

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
36th Day

Tuesday, March 25, 1969

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

QUESTIONS

Wildlife Insurance

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) if he would give some consideration to some type of extension of wildlife insurance through the ordinary channels. There is still a lot of swath out and there will be a lot of damage this spring by ducks. I have had several letters and some representation from people all around the Northwest, the Wilkie area. I think that it is only fair that at least for those who had insurance last fall it should be extended to the spring and possibly there should be some provision made for this untimely spring harvest.

Hon. J.R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources): — I will be pleased to discuss this matter with the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office who is the Minister for this particular Act.

Comment on AGRA

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House an item in the Department of Industry and Commerce's pamphlet called "Saskatchewan the Growth Province." The heading is "AGRA Listed on Toronto Exchange." It says that its shares of AGRA vegetable products in Nipawin were accepted for listing by the Toronto Stock Exchange as of December 31, 1968.

The article says further that AGRA is the second Saskatchewan company to have its shares accepted for listing by the Toronto Exchange. I want to point out to the House that both these industries were started in the 20 years of so-called Socialist stagnation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the former Minister, the Member, as usual has his facts wrong. AGRA was financed almost entirely since this Government took office by SEDCO loans and we are very pleased that it is one more expansion which is now, as I say, listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I thought that this would probably come up so I took the privilege of bringing into the House the annual report of the Department of Industry and Information 1964 when the Premier sat on this side of the House.

March 25, 1969

Mr. Thatcher: — It was almost bankrupt when we took it over . . .

Mr. Willis: — This is a list of new companies which came into production during . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If the Member has a question he wishes to ask he will have to come to the point and ask the question.

Mr. Willis: — I wish to ask this question of the Premier as to whether or not this reference to AGRA vegetable oil producing rapeseed oil, rapeseed meal in the 1964 Saskatchewan Department of Industry and Information is correct or incorrect.

Mr. Thatcher: — I would only say that all the expansion took place once we got rid of the Socialists.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 16 - Anti-Ballistic Missile System

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition) moved, seconded by Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East):

That this Assembly expresses its concern that the proposed construction in North Dakota and Montana of an antiballistic missile system would represent a threat to world peace as well as a particular danger to the people of Western Canada and especially Saskatchewan, and urges the Government of Canada (a) to refuse to participate in such a program; and (b) to use all the means at its disposal to convince the Government of the United States that the said proposal would be an escalation of the nuclear arms race and a consequent further threat to world peace.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion asks the Assembly to express its concern about the proposed construction in North Dakota and Montana of an anti-ballistic missile system. I should perhaps say the extension of the system with the new installations located at these points. We ask that this concern be shown because in our opinion this extension does represent a threat to world peace. In addition it represents a particular danger to the people of Western Canada and especially Saskatchewan since we are right in the flyway.

On the basis of these concerns the Resolution asks that we urge the Government of Canada not to participate in such a program. Furthermore we ask the Government of Canada to use all its influence to convince the Government of United States that this proposal would indeed be an escalation of a nuclear arms race and a consequent threat, a further threat, to world peace.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the proposal is that there would be installed a few miles south of the Canadian border some anti-ballistic missile bases. This system is sometimes referred to as the Sentinel or The Safeguard System. In part its purpose is to protect the larger system of “minute-men bases” and these “minute-men” are of course prime weapons of offence.

One of the bases is to be at Grand Forks in North Dakota which is 90 miles south of the Canadian border. The other is to be at Great Falls, Montana, which is 115 miles south. The reason for the choice of location I gather was so that these missiles could operate over what is called "a relatively uninhabited country." And that, Mr. Speaker, means, in part at least, Saskatchewan. I don't suppose that the President of the United States has been reading the population reports for Saskatchewan since 1964. He might on that basis come to the conclusion that we are relatively uninhabited in this part of the world. Those of us here will take issue with this statement.

These bases will be used to launch missiles which will intercept other missiles. These other missiles presumably would have been launched by the Russians or the Chinese and they will carry atomic, hydrogen bombs if you like. Some of the intercepting missiles which are called Spartans have a range of about 400 miles. Others with a lesser range are called Sprint. As a result the interception would take place over parts of Western Canada and more specifically over Saskatchewan. Now it is argued by some that the interception would take place at such a height above the earth that there would be no danger to those underneath. At the same time, however, there are a number of very reputable scientists, including past advisors to Presidents of the United States, who say that the flash resulting from the interception would blind people on earth, that people would suffer from burns, that fires would be set and atmospheric contamination would occur.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the installation presently being discussed appears to be just the forerunner of an even larger system Defence Secretary Laird is quoted in *The Leader Post* of March 20 as saying:

If we find that this missile promises sufficient advantage, we will substitute some improved Spartans for the standard Spartan.

Now the standard Spartan has an explosive power equivalent to two million tons of TNT. What the improved Spartan has, I am sure I don't know. It does, however, seem clear that the standard Spartan is considered by some as simply the down payment on a more substantial system. This suggests that we in Saskatchewan are going to be part of the testing ground for this new base. We are there, let there be no doubt about it.

Let me try to anticipate some of the opposition to this Resolution which may be expressed, Mr. Speaker. A few days ago when I raised the question about this in the Legislature, I was told by the Premier in effect that this was none of our business. Admittedly the Legislature can't pass laws in this regard. However, there is nothing to prevent us from initiating some discussion about it. Indeed there are many arguments which favour discussion in this Legislature. Certainly public information and public discussion which may create more awareness of the problem are of great importance. Nobody in this House will of course claim or be expected to claim any profound and detailed military or scientific knowledge about it. We do, however, have access to the ideas and thoughts of the people who can properly claim such detailed and specific knowledge. Hopefully we may make some contribution, to this great problem by talking about it here in this Legislature.

March 25, 1969

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Oh, bunk!

Mr. Lloyd: — The Premier says, “Oh, bunk” and that of course is usually his attitude about that sort of thing.

Mr. Thatcher: — I said, oh humm.

Mr. Lloyd: — Oh, humm. Oh, come! Very well. It all adds up to the same thing, the Premier is disinterested and opposed to the discussion of this sort of thing in this Legislature.

Mr. Thatcher: — We have nothing to say about it.

Mr. Lloyd: — I agree. That is one of the great regrets - that the Leader of a political party in this province should sit there and say that he has nothing to say about a problem of this kind.

Mr. Thatcher: — Why don't you talk about something that we have something to say.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I happen to be on my feet . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — It is a waste of time.

Mr. Lloyd: — Waste of time! There it is.

Mr. Thatcher: — Waste of time! A complete waste of time.

Mr. Lloyd: — Waste of time! There it is. That is exactly the attitude which one expects from the Premier of this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If the House is to waste its time, then let us do so in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, if this is a waste of time, then I for one am pleased to be the instrument of wasting some time in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — With respect to discussion in public, let me read a part of a statement by Senator McGovern. Senator McGovern, as will be recalled, was one of the nominees before the Democratic party for the position of candidate for president of that country. Speaking at a public discussion in which he took part, he had this to say:

One of the shortcomings in our defence decisions has been that they have often been made by so-called experts without

the light of day focused on them.

For a good many years I have been more and more sceptical of the decision-making processes under which we commit enormous amounts of money to highly doubtful military gadgets. Even some of the loftiest advisors to our defence establishment have over the years demonstrated that they are long on theory and short on common sense, compassion and the concern for human interest.

I would hope that the Premier would note some statements of that kind. He refers to another participant in this discussion by the name of Dr. Rabi. He says:

If we succeed at long last in building a theoretically airtight defence structure, but in the process create the kind of allocation of resources that neglects our most acute domestic problems, we may discover that we have built a shield around a value system no longer worth protecting.

It seems to me to be important that we should in this Legislature take note.

Mr. Speaker, a second kind of opposition, in addition to that we are wasting time in talking about this sort of thing in the Legislature, may be that this expresses an anti-American point of view. I have just quoted the opinion of a very substantial American citizen to the contrary. Let me refer to a number of other very influential voices in the United States which in recent days have taken a position comparable to that which our Resolution proposes. I can refer to Senator Fulbright, the chairman of The Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate, to Senator Stuart Symington the former Secretary of Defence in the United States, to Senator Church of Idaho and to a number of distinguished United States scientists. To some extent these comments were summed up by Senator Gore. He was quoted on Friday night news saying that the ABM was “a defence in search of a mission.” One might have added, or one might have paralleled that by saying that it is ‘a missile in search of a mission.’

I have looked, Mr. Speaker, for some comment from the Republican Governors or ex-Governors, friends of the Premier, but I find that they have not commented in opposition to this position. I find, as a matter of fact, that Senator Goldwater has supported installation of such bases. Perhaps this constitutes part of the Premier’s objection to discussing this matter in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to some of the questions which have been raised and some of the opposition which has been stated by leading United States figures. There is first of all the question raised in the Globe and Mail of the 13th of March of this year. This is a question as to who will make the decision to launch these missiles. The Globe and Mail says that the decision to launch the missiles would perhaps be made “by computers, not men” according to testimony before the Senate of the United States this week. It quotes Dr. Kistiakowsky, who was a science advisor to former President Eisenhower, saying that “many people could be blinded because of a decision cranked into a computer years before or because of a decision made by a junior

March 25, 1969

officer.” The position is summed up by Dr. York who told the Senate group that the power to make certain life and death decisions is passing from statesmen and politicians to more narrowly focused technicians and from human beings to machines. He added, “The direction that we are going is not toward the ultimate weapon but toward ultimate absurdity.”

Mr. Speaker, whether we talk in the Saskatchewan Legislature or elsewhere, this kind of dehumanization of society is certainly something that is of concern to all of us on a very far-reaching basis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — A second question that is raised is whether in effect missiles of this kind do make any contribution to defence. May I refer to an article in the Christian Science Monitor of the 11th of March. It reports on some of the comments of Senator Stuart Symington, the former Secretary of Defence of the United States. He says this:

I don't think the ABM will work. But even if it does work, I don't feel that it is essential to the defence of the United States.

Senator Symington's position is backed up by the statement of Dr. Wiesner. Dr. Wiesner was a former science advisor to President Kennedy and is presently a science advisor to Senator Ted Kennedy. Dr. Wiesner argues that the ABM concept is already obsolete. In doing this, the article says, he joins forces with three scientists who have served before him as scientific advisors to presidents, each one of whom is opposed to the ABM.

A third question raised is: where is the pressure coming from to proceed with this development? I return to a quotation from Senator Symington. He was asked, “Did he feel that the military industrial complex was heavily involved?” The Senator replied that “the ABM made him more apprehensive about the military industrial complex than anything that had happened” since he had come to government. He is joined in this kind of concern, or he is supported in it, by this information which comes from the magazine Business Week. That article pointed out that “some 15,000 companies would produce the hardware and support services for the system.” They are talking about the larger system admittedly. The article adds that “most of the work will be done by corporate giants.” Western Electric Company Incorporated, the manufacturing arm of American Telephones and Telegrams, is referred to as one of the prime examples.

There is further support for this question of the answer to the question, who is producing the pressure, in the New York Times. It says this and I quote:

American capitalists are extremely intrigued. It may mean tremendous profits for American companies.

Senator Dr. Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania is quoted as saying this:

The vast new defence pork lunch wagon, maybe the biggest ever, has begun to roll and the investors in the stock market know it.

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, is plainly that here is exploitation of national insecurity and exploitation of fear. The old truth is still with us that to keep fear alive means money in the bank for some of our large corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I quote again from Senator McGovern in this same vein. He called the decision ‘a surrender to mounting political pressure from military-minded senators and congressmen and generals and armament manufacturers and their supporters.’ He sums it up by saying “it would be a national blunder of major proportions.”

Mr. Speaker, our particular concern at this point is of course raised by the events and the statements in Ottawa last week. The Leader Post on March 20th carried an article headlined, “Government Mulls Joining U.S. Missile System.” The Prime Minister is referred to as pointing out that if in the judgment of the Government the counter-missile system is a regrettable though necessary step, then we will have to decide if we will participate in the system. On the other hand the Prime Minister is referred to as saying, that if the situation appears to escalate the danger of nuclear war then, “We will condemn it and we will tell the United States we disapprove.” These matters, I suggest, to this Legislature indicate reasons, cogent and urgent reasons, for public discussion in our province and for discussion in this Legislature at this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Now there are two main aspects to the problem and to the proposed Resolution. One has regard to the particular danger to Saskatchewan people. We will become part of the testing ground at least. In the event of the grim, ultimate reality we will be directly under the intercepting point.

George Ignatieff, Canada’s chief disarmament negotiator, formerly our representative at the United Nations, is quoted as saying that “the ABM decision puts Canada in a more dangerous position than any other country.” The Right Hon. gentleman from Prince Albert in the House of Commons, Mr. Diefenbaker, drew attention to this in the House of Commons. His suggestion was that the site should be moved further south.

If our concern could be confined to just the effects on Saskatchewan people directly, then that suggestion would have some added interest. However, our concern can’t be confined to just what might happen in Saskatchewan. It can’t be because there is a second and a greater danger. That danger rests in the answer to the question of whether this development would escalate an armament race. It is our opinion, it is one of the reasons for the appearance of this Resolution, that such a development would escalate the armament race and we feel that we should take a position in opposition to that.

In support of the contention that it would add to the speed of the armament race, let me quote a statement by former Defence Secretary McNamara. He was talking about the total missile system. He said in September 1967 this:

Were we to deploy a heavy ABM system throughout the United States, the Soviets would clearly be strongly motivated to so increase their offence capabilities as to cancel out our defence of advantage.

March 25, 1969

He adds:

It is futile for us (meaning USA and USSR) to spend \$4 billion or \$40 billion or \$400 billion and at the end of all the spending, at the end of all the deployment, at the end of all the effort, to be relatively at the same point of balance on the security scale that we are now.

I add a further comment from Senator McGovern who says that what “we ought to be interested in is reducing both the costs and the hazards of the arms race.”

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The present proposal which is being considered does neither. Our Resolution argues that both ought to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to the question of what we can contribute in this Saskatchewan Legislature. As I have already indicated I think we have a responsibility to attempt a contribution at least.

As previously stated I admit we have no direct legislating function. We can't pass any laws which can have an effect on this. But that is not our whole function nor is that our whole responsibility as Legislators. It is true that in a narrow, legalistic constitutional view of our responsibility we can wash our hands of it and say that the responsibility is not ours. That is what the Premier is advising and urging that we should do. On the other hand in this Legislature we are a part of the machinery by means of which Canadian decisions are made. We do represent part of the machinery which formulates public opinion and which processes that public opinion into laws and practices which become the disciplines under which we live in this country. Surely if anything is indivisible it is world peace. Surely we shouldn't expect discussions of world peace to be limited by political jurisdictions. As a minimum we can hope to create some interest in discussion of this all-important topic. The value of that, I again remind you, was mentioned by Senator McGovern in a quotation I used earlier.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there is the effect which this has on our domestic ability. Canadian participation in the arms race determines in part the extent to which we achieve or fail to achieve many of our national objectives. The extent to which the Canadian tax dollar can be freed from NATO obligations or NORAD obligations or added similar obligations, adds to our ability to provide homes, to guarantee educational opportunities, to advance the health and welfare of all Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I say that, in part at least, the achievement of essential domestic objectives depends on the capacity and the willingness of Saskatchewan people acting through the Saskatchewan Legislature and the Saskatchewan Government. We cannot be disinterested in developments which limit or extend our capacity as a Legislature and a Government to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people.

With respect to these needs I want to refer to a recent article in the United Church Observer. It is by Charles H.

Forsyth who is secretary of the United Church Board of Evangelism and Social Service. This is the Observer for March 15, 1969, to which I refer. Many Members of this Legislature will remember that this position is one which was previously occupied by the Rev. Ray Hord. Many of us in Regina knew him well because he was a minister in our city and in our province for a number of years. Dr. Forsyth has reference to the extent to which military-defence procurement distorts our economy and I refer to this in the context of my earlier remarks. Those remarks were that one reason for being interested in this was that an expenditure of this kind would prevent us from reaching desirable and even essential domestic objectives.

Dr. Forsyth pointed out that thousands of Canadians have their jobs tied to the defence hardware business. He commented that we live off our capacity to destroy. More particularly he pointed out large areas of unmet needs in our society. His reference was to a housing report that leaves its job half-done, "a housing report that offers little or nothing to millions of Canadians who earn less than \$5,000 a year." He reminded us of lakes and rivers polluted. He reminded us of "the opportunity gap in Canada between rich and poor which is growing wider, not smaller." He pointed out that we spend "more millions of dollars betting on horses than we are prepared to bet on people through retraining and education." He urges that we should dissent from an educational system "which spends far more per capita on the have children than the have not." He added this very important paragraph:

We should reject the notion that the health care needs of our citizens can be met by a private plan approach. Medicare is a human necessity for thousands of families.

Those comments, Mr. Speaker, are relevant here because, as I said before, our capacity to do many of these things is limited and can be further limited by the proposals which the Canadian Government is now at least considering.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Legislature is involved in all those matters to which I have had reference. All of them have been discussed during this session. In each and every one of them the Government sitting opposite has said it can't do the job because it hasn't got the money. It said it hasn't got the money because it can't get enough from the Canadian Government. One of the reasons the Canadian Government isn't able to provide money on a more ample basis for these things is because of our commitments to the defence-armament program.

Mr. Speaker, there is a larger and more potent and more compelling reason for discussion of this problem in public forums in Saskatchewan. Regardless of what we may do to meet such domestic problems there is one essential question to be answered first. That question is: are we going to have the time and the opportunity to take care of these problems? I am not referring to time before this Legislature prorogues. I refer to time before mankind may prorogue, Mr. Speaker. Because given a nuclear war, let there be no doubt about it, mankind will prorogue. The curtain will fall on this Legislature, on the Parliament of Canada and all other parliaments. There will be no one to applaud as the curtain falls. There will be no one even to turn off the footlights much less to write the epilogue.

Now there is a shifting of opinion, of thought in Canada as

March 25, 1969

to how Canada can help to prevent such prorogation. One spokesman in this respect is a Member of the Federal Cabinet and I refer to some of the comments and positions taken by the Hon. Mr. Kierans. My reference is particularly with respect to his position on NATO and NORAD. May I refer here to the recent issue of Macleans. The premier referred to some of the material in the yellow pages in this just the other evening. I could have hoped that he would have gone further and read the article a few pages on by Pauline Jewett. Pauline Jewett was formerly a Liberal Member of Parliament at Ottawa. She is, I presume, one of those whom the Premier would categorize as a Socialist in the Liberal party at Ottawa.

In this article Pauline Jewett draws attention to what she considers to be a wrong assumption. She questions the assumption that the Soviet Union constitutes THE great threat to world peace. She goes on to raise the question of some of the other, and, in her opinion I understand, even greater threats. Her references are to the hostility between black and white people in this world. Her further references are to tensions arising out of poverty and famine and illiteracy in many parts of this world. She points out that NATO and other defence alliances are "terribly isolated from these and like problems." She quotes Mr. Kierans with respect to our membership in NATO when he says that this membership "determines the scale of resources we can direct towards the rest of the world . . . and it shapes their attitude toward us."

May I return again to the article by Charles Forsyth. He reports that in 1965 the nations of the world spent \$140 billion for arms. They spent \$116 billion for education. They spent \$46 billion for public health. He adds that these are issues and situations that "cry out for clear, passionate speaking." Mr. Speaker, I think this Legislature must be interested. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have a responsibility to encourage a desire for clear passionate speaking on matters of this kind by Saskatchewan organizations and Saskatchewan people.

Now the recent United States proposal to which my Resolution draws attention, the pending decision by the Government of Canada, to oppose this proposal or to take part in this possible development in continental armaments-defence, underlines and emphasizes the urgency for thought and discussion. The location of this installation, a relatively few miles away from here inexorably and inevitably marks Saskatchewan as the location of part of what could be the world's last battle. May that time never come. All of us will join in that hope. In the meantime we will be part of the testing area.

I want to comment for a moment on some of the basic requirements which are necessary in order to advance, or to at least give some more hope, for world peace. It is because I think we, in this Legislature can do something about that, that this Resolution is before the Legislature this morning.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if we are going to have world peace it is necessary to rid ourselves of the delusion that war is a possible arbiter in settling the differences between nations. Associated with this delusion is the sense of security which comes to some people from the possession of the ultimate weapon, poised, pointed and ready to trigger the world's last battle. In support of that position may I quote from George F. Kennan's book, *Russia, The Atom and The West*."

George Kennan was a former United States Ambassador. At one point he says this:

The beginning of understanding rests with the recognition that the weapon of mass destruction is a sterile and hopeless weapon.

He adds that this sterile and hopeless weapon cannot in any way serve the purposes of a constructive and hopeful foreign policy. "The true ends of political action," he says, "is to affect the deeper convictions of man. This the atomic bomb cannot do." He says that, "the suicidal nature of this weapon renders it unsuitable both as a sanction of diplomacy and as a basis of an alliance." To further quote from George Kennan, he warns that:

a defence posture built around the weapon suicidal in its implications can serve in the long run only to paralyze national policy and to drive everyone deeper and deeper into the hopeless exertions of the weapons race.

The Resolution which is before us warns against this "hopeless exertions of the weapons race." May I add some more comments to support that point of view. I comment again from Dr. Wiesner, a science advisor to former President Kennedy. Dr. Wiesner suggests an alternative to this "hopeless exertions of the weapons race." Instead of extending the missile system he says:

Why not get the same effect by cutting down on the number of offensive missiles? That is the alternative and I think it would work.

He adds:

We could say to the Soviets, "We'll cut down a little more if you will cut down a little more. Let's see whether we both can't race in the other direction and see who can count the most empty holes on the launching sites ten years from now."

The other comment I make because this is the point at which we are talking, about the possibility of speeding up the arms race and the warning against it. It's from a Dr. Sherman who is another scientist. He says:

I don't think it makes much sense to blame either the Russians or ourselves for the escalation. Both sides have contributed to the heating up of the arms race. Escalation of arms leads to escalation of intention and crisis in various parts of the world. My strong feeling is that ABM will heat up not only the arms race as such but the world situation in general.

It is our concern and the concern of this Resolution that this "heating up" of this arms race and world tension in general moves us closer to the horrible point of another and a total and a final war.

The second requirement for world peace I submit, Mr. Speaker, is that before real disarmament can be achieved there must be psychological disarmament. There must be an ending, at least a decreasing, of hysterical hate in the world. Installations of the kind that are under consideration do in my opinion encourage

March 25, 1969

rather than diminish the hysterical hate in the world. They exploit our feelings of insecurity. They exploit the fear that is rampant in the world in these days. I think that these installations encourage this hysterical hate in both of those two large nations, who so largely bestride the world and devote so much energy to upstaging each other psychologically and otherwise. Let Canada say and say with passion and emphasis that "the world cannot continue to wage war like physical giants and seek peace like intellectual pygmies." Let's say in the words of Norman Cousins, President of the World Association of World Federalists, speaking about some other psychological and real armaments build up, let's say that action of this type "is plainly inconsistent with the requirements for maintaining human civilization." Let's be advised again by Ambassador Kennan who says:

To believe that a strategy of mutual threats with ever more destructive weapons can, in the long run, prevent a nuclear war, and that a society following this road could preserve its democratic character is more realistic than the aim of universal controlled disarmament.

Mr. Speaker, those are two requirements for world peace, I think there is a third one. The third requirement is that there must be massive economic aid to those areas of the world where the main realities of life are death by starvation or at least deprivation by poverty to an extent that we refuse to believe. Admittedly Canada's record in helping this situation has improved. Frequently we state our intention of doing more. Dr. Forsyth in the article I quoted from before points out that Canadian defence expenditure amounts to some three per cent of the gross national product of Canada. He points out also that for world development we managed less than one per cent. He makes this observation, "Collective security must be grounded . . . not on overkill capacity . . . but on economic and social mutuality." If Canada participates further in this proposal then we put reliance on overkill. Then our ability to advance real collective security is restrained. The hope behind this Resolution is that we can build collective security, that we gain allies by building people. We can do it by doing those things that save lives and endow them with all human potential rather than prepare to destroy lives.

A fourth requirement for world peace is to demonstrate, better than we have done, our ability to solve our own domestic problems, some of our shortcomings in this, some of these failures I have already noted. For Canada, and even more for a lot of other nations, solutions to domestic problems are hindered, impeded and even prevented by our investment in military defence measures. As a minimum effort we should try to decrease not increase the present three per cent of gross national product dedicated to military defence purposes. Let there be no doubt about it, a Canada of maximum opportunity for human growth and development, a Canada with its doors open much wider to people of other nations, could increase our influence for world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the final requirement for a world of peace dedicated to the pursuit of sanity and sensitivity in all their forms must be for us to move closer to the ideas and the ideals of world government. In this respect a minimum and an immediate objective must be the preservation and strengthening of the United Nations. Every time that we lend moral or tactical support to the extension of the military power of

individual nations we carve off part of the potential of the United Nations. Already alliances such as NATO and its counterpart represented by the Warsaw Pact, as well as arrangements such as NORAD strike dangerously close to the heart of the United Nations idea and the hope it represents. This present proposal now under consideration edges closer to the vital organ of that essential organization.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to demonstrate some of the military effects as they are related by people who are close to them. I want to emphasize that it is more than military effects which we need to consider in this respect. I have tried to demonstrate the severe effects on the capacity of our country and our province to meet our domestic problems as we ought to meet them. But greater than all of these I submit is the effect on individuals, personal effects and psychological effects. I suggest that the greatest effect here is on our young people. I put forward before in this House the argument that we need to try harder to understand young people. You know sometimes we may be inclined to forget that young people today for the most part can't remember a time when there wasn't a serious war going on some place in the world. After the Second World War, Korea, and then Vietnam, in the Middle East, all the others. War, threats of wars - a psychological war that has been going on for their entire lifetime. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that a major reason for the alienation of young people today has been the huge expenditure on military things which goes on in almost every nation. A major reason for the alienation of young people is all that this huge expenditure on military things implies for their future. They question this expenditure, not only from the point of view of the effectiveness of the money. They question, many of them, the morality of this kind of expenditure. Mr. Speaker, the annual expenditure of \$140 billions for arms is surely one of the great obscenities which this society of ours has written on the walls of the world. It's our position, Mr. Speaker, that Canada should use its influence against this proposal. It is our position that we should not participate in one more stage of that which has been called the negative dynamics of the weapons race.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, my first remarks are those of congratulations and commendation to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) for introducing this Resolution and giving me the privilege of seconding it. May I also congratulate him on his remarks which were so salient at this time and which he presented so ably and so powerfully to us.

Mr. Speaker, my Canadian citizenship was largely chosen for me by my parents. They emigrated to Canada from Poland mainly for these three basic reasons: (1) First, they came to Canada to escape the oppressive dictatorships of both the extreme right and the extreme left, which enslaved many of the Central European nations for many decades. (2) They wanted to leave behind the serious privation that plagued them and the working class population of Central Europe. They came to this country when I was only a child, four years old, to seek a better future for themselves and for their children. (3) Above all, they left their native land especially to escape the horror, destruction and brutality of war. They came to Canada, this new land, to seek peace.

March 25, 1969

Mr. Speaker, my father spent seven years in military uniform. First he was conscripted to serve for three years in military training and just before being due for discharge, World War I broke out and he spent the next four years on the battlefields of Europe. He was seriously wounded. At the same time he contracted malaria and for many weeks he lay in hospital unconscious. World War I left scars on his body and an indelible impression on his mind, an impression of fear and hate of war.

Ever since, I can remember as a child, he talked and still does, about the horror of war and how wrong it is to kill. He taught me to respect life and to realize that life is so short and so precious that there should be no room for hate and war, that our place in life as humans is to love, help, and live in peace with our fellow man.

It is because of this teaching and experience of real poverty that made me choose to be a Social Democrat. Social Democrats have consistently condemned war and those who threatened peace, regardless of their political philosophies, whether they be of the far left or the right, Communists or Fascists, or capitalists. We abhor war and any escalation of military weaponry, whether it be for the so-called defensive or offensive purpose.

If we have learned anything, Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of World War II, it is that for every scientific achievement in defensive systems, the next military expenditure is the manufacture of those weapons of war that will nullify the defence and render it useless, and so the arms race continues.

Mr. Speaker, up to now we in Saskatchewan were in a position to sit on the sidelines and remain passive or be critical observers, but as of March 14th the picture has changed immensely. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the decision by the President of the United States of America to locate anti-ballistic missiles near the Canadian border to the right and to the left of Saskatchewan is of major importance to the deliberations of this Assembly. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on record as stating that nothing we have talked about here in recent years is of greater importance, because our very survival is at stake.

It may be true that we, as a Province, are powerless to reverse the unilateral decision of our supposed ally, but surely we can make our views strongly known to the Government of Canada. The action of the United States of America must be condemned as selfish, ignorant and dangerous to Canada, to Saskatchewan and to the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the first two sites are scheduled to be constructed near our border. (Someone just mentioned Russia, Mr. Speaker, I will come to that.) They will be aimed in such a way as to achieve interception and detonation in the skies above the Prairies. Overnight, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has been transformed from a reasonably secure, mid-continental province dedicated to the human task of feeding and sustaining a hungry world to ground zero in the no man's land between the two great super powers. No part of the world has been placed in a more vulnerable position than we in Saskatchewan as a result of this decision.

Mr. Speaker, why should Saskatchewan be selected for the dubious honour of being tomorrow's first battleground in the intercontinental missile duel? In the words of the United States'

militarists, “because this is an isolated area” where the bugs can be worked out of the system, for our good, our honourable neighbours decided, my friends, that Saskatchewan should be the bug house. It is assumed that we are too few in number to be significant, We will be the guinea pigs in the deadly experiment with ever more terrifying instruments of destruction.

While the sophisticated commentators and politicians of Washington and Ottawa may tell us confidently that the ABM system is merely a sop to the military-industrial complex, a new boon to keep employment up and the profits rolling, the ABMs are now our real neighbours, Mr. Speaker. And they are more than just a lurking weapon of ultimate total destruction. Before they are even located in their bunkers, they attack that part of Canada’s foreign policy which is so important to the wheat farmers of Saskatchewan. The ABMs are an escalation of the arms race, the cold war, the atmosphere of fear and suspicion that will make it more difficult to conclude wheat trade agreements with the Soviet Union and China.

The location of these ABMs on our border, therefore, is more dangerous than the strategists and our Prime Minister have yet acknowledged. For their presence will doubtless be a further symbol of Canadian subordination to United States’ paternalism, to Canadian complicity in the arms escalation, and these weapons will threaten the mere steps that we have made thus far to establish the kind of real trade relations so necessary to the Saskatchewan farmers on the one hand and to world peace on the other.

Mr. Speaker, these deadly weapons are being constructed and aimed with the same rationale of security that was used by the Soviet Union in the case of the Cuban missiles. Let us not be deluded into thinking it is the people of Saskatchewan who will benefit from the system. They will be 90 miles away from our home and we are the indirect target. Whether or not they are fired, they are an immediate threat to the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. We must not enter into any kind of national approval of such an escalation of the international hostilities, whatever language of defence is used to conceal the reality, Mr. Speaker.

The world has never been the same since the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, and killed some 64,000 people. Three days later the second bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, August 9, 1945, and killed 39,000 people. People are still dying from radiation burns caused by these bombs. The atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were mere firecrackers compared to the current 20-megaton thermonuclear warhead packing the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT. That is more than 20 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan in one bomb. Mr. Speaker, back in 1963 the stockpile of nuclear weapons was equal to 50 tons of TNT for every man, woman and child on earth. That figure has escalated greatly since that time.

Canada compromised its position as a peace-loving nation when it agreed to accept nuclear warheads on our soil when it allowed the Americans to install the Bomarc. It was a most regrettable day when on January 12, 1963, the former Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, then the Leader of the Opposition, said and let me quote:

The Canadian Government should accept nuclear warheads for its forces overseas and in Canada.

March 25, 1969

After being elected on April 8, 1963, he accepted the American gift of nuclear weapons and made Canada a more dangerous place to live in the event of war.

Prime Minister Trudeau seems to be working from even a more hopeless premise. He apparently shrugs his shoulders and says, and let me quote from the newspaper of the other day:

Canada for one would be destroyed in any nuclear rocket exchange between the United States and the USSR.

Well, Sir, I am not prepared to give up hope or to give up the fight. I know that I have a lot of friends who share my belief and share my hope. They are very much opposed to United States' installation of the Sentinel Missile System. They are very much concerned that the ABMs will seriously threaten the peace of the world and will escalate the nuclear arms race. Let me quote from one of their recent books, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday there came into my hands a book entitled, Anti-Ballistic Missile, Yes or No. It is "A Special Report from the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions." The evidence that is presented in this book, a cursory examination shows overwhelmingly why we should oppose the anti-ballistic missile system. I commend it as good reading for every Member of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, quoting from some of the well-known people in the United States, here we have former United States Vice-President Hubert Humphrey saying this:

Today's offensive missiles with their improved penetration aids probably could overcome the ABM system as now visualized and the offensive improvements that its deployment is bound to stimulate certainly will render the system obsolete before it can be made operational.

He goes on to say:

ABM will intensify rather than restrain the arms race, worsening instead of improving United States-Soviet relationships.

This is the immediate-past Vice-President of the United States of America.

Let me quote from George McGovern, the person that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has already referred to. Senator McGovern has been deeply involved in the whole issue of the ABMs. He says this:

It would be a national blunder of major proportions, militarily, politically, and diplomatically for the United States to deploy a defensive missile system on the basis of our present knowledge about the ABM and about the international situation, into which we propose to inject this dubious new armament system.

I am convinced that the proposed ABM would be obsolete before it could be constructed. I read the evidence to indicate that the Soviet Union could very quickly overwhelm such a system with considerably smaller investment in their offensive capacity. This, after all, is precisely what we have done in recent years in respect to the very limited ABM system we think now is being deployed around Moscow.

I believe that an ABM deployment by the United States would actually decrease our security and our capacity to conduct an intelligent and rational foreign policy. It would do this not only because it would be easily penetrated by the Soviet Union at less cost, if they so choose to do, but also because it would lead to a further escalation of the arms race and the worsening of the Soviet-American relations.

The political heat on the President and on the Department of Defence to deploy the ABM did not suddenly appear in 1967. For more than a decade pressure has been directed in the most intensive fashion against President Eisenhower, later against President Kennedy, and throughout his administration against President Johnson. All three chief executives, different as they were in political background and orientation, staunchly resisted the demands, first for NIKE-ZEUS, then for the NIKE-X system. The important point is that, if they had surrendered earlier those systems would now be totally obsolete and worthless to us. We would have only wasted \$30 billion or \$35 billion for our efforts.

Why, then, are the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommending that such vast sums be spent and why has a majority of the Congress already approved this decision? Curiously, the debate over construction seems almost irrelevant to the actual decision-making process. I have been actively involved in the debate on the ABM from the very beginning. I was much impressed when Senator Stuart Symington, the former Secretary of the Air Force, who at one time was considered sympathetic to the ABM, explained in great detail why he now believes the system is militarily ineffective and would represent an enormous waste of public funds. This, by any definition, was informed, expert testimony, and I have waited for an effective rebuttal by the ABM proponents. It has never come.

So, let us face it, the anti-ballistic missile system is little more than a gigantic make-work welfare project sponsored by the military-industrial complex. I charge that this kind of artificial and unimaginative public spending degrades rather than strengthens our society and that it does so to an extent that more than offsets the highly questionable military advantages.

Mr. Speaker, here is the position of the former Secretary of Defence for the United States of America, Robert McNamara. No one has more clearly summarized the case against a full-blown ABM system than did former Secretary of Defence Robert McNamara when he said on September 18, 1967 and let me quote:

Every ABM system that is now feasible involves firing defensive missiles at incoming offensive warheads in an effort to destroy them. But what my commentators on this issue overlook is that any such system can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending more offensive warheads or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them. This is the whole crux of the nuclear action-reaction phenomenon.

Then Mr. McNamara added:

March 25, 1969

Were we to deploy a heavy ABM system throughout the United States . . .

(And keep in mind that it is the heavy system that is being discussed here now and not the phony, so-called thin China-oriented Sentinel system).

. . . the Soviets would clearly be strongly motivated to so increase their offensive capacity as to cancel out our defensive advantage. It is futile for each of us to spend \$4 billion or \$40 billion or \$400 billion and at the end of all the spending, at the end of all the deployment and at the end of all the effort, to be relatively at the same point of balance on the security scale that we are now.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind this Assembly of the remarks of the well-known United States senators when they questioned Melvin R. Laird just last week. Here are some of their remarks: 'Far less of a shield than a sieve,' said Democratic Frank Church. 'Not a convincing case,' said Chairman Albert Gore. 'Every witness outside the Pentagon knows it's not much good,' said Arkansas Senator Fulbright, chairman of the parent Foreign Relations Committee of the United States. 'Cockeyed,' was the comment described by Stuart Symington of Missouri.

The question of Canada's position in the program figured prominently in last Friday's hearings. Laird told the committee that the United States of America has a working agreement with Ottawa on the deployment of anti-ballistic missiles, but ran into sharp questioning from Mr. Fulbright. Laird said that Canada "has been kept fully informed of the program," but at one point said he did not want to jeopardize the agreement with Ottawa by delving too deeply into the question. Fulbright replied, "You answered. You said that if they don't like it, they can lump it." Laird said although consultations between the two countries had taken place, there was never an understanding under which Canada could veto the sites of the anti-ballistic missile. "I don't think we should put this kind of veto power in the hands of our Canadian friends," said Mr. Laird.

Mr. Speaker, it is our country that he is talking about and he tells us that we should have no right to say anything, that we should have no right to veto, that they have the right to decide what they will do with our people, with our land, with our air, with our skies. Mr. Speaker, but some may say that these are not experts. Well, Sir, the truth of the matter is that every reputable scientist in the United States of America agrees that the ABMs pose a serious threat to the United States of America and Canadian security. They will achieve nothing by way of defence but will merely escalate the arms race. Among them are such distinguished men . . .

Mr. D.C. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Nonsense!

Mr. Smishek: — . . . the Hon. Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) says nonsense. I would suggest to the Hon. Member that he take some time, that he read some of the reports that were appearing in the newspapers, day after day, in the last 10 days. I commend to him this document and others that have been presented. If he reads them and he tried to rationalize and he tried to think he would not be making such statements as nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, among some of the distinguished scientists that have made their positions known are: Dr. Ralph Lapp, a physicist, Professor George Kislcakowsky, a chemist. Both of them, Mr. Speaker, and take note, both of them worked on the creation of the first atom bomb. They agreed that the ABM interception will not stop nuclear fallout, the blinding, killing and burning of people. The views of such people as Jerome Wiesner, scientific advisor to the former United States President Johnson, must be acknowledged here in this debate. He is strongly opposed to the installation of the ABMs.

Mr. Speaker, in announcing his decision to start construction of the ABMs at Grand Forks, North Dakota and Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana, President Nixon was advised that the Soviet Union has started and stopped construction of any antiballistic missile system. Mr. Speaker, let me quote from the I.F. Stone's Weekly and here is what he says:

The Pentagon's experts two years ago expected the first Chinese ICBM shot before the end of 1967. Laird will have to scrape up a pretty fervent Maoist to find someone ready to believe the United States of America in danger of being held hostage by China.

He goes on:

Laird's discussion of the relative anti-missile spending of the United States and the USSR was equally fantastic. Laird was asked on Face the Nation program, 'Can you tell us what the Russians' anti-ballistic missile situation is? How many cities? How fast a deployment? Has it been speeded up or slowed down? How do they compare?' The answer, as provided less than a month ago by Clifford's last posture statement, is that construction has been curtailed on the ABM around Moscow, the only place where the Russians began to build one. 'It is the consensus of the intelligence community,' Clifford reported, 'that this Galosh system,' as it is called, 'could be seriously degraded by currently proposed United States weapons system.' 'Indeed this Russian ABM,' Clifford stated, 'resembles in certain important respects the NIKE-ZEUS system which we abandoned years ago because of its limited effectiveness. It is, in other words, obsolete.'

Mr. Speaker, Clifford was one of the right-hand men to former Defence Secretary Mr. Robert McNamara.

From all this knowledge and opposition of the many United States senators and congressmen, one can't help but conclude that President Nixon has been forced into making this decision by the military industry. This decision is nothing less, Mr. Speaker, than military brinkmanship.

Let me also advise this Assembly that, as Mr. Nixon announced his decision on the ABM on March 14, that same day, Mr. Speaker, press reports show and let me quote:

The nuclear non-proliferation treaty has been ratified by the Senate and the United States diplomats expect Moscow will soon follow suit.

I am completely convinced that the installation of the

March 25, 1969

Sentinel Missile System near our border poses a serious threat to world peace. It endangers seriously the security of Canada and especially Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has no right to unilaterally capture our skies and place our air in complete danger and our land in serious jeopardy. I don't want my country and my province, Mr. Speaker, to be used as a testing ground, as a bug house, in the event of a nuclear war. If that decision is to be made, it should be made by Canada, and not by the United States or the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this Assembly to unanimously endorse the Resolution presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Trudeau is today meeting President Nixon in Washington, D.C. Let us send this Resolution unanimously supported by this Assembly to Prime Minister Trudeau, care of the Pentagon. Let us strengthen his hand in any discussions or any negotiations with the President of the United States. Mr. Speaker, let us do this for the sake of humanity, for the sake of the preservation of life. I am pleased to second the Resolution and support it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, for many years Members on this side of the House have resigned themselves to the fact that sometimes during the session we must sit and listen to the anti-American views of our friends opposite. They attack the American politicians, they attack the American corporations, they attack the profit motive of free enterprise. This year is no exception as we have just listened to another in a long line of anti-American speeches by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the MLA from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). Surely the red star has arisen again today in this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

In 1965 we listened to one of the Members for Saskatoon (Mr. Link) embarrass our province by referring to our friendly State of Montana to the south as a Fascist-type state. In 1966 Members opposite placed a Resolution on the Order Paper regarding the war in Vietnam and their remarks placed all the blame on the United States. I think particularly of Mr. Link's statement on page 1,718 of the Debates and Proceedings, 1966, when he said:

Mr. Speaker, there are however some real discouraging signs at the present time, the most obvious of course is the rapid build-up of the military forces in Vietnam and a further escalation of the war. The war is becoming more and more an American war.

Nowhere did the Member suggest that the provision of airplanes and armaments by Russia had anything to do with the escalation of the Vietnam war. In 1967 the Member for Kelsey, Mr. J.H. Brockelbank, moved a Resolution re the abandonment of violence and war, and again the United States came in for far more than its share of criticism, with no mention being made of Russia, China or other Communist nations and their responsibilities.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, was the first year that I can recall that we did not have a resolution of this kind on the Order Paper. On thinking back perhaps this was unfortunate as one recalls that, in place of presenting their anti-American sentiments in the House, Members opposite showed their sentiments in a more tangible form, by organizing and financing an anti-American demonstration last summer which ended with the burning of the American flag and which brought disgrace to every person in this province. I wonder when Members opposite will realize that we cannot live in splendid isolation. In this day for all intents and purposes, our defence, in fact our very survival is tied to the strength of our neighbours to the south.

The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) who has left the chamber said that we should sit by and offer critical observation or passive criticism. His reference to the supposed allies, his calling our American friends selfish, ignorant and dangerous, I submit, Mr. Speaker, was an unwarranted attack on the friendship between our two countries that has existed for many decades. I would remind all Members of this House we were pleased enough when the United States came to our rescue in two World Wars. We didn't tell them then that we didn't want their supplies, their technology, their assistance, their support, their ships. We didn't tell them then that we didn't want their young men and women to die on our behalf. The United States of America learned the hard way that they could not live in isolation but had to become an integral part in world affairs.

Now we have Members opposite who condemn them for trying to make the Western Hemisphere a safe place for the survival of freedom and democracy. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has suggested that the construction of anti-ballistic missiles system is a threat to world peace and urges the Government of Canada to convince the Government of the United States not to proceed in this regard. We all regret the necessity of continuously upgrading our defence system. We regret also that Saskatchewan, and Canadian soil and people are sometimes involved. But there is no alternative if our country is to be adequately defended. Canada's position today is not clear. As was mentioned, our Prime Minister is meeting in Washington with President Nixon and I am sure that we can be confident that these two great leaders will come up with a solution that is in the best interests of all. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that this is a part of a system in which we are already involved, whether we like it or not, the Dew Line, the Mid-Canada Radar Line, the Pine Tree Line in which Canada and the United States freely participated under the NORAD Agreement, are all part of a system of protection from outside attacks and more specific protection against Russia whose main line of entry to North America is through Alaska and Canada's North.

With advances of technology the systems have become to some extent obsolete. This new proposed anti-missile system will bring us up to date in our defence of North America. It is strictly a defensive measure and therefore in no conceivable way can be construed as an escalation of the nuclear arms race and a threat to world peace. In fact if we did not maintain our defence, it would increase the threat to peace as Russia and China would then be tempted to attack our weakened positions. The aggression shown by both these communist countries recently shows their attitude to an eventual world domination has not changed.

March 25, 1969

I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) would agree that the construction of an anti-ballistic system in the United States would be no more threat to peace and escalation of the nuclear arms race than the construction of such a system elsewhere in the world. I see that he is nodding his head in agreement. I would refer Members to the *Readers Digest* of December 1968 to an article from the United States News and World Report of September 9th entitled, "Spies in the Sky". This article referred to the vigilance of amazingly sensitive devices which gather intelligence from space. It gave some examples of their achievement. The first one mentioned was the positive evidence of the start of anti-ballistic defence systems in Russia. Now the Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) may be lulled into thinking that these are not being built, by some of his friends who wish him to think so but surely to goodness this is enough proof and we know enough of the Russian philosophy to know that they are not going to be caught asleep at the switch and hopefully the United States won't be either.

Surely if the anti-ballistic defence system in Canada and the United States is a threat to world peace, a similar system in Russia would also be a threat to peace. The Leader of the Opposition nodded his head a moment ago. Why then didn't he include Russia today in his remarks? One can only conclude his failure to do so is because he is far more sympathetic to Russian plans to rule the world than he is to the United States attempt to prevent it.

The second piece of intelligence that came through these spies in the sky was the confirmation of the expansion of rocket production that has now brought Russia's land-base missile strength up to or exceeding that of the United States. That shows more than ever that the United States and Canada need an adequate anti-ballistic missile system. The Member for Regina North East suggested our ABM system would motivate Russia but it appears from this article that they were far more motivated before when opposition was considered to be weak.

Because the Leader of the Opposition has singled out the United States of America for his attacks as the only nation threatening world peace, and because his motion would in effect say, "Leave the door open for Communist aggression," we on this side of the House cannot accept this Resolution. Before I sit down I am going to read an amendment, seconded by Mr. Barrie (Pelly), that I will place before this Legislature when I have finished my remarks. I am going to move that this Resolution be amended as follows: That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

1. expresses its confidence in the ability of the elected Governments of Canada and the United States to jointly plan and implement an adequate defence policy for our Continent and its people;
2. re-affirms our deep and abiding friendship for our American neighbor and our sincere regret at the irresponsible action of certain elements in burning an American flag; and
3. regrets that world peace is threatened by recent socialist imperialist aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere throughout the world.

Now in introducing this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Leader of the Opposition, if he believes in his motion, will be unable to support this amendment. His views and his support for anti-American and pro-Communist forces are well known to Members of this Legislature. We recognize also that some of the old guard among the front benchers are so steeped in anti-American philosophy that they will be unable to support it. But I do hope that the young back benchers, who claim to be in tune with the '70s and from whom the future leaders across the way will no doubt be chosen, will see fit to support the amendment rather than the motion. I would remind the Members opposite that they can't support the motion and the amendment.

The amendment will give Members opposite the opportunity to do three things. First of all, it will give them the opportunity to support a defence agreement mutually agreed upon between Canada and the United States. As I mentioned earlier, the Prime Minister and President Nixon are presently discussing this and we can be sure that what they agree on will be in the best interests of both countries.

Secondly, it will give Members opposite the opportunity to condemn the actions of the irresponsible people who burned the American flag last summer. You remember that I have mentioned in several earlier debates in this Legislature that we would like to have them stand on their feet and be counted in this regard, one way or the other. I realize that by so doing Members opposite will be voting against the actions of some of their own NDP supporters and members of their own political party. However, I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan will feel much better if at least they know that their elected NDP representatives were not part of this disgraceful event. It is true that Premier Thatcher sent a note of apology to the United States for this action but I think it is only fitting before this Legislature prorogues that all Members be given the opportunity to show their disapproval of this type of action between friendly neighbours.

Thirdly, this amendment will give Members opposite the opportunity to condemn Socialist imperialist aggression in Czechoslovakia, and in other areas throughout the world. The people of Saskatchewan were dismayed at the NDP Convention last summer, you were concerned enough to send a telegram to Prime Minister Trudeau against United States training flights in Canada, but you were not concerned enough about Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia to condemn them by a resolution. Now we on this side of the House are charitable enough to believe that it was an oversight on the part of the NDP Convention and particularly the MLAs that were present. Therefore, we know you will welcome the opportunity afforded by this amendment to show the people of Saskatchewan that you are opposed to Soviet Socialist aggression in Czechoslovakia and all other forms of Socialist aggression throughout the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we wish to thank the Leader of the Opposition for this motion, we had given up hope that Members opposite would make their views known in regard to the events that I have mentioned and particularly regarding the burning of the American flag and their attitude to Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia. Thanks to his motion, and my amendment, we will now have the opportunity to see exactly where Members opposite stand in this regard. I would hate to suggest that the Members opposite are swayed by the events that take place through resolutions and actions of the NDP but one can't help but wonder

March 25, 1969

when you pick up the paper this morning and you find on the front page of The Leader Post that there is an anti-ABM group protesting in Ottawa. And when you go down the print you find that the protest was organized by Terry Campbell, a freelance writer and broadcaster and president of the Ottawa South New Democratic Youth organization. It seems that wherever the New Democratic Youth leads them, the old members appear to follow. So, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Smishek: — You're weak!

Mr. Guy: — You're looking pretty weak! We'll see how you vote on this amendment, whether you've got the courage to stand up in this Legislature and say that you were in favour of burning the American flag, whether you were in favour of supporting Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia. Thanks to your Leader, you're going to have that opportunity either today or very shortly. If you vote against this amendment, you will never be back on that side of the House or in fact you will never be in this House, period. No, Sir! Thanks to your Leader you're going to get the opportunity to be counted and we'll be waiting and the people of Saskatchewan will be waiting to see whether you are going to support the action that you carried out last year. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, seconded by my seat-mate, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) that Resolution No. 16 be amended.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie: — (Hanley)Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this missile debate. I must add that I welcome, with reservations of course, the American move to defend collectively the United States and Canada.

Firstly, it is really an exercise in futility to have this debate because there is really very little that we as citizens of Saskatchewan can do about it. This is a Canadian affair, it is a joint Canadian-American affair, it is a world affair and something which we are pulled into, not because we want to be there but because this is the way the facts are. Our Prime Minister, the Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, is in Washington at this very moment discussing this very ABM program as a top priority item on the agenda. I presume that he is there representing all the Canadian people and that the deliberations he will have with President Nixon will be in the best interests of Canada and of North America at large.

Now just what is this ABM system? It was first discussed by President Johnson. He is not now in office. A decision has to be made by President Nixon. Now after all, this is not new to North America, North American defence, we have had NORAD with us for at least 12 years and this was a system whereby Canada and the United States, using the advanced technology and the military hardware of the United States, could take part in the joint defence of this Continent against aggression. But at that time it was designed to intercept manned bombers coming over the North Pole from Russia and/or China. Although it strikes us as a very important thing, it is really an extension of the NORAD system. It is an extension of the defence of North America. If it was right for us to take part in NORAD defence in 1955 and 1956, then it is just as correct that we follow it up in

1969. Everyone knows that the advance of technology has almost ruled out the manned bomber as an exponent of military aggression. In its place have come missiles and perhaps even missiles from space stations. These are the facts of life which we have to face up to. All it really is is an improved system to combat Russian or Chinese missiles. Why after all, we had for many years on Canadian soil the Pine Tree Line, the Dew Line, and the Mid-Canada Line. These were a radar defence against manned bombers and were just as much a part of any military defence system as the ABM missile system now under discussion.

Now I really don't care what the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) says. I am quite sure that my family and many others will sleep better on Saskatchewan soil because we know that we have friends in the United States, who have the military power and the will to resist Soviet and Chinese aggression. I wonder if the Hon. Mr. Lloyd really appreciates what a heavy load of responsibility that President Nixon has on his shoulders. It was his decision to say Yes or No and President Nixon on the best advice possible said, Yes. How much safer would we have been if he had said No? There would still be Soviet and Chinese missiles ready to wing their way to North America whether we like it or not. These are the facts of life. It would be most desirable to have universal world peace. The Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) made a long exposition of why he was in favour of world peace, and I think everyone here would subscribe almost wholeheartedly to it. Everyone here earnestly desires world peace, on both sides of the House. We fought two global wars to guarantee world peace. The Great War and the Second World War were to make the world safe for democracy and the wars to end all wars. But since the end of World War II, the world has been constantly at war on one or more fronts. There was the Greek Civil War. There was the Berlin Airlift in 1948 which came close to being a war. Then there was the Korean conflict. There have been three Arab-Israeli wars in 20 years. There is the Vietnam War not yet concluded. There was a civil war in the Congo where thousands of Africans were killed. The Nigerian Civil War is still going on. There was the India-Pakistan War. There was the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviets which was an act of war.

I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition has watched the television programs that come over the networks each year on November 7th on the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. If he did, he would see giant rockets on transports being wheeled through Red Square and an exhibition of military hardware that makes you shudder to look at it. But if he thinks that the United States, as a protector of its own self-interest and protector of Canada and the free world, is going to sit back and watch the build-up of military hardware in Russia, I think that President Nixon would be falling short of the duties cast upon him as President and leader of the free world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heggie: — It used to be that Great Britain on whose Empire the sun never set was more or less the protector of world peace and imposed the Pax Britannica. Now that position since the end of World War II has shifted to the United States. We don't even see Prime Minister Wilson as the Leader of a Labour Government cutting short the moves of the United States to strengthen NATO

March 25, 1969

or to protect North America from Communist attack. All that Mr. Smishek, the Hon. Member for Regina East, says is true about the horrors that his father and family went through in Eastern Europe, no doubt he is not overstating the case at all. He said that his family came to Canada to escape these things. But the facts of life are that the spectre of war has now become global and is not confined to Eastern Europe or to the Balkans. The aeroplane, the missile, and space science have changed all this. I say here and now that the Opposition says that, because there are certain senators in the United States who have opposed the ABM system, we here in Saskatchewan should pass a Resolution seconding their stand against it. I say that it is a good thing that we have senators in the United States who can stand up in a free democracy and oppose the system and bring all the factors to bear, so that the public understands exactly what is happening. Any war which would impose the Communist system on us would certainly be the end of any opposition to whatever the Government decided to do. So we have Senators Fulbright, Symington, and Church taking every opportunity to stand up and oppose what in their opinion they feel is wrong. But the President, on the advice of other senators and the advice of his military and civilian staff, is fully aware of the responsibility that lies on his shoulders. After much agony of thought and mind, I am sure he will come to the conclusion that this is the safest and best thing that he can do for the protection of North America, Canada and the free world.

Now in conclusion, I just want to sum up and say that the whole ABM system is not offensive, as the speakers on the other side have tried to say, but is part of a defensive system which has been in vogue almost since the end of World War II. The other missiles that these oppose are Russian and Chinese. They have them and they have the ability to launch them from nuclear-powered submarines, even if they didn't launch them from the mainland of the Soviet Union or China. They have the ability to launch them and we must have the ability to resist them. I fear with all Members the terrible result which can come from a nuclear explosion and fallout, but I ask: what is the alternative? If there is a war where missiles are used we are all going to be in it, whether we like it or not. The protest seems to be that the missile sites are so close to Canadian soil at Grand Forks and at Great Falls and that this in some way is different from what it was before. Well I am not speaking for the Government in this particular instance, but I speak as a representative of 5,500 voters. I would say that, after consultation between our Prime Minister and the President, it was felt that for the better protection of Canada another site be built on Saskatchewan soil to repel any invasion from the north, I would welcome them in the constituency of Hanley.

All of this doesn't detract from the fact that there are forces working for world peace. There have been concrete steps taken in the direction of the control of nuclear power, the confining of nuclear weapons to a selected number of powers rather than spreading them throughout many nations. There has been progress made, progress such as commercial air flights between North America and Moscow and the fact that the Russian hockey teams play hockey with world teams, both in Europe and in North America, and the fact that the nations meet at the Olympic Games with their athletes. There are long-term effects which are working towards world peace. Any of us who have lived and remember what happened in the Stalin era in Russia and have compared it to the Khrushchev regime and the Brezhnev regime, will

agree that there has been a great change in the outlook of the Soviet Union. It is nervous about its defence and its system - I am not apologizing for it but this is probably the way they see it - and they want to protect it. At the same time I feel that there is a certain amount of yearning for a better standard of living among the Russian people and for world peace. It is a matter of bargaining from a position of strength that the United States has taken this stand and I am glad that we are a part of it. These other forces that are motivating peace ought to have time to work themselves out. I for one have perceived - and I think my perception is correct - that it won't be too many years before there is a real good rapport between the Soviet Union and the Western world as the standard of living improves. Then there is less to be quarrelsome about. The real enemy may be at this moment not the Soviet Union, but the great Republic of China with its 700 million people. Certainly you can read from the edition of Time magazine on March 21st under a heading, "Moscow versus Peking offensive diplomacy". That article summarizes just what the problems are between the Soviet Union and China so there is always hope that, if we can bargain from positions of strength, time in itself will bring Soviet thinking more in line with Western thinking and that this may be in the end the greatest guarantee of world peace. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) has brought forth his amendment changing the content of the Resolution as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and I am very, very happy to be able to speak in favour of the amendment. When it comes in this House for final vote, I will give it my support.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words to this debate. I am a little surprised to see the Resolution on the Order Paper. What kind of nonsense is it to say, if a man picks up a shield to keep another man from hitting him over the head with a club, that he is escalating a war. I think it's ridiculous.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — I listened to the amendment with some attention and in it is mentioned the flag burning episode that we heard about last summer. We all abhor the obscenity of war but we also abhor the obscenity of burning a flag of a friendly nation. I want to say that Members opposite often, usually perhaps, seem quite willing to fight to the last American. They're not very willing to risk anything for the defence of the Continent or the defence of things that we intend to defend.

I will vote for the amendment, I can't vote for the Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I will announce, standing on my feet and giving my reasons therefor, how I intend to vote on this Resolution and on the amendment. I trust the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) will do me the honour of doing the same, standing up in his place and giving his reasons for how he proposes to vote. And if he intends not to enter the debate, I would

March 25, 1969

respectfully ask him not to interject little comments during the course of my remarks, if that isn't too much of an imposition on him.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris Estevan): — I'll wait and see what you say first.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things I want to say about this motion. There is in the main motion a great deal that I can support and in the amending Resolution moved by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), some that I can support. I want first to address a few remarks to the Member for Athabasca and the most unfortunate way in which he introduced his remarks. I never cease to be amazed at his ability to breach at least my standards of good taste. He did it again this morning. Once again he began an attack on the former Member for Saskatoon, Mr. Link. Once again he attacked a Member who isn't in this House to defend himself. Once again he recalled that black day in this House when Members on that side of the House tried to embarrass a new Member of this House on the basis that he was somehow insulting the United States. Once again the Premier stood up - we recall that day - and moved in this House that the House be adjourned because of a matter of urgent public business all to embarrass the Member for Saskatoon, the new Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Link), all to suggest that somehow he had no right to comment upon the United States, that Member for Saskatoon who was the most distinguished war hero who ever sat in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, at no time have we ever had a George Cross winner sit in this House so far as I am aware and the Premier decided that he was going to stand up and embarrass this person because he had commented on Fascism.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And I felt it was contemptible then and I said so then. It's contemptible now . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It's contemptible now and I think the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) shouldn't have raised it in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — What regiment were you in?

An Hon. Member: — Red herring, red herring!

Mr. Blakeney: — That's right. Red herring they say. I'd like to know how the Saskatoon Members name got into this debate and if it is a red herring for me to raise then how much redder a herring was it for the Member . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm sure however that every herring is red to the Member for Athabasca. He probably doesn't eat fish on the ground they are all red herrings and he has nothing to do with things red.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — The Member for Athabasca has the greatest capacity to see red in almost any situation. There must be only two colours in the spectrum for him, red and white.

Mr. Guy: — You're red and we're white!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now, I also want to express regret that he should have found the occasion to make some derogatory remarks about the previous Resolution moved by the former Member for Kelsey, Mr. Brockelbank. I think anyone who sat in on that debate will recall that that was one of the most thoughtful and thought-provoking debates that we have had in the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It was not in any way contentious. It was not in any way anti-American, notwithstanding the comments of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I thought it was most unfortunate - and I choose the word with some care - that he should have selected this time, when the former Member for Kelsey was not here, to express those comments on it. I'm sure that the Member for Athabasca would have been far too careful to criticize the remarks of the Member for Kelsey when he was here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Brockelbank was only too able to look after the rather picayune comments which were ordinarily directed at him by the Member for Athabasca.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) has suggested that our real enemy may be the People's Republic of China. I wonder if we shouldn't hark back to the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and suggest that the real enemy is not the People's Republic of China or the Soviet Union or the United States. The real enemy is the state of the world in which we find our world divided between a world of haves and a world of have nots, and the real enemy is the dissension which is now rampant in the world between the white and the non-white races. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the comments of the Member for Hanley are exceedingly well taken in suggesting that the day is very close when the people of the Soviet Union will see eye to eye with us on many, many things. Indeed they are part of the have world. They're not as affluent as we are but they are part of the have world and they are part of the white world. And they are, as much as we, caught up in this web where we find ourselves at odds with two-thirds of the world who are dark-skinned and hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to direct my remarks to a few of the

March 25, 1969

comments made by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) before I turn my comments to his motion.

He made the point that we were pleased to have the United States come to our rescue in two World Wars and I, of course, concur in that statement. And I mean no disrespect to the United States when I say that we would have been more pleased if they had come in earlier. I mean no disrespect to the United States in saying that in the Second World War they stayed out until they were attacked. And presumably if that was proper conduct for the United States, it would be equally proper conduct for Canada in any forthcoming war. I am not necessarily suggesting that that ought to be the pose for Canada, but I think that it's a little difficult for people who hold up to us the actions of the United States as being thoroughly desirable, to then suggest that, if anyone takes even a quasi-neutralist pose, they are somehow being disloyal to, or unfriendly to, the United States or its allies. I think that we're all aware that during the First World War and the Second World War the United States maintained a position of almost strict neutrality. They were a supplier of goods but they were not in any sense engaged in arming to fight the enemies whom they subsequently found themselves at war with. I am not necessarily commending that point of view to Canada. I am saying that, if Canada did take that point of view, it could hardly be labelled as reprehensible by those who support the position taken by the United States in the last war. Consistency would prohibit them from suggesting that it's appropriate for the United States in one instance to take a neutralist stand until attacked and inappropriate for Canada to take a neutralist stand. I happen to believe that Canada ought not to take a neutralist stand. I happen to believe that Canada ought to be actively seeking world peace, but I suggest to the Member for Athabasca who has commended the stance of the United States in World War I and World War II that that argument is unavailable to him, if he wishes to criticize those who take a similar stand with respect to Canada in any prospective conflict.

The comments of the Member for Athabasca in his suggestion that there is no alternative to an ABM system indicates that he was in no sense listening to the remarks of the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) and the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). Certainly many, many military experts in the United States, including Senator Stuart Symington and Senator McGovern, and many other influential people indicate that far from there being no alternatives there are a good number of alternatives to an ABM system.

Secretary of Defence McNamara, who presumably has some idea as to what the alternatives are to the United States, steadfastly opposed an ABM system and still does. In the face of that, it's a little difficult to say that there are no alternatives.

However, Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn my attention in some detail to the motion of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). It starts, and I will want to deal with it seriatim starting with number three, then two and one, if I may.

It regrets that world peace is threatened by recent Socialist imperialist aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere throughout the world. And I of course regret that the world peace is threatened by recent Socialist imperialist aggression, if these two words are not a little bit of a mouthful and descriptive of

it, in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere in the world. I regret any aggression in the world. I regret Socialist imperialist aggression, if that's the word he wants to apply to it, in Czechoslovakia. I regret aggression when it happens at the Bay of Pigs in Cuba. I regret aggression when it happened of an internal nature in Greece. I regret any type of aggression of that nature, and I, therefore, am going to suggest to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that he ought to join with me in regretting that world peace is threatened by recent aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere throughout the world without bothering to express regret only Socialist imperialist aggression but express our regrets for all aggression. And I fancy Members opposite will agree to that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, we had our motion which we thought was topical because it dealt with a specific matter that happened last week and last month. Now this, as we're well aware of, happened last year. We think it is not particularly topical because nothing is going to happen. There's no way that we can convey any message to the Government of Canada which will in any way affect the Czechoslovak situation. But since Members opposite seem to want to record their opposition and our opposition to aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, were happy to join with them in regretting that aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

Now, I look at paragraph number two, "reaffirm our deep and abiding friendship for our American neighbor and our sincere regret at the irresponsible action of certain elements in burning an American flag." And I certainly reaffirm our deep and abiding friendship for our American neighbour.

Mr. MacDougall: — That's the only . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, is another comment from the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) which I trust he will put together with his other comments and give us the benefit of his full thinking. Or perhaps that was his full thinking in the course of this debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, there is of course no prospect of us being other than friends with the United States. I am very pleased to class myself as a friend of United States. Like most people I suppose in this House I have a great number of friends and relatives in the United States. I have indeed more first cousins in the United States than I have in Canada, and it would be rather difficult for me to take a position of other than deep and abiding friendship for our American neighbour. Now, as to our "sincere regret at the irresponsible action of certain elements in burning an American flag," I want to say that I regret that an American flag was burned. I want to say that I regret that and I'm perfectly happy in saying it. I shared with those people the view that it was perhaps unfortunate to have Saskatchewan as a practice bombing range. I would want to have joined with them in our expression of regret that the Government of Canada had so arranged that Saskatchewan would be a practice bombing range. But having done that then I would

March 25, 1969

have expressed real regret that that concern would be expressed in the form of burning an American flag. I think that it was an irresponsible action to burn an American flag. The people who did it had what I felt were good motives because they were expressing a view, but the manner in which they chose to express it was, in my view, irresponsible. And accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I find myself able to reaffirm our deep and abiding friendship for our American neighbour and our sincere regret of the irresponsible action of certain people, certain elements if you want to use that rather emotive word, in burning an American flag.

Now then we come to the first paragraph, "expresses confidence in the ability of the elected Governments of Canada and the United States to jointly plan and implement an adequate defence policy for our continent and its people." Express confidence in the ability in the Government of Canada to plan a defence policy, Mr. Speaker, I can't express my confidence in the Government of Canada headed by Pierre Elliott Trudeau to plan anything.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I want to make it clear that I most profoundly do not have confidence in the Government of Canada headed by Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: —I want to say that I believe that the Government of Canada should be embarking on a wholesale scheme of foreign aid for needy countries, and I see Mr. Trudeau not doing that, and I certainly have no confidence in a Government which cannot see the merit of that action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I am asked to express confidence in the Government of Canada in defence planning. This is the Liberal Government which in 1962 was against Bomarcs and overnight, overnight with no change in fact but only a willingness to seek votes where it thought there may be votes, changed to policy without any convention, the then Leader of the Opposition changed this policy on his feet, to be in favour of Bomarcs. Now, I think this makes nonsense of any alleged defence planning.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer): — They were there.

Mr. Blakeney: — We had a position where the Liberal party was totally opposed to Bomarcs and the next day we had a position where the Liberal party was totally in favour of Bomarcs. I can easily expect that tomorrow we'll have a position in which Pierre Trudeau will be against ABMs or for them. I don't know what his policy is and the day after he will be the other way. And I'm asked to express confidence in this planning. Well I have no confidence in them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm asked to express confidence in the military organization of the Government of Canada. After reading of the fiasco of the Bonaventure! After reading that they have no concept of what a navy is for! They wouldn't know how to paint a ship for less than \$1 million and they wouldn't know how to billet its crew for less than \$1/2 million.

Some Hon. Members: — And I'm asked to have confidence in this man and confidence in his ability to plan the defence of North America.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm asked to have confidence in the defence policy in the Government of Canada. May I ask whose defence policy? Mr. Cadieux's defence policy? Mr. Kierans' defence policy? Mr. Sharp's defence policy?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . Tommy Douglas', that's for sure!

Mr. Blakeney: — Alright, at least Tommy Douglas says the same thing as David Lewis which is a great deal more than can be said for Cadieux and Kierans.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And I am asked, I am seriously asked, I am asked to express my confidence in the ability of the elected Government of Canada to plan a defence policy. It hasn't been able to plan one in its Cabinet as yet.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — What do you know about it? Defence expert . . . on the payroll?

Mr. Blakeney: — I am not a defence expert.

Mr. Heald: — Well, you sound like one this morning.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I want to say that I have a good deal of sympathy with the position taken by Mr. Kierans and I would have thought that, if Mr. Kierans was the Government of Canada, then perhaps I could express some confidence in its ability to plan, but I have then to think of Mr. Sharp and he appears to disagree with Mr. Kierans.

Mr. Heald: — Are you against dialogue?

Mr. Blakeney: — I am not against . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

March 25, 1969

Mr. Heald: — You don't have that in your party.

Mr. Blakeney: — No one is against dialogue but I am against expressing confidence in the ability of mere dialogue to produce policies.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — If I am asked to express confidence in the Government of Canada's ability to plan our defence policy in consultation with the United States. I at least ought to have available to me the views of the Government of Canada on defence, and that I don't have. The Government of Canada has expressed no views. Not even on NORAD. I don't know whether Mr. Trudeau is in favour of NORAD or against it. I don't know whether Mr. Trudeau is in favour of NATO or against it, and yet the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is asking me to repose my trust in Mr. Trudeau as a planner of defence policy. Now I suggest that that sort of thing makes nonsense, makes nonsense of this Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I indeed want to vote against it and in order to make it awfully clear just what I'm voting against so as I won't be accused of voting against the things I've just said I'm in favour of, I am going to move a subamendment and it's going to be as follows. Mr. Speaker, I want to move a subamendment, seconded by the Member for Swift Current, Mr. Wood, as follows:

That the amendment moved by Mr. Guy and seconded by Mr. Barrie be amended as follows:

That paragraph (1) be deleted; that the words "socialist imperialist" in paragraph (3) be deleted; and that paragraph (2) and (3) be renumbered (1) and (2).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Don't like those words . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — Not at all, I will speak to this, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think the sense of the amendment is perfectly clear. I find myself unable to express confidence in the elected Government of Canada as a planner of defence policy, since it has been in office - is it eight or nine months now? - and it has not been able to come to grips with the question of whether it ought to be in NATO, whether it ought to be in NORAD or the position of any of Canada's defence forces. And I think that it is quite preposterous to ask any intelligent person to express confidence in its ability to plan defence. Maybe a year from now we will be able to express that confidence. I think we cannot now, and I respectfully suggest that we delete that from the motion as being such as will make it difficult for the House to express its views on these other very important issues.

Now, on the second paragraph about the burning of the American flag, I find myself in the unlikely position of being at one with the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — So I leave that paragraph untouched. In the third one, I express regret at the invasion, the aggression in Czechoslovakia, I don't want to confine my regret to Socialist imperialist aggressions, I want to express my regret for all aggressions, and therefore, I have deleted those words but leave in, Mr. Speaker, leave in, the words which say: "by recent aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere in the world" so as to take in other acts of aggression. I could have added Fascist and other emotive words, but I simply wanted in as dispassionate a way as possible to join with the Member for Athabasca in deploring aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, in deploring the unfortunate incident about the American flag but disassociate myself . . .

An Hon. Member: — You're alone on that flag deal . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . but disassociate myself from the caricature of expressing confidence in the Trudeau Government's ability to plan defence.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But it hasn't as yet been able to convince Mr. Kierans. Mr. Speaker, I so move.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the subamendment.

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said he is against the present planning of the Federal Government in regard to the defence of our country and of this continent. This is not a new stand for the Socialists opposite. This stand started back in 1937 and 1938 and was led by T.C. Douglas, then an MP down in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — And he's on record very clearly in the House of Commons debate as opposing every step that the then Government took to try and arm this country and get it ready to fight what was obvious to anyone, Nazi aggression in Germany and Fascist Italy. But he and people like him, and I suggest some of the people are still in this Legislature, in the Socialist movement across this country, fought and undermined every motive and every move that the Federal Government took and people who saw the light and were convinced that we should be ready to fight the Germans and fight the Italians. They fought it and they underplayed it and they undermined the defence efforts. As a result, what happened? we came into that war vastly unprepared and it cost hundreds of thousands of lives of young Canadians and young Englishmen, young people all over this world.

Mr. Speaker, it was an amazing thing. It was an amazing thing, yes, it was a Liberal Government and they were unprepared and they were supported by T.C. Douglas and people like that

March 25, 1969

and they listened to them. But you know when the Socialists opposite suddenly - the old CCF led by T.C. Douglas and those people, Coldwell and the rest of them - you know when they suddenly became enthusiastic about that war? Oh, they didn't mind if the Nazis came over. T.C. Douglas said it is a joke. Who are they going to fight? Who are the Italians going to fight? You know when they suddenly became serious about that war? When their friends, the Russians, were attacked in 1942, that's when they became serious about the war.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, it is always an amazing coincidence that they are always on the side of who? Mao Tse-Tung, Brezhnev, Kosygin, and even Castro, North Korea. If the Americans drop some bombs over in North Vietnam, terrible thing, they parade and they come outside of the Embassy and they have resolutions at their conventions and so on, tearing the Americans apart, downgrading them. But North Vietnam, what did they do? They can do anything they want, they can bomb children, they can burn, they can raid, they can pillage, they can rape and never a word, never a word. I have said in this Legislature year in and year out, I've watched the papers year in and year out, I have waited to see any NDP or CCF convention stand up and go after the Russians, when? When they invaded Hungary, was there one word? Not one word from T.C. Douglas or the NDP or CCF party federally, not one word from these conventions.

An Hon. Member: — Rubbish!

Mr. Steuart: — Then what happened in Czechoslovakia? The same thing. Did they gather up and make a resolution?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — They never did, not one thing. They never raised one until it was all over and they were shamed into it. Finally, finally, in this House, the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) gets up and in an effort to paper over the cracks and in an effort to downgrade the terrible anti-American speech that was made by the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek), what does he do? He says, "We admit that we abhorred the burning of the American flag." But did he say it at the time? Did he raise his voice or did any Members opposite raise their voice and say to these young hooligans who went out and did that that they shouldn't have done this, that this was a disgrace? Never raised their voice. Mr. Speaker, you know it might have some value if these people hadn't been hoist on their own petard. They thought they would bring in a little resolution and as always get us used to these kooky resolutions is the fairest thing and the kindest thing we can say about them. There isn't anything this House can do about them. During the closing days of the House we got used to these kind of kooky resolutions being brought in by the Opposition. That is the kindest thing we can say. What is the unkindest thing? The unkindest thing is that they almost bordered on treason. That is the unkindest thing that some might say about these kind of resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) brought in an amendment. Suddenly you could see by the look on their

faces consternation, and they said, "What are we going to do? We finally have got to stand up and be counted." Dead silence from the back benchers, the usual stupefied silence from the front benchers and finally the little Regina Centre hopeful leader (Mr. Blakeney) - I don't know whether he was running for the leadership of the national or the provincial party today - stood up and made some kind of a plausible out. "This we will support and that we will support, but we won't support the national policy." Incidentally when he was on his feet, did he say whether his party would agree or disagree that we should get in or out of NATO. I never heard him say it. Why didn't he when he was on his feet say, "We support NATO, we support NORAD, we support any kind of an alliance that will hold the Russian Socialists or the Communist Socialists in China or in Cuba or wherever they are at bay." Never a word. He says, "Oh, they can't make up their mind in Ottawa." They have their minds made up in Ottawa, they are still in those alliances and I tell you today that after next Tuesday or next Wednesday they will still be in those alliances because any decent God-fearing Canadian who is ready to defend their country knows . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment brought in by the Member from Athabasca. Again I want to say that this House, this session, this Legislature, has many important things to do. Of all the resolutions brought before this House which we have absolutely nothing to do with, this Resolution and typical ones brought in almost every session, waving the red flag, has got to be, if not the nuttiest, certainly one that would tear down support for our Premier, our Prime Minister when he is down trying to negotiate in Washington right now and needs the support of the country. But as usual the Socialists opposite wave the red flag, tear down the Americans and show their true colours every time they stand up in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The House recessed from 12:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. T.M. Breker (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly, 54 students from grades seven and eight in the Speaker's gallery from the Laurier school in Annaheim. Annaheim is a small village, it is without a highway, without a bus route and without a railway. These people in that area have accepted the things that they themselves cannot change. However, they are not lacking in changing the things that they themselves can change.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — Annaheim is the home of Doepker Industries, the originator of the hydraulic harrow-draw bar and the hydraulic rod-weeder. It has installed water and sewer last year and this little village and the community it serves, stands and grow as a testimonial to the people's initiative, their pride in their community, and their willingness to preserve their community life. The students are accompanied by their teachers, Mr.

March 25, 1969

Thiessen and Mr. Holtvogt, and the bus driver, Mr. John Grunsky. It is my hope that their excursion to Regina will be educational and an enjoyable highlight of their school life and that the authorities responsible will continue to make possible further trips in the future.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Resolution No. 16.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speakers as the seconder of the subamendment, I would like to say a few words, and I will endeavour, Sir, to keep them as strictly as possible to the subamendment which is before us. I'm just not too sure that the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) did that too strictly in regard to the words that he said shortly before we adjourned for dinner. He said, as I recollect, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House and the Democratic Socialists had not come out against Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia at the time it took place. Well, I think that the Members opposite when they refer to any difficulties in the British economy, that incidentally are not any fault of the present Administration there, they like to term the British Government as the same as ourselves and I for one am quite pleased to accept that position that we are of the same political stripe as the present Government of the United Kingdom. Here I have in my hand a copy of the Regina Leader Post for August 21, 1968, the same issue that carried the news of the Soviet invasion, or what you may call it, into Czechoslovakia. It says here:

Britain today condemned the invasion as a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and said this is a tragedy, not only for Czechoslovakia but for Europe and the whole world. A statement issued by Wilson said he has asked that Parliament be called into an emergency session to discuss the crisis. Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart also hurried back from a holiday trip. He told reporters. 'It is very serious news indeed.'

Now I don't gather from that that the Government of the United Kingdom was slow in deploring what was done by the Soviets in their aggression against Czechoslovakia. Now, you may say, Mr. Speaker, that reading this item from The Leader Post in regard to the United Kingdom's position doesn't say very much in regard to the stand of the Saskatchewan New Democratic party in this regard. But I have here, Mr. Speaker, an organ which I think is well recognized as a spokesman for the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan. I don't think I need to say more.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — And on the back page of this, the August 28th issue, which was the first issue that would be put out after - well, I believe the paper was printed on the 21st, which was the day of the actual aggression, but the publishing business being what it is, it is absolutely impossible for anything to be said in the paper of that date. At the earliest possible moment on August 28th we have this editorial, 'Tragedy compounded':

Peace-minded people the world over were shocked and bewildered by the military intervention in Czechoslovakia

by the USSR and other members of the Warsaw Pact. The dreadful situation in Vietnam is now compounded by the dreadful situation in Czechoslovakia. In both places the hawks appear to be rending the entrails of the helpless rabbits. The super powers involved in both places appear to be trying to prove that might is right. When Hungary was invaded by the Soviet troops in 1956 it was argued that the rebellion there had been aided and abetted by outside influences such as the American CIA, and Hungary had been under the influence of a Fascist government at the time of the Second World War. But the situation in Czechoslovakia is quite different. This country has always shown a determination to be independent and to cling to democratic ideals. It is ironical as well as tragic that such a country should first have been betrayed by the Nazis in 1938 and now by the Communists in 1968. As this is written we do not have as much information about the total situation as we would like. Whatever further facts may come to life we feel that the USSR's action towards Czechoslovakia has been a horrible mistake. We cannot see how it can serve any useful purpose from anyone's point of view including that of the Russians themselves. It seems likely that such actions will seriously set back any possible chance of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam and it will certainly hinder the chances of having a peace-minded candidate elected as President of the United States.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this puts the position of the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan very plainly on record with regard to the position we took concerning the aggression in Czechoslovakia. And there is certainly no reason why we should not take this position because after all we are Democratic Socialists and we are proud of the name.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — And this is what the people of Czechoslovakia were endeavouring to become. They were working towards a Democratic Socialist regime in that country when the Russian juggernaut rolled in upon them. We see no reason whatsoever, I can't understand the thinking of the Members opposite that would think that we would take any different view than to condemn the Communist invasion of this country at that time. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we have made it plain in the past and this amendment which we now have before us, as spoken to by the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), also makes it very plain in this House what our position is in this regard. There is no reason and there is no excuse for Members opposite to say that we are condoning the action that was taken there.

I would like to say something further in regard to the part about the burning of the American flag last summer. I'm sure that Members on this side will concur in the fact that it was very poor taste indeed. A flag is a symbol of a nation and a flag stands for all the people of a country. I think that this abuse of the flag of our good neighbour to the south was not very well taken. I'm sure that there is none on this side of the House that would condone such an action. We are quite prepared to go along with that part of the amendment that has been

March 25, 1969

proposed by the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) in that regard.

But I do think that the Hon. Member for Athabasca cannot be very serious in expecting us to voice a vote of confidence in the Ottawa Government. If a vote of confidence were proposed in Ottawa in regard to the general administration of the present Government, it would be opposed by every Member of the Opposition, Conservative, Social Credit, or what have you, and the New Democratic Party. You can't expect the Members of this Opposition to take any different position to that. In regard to their policy concerning defence, I think this is doubly true. I was just reading the other day - it may be a small matter but it is not so small - that the morale in the navy at this time is exceptionally low due to the actions and due to the way that the matters have been handled by the present Government. If this is a good way to carry on the defence of a nation, I am sure I cannot see it, and I'm certainly not in a position to say that I am prepared to give it a vote of confidence in this type of work.

We've had some experience in the Public Accounts Committee of this House this winter and we have also read with a good deal of interest the actions and the proceedings in the Public Accounts Committee at Ottawa. Their findings in regard to a certain aircraft carrier and certain hydro planes certainly do not tend to give us confidence in the way that the Government there has been carrying on the defence of our nation. In regard to NATO or NORAD, I really can't blame the present Government especially for taking their time in expressing their position in regard to these things. I think it is a serious matter and a position which has to be given some thought, and I believe that some study is being given to it. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the time for coming forward in saying where they stand on these things is certainly drawing very close, and we should be looking forward to the time when the Government at Ottawa is going to be able to come out on record and say where it stands on these things. Certainly this is true, Mr. Speaker, that if this House, the Members opposite, or if the Government at Ottawa expects us to give them a vote of confidence in regard to their position on these things, we have to know what that position is. I do not think that the Hon. Members opposite can be serious, if they think that we are foolish enough or dupes enough to give a vote of confidence to the Government at Ottawa in regard to its position on defence.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — I do think, Mr. Speaker, that the subamendment that we have before us, as it was spoken to by the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), sets out very well our position in regard to these matters. I am sure that I will support the subamendment and I would ask all Members of the House to do the same.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, for a large country with a small population in regards to our size, it would probably take our entire Federal Budget to provide an adequate defence with a type of ever-changing models of weapons. As our province is

geographically located on the main air stream between the United States and Asia, we should welcome this defence because in defending themselves - the United States - they are also defending us. I agree that we should have something to say in these matters and believe that we are. The Federal Defence officials are doing this. Mr. Speaker, I am very disgusted to see a motion like this, which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) moved. No greater harm, I believe, can be done to the peace and security of our country than by the action and by the speeches of various people sponsored by the NDP this past year.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned as much as anybody in our country in regard to our defence. I commend both the Governments of Canada and the United States in this proposed construction of an anti-ballistic missile system. I thank God we have such a powerful nation as United States close to us to help protect us. I will wholeheartedly support the amendment prepared by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the Resolution which was proposed by the Minister of Public Works contains three sections and it really does three things.

Mr. Wood: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Members stick to the subamendment as you set out. It is not that I object to the Hon. Member speaking to the amendment as he starts out to do. But if he does that, it will elicit replies from this side and before you know it we are into a discussion of the whole matter and not sticking to the subamendment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is strictly on the subamendment.

Mr. Forsyth: — Mr. Speaker, what I had proposed to do is deal with the items covered by the subamendment, but I can only do this by referring to the amendment at the beginning of my speech. I certainly will end up speaking on the subamendment. But the amendment expresses really, to my mind, the only belief that we have to live by, and that is the belief that intelligent men possessed of both good-will and power can arrive at reasonable solutions to the problems of mankind. What is happening right at this moment is that the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada are meeting in Washington. If we can't have faith in that kind of negotiation then there is very little that we can have any faith in.

The second thing that the amendment does - and this is also done by the subamendment - is to condemn a senseless movement of violent protest that is becoming almost a trademark of our times and which reached its peak in our province with the destruction of the American flag at Naicam.

A third thing which the amendment does and the subamendment also does is to acknowledge the world-wide nature of the problems which concern all peace-loving men. Now because the subamendment

March 25, 1969

faces up to only two of the aspects of the question and leaves out a very important aspect, I cannot accept it as being adequate. I will support the amendment and not the subamendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Subamendment negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21
Messieurs

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

NAYS — 31
Messieurs

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

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want only to add a few brief words seeing that the subamendment has now been defeated and we are now faced with the proposition of being obliged to do something with this extraneous material that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) dragged in by the tails, so he wouldn't have to vote on the original Resolution. This is precisely what it is, Mr. Speaker, extraneous material, another red herring that the Minister of Public Works drags in so expertly every time there is a situation involved where there's a serious matter to be voted upon.

I think the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) has put the case exceedingly well for our Members as has the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood). There are two portions or two aspects of the amendment that the Minister of Public Works brought to this House that I think Members on this side will have no difficulty in supporting. The aspect which in part heaps condemnation on those who were involved in the flag burning, I think, is one which we have no difficulty in supporting because we on this side of the House divorce ourselves entirely and completely from this kind of action. I personally and I'm sure no one on this side of the House was acquainted with those who were involved. Certainly the inference that there was some organized attempt on our part to have something to do with this is completely erroneous. The other portion of the amendment which the Minister of Public Works offered condemns aggression, and we on

this side of the House of course find this like motherhood, equally easy to support. We condemn aggression whether it is in Israel or Egypt or Czechoslovakia or Hungary or wherever.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, we then find ourselves in a position where it would be necessary, if we supported this amendment to heap blessing and congratulation on the Federal Government and certainly this is something that no one on this side of the House has any intention of doing.

I think I have made my position clear with respect to all three aspects of the amendment which the Minister of Public Works brought forward. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention whatsoever in voting on this amendment, neither for nor against. I can't in any way support a portion of that amendment which heaps congratulations on the Federal Government. I know as far as I am personally concerned that I intend to remain in my seat when the vote is taken and I hope my colleagues on this side of the House will refrain from voting on this, because it has been an exercise in futility with respect to the kind of material that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) has interjected into a very serious matter on this day. I intend not to vote on this motion in either case, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing we might expect from the Members opposite. I'm a little surprised and amazed, though, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) would pick up a dead-horse issue like this one. It's a typical NDP type of motion because they are very famous across Canada for picking up dead-horse issues and flogging them to death. You can pick up anything you like. There will be a discussion on Vietnam and Biafra, and they will send delegations over there and all this kind of nonsense, things that we can't possibly do anything with in this House. I think that the motion in the first place was a good bit of nonsense for the Leader of the Opposition to get some publicity in the press. However, it may not turn out the way he wanted it. I didn't expect much more from the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) when he got up to speak. He follows the red line pretty carefully and pretty consistently and I'm almost convinced that Beeching helps him write his speeches.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most anti-American group of people that ever sat in the House in Regina. And I suppose anywhere in Canada. Is it any wonder that we have trouble getting industry, Mr. Speaker, to come into Saskatchewan when one hears all this anti-American propaganda that comes from the mouths of the Members opposite? The men with the money down in the States are ever fearful that it might happen by accident that these fellows may get elected again in Saskatchewan and of course they are a little hesitant to invest here. We have to defeat these people at the next election and badly, for once and for all. We will just wipe them completely out so that the Americans will lose their fear of another Socialist regime in this province. The NDP are forever kicking dead-horse issues. They kick unceasingly at our neighbours to the south and it just turns my stomach.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

March 25, 1969

Mr. MacDougall: — And I have a stomach that's big enough to turn.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — There was one thing that came out of this debate, Mr. Speaker, we smoked out two of them. We smoked out the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who is looking for the leadership of that party. He waffled this way and that way, and he snaked this way and that way, and he reminds me of the American senator who spoke on the issue of whiskey. He said:

If and when you say whiskey, you mean the devil's brew, the poisonous scourge, the bloody monster that defiles innocence, yea, literally takes the bread from the mouths of children. If you mean the evil

...

I've got it here on a piece of paper:

... drink that topples the Christian man and woman from the pinnacles of righteous, gracious living, to the bottomless pit of degradation and despair, shame, helplessness, hopelessness, then certainly I am against it. But, if you say whiskey, and you mean the oil of conversation, the philosophic wine, the stuff that is consumed when good fellows get together, that puts a song in the hearts and laughter on the lips and a warm glow of contentment in their eyes. If you mean the Christmas cheer, if you mean that stimulating drink that puts spring in the old gent's step on a frosty morning, if you mean the drink that enables man to magnify his job and happiness and to forget, if only for a little while, life's great tragedies and heartbreaks and sorrows. If you mean that drink, the sale of which pours into our treasuries millions of dollars which are used to provide tender care for our little crippled children, our blind, our deaf, our dumb, our pitifully aged, to build highways, hospitals and schools, then certainly I am in favour of it.

And that is exactly what the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) was doing this morning. He found himself waffling back and forth because when he goes to his friends to try and get the leadership, he's going to have to stand up and make a statement. And when he stands up he will be able to say that well, I went this way, I went that way and I went another way. And that's what he did. Mr. Speaker, I for one am going to support the amendment.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker. I have listened to the Hon. Members in this House today on both sides. I listened to our Leader (Mr. Lloyd) and the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who brought in a proposition which I think was very serious and important. And I thought that for once the House would take the matter seriously instead of trying to bring forth red herrings and making jokes of the whole situation. You heard Members saying they welcome American defence. Well, if you take that attitude and are quite prepared to have another nation fly over your country and run your country for you, then why should you not say the same thing to the Czechoslovakians because they too were in a certain pact. They are members of the Warsaw Pact and they too

should have welcomed the Communists coming in and protecting them, as you suggest we should be welcoming the Americans coming in, to protect us. Mr. Speaker, my folks, the same as has been pointed out by the Member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek), came to this country because they wanted to live in a free country and that's why we are here now. And because we are free here, that's why I have been proud to sit in this Legislature and to be a citizen of this province and to be a citizen of this country. I am quite prepared to see us defend our land and if the time comes to fight for this country, I am quite prepared to encourage my sons to do so. But I cannot agree for them to fight for either one kind of imperialism or another kind of imperialism.

When it is mentioned in this House by Hon. Members opposite that the Prime Minister is negotiating with the leader of this nation to the south of us, that's fine. But I would say this to the Members of this Legislature that the Prime Minister would probably like to know just how Canadians feel about this whole situation, and he would like to know how the governments of the provinces feel about this whole situation. And we should be serious enough to take the matter into hand and study it and give him the right answer. I said 15 years ago that I was not so much afraid of the attack by the Soviet Union against Canada or attacking the United States, because it wasn't Canada that would be attacked. It could only be great powers fighting each other because of different ideologies, each wanting to conquer the other and Canada would have been the battleground. The Americans themselves said so at that time. I mentioned it in this House. It was said what's 20 million people in Canada when you can save 200 million in the United States of America. Well, my friends, I am not prepared to sacrifice either myself, my children or my grandchildren in order that the Americans can survive and live. I think we have the greatest country in the world and I want to live and survive right here with my children in the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now there seems to be some lack of understanding of what it's all about, what this whole situation is all about and why the Americans are putting up these machines of destruction here in Canada for defence or whatever you want to call it. I can only refer you to some of the people that apparently know what it is all about. I would like to refer you to a report on page 8 of the Socialist Commentary from Great Britain, and they are not Communists. I quote . . .

Mr. MacLennan: — What did you say the name was?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Socialist Commentary, the Labour party in England. They are very good friends of the Americans and I would hope that you wouldn't consider that they are the friends of the Communists who went and overran Czechoslovakia. The author of this is Malcolm Keir, it sounds like a Scotch name and he says:

What went wrong with the Great Society . . .

He is referring to the American society and I think it is worth taking a few minutes of our time. I am sure the young people

March 25, 1969

up there are listening because they are interested in the Great Society. Here is what he says:

How the military managed to take over the war and make it into their own image is a question that disturbs many Americans. For it does nothing to diminish the conviction of those like Theodore Draper of the Hoover Institute of Strategic Studies that America today is in danger not only to herself but to the whole planet. Its military power has become the government of the United States, etc.

I don't need to read the rest, you have it right there. This is what we are afraid of. Here is a great imperialistic power who's concerned with its own survival because of the political philosophies that they have. They don't care whether they overrun Canada or Mexico or any other country, just as the Communists on the other side don't care whether they overrun Czechoslovakia or any other country that steps in their way.

Mr. Steuart: — Which do you think is the worst, Bill?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Me, I think they are both equally bad and I have said this on different occasions. In spite of the fact you said that it has never been brought up in this House, it's only a week or two ago when I talked about the Ukrainian question in the USSR. They are no different. Both are imperialists and they are prepared to join hands and not go to war against each other. They will try and divide this world up into two sections and that's it!

Mr. Speaker: — Point of order.

Mr. Heggie: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Member for Prince Albert Cumberland East a question if he would permit it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — What's the point of order? What have I done wrong?

Mr. Speaker: — I thought the Member from Hanley rose on a point of order but he rises to ask the Member a question. The Member can accept the question or not as he chooses.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Well if he gets up on a point of privilege, I'll answer the question, Mr. Speaker, but he's telling me I'm out of order.

Mr. Heggie: — I didn't say you were out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — No, no, it was I who said the Member from Hanley rose on a point of order and I thought that he did.

Mr. Berezowsky: — And as I said, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we in Canada are innocent.

Mr. Heggie: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — What is the point of order?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I would hope that a judge, a magistrate would know what is order and what isn't order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — If he wants to ask a question let him get up and ask it.

Mr. Speaker: — It is a well-known fact that a point of order has to be taken into consideration immediately. Now let's hear the point of order from the Member from Hanley.

Mr. Heggie: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Member who is on his feet a question.

Mr. Speaker: — Asking a question isn't a point of order.

Mr. Heggie: — Well all right then, on the point of order, the Member from Cumberland East is making a comparison of the friendly relations between the United States and Canada.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I have the right in this House to make any kind of comparison and the Hon. Member opposite doesn't have to agree with me. I don't see any difference between capitalist imperialists and Communist imperialists, and the people of Czechoslovakia know that too! If they were so fond of the capitalists why didn't they ask them to come in, but they preferred to stay under the Communists there and try to work out their own destiny. Don't forget about that. This is just another red herring that you bring up because you refuse to vote for a good resolution which is of benefit to Canadian people and Saskatchewan people. Read this about the bad situation. This is exactly why we have this situation here now with these ABM machines being established in Montana.

And here is what it says in another article taken from the library in "The World Today" on page 60:

Tactical preparedness, stronger force postures, force modernization and the implementation of new strategic concepts hinged upon Czechoslovakia's active participation in Pact planning and operations. From the viewpoint of Soviet hard-liners NATO's military posture was being constantly improved by new developments in United States' strategic forces.

Now don't tell me that it is only the Communists who are improving strategic forces and making better armaments for war. The Americans and the Canadians are doing it according to this article. Do you want that?

Mr. Stuart: — You bet!

Mr. Berezowsky: — You want that? You want to conquer the whole world?

March 25, 1969

Well, there are people like myself who don't care about conquering anybody. We want to live in peace. God help this country if you are going to defend it the way you propose to do. The air above this country belongs to the Canadian people. But you are prepared to let enemies - it doesn't matter who they are - to come and fly over and contaminate the air.

An Hon. Member: — They are not our enemies.

Mr. Berezowsky: — They are not your enemies today but they were your enemies in 1837. We are still an independent country.

Mr. Steuart: — Our enemies are the Communists and Socialists.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I thought that maybe I could say something that was serious enough so that the hon. friends opposite could respect and consider the same but from the interruptions heard from the opposite side, I think it is absolutely useless. They don't have respect for the responsibilities they have in this Legislature. They have no patriotism for this province and country and so I will say no more. Certainly I won't support this kind of an amendment that they brought in. The motion was good, the amendment was not.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments that I would like to make on this Resolution and the amendment involved. I think the best thing about this Resolution is that it has finally forced the Members opposite, the Socialists, to admit and to discuss the burning of the American flag and to finally attempt to absolve themselves of any blame. I would like to refer and point out again that this was the New Democratic Party Youth Committee that did so, and I am glad to hear these people stand on their feet and finally try and divorce themselves from it.

The second thing that disturbs the Members on this side of the House about the original Resolution of the Leader of the Opposition is its anti-American texture. In every single Resolution brought into this House, since I have been a Member in five years, regardless of what kind of problems exist in the world it always has to have an anti-American flavour.

An Hon. Member: — Pro-Russian.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, speaking of that Resolution about burning the American flag brings me to the other Resolution that the young New Democrats passed. It said that they supported the Viet Cong in the establishment of a Socialist regime in South Vietnam. If they are really interested in peace in the world, I would like to ask each one of them what is the most important single problem facing the world today. It is the problem of Vietnam. The Americans have willingly de-escalated, they have willingly stopped bombing and yet the Viet Cong, despite their word in the agreement, have now instituted the most massive rocket attack on defenceless cities and defenceless women and children ever before in the history of the South

Vietnam War. Yet not one of them would stand on their feet and move a resolution in this regard.

The second argument I would like to review very briefly the arguments of the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). First of all he referred to the fact that he couldn't support this Resolution because it expressed confidence in the Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, this is not the way I read this Resolution. It expresses confidence in the ability of the governments of Canada and the United States to jointly plan and implement an adequate defence policy for our continent and its people. It does not discuss the Conservative government, the Liberal government, the NDP government or any government, it merely endorses the principle of discussion and negotiation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that cloak is not enough for them to try to sit down and abstain in this Resolution.

The next thing they tried to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that one of the basic issues was not necessarily the issue of war instruments, but the issue of the black against the white, of the poverty-stricken against the rich or the affluent. Mr. Speaker, if that is the case why do they not stand on their feet and pay the greatest compliment to the American people, because never in the history of mankind has one nation been as generous to its fellow man as have the Americans.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Look at their foreign aid policy. Look at the Marshall Plan. Look at the organization of the American states. In every single corner of the globe the American people have contributed more to the raising of the level of the standard of living in the underdeveloped countries than any other single organization or state in the history of mankind. A thousand times more than the Russians or the Socialists in any country and, of course, Mr. Speaker, it is the greatest vindication of free enterprise and the capitalistic system.

I only want to make one other comment and that was the comment of the Member from Regina Centre in relation to the federal government's attitude toward foreign policy. Of all the political parties that I have ever seen that would condemn a party for a review, a study and a commission to ascertain what Canada's future role in foreign policy should be, it should be the Socialists. Because on every single point and on every single resolution in this House that has come forth they have recommended a study or a commission or a review. We could have spent every single dollar of this year's Budget and next year's Budget just carrying out the studies of that political party.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I will certainly support the amendment and I certainly do not accept the Member from Moose Jaw's abstention because of the first portion of that amendment. It certainly does not in any way do anything but endorse the principle of discussion and negotiation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I have one or two very short comments as the result of the comments of the Member for Moose Jaw North

March 25, 1969

(Mr. Snyder). If I heard him correctly I think he said that he didn't know these people that were involved in the flag burning, that the members of the NDP didn't have anything to do with it, and if that is what he said and that is what I understood him to say, I would just like to remind Hon. Members of the Legislature that, according to The Leader Post of July 19th, 1968, and I am reading from the press clipping:

The president of Saskatchewan's New Democratic Youth said Thursday he clapped when members of the J. Sullivan Brown Brigade burned the United States flag in Naicam a few weeks ago.
And he said . . .

That's the president of the NDY.

. . . the NDP sponsored it.

Not NDY.

'There are those who said burning the flag was in bad taste but I personally clapped. It is unfortunate they didn't burn a couple of five-star generals too.'

This is Lowel Monkhouse of Regina with the NDY. Then it goes on:

Jean Maguire, NDP vice-president was aide-de-camp in the brigade which demonstrated against United States bomb-storing training in Saskatchewan and burned the United States flag in protest. Outside the convention hall, Mr. Monkhouse told the Leader Post the NDP . . .

Not NDY.

. . . had also pledged financial support to the brigade although it had not yet made a contribution.

This is Mr. Monkhouse. The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) said that he didn't know the people that were connected with the flag burning. Well, I have another clipping here, July 27th, 1968, "Five Named by NDP":

Five members of the Saskatchewan NDP Provincial Council have been elected to the Provincial Executive.

And who do you suppose they are? Mrs. Penrose Whelan of Regina, Irving Carison of Melville, Gordon McMurchy of Semans, J.H. Brockelbank of Regina and Lowel Monkhouse of Regina. NDY representatives, NDP executives, so any statement, Mr. Speaker, to this House to indicate that the Members opposite and the NDP Provincial party don't know anything about the flag burning, it is not true, simply not true.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very interesting debate. For a long time I have watched people wrap themselves in the Union Jack on special occasions. This is one of them. My mind goes back, because of some reference that was made to Tommy Douglas and some war policies. I remember the time when to further the war effort, contracts were offered on five per cent and all these good reactionary, free enterprise, flag-flapping, Union Jack-waving industrialists wouldn't touch a contract.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Young people could die on the fields of France and they didn't care. They either got contracts plus or they wouldn't touch them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — We have heard a whole lot this afternoon about criticizing our good neighbours to the south. I haven't heard anyone damning them to the extent that some of their own papers are doing. I have a copy of the Saturday Evening Post here for February, 1969, and I just want to read you an editorial, not somebody's article, I am going to read you a paragraph out of an editorial discussing the United States of America getting out of Vietnam. He is speaking about the will to carry on the war or the will to get out of it. He says that the will to carry on can be sustained only if we are willing to continue telling ourselves the lies about our commitments to our allies. These are not my words, these are the words of the editor of the Saturday Evening Post. There has been nothing uttered on this side of the House in their misgivings of American military policies that can equal a condemnation like that. We on these prairies have built up a way of life over the last 60 years, as pioneers. If we were to sit back with the attitude of the Premier this day with his indifference as to what is going to happen to our children and our grandchildren, I for one don't care who I criticize, I am not going to sit back and let anything like that happen without fighting and taking a chance as to who I offend. So far as the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) is concerned, he ought to be ashamed to get up in his seat and say some of the things he has said today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — I will not support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I had no intention whatsoever in getting involved in this debate until the matter of fishing came up again with all the red herring. My interest picked up a bit and I listened to a few remarks opposite and I just couldn't restrain myself any longer. We heard, and I take note of the remarks made by the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) of a typical, selfish, NDP, Socialist attitude. He says that he wasn't prepared to sacrifice his life or the life of any of his family for any American. I wonder what he thought, when the Americans by the hundreds of thousands sacrificed their lives and spilled their blood for his well-being and welfare, for himself, his family and his grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the names of the people that Mr. Nixon and the American people can label as opponents and as possibly, God knows, even enemies. You have Mao of China, you have Lloyd of Biggar, Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam, Berezowsky of Cumberland, Kosygin of Russia, Smishek of North East Regina.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have no

March 25, 1969

connection with any Communists. I have said in the House the Communists destroyed my family overseas. I resent this. If he wants to go outside I will take him on - outside of this Legislature - if he is going to insult me once more. I want him to withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I have spoken as a citizen of this province and I am not connected with the Communist Ho Chi or anybody else and I don't think I should be insulted in that way or any other Member for that matter.

Mr. MacLennan: — Mr. Speaker, I never said that he was a Communist, I never insinuated that he was a Communist, I just listed him along with some other well-known people who are in opposition to the government of the United States. I will go on with the list if he wants. Smishek from Regina, Ulbricht of East Germany, Wooff from Turtleford, Gomulko from Poland, Berezowsky again, Castro of Cuba and oddly enough Tommy Douglas from anywhere he might be running in Canada. It's a very conspicuous list, it's a list that I hope I am never on and I feel sorry for the gentlemen that are on that list, Consequently they can right their position by supporting the amendment and supporting the amended motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, you know I really think that this is quite a sad day for the Saskatchewan Legislature. It is sad because, I think, we have seen it here probably at its worst muckraking, name calling, yelling across the floor, absolute denials of Members of this Legislature to be able to discuss issues of the day that we think are important. And if the opposition doesn't, they can express it by exercising their power of majority.

Mr. Speaker: — I want to draw to the attention of the Member that is speaking to the fact that there has been absolutely no denial in this Chamber of the right of Members to voice their opinion to the fullest and to the greatest extent. If any Member did not like what was going on he should have risen on a point of order. I'll make jolly sure that everybody, everybody gets a chance to speak before this debate is over and to the fullest extent. There are several people on both sides of this House that have not done so yet, but just don't cast any reflections on the Chair in regard to the defence of freedom of speech in this Chamber.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I cast no reflection on the Chair. I am simply saying . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You just did! Now go ahead.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I ask you, Sir, if it is essential or desirable or necessary to castigate a Member in that particular way.

Mr. Speaker: — Ever since I entered this House and especially in

this Chair I have defended the rights of free speech. When I sat on the Opposition side I defended the rights of free speech and I do so now for you or any Member and I'll be hanged if I'm going to sit here and be accused of stopping anybody from speaking to the fullest extent. Now go ahead. And any time you want me on the floor of the House, all you have got to do is move a motion of non-confidence and I'll get right down there. Go ahead.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the debate is getting very serious and I think you are right that this is a very serious point. I want to make it absolutely clear in my remarks I did not in any way wish to infer that you, Sir, personally have never defended the right to the freedom of speech. I think the contrary is true, that we on this side of the House have found you to be an eminently fair and reasonable Speaker and if I said anything that was misconstrued that way, I, as a parliamentarian and as a member of the legal profession, withdraw. But, Mr. Speaker, I certainly was not saying that. I got up because I was concerned at what I thought was going across in this debate from Members opposite and that was what I said to be muckraking and innuendo and a bunch of shouting, in other words debilitating against the importance of the debate as the Leader of the Opposition has introduced it in this proposed motion, We have all sorts of names being mentioned, for example, by the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan). They refuse to mention names like Senator McGovern when he talked about the people who opposed the ABM system, or Senator Ted Kennedy, or the late Senator Bobby Kennedy who also spoke on the ABM business, or for example, Dr. Spock. He said, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't want to be included in a list of names like that and I can tell him that by his contribution he never would be included in a list of names like that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — He talked about the war of the United States.

Mr. MacDonald: — On a point of order. I just wanted to point out to the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) that the Member did not suggest any list of people who spoke against the ABM when he spoke about opponents to the United States.

Mr. Speaker: — Now these are all debating questions. That is hardly a point of order.

Mr. MacLennan: — My point of order is simply that I did not state that they were anti anti-ballistic missiles. I stated the names of the people that were in opposition to the United States Government and to the United States as a nation generally speaking.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get involved in any debate particularly as to what the Member did or didn't say. I am sure that all Members of this House know what he said when he went down and listed people name by name. I am going to say, Sir, that, if you are going to name my colleague the Member for Regina North East in this debate, you can put him in the category

March 25, 1969

of the Kennedys and the people we have talked about, and no less anti-American than that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to make it personally clear and quite perfectly clear that everyone of us is indebted in some form or another to the United States of America. Accident of geography places us right next door to one of the greatest countries of the world, the United States of America. There is no question about that. But don't ever have the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) tell us about the Second World War and the actions of the American nation. They, Sir, didn't act until 1941 - a full two years after war had occurred in the European scene and only after they were attacked. Only because it was in their own interest. The fact of the matter is this that they decided calmly and rationally, independently, what was best in their own foreign policy terms. And that is what the proposed motion by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) intended to do, to say to the people of Saskatchewan and Canada, "Look, we are an independent province, we are an independent Canada." We may disagree with our friends from time to time but friends are there to be disagreed with from time to time and we object to the system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — May I also remind the Hon. Members that this is exactly what has been intimated by the Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and I hope that this matter can be salvaged yet. May I make one other observation, Mr. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). This can be interpreted as a confessional. As far as I am concerned personally - and this has been said by Member after Member on this side of the House - I don't condone any of the actions of flag burning. That was a piece of arrant nonsense. But I can simply say this: Lowell Monkhouse was no more speaking for the NDP than the Members in the Liberal youth convention who said that the Liberal party is nothing but a stamp-licking and boot-licking party. I wouldn't get up and say that that is exactly the sole purpose and the sole being of the Liberal party. The fact of the matter is that at any function that I have had anything to do with as a Member of the New Democratic party, never has it ever been proposed or approved, that I know of, by any New Democratic Party in convention with respect to the question of burning. And may I also just to clarify the record say that Jean Maguire, whoever she is, is certainly not a vice-president of the New Democratic Party. The fact of the matter is simply this, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is really a red herring. This has been said by the Members of this side. This is why I say it is a sad day. We had here an issue before the House on the question whether or not this Legislature expressed its opinion of opposing the proposed ABM system in the United States. That was all! No one asked for the amendments to be dragged in about flag burnings or about Socialist imperialism or anything of that nature, or name calling, or naming of people in North Vietnam and otherwise. It is a simple opportunity to debate an issue.

All I can say is simply this. The Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) has very adequately told us why we can't support certainly one part of the proposed amendment. And that is

because the Liberal Government in Ottawa does not know and hasn't known for some years what the policy is with respect to defence and foreign matters. I am going to cite one very small authority if I might. In 1963, Mr. Speaker, and this is still a continuing issue and the nub of the argument today, there was a great debate on nuclear arms. There were some of us who said that Canada ought not to accept nuclear warheads because there was an escalation. Many of the same arguments, Mr. Speaker, were advanced today in urging the Government to oppose the ABM installation. And members of the Liberal party, members of the group that sit opposite, also said the same thing time after time. In fact, the then Leader of the Opposition, Lester Pearson, gave his commitment to the people of Canada that we would not have nuclear warheads on our soil. That was good until 1965. Like any other Liberal promise it was a broken promise because in 1965 we turned around and accepted nuclear warheads.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And at that time I can tell Hon. Members that there was a great deal of consternation by some members of the Liberal party.

I just want to quote a little item from an article called, *Cité Libre* in Quebec. Members may have not heard this quote regarding the reversal of the foreign policy decision and defence matter of the Liberal Government of the day:

I have never seen in all my examination of politics so degrading a spectacle as that of all those Liberals turning their coats in unison with their chief when they saw a chance to take power.

And then further on he said this:

The head of the troop having shown the way, the rest followed with the elegance of animals heading for the trough.

That, Mr. Speaker, was the now Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — This man is now the chief man of the Liberal party in Canada and now the Prime Minister of this nation. This man now has engaged in what is called his dialogue with respect to such important foreign matters and defence policies, such as for example, NATO. And now, withstanding what my friend the Minister of Welfare says, this proposed amendment asks us to express confidence in the man who has just finished, and these are quotes from the articles that he has written, who had just said that quote a short five years ago. He has one Minister, Mr. Kierans, going in one end of the country and saying that NATO is no good. He says that Canada should pull out of NATO. He says our defence arrangements are out of date and are obsolete. And another Minister, Mr. Cadieux goes to the other end of the Canadian nation and says, No, NATO is a very good thing. We've got to support it. They don't know themselves what the position is with respect to NATO. And it is the same thing with Red China. Now they are trying to examine the question of whether or not Red

March 25, 1969

China should be entered into this thing. I will be very interested to see what finally happens because there is another book written by one Pierre Elliott Trudeau called *Two Innocents in China*. There is a very interesting comment with respect to some of the type of debate that I have made reference to, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, and that is to say what I consider to be muckraking, and smear, sometimes subtle and sometimes blatant.

Mr. Trudeau says some very important things about the recognition of Red China. Would Hon. Members opposite say that he was towing an anti-American line, because you know the Americans are against Red China being recognized?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The American's don't want Red China in the United Nations. Would the Hon. Members say that Mr. Trudeau, now that he is entering negotiations in defence alliances, in recognizing Red China is probably doing the wrong thing? No. What does he say about this matter when he talks about defence matters and when it comes to recognizing Red China? He said this and I am quoting from his book, Mr. Speaker:

For years anti-Communists of this kind . . .

and I might just stop here from the quotation. Anti-Communists of those kind, because they are not Pierre Elliott Trudeau's Liberals. They are not ours I can say that.

. . . have applied themselves to discrediting any evidence that might suggest that the Russians were not Stone Age barbarians. Then suddenly the Soviets put gigantic Sputniks in orbit around the earth, photographed the other side of the moon and confounded world opinion with the scientific progress. It is evident then, today, that Western governments would have done well to have listened more carefully to travellers who told the progress of the USSR and to have put rather less trust in the witch hunters.

And that is what we have opposite, a bunch of witch hunters when it comes to the question of this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Their reaction to the question of an important issue such as this is exactly the type of tactic that is employed by the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), the Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan), the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), not the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) to such an extent, and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). It is a simple question of witch hunting, the type of witch hunting that is condemned by the Leader of their own party nationally.

You know the Liberal party in Canada really doesn't know where they are going in defence matters, one day we are in NATO and one day we are out of NATO. I was very interested to hear the Deputy Premier say this morning that he knew that next Tuesday Canada was going to announce that we are going to remain in NATO. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hot line has now been reconnected between Saskatchewan and Ottawa. It seems that the

Provincial Treasurer knows a little bit more about what we are going to do NATO-wise. All I can say is simply this. I hope, Mr. Treasurer, that you have more information than you were able to provide for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan on what Ottawa was going to do with respect to wheat prices.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Where was the hot line when the wheat prices were being debated? You couldn't tell us what Ottawa was doing. You didn't know that the International Grains Arrangement was being broken. Now all of a sudden you know what the situation is with respect to the NATO question. You know the situation now. It simply tells us one thing. You have a hot line when it comes to guns, but you have no pipeline when it comes to bread and butter for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You have a great source of information about international defence systems but no source of information about International Grains system, the bread and butter, the type of thing that we were talking about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are so confused they are like the drunken driver, the drunken horse-rider. He got into the stable and he mounted the horse the wrong way. The horse was pointing one way and he was pointing the other way. Someone said, and I think it was a friend from Souris-Estevan, "Hey, you are on the horse the wrong way." To which the guy replied, "How do you know which way I am going?" And that is exactly the position of the Liberal party, both nationally and provincially. "How do you know which way I am going?" they ask us.

Then they ask us in the Resolution, in the first part, to say that we have confidence in the Government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I say that is patent nonsense and the people of Saskatchewan know that.

Mr. Speaker, no one on that side of the House need lecture us or particularly me about Socialism and imperialism. Nobody has to lecture the six or seven people of Ukrainian background.

An Hon. Member: — Oh!

Mr. Romanow: — Oh! All right! The only ones who really know what the effect of it was. You don't have to lecture us why we came to Saskatchewan or Canada . . .

Mr. Steuart: — You don't have to lecture us about how to defend this country. We know that.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I see that the sensitivities of the Provincial Treasurer have been somewhat touched again and he has entered this debate with full flay. I wish that he would make some sense this time, but unfortunately he hasn't. All I am saying is this, Mr. Speaker, it tends to be a bit of a specious argument to talk in personal terms about, you know, the effects

March 25, 1969

of Socialism and imperialism and the like, and I don't want to engage in that. I simply say, Mr. Deputy Premier, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, that by the same token you ought not to try and take by one large brush, knowing the facts of the situation respecting the Members on this side of which I am one, with respect to the question of Soviet imperialism and Socialist aggression, whatever it happens to be and say that we are all anti-American. The Member from Moosomin, the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) tells us about . . .

An Hon. Member: — Milestone.

Mr. Romanow: — Milestone, right. Sorry, but he doesn't know what riding as he is never there anyway. It is either Moosomin or Milestone so it doesn't matter. Sorry, Mr. Minister, your policies are rather confusing as well.

May I simply just say this. He said to us in the course of the debate, he asked us why is it we're always anti-American? Why here we have an ABM system but it is anti-American, the whole flavour of the Resolution. "Why," he says. "every time the New Democratic party speaks it is anti-American." All I want to know and ask the Minister: did the Russians put in the ABM system? Who do you expect us to protest to? Who do you expect us in the democratic country to protest to?

Look, those Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, are saying this: They tell us about democracy. They tell us all about the important virtues of democracy to which I wholeheartedly subscribe, of which one is this debate. Mr. Minister, one of the virtues is the right to protest, the right to discuss, and the right to give suggestions to our neighbours to the south, and this is what the motion of the Leader of the Opposition does.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — There is no use me going up and down Red Square parading with a picket because I am not going to convince anybody in the Kremlin at all, but I am going to convince my own Government. I am going to convince my democratic people in the Province of Saskatchewan and in the Dominion of Canada and hopefully the United States, because it is a democratic country. Arrant nonsense to talk about the question of going around and protesting here in Saskatchewan. For the record may I say this, that I have personally and I am here now reiterating opposition to imperialism, such as, for example the type that has been aired in this Chamber at the Czechoslovakian crisis. The Czechoslovakian crisis was a rape of a terrific country of terrific people. Every one of us on this side has said it. Every one of us on this side. The fact of the matter is that we are talking about one thing. We are not talking about Czechoslovakia. We are talking about the ABM system. The United States government is unsatisfied. They want Canada's participation, and we, as Canadian people want to register our opinion to the Canadian people and that is our democratic right.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I don't know how anyone can say that was anti-American. My colleague and I, I think, get along relatively well. We

discuss from time to time some of the pieces of nonsense that come out of the Liberal Government. I sometimes happen to agree with the legislation and he doesn't agree and we have that right to disagree. I am not anti-Walter Smishek because I happen to suggest a certain course of action to him. I am not anti-American because I happen to suggest a different course of action for the United States of America or the Dominion of Canada. In fact, I am pro-American.

The facts of the matter are that when you show an interest in the activities of another country, another person, or issues of the day, you are not going to hurt the cause. If the argument is strong, it is going to stand up to the test of time and through all of the argument, and even the bungling of the Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that this is a sad day in the Legislature and I quite firmly believe that personally. I watched this Legislature time and time again downgrade itself. I suppose I have - I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I meant to address these remarks personally to the Speaker - I suppose by some of the comments that I have made or were interpreted by Mr. Speaker, I have contributed to that as well. I have apologized wholeheartedly. But you know I came down here in my second year under some crazy delusion that in a democratic system all of these things that the boys opposite talk, I could raise some of the issues and argue passionately sometimes, a little bit of a barb sometimes, about the guts of a particular issue, and we come and we wrestle and we decide in terms of the merits of the issue.

Time and time again, and this is the final clincher, what happens is that every time an Opposition Member introduces a resolution, it is automatically and without consideration opposed by the Members opposite with some form of an amendment, an amendment, simply speaking, that is for cheap politics or harking back to 20 years, and I simply say . . .

Mr. MacDougall: — . . . for 20 years.

Mr. Romanow: — Look, the Member for Souris-Estevan, just stick to the subject that you know best about, that was the poem about whiskey or whatever it was and leave the rest to the people around.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the Member from Souris-Estevan, the argument against the ABM installation, I think, is very simple. It has been put forward very learnedly and scholarly by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Simply, there are enough deterrents now in the American system to deter against any possible attack or act of aggression by the Soviets.

It is told by countless writers and documented by my colleague from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). There is an overkill. Any argument that this particular system is needed as a deterrent is absolutely specious. They have enough now. They have enough systems and enough aeroplanes to deter. There are enough of the books to go around to be able to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is enough documentation admitted. Mr. Speaker, let me say this. I don't honestly think that these

March 25, 1969

people have read a thoughtful book on the question for the last 10 years - 5 years. The question simply is that there are enough deterrents at the disposal of the American nation, the North American people, enough deterrents to blow this whole entire North American Continent sky high.

Secondly, Canada can aid in the fight against Communism, I think, in more meaningful ways. We cannot enter into the rocket age as we don't have the resources. We can enter into the combat against Communism by providing more aid to underdeveloped countries, for example, moving up to three, four or five per cent of our gross national product to help that way. We don't help, I don't think, when in particular, now, the United States has enough weapons and rockets to maintain itself. We don't help in a small area of this nature but we can help in other ways that are more significant.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, to me I think that there is an issue here of independence. I think we have the right and the duty as Canadian citizens to voice and express our concern when we think that our sovereignty is being violated. As Senator Fulbright of Arkansas said, the action of the United States Government was taken without absolutely any consideration or concern for the people of this province and the people of Canada. I think that is bad and that alone is a principle that ought to be supported by this Legislature, that we are a truly autonomous and independent House and a truly autonomous and independent people who are going to give our expressions to our friends to the south.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth argument I think is that any escalation of any arms anywhere is bad in the interests of peace. I think that this is only bound to provoke increased retaliation or the possibility of retaliation, increased armaments on the part of our enemies whoever they may be, real or imaginary, wherever they may be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that this to me has been - and I know that the boys opposite won't believe it - politics of disillusionment. It has been a question of frustration. An absolute disappointment. As I say I am probably as guilty from time to time as anybody in name calling in the heat of debate, but I want no part of a proposed amendment to a Resolution that makes a farce of this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I personally, and the people of the Province of Saskatchewan want no part of an amendment to this Resolution that is simply drawn so that they have cheap politics by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and so on, so they can drag names across the Chambers of this House.

I want to have no part of a proposed amendment to a Resolution that takes away from what we ought to be discussing, one of the important issues of this province and this nation, and that is the question of ABM system, and has now thoroughly deprived us of that right to discuss that issue and at least express our opinion by virtue of the proposed Resolution.

Mr. Treasurer said that the Resolution is nutty.

Mr. Steuart: — Kooky!

Mr. Romanow: — Kooky and nutty! Well, I can simply say this, Mr. Treasurer, that, if being concerned about humanity is nutty and kooky, then put me in that category, because that is what the proposed motion was. You may not agree and you can disagree, you have the right to say that the proposed motion was wrong on the merits. But the fact of the matter is whatever stance the Government would have taken, you would have debated some vital issue that affected humanity but you didn't because of your proposed amendment. Anybody who takes part in this amendment now in my view is only being a party and an agent to the crime that is being perpetrated by the Members opposite. Therefore, I am going to subscribe to one more final quotation of the now Prime Minister . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Ho Chi Minh?

Mr. Romanow: — No, not Ho Chi Minh, the Prime Minister of Canada. Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Do you happen to know him, Mr. Treasurer? Have you talked to him lately? You know he said this and I quote:

Thus the political philosophy of the Liberal party is simplicity itself.

Little did Mr. Trudeau know what he was writing about when he was writing this. He said:

Say nothing, think anything that you like, or better still, don't think at all . . .

We saw that today, that's for sure.

. . . but put us in power because we are best fitted to govern.

Now I don't think that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan will buy that. Rather they will buy this final quotation by the Prime Minister and I quote:

In actual fact only the NDP was morally justified in reproaching the Government on its defence policies. This is the only party which has followed a coherent defence line on this particular point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — That is the issue, Mr. Speaker, and any Member who happens to take part in the Liberal side in this debate at this particular point, in my view, will not only be transgressing some of the views that I have outlined with respect to the conduct in this Chamber, but as well, undoubtedly, what happens to be the word of the most significantly followed person in Canada, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I wasn't here at the

March 25, 1969

beginning of the debate because we had a Telephone Board meeting this morning and it lasted longer than I had anticipated. But it didn't take me very long in the House to catch the gist of the debate.

I recall sitting here that it was reminiscent of the same type of debate that we have had in this House for 20-odd years. My friends across the way resent the fact that someone refers to them as being anti-American. I can remember some years back the Minister of Agriculture, the snoose-chewing Minister of Agriculture, said that we should pass a resolution and we should call down the wrath of the gods against the American Government who have American troops on Canadian soil, who have a division of American troops in North Battleford and we were to adjourn the House in order to go to North Battleford and see what these desperate American troops were doing in North Battleford.

You know that some went to North Battleford and do you know what we found? Three American soldiers walking down the streets of North Battleford. This was the great invasion, the great American invasion that the Minister was talking about in those days. I find precisely the same trend today. I wish, at least if they have a firm conviction, that they would be honest in those convictions. If they have no use for the American Government, and if they are afraid that the American Government and the Americans are a threat to Canadians, as the Member here stated, why don't they say so?

I was interested in the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), coming up and giving above all an address as if he was the sage of the Opposition. A few days ago he was speaking about my generation and what we should do in education. The expert from the Opposition on Education. Today he brings into the House the views of my generation on defence and this is the viewpoint of my generation.

Let me just read the Resolution and I am going to take time to read it:

That this Assembly expresses its concern that the proposed construction in North Dakota and Montana of an anti-ballistic missile system would represent a threat to world peace as well as a particular danger to the people of Western Canada and especially Saskatchewan, and urges the Government of Canada (a) to refuse to participate in such a program;

To participate in any anti-ballistic missile program. Not just that we ask them to remove them from North Dakota and Montana, but that we go on record as refusing to participate in any antiballistic program. Why?

and (b) to use all the means at its disposal to convince the Government of the United States that the said proposal would be an escalation of the nuclear arms race and a consequent further threat to world peace.

They remind me of a teachers' meeting about the new Deweyism in education. One parent got up and said, "You know if my little boy Johnnie is causing any trouble, just slap the boy next to him, that will frighten him." This is the attitude that they are taking. This is exactly the attitude of the CCF. Now they talk about anti-ballistic missiles. Let me read you something

from this week's issue of Newsweek, March 24, 1969:

The US Fuller Reconnaissance plane has detected a new Soviet-built SAM anti-aircraft missile site in Cuba, southwest of Havana. The US Intelligence is keeping a close watch on recent Cuban missile site construction.

Why don't they say this would lead to an escalation of the threat of war? What are we asking in the amendment, Mr. Speaker? We are asking that we express our confidence as Canadians in the ability of the elected Government of Canada and the elected Government of United States to plan and implement an adequate defence policy for our continent and its people. What less can we do? For us the Canadians to express confidence in our Government and confidence in the brand new American Government - our Prime Minister and their President meeting today - to express confidence that they together will plan and implement an adequate defence policy for our continent and for its people. Secondly that we affirm "our deep and abiding friendship for our American neighbor and our sincere regret at the irresponsible action of certain elements in burning an American flag." I notice that my generation from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) expressed regret likewise in his speech. He says, "I wash my hands clean of this action, we don't want to take any responsibility for this." Then why can't he support this amendment that we too regret "the irresponsible action of certain elements in burning an American flag."

"Regrets that world peace is threatened by recent Socialist imperialist aggression in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere throughout the world." Mr. Speaker, these are the fears that are uppermost in the hearts of Canadians, and uppermost in the hearts of the people around in the free world. Their only prayer and their only hope is that the free nations of the world, in understanding and in common cause, would seek out ways of defence that would be a deterrent to aggressors who would think we were weak, and ready to be marched upon. I for one think that this amendment is expressing the heartfelt desires of the people of Saskatchewan, that we express confidence in Mr. Trudeau in his leadership and in the President of the United States, that these two great governments may get together and in the interest of both Canadians and Americans on this continent, devise a means of defence which will be strong enough to say to all those who would think that, we are weak, that we will stand no aggression and we will repulse aggression from whatever quarter it may come.

This is in essence is what the amendment stands for. This is in essence all we are asking. This is in essence what we are asking Canadians and the people of Saskatchewan particularly to subscribe to. May I say in this, there is no indication of anti-Americanism, there is no indication of animosity between Canada and our great neighbour to the South, there is nothing but a determination to build a friendship between us and together that we can be a beacon of peace in the world. That these two great nations standing on this Continent stand shoulder to shoulder together and will protect the interest of the free world wherever aggression may take place.

I take great pride in supporting this amendment as I am certain that every worthwhile citizen of Saskatchewan would want us to do, that we join with our great American friends to the South to say to the world, to any nation to have second thoughts before they would think that we are timid and we are

March 25, 1969

weak and that we are ready for takeover. Thus it will be in my judgment, a deterrent, not an escalation, but a deterrent to all those who have other thoughts that, while we are peace-loving and have no ambition to garner onto ourselves any portion of the world, we will nevertheless defend our borders and we will unite in the process of doing so.

I urge the Members to support this Resolution which is a constructive resolution. We stand in readiness to defend those things which we believe in on this continent. Therefore, if you wish to be counted, stand up and be counted! Stand up and be counted. Would you prefer to carry on a war with our great American ally to the South, to say to Americans, "We want no part or parcel of you." To say as the Member for Cumberland East (Mr. Berezowsky) said, "They are as dangerous to world peace and are as aggressive and as war-like as the Russians. They are equally as imperialistic as the Russians and if it was to their advantage that they would not hesitate to sacrifice Canadian people, Canadian wives and Canadian children." This is the picture we got this afternoon of American people. This is the picture we got . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Point of privilege, I said that the Americans themselves said that. The Americans said it, that they are willing to sacrifice Canada for United States. I'll dig it up for you if you like.

Mr. Cameron: — The Member from Cumberland said it, not I.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I didn't say it.

Mr. Cameron: — This is typical. This is typical of the Socialist propaganda. I have heard it for 20 years in this House. Don't try to tell us now that you have changed your heart, or your basic principles. You were born on the theme of anti-American, anti-capitalist, anti-riches, anti-affluent society, anti-everything that makes progress and peace and order in the world. I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The amendment was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31
Messieurs

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

NAYS — 1
Messieurs

Willis

The debate continues on the motion as amended.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I take it, if the Leader of the Opposition speaks now, I understood your ruling earlier that this is a debate on a concurrent motion, then I would submit that the Leader of the Opposition has lost his right to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — No, no! Order, order! The debate continues on the motion and the amendment concurrently. That doesn't preclude the Leader of the Opposition or any other Member who moved a substantive motion or a motion for second reading of a bill to close the debate.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, if this Resolution was as useless and out of place and irregular as some Members opposite have suggested, it has certainly attracted a lot of attention. Any resolution that brings to its feet five Cabinet Ministers, plus the Member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) must have something at least to commend it. One can't help but wonder, if this Resolution was such a useless procedure, why the Members of the Government side of the House paid so much attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, there isn't much that I want to say in closing the debate on the Resolution. I don't wish to say much because in fact the comments have been in large measure already rebutted by my colleagues who have already spoken. I do although want to make some comments.

May I refer first of all to the Member from Hanley, because I want to separate him from some of the general comments I make about other speakers in this debate from the opposite side of the House. He and to some extent I must admit the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) did pay some attention to the Resolution. They did make some comments about the Resolution itself, and I appreciate the fact that they thought it worthwhile to discuss it. I can quite easily understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are differences of opinion and I respect the differences of opinion with regard to it. I find it difficult to understand the extreme effort to avoid discussing the Resolution which all of the other Members undertook.

In talking about what the Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) had to say, I do want to take issue with a couple of points that he made. He said, "There is little we can do as citizens of Saskatchewan, this is a Canadian and a world affair." I would have thought you know that we as citizens of Saskatchewan are also citizens of Canada and citizens of the world. It is because we are citizens of the world that this Resolution was brought before this Legislature today. He said secondly, in reference to some of the senators whom I have quoted, that it is a good thing there are senators in the United States who have the opportunity and who can stand up and oppose installations like the ABM. I agree with him. But I wonder why, if it is a good thing that senators over there can do it, it becomes

March 25, 1969

automatically a bad thing when some of us do the same thing here. I wonder . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . when he is saying that, how he can excuse also his support of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) who, when someone of us takes this position, immediately terms us “Communist” and “anti-United States.”

Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling, and I share it very deeply, expressed by my colleague, the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). He said it was a sad day. I think it was too. I am dismayed and I am disappointed at the attitude of the majority of those who have spoken from the Government side on this Resolution. I am dismayed and I am disappointed at the attitude of many of those who sat in their seat and did not speak. Here, Sir, was a serious proposal. It was put forward with all sincerity. It was put forward in the belief that it was worthwhile for this Legislature to talk about something which has a bearing on the essential great question of today, which is the question of world peace. The Members from the opposite side of this Legislature for the most part have treated it with frivolity and even with levity. The amendment which was moved was simply a political stratagem, a bit of subterfuge to attempt to avoid talking about this important issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The Premier broke the ice, led the pack in this by suggesting that it was a waste of time. I have to again express my dismay and disappointment that the Premier holds discussions of this kind in such utter contempt.

I would like to read a short statement from a great American document. It is from the Declaration of Independence. That short statement is one which has reference to an obligation “to have decent respect for the opinions of mankind.” In all sincerity, I felt that the kind of talk we heard, particularly from the Minister of Public Works and the Provincial Treasurer, failed to show any decent respect for the opinions of mankind or any decent respect for the right of people to utter the opinion which they hold. There seems to be a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that to be against an idea, is to be against the country of its origin. Obviously, that is sheer stupidity! There seems to be an idea that, to be for an idea, is to be for the country of its origin in all things. That is an equal depth of stupidity. May I submit that those who oppose the right of people to speak out without being called Communists or something else, because they do speak out, are the real anti-Americans in this Legislature and outside of it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Those who suggest that anybody who happens to differ with them is Communist, or label in some other derogatory way, these are the real anti-Americans. I’m sorry the Provincial Treasurer isn’t in his seat - these are the people who are really guilty of treason, guilty of treason against the basic decency of democracy . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, there are two excellent reasons, I think, why this Resolution should have been discussed here today. One is that the Government of Canada, represented by the Prime Minister, is meeting with the political leaders of the United States. We are told that he has not yet made up his mind, that the Government has yet to make a decision, as to which way it wishes to go. We are urged constantly also that the Prime Minister, and I honour him for it, wants dialogue, wants discussion. I submit there is no better place in which we can have a dialogue and discussion about this matter, there is no better way in which we can encourage dialogue and discussion about it in the province, than by discussing the kind of resolution which we have tried to discuss here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — That's one reason why it is appropriate for us to discuss this.

The second reason is that this does in the opinion of some of us constitute a possible threat to world peace. Maybe we're wrong. We don't think so, but thinking as we do, then we surely have a responsibility to speak out. I say to the Member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) who raised some question about this being a dead horse and why the Resolution was here. There is an old quotation:

To sin by silence when you should protest makes cowards out of men.

There is no reason at all for any of us . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . to be cowards by sitting in silence with respect to a proposition of this particular magnitude.

May I turn to just a few of the comments of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). He went back into history some 30 years, I'm not going to bother to go back and comment on those remarks. We say just this, Mr. Speaker, that it is true Canada had some deficiencies with respect to preparedness at the beginning of World War II. I have heard many political and military figures say that our greatest deficiency at that time lay not in the unpreparedness of our military force. The greatest deficiency lay in the deficiencies of education and health of the Canadian people. If we had been putting more of our resources, doing a better job of solving our domestic problems at that time, we would have been way ahead in our war effort when the war was declared. That declaration incidentally, with regret, was supported by all of our Members in Ottawa at that time with the exception of one. That man probably was the most highly respected Canadian there ever was, J.S. Woodsworth, who did vote against it, split with his own party to do so. If my hon. friends want to read one of the moving moments in Canadian history, I suggest that they go back and read Mansard, on the day when J. S. Woodsworth stood up alone in that House and made his declaration. Note the statement of the Liberal Leader at that time, the Right

March 25, 1969

Honourable Mr. MacKenzie King, who got up before Mr. Woodsworth and said:

I know what my friend is going to say, I know that we are mostly in disagreement with him . . .

Then he went on to plead with the House to give this great man his right to speak as he wished to speak and to respect him for his position. I would suggest to my hon. friends . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . especially the Provincial Treasurer that he might read that little bit of Canadian history which I think ought to make us proud of Canada and of the Canadian Parliament.

Now it was suggested by several Members across there, and particularly by the Provincial Treasurer, that there had been no statement by our party with respect to the recent invasion of Czechoslovakia. Now one of the characteristics of our Provincial Treasurer is that, as was said by somebody a long while ago, he relies on his memory for his wit and on his imagination for his facts. This is just one more instance in which he relied for his memory on the facts. Two and possibly three times he made the claim that nobody in this party had raised any protest whatsoever about the recent Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. He is saying it here now. Mr. Speaker, let me read a bit from the record. Hopefully it might convince the Provincial Treasurer that he shouldn't rely all the while on his imagination for his facts. I read a statement by T. C. Douglas, under date of August 27, 1968:

The New Democratic party expresses its support of the people of Czechoslovakia in their endeavor to introduce a greater degree of political democracy in their form of government. The Soviet Union's attempts to obstruct these reforms are unjustifiable. No nation has the right to interfere with the efforts of another nation to freely determine their form of government. It is the hope of the New Democratic party that the Canadian Government will make it abundantly clear to the Soviet Union that the attempt to exert military or any other pressure on Czechoslovakia would be viewed with extreme disfavor by the Canadian people. Should the light of democracy in Czechoslovakia be snuffed out for the third time in this century, world opinion would be outraged, the resulting outcry would be more vehement than that which accompanied the Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956.

Secondly, let me read just a bit of an earlier statement by Mr. Douglas and Mr. Lewis, on August 21, 1968. In this one they said:

The unwarranted invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet Polish and East German forces is a ruthless act of aggression which has shocked the world.

They added later on:

Czechoslovakia and its people have again been sacrificed to serve blind Soviet Communist interests . . .

and went on in that way.

Mr. MacDougall: — What magazine were you reading?

An Hon. Member: — Shut your mouth and open your ears!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the sound of heavy water from Estevan, dripping on the blocks of time over there again - or maybe it's his stomach flopping over as it was a few minutes ago.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I want to say just a little bit, Mr. Speaker, a very little bit I assure you about the comments of the Minister of Public Works. My comment is simply this, Mr. Speaker. Usually I can be pretty proud of this institution of ours. But in fact this morning, as he spoke, I was ashamed to be a Member of this Legislature . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — . . . and it's not the first time I've been ashamed when that particular Member stood on his feet.

An Hon. Member: — He's not there most of the time to stand up!

Mr. Lloyd: — I felt only a little bit worse when the Provincial Treasurer was speaking!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I have just taken some time to demonstrate the Provincial Treasurer getting up here and stating something of fact when the records prove him wrong. Over and over again, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of situation we get in this House.

Mr. Steuart: — What position is the provincial party in?

Mr. Lloyd: — The Provincial Treasurer as usual spits and snarls and spits and snaps from his seat. He spends more time talking sitting down than all the rest of this House put together. He should, because when he gets up he has so little to contribute.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, let me turn to this charge of anti-Americanism. I was extremely careful in what I said, I was extremely careful in my selection of references. Let me recall those references, people whom I quoted to support the position that I was taking. There was Dr. Forsyth, the Secretary of the Board of Evangelism and Social Service for the United Church. There was a Pauline Jewitt, a former Liberal Member of Parliament. I quoted from a number of United States senators and scientists. Do these gentlemen who talk over here so glibly about anti-

March 25, 1969

American ideas suggest that Stuart Symington, a former Secretary of National Defence in the United States, is anti-American when he opposes this system? Do they suggest that Senator McGovern, one of the candidates for the Democratic leadership is anti-American? Do they suggest that the former Secretary of Defence, McNamara, is anti-American when he criticized the missile system and when he pointed out that this would lead to escalation? Do they suggest that anyone of the four scientists, advisors to Presidents in the field of science are anti-American?

Mr. Speaker, they use this term only in an attempt to cover up their own inability or their unwillingness to have a rational discussion of the situation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, may I make just one or two further comments. May I say to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and I hope he will take my word for it, that the New Democratic Party in this province at no time supported or endorsed the unfortunate and regrettable happening of burning an American flag to which he referred. Secondly, will he take my assurance that Jean Maguire to whom he referred is not now and was at no time a vice-president of the New Democratic party in this province. And, thirdly, will he take my word for it that the New Democratic party at no time paid one single solitary nickel to this particular happening or this particular event.

Mr. Speaker, all that I want to say in closing is one last quotation and I hope that the Members don't say that it is an anti-American quotation. I quote from the Hamilton Spectator in an editorial in September of 1968. They talked about the missile system and they said:

Our first endeavor,

Canada's first endeavor

should be to ensure that this country has no part in it.

That is a Canadian newspaper. That is essentially what we have been saying as we discussed this Resolution that is before us. Our first endeavour should be to ensure that this Canada of ours has no part in it. It was the hope, when I put this Resolution forward, that Members of the Government albeit might have differed with it, but might have been prepared to discuss it with some degree of respect. It was my hope that they might, while opposing the idea, have given reasons as to why they oppose it. I can understand opposition. For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand the attitudes that they brought to this discussion since they, Mr. Speaker, since they refuse to respect the Resolution, I can see no reason for respecting this red herring of an amendment which they put forth. That is why I remained in my seat on the other vote and will remain in my seat if they call a vote on it again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The motion as amended was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31
Messieurs

Thatcher	Coderre	Radloff
Howes	Larochelle	Weatherald
Cameron	MacDonald	Mitchell
Steuart	Estey	Gardiner
Heald	Hooker	Coupland
McIsaac	Gallagher	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois
Barrie	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser
Grant		

NAYS — Nil
Messieurs

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 67

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) for Return No. 67 showing:

The acreage of Crown land on which forestry cutting operations have been conducted that has been replanted by (a) the Government or any agency thereof; and (b) others, since April 1, 1964, and the average per acre cost of replanting.

Hon. J.R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, in order to make the information requested in this Order for Return more meaningful, I move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that the Motion for Return No. 67 be amended by striking out all words after the words ‘showing’ and substituting the following therefor:

- (1) Whether the Department of Natural Resources carried out any reforestation programs since April 1st, 1964 on Crown land on which forestry operations have been conducted.
- (2) If so, the number of acres on which such programs have been carried out.
- (3) Whether any reports have been prepared by the Department of Natural Resources since April 1st, 1964 with respect to the reforestation of Crown lands on which cutting operations have been conducted.
- (4) If so, the estimated per acre cost of such reforestation.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

March 25, 1969

Return No. 70

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert-East Cumberland) for Return No. 70 showing:

The average return per acre in stumping dues from Crown land on which timber has been cut for the use at the Prince Albert Pulp Mill.

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, to make the information requested in this Order for Return more meaningful I move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) that Motion for Return No. 70 be amended by striking out all the words after the word “showing” and substitute the following therefor:

The stumpage rate per cord charged by the Department of Natural Resources on timber which has been cut for use at the Prince Albert Pulp Company Limited mill.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I have no objection in obtaining this information but it isn't what I asked. I really wanted a return per acre in view of the fact that I want to compare some figures in connection with another question. I was hoping that the Minister could have given me the average return per acre, but I might have to ask another question to get that information.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 18

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) for Return No. 18 showing:

The number of houses constructed by the government for Indian and Métis people in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968, and the location of each.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, some three weeks ago I discussed with the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland this adjourned debate and was advised that he was primarily interested in houses constructed in the northern area.

This Return asks the number of houses constructed by the Government for Indian and Métis people. Mr. Speaker, we do not keep a record of the occupants of these houses according to nationality, and I do not think any employee of the Department should be engaged in going around to the houses to determine the racial background of any person. So I propose the following amendment, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). That Motion for Return No. 18 be amended by deleting all the words after the word “constructed” in the first line and substituting the following therefor:

or under construction by the Government for northern residents, naming the community and number of houses

constructed or under construction in each: (a) in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968; and (b) in the fiscal year 1968-69 to February 28, 1969.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Resolution No. 1 - Student Representation on the Senate

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University):

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

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd:

That the words "faculty and" be inserted after the word "of" in the first line; that the words "and the Board of Governors" be inserted after the word "Senate" in the second line; and that the following words be added to the motion: "and that the Government also give consideration to appointing a Commission composed of public representatives together with representatives of the University administration, faculty and students to study and report on such changes in administrative structures and practices of the University, which would provide adequate participation by the public, faculty and students."

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, quite a few days have passed since I asked leave to adjourn the debate on this very important subject and I have a few words that I want to say now.

I think I remember saying that perhaps the University does need a slight shock now and again to keep it in touch with the reality of 20th century living. But we ought to be very careful not to shock it to death, to electrocute it by massive and unwarranted change. I want to say first, Mr. Speaker, that I am not afraid that any resolution that we may pass in this Legislature is going to shake down the walls of that grand University that we have built here in Saskatchewan. At the same time, I think that we have to recognize that the University is a creature of this Legislature. If The University Act is to be changed or if the Act that governs the University is to be changed it must be done here.

We have a responsibility to examine the effect of the proposed changes very carefully. We are attempting to recommend to the Government by a Resolution that a change be made in the representation in the Senate of the University. And we are also considering the amendment moved to the Resolution by the Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) which advocates other changes.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Estey) has answered the criticism of the Hon. Member from Biggar and I think has demolished his argument. He made the point that a separate commission would be able to do nothing, that is nothing that the Senate at the University is not able to do now. The Senate is composed of public representatives, together with the representatives of the University administration

March 25, 1969

and the faculty. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we think that the Senate is not able - in his words - "to study and report on such changes in administrative structure and practice which would provide adequate participation by the public, faculty and students," I say again, if we think this is not possible now, then surely it is time for us as representatives of the people of the province to really exercise our prerogatives as Members and to really wade in and to make some significant changes in The University Act.

Now many of the arguments for and against change in our University, I think, spring from fundamental differences in views held about the role of the University or what it should be, or what it should be doing and what it is all about. I think much of the discussion that has been heard in this session of the Legislature ignores the fact that there is serious division as to the role of the University.

Mr. Speaker, at least there is a body of thought that believes that it is an institution set up by society to serve that society, to equip its younger members with the skills needed to maintain the technical services and cultural amenities that society deems necessary. This is a significant body of opinion. I want to say to the Members that if this is the University, then the academic faculty are servants and students have no directing role but are customers for or victims of the training and the certification that the institution provides.

This view can be justified by the way in which most Canadian universities are set up. They didn't come from the banding together of scholars with a common intellectual passion. I don't think they arose from the demands of students sharing an intellectual hunger, but they did arise from the conscious decisions of the public to arrange for a supply of talents, homemade and homegrown, that must otherwise be imported. These origins are reflected in the survival of non-academic boards of governors and the maintenance of universities by public funds.

Other people, Mr. Speaker, believe quite differently. If we want to divide our thoughts about the role of the university into two broad fields, the first one is that the University is set up to serve society, set up to propagate our beliefs and our education, to pass them on relatively unchanged to our young people and generally to provide training, professional training perhaps for doctors, engineers, and to pass on the conventional wisdom of the day. But there is a very significant body of opinion that thinks otherwise about the university. There are perhaps two, three, four or five different shades of view about the role of the university in this other contest.

The first, I think, is that some people believe that the university is a community of scholars. It is like a guild of persons devoted to the furtherance and dissemination of certain kinds of knowledge and skill approved by its members. One joins the guild by graduating or on joining its teaching body. Administrative officers and boards of governors have no other function than to serve and to further the role of scholars. Students in this view are thought to be members, not apprentices.

By the way I want to quote something from The Leader Post that reinforces this view. Dr. John Chappell was formerly on the teaching staff at the University here and resigned two weeks ago. This is dated the 19th of February and I quote:

Dr. John Chappell, 35, said in an interview that he resigned two weeks ago on the general principle. I want to teach in a university where the faculty runs the departments. If the students run the university we are going to lose our academic respectability.

He has other things to say but the crux of the matter is again:

Dr. Chappell said a student should be an apprentice and then he can become a master.

I say to the Members, Mr. Speaker, that this reinforces a particular point of view about what the university ought to be doing.

Then again you might think that the university is a community of students. The professors in this view are the most senior members and the freshmen are the most junior. Such a community does not have the closed nature of a guild. It consists rather of all those members of a community dedicated to intellectual inquiry of any kind.

Again in this view, administrators and governors will exist merely to provide the physical facilities in which such pursuits can be carried on. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that there are many different views about what the university ought to be. They don't all conform to this traditional view. I want to quote something from an interview with Marshall McLuhan who I think the Members know has some different views about the education system. He says about our young people:

It is not an easy period in which to live especially for the television-conditioned young, who unlike their literate elders cannot take refuge in the zombie trance of Narcissus narcosis that numbs the state of psychic shock induced by the impact of a new media.

I don't pretend to understand everything that McLuhan says but, in answer to this question about university and about education generally, "Why do you think they aren't finding the freedom that they wish within the educational system?" Mr. McLuhan said:

Because education which should be helping youth to understand and adapt to their revolution in new environments is instead being used merely as an instrument of cultural aggression, imposing on retribalized youth the obsolescent visual values of the dying literate age.

If education is to become relevant to the young of this electric age, we must also supplant the stifling impersonal and dehumanizing multiversity with a multiplicity of autonomous colleges devoted to an in-depth approach to learning. If we don't adapt our educational system to their needs and values, the needs and values of the young people, we will only see more drop-outs and more chaos.

Now, I don't think many people understand McLuhan and I don't pretend to understand him myself, but he has a different and perhaps a more modern view of what the university is doing to our young people. He said in the same interview that he is essentially a conservative person and that he doesn't really like the changes that he sees going on around him, but at the same time he doesn't think there is any use in trying to turn back the clock and he doesn't think that it is possible or wise

March 25, 1969

to weep over spilled milk or to stop changes that are occurring and have already taken place.

In reference to the university and to the education system generally, he says that, if literate Western man were really interested in preserving the most creative aspects of his civilization, he would not cower in his ivory tower bemoaning change but would plunge himself into the vortex of technology and, by understanding it, dictate his new environment, turn the ivory tower into a control tower.

Claude T. Bissell who is president of the University of Toronto had this to say in 1965: "In the first place we must recognize that each of these estates . . ." and here he is talking about students, staff and administration and about the relationships between them. I think that this is relevant to this discussion today. He says:

. . . will develop a special feeling of individual and distinct interest. Students will have a special interest in life outside the classroom and that interest will, I think, have an increasingly political emphasis. As I have already suggested, the interest will also move into the classroom and professional immunity from criticisms and assessment cannot in the future be guaranteed. The staff will be mainly concerned with the continuity and the quality of academic life and the administration with the integrity and the autonomy of the university as an institution, both in its internal structures and its external relations.

He goes on to say that the main casualty and the failure of convergence of these three streams is the institution itself. Students are less sensitive to institutional arguments and understandably so. It is easier for the middle-aged and the elderly to have love affairs with institutions, the young have less disembodied passions. And he goes on:

Yet if an institution is not loved by those who know it best it cannot long survive.

That is particularly true of a university for it is of all mundane institutions an act of faith, a perpetual experiment, a search for the ideal.

These ideas, I think, are challenging and dramatic in this year and the years to come. I want to say first, Mr. Speaker, and reinforce again the fact that I don't consider change to be undesirable. Massive change that comes too quickly possibly can be, but anyone who believes that what we have now at our university or any university in North America is what has to be for the future or should be forever, I think, is very mistaken. There is a great cathedral in Europe whose first stone was laid 250 years before the last ornament was put on the spire and so I think it must be with our university. We must continue to build on what we have begun as the foundation. We have laid a solid foundation in excellence here in Saskatchewan. But to say that what we have now is unalterable, unchangeable, perfect and complete is nonsense.

Much of the purpose of a university is to be an agent of change and I wonder if we can look any place else in our society for new ideas and concepts. Where else but in the universities

can we expect to find the energy and the idealism and the will to change our society for the better. We don't understand, I don't understand, and I have no patience with the anarchists who smash and burn our institutions to the ground hoping that something better, like Phoenix, is going to rise out of the ashes. I don't have any patience either with those who believe that what is now is necessarily what is going to be in the future.

If part or parts of the super-structures of our institutions, and this includes the university, have become unwieldy and unnecessary or are now impediments to progress, then isn't it wisdom to cut them off. And isn't it wisdom to use these discarded parts to build if possible something better, something of value. Mr. Speaker, a study of the natural sciences teaches us that terrestrial life has been subject to many mutations in response to changes in the physical environment. We know that, if environment changes, organisms must also change or become extinct. Mr. Speaker, it's clear that if our University and if all our institutions as well, are constitutionally unable to change, then they too will be pulled down brick by brick to make room for something better.

Let me say that radical change itself is not always beneficial and is sometimes undesirable. I want to ask the Members how foolish it would be to burn down a good house just because the floor may be dirty, how outrageous it would be to junk a car because the ashtray is full. How much more reasonable to wash the floor. How much more reasonable to mend the roof or to build an addition than to burn the house down and then to have to live in a cave for the rest of your life. Mr. Speaker, how much more sensible to see the need of student representation and to do something about it than to make an inflammatory speech calling out pickets against the Board of Governors. How much more sensible for the administration to try to improve the faculty's teaching methods and to better the physical surroundings if improvement is needed. How much more sensible for students and administration to co-operate in solving problems as they arise rather than to allow relationships to deteriorate to the point of triggering a senseless and berserk attack on a computer.

Mr. Speaker, I've tried to demonstrate my belief in the necessity and the desirability of beneficial change in our university government. I believe, as I have said before, that many of our problems that are generated in connection with the young people are caused by the frustrations by their peculiar position. Physically and mentally, in my opinion, most university people are adults. They're preparing themselves and, in most cases, are prepared for responsibilities which they are denied. These responsibilities are denied to them by the Establishment. These responsibilities are denied because the Establishment just can't bring itself to believe that anyone under 25 or 30 years old is mature enough to make major decisions. I take issue with this view, Mr. Speaker. I say the best way to teach responsibility is to give responsibility. We teach our children to manage money by giving them their own money to spend. Young people gain knowledge and maturity in other areas of social conduct by adult experience. Representation on the Senate of the University will give the students a new stake in university life. As well it will encourage them to think seriously about the problems of participation in the larger society. I believe that the benefits from the change that we are suggesting will flow in equal measure

March 25, 1969

to students and to the institution itself. The day-to-day problems and minor annoyances of space and light of instruction and the curricula ought to be, and I think they will be, more readily solved. But, Mr. Speaker, most important of all I hope and believe that student representation on the Senate will help to lead us one step closer to the solution or at least to the contemplation of a basic question of the role of the University of Saskatchewan in our society.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I will be pleased to support the proposal introduced by the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words to this debate. I want to comment a little bit on the place of the university in our society and the changing pattern of university organization as it has evolved and as it is likely to evolve in the next decades.

I was encouraged to say a few words in this debate by the comments which I read of a speech made by Dr. A.W. Trueman, a distinguished Canadian academic. I would think there must be few people in Canada who would be better qualified to comment upon university government and university affairs than Dr. A.W. Trueman, Bud Trueman. He is now Chancellor of the University of Western Ontario. He was formerly Chairman of the National Film Board and a Director of Canada Council. If my memory serves me right, he served as President of the University of New Brunswick and I am virtually certain that he served as president of the University of Manitoba. He holds an honorary doctorate from the University of Saskatchewan and I had the distinct pleasure of attending the Convocation at which he received his degree and heard the very thoughtful and provocative address which he delivered at that time.

This précis of his remarks is contained in the Dalhousie Alumni News and it happens to be the précis of a speech which he gave to the alumni association of that university on October 21st of last year. I will attempt to sketch his ideas and on occasion quote directly from his remarks.

He is telling us what I think we ought to know, that it is characteristic of our century that the governed are determined to have a larger and larger share in their government and it seems to Dr. Trueman that this movement is inevitable and right. It is a tide which cannot be dammed back or reversed, and obviously the sensible thing to do is to respond with intelligence and understanding of these tidal changes and to avoid violence by involving everyone concerned, faculty, students, administration, governors, in well-meant, useful and constructive consultation and reform activities. And then Dr. Trueman goes on to express some views as to the role of the Board of Governors which I found rather revolutionary. He goes on to say that he thinks that we are blind if we refuse to see we are in a period of transition which will come to an end only when university government is largely but not exclusively in the hands of faculty, assisted by students either on equal terms or as somewhat junior partners. He goes on to trace the history of boards of governors in Canada and to point out that they have in the past largely

reflected the knowledge, experience and acumen of the very able representatives of business and finance. And he says that no one can find serious fault with the quality of this representation. In the days when this type of board was developed, when the proportion of income supplied by government was much lower than it is now, these business representatives constituted a natural and necessary link with the business world which was an extremely important source of direct supply.

Then he goes on to say that this age has passed. The world tide of conviction that the governed must have a much greater share in government is running swiftly, strongly and irreversibly. He then applies this thought to universities and says:

I believe that the board of governors at the apex of university government is becoming a rapidly obsolescent institution. As a matter of fact I think it is obsolete. I favor very strongly the one-tier form of government that President Bissell of Toronto is now advocating.

And I was pleased to hear the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) quote Dr. Bissell in the course of his remarks.

Dr. Trueman goes on to say it seems an anomaly that an institution whose sole concern is the fostering and promotion of art, the humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the professions should be placed under a board of governors of whom the majority are businessmen. A business corporation does not load its board of directors with university scholars. It uses its own kind. I am bound to believe that a university board should use its own kind, at least as a majority, i.e. the scholars on its faculty and its senior students, in conjunction with a smaller group of men representing the outside community and the business world. He goes on to buttress his argument for this proposition by saying that students are much more informed than they have been in previous generations. If I may quote:

We have a generation much more widely informed about the society they live in than their elders.

And he attributes this to film, radio, television, rapid communication, all the reasons which we similarly ascribe to the relatively high degree of knowledge and confidence of today's students.

He says that he does not agree with all of the student demands and then he goes on to say:

But I believe that there is a sufficient basis for many, if not most, of their dissatisfactions. They feel that they have a right to be consulted about and to have a hand in framing the type of education they want.

Mr. Speaker, I won't quote more from this very thoughtful and thought-provoking argument put forward by Dr. Trueman. He advances in the course of his remarks, not only his views with respect to the board of governors and the fact that a business-oriented board of governors is no longer appropriate, but he also levels strictures at the type of instruction and indicates that in his view the formal lecture-type, essay examination procedure is no longer appropriate but is rather sterile, dull, unduly authoritative, and much too demanding of time which could

March 25, 1969

be better spent in more nearly independent study and an investigation under the guidance of interested and skilled members of faculty.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I could agree with Dr. Trueman in the sense that I don't know whether I could advocate those views for the University of Saskatchewan at this time. I think the idea that the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan should be constituted of a majority of scholars does not now fit in with the place which the University of Saskatchewan occupies in the educational and administrative life of Saskatchewan. I don't think it's too remarkable an idea. Older universities have been run on this basis for many generations. I attended Oxford University where the boards of governors of all the colleges are made up of scholars with indeed no businessmen or no representatives of government. And, similarly, the government of the University of Oxford, as opposed to its colleges, is made up of scholars appointed by the various colleges. Certain safeguards are built in to prevent too much self-perpetuation of a little clique, if I may use the word, "guild," I think, was the word chosen by the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), certain safeguards are built in to prevent a guild from engaging in pure self-perpetuation so I think that the idea put forward by Dr. Trueman is not necessarily heretical. I think it is perhaps a little too advanced for Saskatchewan at this time or a little too different, whether advanced or retarded, a little too different than that which would find favour, I suggest, with the public of Saskatchewan.

But I suggest that Dr. Trueman's words do call to our attention the fact that the time is past when the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan can reflect only those people who provide the money. The time is past when the Board can only reflect the views or can only have on it appointees of the government and of those alumni who have gone out into the business or professional world. The Member for Elrose very properly, it seems to me, sketched out three or four or five views of the university, three or four or five ideas of what is the essence of a university. And we must, I suggest, balance some of those ideas. One of the ideas is that the university is primarily a public-service agency to provide society with those persons learned and skilled which society needs in order to carry on its work. Another view of the university society is that it is a place where young people go to mature, to grow, to become men in the true sense of the word. A third view - these are not mutually exclusive - is that a university is a place where scholars gather in order to exchange among themselves the wisdom of the ages, to be guardians of the heritage of learning upon which our Western society is based, and to add to the body of knowledge which is used to build, not only the physical world in which we move our bodies, but the intellectual world in which we move our minds. So I suggest we have to balance the rights of the Legislature to control public funds, and it seems to me, with respect, that Dr. Trueman perhaps gave insufficient attention to that aspect of university government, to balance that right and desire with the desire of young people to have a voice in the world, in which they live and by which they are moulded, and the desire of scholars, who populate this community of scholars, to have a voice in that community, of which they are a permanent part, and in respect of the government of which community they wish to have a voice in order that they may make their work be most fruitful for the community.

I think we can do this by making the Senate reflect these points of view. I think we already have a Senate which reflects the Government's views and the views of the scholars. I think we can add to this a number of students who would be able to add a voice, another point of view to the government of the University. I realize that this is not easy. It is difficult for one student to speak for another. They are a changing community and accordingly the voice of the students is often a voice which is not accurately reflective of student opinion. It is inordinately difficult to assess public opinion in a body which is constantly moving.

I think we can also make our university reflect these three points of view by having the Board of Governors have upon it representatives of the public selected by the Government, and I suggest properly so, representatives of the scholars, and representatives of the students. I don't for a moment think that the addition of a number of students on the University Board is likely to erode in any effective way the necessary financial voice which a government must have in the governing of a university. I think we ought not to try to gloss over this very real fact that a university is a large spender of public funds and in our democratic and our representative form of government, it is necessary that the government of the day have some sort of voice in the governing of a university. But I think that that voice need not be exclusive and it can be effectively voiced at the same time as scholars and students have a voice.

Our task then is to balance the needs of these three groups. We must be careful in arranging our university administration, not to regard universities as solely a factory to produce scholars for public consumption. I always deplore the use of words in applying to universities which might suggest that universities produce a good product or that the product of the university is well received. I realize that this is a form of speech, but I wouldn't want us to fall into the idea of believing that a university is some sort of social sausage factory whose object is to produce a sufficient supply of brand X, brand Y and brand Z to perform needed social functions. Nor would I want the university to be solely a cloistered haven for scholars who would shut themselves off in the proverbial ivory tower and not be aware that they are performing a very real social function.

I would want a university to be, yes, a social-service agency. Yes, a community of scholars, but also a place where a student could stand and grow and increase his stature in wisdom and in truth, where he could become a man, not only in the economic sense but in the philosophic sense and, if we're not afraid of the word, in the spiritual sense.

I am about to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker. I believe that, if we keep those three ideas of a university in mind, we will reach the conclusion that the senate of a university ought to reflect all three of the government, the faculty and the students. Similarly the board of governors ought to reflect all three of the government, the faculty and the students. I think that the particular manner in which we ought to endeavour to provide adequate participation for the public, the faculty and students is not fully worked out. I think the idea of a commission to work this out is not a bad idea. I very much support the Resolution of the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois). I support the amendment which would allow student participation on the Board, and I support also the idea

March 25, 1969

of a commission which would study other ways to provide additional and more fruitful participation by public, faculty and students.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the Resolution we were dealing with and that was dealt with by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) just prior to the supper hour, is on a motion put forward by the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) and the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd).

I would like to make a few remarks on the amendment primarily, Mr. Speaker, and relate it again to the original motion. Now it would seem that the object of the amendment put forth by the Leader of the Opposition is a two-fold amendment to urge membership by both students and faculty on the Senate and on the Board of Governors and secondly, to support or request the establishment of a special commission to study and recommend with respect to the administrative structure of the university. This goes a good deal further than the original Resolution which was concerned primarily and explicitly with membership of students on the Senate and it seems to me that the amendment completely or conveniently or accidentally or otherwise, overlooks some important considerations. Of the 67 members who are on the Senate, 30 or 31 are members of the university community. However, this is the organ of the University which, in a broad sense, is responsible for the academic affairs of the university. The General University Council composed of senior administrative officials together with 18 members elected from the Campus Councils has extensive powers in that same general area, partly in an advisory capacity to the Senate and secondly, of course, in part in authority exclusive to the councils themselves such as the field of making regulations regarding examinations, school terms and other points. This does not include the role of the faculty in the campus Council. I think that it should be fairly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that faculty power or faculty influence, if you will, is very great presently in the power structure of the university, and this, of course, is as it should be with respect to direction and administration of the academic affairs of the University. I have no particular objection whatever to faculty representation on the Senate, although I may say it would probably not add that much to it.

The original motion proposed student representation on the Senate and I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the suggestion in the original motion. I do believe, however, that the value or the importance of such a step has been highly overrated by many of the proponents of the idea. Last year The University Act was amended in this House to allow for a number of changes in the administrative structure of the University with the two-campus idea, and it was the Government's view at that time to defer the idea of students being represented on the Senate until other administrative changes had become operative under the new two-campus structure. As I've said, I firmly believe that the whole question of the value of student representation on the Senate has been overrated by many of the proponents and the people speaking for it. Reports from student representation on

the senate of other universities in our country certainly haven't indicated that the experience has proven to be as meaningful as was hoped for. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it's a good deal more important for student involvement to take place at a level closer to where the action, actually from the students' point of view, in the various committees, within the colleges, or faculties is now, I understand, frequently taking place at our University of Saskatchewan. I suggest also, Sir, that there's a good deal of loose thinking or woolly thinking with respect to this subject of involvement in the so-called decision-making process. We have pronouncements by many people that everybody involved in the decision-making must be a participant right from the beginning right through. Certainly I think that, when everybody tries to manage everyone else's business, quite often what happens we have more chaos and more disorder, because no one really assumes any responsibility in a situation of that kind. To say that management of an institution is everyone's business is almost the same as saying that it is nobody's business. Somebody must have the authority and the responsibility and they must go together.

Some argue for representation on the Senate by the students and faculty. I think there is a good point to be made here, and certainly it will afford faculty and students a greater sense of identity perhaps with the development and the character of the University, and this would have to be a good thing. As I say, I've no objection to these thoughts.

With respect to the other question put forward in the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) in regard to faculty and student representation on the Board of Governors, Mr. Speaker, I do not hold the same view in this regard. The arguments, I think, put forward for student and faculty representation clearly indicate to me that those who propose this really are looking at a different concept of the Board of Governors, or choose not to recognize the present statutory concept as it is. Perhaps as the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) pointed out previously in this debate, we could well look at the concept or the present role of the Board of Governors. However, as the Act now stands the Board is, by reason of a statutory definition, responsible essentially for providing the material resources and the administrative machinery which make possible the real business of the university, the academic program. Now the Board itself is not an academic authority. Reduced to its simplest terms I suppose we could say the task of the Board is to provide the means by which the university, as an institution of learning, can carry out its educational objectives which in their turn are products of the direction given, in this case by the Senate and by the faculties. Why anyone would wish to compound the confusion by creating a situation of overlapping, duplication and perhaps even divided loyalties, is difficult to understand. I suggest that perhaps a more useful exercise - and this was referred to in the remarks of the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) and the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) - might well be for the various groups and interests in the University to clarify their own objectives in terms of their relationship to the University itself and from there on perhaps look at the structure that might better accommodate these objectives and these wishes.

Now, the other portion of the amendment that I'd like to comment very briefly on, Mr. Speaker, was the suggestion that a special royal commission more or less be set up to look at this

March 25, 1969

whole question. Other speakers have referred to this particular point and my only suggestion here would be that it's several years out of date. It would be a duplicate in effect of the Senate, except of course for student representation, because I'm sure that most here are well aware that the University bodies have only recently completed fairly comprehensive studies of their own structure themselves. I think that we should surely give the University itself an opportunity to implement some of the recommendations and some of the changes that were suggested in their own major study on reorganization. So I certainly cannot accept the view that another commission at this point in time would produce anything different or anything helpful at this particular point in time. I'm a little surprised, Mr. Speaker, to see that in the face of all the protestations about autonomy and independence of the University, that the amendment suggested the Government itself appoint such a commission. Now it may well be that as the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) pointed out and again the Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) there could be changes. There perhaps should well be changes in the structure, in the role, in the objectives of the Senate and of the Board of Governors, and I'm sure that as time goes on these changes will come about. However, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to support the amendment but rather the motion itself.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale) Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter into this debate respecting the Resolution from the Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), but some of the comments opposite made today and several days ago, on Tuesday, have prompted me to say a few words especially in light of the fact it was my privilege and pleasure to be the seconder of the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd).

I want to say, first of all, that the purpose of my remarks are to vigorously support the proposed amendment, because I think that it in fact will give true meaning and purpose to the Resolution as put forward by the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University.

At the outset, I would like to make some brief remarks respecting the observations of the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), who just took his seat. Of the points that I noted, the Minister first of all indicated that there was a certain degree of faculty power now present by virtue of the fact the Senate of the University had something like 31 people from the academic community represented on the said Board. My observation here is that it's a misnomer, Mr. Minister, to really talk in terms of faculty power. Essentially what we have here is faculty influence rather than faculty power and really what we do have, in effect is an ex-officio body or members of the academic community on the Senate. And I really suggest to you, Sir, that a quick reading of The University Act will show that the power with respect to very many of the meaningful decisions of the University rests with the Board of Governors.

I direct the attention of the Members of this House to Section 63 of The University Act and I don't intend to go into any detail respecting the powers but Section 63 does set out these particular powers. It says:

The board may from time to time (for example) maintain and keep in order and condition real property.

And it talks of the powers of the board respecting real property:

It may also spend such sums for the buildings of real properties with the approval, etc.

It goes on to talk about a vast variety of powers that have been set out here.

The important point I wish to make is that there is an essential power vested in the Board of Governors that directly affects the students. Members who are aware of the student unrest know that one of the major complaints by the students on the University campus is a question of housing. Students have a direct say and a direct question that they're asking about the question of housing. I have a clipping with me whereby the Students Council talked about the need to find location and roomings for about 10,000 students. I suggest that this is a power that comes directly under the influence of the Board of Governors. And really for the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to say that 31 members of the academic community are represented on the Senate, begs the question, the question in this particular example being: who has the power to make the final decisions respecting such important aspects as for example construction of facilities?

One other observation that I wish to make. The Minister said that he thought there might be a loss of responsibility. Frankly, the argument here lost me somewhat. I don't see how there can be a loss of responsibility by the mere addition of students and faculty on the Board of Governors. The loss of responsibility or the fear of loss of responsibility is more imaginary, Mr. Minister, than real. The responsibility will vest and remain with the Board of Governors. If they make a wrong decision, we know who the body is that can be made accountable for the decision. All we do simply here, by the proposed amendment, is expand the responsibility to a very significant other body of the community, namely, the students and the faculty.

Thirdly, the Minister talked about the concept of the Board and I, for one, feel that the concept of the Board has to be drastically revised. I think that the concept of the Board ought to be based on some large-scale democratization of the Board of Governors. Frankly speaking, I do not think that the Board of Governors presently is representative either of the university community or of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. Now that may not be of any particular fault of this Government. I'm not fixing any blame on any particular authority or anything of that nature. I simply say that as far as the concept of the Board is concerned we can certainly go a long way towards democratizing it and I think it's important too towards democratizing the decision-making powers of the University by adding on to the Board of Governors, the voice of the students and the voice of the faculty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — One final observation by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that I should like to allude to, and that is the argument that the suggested amendment really is a duplication of

March 25, 1969

what we have now. May I say that the studies that the Minister alluded to are beneficial studies. They are studies that certainly added and improved, I would think, the overall concept of the University but I think it's a specious argument, respectfully, to say that the Resolution as amended and proposed by my leader respecting the commission, is a duplication. It is really an unfair suggestion. I don't think that it can be reasonably expected, Mr. Minister, that the Senate of the University of Saskatchewan can realistically, objectively, in cold blood, be able to analyze its own particular composition, or particularly the Board of Governors. I think, if this were the case, then really what the Government of the day three or four years ago would have done on the question of administration of the Government Services, when it set up the Barber-Johnson Commission on procedures and expenditures and administration, likely what it would have done would be to set up a Committee of the House, or perhaps a Committee of Cabinet. But I think the Government was wise to say, look here, the Members of the House are too much involved and too much interested in the question of administration that their judgment is likely to be clouded by what they're going to decide or what they're going to study. Therefore, presumably the rationale and the thinking of the Government was, "We'll turn this over to an independent commission, the Barber-Johnson Commission," (I believe was the name of it), "in order to objectively look at it." And I think this is a very important aspect of the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Lloyd) amendment. A commission of this nature really is looking into, I think, one very important question, a question that has been debated much lately in the news, the question of whether or not there ought to be for example a separate second University of Saskatchewan, Regina campus, independent and separate from the University of Saskatoon campus. I know that some senior officials from the University argue that this would be a bad thing. I personally disagree, respectfully, with the submissions of the University people. But the important thing is that the University people themselves are judging whether in fact this is the best place or the best way for education in the field of university. It ought to be really, I think, the responsible representatives of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that say whether or not there's going to be an independent and separate and autonomous university here in Regina and one at Saskatoon with some strong links of co-ordination.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — It is.

Mr. Romanow: — Now as I say, well, no, it isn't. There is none, I say.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, we say there's not going to be two universities at the moment.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, that's right and I'm saying that the argument and the merit of the Leader of the Opposition's amendment is that an independent commission ought to look into the question of whether or not the position of the Government is valid because I, for one, don't happen to think that it is valid. I think that the Regina campus, for example, Mr. Premier, respectfully, is probably neglected when the administrative structure is so far away from Regina. I know they meet frequently, but I've heard too many complaints and I personally feel the complaints are valid, that the simple fact of the matter is that

there is not independence and this is a detriment to the problems of the University of Saskatchewan right here in the city of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I simply say this, that the amendment, that of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) says, look here, let's set up a commission, and, Mr. Premier, if your contention is valid, presumably the independent commission will make some final decision in this area, that I am sure most Members on this side will be willing to abide by.

Now just a few other comments if I might and this is really the motivation for entering into the debate, a few comments respecting the observations by my colleague from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth). I regret that he's not in his chair tonight.

This also relates to some of the observations by my learned gentleman and friend from Elrose, Mr. Leith. May I say that the Member's contribution this afternoon was a very learned one and well-thought out and I thought one he ought to be complimented on. Somehow, Mr. Minister, the proposed amendment was, I think, interpreted and I think is being interpreted - I have this feeling - by the Members who have spoken from your side of the House, to be the real flood-gates to open up the question of student power. I think the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) entered into the debate bringing in the issue of student power. He did so rather reluctantly with his heels dragging, and he apologized for having to discuss this issue of student power as it related to the Resolution. I thought frankly - I know the Hon. Member from Nutana South and I think very highly of him personally - the speech was really rather a poor antiseptic for the Government's lack of initiative to deal with this problem of student representation on the Board of Governors. I think frankly that the attitude shows through that the Government somehow is afraid of one or two or three university students on the Board of Governors and one or two or three faculty members on the Board of Governors. I really haven't been able to pinpoint the reasons for this fear, but, as I've suggested, I think it has some direct link to some suspicious paranoia about student power.

Firstly, the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) said that we should at all times maintain the rule of law respecting university issues. This was mentioned by the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith). No one disagrees with him on this point. That statement was, I think, a not so subtle implication that somehow the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) or we, the Members on this side, were introducing an amendment which really supported those who wanted to see a breakdown of law and order on the university issues. I think it was a subtle suggestion and an unfair suggestion by the Member from Nutana South that all faculty and students, who are vitally interested in the future progress and decision-making powers of our University, are somehow interested in tearing down this very body within which they are now working.

Secondly, the Member from Nutana South stated that the dissenters should be warned. He warned the students with respect to their cause. He argued that they had to carry their cause through reason and logic. Again no one on this side of the

March 25, 1969

House will quarrel with that. We simply ask why the Government opposite thus far seems to refuse to provide a forum, Mr. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), whereby reason and logic that the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) pleads for can be presented to the governing bodies. We agree with you that the arguments of the students and the faculty ought to be done through logic and through persuasion, though we ask you: do they have the forum now that allows them to present that argument of logic and reason? The simple fact of the matter is that it doesn't because they're not on the Senate and they're not on the Board of Governors where the real decisions are made. I simply say: how does the Government opposite expect the students and the faculty and the taxpayers of the province to put forward the case of student reform to those who decide these matters without even having an opportunity to sit on the Board? It's precisely the fact that the students and the faculty are not allowed to have meaningful representations that causes, I think, many of the concerns among the educators with respect to this question of demonstration and representation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I think the point of the whole proposed amendment is to give these academics - and I mean now students and faculty - an opportunity to put their case, to put the question, as the Member from Nutana South says, before the decision-making powers of the University.

Thirdly, the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) referred to a quotation from one George F. Kennan. The quotation was to the effect that any group who seeks to frighten or present violent objections - I think this is the exact quotation - to the present status quo bears a strong resemblance to totalitarianism. The quotation further stated that it placed all of the other citizens on the other side of the table. The quotation was made by the Member from Nutana South because obviously he thought that the students were, it suppose, likened to totalitarianism because of their posture. Well, I would suggest to the Hon. Member and the Government opposite that they really study that quotation themselves first before asking the students and the faculty to observe it, because I suggest that the posture taken by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), the posture taken by the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth), the posture perhaps taken by the Premier, is really a violent objection to allowing students and faculty to present their views in the orderly and democratic fashion that this proposed amendment calls for. I would suggest respectfully to the Government that it is they who have the violent objections. I would suggest that it is their actions in being inflexible that resemble totalitarianism. Its actions have placed the students and the faculty on the other side of the table and that's why this Resolution is being proposed and amended and what it's all about. This Resolution does not draw divisions between faculty and students on one hand and some other governing body on the other. This Resolution, I think, tries to bring all sides together and I feel that, if the Members reject the proposed amendment, they're drawing a line once again, whereby the reason and the logic that the Member from Nutana South pleads for will not be permitted to be presented to the proper authorities. I say it is they, the Members opposite, who will launch into a politics of confrontation by refusing to provide this much-needed forum for democratic debate in the University.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I just simply have to ask myself very briefly just what in the world the Government's afraid of when it refuses this independent appraisal that the proposed amendment asks for. I want to make it clear as I have already that the proposed amendment does not and will not involve any detailed scrutiny into university functions. We're not worried if the Government appoints the commission. The Resolution merely attempts to recognize the fact that there may have to be a form of dramatic change in the present university organization. I wish to point out that, recently, in the Ontario College of Arts, a one-man inquiry into the school's administration was carried out. It was carried out by the Chairman of Ontario's Committee on University Affairs, Dr. Douglas Wright. He presented a 23-page report made public. For example, he recommended a new 18-member governing council. It was, I think, a radical recommendation with respect to traditional concepts, Mr. Minister, of a board of governors. It stated that the new 18-member governing council should include nine members from the public at large, six from the faculty and three students. The Art College Principal, Mr. Sydney Watson, termed the report "a truly democratic distribution of responsibility" and said that immediate reforms would be instituted in this particular area.

I am now arguing here that this type of reform, I'm not saying that this is the answer, but I merely wish to point out again to the Minister that the question of a commission is not an unheard-of practice. I merely wish to emphasize to the Minister that this is the trend in education to give faculty and students representation. Just to show you how much of a trend it is, recently two Dalhousie students and the Student Council business manager were appointed to the school's Board of Governors. That's at Dalhousie. Dalhousie, now, Mr. Speaker, is the fifth university where students have been offered seats on the Board of Governors and the fourth to have accepted them. Carleton students have one representative on the board. Ryerson has two. Alberta has two representatives on the board. Calgary now has the opportunity but turned it down. This is nothing new. Queen's University is arguing this question now and likely is going to adopt it. I don't see what the hang-up is as far as the government is concerned and why the Members of this Legislature can't express their opinion in support of that concept. I think respectfully the arguments advanced by the Members opposite reflect a narrow and conservative outlook. I think their attitudes are like a car driver, you know, who comes up to a yellow light. You have the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) who is sort of sympathetic to the problem. The car driver comes up to a yellow light and he just doesn't know whether to stop or to go. They just seem to be confused and afraid of this whole situation of student representation or faculty representation. I don't know whether it's because they're afraid that their supporters are going to be fearful or suspicious of their motivations or what it is. I simply say the Government really doesn't know where it's at, to use a common expression kicked around these days.

Mr. Thatcher: — We know precisely where we're at.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, respectfully, I don't agree obviously, Mr. Premier.

March 25, 1969

I think that if the Government knew precisely where it is at, it would get on with the job of appointing the students on the Board of Governors and the faculty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Democratize things.

Mr. Romanow: — Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to just very simply say this. The argument for inclusion of both faculty and students on the truly decision-making bodies of the University is incontrovertible. Firstly, it stands to reason that the professors should have a say over matters ranging from curriculum to construction of buildings. After all it's they who have to live in the buildings for most of their lives, that's why.

Mr. Thatcher: — The taxpayer has to pay for it.

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, that's right, the taxpayer has a say as well. I'm not saying the faculty should have an exclusive voice. I'm simply saying the faculty should have a strong and almost dominant voice simply because the facts of the matter are they are going to have to work in them.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, you don't know what you're talking about. Oh, smarten up.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the argument suggests non-concern for the taxpayer. Can any Member here in this Legislature tell me what is in the proposed amendment that says that we, the Members of the New Democratic Party, don't give a hoot about the interests of the taxpayer? Nothing in this amendment suggests that there's no interest in the part of the taxpayer. In fact, the contrary is true because the taxpayer is now seeing that the need is there for faculty and student representation on the Board of Governors. To that end the proposed amendment tries to reflect the concern that I think we on this side of the House have for the taxpayer. No one is suggesting any exclusive control by the faculty or by the university students of the university. Of course not. But I certainly don't subscribe to any master-servant theory that I think the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) respectfully propounds.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I didn't go to university simply because I could memorize for eight or nine years and regurgitate back what the professor told me. Sure, he had superior knowledge, but the fact of the matter is, as a number of learned authorities are saying, the students of today are more qualified and more capable in order to exercise the things that directly affect them. And, Mr. Premier, that means curriculum, that means buildings and that almost means a say, not a final say, but a say in the choice of professors and classes. It's nothing so radical, so revolutionary. It is, as I said, being done in four or five other universities. And I respectfully say to the Premier that,

if the Government and he really knew where they were at on this business, they'd get on to try and at least institute this type of a reform.

Mr. Thatcher: — It's not a reform.

Mr. Romanow: — What is it? It's a matter of reform. It's a matter of constructive reform, Mr. Premier, and you know it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You know I think a good analogy is the question of, really the question of - yes, my colleague suggested that it's really participatory democracy - but . . . I suppose the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister isn't thought very highly of by the Members opposite these days.

I think the analogy is here. I think, Mr. Premier, that it's the university students and the university faculty who will have to fill out the question of memoranda, countless other detailed documentation that an institution like a university demands. To leave them out of the true decision-making process in these small things to the large things, such as leaving them off the Board of Governors, I think, would be parallel to allowing the Cabinet opposite to determine, for example, all matters of procedure that govern the legislators of this House. I suppose it could be argued in some way or another that we're all ex-officio Members of the Government. In a fashion, it could be argued by some theorist that we have some influence over the gentlemen opposite, although I'm rather frankly coming to another conclusion in that regard. We all know that the true decision-making process respecting the procedures of this Chamber lies with each and everyone of us, the legislators of this province, with us the constituents of this Legislature, and I think the analogy lies here with the university faculty and the university students. They are the true constituents of the university. They are the consumer. They are the persons who put out the end product, the persons that have to live in the facilities and I think to suggest that a board of governors should have the sole authority is an antiquated view.

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — When are you going to give students a chance to study?

Mr. Romanow: — Pardon me?

Mr. Charlebois: — Make your point so I can finish off this debate.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, let's have the vote.

An Hon. Member: — What's the hurry? You're getting paid for it.

Mr. Romanow: — I wish the Hon. Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) had repeated that comment, but I hope he'll make it when he sums up and closes up the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude by one final observation by

a very noted educationist. Mr. Premier, you will be interested that I am quoting from an authority by the name of Dr. Robertson, Principal of McGill University. Dr. Robertson had occasion and has had on more than occasion in recent days to concern himself in the question of faculty participation. Perhaps this quotation will come back to haunt him, but I think it is applicable in this debate. He said that student demands to participate in administrative policy decisions of the University are, "perfectly legitimate." He said what the Leader of the Opposition had said in his remarks, that students today are quite different from those of generations past, namely because they have a greater access to knowledge, automation and technology. Principal Robertson said, "Science has given the student a greater sense of international participation, a greater awareness and concern in world affairs. Students have learned the power of communication media and know that they can voice their concern with considerable effect and merit." Dr. Robertson said that affluence had nothing to do with unrest. It was just simply a matter of growing awareness in the world's problems. What he in effect said is what this amendment is asking the Members of this House to recognize, that the students of our generation see the problems of our world sometimes a lot better than we do, or the board of governors. They want new means and methods in respect to examination testing. They want some say with respect to their activities. I think the amendment falls perfectly in tune with the needs of the 1970s. I think that the Members of this House who vote against this proposed amendment will be cutting off the channel of communication with the faculty and the students. I think the Members who vote against the proposed amendment will be holding back the development of the education and the development of the university by at least five years. I think that the Members of this Legislature who vote against this proposed amendment, especially the Members opposite, really will show to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan that their interests are not with the students, the faculty and the taxpayer of the Province of Saskatchewan. Needless to say, Sir, I shall be supporting the proposed amendment.

Hear, hear!

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21

Messieurs

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

NAYS — 30

Messieurs

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Larochelle	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Gardner
Heald	Estey	Coupland
McIsaac	Hooker	McPherson

Guy
Barrie
Loken
MacDougall

MacLennan
Heggie
Breker
Leith

Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief in closing, but I would like to say that I am pleased that the amendment has been voted down, simply because I feel that the motion as presented is clearly to the point. While to some it may not seem to go far enough, I would like to say that it is a very important step in itself and is better I think not confused with other issues at this time.

For example, we have had some accusations of specious arguments and so on. We can get quite confused I might say in regard to such specious arguments. I would like to make one comment only about the argument that was put forth that the students in order to have their housing needs made known must have representation on the Board of Governors. Nothing could be further from the truth. The students certainly have every means at their disposal to make their needs known to the Board of Governors, so that from this point alone, to get away from confusion, I think it is a good thing that we are going to vote only on the motion itself. I really hope that all Hon. Members will support this motion and I sincerely hope too that the students will respect the confidence that is being placed in them. There are many people and among them some students who are not satisfied with the way the Senate conducts its affairs. I would like to suggest to them now that their representation should certainly be meaningful to them at this time, if only for the reforms they might achieve in this regard. It is our hope that their responsible contribution to the Senate will prove their worthiness for further votes of confidence in the future.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

Resolution No. 8 - Guaranteed Wheat Price

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):

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 insure an adequate standard of living for the farmer.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House had a debate on a Resolution moved by the Government which called for the two-price system for wheat. In view of the fact that it was passed unanimously by the Legislature, and in view of the fact that both sides of the House expressed their view point, I don't see very much point in proceeding with this particular Resolution and the Government will support it as it stands.

Motion agreed to.

March 25, 1969

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. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose this Resolution is one that could be called a basic issue of such impact as other Resolutions heard today. I hope that, when I defend the privileges of the Members in this House, I won't be pointed out as a Communist or anti-somebody or other. I hope I won't hear any other kind of ridiculous charges as well.

What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is what I previously indicated. Briefly it is that we do get student guests into our House and it is a privilege and a pleasure for Members of the various constituencies to introduce them to you, Sir, and to the Members of this Legislature. I think it is a civilized performance, it is a traditional one, something that has been carried on for many years, and I don't really understand why a Resolution like this is brought here in the first place. I said, and I say again, that I think it isn't only a privilege but a personal right that a Member has and I wouldn't want to see it changed, at least at this time. There may be a time in the future, Mr. Speaker, when we may not find a few minutes, two or three minutes a day to carry out this present privilege.

I am sure that all Members of this House, with the exception probably of the mover, would desire to continue this tradition and custom of introducing their own student guests to other Members of the House and to yourself, Sir. Because I think it is a gracious act, it makes the students feel that they are somebody. As well it makes us feel that we have a function to perform which is appreciated by the young people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I can't envisage any normal person objecting to this kind of procedure. As the Hon. Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) has pointed out, it only takes a minute or two of our time and I believe that we have already spent more time on this Resolution than the time spent on introducing students in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — So having said that this is a courtesy, not only to yourself, Mr. Speaker, but to the Members of this House, having said that this is a tradition that has been accepted for a long time and is a pleasant procedure here, I would want to say that . . . there is really not much advantage proceeding further with it, however, because I do want to find out what is happening in other Legislatures, I am trying to get information from other provinces, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Adjournment negatived.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, might I, Sir, add but a few comments to the Resolution introduced by the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan which proposes to deny privileges Hon. Members have up to the current session enjoyed, and that is, Sir, the privilege of introducing to the Members of this Legislature students from their respective constituencies.

At this point in time. Mr. Speaker, neither the mover of the Resolution nor any Member from the Government benches has put forward reasons why this change is necessary. One fact is evident, Sir, that is that Members opposite are reluctant to rise and speak in support of the Resolution. Mr. Speaker, what are we as Members of this Legislature and the constituencies which each of us represent trying to accomplish by seemingly radical deviation from tradition as proposed by this Resolution? Will its adoption save time? Obviously not, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution merely proposes to transfer this task to the already heavy load of Your Honour's responsibilities. Will this change, Mr. Speaker, add to the decorum of the proceedings? I have doubts and reservations. Are we then, Sir, frankly and openly admitting that the Members of this Legislature both past and present have inadequately performed their responsibility and that we now openly concur that introductions of student groups by His Honour will greatly enhance this procedure? Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to make it abundantly clear to Hon. Members that my stand against this Resolution does not dissociate me from the high regard I have for Your Honour's position. I want to impress you, Sir, and all Hon. Members that, since your appointment to this eminent position you have discharged your duties with decorum. I want to congratulate you, Sir, for the manner in which you have discharged your arduous task. However, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the students from the Kinistino constituency should be introduced by the Hon. Member from Kinistino. This is rightly his duty as a Member for the area. I am indeed sorry that the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan does not appreciate the fact and wants to absolve himself from this responsibility. May I assure the Hon. Member, Sir, that at his request he could be relieved of the responsibility at any time by any Member of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member from Kinistino for his self-appointment to officially act for this side of the House as timekeeper for the actual introduction. During his contribution and debate he presented statistics which prove that neither side of this Assembly has achieved records both for length or brevity in introducing respective groups. Have you noticed, Sir, that on several occasions during the session the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) has requested permission of the House to introduce student groups from his constituency when the proceedings were well advanced beyond the Orders of the Day?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — I am assuming, Sir, that I can count on his support. The Hon. Member from Hanley is aware and rightly so that these introductions are a good lever to a bit of good public relations. Students, Mr. Speaker, on leaving this Assembly do carry away educational and personal opinions and viewpoints. Back at the school and in their homes, they probably relate that it was their Member from Souris-Estevan or Hanley, or City Park-University or the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources or the Member from Maple Creek who has risen in his place to recognize their presence and

March 25, 1969

introduce them to all Hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly. Hon. Members must have on occasion been aware, as no doubt you have, Sir, how meticulously, diligently and with utter care the Hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), when the occasion arises, spares no words to show his appreciation and due respect to groups present. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) only a week or so ago crossed constituency boundaries to make sure that he put in a political plug for himself. At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I have a suspicious feeling that he too when he comes back to the House will be in support of my stand in respect to this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, student groups are accompanied by members of the school staff. It has been customary and properly so to give recognition to these teachers and in some instances to the bus drivers. In both these instances, Mr. Speaker, these people at great sacrifice of time, money and effort make it possible for the students to be with us. It is therefore only proper that they too be recognized. There are occurrences, Sir, when changes of teachers occur without notification of personnel in charge of prior arrangements. Hon. Members will recall that I had a group of grade 12 students from the Blame Lake School Unit on February 24th. Three of the teachers accompanying the group were not those whose names were initially given. Let us just assume that His Honour performed the introduction using the names of the original teacher. In all probability he would have introduced the three teachers who were not present in the galleries, while those present would have been unrecognized. What a situation! Do we want to place His Honour in these rather embarrassing situations? I say definitely not. This we could, Mr. Speaker, avoid by opposing this Resolution.

There is but one argument I want to use to gain further support for the stand I take, Mr. Speaker. In some instances, some of the students are known personally to the Member, as may be their parents. The parents may be supporters so that there may be that very close personal aspect which is very vital in constituent-member relationships. This personal acquaintance, Mr. Speaker, is what causes Members to rise in their places to make sure that they recognize the group from the constituency. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) probably is of the opinion that what I have mentioned does not concern him. Here and now, Sir, I want to dissociate myself from his logic because what perturbs me, Sir, is the fact that this Resolution if passed will deny the Hon. Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) or the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank), the privilege of introducing student groups. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am obligated to the people of my constituency. For a group of young students from my area or from any area of the Redberry constituency to come here it is necessary for them to travel over 200 miles. I owe it to them, Mr. Speaker, I owe them at least the courtesy of publicly introducing them to the Members of this House. Does the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan expect me to support a Resolution that denies me this privilege? Definitely not, Mr. Speaker. I call upon all Hon. Members to lend me their support.

Before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the attention of the Hon. Members several other aspects that have a bearing and an influence upon these groups other than the fact as to who will be introducing them. In my opinion, Sir, it is our overall behaviour, our attitude when these students are with

us. It is my opinion that our disrespect to each other, coupled with our total disregard of our behaviour, is what mirrors lasting impressions in the minds of the students for this and other democratic institutions. This attitude that we portray during their presence and particularly that of the members of the Executive Council, who, as Cabinet Ministers represent the highest post in our democratic form of government at provincial levels, is what lowers respect and disregard for the democratic parliamentary procedures. To further illustrate my point, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a school paper, *Belief*, published by the student council at the Blaine Lake Composite high school, Saskatchewan. This issue is dated February 28th, 1969, and was published only after its editorial staff accompanied the grade 12 group who visited this Legislative Chamber on February 24th. Here is the impression of the students as reported in the paper under the title "Viewing Regina." It begins with their departure from home and finally their arrival at Regina. They spent some time at the RCMP Barracks, from there they came to the Legislature. It is this particular portion of the report that I want Hon. Members on both sides of the House to take note of, and I quote:

From there,

(meaning the RCMP Barracks)

we travelled to the Legislative Building where we had the pleasure of seeing Premier Thatcher, Opposition Leader Woodrow Lloyd and our own MLA, D. Michayluk, who delivered a very impressive speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk:

What he had to say captured our attention but apparently not the attention of his fellow MLAs, especially those of the Liberal party, who made wisecracks and walked in and out of the building while he was speaking. Their attitude was shocking! As most of us will be of voting age on the next election, perhaps Mr. Michayluk's speech narrowed down our choice of a political party to only NDP.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, because I am convinced that this Resolution should not be considered at this stage, and more Members are aware that the same opinion and concern is shared and has been expressed by Hon. Members who have participated in debates, I therefore would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) an amendment to the Resolution as follows:

That proposed Resolution No. 3 moved by the Hon. Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) be amended as follows:

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

request the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to study the procedure of introducing students in this House and report thereon.

March 25, 1969

Mr. A. Thibault: — (Kinistino)Mr. Speaker, I am going to relate all my remarks to the amendment. When I spoke on the main motion, I was very kind, hoping to get some consideration. The other side seems to say No when we say Yes. When we say Yes, they say No. It is sort of an exercise in futility. This is why I would like to see this Resolution referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I was expecting to hear some debate about this Resolution from the other side but they sat there like a bunch of kids who set fire to the hayloft and they had to appear before their dad. Nothing to say, and you know what the rest is like . . . I wouldn't tell you. I still have a hard time to figure it out. Are they lazy? They can't get up and spend 40 seconds or are they unhappy about us saying something extra in the House. They want to pull it all over to their side. Or, are they just getting old and out of date and fossilized? Or is it just jealousy? I don't know. I think jealousy played a big part. They remind me of my old dog. Seven years ago a mongrel dog stopped in at my place and I adopted him, he was a very good dog. Now he is old and I got another young one to take his place. This young dog likes to play. Once in a while he goes out hunting with my son. He hunts out the game for him, he helps him do the chores, puts the cattle in and sorts the pigs out. He is very useful. But once in awhile he wants to play with another dog so he goes to the old dog. He pulls his hair a little bit, the old dog growls. If he keeps on pulling on his hair, the old dog bites. This reminds me of the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) when he is disturbed by a bunch of kids. That is why I think we should support this amendment, to give it a chance to be fairly well studied. I want to read to you one of the introductions in this House not long ago. I like to see people voting according to the dictates of their conscience in this House. It appears to me that there are too many leaving their conscience at the door before they come in and then they are free-wheeling. I want to refer to the introduction by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant):

Mr. Speaker, through you and to you and to the Members of this House I would like to introduce a group of grade eight students of Massey school, the largest public school, I believe, in Saskatchewan in my constituency. They are in the west gallery and they are accompanied . . .

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — The hon. gentleman has spoken in his speech on this debate thus far.

An Hon. Member: — On the amendment.

Mr. Coderre: — That's right. He is speaking on the amendment and should he not confine himself strictly to the amendment in view of the fact that he has already spoken in the debate. He is quite broad at the moment. The trend of discussion at the moment has been amply dealt with in the main debate. Now the amendment thereto, he should confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Well if he confines his remarks to the amendment then he has got to say why he wants it submitted to the Committee.

Mr. Thibault: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, now if I can continue after being

so rudely interrupted.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I think that remark was out of order. I think any Member of this House has a right to rise on a point of order as the Minister of Labour did and the Member now just said “so rudely interrupted.” I don’t think that when a Member rises on a point of order he is rudely interrupting any other Member.

Mr. Thibault: — If it offended the Minister I can withdraw the remark. I have heard a lot worse remarks in this House that were not withdrawn and I haven’t done it to hurt anyone. If he wants it withdrawn, if it is going to make him happy, I want him to sleep quiet tonight, I will withdraw it.

Now if I can continue with this. Maybe I will have to start all over again because I lost the line here. However, I want to point out:

I am sure we welcome this large group . . .

and I am quoting Mr. Grant, the Minister of Public Health, the introduction here:

I am sure we welcome this large group and wish them a most enjoyable stay and I am very pleased that the Resolution didn’t pass yesterday so I, at least, got an opportunity to introduce my second class here this year.

Now this is another reason why this should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Certainly we expect the Minister to vote against the Resolution when the time comes.

As I said a moment ago they sort of leave things at the door and they walk in here free-wheeling. I want to remind the Members of another incident that happened in this House and this is another reason why it should be referred to the Committee. In 1964, when the Liberals were elected, I can remember this door being left open during the noon hour. The chain was stretched across here and the commissionaire would come in with a group of students and lecture to them, describe the Chamber to them from that vantage point. That was very nice but as soon as the Liberals got in, whether they were old and grouchy and out of date - “out, close the door, they can’t come in behind the rail any more.” Well, all right that was one move, I didn’t like the idea. That was another privilege that was gone. This was done.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Not by the Government.

Mr. Thibault: — I don’t know who did it but it was done under your rule when you were the Government. When you became the Government, that’s when it was done. All right, that was one step and this is why now you are uneasy. This is why it should be referred to this Committee. They don’t like students, they say OK you get up in the gallery, you can talk to them up there. That’s fine, there is nothing wrong with that. The next step was, “Now you fellows up here you got to shut up.” Well, I don’t like that, and my students are not going to appreciate it. We are going to give it all the publicity you care to have. Now the only time

March 25, 1969

that anybody has got up to speak on this matter is the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) only to try to close me up. So there you are.

Mr. Heald: — On a point of order.

Mr. Thibault: — If you stay in order as much as I am, you'll be very well in order.

What do we see in this Province with this Government? We've got disturbances in the schools, we've got disturbances all over the place - the professors, the trustees and everything is being split up. Just the other day we were down into kindergarten, where will you go next? Pick the pockets of the little fellows. Mr. Speaker, I see that there is a great need to have this Resolution referred to the Committee. There are so many things that should be looked at. I don't know if I should tell you any more stories because I have got to look over my notes. We've already spent more time debating it than we would have spent introducing the students. I don't know what we can do to make them change their minds. I am sure if there was a free vote, one of these secret ones that you fold you know and put them in a little box, we'd win it handsomely. But they made a commitment to caucus. I tell you: Why don't you forget your weak principles once in awhile and do what's right?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — This is the trouble with that outfit. They never know the difference between principles and what's right. There is an awful disturbance in that area. You can see that they are getting out of touch with the world.

When the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) today got up to introduce his students, if he could only have looked up there and seen the smiles on those students' faces, he would change his mind. I know he doesn't approve of that Resolution by the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), not a bit but he is going to have to say Yes. I believe it is a party that is anti-kids. We took them off the main floor. What are you going to do next? This is what I am worried about. Maybe they will have to leave the galleries, I don't know. But if we can convince them that we should refer this to the Committee on Privilege and Elections, I am sure that a good decision will come out of it. I am sure that even the Members on your side will be happy about it, even the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), because he is one that spoiled the soup you know. He was making little political speeches. The offenders were equal on both sides, not any worse than the other. You've been very good, you have not rudely interrupted me for awhile so I will sit down, Mr. Speaker, and thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on this but not on the amendment. I am against the amendment. But I would like to remind the Members of the reason, as far as this Resolution is concerned, why it was brought in. I remember it very well because last year was my first session and I was quite impressed

by a lot of things. As you know first impressions are indeed lasting. One of the impressions that I got was the great political speeches that were being made when Members were introducing the students from their constituency. Now it has just been said by the Member who finished his remarks (Mr. Thibault) that there may have been equal fault on both sides of the House. But I would like you to recall the fact that we had on our bulletin board about halfway through the session last year, a petition from the Speaker that we use a little recommended form in introducing the students rather than giving a political speech each time. This had no effect whatever. I am telling you that as a new Member I did try to use the form that was suggested, but I noticed again that other Members did not do this and I didn't get the best impression out of this. The fact that this went on this way I think there was a real abuse. The fact that the Members simply refused to co-operate. Now when this Resolution has been brought in this year, every Member, every single Member has been reasonable about the introduction when they introduce their students. But let us have this Resolution put to one side and now you'll get all the political speeches all over again. Let's not forget the reason why this was brought in.

The Member for Kinistino I must say that he started off in the debate on the Resolution and I thought he was presenting himself very well, until as he went along he started haranguing and making a mockery out of the whole thing. And even now he has stood up, and simply acting as a comedian, he is not contributing properly to this debate at all in my point of view. It may be his manner that deceives me, I don't know. But he is certainly making a mockery of this debate and because of this I did lose him away, way back when he started putting the time clock on every Member. This was utter nonsense. If he had taken the year before and had taken Members from both sides of the House, believe me that clock of his would have run down a long time before he started to speak in this debate. I would like to suggest here - it has been mentioned that students come in here - it is an awesome sight to come into this House for the first time and to see the Members in their place. We realize that Members are walking in and out and that they are hollering back and forth. This is a disgusting thing in itself, but still they learn some of the facts of life from it. But this idea that it is essential that the Member introduce the students, that this is a God-given right, this is not so. It was mentioned here that the first time they came into the House, they don't know much about what's going on. It's nice certainly to have their Member introduce them but it is equally as nice, Mr. Speaker, that we should have you as the Speaker introduce the students in the proper form that you have already suggested. I think it is quite feasible that you could have the Member that is involved rise in his place. If the Member should happen to have a daughter or a grandchild in the class, he could easily advise you beforehand. I think it would be quite proper and quite impressive. This idea that our hearts have to bleed all over the floor here as if a God-given right has been taken away from us is just utter nonsense. If the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) had shut his mouth away back in this debate, I think he might have made a point, but I would like to suggest that he has made an utter mockery of the whole thing. I am in favour of the motion and against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

March 25, 1969

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — I wonder if I might say a word or two in this debate because since the debate first started I have had the opportunity and privilege of being introduced myself in another Legislative Assembly. That was the Legislative Assembly in Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba a couple of weeks ago. In light of the fact that we were having this debate in our Legislature, I took more than a passing interest in the way in which they introduced students in that Legislature. I haven't talked to the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) and I don't know whether he knew this procedure or not, but what they do in Winnipeg is that the Speaker introduces the students from a particular school and then he introduces the students as being from Birch Hills school or the Kinistino constituency which is represented by the Hon. Member for Kinistino and he asks him to stand. I was very impressed by this procedure. I think it worked very well.

When this debate first started I must confess that I had some sympathy for the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), but that sympathy has evaporated, I am sorry to say, tonight. Because I thought with all due deference to the Member from Kinistino - and I have a great deal of respect for him - he became a bit abusive tonight if I might say so. He referred to Members on this side of the House leaving their consciences at the door. Well, I don't think I need the Member for Kinistino to lecture me on where my conscience is and I wouldn't presume to lecture him on his conscience, Sir, where he leaves it. So I think that was a rather unnecessary addition to the procedure. Then he made a reference to the fact that after we became the Government, the door was closed to the Chamber. Well, I haven't had much opportunity to look into that, but as the Premier said the Government of the day didn't have anything to do with it. I have found out since you made that statement that probably the reason why the door was closed was because during the time it was opened, during the period of 1964-65, a very, very valuable attribute of this Assembly, namely the statue of Lord Nelson disappeared. And it was apparently the decision of the Clerk of the Assembly, Mr. Bradshaw who was here - Mr. Koester was away. It was apparently his decision that in the interests of security the door should be closed. So it wasn't any doing of the Government of the day to sort of make the Chamber more sacrosanct or harder to get into, as far as the students were concerned. This was a decision in the interests of security which was taken by an officer of the Assembly.

Now as to whether or not the Member can do a better job or whether the Speaker can do a better job, I heard a very impressive introduction in Winnipeg by the Speaker and I know, and I know every Member of this House knows that our Speaker can do a better job than any other Speaker in Canada in introducing people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Your opportunity to meet with your constituents or your opportunity to meet with your students is not going to be detracted from in any way, shape or form. The Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) meets his students, I try to meet my students, we have dinner with them, we try to buy them dinner sometimes, we are with them afterwards. You talk in this debate, Members opposite talk in this debate, Mr. Speaker, as though

these students aren't going to be introduced. I think they are going to be introduced in a most eloquent and effective fashion. Your opportunity to meet with them, communicate with them, go through the Chamber, is not being detracted from in any way, shape or form. And I ask in all sincerity of the Members opposite not to try and make political capital out of this. Try something different, don't be so defensive about everything that you started in this House. This is really the trouble you know. You did it this way and because we dare to change, because we dare to make a motion that will change procedure, hopefully for the better in our view on this side of the House, you are defensive about it because you started the other procedure. So I invite you to give it a try and we can assess the situation another year. I think it will work fine and you will have lots of opportunity to talk to your own students, and we will have a good, effective, eloquent introduction of every student that comes to this Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could add a word here. I am one of those poor guys that never gets a group of students down here because I am so far away from home. But to me it has been very interesting to listen to the Members on both sides of the House introduce the students that have had the privilege and have had the leadership to visit the Legislature while it was in session. Just one reference to what the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) said a moment ago that, because they had the courage to change it, he admitted before he said that that they weren't going to change it. At least this was the impression he left and he claimed that some of our chaps had talked them out of it. This is a very poor argument for principle or for procedure or anything else. This is just being plain stubborn about it. I agree . . .

Mr. Heald: — The Member doesn't wish to misquote me. What I said was that when the Member for Kinistino originally made his speech on the original motion that I had some sympathy for his position, I didn't say that I was going to vote against the motion at that time. That's what I said.

Mr. Wooff: — Mr. Speaker, I think the records will prove that you said when you came into this House tonight that you were prepared to vote for it. I'm willing to check the record for the answer. I think that this with all deference due, Mr. Speaker, and I know that you can do a good job, but I would still like to ask the House to reconsider this matter on behalf of the young people, on behalf of the Members. All of you and I'm now speaking for both sides of the House, I personally would very much like to see the procedure continued of Members introducing their own students. I still live in hopes that I might get some students down here, you know. But with those thoughts I am going to leave the argument or the debate as I don't think there is anything to be gained from carrying it on any further. I shall vote for the amendment and against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add one or two words after

March 25, 1969

listening to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). He referred to the statue of Nelson being missing from this Chamber. The implication as I took it was left that possibly it could have been some of the students that took it. He didn't say so but it could have been.

Mr. Heald: — I made no such implication. I said that I was advised that the Chamber was open and it was open at all hours. I certainly made no implication that any students were involved.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The Attorney General said that the doors being opened and the students coming in, it was easy for people to get in and this bust was missing from the Chamber.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the session started that year I noticed that the statue was missing. I assumed that it had been taken out for repair. Later on during the session I asked the Minister of Public Works what had happened to the statue, and it was at that time that I was informed that the statue had been mysteriously taken from the Chamber. During the Estimates I asked the Minister of Public Works at the time if he knew when it had been taken and he said he had no knowledge but it was missing. Well, I haven't made an issue of it since, but I don't think we should say it was because the doors were left open during the session that it was missing. I don't know when it was missing and I am sure the Government doesn't know. I know we wish we all did know.

But one other remark I would like to add, when I was the Speaker, I had groups of students come in from time to time. I felt that it wasn't my place as the Speaker to introduce the students, I got the Deputy Speaker to introduce the students from my constituency to the people of this Legislature, and I would like to see the Members of this Legislature have some private rights that aren't going to be eroded by the majority Government.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 21
Messieurs

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

NAYS — 30
Messieurs

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
Boldt	Larochelle	Mitchell
Cameron	MacDonald	Gardner
Heald	Estey	Coupland
McIsaac	Hooker	McPherson
Guy	MacLennan	Charlebois

Barrie
Loken
MacDougall

Heggie
Breker
Leith

Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — I don't propose to get into the actual debate on this Resolution, I merely would like a clarification and I don't know who may be able to provide it. Perhaps yourself, Mr. Speaker. As I read the motion that is now before us introduced by the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), it calls for the introduction of students by Mr. Speaker. But in reading the Resolution it seems to me that it does not prohibit an individual Member rising before the Orders of the Day, after you have introduced the students, to also draw the attention of the Assembly that there are a group of students in the gallery. I am merely raising the question, Mr. Speaker, because if this Resolution is adopted as the Government Members are obviously determined to adopt it, tomorrow a group of students may come and they might be a group from my constituency or any other constituency. As the Member rises I think it will be unfortunate if the Member or the Speaker or anybody else was embarrassed as a result of this situation. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you can advise us as to how this Resolution will be interpreted. The amendment that was just voted down would have clarified the problem. I think it was a desirable thing for us to have the Committee examine the procedure and bring in a recommendation. I don't feel that strongly on the matter, Mr. Speaker, I think that the procedure that we had has been a good one. I, for one, have tried to limit my remarks to but a few seconds whenever I introduce a group of students. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that there will be some flexibility even after this Resolution is adopted. I agree that we should be very tolerant, but let's also look at the sort of implication of the thing and let's not get into a hassle tomorrow morning or tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, could I say a word on this matter. Of course what the Member has asked for, would circumvent what this Resolution is trying to accomplish. We are trying to save 10 or 15 minutes a day of the House, so that we can get on with more important matters. The Speaker would still, as I envisage it, introduce each school, and then he would introduce the Member of the constituency. But if we pass this Resolution, we would be worse off than before, certainly if the Speaker introduced everyone and the Members repeated the process. I am sure that you will make a ruling, Mr. Speaker. I would only like to indicate the feeling of the Government on this particular matter.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Return No. 72

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North East) for Return No. 72 showing:

- (1) Number of homes constructed during 1968 for people of Indian ancestry under special agreement with CMHC, the Province and the Federal Government.

March 25, 1969

(2)Number of the above homes presently occupied by people of Indian ancestry.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, this Return is similar to Return No. 3. The Member is requesting a list of people of Indian ancestry who are occupying houses that are built under a special agreement in the North with CMHC.

I don't think that any member of a department nor do I think the occupant of a house should be placed in a position where he is questioned by a party as to his ancestry to determine what his ancestry or her ancestry happens to be. Therefore I propose the following amendment, seconded by the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald):

That the words "for people of Indian ancestry" in paragraph (1) be deleted and the words "northern residents" substituted therefor; and that the words "people of Indian ancestry" in paragraph (2) be deleted and the words "northern residents" substituted therefor.

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I regret that the amendment has been introduced because there is every indication in the annual report of the Minister, under Director of Housing and Urban Renewal Branch, that this information might be available.

Construction of houses for sale or rent to people of Indian ancestry. Nothing could be more specific than that, that is the way it is described in your own report:

Special two-year agreement between the Government of Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Province of Saskatchewan provided for the construction of housing units for sale to families of Indian ancestry in Northern Saskatchewan, and negotiations are in progress with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to extend this agreement for a further three years.

Now is this going to be written into a report and then denied to the House? I think that it is most valuable to Members to know if this agreement is entered into, how many homes have been built and what sort of progress is made. We can gauge what is being done, we can assess the activities in this area, we can find out to some degree whether or not the agreement is worthwhile.

Mr. Estey: — I think the Member has missed the point which I intended to make here.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister has already spoken once in this debate.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, and he will have the privilege of closing the debate after we have disposed of the amendment.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I rise because I find this a most remarkable situation. We have been informed in this House that the Minister, who has moved the amendment, is going to be head of the Department of Indian Affairs. He rises tonight and tells us that he doesn't know what is meant by Indians. He says that his Department probably has plans to build houses for Indians and yet he tells us now that he doesn't know what is meant by the term 'Indian'.

Surely this is remarkable. Mr. Premier, I would suggest that you look for someone else in your ranks who can tell the difference between an Indian and another person.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I want to focus in a little on this matter. We have set up a Department of Indian Affairs. This is designed to cater to a particular group of people who must obviously be identified. There is no way to render services to Indian and Métis people without in some way identifying them. So it follows, therefore, that at least for some purposes people of Indian and Métis origin are identified.

Now turning to the Motion itself, Return No. 72, the number of homes constructed during 1968 for people of Indian ancestry. There can be no doubt that that information is available, because indeed the agreements with CHMC I assume provide that it shall be for people of Indian and Métis ancestry. If they don't then it is pretty difficult to know just what the Department of Indian and Métis Affairs is doing concluding agreements. In the future presumably the Department of Indian and Métis Affairs is going to conclude agreements because it fondly believes at least that these houses are being constructed for people of Indian and Métis origin.

So that the question of whether they are being constructed, is not one of asking who lives in the house but what is the intention of the Government in building them. Constructed for Indian and Métis ancestry. Now that is a question of intent of the government. When you build a house you build it for somebody, and when you build it for somebody you can identify the class of people for whom you are going to build it. I trust that there will be no discrimination for or against Reginans but I trust the Minister (Mr. Estey) can tell us whether or not he is building or constructing in 1968 houses for Reginans. Within limits he can certainly tell whether a house is being built and is designed for occupancy by people of Indian or Métis origin or not.

Now the second point, the question of whether or not the house is presently occupied by people of Indian ancestry is admittedly a little more difficult, but none the less I would suggest to the Minister that if he is engaging in programs which are designed to assist Indian and Métis people, and he is providing facilities for them, then it would seem to me that he has to make some decisions as to whether or not these facilities are being used by them. And I would have thought, for example, that a proper question for me to ask would be: of the people working at the Cumberland House farm, how many people are of Indian and Métis origin? Because if the Minister (Mr. Estey) won't answer that on the grounds that he won't go around and ask the people who are working on the farm whether they are of Indian and Métis origin, then we have no basis whatever for believing that the

March 25, 1969

Cumberland House farm, for example, is performing anything for Indian and Métis people. And I think that follows. And similarly the Green Lake farm or similarly the land which is being cleared at Ile-a-la-Crosse or La Loche or anywhere else.

Let us follow this through. The houses are being constructed. Presumably they are being rented or sold. They are being rented or sold to particular individuals and I trust the Minister, before he rents or sells them, finds out whether these people are of Indian or Métis origin. And if he doesn't . . .

Mr. Estey: — Absolutely, in the city of Regina that's right.

Mr. Blakeney: — No, but anywhere else in Northern Saskatchewan . . .

An Hon. Member: — Give them hell, give 'em hell.

Mr. Blakeney: — Here we are asking the Minister two questions. How many houses did you build for people of Indian and Métis ancestry? If the answer is nil, then it's nil. And if the answer is 20, then it's 20, and he will know this because that is a statement of his intentions.

Then the second question is the number of homes, of those homes, not any homes at large, but those homes which are now occupied by Indian and Métis people. If you built 20 homes for Indian and Métis people and you can't tell us now how many of those are occupied by Indian and Métis people, then surely that's a weakness in your program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means a hypothetical question. We heard Members opposite a few years ago tell us how many homes were built in Esterhazy for people of Indian and Métis origin and I for my part heard very frequently the fact that of these 10 or 12 homes which were supposedly built for people of Indian and Métis origin, one or two - the numbers varied - were now occupied by people of Indian and Métis origin and the rest were occupied by whites. Now if this is so, then clearly the program which was launched was a failure in that regard. Because if the idea was simply to provide housing in Esterhazy and to that extent that housing in Esterhazy was not occupied by Indians, the program failed.

Mr. Estey: — What are you trying to say?

Mr. Blakeney: — I am trying to say that the Minister (Mr. Estey) ought to have this information.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I am trying to say that surely the Minister ought to be able to say how many houses he constructed in 1968 for people of Indian and Métis ancestry. Question No. 1. Question No. 2, I'm saying that, if he knows that, he ought to be able to know now how many are still occupied by the people he sold them to or rented them to.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Minister (Mr. Estey) also that there has been an Indian and Métis Branch under the Department of Natural Resources and on page 37 of the report of the Department of Natural Resources you find this: that at La Ronge the Métis organized a committee to examine the possibility of urban renewal to provide more adequate housing. Plans are under way to build 14 units which will be purchased by the occupants and for those not wishing to live in the village, log housing is planned. It mentions Stanley Mission. I would like to point out to the Minister he knows quite well that there has been a housing program, or at least there are plans for housing at Green Lake. Now maybe it's under another department. The question is directed to the Government and surely the Government must have the records as to how many were planned for Indian and Métis people, as it pointed out in the report for La Ronge, so many were planned, 14. I'm sure the Minister must know if they were planned, if they were built and if they were built, whether they are being occupied.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to add a word to what has been said. The Minister (Mr. Estey) has said that he can't answer this question because he has no record of whether these people are of Indian origin or not. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why in the world is he putting it in his annual report for? I ask the Minister to take a look at his annual report where on page 40 he says this:

During the year 10 single-family dwellings were completed at Green Lake and sold to families of Indian ancestry.

Now the Minister has, so he says in his annual report, a record of this and yet he stands up in his place here tonight and says "we have no record of it." Either he has no right to put this in his annual report, Mr. Speaker, or else he has no right to deny the information on the basis he took in the House here today. One or the other.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, just a few words. First of all I think that we're making a mountain out of a molehill.

Number one, there's no effort to deny information. There's an attempt by the Minister (Mr. Estey) to provide accurate information. In number one, the agreement with CMHC is not for people of Indian ancestry. It is for people who live in the Northern Administration District. Therefore, it would be impossible to say whether Smith or Brown or MacDonald or whoever he may be, is of Indian ancestry or not because he lives in that individual home.

Number two, the number of those homes presently occupied by people of Indian ancestry. It is easy to say that the people of the 10 homes in Green Lake are occupied by people of Indian ancestry or not, the housing in Uranium City, the houses in La Ronge, but not in all the areas of Northern Saskatchewan. Therefore, it is a practical impossibility to give an accurate

March 25, 1969

answer to this question according to the terms of reference that are given.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read a little further from the report of the Director of Housing and Urban Renewal Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs. On the bottom of page 9 it says:

Construction of houses for sale or rental to people of Indian ancestry. A special two-year agreement between the Government of Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Province of Saskatchewan provided for the construction of housing units for sale to families of Indian ancestry in Northern Saskatchewan, and negotiations are in progress with CMHC to extend this agreement for a further period of three years.

I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the people that these houses were built for there were of Indian ancestry and of Indian ancestry only.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is on the motion as amended.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) put forward his argument on this Resolution. I failed to understand why he appears supersensitive about this area. Now I perceive why he is supersensitive about the area because he is unfamiliar with the area. I would assume that this motion when it is amended will cause the Premier not to go up and down this Province any longer talking about all the houses he's built for Indians and Métis people, and maybe he will confine himself to the terms as laid down in this amendment by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

I can assure the House that we'll be watching for the Premier's comments when he goes about the Province from now on, talking about his programs.

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I would hope that at the time when this information is provided that the Minister will take another look at this whole thing and admit that he's made a bit of a blunder in moving the amendment that he did and provide the information that should have been provided before this motion was amended.

I think there's no question but what the Minister recognizes that he fumbled this one and he wishes that he hadn't. I think if he's large enough and big enough, enough of a gentleman to recognize a mistake that he's made, I think probably he'll find himself quite able and quite willing to provide the information. I would hope that he would do that.

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to speak on the motion?

Mr. Speaker: — No. When the Member moved the amendment, he was already

speaking for the motion. And then having moved the amendment, he had also spoken to it.

Hon. J.R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, there may be some misunderstanding in connection with the special agreement that we, the Department of Natural Resources, have in connection with the Northern Administration District and certain programs that we have for housing.

I would like to advise the House, Mr. Minister, that insofar as the special agreement we have in the Northern Administration District in connection with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, this is not confined to people of Indian ancestry. We, it's true, construct and have assisted in construction of a number of dwellings for people of Indian ancestry but also any other person that applies for this assistance receives it. It is not confined to people of Indian ancestry.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on this. I think it's most unfortunate that you should attempt, particularly the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder), to take advantage of the position the Minister (Mr. Estey) is in where he cannot reply to any of these accusations that are being hurled against him. Therefore, it's most unjust and most unfair to say that the Minister had fumbled. Now the Minister has made it explicitly clear and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) has further enlarged upon it. This motion makes reference only to one thing. And I want to read it so that were under no illusions, namely the special agreement with CMHC. The Minister pointed out that the CMHC special agreement doesn't refer specifically to homes for people of Indian ancestry. I am talking about the special agreement, I am not talking about the annual report. I am talking about the special agreement which you asked for in this Return. The special agreement makes reference to all homes north of a certain boundary in the Northern Administration Area. Therefore he has no way, because they do not negotiate or build homes under this special agreement particularly for Indian ancestry or should I say, solely for Indian ancestry. Therefore you put him in the position of trying to reach in and pick out every home whether this one was for Indian ancestry or not. He says that this is the difficulty that you put him to in this motion and that is all that the Minister is saying. It is not the matter of denying you information. I should think that you would expect that every bit of information tabled in this Legislature by a department would be accurate information. His viewpoint is that this cannot be accurate information, because the records under CMHC are not kept in that form. That is all that the Minister is saying in this motion and for this they condemn him as trying to hedge and not wanting to give information, of having fumbled and not being in a position to stand up and have the courage to say that he fumbled, therefore, this Minister should be relieved of his responsibilities before he has even been appointed. What sort of hogwash do you think that this House can get away with?

Mr. Speaker: — That word hogwash . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. I admit that I do try to keep within order and it is very rarely that I am called to order. I withdraw it.

March 25, 1969

Just to wind, up again to re-emphasize why the Minister said, "I cannot give the information," is because, as I understand it, the special agreement does not provide the information on that basis.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to reply briefly to the remarks of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron).

I listened and I didn't hear anybody calling for the resignation of the Minister (Mr. Estey). If the Members opposite did, that's fine. It is a part apparently of the custom of some people to make most of their speeches from their chair, and I think this again illustrates the fact that, if we would confine our remarks to those which we make when we are on our feet, the business would be expedited.

To deal particularly with those comments made by the Minister of Mineral Resources, I think that he suggests in his remarks that, because the agreement doesn't designate which houses are built for people of Indian ancestry therefore the Minister of Municipal Affairs would have no way of knowing. It seems to me that this is total non sequitur. The Minister indeed may make an agreement with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to build houses in Northern Saskatchewan and so far as Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is concerned they may well be only for people north of the given line. They may well have nothing to do with the racial origin of the occupants. But I wonder what prevents the Minister from confining these sales or rentals of those houses to people of Indian origin. I think, nothing. I think that he is not bound by his agreement with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to rent them to all corners.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how this confusion will have arisen. If, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) alleges that somehow we are trying to obscure this thing, may I refer him once again to page 39 of the annual report of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. May I refer to one heading which says "Construction of houses for economic rental in designated areas" and then it talks about agreement with CMHC for building houses in designated areas. And then the next heading is this: see whether this might not have suggested in your mind that someone was building houses for people of Indian and Métis ancestry. Quote:

Construction of houses for sale or rental to people of Indian ancestry.

Now that is the heading. And someone might possibly be forgiven if they believed that that dealt with the matter of the construction of houses for sale or rental of people of Indian ancestry.

And then it goes on to say this:

A special two-year agreement between the Government of Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Province of Saskatchewan, provided for the construction of housing units for sale to families of Indian ancestry in Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Cameron: — So?

Mr. Blakeney: — So, I just suggest, therefore, that there were in fact homes constructed during 1968 for people of Indian ancestry under a special agreement with CMHC. That's what I would conclude from reading that, and if anyone can draw any other conclusion from reading those words, I would be delighted to know how it can be rationally done.

Now look, Mr. Speaker, let me make this awfully clear because, if the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) jumps up and says there's nothing in the agreement that says it must apply to Indians, I may agree with him out of hand. But that isn't the issue. The issue is whether houses built under this agreement, whatever the agreement may say, were in the mind of the Minister, for people of Indian and Métis ancestry. That's the question which was asked him. Now if it is not true that any houses were built in 1968 under special agreement with CMHC for people of Indian and Métis ancestry, if that statement is not true, if the answer to Return No. 71 is none, then his report is false. If the report is true, then the only rational answer to this first part is that there are a number of houses. You cannot read the bottom of page 39 and reach any other conclusion. I invite the Member from Milestone to apply his best Thomistic logic and, if he can possibly find any other rationalization of those words, I would be delighted to hear it. It goes on to say:

And negotiations are in progress with CMHC to extend this agreement for a further period of three years, this agreement being the special agreement between the Government of Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and Saskatchewan for the construction of housing for sale to families of Indian ancestry.

And if in fact they aren't of Indian ancestry, I'd be interested to know how the Government of Canada gets into this, but perhaps there's another explanation for that. So I say that, if this report is true, then there is an agreement, there is a special agreement, there is a special agreement for the construction of houses for people of Indian ancestry. Now let's be careful on this. There is a special agreement for the construction of houses and some of the houses may be used for people of Indian and Métis ancestry and the Minister, when those houses were built, had that intention of so many being constructed for people of Indian and Métis ancestry. Therefore he can say the number of houses constructed during 1968 for people of Indian ancestry. He's got to be able to say this or else he built houses without having any idea who would occupy them under this special agreement. If this is so, then his report is totally false. If Members can't follow that simple logic, I think they can be forgiven because there is no way to rationalize what the Minister has said in this House and what he has said in this report. If in fact his report is true, what we are asking is, with respect to the special two-year agreement between the Government of Canada and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the Province of Saskatchewan providing for the construction of housing in it for sale to families of Indian ancestry in Northern Saskatchewan with respect to that, how many were built in 1968, defined in your terms, if you don't like ours? Then the next question is, with respect to those houses, defined in your terms, Mr. Minister, in 1968, how many are still occupied by people of Indian and Métis ancestry?

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I've heard some ridiculous arguments since

March 25, 1969

I've been here. All we want to say is that the agreement constructs houses for residents of Northern Saskatchewan. If those houses are available to Irishmen, if those houses are available to Indians, if they are available to Scotchmen, to Germans, or whatever, Ukrainians, then those houses are constructed for the use of people of Indian ancestry. But when they move in, how is the Minister to know whether Smith or Brown or whatever it is, is of Indian ancestry? As long as those houses are constructed under the agreement, they are available to all people including Indian and Métis people . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . and the NDP, how can we quibble. Let's pass the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — When I listen to the lawyer Member from Regina I just wonder why the good Lord has made lawyers. You know we would have finished this session a long time ago if we hadn't had any lawyers in this House. They just talk, talk, especially the two Members from the Opposition. They repeat themselves five times and you know I'm not that stupid that I can't understand them the first time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — If anybody is stupid it's the lawyers on the other side of the House.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) is prepared to give you an answer which he feels he can answer correctly. He has indicated that he cannot answer it correctly as it appears on the Order Paper. He is not trying to evade anything. If you will just let him answer the way he has said he was going to answer, you'll get the question answered.

Mr. Whelan: — Well, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister fumbled I'm not sure, but there is one thing that we can be sure of and that is that we didn't get the information that we asked for. Now to argue that they are just going to have homes and they are not going to be sure about who is going to live in them, whether they are going to be Irish, or whether they are going to be English, Ukrainians. It seems very difficult to understand then why the Premier of this Province would appear on television a couple of nights ago and tell us that there were 40 homes at the Gardiner Dam and these were going to be given to native people, they would be for Indian people. If they can't tell Indian people, how can you be sure that you're going to have 40 Indian people in these homes?

Now I'm going to ask this: did they have this information? If you look at their report, I say Yes. Could they have given it to us? I say Yes. And why do I say this? I went to a housing conference in Toronto some time ago where a representative from this department appeared. And what was the subject he was talking about? Housing for native people. What did he tell us

about? He told us about the houses that were built and who occupied them, whether they were rented or sold and where they were built and who was in them at the present time. And he finished up by saying that in some respects they hadn't been successful because native people had been moved into these homes and had moved out. Now, what I'm saying is this, that, if this information could be given to the Housing Conference to 500 people in the city of Toronto, then it could be given to this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — And to refuse to give this information to this Legislature is to hold us in contempt. I'm sick and tired of this Government playing hide-and-seek and peekaboo with our money. How can we assess its operations if it plays this sort of a game where it gives us the information in its report and then it amends a request for the same information when we put it in writing. I think that, if it is not prepared to give us these details, it is hoodwinking us and either its own report is false or else it is deliberately withholding information. This is not a satisfactory reply.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 76

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West) for Return No. 76 showing:

- (1) The amount spent for architectural fees during the year 1968 by the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre.
- (2) To whom these payments were made.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this motion, as the Members of this House know the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre tables a report in the House each year and I believe it will be available for tabling this week, in light of that I feel that the question should be related to that report and consequently I would like to move the following amendment, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre):

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

- (1) Whether the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre will be preparing an Annual Report for the year 1968.
- (2) If so, whether the Report will include details of the amount of money spent by the Centre for architectural fees and of the name or names of the architectural firms to whom these payments were made.
- (3) If not, the amount spent by the Centre for architectural fees during the year 1968 and the name or names of the architectural firms to whom these payments were made.

March 25, 1969

Mr. Whelan: — I think the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is in order but the problem we run into is that the date for filing this report could be a date after which we had reviewed the estimates for the hospital. Could you give us the assurance that we will have the annual report before these estimates are before the House?

Mr. Grant: — Yes.

Amendment agreed to. Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 77

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West) for Return No. 77 showing:

Regarding the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre:

- (1) The total amount spent for engineering consultants during the year 1968.
- (2) The firms to which the above payments, if any, were made.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this motion, the same reasoning holds and I won't repeat myself. I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre):

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

- (1) Whether the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre will be preparing an Annual Report for the year 1968.
- (2) If so, whether the Report will include details of the amount of money spent by the Centre for engineering consultants and the name or names -of the consulting firms to whom these payments were made.
- (3) If not, the amount spent by the Centre for engineering consultants and the name or names of the consulting firms to whom these payments were made.

Amendment agreed to. Motion as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Resolution No. 12 - Long Distance Tolls

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that Saskatchewan Government Telephones assume responsibility for collection of long distance tolls on calls originating with Rural Telephone Companies or alternatively pay to the said companies full collection costs.

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try to be brief on this Resolution. I intend to bring in an amendment so I would think that I would be expected to justify the reasons for the amendment. If this Resolution passes as it is presently constituted, it simply means the inauguration of a further program of assistance to Rural Telephone Companies with a cost, an annual cost to SaskTel of something in the neighbourhood of \$250,000. It would be adding further to the Department of Telephones and SaskTel which already makes major contributions to the Rural Telephone Companies. I just want to quickly review some of these contributions that the Rural Telephone Companies are receiving. They get a pole grant of one-third the cost of all new poles which they put in, paid for by the Department of Telephones. Grants are provided to assist in stringing new lines in the form of circuit grants paid by the Department of Telephones. In 1965 this Government introduced a further grant of \$50 per route mile for underground cable. In the fall of 1966 we introduced a further grant of \$25 per mile for each circuit when the buried cable was introduced. The Rural Companies receive a further grant of \$2.50 per subscriber to assist in maintaining the plant facilities. These are all programs aimed to assist the Rural Telephone Companies. Now likewise when the Rural Companies convert to dial operation, the manual phones are removed and the new dial phones are provided free of charge to the Rural Companies, a contribution of SaskTel. This removes the cost of installing these telephones. Again any rural company wishing to replace an older model dial phone with the later improved type, SaskTel reimburses them again for one-half the cost of replacing this older type rural dial telephone. The Department of Telephones at their cost provides 10 of a rural staff to assist the Rural Companies in construction problems, in their financing problems, in the raising of debentures, and in the management of their companies paid for by the Treasury.

Now SaskTel does a considerable amount of engineering and drafting work for the companies at no cost to them. In other areas it subsidizes the Rural Telephone Companies and I want to speak about one or two changes. SaskTel charges the Rural Companies for switching rural calls, just a little more than one-half the amount it costs SaskTel to do this work. The switching calls which the Resolution is making reference to, we charge the Rural Telephone Companies less than 50 per cent of what it costs SaskTel to do the switching for them. In 1968 SaskTel subsidized the Rural Companies in the switching fees alone to \$350,000. We don't charge them the full switching fees. We subsidized them \$350,00 a year. Now in areas where the Rural Companies use SaskTel poles to string their lines, we rent these poles to the companies at prices below cost. We actually subsidize the Rural Companies and that last year was a subsidy of \$170,000. Likewise SaskTel rents the cable facilities to Rural Companies at less than half the cost that they should be charging. All along we are subsidizing from the Department of Telephones and from SaskTel the operations of these Rural Companies. We made another significant change in policy which I think has been most significant to the Rural Companies. Under the former Government where SaskTel operates the switching centres and the Rural Companies are led in where SaskTel amalgamated and made into a larger area, the Rural Company had to then change its connecting line and lead its subscribers into this new centre. Sometimes the centre would be 10, 15 or 20 miles away. This meant that the companies had to construct these lines to bring their people into the new centre. One example of a

March 25, 1969

rural company which I will call company "A" had to construct 78 circuit miles to connect to the new centre. They had to go to the market and issue a debenture for \$15,000. Another company had to go and issue debentures for \$14,000 simply because SaskTel pulled the rug out from under them and switched the centre and made them construct new lines to tie into SaskTel's new centre. This was the program the former Government had. We figured this program was unfair for two reasons: first, the rural company had no choice in the change of the centre. This was a decision of SaskTel not the rural companies. Secondly, why should they be having to bear the burden of building this new line when they had a line that had served them very well? We changed the policy and we don't charge them anything for this. SaskTel does it at its own expense. We went further and said to those companies that in the past had paid for this we would refund every dollar that was paid. That has been one of the most welcome programs that we have instituted. This program if followed to its conclusion would have cost the Rural Companies in excess of \$1 million, we wiped it out and refunded that \$1 million to the Rural Companies. This is the sort of assistance that we are giving and because of that I want to move, seconded by Mr. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

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

commends the Government for its financial assistance to Rural Telephone Companies, and urges that such assistance be continued and expanded.

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