

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
29th Day

Tuesday, March 26th, 1963

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

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution moved by Mrs. Strum.

That this House is of the opinion that the Federal Government should accept a larger share of the costs of education in Canada, particularly through an extension of the Vocational Training program in 1967, and further aid to institutions of higher education.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned this debate some time ago, I indicated that I wanted to say a few words on this matter of federal aid to education. Well, I hope nobody is worried about the size of the books which appear on my desk in speaking in this regard. They are in no way any indication of the length of the speech which I intend to make.

However, the matter of federal aid to education is one which has been of considerable interest to many of us for a long period of time. As I recall it, the matter was first brought rather forcibly to the attention of the Canadian public by the Canadian Teachers' Federation, as far back as 1935, and it is possibly a matter of further interest to those of us in Saskatchewan that the president of the Canadian Teachers' Federation at that time was a Saskatchewan teacher, Mr. J.R. McKay of Saskatoon. I had the opportunity of being associated with this particular subject and the Canadian Teachers' Federation work. I recall one year in the late thirties or the early forties, it was my responsibility to be chairman of a

March 26, 1963

committee in this regard. The reason I mention this is that one of the activities engaged in by the Canadian Teachers' Federation at that time was a survey of organizations all across Canada, and at that time it was correct to say that there was not very much support and not very much enthusiasm for the idea. As I said the other day, I do welcome the way in which this enthusiasm and this support has developed since that time.

With regard to the resolution itself, Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that it suggests that the federal government should accept a larger share of the costs of education, and that it particularly extend a vocational training program and consider particularly further aid to institutions of higher education. While the emphasis is placed on vocational and higher education, I know that all of us would agree that the need for this support to be more broadly based than that.

Now, we have had a good discussion of things in the legislature on this particular resolution. The mover expressed some of the broader reasons for concern that we move closer to the ideal of equal educational opportunity; the seconder of the motion provided us with a number of statistics which indicate the disparity in ability, and to some extent perhaps in effort, in regard to the various Canadian provinces; the Minister of Education outlined in fair detail the technical education program now underway. We have indications of support on the part of the opposition from the member for Maple Creek, and we had what I thought was a most interesting statement from the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) on some of the demands and challenges of the day when one thought about them in terms of educational systems.

As I said the other day, I do want to welcome this indication of support from the members of the opposition; I do want to add the hope that this reflects the position of the federal party with which they are associated. I want to say a little bit about that because I think it is important. Before dealing with it, may I add just one bit of evidence with regard to some of the disparity of opportunity which still exists in Canada when we look at educational opportunities.

I use a set of figures with regard to university students. In doing this I think it should be pointed out that while reference is just the university students, it indicates also differences in ability that do exist all down the line. A part of this difference in ability to take full advantage of educational opportunities is that of the financial cost of going to university, and part of it is also due to the disparity and distribution of income throughout Canada. Indeed if we are going to have a better distribution

of opportunities in education, we will have to do more about the basic problem of a more fair distribution of income generally to Canadian people.

Well, the study to which I want to make reference briefly is a 1956 study by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. At that time they made a survey of university students. This survey showed that one-quarter of the university students in Canada came from those families which represented one-tenth of the total population. It showed, in other words, that 10 percent of Canadian families with the highest income produced 25 percent of the university students, and this was not because this top 10 percent in the income group had more youngsters to go to university. One finds, too, a distribution within university students which indicates again some disparity in opportunity. Twenty-eight percent of the law students and 22 percent of the medical students came from families with incomes of \$10,000 and over, whereas only 15 percent of the total students remaining came from people with this particular level. As we look further inside of the group, the survey showed that 50 percent of the students had fathers who were classified as managers, proprietors or professionals, But this group represented only 15 per cent of the population of Canadian families. On the other hand, only five percent of the fathers of the students was classified as labor, whereas fathers in the groups classified as labor actually made up 20 per cent of the total population.

I mention these figures, Mr. Speaker, just to indicate that this disparity of opportunity does exist; to say again that federal aid to education is necessary in order to remove this kind of disparity; that this represents disparity not only at the university level, but also reflects disparity at levels prior to university; to again emphasize that part of the answer to this, that the whole answer to this, does not lie just in federal aid to education, but lies in part in removing some of the vast differences in income which exist in Canada.

Now I want to refer briefly to a statement that I made previously when I indicated that I hoped the representations on the opposite side of the house, Mr. Speaker, reflected accurately the point of view of the federal party with which the opposition are associated. I say this because there are some rather recent records, as recently as 1956, to indicate that during a long period the Liberal party federally had an opportunity to enter much more fully into federal aid to education and did not do so.

I say it also to indicate that for a long period, prior to 1957, it was representatives of the CCF in parliament who annually led the discussion in favor of federal aid to education. Members all across the country will remember and

March 26, 1963

recognize the particular valuable contribution made by Mr. Roy Knight who was for a number of years member of parliament from Saskatoon. The records will show also, Mr. Speaker, that these efforts were almost consistently opposed by the government and members of the Liberal party. It will show, of course, that the government of this particular group was in a position to act, and did not in fact act in any very extensive way. In support of that, it had been my intention to refer to several resolutions in the house of commons and to read some excerpts from the discussions which took place. I will not do so under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker. I will refer members to resolutions reported, for example, in the 1952-53 Hansard reports which show resolutions by Mr. Knight, which show opposition by some members of the Liberal party. Or I could refer to the other one which is for the 1956 session of the house of commons which shows a repetition of the same sort of thing.

I notice, too, that some of those who spoke against resolutions promoting the idea of federal aid are candidates in this particular federal election. One of them, Mr. Harrison, who is a candidate — my friend from Turtleford (Mr. Foley) could well do some missionary work on Mr. Harrison. And one, Mr. Studor who is a candidate in this particular federal election, and my friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) could well do some missionary work with Mr. Studor; my friend from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) perhaps could join in.

The point I want to make is that Hansard is replete with references which show a consistent support for the idea of federal aid by members of the party to which the group on this side of the house belong. The same thing can be true if one looks at the records of dominion-provincial conferences held over the years. Again you will find that former Premier Douglas, on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan, as did premiers in Manitoba and the Maritimes generally, raised this question and draw it to the attention of the group meeting there and the Canadian public generally.

The point of view, I think, Mr. Speaker, has been this, that whether a child is from the rock-bound coasts of the maritime provinces or in the great metropolises of our eastern cities, or on the wind-swept prairies, that child is first of all a Canadian citizen; he is a Canadian asset. As such, all of Canada gains or loses in part by the extent of the educational opportunity which is made available. That child, as an individual human being living in a country like Canada, does deserve the opportunity to grow to full capacity.

I am pleased that in the discussion, Mr. Speaker, stress has been put by a number of speakers on the needs of the general educational system. The matter of fact is, if we talked about the possibility of federal influence on education,

we can, I think, say that we are more likely to be affected by federal influence when the aid is directed to one or two specialized programs rather than to a general way. A lot of money is made available for technical education, there is some inclination, certainly some pressure, to spend on that rather than to spend on certain other parts of the education system, and one of the best ways of removing possibilities of undue exercise on provincial policy is to make the aid more available in a general sense rather than all in partly specific senses.

I don't want, in saying that, to underrate in any way the necessity for emphasis on technical education. Technologies and sciences are growing and changing very rapidly — something which was pointed out, I thought, very effectively by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) in his talk the other day. Some rather interesting evidence in this regard was given by the president of the university, Dr. Spinks, in a recent address in which he pointed out the sort of telescoping of time which has occurred between the discovery of theory and the application of theory in a practical sense. I read his statement and he pointed out that with regard to photography, some 200 years or back in the eighteenth century, it was 200 years after the discovery of certain theory before there was a practical application of that. By the time we had moved up to the days of transistor radios, it was only about 15 years after the discovery of the theory until the practical application of it was found. This, of course, raises problems. It provides also great opportunities. But the best guarantee of being able to keep up with technological changes lies, it seems to me, in making sure that a large number of people have a broad general educational background. If they are given this kind of background, they are in a better position to adjust to the new skills and the acquisition of new knowledge which is constantly needed.

Even more so I think we begin to recognize that along with the growth of technological skill, there is at least a corresponding, and personally I would feel a greater, need for growth in other skills. I think that the need for better skills in the fields of economics, of politics, and in social arrangements generally are even more demanding in this world in which we live than is the emphasis on technological skills. I'm not personally nearly so concerned about our ability to keep pace technologically and scientifically as I am concerned about our ability to keep pace in the fields of using the new tools of economics and of politics. I'm concerned, as all of us I know are, about a better ability to understand people, and to resolve the differences between people, and to build more productive relationships between people.

I don't under-emphasize in any way the value of technologies and the sciences but I do emphasize the values of these other sets of skills to which I refer. It seems to me that a society that almost at will can fill the sky with

March 26, 1963

flying hardware doesn't need to be too much concerned with it's technological and scientific skills, even though we need to continue to emphasize them. Production of material goods is certainly important and will continue to be important, but methods of distributing those goods and services is at least equally and probably more important.

There is another reason why I think we need to emphasize this matter of generally adding to educational opportunities for Canadian people, and this reason is our responsibility to other parts of the world. There is a great contribution which Canada and Canadians can make to under-developed nations. We need to be more concerned about this. We need to be more responsible about it. One of the best ways in which we can be of assistance is to make available to these nations the teachers, the scientists, the people in social and economic fields which they need in order to be able to improve their lot. One of the ways in which we can best make sure that we can carry out our responsibility in other parts of the world is to improve our own supply of persons in these fields, and consequently make more of them available to parts of the world where they are greatly in need.

Mr. Speaker, with that may I just add the hearty concurrence of the government in supporting this particular resolution.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS PROCEDURES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution moved by Mr. Johnson:

That this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government that a special committee be appointed to examine into and evaluate the function, terms of reference and methods of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, and the adequacy of the information and assistance provided to the Committee in its work of examining the public accounts, and to report thereon with recommendations to the Assembly at the next Session; the said special committee to be empowered to consult with the Provincial Auditor, officials of the Treasury and other departments, to gather information from other jurisdictions, and to sit after prorogation.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — It is my understanding that Mr. Thatcher doesn't desire to speak on this resolution, but I would like to say a few words on it myself, if I might.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that the work of our public accounts committee has not met the needs of and the wishes of either the government or the opposition, and it is my understanding that other jurisdictions, both in and outside of Canada, have made tremendous changes in the type of committee work carried on by their public accounts committee. And I am more than pleased to lend my support to this particular motion as I believe that the work of the opposition can be improved if there is more information made available to us during the public accounts committee.

I would hope that this information could be made available by some of the so-called professional people who are at the disposal of government but who are seldom at the disposal of the opposition, and I have often wondered at the adequacy of the information supplied to the public accounts committee, and I think on many occasions our committee members have been frustrated in the information that they are seeking, not because of the unwillingness of any one to supply that information, but because of the make-up of the public accounts committee. It makes it virtually impossible for members of the committee, and I am speaking personally now, to seek out and to obtain the information that one would like to have.

I have often ploughed through the back 100 pages of public accounts, and often found the information there that one never receives in the public accounts committee, and it seems to me that the most important section of the public accounts would be the back half of the book, and this to me has never been adequately doubted in the public accounts committee, and I would appreciate an opportunity of working with people from other jurisdictions in endeavoring to reconstitute a committee for our legislature that would be able to do the work that I have in mind. And it seems to me the only way that this can be done would be through a committee such as suggested in the resolution, and I would hope that if such a committee is set up, this house should feel fit to pass this resolution, then the committee be given adequate time to study the committees of other jurisdictions, but I hope that this committee could sit at a time of year when people who would, I am sure, be pleased to sit on the committee if they found that the particular time of the year allowed them to do so. It seems to me that we often leave this legislature in the spring of the year, and immediately set out with some committees to prepare work for us, and I

March 26, 1963

am wondering if it wouldn't be wiser to leave the work of this committee and some other committee until later in the year when most people have a little more free time than they do during the summer months. I am only handing this out as a suggestion to both sides of the house, that in setting up this committee we give consideration to them working in the winter months rather than in the summer months. The summer months seem to be the time of the year when all of us have to make our living, and yet many of us have little or nothing to do in the winter.

That is all I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, other than I think it is time this resolution was passed by this house and a committee set up so that we could do a better job of public accounts, and I am not criticising any member of the opposition or the government when I say that. I think our committee is so constituted at the moment that it is not possible to do the job that we ought to do, and, therefore, I hope that this house in its wisdom will change the makeup of this committee and to change the method under which we have worked for many years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Nicholson moved second reading of Bill No. 52 — **An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that there are four main sections to the amendments, the first section deals with clarification of terms in the present legislation. The second section will relieve municipalities of payments of child welfare costs and residence will be abolished. I might say that the SARM and the SUMA for a number of years have asked for relief in connection with these particular expenditures, and the legislation will go even further in meeting the objectives that have been suggested. The third section deals with payment of council fees, and the fourth section deals with reciprocal legislation.

All provinces are planning to enact legislation which will make orders made in other provinces or countries, regarding the committal of children, have the same force as if made under Saskatchewan law. This means that children who move from another province would have the same protection that they would have if they remained in their own province, and when we go into committee I will have a couple of house amendments which will clarify what we thought had been clearly understood in the legislation and had been practiced. I

think any questions that might be raised will be answered more adequately in committee, so I move that the Act to amend the Child Welfare Act be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill No. 53 — **An Act respecting Trading Stamps.**

He said: In rising to say a few words to move second reading to the Act respecting Trading Stamps, I would like to remind the house that those members who were here in 1960 will remember very well that at that time, in November and December of 1959 particularly, a number of the retail chains in Saskatchewan commenced issuing trading stamps to their customers. The government, confronted with this situation, resorted to the enforcement of the Criminal Code of Canada to prosecute those merchants who were violating the criminal code in an effort to restrain the issuing of trading stamps and, if possible, to discourage the practice.

There were two reasons why we felt obliged to do something about this problem, one was legal and the other was economic.

First, the operations that were carried on in Saskatchewan at least were very clear violations of the criminal code and it is our obligation to see to it that the provisions of the criminal code are observed so far as possible.

The other reason was the commercial one. It was pretty clear that the use of trading stamps added to — increased the cost of doing business. Accordingly some 42 merchants in Saskatchewan were charged with an offence under the trading stamps section of the criminal code and 32 of them pleaded guilty and three more were convicted as a result of trials, and the convictions were upheld by the Court of Appeals.

Our concern for eliminating the practice from the economic point of view was based upon well-authenticated reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other studies made by private organizations, such as Consumers' Union, demonstrated beyond doubt that the use of trading stamps induces a vastly wasteful expenditure of money on advertising and other kinds of sales promotion, and this large increase in expenditure was added to the cost of the consumer. Indeed, part of the cost was also the deterioration in quality competition that normally exists in the retail trade. It became manifest that the number of green stamps issued was the real point of competition, rather than the price or quality of the product being sold, so the consumer was being fleeced twice — once

March 26, 1963

through higher prices and secondly to deterioration in quality.

Now, it might be asked, why does the government not rest content with enforcing the criminal code? Well, we thought at first that the criminal code was ample legislative authority for any preventive action that we might want to take until we noticed the code had been amended in 1955, during a consolidation of the code which was made that year, and the definition of trading stamp was restricted, or at least an argument was possible that it had been restricted to less area than was covered by the original definition of trading stamps. And so it became doubtful whether all those devices commonly known as trading stamps were indeed covered by the definition section of the criminal code.

Some confirmation of this doubt or fear was found in the fact that other provinces either decided that they couldn't enforce the code, or couldn't prevent the use of trading stamps by enforcing the code, as trading stamps had become widespread, had become rampant in most of the other provinces of Canada.

In January of 1960 it became perfectly clear, as a result of a decision of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal that it was possible to operate a trading stamp plan and still escape from the prohibitions of the code. That raised the question of what the province could do about this.

We didn't want to try to cover the same ground as the criminal code, we didn't want to pass legislation which would be held by the courts to be ultra vires because it exceeded the jurisdiction of the province. Once the criminal code has occupied an area, that area is excluded from the province's jurisdiction, and so we tried to devise some method of regulating trading stamps so as to eliminate their objectionable features without at the same time contravening the criminal code, without at the same time encroaching on the area covered by the criminal code.

This was an uncertain area and we were reluctant to submit to the legislature a specific piece of legislation for fear that promptly after the prorogation of the house some defect would be found in the legislation with the result that trading stamps would break out again before another session could be summoned to deal with the matter. And so we followed the procedure that has been successfully used in Alberta. Alberta has a Retailers' Licensing Act which gave to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council wide powers of regulation. This meant that the actual regulation under the act could be adapted to changing circumstances in the interim between two sessions of the legislature.

We were also aware of a proposal in British Columbia to follow the opposite course. British Columbia, you will remember, proposed to pass a simple statute regulating trading stamps and outlining certain kinds of trading stamps. We were confronted with these two choices and the fact that there were these two choices was clearly recognized by the government, and I would refer briefly to a statement which I made to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers when this question was referred to that committee, and I quote.

It should be noted that British Columbia did pass a bill designed to prevent stamp companies from selling their trading stamps deals to retail merchants in that province. Presumably they went just as far as they thought they could safely go in preparing such legislation. And yet their legislation does not appear to prevent a chain store from operating its own stamp scheme nor to prevent a chain store, whose head office is outside the province of British Columbia, from buying and using a trading stamp plan purchased at the head office outside the province.

It also appears possible under their legislation that any retailer, by simply going outside the borders of the province and purchasing his stamps, could do the same thing.

We have, therefore, considered other possible methods of preventing trading stamp operations in this province in order to avoid the hazards involved in trying to foretell judicial interpretation in a field which is almost completely without precedent. We believe that the flexibility of Lieutenant-Governor's regulations is to be preferred to the rigidity of legislative statutes if we are determined to effectively carry out the policy of preventing trading stamps in this province."

So that we were well aware of the choices which were before us. No one suggested at that time any form of statute which would have overcome the difficulties inherent in the British Columbia statute.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our fears, our anxieties were borne out by the subsequent events. British Columbia's legislation did fail to curtail or restrict the use of trading stamps in that province and they continued unabated in that province for another year. The following year, however, 1961, the British Columbia legislature had another look at the problem and they did evolve a new Trading Stamp Act. This new act went much further than the one which was passed in 1960 and caused us

March 26, 1963

some anxiety that this might encroach on federal jurisdiction. However, the experience of British Columbia with this new act has been completely satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, we had made it perfectly clear to the legislature and to the law amendments committee in 1960 that the government was reluctant to pass legislation of such sweeping effect as The Retail Merchants' Licensing Act. The assurance was given by the Premier of that time that this legislation would not be used except as a means of preventing the outbreak of trading stamps, and I quote from the statement which I made myself in volume 40, page 21 of the debates as follows. I would like to repeat it in exactly the same words, that I used before so you will pardon me just for a moment and I will quote from myself. This is the undertaking I made on behalf of the government to the committee, and I made exactly the same undertaking here, and this was the quotation that I used in the third reading of the bill:

The Premier and myself have both given emphatic assurance on behalf of the government that this legislation would not be proclaimed except as a means of preventing trading stamps within the ordinary meaning of that term. The government is convinced that trading stamp companies will bypass this province if we have effective legislation and make clear our determination to use it if necessary.

The Premier said, a little later in the debate:

We say that if the legislation has to be proclaimed that the legislation will be directed only at those stores where it is necessary to direct the legislation in order to stop the use of trading stamps.

So it was made abundantly clear in this house, and in the committee of the legislature considering the bill, that The Retail Merchants' Licensing Act was an act designed solely and exclusively for the purpose of preventing trading stamps from being used.

We also said that if anyone could come forward with a simple and direct method of doing it, by legislative enactment, the government would be more than willing to adopt this method rather than the method of indirect legislation or delegated legislation inherent in The Retailers' Licensing Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of the government's decision in this matter was amply vindicated by the event. The event was that if we had not used the device of a Retail Merchants' Licensing Act as a threat of Lieutenant-Governor's order to forestall the outbreak of trading stamps we would have suffered the same fate as British Columbia did. We would have had them and there would have been nothing we could have done about it for a whole year.

Now, the government has, therefore, no reluctance at all about coming before the legislature, now that a satisfactory alternative and effective method has been evolved, and asking the legislature to replace the Retailers' Licensing Act with a statute similar to the one which has been since worked out in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the only three provinces in Canada that have been able to prevent the use of this gimmick in sales promotion have been the three western provinces. Saskatchewan and Alberta were the first to succeed in this campaign, and both provinces used the method of vesting in the Lieutenant-Governor the power to pass delegated legislation. British Columbia succeeded a year later by using the more direct form of legislation, that passing through the legislative assembly. By asking the legislature at this time to adopt the British Columbia precedent we are, therefore, taking a benefit from the experience which British Columbia pioneered in this field.

I want to just say in conclusion that it really isn't necessary for me to argue here the advantages of direct legislation over the advantages of delegated legislation. I think it is recognized by everyone, and was certainly recognized by the government in 1960, that direct legislation — that is legislation passed by the legislative assembly itself — is preferable on almost every count to the alternative of delegated legislation — legislation passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council on the authorization of the legislative assembly. This makes it possible for the public and the private interests involved to know precisely what the law is before taking any action which they may contemplate. It makes it possible for everyone to have the protection of knowing well in advance what the law really is on the subject. Even more important, Mr. Speaker, it makes it possible for the members of the legislative assembly to have a direct hand in the preparation and promulgation of that law, and we here subscribe to the principle that the closer the law-making function is to the elected representatives of the people, the better it is for the people of the province. We only reluctantly used the other procedure when no one was able to come forward with a satisfactory draft for a legislative enactment.

We gave the undertaking then that when such a suitable draft was produced by anybody we would be glad to acknowledge it here and to follow its precedent. By taking this action at this time it ought to remove any apprehension on the

March 26, 1963

part of anyone that we might have violated our undertaking and proclaimed the act and used it for purposes for which it was not intended. It's not right that the people of Saskatchewan ought to be under any reasonable apprehension that power given under legislation will be abused. I think the undertaking which was given the Premier at that time and by myself, on behalf of the government, was entirely lived up to, honored in every way. But it isn't possible for the government to prevent some people from being reasonably or unreasonably apprehensive that it might not be lived up to. We deplore any suggestion that the honor of the government is not good enough for people to repose their confidence in but we can prove now that we were sincere in the undertaking which we gave. I remember some member said that it would be proclaimed and the government would go in and take over people's stores and run them and dictate to them, in spite of the fact that an undertaking was given solemnly by the government that no such action was contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, this action by the government simply proves that we were right on that issue and others were wrong on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can give any absolutely categorical assurance that this new procedure will be absolutely successful. It hasn't been tested of course. The only evidence we have for saying that it is probably good is that our own law officers think it would be upheld by the courts if it was taken there and the experiences in the province of British Columbia where it has operated now for two years. It hasn't even been challenged in the courts of British Columbia. Apparently the trading stamp companies themselves do not feel that there is any merit in attacking its validity in the courts of that province. It has this hazard, of course, which I must acquaint the legislature with. If it is successfully attacked in the courts, then we would be helpless to take any preventive measures until the legislature could again be summoned. This risk, however, I think is worth taking in order to make the law more certain, to make it a direct enactment by the legislature rather than by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I think in the interests of certainty in the law, in the interests of upholding the principles of legislative responsible government, this is a risk worth taking.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in moving that this bill be now read a second time in compliance with the undertakings which were given previously in this legislature and in fulfilment of the prophecies which we made to the legislature in 1960.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Walker that Bill No. 53, An Act respecting Trading Stamps, be now read a second time.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a few questions.

I never heard the minister devote so much time to justify a blunder he made about three years ago. He surely made a mess of a piece of it because he went back to it four times, trying to convince this house that it was a blessing to us that he made a blunder of this thing.

Now then, if I understand him correctly, the act that was passed in 1961 . . .

Hon. R.A. Walker: — 1960.

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — 1960, well that's all right. . . . was never proclaimed. You never used that act. I looked at the title of this new act and it is a new act, it is not an amendment of the old one so that means the act that you passed in 1960 was never proclaimed. Now that has been used as a club or as a threat to the business interests of the province of Saskatchewan in all these years.

Hon. R.A. Walker: — Not by us.

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — Yes, you had it, and if anything wasn't just the way you thought it would go or if there was any indication in any way that someone might violate the principles of that act, you were ready to proclaim the act. It was a club to beat the fellows over the head before they had committed any crime. That's what it was.

Now, then, I would ask you this. If this act, copied from British Columbia — well, the Social Credit showed you something anyway the CCF never could think of — you put through an act which has received a great deal of praise from the Attorney General. I'm not so dang sure but what we would be better off if we hadn't had that praise from the Attorney General.

Now are you going to proclaim this act if that goes through the house? Are you going to put it in operation or is it going to be used as a club or a weapon to subdue something that doesn't exist, like you did with the other act?

I would like to ask the Attorney General, is he now going to use this act if it is passed by this house, or is he going to sit there like a lump on a log for the next three or

March 26, 1963

four years, if fortune lets them stay there that long, of which I am very, very doubtful. I would like to have him tell the house if it is the intention to use this act or is it just put up as a declaration or some kind of an instrument to hold a threat over business interests of this province.

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add just one word to what the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said, and he is, of course, so completely right. The Attorney General and this government saw fit to introduce that obnoxious Retailers' Act which cost the people of this province a great deal of money because, first of all the opposition had to awaken to the implications of that act the conscience of this province and then when people became aware of what those implications were, they had to hold meetings and travel here and prepare briefs, and appear before a committee, and I will never forget the spectacle of the then Premier sitting and actually badgering people because they had the temerity to suggest to this government that the powers in this bill were too wide. These people that appeared before the committee were subjected to some of the most gruelling cross-examination that even accused persons in court are not subjected to. It was quite a spectacle, and this went on for days and days, and the hours of preparation and the hours of difficulties that people encountered merely because this government wanted power. This is another example of how the government tried to take over powers and try to hold a club over an entire section, an entire occupation and class of people. Because the government couldn't get away with it, this bill was held in abeyance, but it was still there as a club over people and no doubt contributed a lot to political quietude on the part of many people who have been afraid to say one word in the exercise of the freedom, the political freedom, to which they, as Canadian citizens, are entitled, because they didn't know when this bill would be put into effect, and the powers under that bill, as you know, Mr. Speaker, are almost limitless.

I certainly want to congratulate the government for coming to its senses and for realizing that the people of the province have had quite enough of this kind of legislation and putting in the bill which should have been passed in the first place without handing over to a minister of the crown all those powers which the retailers bill did.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert): — In listening to the Attorney General explain this bill, of course I was struck as all members on this side with the irony

of him complimenting British Columbia. We listened to them not long ago and were led to the opinion that everything that government did was taking away freedoms, and now we find them following neatly behind.

Obviously they didn't have the people in their employ that could come up with a very simple act like this, if they feel that trading stamps are such terrible things to prohibit them. Well, most of the time I agree with the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten). I will not congratulate the government for taking off the retailers bill which they never proclaimed.

I think this is again an example of a death-bed repentance. I don't think they have changed their minds, they just changed their plans. They found, along with the medicare, that one more step in compulsion, regimentation, another group rose up and they were afraid to put it into action. They have taken it off to get ready for the next election, and I don't think the people of this province should be fooled for one minute by them taking off some of the more obvious examples of compulsion and force, because if they are ever given another term, we will find them putting them right back in.

This could have been done last year, two years ago, when they brought the bill in. They held a club over every retail merchant in this province, and then the Attorney General had the nerve to stand up here and say "We have accomplished what we set out to do. Isn't this a wonderful thing we did? We kept our word, we kept our word." The only reason they kept their word is because they didn't have the nerve to put it in, and if they did keep their word it is one of the few times that they ever have, and then they bring in a bill like this and attempt to stand up and take some credit for it.

Premier Lloyd: — I'm sure the member who has just spoken is a great compliment to his constituency when he speaks in that way.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, he is. If you had . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Didn't have . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the house ready for the question? Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The suggestion has been made that the original bill was brought in over the opposition of the merchants and everybody in Saskatchewan. Just, Mr. Speaker, so that the record will be straight, I would like to quote briefly from the brief which the Canadian Association of Consumers presented when this bill was before the committee. I quote:

March 26, 1963

The Canadian Association of Consumers has asked for legislation to prohibit the use of trading stamps, give-aways, gimmicks, dishonest advertising or merchandise, generally all unfair trading practices. If the bill covers all these, then we are in favor of it. Maybe the proposed bill is wider in scope than necessary, but experience has shown that it is better to be wide enough to do the job, than so limited as to leave loop-holes as evidenced by the federal criminal code.”

The Regina Council of Women said:

We would, therefore, urge the government of the province to enact legislation such as to make possible comprehensive and lasting controls over trading stamps, and similar sales gimmicks, for the protection of the public.”

Federated Co-operatives in their brief said “After due attention, and for their reasons, we urge the adoption of Bill 61 as proposed.”

The Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan says:

The co-operative union is of the opinion that provincial legislation enacted solely to make the use of trading stamps an offence would be held to be ultra vires of the province, and, therefore, the need for broader legislation is appreciated. The Union acknowledges the stated intention of the government to not proclaim the act unless judicial authority holds that the criminal code is not adequate to protect every situation. After careful consideration of the matter, the union has concluded that the legislation being proposed is desirable.

The Saskatchewan Farmers’ Union says “In summary . . .

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — Take it as read.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — But, Mr. Speaker, we can’t allow mis-statements to go on the record without being replied to.

The Saskatchewan Farmers’ Union said:

In summary, we go on record as being in support of the Retailers’ Act as a means to prevent the introduction into Saskatchewan of this further contemptible type of premium promotion.

The Saskatchewan Federation of Labor in their brief said:

The federation is of the opinion that if there is to be any effective guarantee against trading stamp schemes generally this can perhaps, under the above circumstances, best be provided through provision at provincial level for licensing retail stores with the object of denying licenses to any store which attempts a trading stamp scheme.

It is perfectly clear that these groups endorse the legislation unreservedly.

The Retail Merchants' Association of Canada, Saskatchewan section . . .

Mr. Steuart: — All eight of them.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And the hon. lady says that the merchants oppose this. They say:

It is the humble submission of the Humboldt Retail Merchants Association, that the proposed legislation is absolutely essential to the continued well-being of its members, the retail trade in general, and the public.

and they went on to say, "it is noteworthy . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Question. Does he realize, does he know how many members were at that meeting when the retail merchants passed that? Less than a dozen. And how many they represent in the province? Less than 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The member cannot ask a question and then proceed to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I know very well that this was discussed at the convention as Saskatoon, at which I was present, and there were nearly 200 retail merchants there who discussed this question. I addressed that convention, Mr. Speaker.

Government: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That may account for the fact of the large attendance that was there, but they went on to say:

March 26, 1963

It is noteworthy that this type of legislation is similar, and if anything not as stringent as that which has been so successful in the province of Alberta, in Britain, in Holland and in Belgium.

So there are some members who weren't here in 1960 and might be misled by the remarks of the member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) and I think the record needs to be made clear.

Mr. Speaker, the government makes . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? Are the people that the Hon. Attorney General listed, have they been consulted about this new bill, and are they prepared to waive that protection that they received in the last bill and accept this one.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the people that I have quoted from will be perfectly well prepared to accept my word that I think, and the government thinks, that this new bill will give them as adequate protection as they had under the old one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) that this represents an about-face. I suggest that the hon. member wasn't listening to what was said, or else he has completely forgotten what occurred in this house at the time that this Retailer' Licensing Act was before the house. The government made it clear then that if and when we could find a simpler and more direct way to accomplish the end which we enunciated, we would be glad to adopt it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are doing and the member says we should have adopted British Columbia's proposal in 1960. I can only remind him . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I never made that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — I would like to ask him why . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — . . . why, if this legislation was a blessing, why he threw it out.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I don't think the member has the right to rise on a point of order then, when he proceeds, to ask questions. He must ask the minister's . . .

Mr. Danielson: — I didn't ask questions, I just pointed . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! That was still not a point of order. It was an allegation of facts.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am glad to accept his assurance . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Call it anything you like, it was my right.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to accept his assurance, that if the suggestion was made that we should have done this three years ago, we should have adopted British Columbia's draft three years ago, by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart).

Mr. Danielson: — On a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — I said this, "I see now that you are going to copy the British Columbia act, and I'm not so sure that would be a good thing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — He says that I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I believe the hon. member was not referring to the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) at all in his statement at this point, and you cannot enter the debate twice.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, but he said it three times, and I have denied it. I didn't make that statement.

Hon. Walker: — I accepted the hon. member's denial, and then I said, however, the statement was made on the other side. I wasn't attributing it to the hon. member, and the statement was made that if the present proposal was so good and adopted in British Columbia why didn't we adopt it in 1960. It wasn't in existence in 1960. Some of my hon. friends opposite suggested then that we should adopt the proposal which British Columbia was then enacting, and I warned them that their proposal would fail. It did fail, Mr. Speaker, it did fail. It wasn't until a year later that the formula which we are now proposing was devised, and it has succeeded. If this particular formula had been in existence in 1960, I think probably we would have proposed this instead of the Retail Licensing Act. We said we would and we have done it.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

March 26, 1963

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved second reading of Bill No. 57 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which proposes to amend the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Act. There are comparatively small number of changes. I will mention them briefly.

Members may recall last autumn, at the time of the collection of the joint hospital and medical care tax, a situation arose whereby it appeared that persons might be denied the right to purchase the joint card by reason of the fact that they were in arrears with respect to their hospitalization payment in past years, and the government took the position that this was not intended and that legislation would be introduced at this session to, in effect, provide for a moratorium with respect to hospital tax arrears.

The legislation which is before you provides for such a moratorium. What it does in this regard is to provide that arrears of hospital tax which were outstanding should not be a bar to eligibility. That means that if you had some arrears of hospital tax outstanding you could still buy your card last autumn. It does not mean that the arrears would be wiped out. The arrears are still owing and the only effect is that arrears which were outstanding would not be a bar to your getting current coverage. The act provides for that arrangement.

It also provides to cut down the period during which arrears can be collected in the past, cuts it down to a period of the current year and two years back, rather than a longer period. Five years, I believe, was the term.

The bill before you contains a definition of residence for the purpose of determining eligibility. The present act provides that the residence shall be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Members have from time to time expressed the view that this was legislatively a bad arrangement in the sense that it would be better if the definition of residence were contained in the act so that the citizens would have this assurance that their coverage could not be adversely affected by a regulation. So the definition of residence is included and there is also a provision that people can be made beneficiaries by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in case the definition of residence proves to be defective in some small respect.

There are a number of other small changes; a re-definition of the enforcement sections which I think are an improvement from a purely legal point of view. I think they contain no change in principle, no substantial change in principle,

and a couple of changes in wording by reason of the fact that the card which is issued to persons now is a card which entitles them to both hospital and medical benefits, and the name "hospital services card" is perhaps inappropriate.

Those, then, Mr. Speaker, are the changes which are proposed in this bill. All of them, I think, the details of them, can most effectively be dealt with in committee, and I, accordingly, move that the said bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Kramer moved second reading of Bill No. 60 — **An Act to amend The Forest Act, 1959.**

He said: This bill, Mr. Speaker, involves some parcels of land in the forest region. Section 1 pertains to the south-east of 20 and the south-west of 21, in the Fort Lacorne provincial forest. It has very little forest potential and we feel that it is better for pasture than — be turned into be turned into pasture without any unrealistic costs. Therefore we are recommending this.

In the section 2, the east half of legal sub-division 10 and the east half of legal sub-division 15 is being removed from the Nisbitt provincial forest and the area is going to be turned over to the city of Prince Albert for construction purposes, bridges and overpass.

The section 3 deals with quarter section of land that should never have been included in the forest area. It is patented land, it has been patented since October 17, 1933, to one Mr. Jesse Gunther, and it was inadvertently included when the northern forest boundary was first drawn up.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill No. 59 — **An Act to provide for The Central Filing and Publication of Regulations.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this bill, I would like to say this is the bill to provide for the central filing and publication of regulations. I would like to say a few words in explanation.

This legislation passes statues of a general legislative character which have the force of law in the courts of the province and which are applicable to the people of the province. But all of the statutory law applicable to the people of Saskatchewan does not come from this legislature. A large

March 26, 1963

part of it comes from bodies with delegated powers, and this act will deal with such delegated legislation. It deals with regulations. A regulation, and I am not going to try to give a scholarly definition of it, is a rule or an order or a by-law made under the authority of an act of the legislature. These are the regulations that we purport to deal with under this Regulation Act.

The usual formula for a statute delegating the power to make regulations is something like this: "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such orders", and so on, "for the purpose of carrying out the effect and intent of this act", etc. The number of regulations and the volume of regulations far outweighs, in terms of sheer wording, the statutes that are formally passed by this assembly.

Regulations or rules or bylaws emanate from sources which we don't ordinarily think of as legislative bodies. This assembly delegates, for instance, to rural municipalities and urban municipalities the power to pass by-laws. Those by-laws are only as good as the authorization which this legislature gives to those delegated bodies. Rules and regulations under the professional societies are likewise delegated legislation. Indeed one might even go so far as to say that by-laws by joint stock companies made pursuant to the Companies Act have the effect of regulations and have a limited effect as a statute. Peoples' rights can be determined, can be modified or altered by these regulations just as if they were passed by the legislative assembly.

We have the orders of the highway traffic board. These have a legislative effect. Labor relations board orders, many of them, particularly of procedure before the labor relations board, are, in effect legislative enactments, delegated to that board by this legislature. The liquor licensing board makes regulations applying to the licensing of liquor outlets, and these are in the eyes of the court statutory enactments. The securities commission makes general rules governing the sale of securities. These are just as much the law of the land, so far as they purport to go, as if they were passed by this legislature, providing the legislature has authorized their passing. The rules of court are legislative enactments promulgated by the judges, and made pursuant to authority vested in them under the various court acts.

When the representatives of the voters meet here to pass legislation, it is quite literally true that they don't always know what legislation they pass or authorize. Those statutes which are passed through this house, of course, we hear them read and we take part in the formulation of the statutes, but where those statutes delegate to some other body, the legislation that comes from that body is not subject, generally speaking, to review in this house. It means that

the legislature is increasingly called upon to repose confidence in outside authorities or in delegated authorities to carry out the true intent and purposes of the legislature.

I am sure it is not lost on the people of Saskatchewan and especially members of this house that there are certain inherent dangers and hazards in this kind of procedure. There is always the possibility, and indeed often the authorization, for taxes and imposts to be levied upon the public that are not in the old formal sense approved by the representatives of the people in parliament assembled. There are often regulations providing penalties and, in effect, almost creating offences which are punishable in the courts.

And so the legislature is often, and the members of this legislature on both sides of the house have often expressed concern and anxiety about the scope and the use made of such delegated powers. Sometimes we find these powers used for the purpose of seeming at least to deny “due process” to the public. The ordinary rights of the public with respect to the courts and the pursuit of their lawful remedies in the courts is sometimes abridged.

Sometimes these regulations are not as carefully or as skillfully drafted as are the statutes that are submitted to the assembly—sometimes they are more hastily done—and are not as clear, concise and ascertainable as to their meaning as are the direct enactments of the legislature. There is also, of course, the danger that such legislation may escape the notice of the public who are bound by it.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that ignorance of the law is no excuse and a person can be convicted of a law of which he is unaware. It is possible, indeed, for such a law to have been passed without anybody being aware except the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the by-law making authority or the regulation-making authority, or the administrative board or whatever is its source. These are all serious hazards which the public face, which the legislature has to endure if it is going to delegate power to pass legislation to administrative boards and other tribunals.

Mr. Speaker, the extent to which this power has been delegated in the last 50 years is, I believe, a symbol of the complexities of our modern economic society. If we lived in a primitive and pastoral society, where there was little happening in the way of economic development, in the way of political development, we could go from year to year with very little addition to the statute law. However, in a complex society, where everybody is impinging on everybody else, either as an individual, as a worker, as a member of a professional society, or as a shareholder in a joint stock company, it becomes in such a complex community more and more

March 26, 1963

necessary to provide a framework or regulations to ensure that the real rights of individuals are protected against exploitation and oppression from other citizens.

This growing complexity and growing volume of delegated legislation is a symbol of the times that we live in. It is a part of the price we pay for living, not in a primitive community, but in a modern, free society.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency for people who see developments that on the surface appear to be repugnant, for them to just strike out and lash back against these developments blindly. We sometimes hear people saying that we should get rid of administrative boards, we should prevent the delegation of legislative powers, that we should dissolve this complex machinery of social administration. And of course this attitude is not new in our time. Wasn't it the Luddites in Britain who smashed the machines? The machines did carry with them some connotations of exploitation and oppression, but they did liberate man from want and insecurity. These rules of the modern economic society do create the means of a more abundant life. They do create the means of increasing specialization of labor. They do make, in short, possible for all mankind to enjoy a more secure and more abundant life. And for all the facts that they are curtailing and restricting us in some ways, they are nevertheless on balance impossible to dispense with.

Mr. Speaker, instead of just striking out blindly at this growing complexity of laws and rules of living, it seems that it should behoove us to try to evolve some more democratic way of promulgating them, some more democratic way of putting them together, of publicizing them. In other words, we should recognize that we must face a growing volume of regulations and restrictions but we must make sure that these represent the real will of the people, that the voice of the people is not lost, that these regulations do not get out of reach of the control of the voting citizen.

It is to try to establish some direct link between the elected representatives of the people and this large body of regulations, this large group of regulation-making authorities, that it is proposed at this time to produce this act to provide for the central filing and publication of regulations.

Britain, back in the early 1940's, passed its Rules Publications Act which required that all such delegated legislation must be adequately and widely published before it could have effect, and this is one of the purposes of this new act.

Some years ago the Commissioners for the Uniformity of Laws in Canada gave some considerable thought to this problem and this group formulated a uniform act. The uniform act has

been adopted in part in several provinces of Canada. Manitoba has gone perhaps farther than any of the other provinces and not only for the publication and filing of regulations but went as far as they did in Britain and provided for the tabling of these regulations in the legislature and for their review by a legislative committee. Our act provides likewise.

The British legislation, or rather the British rules of parliament have vested in their legislative committee the power to scrutinize regulations to ascertain whether or not they impose a charge on the public revenues. It is thought apparently by the British parliament that this is something which should be expressly brought to the attention of parliament — any attempt of a regulation-making authority to impose charges on public revenues.

Any regulation which purports to exclude challenge in the courts is also made by the terms of reference of their committee a proper matter for report to the house.

The British parliament also asks their committee to report to them any attempt at unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred on the regulation making authorities. The British parliament also wants to know whether any regulation purports to have a retrospective effect or whether it has been delayed unduly in the time of publication or in the time of laying on the table of the house. And they also examine them to see that the regulations are clear in their meaning and if they appear not to be clear, this fact is reported to parliament.

Saskatchewan took a preliminary step in this direction back in the late 1940's when it required the professional societies to table their by-laws in the law amendments and delegated powers committee for review by the house. Members will recall that there has been some instances of attempts by professional societies to enforce by-laws on their members, punish their members for breach of by-laws, which had not complied with the provisions of the professional act, and the court then quite properly refused to give effect to the by-law.

There has been cases where by-laws have been the subject of comment in the committee and I don't need to go back and review the history of that. That commenced in 1947 in Saskatchewan.

The time has come now when we think we should move another step in making our regulation-making bodies amenable to the discipline of this legislature. So we propose to submit this bill which contains a number of salient provisions. First of all that there will be a uniform requirement calling for the publication of all regulations which are of a legislative

March 26, 1963

nature, are of an administrative nature or derive from the executive prerogative of the crown. But those which are of a legislative nature should in all cases become published. Most are now published but there ought to be some assurance by the public that they will all be published.

There are very few acts of the legislature that require such regulations to be published. This could result in convictions for breaches against regulations which were never published. This doesn't happen, but the reason it doesn't happen is by virtue of the goodwill and good intentions of the departments rather than by any compulsion upon them at law.

It is also provided in this act that such regulations will be available for inspection at a central point. There will be a registrar's office where they will be duly filed and kept on public display for anyone who wishes to examine them. It is also provided in this act that there will be some uniformity in the method by which regulations are brought into effect. In other words, we aim to provide that they can't be brought into effect until after they have been published unless the statute expressly authorizes that, and it is up to the legislature whether it passes such a statute.

It is also proposed that they will not come into effect until after they are filed with the central registry, and for the protection of the public Section, 14 provides that no one can be convicted of an offence or convicted of a breach of a regulation which has not been published unless the crown can show that the contents of the regulations were expressly brought to the attention of the person charged.

The act authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to make regulations prescribing the form which all regulations shall take in the hope that we can achieve more uniformity in the form of the regulations issued by the various boards and authorities.

And, perhaps, most important of all, the regulations will be coming on the table of this assembly and will be available to the legislative assembly for whatever action the assembly considers advisable.

One other provision in our act, which I think is unique in this province, is that all present regulations should be reconstituted, re-enacted. We have many regulations which go back 20 or 25 years and in order to say exactly what they mean one would have to do a research job going back 20 or 25 years unless one happened to be fortunate enough to be in possession of one of the little consolidated versions which are put out by the various departments, one would have to go back and review 25 years of Saskatchewan gazettes, 26 or 27

issues a year, and then you wouldn't be sure that you had completely covered the field. It is proposed that within the year immediately following the proclamation of this act all regulations to be effective must be re-enacted and published. This will mean that the regulation-making bodies will have to immediately commence a review of all their regulations with a view to consolidating them and getting them ready for re-issue sometime before the end of the year following the proclamation of this act.

Mr. Speaker, it is felt that these provisions will greatly improve the quality of the regulations, will improve their availability to the people who are affected by them, and will insure that every citizen will have the means at hand of avoiding breaches of the regulations, at least he will have the chance to know what they really are. It should be, of course, conceded that this bill itself, without anything else, will not completely solve this problem. This problem will not be solved unless the members of the legislature, members of the committee go to some trouble and pains to make a serious, a systematic review of the delegated legislation that is submitted to it.

There is no doubt that the institution of such procedures will present difficulties. The government is well aware that this will cause some difficulties, some anxieties and some frustration and embarrassment to the government and to government agencies. It may cause some extra work and trouble to the legislature, but, on the other hand, we believe that if there is to be any successful establishment of these democratic procedures, we have to court those inconveniences and those risks. We believe that if we can overcome these minor difficulties and obstacles that we will succeed in strengthening parliamentary government, thus giving better government to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, with these words of introduction, I move that the said bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall this bill be considered in committee?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I think it would more suitable to the members of the house if this bill could be considered in the committee on law amendments and delegated powers, in addition to being considered in committee of the whole. I think there will be a good deal of discussion as to the terms of reference we will need to give the committee, the size of the legislative committee, and so on, and I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Kuziak:

March 26, 1963

That the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers be instructed to consider and report with recommendations procedures of the legislative assembly pursuant to Bill 59, An Act to provide for the Central Filing and Publication of Regulations.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:00 p.m.