

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**31st Day**

**Thursday, March 28, 1963**

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

**SALES OF SASKATCHEWAN BONDS**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to inform the members that the sale of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds, which have been reported today amounted to \$10,113,400.

**REDISTRIBUTION — REGINA AND MOOSE JAW**

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, might I have permission to revert to the orders of the day for one question to the Premier?

Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in the past two days in the press considerable information about the redistribution bill regarding the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. We still do not have this bill on our desks as far as I know and I wonder if this procedure is the usual type of thing with regard to a matter as important as this, Mr. Premier.

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, the information to which the hon. member refers to was given attention in the press at the time that I gave notice of motion of the bill in the house, and if the hon. member reads carefully at that time he will note that the press was purely speculating on the basis of what had been said before.

I at that time said to several members of the press I shall make no statement at all on the matter as to what has been proposed until after the bill is given first reading.

**March 28, 1963**

I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member calls it to my attention, I may well have been in error at a later date and if so I apologize to the legislature, because a copy of the bill, a draft copy of the bill I should say, was made available to the press. I think perhaps the hon. member is quite correct in calling this to the attention of the legislature, Mr. Speaker.

It had been my assumption that the bill was printed and would be available on the members' desks, and I think the member is quite correct in calling attention to this fact. I may say, however, that the bill is not as yet printed and of course can't proceed to second reading prior to the time it is printed and on the members' desks.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Foley:

That this Assembly respectfully requests that the Government, in consultation with the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan, immediately give consideration to the establishment of a Dental College in Saskatchewan with a course leading to the degree of Doctor of Dental Surgery.

**Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to take the time of the house today in a lengthy speech on this subject. I certainly can see many advantages of a dental college in Saskatchewan, but I believe the Hon. Minister of Public Health has given this matter some study so I will defer to him on this matter.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this resolution and I want to say at the outset that I am in general sympathy with the tone of the resolution. I listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks of hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) and I think that generally all members of the house will be able to agree with him that the provision of dental services, the adequate provision of dental services has proved to be a difficult task not only in Saskatchewan but generally across Canada. I think that his remarks established the fact that a dental college will not necessarily be a solution to the problem. He pointed out that there is a very high incidence of dental disease all across Canada and that the standard of dental care almost universally across the country, except for

a few small urban areas — or large urban areas, but geographically small areas — the standard of dental services in all but these few urban areas is perhaps inadequate.

It is inadequate in Saskatchewan and it is inadequate in provinces where they have dental colleges. We can, I think, from that see that the establishment of a dental college will not necessarily in itself be a solution or a complete solution to the problem.

There are other possible approaches to the problem of providing more adequate dental services and some of these were mentioned by the Thompson Committee in its survey of the health needs of the province. That committee listed a number of recommendations and outlined at least three other lines of attack on this problem of provision of adequate dental care. They spoke of the need for public education as to the importance of dental health and this is very important.

It is rather remarkable in some ways that persons generally are so lax in appreciation of the need for keeping themselves healthy in the dental sense. And notwithstanding the fact that there is a substantial incidence of dental disease, there has been up until very recent times very little effective demand for dental services. People simply haven't sought out dentists to get care.

The Thompson Committee also urged that attention be given to the prevention and control of dental disease among school children and here, I think, there is a very fruitful field for activity. Programs of preventive dentistry for school children have operated in Saskatchewan, more particularly in the Swift Current Health Region and the Gravelbourg area, the Assiniboia- Gravelbourg Health Region, and these have run into some difficulties because of the difficulties of obtaining technical staff but they have, I think, indicated that there is in this area a fruitful field for activity.

There is also a third area which the Thompson Committee suggested would require attention. And this would be the area of providing assistants to dentists so that they might increase the number of people they can serve. I think many of us have been struck or will have been struck years ago with the fact that many operations which a dentist in the ordinary course of his practice performed could equally well have been performed by some person of lesser skills. Many of them of course require the very substantial skills, and the training of dentists and the problem of increasing the collateral, para-medical or para-dental assistants which dentists may have to call upon is one which the Thompson Committee suggested was worth of attention.

**March 28, 1963**

I think that having said these things we can also agree that there is, even if all of these things were accomplished, there is probably a need for increase in the supply of dentists in Saskatchewan, and indeed in Canada. We have then to ask ourselves whether, if we wish to increase the supply of dentists in Saskatchewan, the building of a dental college is the most appropriate way to achieve this.

Now the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) pointed out that there were six dental colleges in Canada – five, I believe, and a sixth one coming; or is it six and a seventh one coming? In any case, assuming that the figure is six, and I think that is the number operating presently, this would be one dental college for every three million people. There have very recently been established new schools in Manitoba which, as the member for Turtleford pointed out, is now in operation and in the province of British Columbia, which school is not yet in operation. They have laid plans and are developing a school there. Their first graduating class has not yet reached graduation.

It might well be suggested that with the pattern having been developed for one dental school for three million people in Canada, and with the pattern developing of three dental colleges in the four western provinces, one might well wonder whether a dental college in Saskatchewan is the most appropriate way to tackle this problem. And in this regard I think it is interesting to note that, so far as I am aware, neither the Senate nor the Board of Governors of the university has at any time requested that the government give consideration to the establishment of a dental college; by which I mean that they have not included it in their annual financial submission to the government in which they outline what academic courses they propose to offer, and they add from time to time new courses of study. They have not regarded this as particularly high priority up to the present time to include it in their submission, so far as I am aware.

There are other possibilities and I think one of them that occurs to one immediately, one which we are taking steps to introduce this year, is the possibility of providing expanded program of bursaries so that Saskatchewan dental students may seek their dental education in Manitoba, or in Alberta, or in British Columbia. We believe that the provision of bursaries will substantially increase the number of persons seeking to equip themselves to become dentists.

Admittedly the bursary program in the past has not been entirely successful in attracting recruits to the dental profession. As the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) pointed out, this is probably largely due to the fact that the bursaries were obtainable only in the final year of the course, and by the

time a person has persevered through five or six years at university, he perhaps doesn't wish to accept a bursary for his final year which will obligate him to practice in Saskatchewan when he might have wished to practice in some other province or in some part of Saskatchewan where he is not entitled to practice if he accepts the bursary.

Accordingly, therefore, the bursary program which was announced by the Provincial Treasurer in the budget address — I don't intend to refer to that address, Mr. Speaker, but only to the announcement — was for a bursary program which would enable bursaries to be held in all years of the College of Dentistry, and which bursaries will carry with them a commitment to serve in Saskatchewan, but which would not prevent the graduate dentist from serving in the larger cities. At least, this is the program as presently envisaged.

I think that, in my own mind, there is one other area which ought to be explored a good deal more fully than has been explored at present. That is, evolving a program of consciously exchanging students among the universities of western Canada, and particularly among the universities of the prairies. I think that it is not possible for a constituency the size of Saskatchewan of one million people; or Manitoba of a million people; or of Alberta of a million, three hundred thousand, or whatever their population is; it is not possible for constituencies of these sizes to develop a university and to offer at that university all possible courses of instruction.

And, Mr. Speaker, wherever this has been tried, wherever universities have tried to operate on too small a student base and too small a financial base, and have tried to offer all the courses that students may wish to pursue, it would be my submission that the result has been a relatively lower standard of instruction. And I think we are going to have to see, over the next decade, the universities of western Canada divide up among themselves the fields of instruction and decide that university A will specialize in one particular area of instruction, university B will pick another, and university C another.

We have this to some extent already in western Canada and I think we have to pursue this with more vigor. This obviously is a matter which is primarily in the purview of the universities concerned, but it is one which I think that both they and the governments concerned will have to give particular attention to.

We virtually conceded this principle earlier in this House when we talked about a veterinary college for western Canada. And all of us know that there is a need for doctors of veterinary medicine in Manitoba, in Saskatchewan, in Alberta

**March 28, 1963**

and in British Columbia, and yet the proposal has not come forward that each the universities in these provinces establish a college of veterinary medicine. It was acknowledged that there was only room for one such college in western Canada, at least at the present time. And it was further acknowledged that notwithstanding where that college might be located, it ought to serve students from all four western provinces.

And similarly I would suggest that there are appropriate areas for specialization. I wouldn't attempt to define them but one might speculate idly that the University of Saskatchewan might pay special attention to agriculture, to veterinary medicine, to perhaps advanced physics; other universities might have a school of architecture, and that this not be duplicated in the other universities; that three schools of dentistry might well serve western Canada adequately. I think these are things which ought to be looked into before it is decided that the only way to provide Saskatchewan with an adequate supply of dentists is the establishment of a dental college at the University of Saskatchewan.

There are, as far as I am aware, three provinces in Canada which have Liberal governments, and so far as I am aware they have one dental college among the three of them. And doubtless they will be pursuing the same course of action which is recommended by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall).

There are some real difficulties in establishing a dental college in Saskatchewan, and at Saskatoon. One could question, I don't think one can say definitely, one could question, whether there will be an adequate supply of students. A dental college perhaps should have a minimum of 30 or 40 students in each year, giving a minimum enrolment for effective instruction and the best use of facilities and staff, of 120 to 160 students, and there is real doubt whether Saskatchewan could attract 120 or 160 students to the study of dentistry, which would be 30 or 40 per year.

The Thompson Committee recognized this problem, and suggested that more work would have to be done in informing high school students about the profession of dentistry, about the opportunities which exist there, the opportunities for remunerative employment, and for effective community services. There are other problems, Mr. Speaker, not the least of which is the supply of clinical material. It is estimated that there should be available 10 patients per student at a dental college, so that they may have persons upon whom they can perform the various operations which are necessary for dental students to perform in order to further their training.

Saskatoon is a relatively small city, notwithstanding the paeans of praise which we heard in the house, and smaller I believe than Regina, but there is real doubt even in a bustling metropolis like Regina, there would be enough clinical material. There is no dental school in Canada established in a centre as small as either Regina or Saskatoon. I may say that I don't think it would be at all feasible to establish a dental school in Regina, much as I regret it, as I think that all would admit that a dental school can most conveniently be established in conjunction with an existing medical school, and the idea of establishing a dental school independent of the medical school is one which isn't attractive unless the volume of students warrants a very substantial expenditure.

There are real problems about clinical material. Many people in the past have said that there was not enough clinical material in any single urban centre in Saskatchewan to support a dental college. I'm by no means saying that this is a fact; I am saying it is a problem and one that would require a fair amount of attention.

A third problem concerns staff. The staff for a dental college would be very difficult to obtain, as has been found to be the case in both Winnipeg and Vancouver, where dental colleges are being established. The staff at Manitoba, as I understand it, involves four full-time specialists, and fourteen part-time specialists and six or seven other staff. Now, these people simply don't exist in Saskatchewan. I am not sure of my figures but I believe it is essentially accurate when I say there are only two dental specialists in all of Saskatchewan, people who have taken post-graduate training. Now, I am aware of the fact that this is partly a hen-or-the-egg argument. It is partly true to say that the existence of a dental college would attract some specialists in dentistry, but it is clear from the figures which I quote, I think, that there would be very substantial difficulty in assembling a staff of people in Saskatchewan, really from the ground up, in order to provide adequate instruction in a dental college.

And one might really question whether we in Canada, and particularly in western Canada, have enough experienced instructors in dentistry, either full-time instructors or part-time instructors, to enable us to split our forces four ways to establish four dental colleges, each one of which will perhaps be below the optimum size, although probably two or three of them might well be up to a fairly adequate size. One might well question whether this is the best use of the resource — the very scarce resource of university instructors — and I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this resource is going to get scarcer in the years ahead.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you will have gathered from my remarks that I believe that there are some real problems in establishing a dental college in Saskatchewan. I

**March 28, 1963**

don't mean to say by any means that the possibility should be dismissed; I think only that it requires very careful consideration: consideration as to whether the establishment of the college would be feasible, consideration as to whether the establishment of the college is the best way to meet the dental needs of the people of Saskatchewan.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I and representatives of the Department of Public Health have had some discussions with the College of Dental Surgeons with respect to this matter, have had very cordial discussions about dental supply in Saskatchewan, and I may say that they are as anxious as we are to increase the number of dentists who are available to serve the people of Saskatchewan.

I would suggest therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution is one which will generally command the support of members of the House; but one which is in its terms somewhat too narrow, in that it does not specifically raise the problem of whether or not the establishment of a dental college at this time is the most effective way to serve the needs of the people of Saskatchewan; and accordingly, I propose to move an amendment to the resolution which will change it's effect slightly, and I accordingly move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd:

That the proposed Resolution No. 7, moved by Mr. Foley, be amended by deleting all of the words after "requests" in the first line and substituting therefor "that the University of Saskatchewan and the government of Saskatchewan study ways of making dental services more readily available to the citizens of Saskatchewan, including the desirability or otherwise of modifying the dental bursary program, of making appropriate arrangements with other universities for the education of Saskatchewan students of dentistry, and of establishing a dental college in Saskatchewan, with a course leading to the degree of Doctor of Dental Surgery.

The resolution would then read:

That this Assembly respectfully requests that the university and the government study ways of making dental services more readily available, including the desirability of expanding the dental bursary programs, of making arrangements with other universities for the education of Saskatchewan dental students, and of establishing a dental college in the university.

I accordingly, Mr. Speaker, so move.



**Mr. Speaker:** — The amendment to Motion No. 7, as moved by Mr. Blakeney, and seconded by Mr. Lloyd. Will the house take the amendment as read? The amendment is now before the house. Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to make a lengthy address on this particular topic. I think that it has been very fittingly covered both by the mover of the original motion, and by the mover of the amendment that we have just had presented to the House. However, I would like to make a few remarks in this connection, and particularly in connection with the address that we have heard from the Minister of Health this morning.

I know that the present minister has not been in the position for a very long period of time, and possibly because of the fact that he has only been in the legislature since 1960 he does not realize that since at least since 1956, and as far as I know even prior to that time, that members in the legislature on many occasions have urged the government to take more steps to provide some of the improvements in dental health care in the province that he has suggested in his remarks this morning.

I do not think the original mover of the motion thought for one moment, or claimed in this address, that the dental college would be the full solution to the question of a shortage of dentists in the province of Saskatchewan. I am quite certain that the mover recognized, as does the minister, that this was just to be one step, one step in the proper direction of providing a solution to the question of a shortage of dentists in this province. However, I will say that as far as the amendment is concerned, I don't think that the mover of the motion, or myself as seconder, could find any particular objection to the amendment that has been moved here today. It still leaves the original motion of the mover in context so that the university and the government together can consider the advisability of what steps to take in order to improve the dental position in this province.

However, I would like to point out to the minister that particularly in the last seven or eight years, members on this side of the house have continually urged the government of this province to undertake the various measures that have been suggested by the College of Dental Surgeons in the brief that they presented to the Thompson Committee, and so I would say here that the government has had, in the past seven or eight years, sufficient urging to have taken some of the steps that he suggested were necessary at the present time.

**March 28, 1963**

The question of public education; this is something that much more money could have been allotted to during the last seven or eight years in order to improve the situation as we find it today. This has been brought to the attention of the government and the Department of Health year after year in this legislature, and we have urged the government time after time to provide more money for the purposes of public education in the field of dental health. And I here want to congratulate the College of Dental Surgeons for the work that they have undertaken in the past years in the field of education as far as dental health in the province of Saskatchewan was concerned.

The dentists themselves have done a great deal of work in this regard. They have done a great deal of work in trying to persuade the people, particularly in our larger communities, to accept services that they feel would be of assistance in the field of dental health; and I think that they have provided a service which has been very useful over the years to the people of this province; and I think it is regrettable that the government has not done more in this field in the last seven or eight years.

Then, of course, the minister referred to the question of prevention and control among school children. Of course, this is something that used to be considered of more importance in the province of Saskatchewan. I can remember when I attended school in the country areas back in the 1930s, we had a dentist come into our classrooms and examine the teeth of all the children in the school, and also gave some public education work as well in the school that I attended in the town of Lemberg, and this took place probably chiefly, I think, in the rural areas of the province. This type of work has been carried on in the past in this province, but it has not been carried on to the same extent in the last few years, because as far as my knowledge is concerned, I don't think my children have ever actually had their teeth inspected in the schools by a dentist or a person who was actually educated in the dental field. Sometimes the public health nurses do look at the children's teeth, but I can remember when I went to school we actually had a dentist; we actually had work done, and assistance provided by the government for the care of the teeth of the children that were attending school at that particular time.

So that in the past there have been programs, and these programs could have been extended over the last number of years, and this I am quite certain as the minister pointed out, could have added greatly to the improvement of the dental health of the people of this province. And so I wanted to point out to him that these various points have been brought to the attention of this government for the last number of years, and it has been largely the refusal of the government

of this province to adopt improved methods — to put out more money for dental services in this province — that has brought us to the present position where we have neither the services, sufficient dentists to look after the problems of the people of this province, or that we have not the type of program that we should have, not only in our schools but in our communities to provide the proper dental health education for the people of our province.

And so I say here today that in the suggestion of the mover of the motion and myself as seconder, that this is only what we felt was a step in the right direction, and quite certainly the amendment that has been moved, I believe, adds certain aspects to that. But I think at the same time of the argument that has been used by the minister here this morning — that there are insufficient people in the province of Saskatchewan, and probably an insufficient supply of students in order to construct a dental college — is not a reasonable argument at this time, because I would hope that the Minister of Health and the government feel in the years to come that we here in Saskatchewan are not going to remain at the present population figure of some 920,000 people. I would hope that in the next 10 or 20 years, under proper government policies in this province, that our population is going to increase by at least leaps and bounds, and for that reason I think we should be looking ahead. We cannot look at the condition that exists here today as far as our population is concerned. We must look ahead to the future; what we are visualizing is going to be the needs of the people of this province ten or fifteen years hence. Because I think all of us realize that the establishment of a dental college in this province is going to take time. It is not a thing that we are going to pass in this legislature and it is going to be created tomorrow. It is a problem that is going to take time to solve.

As the minister pointed out, we are going to have to obtain proper staff in order to conduct a dental college in this province. They are going to have to carry on an education program so that we can get our students in this province to attend dental college and take up dentistry as a profession. All of this, we all realize, is going to take time, but as I said we have to look to the future. We can't look at the present conditions that exist here today. I know in my own constituency I notice that in this present year, I think it is the first time that I have noticed many students going into dentistry from my own part of the province, and I think in this last year in the letters that I wrote to various students that had graduated and were proceeding to university, I noticed almost a half dozen students from the surrounding district of my own neighbourhood that were going to various parts of Canada to study dentistry, and I think it is regrettable that these students couldn't have remained here in Saskatchewan and had a school that they could attend.

**March 28, 1963**

But I understand, as the minister does, that we have problems at the present moment, but I feel that the resolution that is presented here is a step in the right direction, and one that the government should immediately proceed to consider along with the university, and also the College of Dental Surgeons in order to provide a dental college in Saskatchewan for the future. I am quite certain that the mover of the motion, as well, did not feel that the creation of a college this year or next year would mean an immediate increase in the supply of dentists in the province of Saskatchewan, because we all realize that this would not be the case. It will take time for the first students from this particular college to come out and be of use to the people of this province, but I would hope when that time comes that the first students start rolling out of a college in this province, that we will have plenty of students to attend our own dental school here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Of course, the minister also pointed out that there are very few centres of the size of Saskatoon or Regina that have a college located in them. Halifax, I know is slightly larger than those two centres at the present time, but not very much so. The province of Nova Scotia has a much lower population, total population, than has the province of Saskatchewan, so I am quite certain that if that province can support a dental college, I am quite certain that the province of Saskatchewan could support a college as well. So I think that that particular argument of the minister at the present time doesn't hold water as far as this resolution is concerned.

But I do want to point out in closing my remarks that the bursary program that will be increased in this present session itself as the years go by, should increase the number of students that desire to go into dentistry in this province, and make it possible for us to supply a school with students at the time that we would have all the services available to actually commence operations of a dental college in this province. For I think that the fact that we are going to promote the number of bursaries that are mentioned this year, 35 for students in the province, the increase that is bound to take place in student enrolment in dentistry. I am quite certain the minister would have to admit that if this program is extended in the future, there will be sufficient students in this province to allow us to have a college which could be economically feasible, as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, and will start to provide the answer to the dental shortage in the province of Saskatchewan.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel we will be prepared to support the amendment because it does contain the principle of the main motion, and it does make extensions to which I don't think anyone on this side of the house could

object, as far as relieving the dental problems of the people of this province; and so with that, Mr. Speaker, I'll support the amendment and support the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the amendment?

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is my duty to inform the House that the mover is about to exercise his right to close the debate. If any one wishes to speak, they must do so now.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to conclude the debate on the motion with regard to the establishment of a dental college at the University of Saskatchewan with a few brief remarks.

The member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) stated that the amendment as proposed by the Minister of Health adds to the motion which I moved by suggesting that a study be made of the ways of making dental services more readily available to the citizens of Saskatchewan. We all recognize this as a desirable attribute of the problem of dentistry in the province.

I think in my remarks which I made in moving the motion I referred to the dental bursary program, the fact that they were being increased, and certainly this too is an essential step in the right direction.

The third point mentioned by the Minister of Public Health in his amendment, that of making appropriate arrangements with other universities for the education of Saskatchewan students of dentistry, I think has been well taken care of up until the present time.

However, I would like to point out to the minister, and to all the members of the legislature, that in moving the motion I made the remark that at the present time all existing facilities for the training of dentists across Canada are being fully utilized; and that it is the considered opinion of many authorities that there will be a shortage of training space for future dental students; and that this is one of the reasons why I feel it is a responsibility of our legislature and all those officials in charge of public health in this province to look ahead to the time when there will be ample potential for students at our own dental college.

**March 28, 1963**

I stressed during the moving of the motion that this is a long term project. It is not something that can be done in a few years. There are many things to be done in this direction. First of all, of course, the idea of a dental college must be fully sold to the senate and to the Board of Governors of the University of Saskatchewan. In order to do that, intensive surveys must be carried out throughout our province to find what student potential we have, and what potential we have for a dental faculty. As I pointed out, however, when I moved the motion, if we go by the experience of the University in Manitoba, the year before they opened their own dental faculty, they had only 21 students in training at other dental colleges, but by the time they reached their first graduating class in 1961-62, the number of students in training from their own province had risen nearly 4 times to 71 students, out of a total of 79 in that class. This certainly is a very strong argument for the building of the dental college here in our own province.

The fact that in the present dental class at the University of Manitoba, 71 of a total of 93 students are from the province, indicates the strong effect of the geographic factor.

The Minister of Public Health mentioned the problem of getting adequate staff. Of course we recognize that problem, since we have less than 200 dentists in our province now. In order for Saskatchewan to reach the national average we would require 298 dentists in the province at once. If we were to reach the average of dental service in British Columbia, we would require nearly 400 dentists; which would mean then to reach the Canadian average 123 additional dentists now or 210 additional dentists to reach the B.C. average. Of course, obviously, gaining added staff will not be easy. However, I have been assured by officials of the College of Dental Surgeons that there is every hope when a faculty is established at our university, that adequate staff will be available.

This motion with regard to the establishment of a dental college is an act of faith in the future of the University of Saskatchewan, which I believe is one of the finest in Canada, in fact one of the finest in all of North America. And I feel that we should continue to do everything in our power to expand the training facilities of our university. Along with other members I am of course happy to see that our university has now expanded to a Regina campus as well as a Saskatoon campus. We welcome this expansion and we trust that it will from year to year gradually expand the courses of training offered. There are many other courses besides that of dental training which are not as yet available in Saskatchewan, but which will become available as years go along.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the very good hearing which this motion has received by the legislature, and the remarks of the Hon. Minister for Health with respect to this problem. I know that the people of Saskatchewan are intensely and keenly interested in our legislature doing everything possible to increase the supply of dentists across the province. I can think of no other act by this body or no other expenditure by our legislature which can go further towards assisting every man, woman and child of the province than the establishment of a dental faculty which over the years will alleviate our dental shortage, and do much to improve the level of dental health here in the province.

For those reasons then, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the motion will receive unanimous support of the legislature at this time.

Motion as amended agreed to.

### **Royal Commission on Public Administration**

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

That this House is of the opinion that the Government should give consideration to appointing a Commission to inquire into and report on organization and methods of operation of the departments and agencies of the Government of Saskatchewan and to recommend such changes as in the judgment of the Commission, will promote efficiency, economy and improved services in the dispatch of public business.

**Mr. E.A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I am among those that find myself in agreement with other people who have expressed an interest and a desire for improving governmental efficiency, and for that reason I took a good deal of interest in the motion moved by the member from Morse (Mr. Thatcher). Before expressing what might appear to be an unqualified agreement with some of the statements, I would like to say that the desire for efficiency must depend upon its interpretation. I do not agree with those who might put an interpretation of efficiency that is purely on a dollar and cents basis, and I am in accord with the expression of opinion by the editor of the Western Producer in the issue of March 7 in which he suggests that perhaps the Glassco Commission had dealt with the matter of governmental efficiency to too great an extent on a dollar and cents basis. Of course one cannot put a dollar and cents appraisal on such government functions, and these functions are essentially governmental, such as matters of education and health and law enforcement.

**March 28, 1963**

However, I think we should examine the resolution proposed by the mover and examine the reasons that he had indicated for moving this sort of a resolution. He indicated firstly that the United States government had initiated a Hoover Commission. He also indicated that the Canadian government had also initiated a Glassco Commission. However, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is a very tenuous relationship, and I think it is far from being established that because these two important and worthy governments have set up commissions to study the performance of their departments, I see that it in no way follows that the Saskatchewan government should therefore put up a some sort of similar commission. This is independent of the possible value of these commissions and the good work that they have no doubt done – I am not disputing that at all, but I am saying that it doesn't follow, because these organizations have done this, that therefore Saskatchewan should.

In referring to the Glassco Commission, the mover made a statement that many of us could say something similar about – he indicated that he agreed with parts of it and disagreed with parts, and I myself could make a similar statement that I agree with some parts of it and disagree with some other parts. And of course the Glassco Commission has made recommendations, such as the initiation of purchasing boards and so on, and the opposition has commented on that — presumably it is one of the items that he agrees with. He hasn't indicated the aspects which he disagrees, he hasn't indicated other things with which he basically agrees.

The main point the mover tried to make was this — that because government expenditure in this province has increased, and its gross debt has increased, therefore a commission is desirable. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of using the right facts to come to a wrong conclusion. Of course this is true that government expenditure has increased; of course it is true that gross debt has increased; and both of these quite appreciably over the past few years. However, I think the mover is in error in deducing that because of these, therefore this indicates the need for a commission to study the various performances and methods of operation of departments and agencies.

Let's look at this whole matter of increased expenditure of government. Also we must look at where the revenue has come from and, of course, he quite rightly says that this has come from taxation of the people; and it has also come, of course, from revenue from natural and mineral resources, but it is not usually called a taxation. It is the property of the province and of course it is quite right to say that this money the government spends comes from the people or their property.



However, to look at some of the taxes proper that provide a main source of revenue for governmental spending; the sales tax is of course one of the most valuable means of raising money to be spent. And this is derived from the tax on purchases people make. It derives from the expenditures they make on things like clothing, cameras perhaps, boats, automobiles, machinery, building materials; and of course I am cognizant of the fact that taxes have been increased, but nevertheless the steady increase in this form of revenue has come from the increased prosperity and increased industrial activity of the province. This, I suggest, does not indicate that a commission is necessary but simply indicates that the province is showing continued, steadily increasing economic vitality.

Another important item of taxation that the government of course collects and of course spends is that derived from the gasoline tax. Of course all members are aware that people are travelling more, more people are travelling, more loads are being hauled and of course this item of revenue indicates not that a commission is needed, but that people are travelling more; there is more industrial activity, people are spending more of their time and money travelling on the good roads that have been provided. I see no reason why this sort of an expenditure warrants a commission.

Another item of revenue that I must draw the attention of the house to is the expenditure on liquor. This is one of the provincial revenues that is of significance. This is something that we can't class as a necessity. I would say apart from those very few people who use it purely for medicinal purposes, apart from those people who might be called alcoholics and find it a necessity, for the rest of us alcohol is sort of a luxury, and the increased expenditure on this item of course indicates a greater degree of affluence, if I may use that term, in the province.

And therefore, for those reasons, and these reasons are only part of them, I submit that these increases in revenue, and therefore government expenditure, indicates in no way that we need a special commission.

Another point that the mover raised was an apparent objection to government purchases from co-operatives. I would say firstly and perhaps regrettably that the government buys only an insignificant amount of material from co-operatives. However, if the mover was correct and the government is actually losing money by purchasing from co-operatives, they must be doing so by purchasing from these organizations that were designed to serve their owners at cost; these organizations themselves are being ineffectively and inefficiently run, and to patronize these organizations must be a criticism of the co-op boards for operating inefficient organizations.

**March 28, 1963**

Another point that was raised by the mover was that of the budget bureau. In fact, I believe he intimated that the budget bureau itself should be examined. But his main reason for being critical of the budget bureau was this: that he said government expenditures have increased, and therefore the budget bureau is not doing a proper job. My understanding of government is not complete of course, but I doubt if the budget bureau should say to the government, "We submit that you shouldn't spend so much money on grid roads or education or health care plans." I suggest that the budget bureau would be out of order if they did this sort of thing.

However, I think that we can well dwell on some of the very positive accomplishments of the budget bureau. Members of this house will recollect that it was not very long ago that there were very considerable complaints coming from the operation of land titles, and that they were rather slow and there were difficulties; and I think that all members will now recognize that this problem has been solved to a very large degree, and that there is a very high degree of satisfaction with the handling of the land titles system. This is a very important reform and no matter what members may say, things are very, very much better than they have been, and this reform has been largely due to the activities of the budget bureau. In fact, it can be quite accurately said that the savings by this reform alone would go a long way towards paying the entire salary of the budget bureau. That is an estimation on my part, but I think it is not too grossly in error. This is certainly a very positive accomplishment of the budget bureau.

Another matter that the budget bureau was involved in was assisting the government in deciding to put in a computer centre. That this has escaped the attention of the mover may be due to the fact that when the Provincial Treasurer invited us to visit the computer centre, that no one from the opposition cared to visit the computer centre. And yet this is something that is very important and very significant in the operation of governments and their departments. Certainly the methods that are used for making out cheques and the way they can compile and sort information; the way they can calculate the volumes of earth and roads is certainly something that is very significant and very important, and this is something that the budget bureau was involved in. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to deal with all the points that have been raised in favor of the motion, but I say this, that I do not regard the need for this commission to have been established.

And, Mr. Speaker, I further submit that it is better to have a continuing organization that looks into this matter of organization and methods of operation of departments, one that is always with us, and not one that is hired and makes a report and then no doubt forgets the whole thing. And, of

course we have a budget bureau that has the continued experience with the administration of the province and the departments and of course we do have a purchasing agency, and for these reasons Mr. Speaker, I feel that this motion should be amended. It doesn't detract from it, it makes it more complete. It gives acknowledgement to the good work that has already been done. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mrs. Cooper:

That Motion No. 5 be amended by deleting all the words "house" in the first line and substituting therefor the following: "approves the action of the government in having centralized in one agency in 1944 the purchasing of equipment and supplies required by the government and for having established in 1946 a budget bureau to enquire into and report on organization and methods of operation of the departments and agencies of the government of Saskatchewan on a continuing basis, and further urges that the government proceed with any other measure which will further promote efficiency, economy and improved services in the dispatch of public business."

I so, move, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The amendment to Motion No. 5, which has been moved by Mr. Johnson and seconded by Mrs. Cooper, is now before the house. Will the house take the amendment as read or do you wish it read again?

**Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — Read again, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The amendment is:

That Motion No. 5 be amended by deleting all the words after "house" in the first line and substituting therefore the following: "approves the action of the government in having centralized in on agency in 1944 the purchasing of equipment and supplies required by the government and for having established in 1946 a budget bureau to enquire into and report on organization and methods of operation of the departments and agencies of the government of Saskatchewan on a continuing basis, and further urges that the government proceed with any other measure which will further promote efficiency, economy and improved services in the dispatch of public business."

**March 28, 1963**

The amendment is now before the house. Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — . . . I doubt that this is a proper amendment. You can add to or take from a motion but you can't negative. You ruled the other day that anybody who felt that way could vote against it. If these people feel that way they can vote against it.

Well, I'm not going to make a long tirade on it but it has been done in this house innumerable times, Mr. Speaker. I think we should look very carefully at it. You ruled the other day, in a similar situation, that anybody who felt that way about it could vote against the motion. I suggest to you that if anybody feels. . . that the gentleman who moved this amendment could vote against the motion and it would have a similar effect and be much more parliamentary.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of order raised by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), I would like to point out to you that the motion as it appears in the order paper refers to certain things and then "as in the judgement of the commission will promote efficiency, economy and improved services in the dispatch of public business." Now it is obvious that any person who is interested in promoting efficiency, economy and improved services in the dispatch of public business couldn't vote against that, would have to vote for that. But they may disagree . . .

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy:** — . . . to that for the last ten years.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They may disagree with the methods proposed in the motion to get this desirable end, and so the amendment suggests another method of getting the same result of efficiency, economy and improved services. I would think that the member's point of order is not well taken.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — I think the hon. minister has just put his finger on the substance of the whole matter. He said the amendment proposes another method of getting at the same result. Now the original motion proposed an independent commission. The amendment doesn't propose anything along those lines at all, and I think what the hon. member from Cannington said is quite right. This amendment is not in order and it can be decided by a simple yes or no vote. Certainly the opposition cannot accept this amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are you rising on a point of order?

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — No, I was rising to speak to the . . . Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to the point of order which has been raised. I would like to quote from section 404, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

Amendments may not be proposed to insert words at the commencement of a clause with a view to proposing an alternative scheme to that contained in the clause or to leave out from the first word to the end of the clause (that is what has taken place here) in order to substitute other words or to effect the redrafting of the clause, such amendments being in the nature of a new clause. In such cases the regular course is to negative the question that the clause stand part of the bill and to bring up a new clause at the proper time.

That is precisely what is taking place here, Mr. Speaker. I think it is perfectly clear. It says here in Beauchesne's parliamentary guide that an amendment may not be proposed to insert words at the commencement of a clause with a view to proposing an alternative scheme, and that this amendment proposed would be an alternative scheme to that contained in the original motion.

It also says that you should not leave all the words out from the first word to the end of the clause in order to substitute other words or to effect a redrafting of the clause. Now this present effort of the government is a redrafting of the entire resolution. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only absolutely, completely and entirely out of order, but it is a complete negation of the democratic process. This action is absolutely contrary to the principles of freedom, the principle of free speech and our system of British Parliamentary democracy. This is just twisting and turning a resolution that has been submitted to his house by somebody on the opposition side of the house.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking to the motion or to the amendment. I'm speaking to the point of order and I contend that it is contrary to our parliamentary traditions and procedures. Actually when this is done it denies the right of anybody in the opposition and to people on the other side who might want to submit resolutions to the house. It denies our right to submit resolutions to this house and have them either passed or voted down in their own true form. This is absolutely contrary to all the privileges and traditions of our British Parliamentary institutions of democracy. I have seen it happen in this house before.

**March 28, 1963**

I was astounded the first time it did happen. I would consider that surely members in this legislature would be more devoted to the principles of freedom, parliamentary democracy and self-government to continue in what I consider is a most reprehensible practice.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, just on the point of consistency alone, I don't see today how you can possibly rule this amendment out of order after having let the government side get away with the same type of amendment the other day. Now, you made it perfectly clear on that occasion what the rules of this house would be in the future and if you should change your opinion this afternoon I don't think it is going to be consistent at all with the stand that you have taken in this house in past days.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just draw attention to the fact that citation 404 is headed "Annotations, Comments and Precedents on Public Bills" and if my hon. friend had read the whole citation he would have noticed that this citation has particular reference to clauses in a statute or a bill before the house. I will read the whole citation.

An amendment may not be proposed to insert words at the commencement of a clause with a view to proposing an alternative scheme to that contained in the clause or to leave out from the first word to the end of the clause in order to substitute other words or to effect a redrafting of the clause, such amendment being in the nature of a new clause. In such a case the regular course is to negative the question that the clause stand part of the bill and to bring up a new clause at the proper time.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about a resolution here and not a clause of a bill.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker:** — You're opposed to parliamentary democracy . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to give to the house a ruling which was put down in this house by a previous Speaker on a previous occasion.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Who?

**Mr. Speaker** — I will give you that information in a moment. I would like to thank the members for taking part in the discussion of this point in this way because it does bring to my attention certain facts and it also gives me a chance to check back on previous occasions. On Tuesday, March 23rd, 1937, Mr. Speaker Parker ruled:

Amendments to any motion may be quite in order and yet may place individuals or groups in a position where they may be deprived of the opportunity to either vote for that which they desire or against that of which they are not in favour. It is perhaps unfortunate in the interest of clarity of procedure that the original motion expressed redress for a matter for which the house had not expressed an opinion. This, however, is a matter of strategy on the floor of the house and not one to be decided by the Speaker.

Now, Beauchesne, on page 170, clause 13, says:

An amendment to alter the main question by substituting the proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

That is Beauchesne, page 170, clause 13. I will read that again:

An amendment to alter the main question by substituting the proposition with the opposite conclusion is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

So, in my opinion, the latter part of both of these two motions refer to increased efficiency, or to the promotion of efficiency, etc. within governments or agencies. So I think that I would have to rule that the amendment is in order, when I consider previous rulings or Beauchesne.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — May I appeal your ruling, Mr. Speaker, with all deference then?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The ruling of the Chair has been appealed. Call in the members. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

**Yeas – (27)**

**Messieurs**

Lloyd	Strum (Mrs.)	Thibault
Johnson	Meakes	Berezowsky
Brown	Thurston	Semchuk
Blakeney	Wood	Perkins
Brockelbank	Davies	Snyder
Walker	Nicholson	Stevens
Nollet	Turnbull	Dahlman
Kuziak	Stone	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Whelan	Brotten

**Nays – 17**

**Messieurs**

Thatcher	Danielson	Boldt
Klein	Cameron	Coderre
Batten (Mrs.)	McFarlane	Snedker
McCarthy	Gardiner	Gallagher
Barrie	Foley	Steuart
McDonald	Guy	

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — I rise to speak against the amendment. I'm in favor of the motion. I am opposed to the amendment. While it is the ruling of this house that this amendment does not negate the motion, does not turn it around 180 degrees, in my opinion it does turn it around about 179.9 degrees.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out first just one or two errors, or wrong impressions, that the hon. member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson), whether he attempted to or not, I don't know, but he might have left in his talk before he moved the amendment.

I would like to point out first, that not only has the spending of this government since it took office increased about ten times, the number of employees has increased three-fold; the inefficiency has increased; the compulsion has increased; the waste and the extravagance have also increased. I would like to set the record straight. They love, over on the other side, to bring up this question about the co-ops. They would like to leave the impression that we, on this side of the house, criticized them and opposed them if the government through its purchasing agents, or through any of its crown corporations, or any other of its agencies buys from the co-op movement.



This is not true; they know it is not true, they attempt to leave this impression. We say that they should buy goods where they can buy them at the best price, on a comparable quality. We don't feel. . . we know certainly that private enterprise. . . we don't feel that the real honest co-op movement want any special favors. All they want from this government, or from any one else is a fair deal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to begin with it makes sense for any government to take stock of its performance from time to time. But to be of any value, this stock-taking should be done by people who have first, the experience to know what to look for, and then the independence to make public what they find. And certainly this independence would be impossible if the amendment that has been suggested, that has been moved, is followed through with.

Now we have all seen governments set up commissions and boards to inquire into some part or all of their activities. And we know that far too often these so-called investigations fail to achieve their purpose. In fact, many of them do worse than fail. They encourage the very evils that they were supposed to stop. This happens, Mr. Speaker, when a government wants to white-wash or cover up its past performance. It also happens when a government wants to avoid making decisions. Or it happens when a government wants to give respectability to some course of action that they have already decided upon. Now these types of boards, or committees, are easy to identify. And they fall into well-known categories. They are either composed of friends of the government who will do what they are told, or they are composed of fuzzy-headed impractical planners who will foul up everyone, including the government.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan socialists have specialized in both these types for the past 18 years. Now this is not the kind of commission suggested by this motion. On the contrary, it must be composed of able, experienced, and above all independent people. They must be given access to every department and agency of the government. Only then can we hope for a report that will expose the waste, the duplication, the unnecessary activities that have become part of this government's structure.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 18 years, our population growth has virtually stood still. Yet this socialist government spending has increased ten-fold. We have over three times as many civil servants, crown corporation employees as we had back in 1944. This particular payroll, this total payroll has increased from \$3 1/3 million to over \$33 million annually.

These, and the facts that the Leader of the Opposition put on record when he spoke on his motion the other day prove, beyond question, Saskatchewan's need for such an inquiry. They also prove the total failure of the government tame watch dog committees, including the Treasury Board.

**March 28, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, these socialists seem to be convinced they have cornered all the worthwhile brains in Saskatchewan. But one look at the benches opposite, and one look at their record proves the fallacy of their idea. There are many, Mr. Speaker, there are many outstanding people who are outside of government service, and outside of the political area, and we are suggesting that they take advantage of this fact and use some of these highly qualified men and women in this country; people who will not ordinarily become involved in government, people who will not at any time become involved in any particular party, but who will render good service, sound service, as good citizens if they are called upon.

Now, of course, this government claims that they have always done this, but again a look at their record proves that they neutralize these independent people by loading their committees with socialists or fellow travellers who will do what the government tells them.

Mr. Speaker, let them for once give a really qualified and independent commission the opportunity to assess their operations. If such a commission was set up it would be like a breath of fresh air blowing through the departments and the corporations too long closed to public scrutiny. It would save the taxpayers millions of dollars and would bring better government to the province of Saskatchewan.

One of the problems that face us in this province is to gain the confidence of all segments of society. There are large groups, Mr. Speaker, in our business community, large groups in our trade union movements, among our farmers, especially among our municipal people, who have deep suspicions of the motives of this socialist government. And these suspicions are shared in too many cases, far too often, by people outside this province. If this government had the courage to follow the course of action suggested in this motion, and denied by this amendment, they would benefit themselves and this province. We would have a more efficient government. The taxpayers would be saved millions of dollars. I am convinced many unnecessary and restrictive and compulsory laws would be taken off our statute books, if this happened, Mr. Speaker.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a commission of this kind, properly carried out, with real independent people, would help restore the confidence in Saskatchewan; that it is a good place in which to live, a good place in which to invest money — and this we badly need, if we hope to see real development take place in our province on a scale comparable to other parts of Canada. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that through this amendment, this government has no intention of setting up such a commission. In fact, they haven't even the intestinal fortitude to stand up as men and vote either for it or against it. They are going to hide behind this watered down. . . this amendment that they have introduced today.

So it will happen. They will refuse to take this course of action that we have suggested, a constructive course of action. We will see the waste, the extravagance continue to grow; we will see the government in this province continue to grow; we will see compulsion and less of freedom continue to grow; and I am afraid the only thing that will change it is not a commission, but a change of government. I oppose the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.G. Davies (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak too long on this, but there are some comments which I would like to offer and which I think may be important. I would like to refer in the beginning to some remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke on this matter the other day. While he spoke he advanced the merits of a Glassco Commission, I . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! These two motions are to some extent similar, and I find that it is quite difficult to prevent members from straying back to the original motion and not speaking just on the amendment. I know we could facilitate discussion if the members were prepared to agree to discuss them both at the same time, because in order to discuss against one, we want to bring forth the argument for the other. So if the house is prepared to agree, I shall take the discussion on the amendment and the main motion at the same time in order to give members that latitude of discussion.

Is that agreed?

**Mr. G.H. Danielson:** — What does the amendment do? Is it an amended motion at the present time? We have an amended motion. All that is left of the original motion is to go dead. And anyone that starts to talk about the Glassco Commission is out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! We do not have an amended motion. We have the proposed amendment, which would make an amendment motion, and that is the point I am asking. Is the house prepared to discuss the proposed amendment? Neither the motion nor the amendment are yet passed by this house, they are both to be voted on. Therefore, the whole topic is before us. Agreed? Proceed.

**March 28, 1963**

**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — I take it, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I may range as far as the original discussion on the motion by any previous speaker.

I think I had begun by making reference to the comments of the Leader of the Opposition, when he had advanced the Glassco Commission as a reason why we should do something similar in this province. I couldn't help but remember the fact that for some 23 years the government in power at Ottawa that had really actuated the need for the Glassco Commission was a Liberal government, and members of the party represented by members on your left. But it seems to me, while charges of waste and extravagance and like things are said in this house, we should know that many of the items that the Glassco Commission have charged as bad and unsatisfactory are those shortcomings that arose under a Liberal government at Ottawa during the many years that they held power.

I also would like to make reference to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke about political patronage in the civil service of this province. I think he made, as near as I can recall, the comment, the remark that no provincial government has ever used patronage to the extent of this government. I couldn't help also, Mr. Speaker, remembering the performance of the Liberal administrations in this province over the years and I wondered how the Leader of the Opposition could dare to make a reference of that kind in view of what had gone on in Saskatchewan previous to the advent of this government.

And he also made reference to the fact that no civil servants could expect to have their seniority or years of service favourably considered so far as this government was concerned. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the only senior governmental jurisdiction in Canada that has given civil servants effective bargaining power is the government of the province of Saskatchewan. I want to assure you that the employees of this government do appreciate this fact, and that this is really the only governmental administration in this country that does recognize years of service by "built-in" factors, written into the collective bargaining agreement. These give true recognition to seniority by promotion if merit and ability are sufficient to warrant it.

I want to say categorically that while certainly there are persons who are appointed to various positions in the government service, positions of confidentiality — and this, Mr. Speaker, differs in no fashion from the practice of any other government in this dominion — that 96 or 97 per cent of all of the positions in the public service are governed by the practices of the Public Service Commission. Employees

get appointed on the basis of merit, ability, and capacity, as defined by the specifications and having been chosen by impartial bodies that operate through the Public Service Commission and the departments of this government. The members on this side of the house, including the cabinet ministers, do not influence that choice in the manner that has been suggested.

Some reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition to the business of auto repair. I take it this was a reference to the government garage. He said we should not be in this business. I want to remind the Leader of Opposition that the province of Manitoba, I believe beginning under a Liberal government, has also initiated the same kind of a service. Apparently it has not considered it uneconomical. Again, may I remark that this is not an uneconomical service, that it is not ordinarily provided for automobiles from Prince Albert, or Nipawin, or Tisdale, or wherever else outside of Regina; but is mainly one for automobiles that have their headquarters here. I do not consider over the years since this has been in practice that it is a bad practice. The imitation by the government of Manitoba of our leadership should show that it must be successful as far as this government is concerned.

The member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), Mr. Speaker, has made reference to the number of employees in the Saskatchewan civil service as having increased, I think he said three times. He linked this in his remarks immediately following with charges of "waste and extravagance." I suggest that this is the sort of thing that we have been listening to for some time in debates in this house in other years, namely that the civil service of this province is one that is swollen, is one that is not economic, one that is not efficient.

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that in the minds of the people who know the facts across this country, including the senior civil servants in every government jurisdiction, that there is another province in Canada enjoying the same enviable reputation of a good civil service as does our Saskatchewan body.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — And I say that this is not something that you need to go to politicians about. All you need is to go to the civil service sector anywhere to get information about it.

Now, I believe in debates we have listened to on other occasions, in other years, and certainly in some newspaper reports, there has been misrepresentation about

**March 28, 1963**

the size of the Saskatchewan civil service. I think that the most telling comparison cited, at least from the view-point of the members of the opposition, has been the province of Manitoba. If I may digress for a moment, I might give you the figures for the province of Alberta, which has 11,142 civil servants as of 1962. The ratio per thousand of population would be eight civil servants per thousand for Alberta, as against seven per thousand for the province of Saskatchewan. I believe it is well known too that the number of civil servants in the province of British Columbia is approximately twice the number of government employees in the province of Saskatchewan.

But to revert to the Manitoba comparison. It would be interesting for us to spend just a few minutes on what the actual situation is. I was able to get figures from the Manitoba Civil Service Commission and these are the latest figures available. These may not show as many employees as are now in the employ of the province of Manitoba, but are, in any event, the latest figures for 1962. There were 5,626 employees in permanent and temporary positions in that province. Our latest figures, Mr. Speaker, show that Saskatchewan had permanent and temporary employees: 7,163, a difference of 1,537 employees. I first want to make comment that our figure was taken at a time when there was a rather large number of temporary employees, so that our figures are not given perhaps to the best advantage. But in any case, let us see how the comparisons go as they apply to government employees in Manitoba and Saskatchewan in the various departments.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we notice that in the Department of Public Health for Saskatchewan there were, according to the latest figures, some 2,672 employees, which I believe is about 40 per cent of all the employees in the civil service of this province. Permanent posts in Manitoba there were 1,870. A difference of 802. In the Department of Social Welfare, Saskatchewan: 968; permanent posts in Manitoba: 638, a difference of 330 employees. In Education there were 436 employees in Saskatchewan and 351 in Manitoba, or a difference of 85. In Agriculture, 410 for Saskatchewan; 345 in Manitoba, a difference of 65. The Department of Labor, 172 in Saskatchewan; 111 in Manitoba, a difference of 61. Proceeding just that far, Mr. Speaker, you will see that there are 1,343 more employees in Saskatchewan in these departments than in Manitoba. I think it would be legitimate. . .

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane:** — I wonder if you could give me the figure for Agriculture again that you just quoted?

**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — The figure for Agriculture, permanent posts in Saskatchewan was 410; 345 in Manitoba, a difference of 65.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — What date was that figure taken off?

**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — I believe the figure for Saskatchewan was for January. The figure for the Manitoba Department of Agriculture would be about mid-1962.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — I suggest in all sincerity your figures are all together different from . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!, I think the member is out of order.

**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — Mr. Speaker, he can speak himself if he wishes on this.

Let me see, just where and why these differences occur. First of all, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan had 493 more employees for mental hospitals than Manitoba. This by the way would leave 309 more posts to be accounted for in terms of the comparison that I was giving a few minutes ago. Now the average number of employees for 1,000 patients in mental hospitals for all of Canada is 418, and the average for Saskatchewan is just slightly under: 415. In Manitoba it is 394, or considerably below the Canadian average. So that this would indicate that while Saskatchewan mental hospitals are not understaffed, Manitoba hospitals are understaffed according to the national average.

The Department of Social Welfare. The Manitoba government in respect of this department does not operate geriatric centres. It has no bureau of alcoholism, it does not supply child welfare services in the organized parts of the province. I here observe that the province of Manitoba has The Eastern Manitoba Children's Aid Society, what is known as The Central Manitoba Children's Aid Society, and The Western Manitoba Children's Aid Society, with headquarters at St. Boniface, Portage La Prairie, and Brandon respectively. So that here we have these private agencies carrying out a good deal of the relevant work. But Saskatchewan has 362 employees for geriatric centres, 150 for child welfare service, 16 for the bureau of alcoholism; a total of 528, or 198 more than Saskatchewan's excess over the total number of employees in Manitoba's social aid department. In other programs, therefore, it might be said that Manitoba has an excess over that of the province of Saskatchewan.

**March 28, 1963**

And of course the same kind of thing is seen when we look at the Department of Education. Manitoba has no School for the Deaf. It has no school music supervisory program. It has no guidance branch, no adult education branch, or physical fitness branch. In these areas it is of interest there are respectively 62, 1, 12, and 11 posts, or a total of all of the occupations of 87, or two more than the excess of Saskatchewan's total over Manitoba's total number of posts.

And if I may stop here, Mr. Speaker, are the members of the opposition suggesting that we should reduce these services in mental hospitals, do away with the geriatric centres, the bureau of alcoholism, the school for the deaf, the guidance branch, the adult education branch, and all the other agencies that I have enumerated? Do they consider that these are wasteful and extravagant? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. members opposite want to bring Manitoba into this house as a basis of comparison, let them say what they want us to do away with here so that we can let the people that live in this province know what they call "waste and extravagance."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — Now may I also suggest that, in terms of all of these departments, Saskatchewan is a vastly different geographical area than Manitoba. The city of Winnipeg has better than half of the population of Manitoba, and much of the remaining population is within 50 or 60 miles of the city of Winnipeg. In servicing, the expense of servicing, contact and all the rest of it, there just isn't really a legitimate comparison in the cost of providing them.

If one looks at the Department of Agriculture, I think it isn't necessary for us to excuse any additional number of employees that we have in this province. We have an agricultural industry in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that is twice the size of the agricultural industry of the province of Manitoba.

May I just say something briefly about the Manitoba Department of Labour. Now, the Manitoba Department of Labour does not provide electrical and gas inspection services, perhaps for obvious reasons. Again, if you consider the size of the province, the ease of access of providing services for electrical inspection, it would be seen that even if they did they would be able to provide service more cheaply. But, in any event, Saskatchewan employs 33 electrical inspectors and 24 gas inspectors for a total of 57, which almost equates the extra number of employees in the province.

**Mrs M.J. Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? How does the working force in Manitoba compare in numbers with that of Saskatchewan?



**Hon. W.G. Davies:** — The labor force, is this what the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Speaker? I am sorry I have to ask her a question in return. Well, the labor of the province of Manitoba, I would think, Mr. Speaker, would be somewhat similar to our own employed force, somewhat larger. But this isn't what we are here talking about here. We are talking about the fact that the increase in electrical inspection for 33 persons and 24 gas inspectors almost equates the additional number of persons that are employed by the Department of Labor in Saskatchewan.

Now, if the hon. member is saying that even at that there shouldn't be this number of employees, let us again look at the size of the province. A labor problem takes place in the province of Manitoba. In nine cases out of ten it will be in the city of Winnipeg. There are very few labor disputes actually that take place outside of the city of Winnipeg, Flin Flon, Brandon, Portage la Prairie. A completely different situation, Mr. Speaker, in the terms of having to look after labor relations or doing all of those things that require the services of employees in this province.

And again, Mr. Speaker, if any of the members opposite want to suggest where waste and extravagance is shown by the Labor Department, let them say so, so that we will have some basis of judging really what they are getting at in this house here today.

Now, I just want to make a few more comments, Mr. Speaker, in the way of what we are getting at in this resolution. We on this side of the house say that the whole activity of this government, since its election in 1944, was the promotion of efficiency, economy and "improved services in the dispatch of public business", to use the phrase in the resolution, by a built-in or continuing method that by constant study applied means for overcoming difficulties and making remedies for improvement. And, of course, the members of the opposition in their motion are suggesting that this should be done by a Glassco-type commission. Now, I would like to suggest that if you substantiate the need for a commission you have to do so not by vague and perhaps sometimes — if I may be pardoned for saying so, Mr. Speaker — abusive allegations about waste, inefficiency. The members of the opposition have to pinpoint this in such a fashion that the need for a commission is validated.

Now, what have actually been some of the recommendations of the Glassco Commission, and what has been the experience in that respect in this province?

We all know that the Glassco Commission, established in 1960 to promote really the same thing that is suggested in the resolution — efficiency, economy and improved services —

**March 28, 1963**

suggested methods of improvement and benefits from that improvement in terms of savings of money. Now I say that efficiency, economy and improved services have continued since 1944, not as a “one-shot” commission effort, but as a built-in and continuing mechanism. The Glassco Commission suggested in Volume No. 1 what they called a plan for management that would concentrate on the general allocation of duties between departments and central agencies. They suggested that a system of close control of departmental activities by central agencies had grown up from the public service, and that these controls hampered the effectiveness of the public service. The commission recommended that responsibility for the control of both men and money should be assigned to departments, with Treasury Board assuming a major and central control. I suggest that has been done in Saskatchewan. I don't for a moment say that there is not room for improvement, but I do say that there is a continuing review by a central agency and that departments in the beginning have room for initiative and for departmental effort to encourage them to continue in the best way, shape or form that they believe work should be done. I think that that in a large measure this aim has been accomplished. I do not deny that there is room for improvement.

Now, the Glassco Commission, also in Volume No. 1, suggested that to enable departments to use increased authority effectively, the establishment of two senior assistants to each deputy minister, a finance officer, and the personnel officer. The Treasury Board, according to my understanding of the recommendation, would appoint these officers. Now this also I suggest has been accomplished in Saskatchewan. The government here has established the position of personnel officer and administrator, or finance officer, and in the smaller departments these are combined in the administrative officer position.

The Commission, also in Volume No. 1, emphasized the need for a high quality and a responsible staff, both in management position and in departments; also in the staff of Treasury Board. Again I think this has been, manifestly enough, partly done. I think perhaps there is room for improvement but at least the process has been recognized here for some substantial time.

The recommendation was made as follows: That Treasury Board staff would be divided into three divisions: the personnel division, the programs division and an administrative improvement division. I say that this has been partly done as well. I think that there are some changes that could be made, but we already have two divisions in the budget bureau — which is the staff of the Treasury Board — first a budget division and projects group. These concern themselves with the analysis of departmental programs. Secondly, an administrative management division which concerns itself with improving the administration of government programs.

A recommendation of the Glassco Commission was made with respect to financial management. The main recommendation is that the central agency, that is the Treasury Board and the comptroller of the treasury, should reduce the amount of the detailed control exercised over departments. At the same time it was recommended that departments should improve their accounting techniques. Now I say that, without going into all detail, this has been done to a substantial degree.

Another recommendation: that departments and the Treasury Board should make long-range program and expenditure plans. Now this, Mr. Speaker, has certainly been done. The cabinet conference on planning and budgeting that is held each year in November examines the departmental long-range program, indeed all programs, and at this time it is possible to re-assess and assess old and new programs and anything new that should be done.

The commission recommended, in Volume 1, that once parliament had established expenditures on programs, departments should have the authority and responsibility to spend. I think this has been a key feature of the operation of our Saskatchewan departments; that once the legislature has approved the expenditures, the departments have the authority to proceed with the commitments and with the expenditures so that the maximum of initiative can be displayed by employees of the government according to their competence.

Another recommendation: that the Treasury Board should set the guide lines for expenditures but not control the details. This is somewhat similar to the last one that I dealt with. I say here that this has been done. I do not suggest that the last word in accomplishment has come about, but I do say that the process is an active one in this province.

It would be possible to go on in this vein, Mr. Speaker. I am going to leave this particular area for the moment and talk about what happens in the field of personnel.

Now, one of the recommendations of the Glassco Commission was that the civil service commission would approve all permanent appointments to the public service for the obvious reason of preventing patronage, and serve as the final court of appeal on grievances, and offer recruitment and selection services to the lower 95 per cent — under \$5,200 a year — in the civil service. It would also advise the government departments on pay and conditions of work. Now this is precisely, Mr. Speaker, the method that has been followed out in this province since 1944. Moreover, the percentage of employees that would be effected by this process is even better, I submit, than the 95 percent that seems to have been advanced in the Glassco Commission report. I say that we have done

**March 28, 1963**

somewhat better than the recommendations through the union agreements with our employees. We have a procedure for their advancement when service, merit, and ability are equal. And this, by the way, is not on a unilateral basis but on an effective collective bargaining basis. We are the only jurisdiction in this country that has undertaken to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a little longer than I intended to on this. I suggest again what others have touched upon previously, that the on-going mechanism for improvement and efficiency in the public service has been constant in this province. I would be the last to say that all has been done that might have been done, but I think the most careful scrutiny has been attempted, not only by the elected representatives of the government but by a civil service. This, to my mind has improved immeasurably in ability and performance since 18 years ago. I suggest that this is perhaps the best reason of all reasons I can think of at this moment why the support of the amendment moved by my friend from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson) should be the one that this house will accept.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mrs. M.J. Batten:** — I want to say only a few words in comment on the speech that the hon. member who just sat down made.

I think his speech, Mr. Speaker, illustrates better than anything else to us why we need this commission and why the amendment is not satisfactory. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to have reform you have to admit that there is need for reform. Now, unless this admission is made, and unless this government can bring itself to say with humility that they could perform than they are doing, there is of course no possibility of improvement.

And this is exactly their attitude. They think there might be some little minor matters that could be changed, like the color of the minister's tie or something, but anything important does not have to be changed — it is already perfect because it belongs to the socialist government.

In addition to this, I resent very much, Mr. Speaker, the minister suggesting — and this is a consistent practice — suggesting that every time the opposition has a motion asking for better service for the people of Saskatchewan, we automatically mean the firing of civil servants. This equating of efficiency with the firing of civil servants doesn't make any sense to anybody except the socialists on your right who want to inspire and instil fear in the minds of civil servants. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one more anxious for reform than the civil servants themselves.

**Hon. W.D. Davies:** — I made no reference whatever to the firing of civil servants at any point in my talk.

**An Hon. Member:** — You insinuated that.

**Mrs. M.J. Batten:** — There certainly was that implication in the words, and certainly this is the impression that was left when the hon. member compared the number of civil servants in the one province with that of the other. And certainly this was the impression that was left with me, and I am sure with other people listening.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the intention of the mover of this motion was not to do a clean-up job on civil servants. The intention was to give better service for less money to the people of Saskatchewan in the performance of public duties.

Now, services and performance can't be equated with money, and with the number of civil servants. There are many other factors that come into play, and this is exactly the reason for an independent commission. I could sit aside, for instance, and take the Minister of Social Welfare to task for many inefficiencies in his department, but it is certainly not the fault of the civil servants in that department. These certainly lead to the tremendous frustration of those civil servants who want to perform their duties but because they are subjected to so much red tape and so many overlords, and so many tensions in the communications system in that department, they can't perform as efficiently as they themselves would like to and the people of Saskatchewan deserve.

I don't want to go into detail because the hour is going on and I would like leave, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn this motion.

Debate adjourned.

### **SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON EXPROPRIATION**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Lloyd respecting the advisability of conducting an inter-sessional study of expropriation.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this motion and we can't see any reason for objecting to it, so I have nothing further to say.

Motion agreed to.

**March 28, 1963**

The order of the day having been called for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown for second reading of Bill No. 61 — An Act respecting Industrial Development.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, this has been adjourned and I would certainly like to see this proceeded with as soon as possible. I wonder could the hon. members agree to take it up later today.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, if the house agrees I would sooner take it up tomorrow.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We may call it later today. Can we do that? We may call it later today and maybe you had better be ready. It stands for the present.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, if they won't call it tonight, if they agree to call it this afternoon. Could we call it 12:30 and take it up after dinner?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All you have to do is say one word and the Speaker will interrupt you . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — One word.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We will call it 12:30.

The sitting was recessed at 12:30 p.m.

The sitting was resumed at 2:30 p.m.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, to carry on the great oration I started when we finished this morning at 12:30, and speaking on Bill No. 61, I would first like to say that we in the opposition support this bill in principle. Anything within reason that this government will do, can do or will do to encourage industrial development in this province, we welcome.

We don't need, on this side of the house, to heap any praise on it. I am sure the department of propaganda will spend the usual thousands of dollars and send out the millions of words doing this on behalf of the government. We don't need to do it.

But we do need to look closely at the millions of dollars that this bill will authorize the government to spend in an attempt to bring business and industrial development to

this province. Mr. Speaker, we have seen growth and development, especially in the two major cities in this province, Regina and Saskatoon. And we people who don't happen to live in those two major cities, naturally as residents of Saskatchewan, are very proud to see these two cities grow. But I don't think, in fact I am convinced, that the industrial development and the business development that these two cities have had, I don't think it is because of the efforts of this government. I am inclined to think it is in spite of the efforts of this government.

But regardless of this, almost 25 percent of our population in this province now resides in the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, and what we really need in this province is province-wide development. Where we need the development is in the towns and in the small cities. These are the places that are really suffering, that need the new payrolls, need the new businesses. By and large, these are the places that this socialist government failed to provide the incentives to bring these payrolls in to help these towns and cities not only grow, but in most cases just hold their own.

Mr. Speaker, the real question I think that is posed by this act is. . . is it just so many more words, is it just part of this so-called new look that the government has been attempting to develop the last little while, especially in this session — we've seen them repealing compulsory acts, we've seen them backing away from the county system, we've seen them now trying to appear as the friend of free enterprise. Well, is this a case of the leopard changing his spots? I don't think so. Is this the case of the prodigal son coming home? Well, I don't think we could ever say those sons over there were ever at home with free or private enterprise. I think before we can answer these questions, before we can find out if this is just another feeble effort on the part of the socialists to redeem their tattered reputation throughout this province — throughout Canada and the United States — I think we have to look back at their record and examine how many times socialists, since they have held office here in the province of Saskatchewan, have come up and told the people of the province they have the answer to industrial and business development, they can solve the problem of industrial and business development, and how many times they've failed.

I think first we have to go back to when they came into office in 1945. This was the era of the great socialist experiment. This was the era of the crown corporations. According to statements, members of the government, when they launched the famous crown corporation experiment, I quote "it was to rebuild an economy of peace which will lead to the creation of a balanced economy." Another quote: "A first venture in trying to make Saskatchewan an industrial as well as an agricultural province." Another quote, they said:

**March 28, 1963**

“These crown corporations were a challenge and a great call,” and, according to T.C. Douglas at that time, they were to finance the free services he promised. He said at Weyburn, June 13, 1944, the CCF social service program would be financed, and I quote: “raising of revenue by government engaging in revenue-producing business.”

They were new in office. They were socialists. They thought all they had to do was go in business, billions of dollars would roll in, pay for all these wonderful free services and we would all live in Utopia. Well, we all know what happened.

This was the crown corporation experiment.

With few exceptions, Mr. Speaker, these exceptions being notably the crown corporations that they inherited when they came into office, a few more they set up, gave themselves a monopoly, this program failed. It cost the taxpayers millions of dollars. But even worse than that, it diverted the attention of this government. Back in those boom years when the rest of this nation was really developing, when capital was pouring into Canada for industrial and business, we weren't getting our share because the government opposite, Mr. Speaker, was too concerned with this new socialist toy, this new socialist experiment. So we fell behind, we failed to get our fair share. This was the time when thousands and thousands of young people had to leave our province to find a job, to find opportunities in other parts of Canada and in the United States.

**Hon. A.C. Kuziak (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — That was under the Liberals.

**Mr. Stuart:** — He says that was under the Liberals. Thousands and thousands of people in this province when they took over, showing the smallest percentage of growth of any province in the Dominion of Canada. This was the era, this was the time, Mr. Speaker, when we saw the taxes on our homes and our farms and our businesses rise to unprecedented heights in this province.

**Hon. Mr. Brown (Ministry of Industry and Information):** — Order. I don't mind listening to the hon. members perpetual political speech about socialism but I can't help but wonder whether or not he is in order, or whether he is actually dealing with the principles of this bill.

**An Hon. Member:** — You can't take it, eh?



**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — I can take it. I don't mind listening to him, I've heard it so often.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, as an explanation. Before we can decide whether we will approve this bill, whether we will vote in favor of this bill, I think it imperative that we look at the background. We've seen other bills of this type come in and I don't blame the minister for not wanting me to go on. If I was in his position I would be embarrassed too. But I think I am quite in order and we sat here and listened to these people, when they are talking about something, wander back into the thirties day after day, and I think we can be excused if we examine their record and hold it up to public scrutiny, no matter how much it embarrasses them.

**Mr. Speaker:** — On the point of order, I do believe that the member is referring to industrial development under the crown corporations, which I think is correct, but I would ask him not to go into detail of discussing the crown corporations because then I am afraid he would get out of the balance of this bill. But I do agree that referring to the crown corporations, which was industrial development, could be used as an example.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, Mr. Speaker, I say this. I am afraid it will take more than a change of heart in the members opposite to bring in industrial business development. I feel it will take a change of government before we will see real development take place all over this province.

Mr. Speaker, I think very early in the game they made impossible blunders in their earliest attempts to bring industrial development to this province in the nature of crown corporations. In 1946 they set up the economic advisory and planning board. According to a press release by Premier Douglas at that time, and I quote: "The board will engage in economic research, planning and industrial development. It can formulate long-term plans for industrial development of the province." Then this was to be the new answer. And again it was hailed by the government with great fanfare, thousands of dollars of propaganda and publicity. There was one little thing wrong with it.

All the time the socialists — as they will probably do if this act is passed, sending out this propaganda, all this fanfare about this new deal they were bringing to the industrial development expansion of Saskatchewan — all the time they were doing that they failed to tame or to hold down some of their wild, left-wing socialists, people like Joe Phelps; many

**March 28, 1963**

people who are still sitting over on that side of the house today, and the confusion, the talk of these people, the speeches they made, the speeches they made in this house, made all over this province, in fact all over Canada, against the business community. Some of the laws they passed, hamstringing the business community. This drowned out the voice of these people and the planning board who were attempting to woo industry and business into Saskatchewan.

This new board set was set up, and the results I am afraid were another failure, Mr. Speaker. They failed to bring business and industrial expansion to this province on a scale necessary to provide jobs just for our own people, a scale necessary to hold down taxes; to keep them down to a reasonable level ordinary working men and women, farmers could afford to pay; failed to have this province keep pace, not only with the rest of Canada, but even with our sister provinces of Alberta and Manitoba.

And in 1947 they went another step. They established the industrial development board. And it was to encourage the establishment and development of industrial plants and projects. I think maybe one of its most notable loans, if you will recall, was to the infamous Douglas-Fines Theatre just south of the city. But again they spent thousands of dollars on propaganda, they did lend some money . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — On a point of order. The industrial development fund was not involved in lending money to any theatre.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I'm sorry I had the wrong fund. Which fund was it that lent that money? Or the insurance company.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney:** — . . . nor any fund.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Nor any fund, eh? Would the minister that is speaking care to say that no part of this government or agency loaned any money to that. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think . . .

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney:** — I would say that unequivocally.

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about the insurance company?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney:** — Unequivocally, no.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Then you evidently didn't know what you were talking about.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — What do you know about it? Fines got . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

Will the hon. members please refrain from speaking when I am asking for order. I do believe the hon. member speaking is getting away from the motion before the house.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I guess they must have been hiding that hon. minister in one of the back rooms at that time and he didn't know what was going on.

Regardless of what they say, Mr. Speaker, they set up this fund and again, by and large, it failed. Then came 1960, and the socialists set up an entirely new department, the Department of Industry. I don't know how many real experienced business people they have in that department — I don't think they have too many judging by the results — but I know one thing, they have failed to get the confidence of the business community in this province and across this country. And again the whole project was a failure.

Regina and Saskatoon have shown some progress but I ask them come up to Prince Albert, take a look at North Battleford, go to the smaller cities, the smaller towns, show us this industrial development. They have been able to do it in Manitoba. They've been able to do it in Alberta. These socialists have failed to do it here. . . What did he say?

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Rotten something — rotten mayor.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I don't know, I don't know if he is talking about his own mayor or not. If he is talking about the kind of mayors they have. . . I don't know what he is talking about.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say come and take a look at the rest of Saskatchewan. Come and take a look at the small towns and the cities that are failing because they haven't had the industrial and business development that they deserve and that they would have had if we had had a free enterprise government; a government that really cared about business and industrial development, and not one that just pays lip service to it.

**March 28, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, maybe this new bill will help. Maybe this will do the job. The question is, has the leopard changed its spots. Well, I don't think so. If these people are really serious, if they really want to see free and private investment come into this province and create jobs and bring down taxes, get this province of Saskatchewan on the road to real development, if they really want to welcome free enterprise, let them stand up and deny once and for all the Regina Manifesto. They have never done it and they haven't got the nerve to do it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I do believe the member is straying from the bill that is before us.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it has everything to do with this bill.

They are asking this side of the house to vote with them, to give them the authority to spend millions of dollars. I say if this money is to be well spent, if it is the job that it is intended to do, let them stand up and denounce socialism; let them admit that socialism has been a failure, that it failed to do the job in this province. If they had the intestinal fortitude to do that, maybe they would, I say maybe they would get the confidence of the business communities, not only in this province but in the rest of Canada and in the United States; the people who can come in and bring in the capital to put this province on the road to real development. But they haven't got the nerve to do that, they aren't big enough, they won't admit they made a mistake. I'm afraid they won't do it but we will still support this bill because I think it is a step in the right direction even if it is done by the wrong people.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the house ready for the question? It is my duty to warn the house that the mover is about to close the debate on this bill. If anyone wishes to speak, he must do so now.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — I don't intend to take very long, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I am quite happy indeed to hear that the members opposite are prepared to support this bill. I rather thought they would and I am happy to hear them say that they will.

I don't want to comment at length on the remarks of the hon. member who just took his seat. As a matter of fact, I am never too unhappy when I hear the hon. member or someone else opposite carry on in that vein which they continuously do because I have found out over the years that the more they talk

this way, the more friends they make for me and my department and this government amongst the businessmen of this province. So I am not particularly unhappy to hear him go ahead and say that sort of thing.

I just want to comment on a couple of points though that the hon. member mentioned. One, he suggests that we are only now turning our thoughts to providing some assistance towards the economic development of the province. He suggests that these are something new that we brought in. I would like to remind the hon. member that if we are only changing our minds now, then apparently the same change is going on in every province across Canada. If he would pay attention to what is going on in the other provinces, he will find that practically every province is doing exactly the same as we are doing here. That is, taking a look at new means by which they may assist in promoting the development of those provinces, and practically each and every one of them is coming in with some new kind of a program. You can go all the way across Canada and you will find that they are all doing it.

The other point that I want to comment on is the one my hon. friend made about development taking place in the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon, but he says nothing is taking place in some of the smaller cities.

Well, I am glad he recognizes that something is going on in the major cities, and I would remind him that if he had bothered to check some of the smaller cities in the province he would find that a number of new developments have taken place in those communities over the past few years. But he seems to suggest that it is entirely the fault of this government because a particular community doesn't get an industry. Well I am sure that the hon. gentleman would be the first one to howl his head off if we as a government or I as a minister and my department tried to tell private enterprise where they should locate in the province of Saskatchewan. They've got to have a free choice, and they have a free choice and they exercise it. The only thing we are interested in, Mr. Speaker, is to get industry in Saskatchewan. Where it locates in the province is entirely up to what the local people can do to attract that industry to their own community.

And I would suggest my hon. friend, who was head of the civic government in Prince Albert for quite a number of years, might take a look at just what he did towards helping get industry in the city of Prince Albert during the time that he was in office.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I did a fine job but I couldn't carry you on my back.

**March 28, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — Now, as I say, I don't want to take a lot of time of the house.

I am very pleased indeed that the gentlemen and the lady opposite are going to support the bill, but I just felt that I just had to make one or two comments. I can assure the hon. gentleman and the other members opposite that with this legislation, and the fund that will go with it, it will provide a new weapon, or a new means by which we will be able to improve our efforts to spark development of the economy, and we are very hopeful that because of this we will be even more successful in the future than we have been in the past in attracting new industry to the province, and I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**Yeas – 43**

**MESSIEURS**

Lloyd	Turnbull	Batten (Mrs.)
Johnson	Stone	McCarthy
Williams	Thibault	McDonald
Brown	Semchuk	Cameron
Blakeney	Berezowsky	Danielson
Brockelbank	Perkins	McFarlane
Walker	Thiessen	Gardiner
Nollet	Snyder	Guy
Kuziak	Stevens	Boldt
Cooper (Mrs.)	Dahlman	Horsman
Strum (Mrs.)	Peterson	Coderre
Meakes	Broten	MacDougall
Thurston	Thatcher	Erb
Davies	Klein	Steuart
Nicholson		

**Nays – Nil**

Bill read the second time.

**SECOND READINGS**

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 54 — An Act respecting The Undertaking of Local Improvements in Urban Municipalities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is the Act respecting the Undertaking of Local Improvements in Urban Municipalities. We have, up

until this time, had sections in the various acts — the village, town, and city acts — that had to do with the undertaking of local improvements such as the laying of sidewalks, sewers, and water systems in these municipalities. They have grown up through the years and there is a good deal of confusion in regard to them in the different acts.

We are proposing here that we repeal these parts of these acts dealing with the local improvements in these urban municipalities, and place them all in one act, which would be The Local Improvement Act, which would deal with the installation of such improvements in any of these types of urbans. There is very little change in this act from the present way in which these things are handled. The principals are much the same. It is a matter of consolidation, and endeavoring to get a more adequate and simple method of going about these things; having them set out so that they are a little easier for the municipal people to follow; not quite so complicated, but the actual policy and the actual ways of doing these things are very much the same as they are in the City Act at the present time.

There are one or two things that are a little different. One is in regard to the assessment for local improvements of agriculture lands, irregularly shaped lots, and the railway properties in these urbans. At the present time there is no provision for treating them in any different way than what there is any other type of lot in a village or town.

It is proposed here that we allow the villages, or whatever urban it is, to make agreements with the people concerned on these type of lots, whether it is railway right-of-way, or irregular-shaped lots belonging to any other individual or agriculture land. There is nothing compulsory about this, but we are making it permissible for them to work out agreements with these people in regard to something that is not considered to be the usual in regard to the ordinary lots.

Another slight change is in regard to the handling of resolutions in the council concerning local improvements. At the present time, in many of the resolutions that come before a council having to do with local improvements, it is necessary that they have two-thirds majority of all members before these things are passed. We are retaining this principle in this act in regard to places where the council overrides the wishes of the citizen, and puts in these improvements irrespective of any petitions that may have been put up. There is provision for this in the present act and we are retaining the same provision, and we are also retaining in this instance the necessity for a two-thirds majority of

**March 28, 1963**

all the council. However, it is felt that in most instances on voting on things dealing with local improvements, there is no difference between this type of a resolution, this type of a motion before a municipal council than there is in other motions which often times have to do with more important, or at least as important matters, so we are putting in here the principle that all that is necessary in dealing with these things is the same as in the other instances, a simple majority in council.

There are possibly some other small changes that I have not felt were any real departure in principle, that we can discuss when the bill is in committee, and with this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move this bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 55 — An Act to amend The City Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill has to do with amendments to The City Act. We have some amendments this year in this act which cover quite a bit of space, and I think will be of a good deal of interest to the legislature.

The one has to do with the sections of the act regulating the closing of shops. As the hon. members are no doubt quite aware at the present time, certain types of shops are allowed to stay open, but they are only allowed to sell a restricted list of merchandise. In other words, they are not allowed to sell anything except those things that are mentioned in a list of exemptions. I am afraid that experience has shown us that this is observed not as well as it should be, and I think that this legislation has grown into rather disrepute because it makes provision for selling such things as a loaf of bread, but at the present time they are not allowed to sell any butter or any jam to go with this bread, and the actual result is that it is flagrantly disregarded. And any attempts at enforcement have been not too good.

At the present time, I believe it is the law that garages and filling stations are not allowed to stay open after hours or on a Sunday except by some system of rotation which is worked out by the council. In many cases again, this is being disregarded and it has become to be an accepted fact that garages, not garages especially, but filling stations do stay open after hours and on Sunday.



Actually what we are doing here is endeavoring to more or less make legal what is now going on, what the people have come to accept as the norm. We are saying that certain types of shops may stay open, and these are set out by definition, such as confectioneries, refreshment houses, tobacconists, news agents, druggist, baker and milk supplier, garage, filling station, gas pump, automobile dealers. These are set out here, and anyone who qualified for operating under one or more of these definitions may stay open and sell those goods that they would ordinarily sell as an operator under this section, so long as the majority, the greater portion of the business that he does is in the business that is covered by the types of shops set out under this section, and he may sell anything that is on his shelves that he ordinarily sells.

This whole section, of course, is subject to the regulation of the local council. The municipality has the direct control over this, and they may regulate the hours the shops are allowed to stay open. They may also regulate the types of goods that are allowed to sell after hours. In other words, the shop may not be able to sell refrigerators, they may not be able to sell certain canned goods or staples. Whatever they wish to do with it; we are leaving this in the hands of the local council.

We are also setting it up that they make their arrangements with the surrounding municipalities or villages in regard to a belt around the town wherein these same regulations would apply. We are not giving to the cities or the towns the privilege of regulating shop closing in these areas them, except with the consent of the local rural municipalities or the villages. They may work out an agreement.

In this bill we are also allowing agreements to be worked out between cities, neighboring cities and neighboring towns, villages or rural municipalities in regard to different types of undertakings that are legal for these to undertake — they may undertake them as joint undertakings with another or a neighboring municipality.

We are also here endeavoring to clarify the position of the city in regard to the indigents holding cards under the medical care or hospitalization acts. We are trying to make it clear here, and I believe we are making it clear, that the indigents holding cards have the same privileges and the city has no more responsibility towards these people who are indigents and who are holding cards of the Hospitalization or Medical Care Acts. The city has no more responsibility towards them in regard to services that are covered under the Medical Care or The Hospitalization Act than they have in regard to any other persons holding these cards in the municipality.

**March 28, 1963**

These people also will have the same privileges in regard to services that are provided under these acts as any other persons may have, irrespective of whether they have gotten a card or not.

There are, of course, numerous places in the act where adjustments are made in regard to the appeal of the Arrears in Taxes Act and the Consolidation Taxes Act as well.

We are bringing in here a new principle which we will be putting in all the municipal acts, in regard to the disposition of grants received from senior governments. At the present time there has been no permission given in the acts for these grants to be distributed on a pro-rate basis between the municipality and other local organizations that would naturally have an interest in these. What I am speaking of here is such grants as are given in lieu of taxes by either the provincial or federal government to the city. There is nothing said in the present act about these. In the cities, I understand, it is the usual thing that these be split on the normal basis between municipal purposes and educational purposes. We are putting this all through the acts that this is now the thing that must be done. It hasn't been too much of a problem, as I have said before, with regard to the cities, but we are putting this principle into all the acts that these grants be divided between the various local government agencies in the same basis, the same percentage as their requisitions or their mill rates.

We are also giving permission to close roads and highways. At the present time, as you know, city streets are being closed for repairs where it is deemed necessary, but there is actually no provision in the act which allows them to do this. The roads are normally under the control of the Department of Highways, all the roads and streets in the province, and no municipality has any right to close them without permission from the Department of Highways. We are here making it that — we are making the same amendment in all the acts — roads or streets may be closed for two weeks for these purposes without any permission from the Department of Highways.

Also in this act we are disposing of the interim financial statement in regard to cities. Many of our people and the auditors and people we have discussed this with feel that this interim financial statement does not accomplish any real benefit and have suggested that it be disposed of.

There are other things in this bill, Mr. Speaker, which I consider to be of a minor nature which can be better discussed in Committee of the Whole when this bill comes up, and I would thus move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 56 — An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

He said: This is an Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act. There are two things in this regard which I would like to mention.

One is the change we are making in regard to the terms of reference of our board of examiners. They have hitherto worked in regard to the certification and examination of rural municipal secretaries. Town clerks have approached us desiring to have certification. Now, we have gone along with this on the basis that no town would be compelled to have a certified clerk at any time because as you know there is such a wide range between the size of towns. It is just not logical that we should have any, especially the smaller towns, compelled to have their clerks of a specified certification or certain standards. However, for the benefit of clerks themselves, they like to have something that gives them some standing, that shows what they have accomplished and their qualifications in regard to town clerks, and also there is a benefit to the towns if they know what type of standards and what qualifications a clerk has when they apply for a position. In order to help out in these ways we are going along with assisting the clerks to set up as a series of certifications, and in order to have our board of examiners deal with this we had to make a small change in The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

As you know, I was speaking to you on the budget debate, I believe in regard to certain responsibilities that the Department of Municipal Affairs had taken in regard to community development, which necessitates us drawing up contracts from time to time. We have, in any contract that we have been able to do so far, been by order in council through some other department. This gives us the ability to make contracts through this department.

With this explanation I would like to move second reading to this bill.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak on second reading of the bill if I might, in connection with the method of certification of the clerks in rural municipalities and towns and villages and cities.

Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, and I agree that it is necessary, the people who are going to act in this capacity should have certain qualifications. There is only one way in

**March 28, 1963**

which those qualifications may be ascertained, and that is by means of conducting an examination, and after the examination has been conducted, if they pass it successfully, issuing some sort of a certificate to them in order that they will know what their qualifications are, and in order that those who wish to engage them will know what their qualifications are. But what I object to, and I object to most strongly, is the method the government has chosen to do this. Now, I don't propose for one minute to disagree with the necessity of municipal secretaries writing examinations, having the necessary qualifications for jobs that they are going to hold. I want to repeat that once more so that everybody understands me. But the method by which this is done is one which I most strongly object to, the method that is being chosen under the amendment to the act is much the same method that was used under the old act. Now, either one I consider to be repugnant and not in the best interests of impartiality or freedom in our province.

The minister is going to appoint a board of examiners to issue certificates. Everything is left in the hands of the minister; the man appointed by a political party; the man appointed because he belongs to a political party. Yes, the minister, the Deputy Premier of the province is snickering as usual. Nobody has contributed more to the destruction of self-government in the province than he has and it is my personal opinion that he is the power behind the throne in the Department of Municipal Affairs still.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I like to laugh whenever I hear anything funny.

**Mr. Snedker:** — As I was saying when I was interrupted by the member opposite, I object to the method in which this is being done. I consider if examinations are to be called for and if examinations are to be written, they should be laid down; they should be administered by a body as impartial as it is possible to do. I would suggest in all sincerity in the interests of those people who would like to be municipal secretaries, in interests of those people who already are municipal secretaries, in the interests of those people who wish to hire municipal secretaries, that the governing authority for the laying down of the type of examination that these people should have to write, that the certification which should take place after the examination has been written, should be absolutely and completely under the jurisdiction of the university of the province of Saskatchewan and nobody else. And any municipal secretary-treasurers with which I have discussed it — and I have discussed it with a good number of them recently, in fact I discussed it with as many of them as I could — have agreed with me, in order to remove the certification of secretary-treasurers of rural municipalities as far out of the field and the realm of politics,

political manipulation, political pressure as possible. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and I think I have stated the case briefly and as fully as is possible to state it, I certainly with all my heart and soul oppose the method which has been chosen by the government for the carrying out of the function of certification of secretary-treasurers.

Motion agreed to and read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved second reading of Bill No. 63 — An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to amend The Health Services Act.

The amendments fall into three or four different categories. There has existed in Saskatchewan since 1946 a body called the Health Services Planning Commission, and in 1952 the Health Services Planning Commission was reorganized and set up as a body which gave advice to the Minister of Public Health on health matters. It has rendered very valuable service in giving advice to the minister from time to time. It is now proposed that this body be reorganized somewhat, that a larger membership be provided for and that some slight changes in the wording of the powers of the commission be made.

I think that a perusal of these in committee will indicate that the changes are not at all substantial in nature.

A minor amendment is proposed in the definition of the word “resident” so as to deal with a specific little technical problem which has arisen with respect to the Swift Current Health Region and the inter-changing of residence from the medical care coverage when a person moves into or out of the Swift Current region.

Another minor amendment to make clearer the power of the minister to make grants to the cities of Regina and Saskatoon for the purposes of their city health departments.

All of these amendments are of a technical nature in the sense that they do not import into the act any new principles or any principles which, as I believe, have not been generally understood to be the case by the house. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I think they can best be considered in Committee of the Whole.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the said bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**March 28, 1963**

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Town Act.

He said: This, Mr. Speaker, is an Act to amend The Town Act. The same sections dealing with shop closings will be in this bill as regard to this act as there were in the bill concerning The City Act.

There also is in this bill an amendment allowing the council to purchase certain approved types of investment without the consent of the local government board. Up until this time there were certain investments which were specified which they might purchase with the consent of the local government board. The local government board has approached me and with regard to this they feel there is no necessity for them to have to exercise any control of any kind over the purchase of this type of investment. So they are asking that this control be removed. The same amendments are in this with regard to the definition of indigents in regard to medical care and hospitalization that I spoke of earlier in The City Act.

There will be numerous other small amendments but I feel they are better discussed in committee and I would thus move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Village Act, 1960.

He said: This is an act to amend The Village Act. In The Village and the Rural Municipality Act we are removing restrictions that have been placed in these acts in regard to the purchasing of certain types of land and other things that hitherto they have only been allowed to spend so much money on. We are removing these restrictions and allowing the council to buy in regard to these things the same as they are in regard to other things any amounts that they may have available on hand, and they may incur debts up to the allowable amount without going to debenture borrowing, with the permission of the ratepayers, either by a vote of the ratepayers or by permission of the local government board. This is a new approach in regard to this but we feel that it is sound and it does give the councils a little more leeway in which to operate.

Some of the other amendments that I mentioned in regard to The City and Town Acts will be in The Village Act. Of course the shop closing hours section will not be in The Village

Act. The villages have a different way of handling these things and we are not changing that at this time. There will be other amendments but I do not think it is advisable to take up the time of the house at this time as I feel they are better discussed in committee, and I will thus move second reading of this bill to amend The Village Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved Bill No. 66 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1960.

He said: Bill No. 66 is an act to amend The Rural Municipality Act. I made reference a few minutes ago in regard to removal of certain restrictions in regard to certain purchases that may be made and borrowing powers. We have also put these in The Rural Municipality Act and it is in this act that we have run across some difficulty in this regard in the last year or so. Certain municipalities have desired to build grid roads beyond their financial powers in the year under which they wish to make the construction. The contractors are often willing to do this work for them and carry a good amount of it as a debt owing to them, and the municipalities are often able to thus open up a stretch of road which will be of use to their ratepayers and also, as well, can obtain a beneficial rate from the contractor. Hitherto this has been very difficult, if not impossible, for them to do under the present legislation and we are making it possible here that they may borrow this type of money with the consent of the majority of their ratepayers or with the consent of the local government board.

We are also here allowing surplus funds to be invested in certain types of investment without the consent of the local government board, and making it necessary that grants from senior governments be distributed for municipal and school purposes alike, according to the mill rates that are struck in regard to these different types of local government.

There are other amendments which I think are better discussed in committee, Mr. Speaker, and will thus move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Local Improvement Districts Act.

He said: This bill has to do with the amendment of The Local Improvement Districts Act. Several of the amendments which we have

**March 28, 1963**

proposed to The Rural Municipality Act are also being included in The Local Improvement Districts Act.

There is one here that is not, I believe, included in The Rural Municipality Act. This has to do with striking a mill rate up to 3 mills for setting up a special fund for removal of snow in local improvement districts.

With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act, 1959.

He said: Bill No. 68 is an Act to amend The Municipal Employees Superannuation Act. Up to the present time there has been a provision in this act to allow employees to continue on with their superannuation privileges following a lapse of six months in employment, which may be due to various causes such as sickness. This six months is allowed to be extended by an additional six months, making a total of a year. It has been felt that in many cases this has caused a hardship because some things, such as tuberculosis, for various reasons make it impossible to return to work in a year, and it is very necessary that this employment be allowed to be discontinued for at least 18 months. And so we are proposing at this time that this term be extended by an additional six months.

I will thus move second reading to this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, before I move the house adjourn, the members might be interesting in knowing what is contemplated for tomorrow. I think tomorrow's order paper will have about 14 bills on for second reading — if I counted them right — and about a dozen in the Committee of the Whole, so we will be working at legislation. Then, if we get through government orders there will be one resolution standing under public bills and orders. That is about the intention.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:29 o'clock p.m.