

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session – Fourteenth Legislature
32nd Day

Friday, March 29th, 1963

The House met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GORDIE HOWE, WINNER OF NHL SCORING TITLE

Mr. C.H. Thurston (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to draw the attention of the members to another native of Saskatchewan who has made a name for himself in the field of sport. I am referring to the great Gordie Howe of National Hockey League, a native of Floral, Saskatchewan. Gordie has again won the National League Scoring Title for the sixth time. He has been an outstanding player in the N.H.L. for 17 years, entering the National League from junior ranks at the age of 18. Not only has he won the scoring title but has scored more points than any other player over these 17 years, even topping the great Maurice Richard. Along with his hockey fame, Gordie has a reputation of being an excellent all-round athlete and sportsman. I am sure that all members offer Gordie our congratulations and hope that it is many years yet before he lays up his skates.

ORATORY CONTEST WINNERS

Mrs. M.J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to introduce to this house the oratory contest winners from my constituency. These are the young people sitting over the clock in the Speaker's gallery. The young lady is Paulette Elhert from the Sacred Heart Separate School at Watson, and the boys are Bruce Thompson from Naicam High School, Gerrard Corpantan from St. Brieux, Norman Paproski from Layola School at Sinnet, and Douglas Gallambas from St.

March 29, 1963

Benedict. These young people were to have been joined by Ellen Ebert from Humboldt but unfortunately she was ill. They did best in the oratory contest as runners up in the Bryant contest in the Humboldt constituency and we are very proud of them. These young people have every year come down for one day to witness the goings-on at the legislature and to visit various places in Regina.

I intended to speak to the Hon. Minister of Industry and Information to provide some other points of interest for them to visit this afternoon before they leave and I might say they have been very impressed with the decorum of this house, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION TO SASKATOON MEMBER RE PRESS REPORT

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to ask the hon. lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum), if she is correctly reported in this morning's press as stating that the blame for the world threat from nuclear weapons and the near-fight in Cuba . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!, Order!. Questions to private members are not permitted . . .

Mr. Foley: — . . . was placed on . . . the world.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member cannot quote a press report.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a very urgent matter and if the statement is correct it has brought this legislature into ill-repute.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I can't entertain how important it is because the question is out of order to a private member.

BRYANT ORATORY CONTEST WINNER

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the house that the Bryant Oratory Contest winner was Ivor Nicholson from Hagan. He is a boy from my constituency and I would like to bring it to the attention of this house at this time.

Mrs. M. Batten: — They didn't compete in my constituency and I regret very much that for that reason I couldn't bring him in. I believe that one of the young people present is from the hon. minister's constituency but since he has a good Liberal name I was happy to bring him in.

QUESTION TO PREMIER RE PRESS REPORT

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, then, I would like to re—phrase my question and direct it to the Premier. Would the Premier associate himself with these remarks . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is out of order. You cannot bring in press statements made by the government outside the house, especially private members and question the Premier on them.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — You don't know what his question to the Premier is yet . . .

Mr. Speaker: — But I do know what the rules of the house are . . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . . ask questions and with no interference from you or anybody else, when you don't even know what the question is. That is contrary to the rules of the house, Mr. Speaker.

March 29, 1963

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — The rules are perfectly clear. Rule No. 175, citation 17 . . .

Opposition Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! A point of order was made by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) that any member has a right to rise on a point of order. I have said that the hon. member from Turtleford (Mr. Foley) was out of order and the point of order was raised by the member from Arm River and the Attorney General has a perfect right to enter the point of order as other members.

Mr. Danielson: — How can you rule on a point of order until you know what the question is going to be?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — You don't know what the question is . . .

An Hon. Member: — Talk about rules. You want a law on everything.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, the rule is quite clear. Citation 175, page 150 . . .

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — What book are you reading?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Citation 175, page 150 of the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, says that “the strict rule is that no question can be put by one private member to another on the orders of the day, and on measures with which the member to whom the question is put may be connected.” I submit Mr. Speaker, that if it is not possible to ask

the private member, then it isn't possible to raise the matter by some subterfuge of asking the Premier. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite out of order.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, might I respectfully submit that I requested permission to ask the Premier a question. You have granted this permission on many past occasions and I now request permission to ask a question of the Premier, before the orders of the day.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, it was evident when the hon. member for Turtleford attempted to ask this question that he . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . You don't know.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — All right. The hon. members have trouble in keeping quiet but when the hon. member got up to ask this question he made it clear . . . if the hon. member for La Ronge would sit still he would learning something . . .

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabaska): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is Athabasca.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He doesn't deserve to represent such a big constituency. I was just cutting him down to size.

Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, the member indicated quite clearly that he was going to ask the Premier a question on the same thing which was in regard to something the private member has said, and obviously it was out of order. There was no question.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Now I believe that the rules and regulations of any legislature, or any house, are such that when a member gets up to speak, regardless of whether it is on that side of the house or on this side of the house, isn't it the proper thing for you to sit and

March 29, 1963

listen to his point of order, listen to his question before you interject or try to make a ruling. I think this is something that has been happening in the past, especially to members on this side of the house, and we more or less resent this type of thing.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The task of the Speaker is, when a member rises, as the member for Turtleford did, and said he wished to ask a private member a question, based on an article in the paper, it is out of order and to entertain the question. The only time you can ask a private member a question is on a private bill submitted before the house, but the rules make it quite clear, as does also Beauchesne that questions asked as to whether the newspaper report is correct or not, are out of order. The member doesn't know whether what the newspaper reported, and they are not to assume responsibility for it, so the question was clearly out of order and I am trying to give the members guidance, not obstruction.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I was merely attempting to ascertain if the hon. member had been correctly reported. I was making no statement of view myself.

Mr. Speaker: — I realize what you were attempting to do but it was still out of order.

TRUCK LICENSING AGREEMENT WITH MANITOBA

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the house an agreement between the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Manitoba has been signed providing for reciprocity in regard to commercial trucks travelling in both provinces. The previous arrangement was that trucks registered in Saskatchewan, when they travelled in Manitoba, commercial trucks, they had to pay half of the Manitoba fee and vice versa, trucks registered in Manitoba coming into Saskatchewan paid half the Saskatchewan fee for a licence. The arrangement now is that commercial trucks registered in either province and travelling in the other province will get a reciprocity licence for \$10 per ton of gross weight for which the truck is licenced — which is about 20 percent of the cost of a licence, roughly 20 percent. Other agreements will probably be negotiated with other provinces but this one is complete.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. Mr. Turnbull moved second reading of Bill No. 58 — **An Act to amend the Secondary Education Act.**

He said: Bill No. 58 refers to the Secondary Education Act, Mr. Speaker, and the amendments before us concern themselves primarily with stating rate of salary schedule when no particular individual salary can be listed and gives the board authority to advertise by advertising a schedule rather than a particular salary.

It allows for some discretionary power on the part of the board in respect to granting leave of absence to teachers if they have served for less than seven years and the third part deals with giving high school boards the right to enter into agreements. This would be entering into agreements with the government of Canada, the government of Saskatchewan and other school jurisdictions.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move that Bill No. 58 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Turnbull that Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Secondary Education Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just direct one question to the minister. I think he stated that it also had some effect where a teacher had been employed for a period of less than seven years. Now what particular clause points that out. Would the Minister just explain?

Hon. Mr. Turnbull: — This is under clause Section . . .

Premier Lloyd: — Order! It seems to me that this is a statement that is out of order on second readings. It is a question which should be asked in committee, if I may so suggest.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the questions are details which could be asked in committee. If it was a question dealing with the principle of the bill it is a different thing and if the minister rose now to answer he would be closing the debate. Is the house ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

March 29, 1963

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill no. 70 — **An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading to Bill No. 70, I think all I need to say is that the intention of the bill is to allow the Court of Appeal a little more latitude in arranging and fixing the times of the sittings of the court at Saskatoon and Regina. The present Act requires a minimum of three sittings a year in each place. The court normally sits more frequently than that and by having to be bound by these sittings that are announced in advance of the beginning of the year, it makes it more difficult to fit in special sittings and I have the concurrence of the Law Society in both Saskatoon and Regina that this would in fact make for more convenient access to the Court of Appeal at both places if this is done, and this amendment has been arrived at as a result of discussions between myself and the Chief Justice.

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

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill No. 71 — **An Act to amend The Securities Act — 1954.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to The Securities Act are designed to give the Securities Commission the means and power of preventing certain practices which take advantage of a loophole for fraudulent stock promotion. The practices that I refer to are first of all, the practice of taking over the registration of one or more defunct companies and using the names on their shareholder lists as a sucker list for a further promotion. There is an exemption, Mr. Speaker, in The Securities Act, exempting from compliance in the Act any company selling shares or distributing shares to their own members. Now this has been used a device, not so much in Saskatchewan yet, but on a rather widespread basis across Canada in the last few months, of promoting doubtful or fraudulent ventures without having to file with the Securities Commission, without having to disclose a prospectus to the Securities Commission. And so it is proposed here to give the Securities Commission the power to exempt any particular promotion of this kind from the immunity which it presently enjoys. I may say further that this exemption

has resulted in a fairly widespread operation, almost patently fraudulent, extending from one side of the country to the other in connection with the formation of a finance company. And this is being done by buying up the charters of a number of finance companies and then just unloading these stocks on the lists of shareholders of these old defunct companies. Now this has caused so much anxiety among securities administrators across Canada that the securities administrators of one of the provinces saw fit to call a conference in Toronto last January, a month ago, to try to work out a formula to cope with this situation, and this amendment has been formulated to deal with that situation. The province that initiated the discussion was the province of Alberta. The Attorney General of Ontario, as far as I know, is the only one who has acted on this recommendation and they have amended their Act to conform with this proposal.

The second area that is proposed to be dealt with here is to limit the exemption which people have heretofore enjoyed in the sale of promissory notes for a term of less than 12 months. We had a little venture in Saskatchewan with promissory notes of less than 12 months, taking advantage of the exemption contained in the Act and selling some 140 or 150 thousand dollars worth of worthless paper to people in this province. Although the Securities Commission tried to forestall and prevent the operation from beginning, it was powerless to do so. It was not until the operation had reached a certain stage that it became demonstrable that it was fraudulent and then the Securities Commission did withdraw the exemption. It is now proposed to provide that in these operations regard must be had to the Securities Commission before they are undertaken and the Securities Commission may exempt them from compliance with the ordinary rules, or may require them to comply with the ordinary rules.

I say that these two stoppers in two loopholes are brought in with some degree of urgency and some sense of urgency. We had had in mind some fairly extensive amendments to the Securities Act but these are of some urgency and it was decided we should proceed with these this year rather than wait until another year when the act may be consolidated.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would move that 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. 73 — **An Act to amend The Community Planning Act, 1957.**

March 29, 1963

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill has to do with a couple of small amendments to The Community Planning Act with regard to powers of the interim development board. I think these are more easily considered in committee and I would therefore move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank moved second reading of Bill no. 74 – **An Act to amend Chapter 57 of the Statutes of 1962, being An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1957.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill just provides for the use of two licence plates on motor vehicles. I would move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank moved second reading of Bill no. 75 – **An Act to amend The Treasury Department Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill gives the treasury the power to purchase the bonds and debentures of the Economic Development Corporation, just the one amendment, and I would move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Meakes moved second reading of Bill no. 77 – **An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, really I think all the amendments are more or less minor, which I think could be dealt with better in committee. I might say that the amendments are being brought in, Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. There has been consultation with other interested bodies, the Wheat Pool and such, and they have been agreeable. I think with those remarks I would move second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I informed the Leader of the Opposition some time ago that the Lieutenant Governor is here to give assent to a number of bills that the legislature has passed. I therefore request that the house proceed to do whatever it has to do at this particular point and we return to second readings later.

His Honour entered the chamber, gave Royal Assent to certain bills presented to him, and retired from the chamber.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill no. 78 – **An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, The Legal Profession Act is one of those strange creatures that is half-way between a public bill and a private bill. It is a Professional Act, and yet it is a public bill because apparently the management of the legal profession is related to the administration of justice and therefore the activities of the profession are under the direct interest and notice of the Department of the Attorney General.

I am going to propose after moving that this bill be read a second time, if it carried, that it be referred to the committee on law amendments and delegated powers because the benchers have expressed a willingness to come before the committee and explain its purpose, and I would just therefore like to confine my remarks to a few brief comments on the purpose of the bill at this time.

The press I must say fell below its usual high standard of accuracy when it reported the effects and purpose of this bill. The purpose of the bill as outlined in the press really is something which the Legal Profession Act has always done. The only change there, is that the word ‘felony’ has been replaced by the words ‘indictable offence’ a more modern term. The effect is, I believe, substantially the same.

The real substance of the bill is contained in section 2. Section 2 permits the discipline committee to receive transcripts and documents, exhibits and so on from a court of record as evidence in a proceedings before the discipline committee. Hon. members who are members of the legal profession will know that Section 20 of the Evidence Act gives the courts the authority to accept into evidence transcripts and documents, judgements and orders, and so on emanating from any court of record or even magistrates’

March 29, 1963

courts as evidence. Section 20, however, only refers to such documents in any “action or proceeding”. Now the Law Society has expressed some anxiety as to whether or not a “proceeding” before the discipline committee is an “action or proceeding”. the discipline committee are very busy people and they don’t want to be in the position where, through some technicality, they might be required to sit for days or weeks or months hearing evidence on a disciplinary matter. So what is the reason for the proposal.

I may say further that the Law Society had indicated to me last July that they would wish to have some amendments made to the Act at this session. I heard nothing from them further until the end of February when a fairly lengthy submission was made. I had to advise the benchers at that time that I doubted very much whether it would be possible for the legislature to consider any very substantial amendments to the Act and so I declined to give any undertaking that it could be proceeded with. I understand the benchers then met again, or a committee of them at least — the whole group met I believe and they narrowed down their request to just this small amendment. They had hoped to have an amendment to their Act of quite some length but, as I say, in view of the lateness I had to advise them that it couldn’t possibly be proceeded with at this session, and indeed even this short bill was only barely possible to handle at this session by the draftsmen, and therefore, I am sure the benchers will tell you that they have other amendments in mind but which they were not pressing this year due to the lateness of their being formulated.

However, Mr. Speaker, members will have all kinds of opportunity to question the benchers about the terms of the bill on Monday, or whenever the law amendments committee meets, providing it passes second reading and my motion to refer it is adopted.

With these words, Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Mrs. M.J. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not at this time opposing this. I must say that the main principle of the bill, if it is embodied in section 2, is a little strange to be brought before us at the request of the benchers. I certainly think that the members of the committee, if not the entire house, should want to hear the explanation of the benchers before voting in favor of this bill in principle.

This is certainly a bothersome point. I hesitate to say very much since I am a member of the legal profession and naturally I have a great deal of respect for the governing body. I am a little amazed that they should submit a request of this kind. I think the hon. members will

realize that this is a rather extraordinary power because in essence what they are asking for is the right to examine or to take as evidence, (and this section doesn't specify what weight that evidence is to have, or anything else) but if this is approved the disciplinary committee will have the right to take as evidence transcripts of evidence heard in other courts in any action. There is no time limit on this, there is no limit — this isn't evidence that was given by the person that is appearing, by the lawyer that is appearing by the disciplinary committee, this could be evidence by Joe Blow who said that I was a murderer, in an action that had nothing to do with me, where I was not represented in court whatsoever. And this evidence could not be certified and brought before the disciplinary committee and used as evidence before them.

I certainly would hesitate very strongly before allowing any body of people to have this kind of power. The disciplinary committee should have a lot of power and I for one want to see the legal profession held in the highest esteem. I want us to be clean, I want our profession to be respected, and I realize the disciplinary committee must have the power to deal with barristers and solicitors who fall below those standards, but even more important, is that the law society should uphold those principles of justice that say that no man shall be accused except to his face and every man shall have the right to speak in his defence. This type of evidence could come and bring accusations before the disciplinary committee by a man who is not there to be subject to cross-examination. He could be dead, he could be gone and this is certainly a very wide power. I for one am very uneasy about this. I certainly would not vote in favor of this bill until we have had an opportunity to have an explanation from the benchers of the law society.

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

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would inform the house that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anyone else wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the point really here is not as to what weight might be given to the evidence but whether it is admissible at all. I am one who believes that the rules

March 29, 1963

of evidence in a judicial proceeding can afford to be quite loose if the person who is weighing the evidence is a person who is in a position to deal with it in a manner in which he is able to assess its weight.

It seems to me that most of our rules of evidence have come to us as a result of jury trials, where it is understood that a jury cannot be expected to assess the weight of evidence, and, therefore, you have to shield them from evidence which has very little weight. But with a body like the legal profession, it seems to me that no great harm results from having evidence before them which is extraneous and might be inadmissible in the ordinary sense of the word, because they are quite capable of assessing its weight.

Members will know that in a trial before a judge without a jury, the judges very frequently let evidence in which they say may or may not be admissible and they will assess the admissibility later on and in their final judgement they say, (sometimes they don't say) that they have excluded this bit of evidence from their considerations, or not.

And the courts of appeal habitually say that "Ah, well, it may or may not have been admissible, but surely the judge knows this, and if it is a marginal case, it may have been admissible or not, but he will give what weight to it that ought to be given." and in my view the legal profession, the governing body of the legal profession, is in the same position and I am not too disturbed if evidence may go before them, particularly where it is evidence which was gathered at a previous judicial proceeding of some kind, which may indeed be irrelevant and inadmissible, if this group, the ones who are going to assess it. I am sure that they are in a position to make the appropriate judgements, and if in fact it is extraneous to the issue, or if in fact it represents testimony that was not subjected to the rigors of cross-examination but not on behalf of this particular person, then I think they will make the appropriate judgments in that regard.

I can understand some of the misgivings of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), but as I say, in my own view, there is not very much to fear from having evidence of almost any kind put before a judicial tribunal, which is one which can appropriately assess the weight to be given to it.

Hon. R.A. Walker: — I recognize that —

Mr. Speaker: — I must inform the house that the mover is about to close the debate.

Mr. Walker: — Let me just add a word, Mr. Speaker. The law as it stands now, makes it perfectly clear that a court may accept such documents in evidence, they may accept these transcripts in evidence even though they are made from proceeding from which the person presently before the court was not in any way related or connected. And the person against whom they are admissible, may not have been there, may not have cross-examined and yet these documents are admissible as against him in a court.

Now I recognize that this is a power which you wouldn't ordinarily give to administrative boards, and non-judicial tribunals of one kind or another, but I think it has to be remembered that here there are first of all the members of the discipline committee are lawyers and are senior lawyers, and have a much seniority at the bar as judges have and are experienced and used to according what weight should be given to evidence that is put before them and there is just as much likelihood of them protecting the rights of persons before them, as there is for a court to do that, and this legislature has seen fit to give this power to the courts.

I can only say to the house that this has been asked for by the benchers, without any invitation from the government, and I think that for my part I don't hesitate to rely on the benchers and the disciplinary committee to use this with full regard for the protection of the individual and for the rights of accused persons. I have every confidence in the benchers and in the discipline committee that they will exercise these powers just as wisely and just as circumspectly as would the courts who now have this power.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Brown moved second reading of Bill no. 79 – **An Act to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act.**

He said: Well, Mr. Speaker, these two short amendments to the power corporation superannuation act, are exactly the same as those already passed with respect to the other superannuation acts, and I would move second readings.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

March 29, 1963

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved second reading of Bill no. 80 – **An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act, 1962.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Wascana Centre Act, 1962, and the bill really consists of a whole series of relatively small amendments to the Wascana Centre Act. Most of them are of a relatively technical nature, to correct defects in the original act, defects which have been realized to be such in the course of operations of the act. I would, I think, wish to deal with such matters as setting up a quorum, and provide that certain powers may be exercised by resolution and certain by by-laws.

I would like to draw the attention of the members to provisions which provide for the endorsement of the authority bylaws by the insertion of a provision which is very similar to the existing provisions in the City Act. This, to enable the traffic bylaws and bylaws of that nature which operate in Wascana Centre to be enforced in precisely the same way as the city bylaws which they complement.

There are a number of provisions, (you might say) making less rigid the financial arrangements between the government, the city and the university. The arrangements do not change the proportion of the expense to be borne by each of the bodies. They merely allow some of these expenses, which are to be shared in this way, to be lumped and rounded out, if this is acceptable to the three parties. The act as it stood provided for fairly detailed account to be kept with respect to a good number of things. Some of these clearly are best handled by rounding them out and we have made provisions whereby everybody agrees we can round some of these out. Similarly, we can, when sums are paid, we can pay some of them in advance in order that the financial affairs of the Authority may be operated with a little more ease than was contemplated by the original statute, although, I would point out that there is no change in principle.

There is one other section which does represent a change in principle, that I ought refer, I think, to hon. members, and this is one where dealing with the borrowing powers of the authorities. This is a provision which permits the Lieutenant-Governor-In-Council to guarantee borrowings of the Authority, and provides for what is in effect a re-guarantee by the city of Regina, of their appropriate percentage of the borrowings. It may be noted that the government has assumed responsibility for its share and for the university's share, and the city assumes responsibility for its share. Slight changes are also provided in policing power, and some other very minor provisions of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have dealt with all of the points of principle, which are raised in the act, the other matters might more easily be dealt with in committee. Mr. Speaker, much as I would like to treat the house to a long

address on the virtues of Wascana Centre, I will forego that pleasure and move that the said bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved second reading of Bill no. 81 – **An Act to Provide for Financial Assistance to Certain Persons Engaged in Medical Studies.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill, a relatively short bill, as you have noted, in seeing it on their desks, dealing with the medical scholarships and bursaries, which were referred to in the speech from the throne, and also in the budget address, perhaps they were just in the budget address. I'll correct myself, Mr. Speaker, and say that they were referred to in the address of the Provincial Treasurer, the budget address.

The act provides for the Medical Care Insurance Commission entering into arrangements with the university, to provide scholarships and bursaries and also to provide for certain sums toward the costs of short courses, refresher courses and like educational courses. The import of the act is to provide that scholarships will be sums paid to students at the University of Saskatchewan, on the basis of the quality of their academic work. Bursaries will be sums paid to students at the university and elsewhere, they may be at another university, having regard to their expressed willingness to provide services in Saskatchewan at some future time. This is the ordinary service component of a bursary, Mr. Speaker. The act goes on to provide that the scholarships, Saskatchewan medical scholarships, and Saskatchewan medical bursaries — it provides that the commission make rules and regulations dealing with the provision of the scholarships and bursaries and puts a limit of expenditure of \$150,000 for these purposes in any one year.

This, I think deals with all of the matters contained in the bill, Mr. Speaker, and with that explanation, I would move that the said bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank,

That pursuant to provision of standing order 33, that when this house adjourns today, it will stand adjourned until 2:30 p.m. on Monday, April 1st, 1963.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.