament. Older citizens cannot find homes to live in if they plan to retire to this city.

Mr. Speaker, to argue that good housing reduces social problems is hardly fair or accurate because many people without housing have no such problems and those with problems in many instances have good homes, but it can be said good housing can certainly improve living conditions and make a city a better place to live.

A Housing Authority would work with a Federal Department of Housing. Mr. Speaker, it would be the voice, the administrative apparatus for regional examination of housing needs through local governments. Does the need for the Authority exist? Well, without any machinery for seeking a solution, what do we have at the present time? No homes for young couples, no places for rent or purchase by low-income groups, high rents, poor housing in urban centres, in the North and in some of our rural districts. Why? Mr. Speaker, we have neither given the finance, the leadership or the construction advice, nor even examined the needs of Saskatchewan in regard to housing.

To qualify for an NHA loan you must earn about \$8,000 per year. How many people do? If you qualify the interest rate is almost 10 per cent, nine point something. Who can pay this kind of interest? A \$30,000 mortgage at 10 per cent for 40 years costs \$120,000 when it is paid off. Socialism for the rich is the way this Government's housing plan is described by working people.

A Housing Authority could look at subsidizing interest for low incomes, could negotiate income tax incentives for residential mortgage loaners, could through proper legislation authorize the use of pension funds for housing at a reasonable rate of interest. Do we know how many homes we need? Without knowing our housing needs and planning to meet them, money and contractors will not stay in the housing field. With the need to plan urban areas, with the need to provide transportation, schools, parks, recreation areas, main arterial roads, shopping centres, sewage, disposal systems, anti-pollution measures, urban regional planning is a must. Development of adjacent areas or new areas for urban living by huge land assembly projects would be routine work for such an Authority. With no shortage of land an Urban Development Authority could forecast population needs, reduce costs in land, installations and transportation but most of all, Mr. Speaker, build for the future attractive pleasant centres for urban living. Even the location of industry, shopping, medical services could be more available and better located for practical use. Constantly the Authority could be surveying the problems of housing with the builders, with the owners, with the designers, the local administrators. For the first

time, the place we live and how it is provided would be under constant study.

Mr. Speaker, with evidence all around us, with young people seeking housing that is either too expensive or in many respects inferior, with the construction of homes at a standstill and with the need for an overall program to develop housing as part of an urban development plan, we must have a proper authority, staffed by people who know housing and are ready to work on a solution to this most urgent problem.

Mr. Speaker, the present requirements to qualify for housing loans are such that a huge portion of Saskatchewan's population is unable to obtain the money to construct a home. Recently the Canadian Welfare Council declared in a statement that all Canadians have the right to be adequately housed. If we believe this, then steps must be taken to provide at least 250,000 homes a year, a large portion of which would be for rental or purchase by low-income groups. Money made available for this purpose, Mr. Speaker, would be a good investment. It is a social necessity and I think failure to do so cannot be explained, when one realizes all the component parts of a housing program of this magnitude are readily available. List them, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of unemployed tradesmen, lumber, cement, fixtures that are produced throughout Canada, and if you say there isn't money perhaps we should remember there wasn't money before the Second World War started and they found it overnight in great quantities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a war too, a war against poverty, and against non-modern shacks on muddy streets, that we tip-toe past to attend palatial schools and expensive hospitals to quote the Budget.

But, you say, where are we going to get the money? Other countries have solved this problem, Mr. Speaker. Norway has a housing bank which supplies fund for co-operative and other types of public housing. At present this Province gets money from the Canada Pension Plan. A good portion of this money comes from working people without proper homes, Why not re-invest a portion of this money in housing? Housing bonds could be sold and guaranteed by the Province for this very purpose. We put up money to guarantee other industries. Why not guarantee a basic long-term industry that could supply a product many Saskatchewan citizens need? It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that we have sat back and allowed the kind of financing for housing that has put us in a position where we have neither housing nor financing. A Housing and Urban Development Authority could and would study every financing technique that has been used for every successful, private, public and co-operative housing venture anywhere in the world.

Part C of the Resolution asks to establish the long-term and short-term housing needs of rural and urban people in Saskatchewan. This type of inventory by the Authority would give us the information for deciding the best type of housing for farms, towns, villages and cities in our province. It would estimate the needs of people in the North, on industrial sites, in sections of the cities where older homes have to be rebuilt or repaired.

By establishing the housing needs, immediate and long-term, the Authority could plan the activities of the public and private housing development, rural and urban. Quotas could be set, Mr.

March 6, 1969

Speaker, housing built on the site and off the site, in factories and partly assembled. By using this approach Saskatchewan's housing problem would be under constant surveillance and the housing industry would be on a full-time, year-round basis.

Mr. Speaker, recently a contractor in Canada by using a pre-cast, pre-assembly approach, decided to construct multi-storey apartment blocks with a small crew of seven or eight. A multi-storey apartment block was completed in seven weeks. The result was a sizeable reduction in the cost. Whether it is the assembly line approach, a sectional house that can be added to, or new methods of assembly on the site, this Authority that we are advocating could be by research, by scholarships, by cost studies, and by developing new materials, eventually lower the cost of constructing a home.

The Hellyer Task Force makes many trivial recommendations. Some of them are ineffective. Its suggested curtailment of public housing is preposterous, and its failure to supply funds or recommend a method of providing funds or plans for low-income housing identifies it as a failure. But in a couple of areas it speaks of Provincial agencies for housing and it does put forward in my estimation a fairly good case for regional development of housing.

Cities that grow up like Topsy are expensive, unsightly, and unpleasant places to live. Regional development, properly planned, holds forth the hope for building a long-term basis, carefully thought out and well planned communities, complete with recreational areas, parks, schools, trees and boulevards, shopping centres, hospitals, large and small industries, every acceptable facility a human being could enjoy. But because the land was purchased ahead of time and properly laid out, it would be less expensive, easier to move around in and a better place to live than anything yet developed.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, this Housing and Rural Development Authority would in the long run save us money, but beginning immediately it could work on the housing problems confronting us today. How could this be done? Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest as a start, the Authority could develop a program that would: 1. Co-ordinate housing programs of every kind at the Federal Provincial and local level; 2. Examine methods used in other jurisdictions and recommend financing for housing at low-interest rates and low-down payments; 3. In co-operation with co-op leaders develop huge co-operative housing projects; 4. Constantly research and study construction methods and building costs in order to reduce the price of homes; 5. Take inventory of Saskatchewan's housing needs and in conjunction with the construction industry set quotas for home building; 6. Examine the legislation for leases, ownership and option contracts for housing; 7. Plan urban regional development on a long-term basis to provide transportation, streets, schools, recreational areas, shopping centres and industrial locations; 8. Examine and recommend legislation to guarantee priority for investment of funds in housing.

The objective would be a good home for every Saskatchewan citizen regardless of where they live or where they work or what they earn.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate on this

Resolution.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — GUARANTEED WHEAT PRICE

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey) moved, seconded by Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook):

That this Legislature recommend that the Provincial Government requests the Federal Government to adopt an agricultural policy that would provide for both an export and domestic guaranteed price for wheat, set through a study of production costs and world market trends and subject to periodic review, to ensure an adequate standard of living for the farmer.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I say at the outset that this Resolution is not basically a new resolution. It is a Resolution that has been brought before this Assembly as well as other assemblies in the Prairie Provinces. It has also been brought forward in one form or another to the Federal Government of Canada. It has been suggested by different and various voices speaking on behalf of the farmer. But, never, Mr. Speaker, have the results that this Resolution would bring forward and put into practice been more needed by the farmers of Saskatchewan than at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I am not, Mr. Speaker, a person who speaks of doom and gloom unnecessarily, although it has been suggested that a great many spokesmen for the farmer are now doing just that. This is not entirely true. It may, however, seem to be true to the people who are not directly involved in the agricultural field. It appears as though the farmers, because they have money, and large volumes of money tied up in farming land and in machinery and even in some instances some of the minor luxuries of life, it appears that the farming industry is not suffering any real hardships. But these are not due to the affluency of his position. It is primarily due to the fact that the farmer today is very much in debt, much, much further than he has ever been in the past. And as I have stated previously in this House, the farmers' net debt is now believed to be in excess of \$2 billion in the Prairie Provinces. In order to carry on his farming operations there is going to have to be a great deal more credit extended to farmers. The unfortunate part about this, firstly, is that it does not solve the problem that the farmer is in at the present time, because he cannot foreseeably see in the future being able to repay volumes of money out of the enterprise that he is now involved in, not at the present price he is now receiving for his produce at any rate.

Secondly, the interest rates are much too high, much higher than they have ever been in the past five or ten years. It is not now uncommon for farmers to be paying on demand notes, eight, nine and ten per cent interest and in instances even higher. It is also not uncommon for farmers who are repaying debts incurred in land purchases, interest rates of eight, nine and ten per cent and in instances even higher in this field. It's further not

March 6, 1969

uncommon for farmers to be repaying debts which they incurred in the purchase of farm machinery or operating capital interest rates of anywhere from 8 to 16 per cent interest. These interest rates are completely unrealistic in regard to the kind of returns that the farmer can expect for his produce at the present time. To compound this problem, the market situations that the grain producer now finds himself in in the Province of Saskatchewan as well as other grain producers in Canada is not good. In spite of the optimism of the Canadian Wheat Board in their hopes of selling 1,300,000,000 bushels in the next three years, the farmer is still going to remain in the present cost-pricing squeeze. I must say that I wish the Wheat Board good luck and success towards the goals that they have set out. However, Mr. Speaker, if we do not update our means of moving and selling grain, I doubt whether they will reach that objective of 1,300,000,000 bushels. Consequently, we see a very serious problem developing in the near future for the farmer, a problem such as the United States had in regard to their agricultural production not too many years ago. But as we all well know, the solution that the Americans came up with was to pay farmers not to grow grain. This is an unrealistic solution to present day agriculture and especially to the forthcoming problems that Canadian agriculture is now developing. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I cannot see any truly humane society paying farmers not to produce food, when we have great numbers of people in this world who are going hungry and indeed starving.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Such a situation cannot continue. But we cannot expect the farmers of Saskatchewan or the farmers of the Western world to carry the cost of being able to supply, trade, or sell these foodstuffs to the starving and under-developed countries. He cannot do this for reasons I have already stated. To expand on this, I want to relate to you just how bad the farmer's present circumstances are.

In spite of the drastic straits that the farmer now finds himself in, due to the tough and damp grain situation in Western Canada, his position economically would not have been much better if this crop had been harvested under better climatic conditions. The tough and damp grain situation is definitely another expenditure to the farmer. Indeed most of them are finding it very difficult to find the solution to the problems that tough and damp grain has created for them. However, I say their position would have been nearly as bad whether the grain was taken off dry or in the present tough and damp situation, because of the fact that he would have still been in the position where he is now, with a reduced revenue and not the amount that he needs in order to carry out his farming operation in an economic and farm profit-making way.

These are of course due to the declining prices, declining sales and increased cost of operation and production of farm produce. Figures that show agriculture's declining share of the food processing industry were recently compiled by the Agricultural Economics Branch of the Marketing and Economics Division of the United States Department of Agriculture. I am using American figures in this case, because they are the most recent and most up-to-date as they include up to and 1967. Even though they are American statistics the percentages will not change that much in regard to the farmer's situation regarding food processing

in Canada. If anything, the Canadian farmer will be in a little worse position in regard to his share than that of his Southern farming neighbor.

Let's take a look at the comparisons that these statistics provide. In 1947, the marketing bill which is the difference between civilian expenditure and the farm value was \$22,643,000. The farm value, which is payments to farmers less input value by producers from the quantities of the raw product equivalent to the product purchased by consumers, was \$19,294,000. Civilian expenditures, meaning the market value of food derived from products produced on domestic farms and purchased by civilian consumers, was \$41,937,000. The farm share in percentages was 46 per cent of the total civilian expenditures on food stuffs. Ten years later in 1957, the marketing bill was \$37,888,000. The farm value was now \$20,405,000. The civilian expenditure had jumped to \$58,293,000. This showed a drop in percentage of the farmer's share of some 11 per cent as his share at this time was reduced to 35 per cent.

In another ten years' time to 1967 the marketing bill had again increased considerably to \$58 million. The farm share, however, did not increase quite so drastically. It now stood, in 1967, at \$27 million. The civilian expenditure increased to \$85.5 million, thus leaving the farmer now with a percentage of 32 per cent, a further reduction of 3 per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in 1947, a little over 20 years ago the farmer was receiving nearly half of the money that was being spent on food-stuffs. Twenty years later, in 1967, he was receiving less than one-third. Now there will be some who say that he can afford to do this and his position has not changed too drastically, because of the increased efficiency that the farmer now has due to the type of machinery, that he is able to work with and that gives him the opportunity to produce these agricultural products at a less costly figure to himself than was established in the past. But this does not allow enough compensation for his own sky-rocketing production costs. However, Mr. Speaker, this loss of income to the farmer and the falling prices of the farmer, do not apply to leading corporations that are marketing farm products. I here again want to use American statistics for the years 1966 and 1967. Again the business processing and selling food products will not differ tremendously between the United States and Canada, at least not on a percentage of profit gained to themselves.

These corporations that were marketing agricultural products included food manufacturers and retail food stores. Their income according to the National City Bank of New York, their net income profits, after taxes of 153 food manufacturing corporations, were 3.1 per cent higher in 1967 than they were in 1966. By comparison, the net income of other leading corporations in all manufacturing industries in 1967 declined by 4.6 per cent. The increase in net income of food manufacturers are due to the increased percentage margin on sales in the baking, meat packing and the sugar industries.

The total net income for 25 leading meat packers rose 50 per cent in 1967, far more than any other industry marketing farm products. Meat packers' margin as a percentage of sales rose from 0.6 per cent in 1966 to 1 per cent in 1967. During the 1960s the meat packers' margin on sales has ranged from 0.6 per cent to 0.8 per cent with the exception of a 1.1 per cent

March 6, 1969

rate in 1964. The 1967 increase in meat packers' net income as a percentage of sales coincided with an increase of livestock and decline of farm and retail prices in the year of 1967 for livestock. As a result of the dramatic increase in the meat packers' net income, their net income as a percentage of their net assets, which could be termed as stock-holders' equity, also rose to 7.9 per cent in 1967. Return on net assets was higher in all other food manufacturing industries, ranging from 9.9 per cent of net assets for the sugar industry and 15 per cent in the baking industry.

These figures show, Mr. Speaker, that, while other industries can fluctuate, the price of food stuffs generally speaking is on an upward scale to provide better profits to themselves in that industry. The farmer is compelled to sell at a stable or declining or decreasing price, putting him in a position where he is not receiving a fair share of the income of the product of which he is actually the key man in the producing.

These figures, Mr. Speaker, show the need for a guaranteed price to the farmer, a price that is to be reviewed periodically, that would give him a profit that would be comparable to those who are in the food processing, distributing and selling of the produce that the farmer has grown. But further proof, singling out one particular finished product that the farmer supplies, is the raw produce to the bread industry. The average price in 1947-49, the average retail price for a one-pound loaf of bread was 13.5 cents. The farm value in the price of that one-pound loaf of bread for total ingredients was 3.3 per cent; for wheat only was 2.6 per cent. Ten years later in 1957-59 the average retail price of a one-pound loaf of white bread was 18.9 cents. Farm value rather than increasing had decreased to 3 cents. Wheat only had also decreased to 2.3 cents, rather than 2.6 cents. In 1967, another ten years later, the average price for the one-pound loaf of bread was 22.2 cents. Total farm value in that loaf of bread for all ingredients had again risen to 2.6 cents for wheat, 3.3 cents for the other commodities. Mr. Speaker, the interesting point about these statistics is that exactly 20 years later the farmer's share for all ingredients is 3.3 cents, the same as it was in 1947-49 era. 1967 finds the farmer's share at 3.3 cents exactly the same. The prices in neither instance increased to the farmer at all, although there were fluctuations during the 20-year period. But the increase in the total price of bread increased from 13.5 cents average, to 22.2 cents average, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 8.7 cents per loaf.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the increase in the prices of producing this loaf of bread was not justified. Most certainly the sale and labor going into bread have increased to some extent. It may even be justifiable that the price for bread, the present price, is the fairer one and that the profits are not high to any one individual from the time it leaves the farm to the customer. However, justifiable or not, and I would suggest that it is not, when the return remains the same, exactly the same to the farmer, over a 20-year period, he certainly is not getting the fair share of the profits that he is entitled to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Another reason why such a Resolution is needed at the present time is that further statistics show net income of

153 leading food manufacturing corporations totalled 13 per cent more in 1966 than they did in 1965. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to show to some extent that the income structure of the farmer and other industries handling agricultural products are split when it comes to the proper picture of the two. Although efficiency has increased in both, the efficiency on behalf of the farmer has not awarded him with any appreciable increase in his net income.

I believe there are a great many other people concerned about the agricultural field. These people believe that the majority of the farmers cannot continue on under the circumstances that the farmer now finds himself in. Agriculture is a major industry in the Canadian economy. Changes in farm production and income affect the welfare of producers and consumers in diverse ways. Accordingly, the farm income problem takes on different aspects depending on the point of view of the group whose welfare is affected. The farmer, the consumer, and the non-farm producer, each define the problem in different terms. But I believe the only terms we can define the present problem we are now in is on the terms of the farmer and that they will be solved on the terms of the farmer. I feel quite confident at least presently and for the near future that this Resolution is the most direct and applicable means that will put the farmer in a position where a great many of them will be able to continue their operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I must, however, say that this is not going to solve the entire agricultural problem that we have today. In spite of the concern at all levels of government in regard to the agricultural industry, no one has really come forward with a long-term, long-range constructive program to solve the farmers' dilemma. However, to confine myself to this Resolution, the most direct and serious problem at the present time is the lack of income that the farmer has and the workings of this Resolution would solve that problem to a great degree.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — I want to impress upon you that we would not be by far the first country to bring in similar legislation in helping the farmer. Nearly every agricultural country in the world has a policy that guarantees the farmer an adequate income. The only significant difference is that of Canada. Briefly here are some of these policies.

Austria's objectives aim at maintaining economically the farming population, with special regard to family farms and endeavor to ensure that those engaged in agriculture participate in the progressive development of the Austrian economy. Their policy provides for an annual submission of the report of the situation to Parliament. This report, termed the Green Report, gives an assessment of the economic situation of the agricultural sector and an account of the measures applied in accordance with the provisions in the Green Plan. For most agricultural products, prices are determined through decisions of public authority. Any price changes of goods, which fall under this jurisdiction, are discussed by the representatives of the responsible minister of three chambers, Chamber of

March 6, 1969

Commerce, Chamber of Labour and Chamber of Agriculture. The result of this consultation is submitted to the Price Commission, seated in the Ministry of Agriculture. The Commission forwards its decision to the Minister who confirms it definitely, consequently being able to keep agriculture in the viable position in regard to profits and loss.

Belgium is primarily concerned with keeping their farm prices at a reasonable level, ensuring profitability of well managed farms whose existence is socially and economically justified.

In Denmark, the Danish Agricultural Policy aims at utilizing the production capacity of agriculture to the fullest possible extent, taking into account market conditions abroad and at home. Although no particular income levels for farmers have been laid down, the Grain Marketing Act which was passed in Denmark in 1958 shows Danish farmers have been assured a minimum guaranteed producer price for bread grains. Wheat and rye marketed to the end of March are also included. Producers may sell wheat and rye to authorized dealers and millers at fixed prices. Adjustments are made according to the grade. The guaranteed prices are increased by a storage allowance.

In Finland, the basic aim of the agricultural policy is to make it possible for farmers to have a satisfactory degree of rationalization of their farms to attain an income level corresponding to that of other economic groups. Price supports and agricultural policy, with emphasis on seeking adjustment through structural improvement in agriculture, have reversed the agricultural trend in Finland in comparison with many other countries. The number of farms in Finland has been increasing rather than decreasing under such a policy.

In France, the policy is to allow a fair share of general economic growth by eliminating the causes of disparity between incomes obtained in agriculture and in other economic sectors, and to bring in particular the farmers and hired farm workers up to a social status as enjoyed by other occupational groups. Also, by enabling agriculture, and family farms in particular, to compensate for natural and economic disadvantages which it has compared with the other economic sectors, their policy has basically fixed itself with the objective that it would assure that incomes obtained in agriculture would catch up with those in other population groups.

In Germany, The Agricultural Act passed in 1955 set the principal objectives of German agriculture policy.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — East or West?

Mr. Messer: — These are achieved in the West in this case, Davy! These are achievements for a reasonable standard of living for the agricultural population, thus permitting agriculture to participate in the development of the economy.

An Hon. Member: — How about the East side of the House?

Mr. Messer: — You had better listen because this agriculture

policy is going to be the one that is going to put you out of power in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — The financial support given to agriculture is either in the form of direct subsidy or on prices or inputs, or given for different improvement or promotion schemes, or falls under the group of fiscal and social measures affecting the sector.

In Sweden, the objectives of the Swedish agricultural policy laid down by Parliament in 1947 are to give the agricultural policy the same possibilities of other groups of society to obtain reasonable levels of income and to participate in future increases of general prosperity. Farm prices are supported through import levies adjusted to provide a direct link between prices received by Swedish farmers and the level of world prices for agricultural products and changes in industrial wages and changes in costs of agricultural production in Sweden. The system provides for the fluctuation of Swedish farm prices and the market situation, but within predetermined limits on either side of so-called middle prices. The middle prices originally served as a basis for fixing import levies. The intention is to maintain middle prices at a level which would give the basic farmers an opportunity to reach a parity of income.

The United States, Mr. Speaker, has somewhat the same problem as we have, expanding production and declining net returns to the farmer. At any rate, they realized that they had to also assist the farmer's income if the economy of the United States was to survive. Their main instrument for doing this was the price support program which was closely linked with production control. They also, however, imposed acreage control for major crops, along with the introduction of the soil bank program in the mid-1950s which was set up to offset the rapid rise of crop yields and to stem the accumulation of stocks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not saying that these countries that I have mentioned, some of them small agriculture countries, some of them large agricultural countries, have the solution to the problem that the Canadian and in particular the Saskatchewan farmer is suffering from. In fact I think a great many of these countries would learn a lot from us, rather than we learn from them. However, in each case of those I have mentioned, and the many that I have not mentioned, they have all realized that the farmer has to have some sort of basic guaranteed income so that he may be able to maintain himself and so that he may be able to bolster the economy of these countries. If we do not soon realize and face the facts here in Saskatchewan and in Canada as to just what role the farmer plays and how serious it affects the economy, our economy is surely to suffer. To put it briefly, and bluntly as did the Secretary of Agriculture in the United States a year ago, "Depressions are farm bred and farm fed."

In Canada as in the United States, I have stated before, the farmers are not getting a fair share of the increased food expenditures. In Canada the farm share of the food dollar dropped from 60 cents in 1949 to 40 cents in 1965. According to the Economic Council, only a small portion of the increased food prices since 1949 found its way back to the farmer. It also stated that the situation in Canada is much the same as that

March 6, 1969

in the United States in establishing a close relationship between the rise in retail food prices and the increase in processing, packaging and distributing costs. The Council took particular note of the increased level in gross margins in food processing industries. The gross margin for all food processing in 1963 stood at 63.9 per cent of sales higher than that of 1949, when the level was 30.4 per cent. None of this increase is going to the Canadian farm industry.

The importance of agriculture in the economic and social welfare of Saskatchewan and Canada is of utmost importance. It contributes to a great many industries in the economy as well as providing employment directly and indirectly for the Canadian population. It provides a great many benefits to the people of Canada. Because a large portion of the people who are not aware of what it contributes, I am again going to relate them in this Assembly, some of them at a later time.

The farmer cannot much longer survive the increasing costs of production. In the period from 1962 to April 1966, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics index of prices paid by farmers, exclusive of living costs, rose from 282.2 to 340.8. The indexes of prices paid to farmers for field products during a similar period, 1961 to 1966, dropped from 191.7 to 179. This rise in cost of production and decline in prices received are a major contributing factor to the present economic problems of farmers and are a reason for the exodus of the farmers leaving their farms. If such conditions prevail, the now some odd 190,000 farmers who are now holding permit delivery books with the Canadian Wheat Board, will drop to less than 100,000 in a very short time.

The major increase that spirals higher every year is the purchase and operation of machinery. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the costs and operation of these farm machines that are necessary for a farmer to properly farm his operation, increase significantly every year. However, a trend has begun to develop in the last year and I think it will continue to become a faster downward plunge and, that is, the dropping off of sales or decline of sales of farm machinery and parts. Statistics for 1967 and 1968 show that for Manitoba, sales dropped from \$56,906,000 in 1967 to \$48,623,000 in 1968, a percentage decrease of 14.6 per cent. In Alberta, sales dropped from \$108,535,000 in 1967 to \$91,236,000 in 1968, a percentage decrease of 15.9 per cent. In Saskatchewan, where there apparently is no agricultural problem, at least not recognized by the present Government in Saskatchewan, sales dropped from \$130,940,000 in 1967 to \$102,909,000 in 1968, a percentage drop of 21.4 per cent. In Saskatchewan it means \$28,031,000 less money was spent by the farming industry. It means that on an average every dealer in Saskatchewan did \$16,239 less business than he did the year previous.

The only reason for this is that the farmer has now got to a point where he cannot borrow the capital he needs to replace the farm machinery and consequently is not buying machinery in the volume that he was in the not too distant past. This means not only hardship to the farmer as such, but it means a hardship to the farming communities which he caters to. In particular in the last several months it is not uncommon for a great many businesses, who serviced the farmer in these smaller farming communities, to be locking their doors, or to put it bluntly, declaring bankruptcy or simply going broke.

It is not only the machinery suppliers and distributors that will be suffering during this economic crisis, but, because the number and complexity of the products that are available to the farmer and that are a necessity to the farmer for his operation because these have increased fantastically, and the dealers have increased, these dealers that have been providing these services are also going to suffer because of the lack of business. There will be a developing situation of either smaller sales or more accounts receivable carried by businesses, which supply farm chemicals, fertilizers, pesticides, insecticides and other needed services of the farmer.

It is not hard for one to see, if this trend continues to develop, that economic hardships are going to develop in nearly all segments of society. This problem, as I have stated before, is compounded by the world situation, a situation where world wheat production is increasing yearly and other countries are becoming more active in the world trade arena. Principal suppliers besides Canada are Argentina, Australia, United States and even France. These countries are now setting a pattern of continued production and expansion of grain for export wherever it may be found. The International Grains Arrangement gives us to some extent an equal footing. But when we take into consideration that the other three major exporters of wheat, Australia, Argentina and the United States, are subsidizing their farmers, it sheds a somewhat different light on the whole situation. Because it is inevitable that all these countries along with some developing countries will be producing more and more wheat and grain for export. It is of the utmost importance that we look for and establish new markets and new marketing trends in Canada. In the process of doing this we are going to have to guarantee our farmers, in some form or another, a realistic income for the production costs which they incur in growing this grain.

I said at the start that this Resolution was not a new one and the Resolutions in one form or another meaning ultimately the same have been introduced in the past and are now being urged upon the Provincial and Federal Governments of Canada. Only weeks ago the Canadian co-operative wheat producers laid on the desks of all Members of the Legislative Assemblies in the three Prairie Provinces and the Members of the Federal Government of Canada, a resolution in regard to a two-price system of wheat. Their resolution called for the Canadian Government to establish a two-price system on wheat, the price of that Canadian grain used for domestic human consumption to be increased by an amount that bears a fair relationship to the cost of production, and further that this amount to be charged to the consumer by increasing the price to the flour mills on that portion of their wheat purchases.

They stated that the amount of wheat used for domestic consumption is in or about 50 million bushels per year. They suggested that, if the domestic price level was increased by \$1 per bushel it would mean \$50 million per year to the Prairie farmers in Canada. This, with equal distribution, would mean approximately \$225 per farmer. Alternatively, if the total amount was added to the producer price, it would provide an increase of 11.7 per cent on the basis of a 10-year average delivery of 432 million bushels.

On the other hand, to the consumers they stated that, as the cost of wheat accounted for only 3 cents in the price of a

March 6, 1969

now 26 cent loaf of bread on the basis of present wheat prices, an increase of \$1 per bushel in the price of wheat, roughly 50 per cent of the present price of wheat, should not increase the consumer price of bread by more than 1½ to 2 cents per loaf.

They further pointed out that the index of the cost of goods and services used by farmers increased by 153 points or 76 per cent between 1949 and 1967. The price of wheat rose 29 cents or about 16 per cent in the same period of time. The price of wheat is clearly lagging far behind other price levels in the cost index. They further pointed out that the two-price system for wheat would not create hardship for Canadians who are part of the national work force. They stated that the Canadian worker is already enjoying every cheap food. This is shown in the number of hours of work required to purchase the food for an average family of four on a weekly basis at average manufacturing wages. These figures which were Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures showed that in 1949 it took 20 hours of work to buy a week's supply of food. In 1959, it took 14 hours of work to buy a week's supply of food. In 1966, this had further fallen to 13 hours of work to purchase that week's supply of food. Most of this increased reduction in the real cost of food was due to the increased productivity and efficiency of the farmer. They further pointed out that the two-price system for wheat is used in one form or another in many parts of the world already. The major countries, as I've already mentioned, using these are the United States, Australia and France. This policy has put the farmers of these three countries in a much more viable economic position.

Another spokesman for the farmers of Western Canada is the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. In a proposal prepared at the Western Agricultural Conference of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in May of 1968, they asked the Canadian Government to guarantee the Canadian price of wheat to the producer at not less than \$2.12 per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead on all wheat, plus \$1 per bushel for domestic wheat used for milling and consuming in Canada, which could be charged to the consumer by increasing the price of wheat to the Canadian miller, with proceeds of the same to be distributed on a basic quality of producers' deliveries. Their reasoning for this resolution was much the same as that of the Canadian wheat producers. However, they went on further to state the system was devised for distribution of the additional dollar from the domestic consumption, which would limit the return to individual farmers, so that the largest farmers would not necessarily receive larger payments than the smaller farmers. This is a realistic observation because idealistically they are trying to save and improve the conditions of the smaller farmer primarily.

In the last edition of the Western Producer, it's interesting to note that a full page ad was put in this paper by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool with a resolution similar to the one I have just stated by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, that the Government of Canada guarantee a minimum of \$2.12 per bushel for the announced goal of 1,300,000,000 bushels of export wheat over the next three-year period. This paper shows that the resolution wasn't drawn up by a small-core group of people speaking only for agriculture. It came from farmers who were Pool members, to the committee men, to the district delegates, to the annual meeting, to the board of directors, to the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and they say that it's time for action. I would

suggest that the time for action is somewhat in the past. However, they are trying to bring before the governments of Canada that we cannot as farmers tolerate the situation much longer. I just want to read a bit of what they put in this advertisement making, and trying to make, the people of Saskatchewan aware of what the situation is in regard to the farming industry:

The resolution was presented to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture at its annual meeting recently in Quebec City. It was concise and to the point and readily passed by the delegates. The resolution or the idea of it was nothing new to many of them, for they had been around when it first started to take shape in the Prairie Provinces many months ago. The idea expressed in the resolution was generated in discussions among farmers throughout Saskatchewan. Then there was the consideration by numerous Saskatchewan Wheat Pool local committees at the district delegates' level. The subject was on the agenda of the Pool Annual Delegates meeting and it was passed, thus becoming Pool policy. From there a resolution on the price topic went to the Pool board of directors and a decision was made to carry it forth to the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. Endorsed there it also received favorable consideration at the Western Agricultural Conference. Next stop was the Canadian Federation of Agriculture where backing was also achieved. The proposal will be carried forward to the Canadian Federation of Agricultural policy and a strong representation will be made to the Federal Cabinet in March to have it implemented. This far-reaching and important motion was once an idea that originated amongst farmers on the Prairies, but it quickly gained momentum and it became policy and was carried by their spokesmen, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Producers thus have a concrete example of what is possible when they work through the organization.

But what it definitely points out is that the entire farming community is now desperate and is in much need of this guaranteed income to that segment of society.

There have been other voices that have brought forward similar proposals, but these are the two most predominant and the larger voices speaking on behalf of Western agriculture, and I bring only them to your attention. They, you will see, do not differ basically from the Resolution which I have introduced to this Assembly.

The most recognized voices of spokesmen for farming will agree that the acceptance of such a resolution will be a step in the right direction towards alleviating the unbearable pressures being carried by the Western farmers at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Just in winding up, Mr. Speaker, it has been conclusively proved that the majority of farms cannot survive on a 6-bushel per acre quota at a \$2 per bushel price. Consequently some desired boost is needed to the farmer if he is going to survive in this province. It has been shown that, until the last year or two, all members of the agricultural industry with the exception of the farmer have been continuing to increase

March 6, 1969

profits yearly. When we take into consideration what agriculture does for the economic climate of Canada, the facts are that it purchases petroleum in excess of \$146 million, machinery and repairs in the excess of \$300 million yearly, fertilizer and pesticides and chemicals in excess of \$90 million yearly, and that in this province, half of the total income of the people of Saskatchewan is derived from the people in the agricultural field or persons engaged in the agricultural industry or its related industry, that 22 per cent of our manufacturing industry use raw materials from farm origins, that 20 per cent of the gross value of factory shipments are made from farm products. I could go on, and on and on, Mr. Speaker. But if we are to maintain this industry and in turn maintain other industries desirable to Western Canada and Canada as a whole, we have to accept the fact that the farmer's income has to be increased so that he may be able to survive as a farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members of this Assembly give due consideration to this Resolution. I'm sure that they will realize the importance of it. I hope that they will be in a position to support it so that the farmer of Saskatchewan will be put in an economic position to continue his present operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I have limited comments that I want to make today and that I would like to have the opportunity to express in more detail those things which have already been said by my hon. colleague from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who has made a very good contribution towards the development of the Resolution which is presented.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

RESOLUTION NO. 3 — INTRODUCING STUDENT GROUPS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):

That this House request Mr. Speaker to introduce all student groups sitting in the galleries before the Orders of the Day are entered into, and should the House be in a Committee of the Whole, request the Deputy Speaker to perform the same function.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Bon jour, Mr. Speaker, this being Education Week, I think it's very appropriate to speak about the introduction of students to this Chamber.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — It could very well go down as the day or the session

that the introduction of students by Members was discontinued. I want to say a few words about that in the meantime. I'll take a little time and as usual I haven't got my speech written out so I'll just do it this way.

I want to say that I'm very disappointed that such a Resolution has been brought before the House. Even the thought of it, I didn't think a Member would come out of hibernation and make a motion like this, but it's to be expected when a situation like that happens — kind of grumpy, growling. I want to say that we're going to spend more time debating this Resolution than the time that it takes to introduce the students.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I think it's a plain silly move. I know that we do spend a lot of time in this Chamber thrashing chaff and straw as a lot of it has no meaning. When it comes to introducing the students, I wonder whom the job properly belongs to. If someone comes from a constituency, it's only proper for the Member from that constituency to do the introducing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I have no objection to the Speaker saying a few words of welcome after the students have been introduced. I think this would be quite proper. I know many of you who don't want to introduce students, perhaps you would sooner stay sitting down and dozing away. That's not what you're paid for. You're paid to come here and stay awake. If you would only look up when these students are being introduced and see the smiles on their faces — the communication. Many of these students who come to the building have never seen it before. They are impressed with the grounds. They are impressed with the buildings. When they come into the galleries they are impressed with the Chamber, and they are impressed with being introduced by their own MLA . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . for those who know their MLA.

You know, when this question came up, I did a little research. On two or three occasions I walked amongst a bunch of students. I'd say, "Well, what constituency do you come from?" and they'd say, "I don't know." "Who is your Member?" "I don't know." It happened that from three constituencies the pupils did not know their Member and I'm going to name two of them in the House today. They are the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) who moved the Resolution. I can understand why he doesn't want to get up in the House. He doesn't want to be known. If he ever introduces a group of students, they'd say, "Who is that fellow, we don't know him." His students said that, and I could even give him the day it was, but I'm not going to dwell too much on that. It's very important for the Member to get up in the House and introduce the students.

Mr. Gallagher: — Who's the third one, Art?

March 6, 1969

Mr. Thibault: — He's a very good Member and he hasn't been in the House very long. He's from your side, so don't ask.

I was amazed, you know, that in every group of students I interviewed — I didn't interview very many. I don't go chasing around. Once I had interviewed about six groups, I thought that was enough — the students that came from this side of the House all knew their Members, so I cannot make any reproach there. I think it is because I've been telling them to get acquainted with their schools and their students, because after all, if all we do here in introducing the students, leaving the fun aside, is to make these young people interested in our Government, we will have done something.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — This is Education Week. The other day there was a remark made in the House about the three-cornered hat of the Speaker. Now, I wasn't too upset about that, but with all due respect when I got back home, the questions I got about it. They did not know that some wore garb and wore a tricorn, and so on. I had a lot of questions to answer. You just don't know how educational that was. They heard it over the radio. I have several letters that I'm going to read to you today and it'll show you what it means to students to be introduced by their Member. I'm going to give you my opinions as I go by and then we'll talk about the time involved.

Now in 1968 we had 170 introductions. I'm not talking about the introductions that we had today, Senators, the soccer champions. We may have some more champions, that's all right, that's beside the point. We're talking only about the students. Last year I estimated the amount of time that it took the Legislature to introduce the students. Allowing 40 seconds per introduction, you had 171 introductions which took in the neighborhood of two hours. Two hours for thousands of students and we cannot get off our seats to say a word of welcome. You know it's a sad day. I would like the Members opposite to consider this on a non-political basis. I've spoken in my constituency on the question of the tours through the Legislature. There is one thing that I have assured my people, that at no time will I play politics with these tours. At no time will I mention politics when I introduce the students. You can check the records and never did I do this because these children come from every political belief.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — To be fair to all my people in my constituency when I got up to introduce the students, I talked about their home, their teacher and their trip and so on, and tried to do it within 40 seconds. Check the records, I never mentioned politics, never mentioned the bad roads or anything like that, straight introduction. Why should we, because of those who do make politics of it, be just wiped out. When people visit my home, I don't go and get somebody from the neighborhood to come and introduce my family and my wife. We don't do that. Well, all right, the proper one to introduce these students, I say, is the Member where they come from.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now we'll start from today and work backwards and I'll give you the names and the time that it took to introduce the students. Today, Mr. Coupland (Meadow Lake), 85 seconds; Mr. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South), 60 seconds; Mr. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair), 75 seconds; Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale), 45 seconds; the Member for Elrose, Mr. Leith, 30 seconds; the Member for Nutana Centre, Mr. Estey, 40 seconds; Mr. MacDonald (Milestone), 65 seconds, for a total of six minutes, 40 seconds.

Then we go back to March 5, Mr. Estey, 18 seconds; Mr. . . . well, I'll read it quicker if I just say, 18 seconds. I congratulate him, he broke the record. Mr. Smishek, if you'll excuse me, we'll get through it faster, I'll just read the names. If the Speaker wants me to identify each one by constituency because I'm going back practically since the session started. Smishek, 40 seconds; Whelan, 38 seconds; Mr. MacDonald, 45 seconds; Roy Romanow, 30 seconds. That was March 5, for a total of two minutes, 51 seconds.

Now another one here. Mr. Gardner, 30 seconds; Mr. Estey, 27 seconds. Say, Mr. Estey (Nutana Centre) has a good record. Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan), 60 seconds — one minute . . . well, he doesn't do it very often so it takes him longer. Mr. Forsyth, 28 seconds, the Member for Nutana South. For a total of two minutes, 15 seconds.

March 3 . . .

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Tell us how long Henry took.

Mr. Thibault: — This is to show you that I've kept track and I've made research if you're complaining about the time. This is what you're arguing about in your Resolution, to save the time in the House. This time is well spent, Mr. Speaker. It's well spent and I'm going to spend enough time to try and drive it home that we should continue the practice, a practice that we have had since I came to this House and I want to prove also that the time is not being abused, Mr. Speaker.

I'll just read the time, I'll shorten it up, I know you people are in a hurry. I got a bunch of letters to read so they'll all take a while.

Now, March 3 it took one minute, 33 seconds. On February 27 it took two minutes, 10 seconds. On February 26, oh, that's the day that the Member for Souris-Estevan spoke and his kids didn't turn up. He spoke a whole bunch of nonsense. It took him 70 seconds with no kids in the gallery. You can understand why you'd bring a Resolution like that in. I think he woke up and thought he had kids in the gallery. They weren't there, then he realized they weren't in town. Well, so, all right.

Here's one, February 25, I don't want to leave the Leader of the Opposition out. He took 65 seconds; Davies, 75 seconds; MacDougall (Souris-Estevan), 90 seconds. A minute and one half. I think he had the kids there that day and he spoke the longest that's ever been spoken. He must like the job because he went a

March 6, 1969

long time. We took five minutes, 10 seconds that day.

Monday, February 24, it took four minutes, 10 seconds, Lumsden, Redberry, Shellbrook, Regina and Saskatoon Mayfair. The record for that day was held by Mr. Brockelbank for 35 seconds.

February 21, we had three introductions that day that took 4½ minutes. We had the Member's from Yorkton (the kids that didn't know who their Member was) make a little political speech and his children did not know him. He should spend more time at home there and get acquainted with his kids. Then he got up like what my dad used to refer to 'like a jumping jack' and bounced around and tried to find some reason for not introducing the students. Well, I can understand fellows like that, not wanting to introduce them.

The next day, we have here, three minutes, 22 seconds. On February 19, five minutes, 11 seconds. You know this is getting kind of dry. We'll speed it up here. The next one, February 18, four minutes, five seconds. February 17, well, there's one that broke another record here. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana), 33 seconds, but Mr. Hooker from Notukeu-Willowbunch, of course I don't hit him too hard, he doesn't get them too often. It took him 110 seconds. We have a record broken here again, February 13, students — Mr. Charlebois from City Park University took 20 seconds. Congratulations! Forsyth, Nutana South, 25 seconds for a total of 45 seconds. That was a record day. You try and convince these fellows that don't know how to do it out there and it would take less time.

Now another one here of February 7; Mr. Meakes, 35 seconds; Weatherald, 35 seconds; Leith of Elrose, 30 seconds for a total of two minutes and 37 seconds. Now on February 6, we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven introductions for 5½ minutes. Now in many cases you have one person that introduces two or three groups so we have to make a few allowances. Now we have February 5, the Member for Yorkton again. He took 56 seconds, almost one minute. He did better at first than he is doing now. Lumsden (Mr. Heald), 75 seconds, but even though he makes a little speech I don't even quarrel with him. If he wants to do that, that's fine. If a few others want to make some speeches, that is okay with me, as it doesn't offend me at all. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now call it 5:30.

The House recessed at 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Thibault: — Mr. Speaker, I was proceeding before supper with a little bit of research that I have made. I have two more days that I kept a record of. February 5, the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) took 56 seconds; the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald) took 75 seconds and the Member from Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) took 42 seconds; the Member for Rosetown (Mr. Loken) took 25 seconds, for a total of 3 minutes and 17 seconds on that day.

On February 4, it took one minute and 40 seconds with the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) taking the record for that day with 20 seconds. Out of 23 days that we have had, I kept track of 18 days. It took 63 minutes to introduce students in this House until now. Now if you want to add a few minutes to that, we could say that we have taken 70 minutes introducing students so far. I think that that is a very small

price to pay to interest our young people in the Government and in seeing the procedures. As I said a moment ago, when you see the interest in these young people and the kind of letters that they will write back to the Member — and I am sure that you fellows across the way have letters — that indicate how much they appreciate the tour of this building. Time and time again the introduction by the Member is referred to. I would rather not bore you with the reading of a whole bunch of letters, I will quote from some parts of them. If you want me to table the letters I can do that without any objection. These letters are very precious because they are personal, but nevertheless if they need to be tabled I will table them.

Mr. Speaker: — By the rules of the House the Member for Kinistino doesn't have to table them. He can take full complete responsibility for the letters and a bona fide signature at the bottom thereof or table them.

Mr. Thibault: — I will take full responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) is very worried. I have a letter that is a Xeroxed copy. It is a thank you card. And you should see it, all the little notes of individual students that wrote. One is written in French:

I enjoyed the trip to Regina very much. Thank you very much.

Philip Georges.

Another one:

Dear Mr. Thibault:

It was a great experience for me to hear our dear MLA speaking in the Legislative Assembly. Thank you and congratulations.

Allan . . .

Mr. MacDonald: — Your wife . . .

Mr. Thibault: — I haven't got any in Ukrainian.

An Hon. Member: — You got any Welsh?

Mr. Thibault: —

Dear Mr. Thibault:

I have enjoyed every minute of the trip to Regina. I thank you for making it possible.

Donald . . .

Now I'm not going to read all the letters, but there is one letter that I want you to listen to and it applies to both sides of the House. There is a lesson to be learned. I will quote from one letter from a school teacher, Ike Gillard from Crystal Springs. There is one part that I want to read. It is very complimentary all the way until he gets to this spot. This was

March 6, 1969

written in 1967.

We were impressed by the appearance of the Legislative Chambers, but we were a bit disappointed with the behavior of some of the Legislative Members. The student body did not appreciate their apparent lack of respect for Parliamentary procedure, lack of sincerity shown for Provincial business and a lack of respect and courtesy shown each other. This negative behavior creates a bad impression.

And he goes on about the RCMP barracks and how they appreciated all the rest. This school teacher talked about his students and the way they felt about the Chambers. This is two years ago. He wrote another letter the other day after he got back home. I am going to read the whole thing. Quite an improvement:

Dear Art:

Sorry to be so late in expressing my thanks to you for our trip to Regina. My excuse is not too good for being so tardy, however, we are tied up with salary negotiations and it seems to be an exercise in futility. We are becoming quite alarmed with the trend that negotiations have taken this year. I believe that the tour that you mapped out for us this year was better than the previous one, for it permitted more time in each stop. As you know we were unable to visit the steel mill due to bus trouble. This, of course, was a disappointment, however, by foresaking the steel mill we were able to get on schedule at the Natural History Museum. The Museum continues to be of tremendous interest. This year we were permitted to see specimens being prepared for displays. These preparations proved to be very interesting to our students.

Our dinner at the legislative cafeteria was appreciated and enjoyed. We had been on the road since 4:00 a.m. You are a splendid host. The youngsters will long remember your generosity. Miss Bender was a splendid guide. Her explanations and description on the exhibits shown to the students were greatly appreciated. Our time in the Legislature gallery was very educational for all of the students. It was the first time that the students were impressed by the joviality and sincerity of the MLAs. One student said, "It is the same as we see on the Quentin Durgen show." Personally I am very pleased at the way the MLAs behaved. It was a lesson in good citizenship. Two years ago our students were thoroughly disgusted with the procedures, but this year they considered their stay a real pleasure and a privilege. I wish you would convey my appreciation for a sincere performance to all the Members of the Assembly.

That, I am doing at this time.

From the Legislative Buildings we went to the RCMP barracks. Our stay at the barracks was far too short to see the teaching method and to hear the corporal's choice of description to our students, amazing, unbelievable and to some shocking. Our young people now realize that being pampered ends when one leaves home. Personally I believe all the students, male and female, would profit from such a training for a few weeks each year. It would

give them greater self-confidence.

The exhibits in the Museum with close scrutiny clearly illustrated the work that the police have been doing and continue to do, in spite of dangers and hardships to make our country the best place to live in. The Museum tells all about the RCMP, the faithful defenders of our rights and privileges. The tour was a total success. In another two years I may have another opportunity to visit you in your Capital City again. I say Art, you are a fine host. We enjoyed the tour thoroughly and thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I could give you a lot of letters but I am not going to bother reading the letters all the way through. I want to tell the Members here what actually I do to organize these tours. That teacher gave me the job of lining it up and you can do the same. Every bit of that tour is precious, and I have worked over the schedule of that tour for ten years, improving it every year.

They leave home at about five o'clock. We make arrangements with the filling station on the way so that there will be somebody there to fuel the bus. They arrive at the steel mill at 9:30 in the morning. After they visit the steel mill, they are down at the Museum of Natural History at 10:45. From there they come to the Legislative Building and they have their dinner in the cafeteria. Then they tour the building. They proceed to the galleries at 2:20. They leave the galleries at 3:15. They arrive at the RCMP barracks at 4:00 o'clock. You see we keep them busy.

The introduction of the students is part of the tour and, if some of you want to take a lesson in getting our youngsters interested, then there is a job for you to do. Get our young people interested in government. This is what I worked on. Get them interested in our Legislature, show them that they are important and they will be better citizens for it. But you people, well there is a very bad situation with the students at the present time, and refusing to introduce students in the Legislature doesn't make the condition better. It makes it worse. I want to read the last letter that I received from one of the students. The previous one was from a teacher; this one is from a student from Crystal Springs. This is from Miss Margery McLeod, Dixon Lake high school.

On behalf of the students of Dixon Lake school I wish to express my sincere thanks to you for arranging our tour to the Parliament Buildings, the citadel of Regina, the Museum of Natural History and the RCMP barracks. Unfortunately we were unable to visit the Interprovincial Steel Mill due to transportation difficulties but such circumstances cause alterations. The entire tour was most enjoyable and knowledgeable to our inquisitive minds. These tours give students a chance to see how our country operates and help us to develop an opinion of our own.

Would you kindly thank our guide, Miss Bender, for her assistance and aid in the tour of the buildings. I would also like to thank you for the fantastic meal which we were treated to. It was appreciated very much and was

March 6, 1969

most considerate of you.

Once again, I thank you for the interest and co-operation in dealing with the young generation of Saskatchewan.

This is a little girl who is writing this. I will defend my right to be able to introduce the students in these galleries. I hope that I have not spent my time here this evening in not trying to prove my point. I hope that you will reconsider your position on this Resolution. Therefore, to give you a little time to think it over, I will move an amendment. I think that it is a very small price to pay to spend two hours every session towards enabling our young people — they are in the thousands who have visited these buildings, not in the hundreds but in the thousands — to come in this House and admire the proceedings and to give the Member from their constituency a chance to say a few words. I will move, seconded by Mr. Whelan, in amendment thereto:

That all the words after the word “House” where it appears in the first line be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

“request the Special Committee on Procedures of the House to study the procedure of introducing students in this House.”

I have plenty of copies and I have it signed.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), has made a good case. In view of the fact that we will have a Committee studying the procedures in this House, I think that the amendment is a good one. It will give the Committee ample opportunity to study a procedure that will do what the Hon. Member would like to have done, that is give each Member of each constituency an opportunity to introduce the students. I am fully in favor of the amendment and I hope that all Members of the House will agree with it. I think that referral to the Committee is a good idea and it will give the Committee an excellent chance to study the proposal.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have just one or two comments that I would like to make. I was interested in the Member’s long dissertation on why he should introduce his own students and to those Members that he referred to where the students didn’t know the name of the Member, I would ask them not to be too down-hearted about that. I can recall about 10 years or more ago in the House we had a similar discussion on this and someone raised the question at the time and brought a press clipping in from the city of Weyburn in which the principal was going through the exercise of asking students in grade 12 about the political leaders and their responsibilities and so forth. To their amazement some of the students didn’t even know the sitting Member of Weyburn who at the time was the Premier of the Province.

I have no objection to the amendment. I have no objection to the discussion that just went on. I think it is a matter that probably could be referred to the Committee. I would like to look into this and perhaps I might have a suggestion or two that I would like to make in this regard. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RETURN NO. 37

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair) for Return No. 37 showing:

The name, address, position, monthly salary or wage rate of each person appointed by Order-in-Council to the staff of a department, agency, board, commission or other branch of the Government service since February 23, 1965.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few observations that I would like to make on this request on this Motion for Return. It asks for name, address, position, monthly salary or wage rate of each person appointed by Order-in-Council to the staff of a department, agency, board, commission or other branch of the Government services since February 23, 1965. Now that is four years. I had this looked into and I was advised that during that period of over a little four years, there have been about 10,000 Orders-in-Council passed or 9,500, something like that. I have been advised by the Executive Council that in order to establish the information which is requested in this Return it would require a very large undetermined number of hours to sort out all of these Orders-in-Council which are not relative to employment in order to ascertain those which are. I have also been advised by the Executive Council that they do not have this extra staff available. It would, therefore, necessitate the bringing of outside staff. I am also advised that any person or Member that desires to contact the Executive Council Office and request to be advised whether or not a person is employed by Order-in-Council appointment, they can then contact the Public Service Commission which would in turn be able to supply them with the present salary, address, etcetera.

I am further advised, Mr. Speaker, of course as all Hon. Members know the Public Accounts are published annually in which are shown the name and earnings of every employee, and at least three-fourths of the information asked for in this Return would be available to March 31, 1968 in the Public Accounts. In addition to that the Report of the Public Service Commission which is tabled in the Legislature provides information as to the number of Order-in-Council appointments by departments and lists the various position by title. Of course, the Orders-in-Council are all available. Copies can be provided to Hon. Members. What I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this information each and every bit of it, is available to Hon. Members. I am really asking Hon. Members opposite not to persist in this Motion because of the great amount of time that would be involved in the Public Service in getting the information. I think that it would be a great cost to the taxpayers of the province. This of course, Mr. Speaker, is not in itself a justification for refusing information, but in light of what I have said, I suggest to you in all sincerity that this information is now available by the means that I have indicated to you and, therefore, it is the judgment of the Government that this added expense is not necessary.

In referring to the matter I would refer you back to a

March 6, 1969

debate last year, in the Journals of last year's Debates and Proceedings, in which there was a discussion about a Return asking for this kind of information for a several-month period I think that it was for about five or six months. At that time the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) was objecting to the position of the Government taken by the Minister of Agriculture. The main point that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South was making was that he agreed that, if a lot of time was involved, probably the Government would be right in not accepting the Return. He used the words, he was talking about a question that was asked or a motion that was asked for several years before, and in that case the Government of the day of which he was a Member turned it down because several years were involved. So I suggest to you that here you are asking for information for a period of over four years, information which you can get in other ways. I am inviting you to agree with me, with the position of the Government in this case. The extra expense to the taxpayers would not be justified and, therefore, I would ask you to defeat this Motion.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I can find some sympathy for the comments for the Attorney General in this particular question, but I think that it should be noted at this time that in 1965 a Return was tabled in this House and it is Sessional Paper No. 68.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks of the Attorney General, and I would suggest to him that this information was provided to the House before by the previous Government. I am sure that I recall information in depth for many years being provided when Members of the Opposition in that day asked for it.

Mr. Heald: — They did and sometimes it was turned down.

Mr. Davies — Well, if you can tell me when it was given and when it was turned down you will amplify your arguments. But you haven't done it up until now. The point here, of course, is that the positions that were appointed by Order-in-Council are not identified as far as I can see in the Public Accounts. Now I am astounded to hear the Attorney General say that one of the reasons why this information cannot be provided is that there have been about 10,000 Orders-in-Council in the last four or five years and it is impossible to segregate the information that is desired from these Orders-in-Council. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, if there is not now a procedure for making this kind of separation, that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and his colleagues had better institute it, because what should now happen is that the Public Service Commission should be provided with a copy of every Order-in-Council appointment so they can supply you with this information when you want it. The argument that there is a great mass of Orders-in-Council that you have to thumb through in order to identify Order-in-Council appointments to agencies and departments, boards, etc. is to me simply ridiculous. I say that, if you haven't got a procedure for making that identification and separation, you had better do it because . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — . . . well, whether we did it or not, we at least provided the information, Mr. Attorney General, when we were asked for it. And that's my point. And you are now refusing to do it. And some of you have been here for very brief periods. Mr. Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) you weren't here for very long. Some of us were here. I'm sure that they can remember this that, when information was asked for periods of 10 years, not just half of that period as here. I'm saying that this is information germane and important to the public of Saskatchewan. They have a right to know how many people are being appointed apart from the procedures of the Public Service Commission that the former Government established. I think that the information that is being asked for is not as voluminous or as hard to extract, as the Attorney General would like to have us believe. I for one do not accept his reasons.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — One additional point, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General, the reference that was made to the possibility of Members of this House going to Public Accounts for the purpose of searching out this kind of information, I would suggest to him, is less than worthless when you consider the fact that there is no way where Members can decide the people that are noted in Public Accounts as to whether they were appointed by Order-in-Council or some other process. So really this is a bit of subterfuge in that connection.

An Hon. Member: — It only gives the position and there is no way to link up the position and the names.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Attorney General, I don't think this question is out of order or will cause too much difficulty or too much work. I know that in the period when I worked in the Public Service Commission, every Order-in-Council was recorded, every Order-in-Council for the services that were attached to the Government, with the exception of Crown corporations. I fail to see where there is any extra work. I'm sure a girl could do this in one afternoon in the Public Service Commission, if you still have records as we used to keep them.

Mr. Heald: — I'll pay . . .

Mr. Baker: — I don't know whether you have changed the procedure since you've gone in. Someone else must be looking after these Orders-in-Council or then you are hiding them. What for? The facts that every Order-in-Council was recorded in the Public Service Commission, because I had to look up the names for questions that were asked in this House when the former Government was in office. I cannot for the life of me see what's wrong with giving us this information.

Mr. Heald: — You can ask for a copy of every Order-in-Council if you want it.

Mr. Baker: — They are all listed in the Public Service Commission

March 6, 1969

by name, salary and so forth. This is what Mr. Brockelbank is asking and I don't see why we are keeping them secret. Have you appointed so many by Order-in-Council that you are afraid to tell us? Perhaps you have 5,000 more employees on than we had before. Why hide it? I'm not criticizing you. If it is not in the Commission office, it should be there. I don't think that we in this House should be denied this information. When I worked for the Government, every session somebody asked what I was doing and how much money was I earning.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — You people got the information. If Mr. Thatcher was here, he will remember that was his favorite question. How much was I making?

Mr. Heald: — I can't see it, I can't see it.

Mr. Baker: — Well, I did an awful lot of work, I kept the Government in office anyway.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — However, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is not such a gigantic job that it cannot be done within a half day.

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, this question is rather superfluous and I say it in all sincerity. Every Order-in-Council that is passed by the Government of Saskatchewan is a public document. Every Member on that side of the House can merely walk through that door and into the office of the Legislative Clerk, where the Orders-in-Council are available. He can pick up every single copy of every Order-in-Council that has been passed since this Government took office. As far as I am concerned the purpose of a question or an Order for Return in the Assembly of this House is to provide information to Members of the Assembly that is not normally available under normal channels. Not only can they get this information, but it is public information. Now they are turning around and saying because we are too lazy, because we are too busy, because we don't want to sort through all the Orders-in-Council, that we want the taxpayers to provide the civil servants to provide the time and the effort and the money to do their work for them. When I want some information that is public information that's available to everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan, to every Member of the Assembly, I am not going to ask the Government or the Civil Service to do that for me. Mr. Speaker, this is public information, it is not a question that should be asked at all.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that not only that, Mr. Speaker, that's why we provided this extra money for the Members opposite . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . because we wanted them

to improve the research that they had in their office for Members of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, over the years they refused to provide this service to the Opposition. We wanted to provide them with the money and the funds and the research staff so that they would be able to provide a decent and respectable and intelligent Opposition. Those funds or those documents are available, they just have to send that research man that we are paying for, the taxpayers and the Government into the public documents where they are available and he can have them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, who just sat down, I am very pleased to have the comment which the Minister has made, that I can go in and pick up the Orders-in-Council and go through them, all of them. When I try to do that, I don't want the Minister's staff, or the Premier's staff to tell me that I can't go through these.

Mr. MacDonald: — You got two today you asked for.

Mr. Blakeney: — I did indeed, but I didn't go through them. I asked for them. The staff retained the right to go through their index, and this is how I've always been treated. I'm perfectly happy to have that arrangement except that the Minister now says that I have other rights. He now says that I can go in and look at all those Orders-in-Council. I propose to exercise that right and I propose to go in and say, "I want the 10,000, I want the 10,000," and I'll go through them. This is a very interesting right which we haven't up until this time had as far as I am aware. I think it will be a very destructive right, because it seems to me if you get members of the public going in and asking, "Can I see 10,000 Orders-in-Council?" you are going to raise a fair amount of chaos in the office of the Executive Council. However, that's the way you want it.

Hon. Mr. Heald: — You'll do it responsibly . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I'll do it responsibly, but how much more responsible would it have been when these Orders-in-Council which are asked for are already segregated. The point here is that there are 10,000 Orders-in-Council in the last five years; there may be 200 in answer to the question: those 200 are already identified, selected and on file with the Public Service Commission. Now the Members opposite say, "We will not tell you what's on the files of the Public Service Commission. You go and look through the 10,000 yourself." This on the grounds of efficiency. Now I think that this is a pretty picayune position for the Government to take. It knows what is there. It knows that they are all segregated at the Public Service Commission. For example, as the Minister says, I got a couple today. I went in and asked the clerk for them and she said: "These have to do with Crown corporations. I won't go through this enormous index, I will simply call up the Government Finance Office, where they are separately indexed and get the numbers," which she did and therefore she had them for me in a little less than no time. Now, it would have taken her or me a day or two to get them, because she doesn't have that index and neither do I. But the Government Finance Office does. Now in response to this question,

March 6, 1969

the staff at the Executive Council will not have that index. I will not have that index, but the Public Service Commission does. What the Government is saying is, "Notwithstanding the fact that this index is available at the Public Service Commission, we will not give it to you. There are 10,000 orders there, go look at them, pick out your own 200." notwithstanding the fact that the Orders are all segregated there and could be given in a half an hour. Now the Government can take this position if it likes, but I think it is a pretty, pretty picayune position. Well, is the Minister saying that the Public Service Commission does not now keep the index which they used to keep?

Mr. Heald: — I am saying it will take a lot of time to give you what you want.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I find that remarkable. As I say the indexes for the Crown corporations' Orders, of which would be 100 or so over this period, they could give me, I know because I used to keep that index, I could give it to you in 15 minutes, and I am surprised that the Public Service Commission is so inefficient that what could be done by one agency in 15 minutes is going to take them a day or two. Mr. Estey ought to look into this, the Member for Nutana Centre, if in fact his staff have reached that level of inefficiency.

Mr. Heald: — . . . They will be glad to hear that you think they are inefficient.

Mr. Blakeney: — I want, Mr. Speaker, to refer the House to the fact that, let us say in February, 1964, there was a Return No. 67 in this Legislature of that time, Sessional Paper No. 67. This one answered a question by Mr. Thatcher for the name, position, and annual rate of salary of each person appointed by Order-in-Council to the Public Service of the Province during the fiscal year of 1961-62 and the fiscal year 1962-63. That's two years and it seemed to cause no great difficulty. I don't remember any great upheaval in the Public Service Commission in getting this information.

Mr. Heald: — Public Service . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — No, this says, "To the Public Service of the Province of Saskatchewan."

Mr. Heald: — It is a much wider one.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well now this just says Public Service. It doesn't say by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Heald: — Departments, agencies, boards, and commissions.

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh, I see. So I take it then that the Minister wouldn't have any objection if a Motion for Return was worded in this way because it seems to me that, if the objection is based upon the fact that it refers to other boards and commissions,

that can be fairly effectively met by referring to the Public Service. But my basic point is that this information, at least so far as the Public Service Commission is concerned, is on the files of the Public Service Commission. It can be picked off promptly unless the records have been changed. It is available quickly and I think it is picayune and a pretty poor show on the part of the Government to refuse this and to take the position of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) saying, "Okay, there are the 10,000, pick them out."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — I'm probably out of order, yes.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! When the Member has spoken once . . .

Mr. Heald: — If you would like to make that amendment I think that would be acceptable.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) has suggested an amendment and for the life of me I can't see what difference it would make. The present Order says, "Appointed by Order-in-Council through the staff of a department, agency, board, commission or other branch of the Government service. The proposal is that we substitute "Public Service." The Public Service doesn't include the department, agency, board, commission or other branch of the Government service, I'd like to know what it does mean. Since the Government is indicating its willingness to accept the Resolution substituting those words then I shall be very happy to move:

That all the words after "staff" in line two be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"of the Public Service of the Government of Saskatchewan since February 23, 1965."

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad we are going to get this information. I'm sorry if we appear to be suspicious about some of the appointments that may take place by Order-in-Council. I was just thinking and running my mind back over some names that I have heard in Order-in-Council appointments and there is one, Mr. Bierschenk, now I'm not sure who he was, but I think he was the bagman for the Member for Lumsden or something of this nature. Very dedicated man I understand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And then there is another man. I'd be interested in knowing if he is in the Public Service and was unable to pass the tests that people normally go through to get into the Public Service and this is Mr. McKerral. I don't know if he is in or not but it happens that . . .

Mr. Heald: — Ask the Member for Regina

March 6, 1969

Centre (Mr. Blakeney) if he knows him?

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . he happened to be the Liberal opponent of the Member for Regina Centre. Then there is another name that came to my mind, Mr. Speaker. I understand he is buried somewhere in the liquor vat in this province, a Mr. Kleefeld, the Liberal opponent of the Member from Regina North West. I just want to check up on these things. You've made us suspicious and, if we are denied this kind of information, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the public can only conclude that the Government is trying to hide something. I'm quite willing to submit to the . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . amendment, Mr. Speaker. It will get some of the information that we were aiming at and I therefore support the amended motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 43

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino) for Return No. 43 showing:

With respect to payments to physicians under the schedule of fees of the Medical Care Insurance Commission, since May 22, 1964: (a) the dates on which general increases in the schedule went into effect; (b) the estimated dollar value; and (c) the percentage rate of increase in each case.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. Grant:

That all the words after the word "showing" be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

"With respect to the Schedule of Fees of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan: (a) whether there has been a general increase in this schedule since 1959; (b) if so, the dates the increases became effective; (c) whether any increases became effective between 1959 and July 1, 1962, and, if so, the estimated annual dollar increase; (d) the percentage rate of increase; (e) the estimated annual dollar increase to the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission of any increases effective since July 1, 1962; (f) the percentage rate of increase; (g) the average annual percentage rate of increase per year since 1959; and (h) the average annual percentage rate of increase since July 1, 1962."

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this the other evening because the amendment was somewhat lengthy and we hadn't had a chance to look at it. On examination, it appears that it does give the information in the main which the original motion sought to get. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the

amendment, if it is passed, since it is moved by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) presumably it will be, will give us the schedule of fees for the College of Physicians and Surgeons since 1959. In other words we will have the rates of pay for them. In light of our effort to get rates of pay for other groups of people, this is interesting. The amendment also offers to give us what I called the other evening, the collective bargaining agreement between the Medical Care Insurance Commission and the College of Physicians and Surgeons and this is interesting too in the light of other events. However, we are glad to see the Government adopt a precedent in this respect and so we are prepared to accept the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — I'd like to clarify a point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh, he moved the amendment, he has spoken once, he can't speak again, I'm sorry. It was his amendment in the first place.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

RETURN NO. 53

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood) for Return No. 53 showing:

The average weighted cost in cents per cubic yard of the 34,593,646 cubic yards of earth moved in 1967 by Government crews in regard to (a) earth excavation (compaction); (b) earth excavation (non-compaction); (i) including northern roads; (ii) excluding northern roads; and (c) earth excavation (combined compaction and non-compaction); (i) including northern roads; (ii) excluding northern roads.

Amendment proposed by Mr. Dewhurst: That the figures "1967" in the second line be deleted and the figures "1968" be substituted therefor.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the Member that moved this motion and I thinking he is seeking information from 1968 instead of 1967 and I would agree that if he wants 1968 information that I'm not opposed to it, but he would have to move the amendment.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, the 1967 date is correct. I had raised this question with the Member when he first submitted the question. I thought that he had the wrong date in there. But he is referring to the dirt which was moved in 1967. He has the figure here of 37 million cubic yards. That figure refers to 1967 and this is information he is seeking, I think. No, pardon me.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I believe from discussions of my seatmate here, and in conjunction with what the Minister has said that

March 6, 1969

the word "1967" should be "1968" and in order to get it into line as to what he wants and not of the mover of the debate, I would move:

That the figures "1967" in the second line be deleted and the figures "1968" be substituted therefor.

Amendment agree to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROVINCIAL CONSUMERS' AGENCY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):

That this Assembly, believing that action to help and protect consumers is vital and essential, recommend to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the establishment of a Provincial Consumers' Agency, on lines proposed in February of 1968 by the Batten Commission, that would develop a full and effective program of consumer assistance, education and protection, in conjunction if possible with the Federal Department of Consumer Affairs, and report as often as required to a Standing Committee of the Legislature on Consumer Problems respecting their work; the Committee to be so constituted that it would from time to time sit to receive representations from the public on all matters relating to the welfare of consumers.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) for having placed this Resolution on the Order Paper. It specifically asks for implementation of the Batten Royal Commission Report, organization of a Government agency and a permanent Legislative Committee to hear representations from consumers. Mr. Speaker, a public opinion poll taken in Canada in 1967 asked what was the number one problem of our country. The problem mentioned most often given as the worst thing about living in Canada according to the Gallup poll of that day, and therefore one could deduct as being the number one problem, was listed as the high cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone doubts whether we were worrying about the high cost of living perhaps we should look at the original Order-in-Council dated October 7, 1966, and signed by the Premier of this Province when the Batten Royal Commission was established. Here we are two years and two months later, looking back on the wording of the Order-in-Council which reads, and I quote:

To inquire into the causes of price increases and of the general rise in the cost of living in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta. To investigate specific complaints of major increases in commodity prices. To inquire into the various factors which may have contributed and are now contributing to price increases and to the general rise and the cost of living and including without restricting the generality of the foregoing, such matters as contests,

draws, premiums, sales incentives and other giveaway programs, alleged misleading packaging or false packaging, and lack of standardization in sizes, weights, and contents of packages. To investigate as the Commission deems expedient matters relating to the effects on standards of living or recent price increases of food and other commodities in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, here we sit, two years and two months later twiddling our thumbs doing nothing about the number one problem, according to the people of Canada, about the problem that allows the consumers' pockets to be picked, allows those on fixed incomes to do without life's amenities in order to pay for life's necessities, because the cost of the necessities has risen beyond their means. Oh, sure, we recognize there is a problem, so we raise the pension of retired civil servants. We recognize that hawkers and peddlers fleece consumers sometimes at their doorstep. Good, we recognize it. We recognize that unconscionable contracts are written sometimes. Fine, we recognize it. But meanwhile, the biggest, most widespread pickpocketing of the consumers of Canada goes on unhindered, unimpeded and apparently unnoticed. Does it exist? The Canadian public says that it is their roughest problem. What did the Batten Royal Commission say? Not wild-eyed Socialists, these people. No, not wild-eyed radicals. These people made certain recommendations. What were their recommendations? What were their conclusions? Let's look at some of them. There's the recommendation that the governments of the three provinces with other agencies of the Government of Canada study the cause of inflation. That was one of them. The report said that not only those people receiving fixed incomes, but also those on low income are adversely affected by not being able to secure full participation in the economy. In other words, they are left out. Further that in the retail trade the large chain stores made a higher profit in the five Prairie cities as a percentage of sales and as a percentage of net worth, and they turned their stock more times per year than did the chains in other parts of Canada. They found that the chains made higher profit here than in other parts of Canada and in the United States. They were critical of techniques used in advertising, as they affect the cost of goods purchased by the consumer. Mr. Speaker, they urged the establishment of a Federal Agency, and I quote:

With power to force advertisers to restrain or modify their announcements, when the announcements are unacceptable in terms of honesty, adequacy, taste or such other characteristics that can be agreed upon. They urged the Provincial Government on the Prairies to support consumer groups whose work is designed to aid the consumer to assert himself more effectively in the market place.

Mr. Speaker, the Batten Royal Commission urged the governments of the Prairie Provinces to examine labelling, particularly with a view to proposing legislative action to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of labelling over a wide range of products. The Commission suggested the three Prairie Provinces ask to initiate the establishment of a national committee to study and prepare a program of consumer education to be used in the high schools. Failing success in establishing a national committee, the Commission recommends that a similar committee be established for the Prairie Provinces. They recommend that the Committee be established and set out qualifications of members of the Committee. It states that the program should be developed not

March 6, 1969

only for use in high schools, but also to be made available to adults on some workable basis. They urge support of research in consumer problems, and they recommended that the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs embark at once on the compilation of a handbook for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, they recommend in careful details the organization, objectives and activities of agencies, provincial agencies for consumer protection. Mr. Speaker, the time of the House does not permit me to list in details the many accurate, necessary, worthwhile, and urgent recommendations that were handed to this Government more than a year ago. No one, not even the most reactionary Member of this House would have the nerve to suggest or produce the evidence to substantiate or try to politically argue against the fantastic cost of living that confronts us. The indifference, the callousness, the refusal to organize this agency, the failure of the Government condemns it, identifies it as heartless, and pinpoints the organization of this industrious Royal Commission as nothing more than a stall to hush the justifiable wrathful consumer protests of that day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Give them a Royal Commission to quiet them, they said. They got a Royal Commission. The Royal Commission did its work well. Its recommendations now have been ignored. The agencies that it suggests have not been set up. We have only to walk by a grocery counter to see the ‘four cents off’ sign, the ‘ten cents off’ label to realize the gimmickry, the trickery used in advertising and labelling that was rampant then and is even more rampant now. To ignore this is to deliberately plot against the wishes of the people of this province. Let me quote just one item on packaging from the February 1968 issue of the Consumers’ Report. I quote from page 66:

Candy bars seem to be shrinking in direct inverse ratio to prices. But the wrappers aren’t keeping pace. “Modern packaging” editors recently compared package and product dimensions of a well-known confection. Less than 45 per cent of content by volume including nuts on top was edible. The rest was air.

Every time we pick up a paper we read of the increased profits in the grocery business or in the increase in the cost of living. The Report of the Batten Commission pinpointed the Safeway and Weston chains. Mr. Speaker, why wasn’t there a committee to carry on the work? Why wasn’t there an investigation conducted? Why do we not try to find out who is behind this daylight robbery? Is it because perhaps they are friends of Members opposite, because they have received some political donations from them? Let me give the most recent profit figure for the Canadian portion of the Weston empire. “In 1966 the profits of George Weston Limited of Toronto increased 29.4 per cent to a record of \$19,772,000 according to the Globe and Mail of May 10, 1968.” The same year that this Government ignored the recommendations of a report that pinpointed this company as one of the groups of profiteers responsible for the high cost of living.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — It is all right to say we have introduced a bit of

legislation here, a bit of legislation there. But to ignore the robbers who picked the pockets of every consumer, according to the Batten Report, by refusing to set up this agency is to shirk responsibility. Every few months, a reliable consumer organization reports on tobacco and its effect on health and proves conclusively that cigarettes cause death by cancer. Yet cigarette advertising continues unabated in this country. Why? Because there is no agency of this Government, Mr. Speaker, or for that matter, of the Federal Government to which the victims of this killer, this tobacco, nicotine, have an opportunity to even express their point of view. Automobiles by the thousands are recalled to the factory because the brakes don't work, because the steering mechanism is wrong. They are quietly fixed because they are dangerous to drive. The people who are responsible for selling this defective machine are never called to explain to the public. The public is never given the facts. There is no agency to condemn the manufacturer or to prevent this from happening again. Any of you who have bought children's clothing in this country know the need for the standardization of sizes. You can buy the same size of skates and anyone with small children knows the size of one make will fit, while the same size in another line will not fit the same child. You could buy a size 12 jacket for a boy from one company and it won't fit a 12-year old, because it is too small. Yet one made by another company, size 12 will fit nicely. The whole area of sizes is a jungle where the consumer has no opportunity to state his case and few standards exist.

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (City Park-University): — Try CAC.

Mr. Whelan: — There is a need to specify the exact weight of a product whether it is a foodstuff or a cosmetic. A well-known cosmetic is described in the Consumers' Report of February, 1968, on page 66, and I quote:

Ban Roll-on deodorant comes in three sizes. The one-ounce size is the first of this product introduced by us, from the date of its introduction and continuing to the present time, this size has been known as the large size, one ounce is the large size. Subsequent to the introduction of a one-ounce size, a 1.5 ounce was introduced and this size has been called since its introduction the extra large size. Lastly, the 2.5-ounce size was introduced by us and this size to distinguish it from the other two sizes has been called the giant size. Giant size Ban weights 2.5 ounces.

I wonder what they would call a 3—ounce size.

If ever there was a need to put the weight on foodstuffs and cosmetics and breakfast foods and washing powders, it is in this province where people are constantly buying from the retail shelves without knowing the actual weight of the item they have purchased.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop and think for a moment. If this Royal Commission wasn't organized as a stall to stop the protests against the high cost of living, and if the Members opposite are not in the hip-pocket of the big grocery chains, then the recommendations mean something. Then they are deadly serious and they are saying in effect that the consumer in this province is getting a bad deal. Mr. Speaker, I say to these people, you are the Government, you are the people who must introduce this

March 6, 1969

legislation. You must look ahead to protect the consumer, to help cut the cost of living. You can't look back if you are going to give leadership and if you intend to do something.

The Batten Royal Commission Report set out the path that you must follow. It is a consumer's blueprint. All you have to do is pick out an appliance that was financed at an outrageous rate, or a package that sold some shoddy goods or you will know of someone who bought an appliance that worked for a short period of time, and you must come to the conclusion that in some ways, in this province the high cost of living is caused in some places by a small hand-picked group of plotters who practised the three r's — rooking, robbing and re-possessing.

Consumer agencies would put a stop to the three r's. It would arrest the rising cost of living. It would end the frustrations citizens of this province are faced with when they hope for an answer after they have been exploited as consumers.

The Legislative Committee the Hon. Member has included in his Resolution would be a sounding board that would restrain anyone who, by some dishonorable merchandising method or gimmick or advertising, would deceive the consumers of this province. It would also place every Legislator on such a committee in a position where he would have no choice. He would have to face up to the problem as he would be confronted by the facts as presented by the citizens, citizens dissatisfied and disenchanted with present merchandising methods and demanding a better deal, a better procedure for any other consumers in the same predicament. Mr. Speaker, to hesitate to implement the recommendations of the Batten Royal Commission Report is to admit that the Batten Royal Commission Report was used as a stall. To hesitate is to admit that this Government doesn't really care. To hesitate is to admit that it doesn't care about the high cost of living, as long as the Weston interests and Safeway's get their profit. To hesitate is to admit that it doesn't understand or sympathize with the problems of the high cost of living and its associated problems, problems that face the majority of the people of our province. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — When I listened to the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), when he introduced the Resolution, he made a long, and, I thought, quite effective speech. He incurred some sympathetic sentiment in my heart I must confess, about the consumer. I listened to the Member that just took his seat. I found myself again wandering up that posey-strewn path that I think he wants us to go. I have a few comments that I wish to make, and I am not prepared to speak yet, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

RETURN NO. 9

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Messer (Kelsey) for Return No. 9 showing:

- (1) The total acreage of Crown land sold under the

Saskatchewan Government Land Selling Program since January 1, 1967.

(2) The Government's objective, if any, of acres of land sales for the year 1969;

(3) (a) The name of each purchaser of land up to December 31, 1968; (b) the number of acres purchased, and the location of each purchase; and (c) the total selling price for each purchase.

(4) (a) The amount of down payment on all purchases that were not fully paid for on date of purchase; (b) the length of repayment in terms of years of purchases that were not fully paid for; and (c) the interest on unpaid balance.

And the proposed amendment thereto by the Hon. Mr. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):

That all the words after the word "sold" in paragraph (1) be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

"by the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture from January 1, 1967, to December 31, 1968";

That paragraph (3) be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"(3) (a) the number of purchases of land from January 1, 1967 to December 31, 1968; (b) the total value of all sales of land from January 1, 1967 to December 31, 1968; (c) the interest rate charged for instalment sales; and (d) the total revenue received from land sold between January 1, 1967 and December 31, 1968"; and

That paragraph (4) be deleted.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Return No. 9, frankly, I am somewhat puzzled by the intention of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) with respect to the proposed amendment. Mr. Speaker, Members will notice that the proposed amendment deletes everything after the word "sold" in paragraph 1, then purports to in fact emasculate totally paragraph 3, and paragraph 4 is just deleted entirely. It seems to me that when Members of the House ask for information pertaining to contractual arrangements that two of the most important aspects are to determine first of all (a) who the parties of the transaction are and secondly, the financial terms of repayment or payment respecting the particular transaction involved. In here, the amendment to me in effect attempts to do the following, hide, and there is no better word. It hides such vital information that we as Legislators must know, for example, the name of the purchaser, length of repayment with respect to any particular deals, the amount of the down payment in any one particular individual transaction, and secondly, the total payment on each side. Now it is not good enough to cover up, as I submit this amendment proposes to do, the transaction by simply lumping the whole issue into one total sales figure, one total number of transactions, because in order for the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan to judge, if an individual transaction

March 6, 1969

is conscionable, we have got to be able to take a look at the size of the down payment, the total amount of the payment to be made. I think this amendment is in fact hiding that very valuable type of information. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have witnessed tonight, now I think, a second attempt by this Government to cover up people's information. This Government persists in hiding information. It reveals in a concept that the people's business is somehow restricted only to the Cabinet Chamber and cannot flow out onto the floor of the Legislature. After all, we are dealing here with public lands. We are dealing with lands that belong to the people of Saskatchewan. In order to judge such things as: does everyone have an equal opportunity of getting land? is the price asked unconscionable? is it fair? We ought to have that type of information. But I think rather here we have an attempt by the Minister of Agriculture to hide. He would really like to shovel the whole thing under the table.

Mr. Speaker, my view simply is that this Government continues by its repeated endeavors and especially by this amendment to hide valuable information that is the public's business.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to participate in this debate at all. The Minister of Agriculture I noticed in his amendment did as the Member suggested, that paragraph 3 be removed. Paragraph 3 asks for the name of each purchaser of land up to December 31, the number of acres he purchases, the location of each purchase, the total selling price of each purchase. Now this would be looking, in many aspects, into the private business dealings of every farmer in Saskatchewan who happened to purchase land from the Province of Saskatchewan. He has to reveal his name to the public — which is not so bad — the number of acres he purchased, the location of each, the price of each and the total price he paid for it. I don't think it is in the public interest to do that. I don't think that a Member of this Legislature has the right to ask that every man's name who dealt with the Government be on the front pages tomorrow morning, or whether or not he had a loan or if he was delinquent in the loan, and what the Government proposes to do about it. I think that the Minister has shown a bit of compassion here, because I am certain that, if all of this was divulged as the Member has asked, perhaps in all innocence, that there may be a name or two that would be very embarrassed, and they are sitting in this Legislature now. If you want the information, I think we are prepared to give it. But I think you will be embarrassed by the information that you get.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — He's sitting on that side.

Mr. Cameron: — This is a man who has done business with the Government, has purchased land from the Government. If you want it revealed, we are prepared to do so. I think this is why the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) was kind enough to quietly ask that paragraph 3 be omitted, in order that this information would not be divulged, and have to embarrass a Member of this Legislature. Unless you want it otherwise, I felt as the Minister of Agriculture did. But if you want it this way, we are prepared to give it this way.

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, it appears that

the Government by the statement made by the Minister of Mineral Resources is prepared to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, a Member is supposed to speak from his own seat, but I'm quite sure the House will overlook that, if he can get to a live mike. I want to make sure what he says is on the record.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, it appears as though, from what the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) has just stated, the Government would be prepared to drop the amendment and therefore give me the request that I asked for in the original Return. If this is the case, I will have very little else to say. We certainly will take the responsibility on this side of the Legislature for any embarrassment that may come up. I am quite certain that there is not going to be. Any embarrassment that does come up will have to be also the burden of the Government because they were the people that were administering these land sales, so it cannot possibly fall entirely on behalf of the Opposition. Consequently, as I said, if it is prepared to drop the amendment it put forward, I am certain that we as the Opposition on this side of the House will take any responsibility for the information that is brought forward in the original request.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — The Government will be prepared to withdraw the amendment, if you wish then, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been said.

Mr. Speaker: — Just a minute, the only person that can withdraw or can ask for the withdrawal of the amendment is the mover of the amendment, which is the Minister of Agriculture. If he so requests, it has to be done by unanimous consent of the House.

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — In that case, Mr. Speaker, I will be agreeable to withdrawing the amendment. But I point out to this House it will take a great deal of time to compile all this information. There are 1700 files to go through. It may not be done before the session ends, we'll try and get it done inside of a week's time.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.