

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session – Fourteenth Legislature**  
**33rd Day**

**Monday, April 1, 1963.**

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mrs. J.E. Cooper** (Regina City): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to call the attention of the members of the assembly to a fine group of students in the Speaker's gallery. They are students from the Bosco St. Johns High School in Regina. They are Grade 12 students. They have with them their teacher, Sister Catherine. I am sure you will all wish to welcome them and hope that they will have a pleasant afternoon with us and enjoy their visit to the legislature.

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. D. Boldt** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to introduce and welcome a fine group of students from the Dalmeny Public School under the supervision of Mr. Thiessen and Mr. Cron. I am sure that all members will wish their stay here to be a pleasant one.

**TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE RE VETERINARY COLLEGE**

**Mr. J.E. Snedker**: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to once again ask the government when we may expect the tabling of the correspondence relative to the establishment of a veterinary college agreed to by motion of this house on February 21st last.

**Premier Lloyd**: — Mr. Speaker, members will recall that this was a

**April 1, 1963**

motion which required the consent of the people who may have written to the government with regard to this. My information is that while consent has been sought from each of these individuals or organizations, consent has not yet been obtained, and we of course are unable to table the documents until such time as we do have that consent.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that an agreement in principle was reached between officials of his department, the medical care commission and the radiologists and pathologists, why has the government still refused to sign an agreement which would bring these physicians under the Saskatoon agreement?

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I think my answer would have to be that the hon. member knows well that it is quite improper for him to assert facts in the course of answering a question, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when the facts are not facts.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — Newspaper reports . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney** (Minister of Health): — Newspaper reports. And I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, and I am answering that this is not a fact and I venture to think it has not appear in any newspaper as a fact. But my answer is, no such agreement has been arrived at by officials of the Department of Public Health with representatives of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, or representatives of the radiologists and pathologists, and may I assure the house that when an agreement is arrived at between the officials, which is concurred in by the government, an agreement as soon as possible will be reached.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — May I ask a supplementary question? Is the minister, or is departmental official still in the process of negotiating with these people:

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — The answer is Yes.

### RETURN NO. 58

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane** (Qu'appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the government when we can expect an answer to Return No. 58, dated March 11.

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, it is a little difficult to give an answer immediately on this, I say it is difficult to give an answer on a specific one immediately without some looking as to see what is involved. I may say that the attention of all departments to unanswered returns was drawn in the course of last week and they were asked to do everything possible to speed up the information in regard to all returns. It will be down as soon as possible.

### RESOLUTION NO. 9

**Premier Lloyd**: — Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity earlier today to discuss with the member from Moosomin the procedure with regard to his motion which is Resolution No. 9. I understand that he is prepared to proceed with it and if the house would agree, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to proceed directly to Motions – I would venture the hope that when we have disposed of it we would then also get leave to return to Government Orders in the usual way.

### WITHDRAWAL OF ESTIMATES

Mr. A.H. McDonald, (Moosomin) moved:

That the estimates and supplementary estimates submitted to this house on March 1, 1963, be withdrawn and resubmitted in a form consistent with the established parliamentary financial procedures.

He said: — Mr. Speaker, my purpose in placing this motion on the order paper and in introducing this motion at this time was to bring what I consider to be a practice that is not normal to the attention of this house in the hope that the house, in their wisdom, would decide to make some changes before we proceed with estimates and supplementary estimates

In preparing my remarks I could have dealt with many items that appear in the supplementary estimates

**April 1, 1963**

which I contend are not proper supplementary estimates for the fiscal year 1962-63, but should rather appear in the estimates for 1963-64, or should be a supplementary to estimates of 1963-64. But I think, Mr. Speaker, if one is to refer to many items they are more liable to confuse the issue before the house than if they restrict their remarks to one particular vote in the supplementary estimates. Therefore it has been my decision to base my remarks chiefly on one vote in the supplementary estimates, and, of course, that is the vote that we have discussed previously in supplementary estimates and we discussed on Friday last during the discussion of a particular bill in committee of the whole and given third reading Friday last. And, of course, that is the so-called supplementary estimates of \$2 million to provide a grant for the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation for industrial assistance grants which appear in the supplementary estimates which were tabled after the budget speech.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very technical problem and I will attempt to deal with it in a technical way. I have no desire to say some things that might cause me to be ejected from the house but this is a difficult problem to deal with in any language and remain within the parliamentary rules of this house. Therefore, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow my notes very closely, and I hope I will not be accused of reading because this is a technical matter and I will be quoting to some extent.

There is nothing in British parliamentary practice that is more important than the control of expenditures of government by the elected representatives of our people. Much of the controversy with regard to the reign of the Stuart Kings in England revolved around this particular matter. As a matter of fact, if members will think back for a moment they will realize that in days gone by people have been beheaded for attempting some of the things that I think are similar to what we are attempting to do in this house at the moment.

To protect and preserve this fundamental right of the legislative body there has developed a set of definite and well-defined principles of procedure. And again, Mr. Speaker, in handling of the finances of our legislature, of our parliament, there are procedures laid down by people who have been considered to be authorities, just the same as there are other procedures that have been laid down with all activities in parliament. And of course we accept the writings of Bourinot, Beauchesne and May as accepted authorities on parliamentary procedure, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Durell is the accepted authority on financial procedure. I do not mean by that that any of the three former mentioned, Bourinot, Beauchesne, or May, do not deal with financial procedures, but I suggest to you that all people who have written on this matter since

Durell, have used his work as a basis for their particular work. I have in front of me Mr. Durell's book, another one 'An Encyclopaedia on Parliament' written by Norman Wilding and Philip Landry, 'The Public Purse', 'A Study of Canada Democracy', 'Parliament at Work', and so on and so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, I find that in each instance, the writer has based his work on the book that was written by Mr. Durell. I want to suggest that to deviate from proper financial procedure risks an impairment of the legislature's most valuable prerogative. In other words, if we are to deviate from the proper procedure of dealing with financial matters in this house, then we have destroyed the most valuable prerogative of this house, and that is to deal with the money that is collected and at the disposal of this legislature.

The purposes of supplementary estimates are very clearly defined by Mr. Durell, and in this book 'Parliamentary Grants' on page 47, where he refers to supplementary estimates, he defines the proper use of supplementary estimates, and I would refer all members to page 47 of this particular book 'Parliamentary Grants' by Mr. Durell.

He outlines what supplementary estimates are meant for, and I want to quote,

No. 1 For a further grant to service already sanctioned and voted for, or

No. 2 For a grant for a further occasion of expenditure arising since the estimates were presented,

(a) for expenditures newly imposed on the executive by statute,

(b) to meet an unexpected emergency.

And I think (a) of 2, deals with the vote that is now in question; "further expenditures newly imposed on the executive by statute".

Now, last Friday this house imposed a new expenditure on the government by passing a certain statute, and in order for that expenditure to be made under that statute then there should be either in the estimates that are now before the house for this fiscal year, or in supplementary estimates for the fiscal year 1963-64, money made available for this corporation to spend, and there is no precedent, there is no parliamentarian who has ever authorized the type of expenditure that now appears in the supplementary estimates that are before this house.

I want to go on and quote further from Mr. Durell, and he is referring again to supplementary estimates.

**April 1, 1963**

When treated as customary and as a matter of course, instead of being restricted to occasions of unforeseen contingency, supplementary estimates do more to destroy effective control in parliament than any other indirect method that could be devised.

I don't think anything could be more clear, Mr. Speaker. Durell has pointed out that no method could be devised to destroy the control of this legislature over expenses than the method which has been adopted by the government on this occasion.

I want to refer members to page 49 of the same document, and I quote further from Durell, when he is referring to revenues that exceed the estimates of the year previous, and I quote,

The fact that circumstances often unexpectedly increase the revenue since the estimates were made does not in itself justify supplementary estimates. The surplus should be treated in the recognized manner and be taken in the diminution of the national debt."

Again, Mr. Speaker, what could be more clear. Mr. Durell has told us that if revenues exceed the estimates, this does not in itself mean that it can be spent through supplementary estimates. I indicated a moment ago to the house his interpretation of what you can do and cannot do with supplementary estimates. Here he has told us again that supplementary estimates cannot be brought in for the sole purpose of getting rid of a surplus that appeared the year before. In fact he has told us that surpluses should be used to decrease the public debt, and I agree with him, and I will say more about that later on.

Again, in the work of Mr. Norman Ward, in 'The Public Purse' he has some remarks with regard to this particular matter, and I would like to quote from his works, and I am quoting,

Like supplementary estimates, interim supply and Governor-General warrants could if improperly used almost destroy parliament control.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what the supplementary estimates are doing on this occasion – they are destroying the control of this house on the expenditure of public money.

The supplementary estimates placed before the legislature in this session introduce a serious departure from proper procedure. We were asked to vote \$2 million to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation before the Act establishing the corporation had been passed by the

legislature. Mr. Speaker, this house will recall that the estimates in question was placed before the committee of this house before the act had ever been passed. And I noted on Friday last that my friends opposite seemed to be gleeful because they were making some progress in trying to justify the wrong that they had committed a few days previously.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way that this house can justify the actions that they took in endeavoring to pass this supplementary allowance. It would be as responsible to say that if a bank robber was caught in the act of robbing a bank, and didn't get any money, that he wasn't guilty of robbing the bank. In attempted robbery, that person is just as guilty as if he had got the money.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher:** — That's what the socialists did . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — It appears quite clear that this \$2 million is to be used by the corporation in the fiscal year 1963-64, and not in the fiscal year 1962-63.

You will recall that when this bill was in committee, not you, Mr. Speaker, but the members of this house will recall that when this bill was in committee of the whole on Friday last, the Leader of the Opposition asked the minister what money would be available for the corporation in the coming year. The minister answered that he hoped that the \$2 million in supplementary estimates for the fiscal year 1962-63 would be available. In other words, the minister informed the house that the \$2 million had not been spent and if passed by the legislature would be available for the fiscal year 1963-64.

The corporation was established two days before the end of the fiscal year 1962-63. The two remaining days were Saturday and Sunday. Government offices, to my knowledge, are closed on Saturday and I hope they are closed on Sunday, in addition to the fact that Sunday is not a legal day to conduct business. The whole of this appropriation of \$2 million should, therefore, have been included in the estimates or the supplementary estimates for the year 1963-64, and not in the supplementary estimates for 1962-63. And I want to repeat here, Mr. Speaker, things that I said at the beginning of my remarks. This is not the only item in the supplementary estimates that is wrongfully placed, in my opinion. But I want to repeat that it isn't my intention to deal with every issue in the supplementary allowance, I am only going to deal with the one, because if you are wrong on this score you are wrong with many, many millions of dollars that appeared in supplementary estimates.

**April 1, 1963**

In the estimates that were tabled for the fiscal year 1963-64, there is included a small amount of \$25,000 for the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, and this vote, according to the estimates, is for administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, why on earth would this legislature set up an Economic Development Corporation and ask themselves to vote \$25,000 for administration but not a dollar to be spent in carrying out the work which the legislation intends this corporation to do. It is obvious that this supplementary vote for 1962-63 year ought to either be in the estimates and be included with the \$25,000, or this house should bring in a supplementary estimate to the main estimates for the year 1963-64. Not only for this item but for other items as well.

For some reason the government declined to disclose the sum of \$2 million to be spent in the fiscal year 1963-64, and have included it as I mentioned a moment ago in the supplementary of last year. This appears to be utterly unwarranted and a departure from procedures governing supplementary estimates. We have asked for an explanation and we have got none. The normal, proper and easily understood procedure would have been to pass the legislation authorizing the corporation to make expenditures and then to vote money in the appropriations of this fiscal year – a year which starts today. Why does the government depart from the obvious proper course, I don't know. What is the motive behind this strange and unprecedented procedure? Again, I don't know. The Leader of the Opposition said the procedure was dishonest. Well, Mr. Speaker, what adjective would you use to describe it?

**An Hon. Member:** — Crooked.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The hon. member for Gravelbourg, (Mr. Coderre) said the action of the government was fraudulent. Can you think of a better word which describes this action? Which would more appropriately describe this action, than either of the words used by the member for Gravelbourg or the Leader of the Opposition?

I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I have no desire to use unparliamentary language but it is most difficult to deal with a procedure that you know is wrong and to keep within the confines of parliamentary language. In fact what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the government have been caught with their fingers in the cookie jar. This reminds me of the story which was often told by a former premier of this province when he referred to the skunk in the chicken coop. Well, I suggest to you that the opposition has caught the skunk in the chicken coop and they have a \$2 million rooster over in the corner. When the Provincial Treasurer presented his budget to this house he referred to



the budget as a warm budget. Well, I would like to suggest to you that if the budget was warm the supplementary estimates were hot. Mr. Speaker, the action of the government is unexplained and apparently inexplicable. It is unwarranted and unnecessary. It is a departure from accepted precedence and proper practice. Therefore, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Thatcher, the member for Morse,

That the estimates and supplementary estimates submitted to this house on March 1st, 1963, be withdrawn and resubmitted in a form consistent with established parliamentary financial procedure.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank** (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I have a very considerable degree of admiration for the hon. member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald). I think he is the most adept at making a good story out of a bad case of any of the members sitting on the opposition. I also admire his ability as a parliamentarian because he can come right close along beside the edge without getting into trouble with the rules. I can't help but admire him for these two things.

Now this motion that the hon. member has moved, of course, is nothing else but a pure non-confidence motion dressed up with some fancy paper ribbon, and that is all that this motion is. The hon. members opposite could not bring themselves to vote against some of the things that are in estimates so they had to find some way in which they could enable themselves to register a vote against the government and this motion is the device.

Now I want to say a word or two about the supremacy of the House of Commons, or in our case the legislature, in regard to expenditures of money. This was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. He was right when he said this was one of the questions over which there was a great deal of struggle. And it was a long time and after a great struggle before the House of Commons won the right to control the public purse. And the situation is now, Mr. Speaker, that all expenditures made by the government must at some time be authorized by the legislature. This rule we do honor too. We have followed this rule and the only case I know of in the province of Saskatchewan where a government tried to evade this rule and to make expenditures without the approval of the legislature was back in 1917 when C.A. Dunning was Provincial Treasurer and Chairman of the Treasury Board. They passed this order of the treasury board,

**April 1, 1963**

The Provincial Treasurer at his discretion shall set aside out of the appropriations affected such sum as shall represent the amount of liabilities showing in the books of the Treasury Department at the close of the fiscal year. The said sum shall be deposited in the Treasury Department suspense account, out of which account the monies shall be withdrawn from time to time as vouchers are presented for payment.

This order was passed on the 18th of April 1917, I should have said 1918. Then there is a second clause to it:

Inasmuch as the liabilities incurred are estimated the following procedure shall be followed:

(a) in the case of underestimate, the appropriation for the succeeding fiscal year shall be charged with the same;

(b) in the case of overestimate, the surplus funds at credit in the Treasury Department suspense account shall be deposited to the credit of the departmental revenue account under the heading 'casual revenue'.

If they had been able to use this treasury board order for making payments there would have been payments made which the legislature at no session had any chance to authorize. Obviously they were caught out because the order was rescinded three weeks later on May 9th. I presume that the Provincial Auditor told them that this wasn't legal to do it this way.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson** (Arm River): — What the did the Provincial Auditor tell you?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — This is the only government that I know of in the province of Saskatchewan that has ever tried to get past the legislature, make expenditures, and not have them at any time approved by the legislature. Now, there is one well-accepted practice, in regard to expenditure, where money can be paid before it is dealt with by the legislature and that is in the case of Lieutenant-Governor's warrants, or special warrants as they are sometimes called, and this is authorized under section 51 of the Treasury Department Act. But expenditures made under the authority of special warrants, must subsequently be approved by the legislature.

The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) has quoted form Durell as one of the authorities, and I have all the

respect in the world for the authorities, but I would point out that legislature and parliament in regard to the expenditure of money by the government are supreme, and though we should pay attention to the expressions of the authorities and Durell is not all on the side of the member from Moosomin, by any means. Neither the House of Commons nor the legislature in this regard should be put in a straight jacket; the important thing is that all expenditures must come to these legislatures for approval, even if they are previously spent by special warrant. But I have read the books too, and I find that in the books the greatest emphasis is being put on the use of special warrants. Special warrants in our Treasury Department Act, are only to be used for certain purposes, and Durell says this

Since no expenditure can legally be incurred for which parliamentary provision cannot be made, (this is on page 50, if you want it) the taking of a supplementary estimate should in theory precede all excess expenditure on a civil vote, or on a gross army and navy vote respectively. In practice this is not always possible, it is, however, eminently desirable to do so whenever practicable, as when once the payment has been made or the department committed to payment (and listen to this) parliament is obviously hampered in its decision as to the expediency of such payment.”

In other words, parliament is confronted with a fait accompli . . .

**Mr. McCarthy** (Cannington): — What is he talking about?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and this cannot be avoided at times in regard to emergency questions. This is not the case in the vote referred to by the member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald). This legislature at this session had not only to deal with the vote of \$2 million for grants to new industries in the province of Saskatchewan, but also had to deal with the legislation setting up the act to constitute this corporation, and anybody who can infer that anybody was caught with their fingers in the cookie jar, or was trying to get away with something, without the approval of the legislature, is completely ridiculous . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . because the whole thing was brought here, both the bill and the vote of \$2 million and is completely in the hands of this legislature and if the members of this

**April 1, 1963**

legislature don't want to vote \$2 million for grants . . .

**Mr. D. Stuart** (Prince Albert): — Talk yourself out of it . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . to industry in the province of Saskatchewan, let them when the proper time comes stand up and say so . . .

**Mr. McDougall** (Souris-Estevan): — You are doing . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There is no need for the members of the opposition to try to hide themselves by this means. It will not hide them.

Now supplementary estimates have legitimate uses for many purposes. First of all they are used to confirm and approve special warrants. They are used to authorize expenditures not covered by the previous estimates and not covered by a special warrant either. Because you can have an emergency where money has to be spent, the house may be in session, the money may be spent, you can't issue a special warrant, it has got to wait for the approval of the legislature. Supplementary estimates are commonly used for new services, or new programs which are adopted during a year, and the theory which some support, that the budget and the estimates which are introduced at the beginning of the fiscal year are the last word in regard to that year, is not good ground, because the budget is a forecast, the estimates are estimates of what will be required and the revenue estimates are what the revenue will be.

And it is obvious that if governments and legislatures want to make progress they will on some occasions want to adopt new programs, and I will give my hon. friends some good examples of that before I sit down. Another use of supplementary estimates is for new services which are emergent in character when there is no legislative authority for them at all, and no special warrants, of course, are issued in such cases. And when this is the case, Mr. Speaker, in the case of new services or programs which haven't got legislative authority, with or without special warrants, and new services even if they are emergent in character, when there is no legislative authority exists, with or without special warrants; and in these cases, the working of the appropriation bill must be such as to give the necessary authority, and that is exactly the situation in a number of instances in regard to the supplementary estimates which are now before this house.

The Treasury Department Act, section 49, reads as follows, the first part of the section:

All estimates submitted to the legislative assembly shall be for services coming in course of payment during the fiscal year, or during such other period as the estimates may expressly purport to cover.

and that clause comes from the revised statutes of 1940, probably it was in existence for many years before that. This legislature contemplated a situation where the legislature would vote money in regard to a period of time which did not coincide with the fiscal year, because it said “or during such as other period as the estimates may expressly purport to cover”, so that this insofar as the legislation is concerned, this is really nothing new at all . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Will you permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, sure.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Are you referring to estimates or to supplementary estimates in the document that you now read from?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The act says estimates, and the act refers to estimates and this includes all estimates, unless it is specifically indicated that it is only supplementaries that we are speaking about, but this is estimates, and that includes all estimates that are introduced in the house. Now, I said, in regard to the period of time and the special authority in the appropriation act, take for example a vote in regard to the veterinary college – and the resolution for the committee of supply which will be included in the appropriation bill, will read like this:

To provide for grants to the University of Saskatchewan, construction of a veterinary college, including authority (and get this, Mr. Speaker) notwithstanding any thing in section 57 of the Treasury Department Act, to charge the payment to the fiscal year ending on the 31st day of March, 1963.

Now this will be the choice of the legislature, if the legislature doesn't want to pass this vote, they can turn it down; if they want to amend it, charge it to some

**April 1, 1963**

other fiscal year, they can do that too. This is all in the hands of the legislature. And in regard to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, the \$2 million vote will read like this:

For industrial assistance grants, including authority notwithstanding anything in section 57 of the Treasury Department Act, to charge the payment to the fiscal year ending on March 31st, 1963, and to hold the monies in suspense until the act establishing the said corporation becomes effective, and the members of the board have been appointed.

And the item is \$2 million.

Now this was what the former Liberal government illegally tried to do by a treasury board order. We are bringing the whole thing before the legislature for their approval.

The appropriation bill, Mr. Speaker, of course, does impose conditions on certain votes as you would hear from what I read, and if you look up the appropriation bill you will find that there is certain votes in there, for example, a vote to the local improvement districts, a grant to the local improvement district, for example, the vote for winter works, the vote to the municipal road assistance authority, and they all read "on such terms and conditions as may be laid down by the Lt.-Governor in Council." This is a common practice that is done on many occasions. Now some examples that we have, 1954-55 supplementary estimates, there was a vote grant to the City of Regina, Buffalo Pound project, \$325,000. Now the same poor case could be made in regard to that, as the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) made today. In 1962-63 our supplementary estimates, the ones before us, we have the grant to the municipal road assistance authority to advance pay to municipalities nearly \$1 1/4 million. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the opposition couldn't afford to get up and vote against these items, but they don't like them being done. This is the situation.

Now, we go back for another example to 1943-44 supplementary estimates. My hon. friend and I were in the house at that time and in the supplementary estimates there was an item "roads and bridges" \$650,000; that was a lot of money in those days too, Mr. Speaker, nothing wrong with that;

**Mr. Danielson:** — Be honest and say . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — This wasn't a vote for relief, Mr. Speaker, this was a vote for "roads and bridges", and then there was another vote for pensions, \$554,000. Well, this may embarrass my hon. friend, but, of course, everybody knows what they were there for, this was — they had already gone over five years, over their full term, and so they had to have an election pretty soon, they were getting ready for it but it just didn't do them any good.

Now, supplementary estimates may be properly submitted and all of this can be substantiated from the same authority as the member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald), was quoting, from Durell. "For a further grant for a service already sanctioned and voted," no question about that. That is exactly what the hon. member read, and "for a grant for a further occasion of expenditure arising since the estimates were presented, (a) For an expenditure newly imposed on the executive by statute" and when this act, and it is now passed, and it has the royal assent, so a new expenditure has been imposed on the executive by the passing of this act now. So it fits this picture exactly.

**Mr. McDougall:** — Pretty weak . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — This isn't weak; this is a fact. That is the trouble with my hon. friends. The last thing they want is to be confused by the facts, they have got their minds already made up. Let's take a look at these — at the first case: a further grant to a service already sanctioned and voted for, and of these supplementaries before us, \$7.9 million are in this class. A further grant to a service already sanctioned and voted for.

And then look at the second case, a grant for further occasion of expenditures arising since the estimates were presented, for expenditure newly imposed on the executive by statute. And of the \$14.7 million supplementary estimates, \$3 million is for new services which the legislature is establishing by special statute in the current session. \$2.9 million is for services which might be considered to have general statutory authority, and I think could have probably been handled by a special warrant and handled a month or two months ago, but we don't believe in using special warrants and spending the money before it is voted by the legislature if it can possibly be avoided, because as I quoted from the authority this does put the legislature in a position where it would be difficult for them to turn the expenditure when it

**April 1, 1963**

had already been made. But we would much prefer that we get the specific authority for these expenditures from the legislature.

Now, I think a lot of confusion has arisen in the minds of the members because we have been for the last while close to the end of the fiscal year. But remember we are still close to the end of the fiscal year, a few hours past it. I wish my hon. friends wouldn't contradict me unless I am really wrong. But remember, Mr. Speaker, parliament in Saskatchewan, or legislature in Saskatchewan, through custom has been meeting about six weeks or seven weeks before the end of the fiscal year, and years ago when the fiscal year end was April 30th, we didn't run into this situation, because I think without exception the session was over before the end of the fiscal year. But I don't think the fact that we are at the end of the fiscal year should have any effect on the situation, and should be a controlling factor as to when the legislature has to meet. The fact is that the new legislation and the notice of these special votes that we are talking about, and particularly this one, they have all been noted right at the opening of the session, further detail was given on them when the budget was introduced two weeks later and the estimates were tabled at that time in the house. And so I think it can be said that we did proceed with all convenient speed, insofar as the house was concerned, to bring these matters to the legislature and to get authority for that, because we believe in the supremacy of the legislature, the right of the legislature, to deal with the questions, so no one can say that we made, that anything was done to either hide anything or to spend any money which was not either going to be, or had been approved by the legislature, and Durell says "it is appropriate to submit supplementary estimates for expenditures newly imposed on the executive by statute.

Now, let's look at what the alternative might have been. We could have instead of having \$14 million supplementary estimates, had only \$3 or \$4 million supplementary estimates, and ended up with a huge surplus of someplace between \$15 and \$20 millions this year. That could have been done, that surplus could not according to proper parliamentary procedure be carried into the next year as revenue. They do that in Manitoba, but I don't think that is the right way to do it. I think that is misleading, to carry surpluses as revenue in the next year.

Now, there a number good things, and everybody admits they are good things, that could be done. And if we were going to do as has been suggested by some of the members of the opposition, put into the budget for the coming fiscal year this vote that is discussed by the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) \$2 million, a million dollars for the veterinary college, a million dollars for the public administration foundation, and some of those other things, we would have been budgeting for a deficit in the coming fiscal year of anywhere from \$10 million up.



Now, I don't know maybe that would make my hon. friends happy, if we were budgeting for a deficit of \$10 or \$15 million dollars.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if we could not have spent this money out of the surplus in the 1962-63 fiscal year for these good things, we would not be spending it at all, because I don't . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — What a calamity.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** —The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) laughs, and he says what a calamity. It is obvious that it would be no calamity as far as he is concerned, Mr. Speaker, if there never was a veterinary college; he doesn't care. Mr. Speaker, I don't think this legislature, and I certainly am sure that this government would not have liked and would not have introduced a budget to this house under the present circumstances, with a deficit of \$10 or \$15 million. We would not have got these things.

You know there are people when they get a windfall, they hide it away, they put it away, they don't do anything with it, and most of these people, Mr. Speaker, are ultimately found dead of starvation in a shack, with a \$100 thousand buried under the floor. We believe that the money which belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, the revenue of this government should be spent for good and useful purposes. My hon. friends object – can object if they like. Now, I am not going to be able to convince my hon. friends that these are good programs and that they should vote for them.

**An Hon. Member:** — It has nothing to do with the programs.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Oh, yes, it has, because I know very well, Mr. Speaker, that if we had started out to include all of these programs in the budget for the fiscal year 1963-64, showing a deficit of between \$15 and \$20 million, I know the screams that we would have heard from the opposition. They wouldn't have supported that budget any more than they support this one, as a matter of fact you can't win with them anyway because they are opposed to all these things, they have already put them on record as voting against them.

**Some Hon. Members** — Hear! Hear!

**April 1, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no question of breach of this very important principle of legislative control of the public purse. The whole thing is brought to the legislature and submitted to them for their approval, they can vote it down, they can pass it, as they like, but don't try to make something of it that actually isn't there.

Now, I would like to deal with one or two other examples which are down in history, a bill assented to in the House of Commons in Ottawa, on April 18, 1962, that was a Conservative government then, wasn't it? And it was The Appropriation Act No. 4, (I wouldn't be surprised if it was going to be our government) (yours and mine, after the 8th,).

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We don't want . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, I hope not, but it could be worse, after the 8th, we could have the Liberals, but there is no danger of that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! There is far too much cross fire here, I think this debate deserves a little more seriousness.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriation bill said this:

Notwithstanding the provision of the Financial Administration Act, the Financial Administration Act, the accounts appropriated by this act, may be paid at any time on or before the 30th day of April, 1962, and such payments shall be deemed to have been made in and chargeable to the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962.

That was chapter 23, assented to April 18th, 1962. Here is another one, Chapter 22, assented to the 6th of September, 1958, and this act may be cited as a Special Appropriation Act, 1958. It says the amount paid or applied under the authority of this act shall be recorded in the accounts of Canada as transactions of the 1957-58 fiscal year.

The provisions of each item in the schedule shall be deemed to have been enacted by parliament on the 1st day of April, 1957. And this was assented to on the 6th of September, 1958, parliament was saying it is just the same as if this had been enacted by parliament on the 1st day of April, 1957, 18 months before.

Now, that is two, here is another one, this one was assented to on March 31st, 1955. Our government was in power then, the government of all the Canadians, a Liberal government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Nothing wrong with that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And it reads:

To provide for a contribution to the government of the province of Ontario for assistance in meeting costs resulting from floods arising out of Hurricane Hazel on October 15 and 16, 1954, and to authorize (listen) notwithstanding section 35 of the Finance Administration Act, the making of payments under this vote up to May 31, 1955.

Their fiscal year ended March 31st, and on March 31st, that day, the House of Commons passed a bill authorizing for this purpose the extension of that fiscal year by two months, and this means that this account could be paid anything up to the 31 of May, 1955, so all this argument . . .

**Mr. McCarthy** (Cannington): — . . . In an emergency . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — If the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) will just keep his finger wiggling and keep quiet we will get along better. Now all of this talk about the end of the fiscal year, and about the question of extending the time in which payment can be made in regard to the 1962-63 accounts, all this talk is really just so much nonsense. This has been done by legislatures and parliaments all over Canada and will undoubtedly continue to be done, and I will give my hon. friends some more illustrations of supplementary estimates.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I'm sure will appreciate this. Now here is a good one – in the province of Quebec.

**April 1, 1963**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Give us a good one . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — In the province of Quebec, in the year, fiscal year 1960-61, their main estimates total \$392 million. Remember all the cheering on the 22nd of June, 1960, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal government got elected in Quebec, well, I was even happy in that case, I thought that was an improvement over the previous government, and my hon. friends were happy.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Same thing in Saskatchewan . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, do you know, Mr. Speaker, that good Liberal government passed supplementary estimates totalling \$93 million in Quebec. This is equal to almost 24 per cent of the original appropriation . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — What you say . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — This is the double standard that my hon. friend goes by. Included in the Quebec supplementary expenditures was the amount of \$15.4 million for education. Now this was something new that had come up over night, surely, of course, it was a new program in regard to education. They had education there long before that, this was an increase of 25 per cent over their original appropriation. \$15.2 million was for school grants, there was a \$12.7 million increase for social welfare, an increase of 20 per cent over the original estimate. An increase of \$31.6 million for public health, and this, Mr. Speaker, was absolutely a new program. They had got around to putting into effect the hospitalization plan, and this was a new program introduced by the new government, elected on the 22nd of June, 1960, and they came to the legislature of the province of Quebec with legislation and with estimates to cover this new program, exactly the same as is being done here. My hon. friend from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald), is like the hon. member for Arm River, he has two standards too, one for Liberals and another for everybody else. Now, I wonder what he says about the Liberal treasury board back in 1918, trying to get away with spending money without taking it to the legislature

at all. I guess that is all right too.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner** (Melville): — Sure it was . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — No, we didn't even try that . . .

**Mr. Danielson**: — Same as you did . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — No, we didn't even try that, they tried it and got caught. Now there was an increase of \$3.6 million for mines, and this was over 50 percent of the original estimate in the Department of Mines; most of this was for construction of roads and bridges. The Department of Mines in the province of Quebec carries on the business of constructing mining roads, and that is what this estimate was for. So there is plenty of precedent, for what we are doing today, and I think what is really troubling the opposition is that there has been a surplus, there is a surplus at this end of the fiscal year.

**Mr. Danielson**: — You haven't mentioned one . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank**: — And I want to put it on record how the surplus rose. The consumption taxes because of good conditions, good economic conditions, a bumper crop, brought in \$5.9 million more than was estimated. The oil business, capacity oil production and increased bonus bids on crown lands, a little over \$5 million, more than was estimated.

The rise in the gross national product affected our payments under the tax sharing arrangement, under the current arrangement, to the extent of \$2.8 million, and under the adjustment of the previous five year agreement of \$4.2 million. Then there were the receipts from agriculture shared costs programs, my friend the Minister of Agriculture, made better progress than we thought he would, and he got more of the shared costs refunded from the federal government to the extent of \$1 million, I hope he will do that again this year. And then there were minor other small revenue increases of a million dollars making a total of \$20 million over the estimated revenue.

Now, how was it disposed of. Well, first of all

**April 1, 1963**

there was the estimated deficit of \$2.4 million which had to be covered. The unusually long construction season meant over expenditure on a number of projects, highways, buildings, projects, and so forth, agriculture, water and sewage grants, municipal road assistance, and grants to hospitals of \$4.1 million. No one would argue with those. They are all very good, and they all said they paid, and I hope this legislature will vote those estimates, approve them so they can be paid. Then there was special new projects which includes such grants as SEDCO, the public administration foundation, veterinary college, Saskatchewan diamond jubilee, and Canadian centennial committee of a quarter of a million, Wascana Centre, \$1.5 million, and the Fathers of Confederation memorial a \$138,000 making another \$5.9 million.

Then there were uncontrollable overexpenditures, maintenance of buildings, emergency fodder assistance, etc., etc., \$3.5 million. Things which actually could have been left off but I don't see the advantages of leaving them off, certain items of equipment, including some vehicles, purchased out of 1962-63 estimates, which could have been put off, and you would think that this was most of the \$14 million, it was actually about \$400 thousand and the other minor increases \$800 thousand and then there were under expenditures in some votes, which will be refunded to treasury of \$3.3 million, take that off the \$14.7 million total and it looks like we will have a surplus at the end of the year of (when the figures are all in) of someplace around \$6 million. I said over \$5 million before, it looks like \$6 million of a surplus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after reading the budget speech, after looking at the estimates, after listening to the explanations that have been made in this house, after listening to what I have said, I don't see how they can say there has been any effort or any attempt to hide anything from this legislature. This legislature has full power to either pass these items or turn them down. So all members must remember that they will have to take responsibility for their actions. I don't think members of this legislature would really want Saskatchewan to bring in a budget in times like these with a deficit of \$15 or \$20 millions. I don't think we want this kind of a picture to go out to the rest of Canada, and to the financial people and all the rest of them, I certainly don't want it, because it would give a completely wrong picture of the financial situation of the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, I want to say to the hon. members that this is again, a non-confidence motion, a vote for this motion is a vote against the good things in the budget, because this is a want of confidence motion. There is nothing wrong with the budget, that is what troubles my hon. friends, and there is nothing being covered up from the legislature. I will certainly oppose the motion.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — The hon. member for Moosomin has summed up the viewpoint of this party so well, that I only want to take two or three minutes this afternoon. But I felt that after the Provincial Treasurer has spoken I must say a few words.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to have been in politics on and off for about twenty years. But never in all those twenty years have I heard such disjointed, such a mixed up, such a confused speech as was made in this house this afternoon, by the Provincial Treasurer.

I don't know whether or not he is trying to confuse this house with verbiage, I looked up in the gallery and I saw that a lot of the people up there looked confused. As he was proceeding, I looked up in the press gallery and I thought a lot of those people looked pretty confused; I looked at some of his back benchers, most of them were just going to sleep.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, said that the member for Moosomin, when he spoke did a good job with a poor case. I want to tell him that he did a poor job with a poor case. You just can't make a case for what he was trying to prove this afternoon. No authority can justify, whether it is Bourineau, May or anybody else, no authority will justify what this government has tried to do since last Wednesday.

The minister said there was plenty of precedents for what the government is trying to do. Why didn't he give one of them then? Why didn't he give one precedent?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet** (Minister of Agriculture): — Just words . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He didn't give us a single precedent that applied to what we are discussing. There is only one aspect of this debate, Mr. Speaker, that rather pleases the opposition, to see the confusion that has existed on that side of the house for the last three days. They have been like a ship without a rudder. This would never have happened in the old days of Tommy Douglas and Clarence Fines. They would never have got caught red-handed, juggling the financial books, never — they would have been a little bit more subtle, at least.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister said that supplementary

**April 1, 1963**

estimates have special uses for legitimate purposes; we agree but this government is illegitimate, it is not a legitimate purpose. What this government in essence has tried to do, is to put \$2 million into last year's supplementary estimates to be spent this year's budget, and in an election year make the budget look that much better. The minister said this is all right, we don't want the people or the rest of Canada, thinking that we have a deficit, next year. Surely, that is a pretty weak excuse. What happened last week was this, the government came into this house on Wednesday morning, asking for a supplementary estimate to be voted for a body that didn't even exist. Then they found they were in trouble. First of all they got rid of a couple of members. Then in the afternoon, they adjourned the house rather than even talk about the matter, and they haven't talked about that estimate for three or four full days. In the meantime, they decided we had better pass that bill in a hurry. So they rushed the bill through, step by step. Friday afternoon we had the spectacle of the Lt.-Governor being rushed down here about 4:30. Why they got his aide-de-camp in such a rush he didn't even have his uniform on.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the minister, can talk from now until doomsday, but he cannot justify estimates being used in the manner that the government is trying to use them. I'm not going to give a lot of citations but I would like to give one, Sir Erskine May's, Parliamentary Practice, I quote page 715, where he is discussing how supplementary estimates may be used:

A supplementary estimate may be presented either

1. For a further grant to existing service in addition to the sum already demanded for the current financial year.
2. For a grant caused by a fresh occasion for expenditure, that has arisen since the presentation of the sessional estimates, such as an expenditure on behalf of a service newly imposed on the executive government by statute, or to meet the costs created by an unexpected emergency.

We say that this item simply does not fall into this category. To sum this whole matter up, Mr. Speaker, we in the opposition say that instead of hiding millions of dollars in the supplementary estimates, this government should have given the hard pressed taxpayer of Saskatchewan, some tax relief.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, like the Leader of the Opposition, I don't want to say more than a few words at this time. He had some reference to ships without rudders, but what we have witnessed just now is a wind without a ship, may I suggest, nothing to drive and no place to take it.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Bad humor . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — If there ever was an attempt to impose on this house something by virtue of verbiage, that we have heard just now.

May I comment on just a few of the remarks that have been made. He suggested that one day last week the government got rid of a couple of members. May I point out, Sir, that it was not the government that got rid of any members, (if that is the right term) it was this legislature who did so because of the refusal of certain members of the legislature to accept the ruling of the speaker, based on long standing parliamentary principles.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker** (Saltcoats): — Social steamroller . . .

**Mr. McDougall** (Souris Estevan): — This side of the house . . .

**Premier Lloyd:** — Secondly, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for the adjournment in the afternoon was not because of any concern about facing the problem as he put it. It was because it was sincerely felt by myself, and I so say to this legislature, that we would not be making progress with that item or any other kind of item, and consequently I felt then, and I feel now, Mr. Speaker, it was wisest to adjourn for that time. And in his reference to not looking at estimates since that time, dare I speak of a conversation and I hope you won't mind, which the member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) and myself had, in which he suggested he would like to see estimates withheld until after this resolution was discussed; and I said I was perfectly willing to do that so long as the other business was sufficient to keep us busy, and keep the house busy, and that, of course, is exactly what has happened.

**April 1, 1963**

Just to say a word or two about the general subject matter which is under discussion, and I think probably it is well that we have had this kind of a discussion here and I am not referring to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Moosomin presented for us some documented opinion with regard to the procedure that is proposed. His main concern, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the danger which we might be facing of the legislature, in one way or another, losing control over expenditures of the government. As my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, very clearly stated, this is a matter about which this legislature, and all legislatures, ought to be concerned. It is a very important parliamentary principle that the members of the legislature, and the members of parliament, should have every opportunity to scrutinize, and to discuss, and to control within their capabilities, the expenditures of the government.

The point with regard to control, and the procedures recommended by the government in the estimates and the supplementary estimates, is, of course, that members of the legislature have every bit as much control over the amounts in the supplementary estimates recommended as they have over estimates recommended in any other way. He confined his remarks to that of the \$2 million item specifically. The members of the legislature have as much opportunity and as much right to vote this down in the supplementary estimates as they would have had had it been in the main estimates, or had it been in the supplementary estimates next year.

As a matter of fact, they have more control over it being in the supplementary estimates this year than they might well have had were it in the supplementary estimates next year.

So, there can be no question about it. There has been no attempt and there is nothing to suggest that there has been any attempt on the part of the government to hide any expenditures. Indeed, if we had wanted to hide it, we couldn't have proceeded in a way less likely to hide it than we did. It would have been much more effectively hidden, it would have recommended itself to the attention of the legislature much less, had we included it in the regular estimates.

Now, I hope we can dispose of that allegation that the government somehow is caught red-handed or cookie-handed, or any other kind of handed, left-handed or off-handed, as the case may be.

There has been no attempt whatsoever on the part of the government to conceal any of these expenditures. On the other hand we had proceeded in a way which most forcefully draws them to the attention of the legislature and of the country generally.

That is a point which need to be made.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Premier Lloyd:** — The second point, may I add again, there has been no attempt on the part of the government to remove the voting for these expenditures out of the control of the legislature. They have as much control over the money in voting, in the way that supplementary estimates are presented, as they would have had if they had been presented any other way.

I too, would like to examine just for a moment the effects of proceeding the way in which the opposition had suggested they would have preferred.

Now, it would have been entirely possible for the government to have put this \$2 million in the main estimates, quite obviously. And to have provided out of the revenue available next year. This would have meant that we would have had in the year just finished last evening, to be specific, as members seem to like to be these days, an additional \$2 million in surplus. It would have meant that in the year which we have just entered we would have had an additional \$2 million of deficit, or \$2 million less of surplus next year. But the effect insofar as the cash position in the government is concerned, the effect on the economy of the province, would have been absolutely nil, would have been precisely the same except for a bookkeeping recording. For the life of me, I can't see what there is to get so excited about, because of that situation. There will not be more money spent and there will not be less money spent. It is true, as the hon. member read from Durell, we could have applied this to the public debt. We could have done this and this would have reduced our public debt for the space of a few hours, because within a few hours, or a few days, or a few weeks, we would have then borrowed from something or other in order to make up this amount of money and the public debt would have been right back where it was just a few days before.

And so again, with all due deference to the argument about Durell, it is not necessarily true that in his writings he could contemplate the effect of every situation when he was making a general sort of statement.

Now, it is suggested by the member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) that there is no precedent from the activities of any parliament whatsoever for an action of this kind. The Provincial Treasurer gave some precedents. May I just add one or two, which seem to me to be precedents in this regard. My reference is to activities of the Canadian House of Commons, in the year 1957-58 for example, they provided for contributions to the provinces with regard to the development of certain camp grounds and picnic areas in the province, \$1 million.

**April 1, 1963**

This was done. This was a new service. It was a service which was not of emergency in character; it could have waited; they didn't have specific legislative authority to do it, there was no provision made in the appropriation act, but they did it. I submit this is almost precisely what is being recommended in some of these particular votes this year.

In the year 1959-60, another appropriation:

To sustain technical technological capability, in Canadian industry, by selective defence development programs on terms and conditions approved by the treasury board and to authorize commitments against future years in the amount of \$4 million.

It was again categorized as a new service, it wasn't an emergency service, didn't have specific legislative authority for it, no provision made in their appropriation act, but they did proceed to spend the money and to do so by virtue of supplementary estimates in almost precisely the same way that we have done here.

So it is not true to say, not accurate to say that this is an expenditure or a procedure which has never been followed in any other parliament in Canada or outside of Canada.

The other point which I want to make before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, is that we have been talking mostly about the printed estimates which appear on the desks of all of us. These estimates, the printed form in which they appear, and which it is suggested in the resolution be withdrawn, are, of course, not in themselves legislative in character. They are in fact in the nature of working papers which become statutory as a result of the passing of a bill, particularly and in part as a result of the passing of a resolution by this particular house. Now when money is to be spent, and here there can be no difference in opinion, this money should be authorized by the legislature. This is the prime consideration. And the resolution which will authorize the spending of this money if passed by the legislature makes provision for doing those things which the supplementary estimates propose. It makes provision for the payment of this \$2 million which is under discussion to this particular corporation sometime during the months that follow but out of the revenues which are available at the end of the last fiscal year. In other words, far from trying to escape in any way whatsoever from the rules and regulations and decisions of the legislature, the resolution will make it perfectly and abundantly clear that this money is to be spent in this way and that when the legislature votes on that resolution, it is giving specific and proper and adequate authority for the government to proceed in the way which has been proposed.

May I just say again, Mr. Speaker, there has been no effort, and none should be suggested, on the part of the government to conceal any of the expenditures. Secondly there has been no effort whatsoever to remove from the legislature any opportunity to discuss fully these expenditures. The proposal will provide an opportunity for this legislature explicitly to authorize that this \$2 million be spent as a grant to this organization sometime in the months to follow out of the revenues which have accrued over the period of the months that have just been completed. There is no whatsoever attempt to avoid any information or to avoid any opportunity of discussion on the part of the opposition with regard to it.

Finally, it is true that this precedent has been followed by other parliaments in Canada. Mr. Speaker, consequently I will not vote for the resolution but will vote against it.

**Mr. J.R. Barrie** (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I first wish to compliment and commend my colleague, the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) on the remarks he delivered a few minutes ago in this debate, and to fully concur with him in those remarks.

I also wish to point out to the house that his remarks were backed up by authorities on the point under discussion. This is something more than the Provincial Treasurer in his remarks was able to do or failed to do. I think it should be abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that the procedure which the Provincial Treasurer was attempting to use in order to dispose of large excess of revenue over expenditure for the fiscal year 1962-63, is most unusual and irregular. This action, Mr. Speaker, is undoubtedly for the purpose of trying to obscure from the general public the fact that they have been over-taxed, and substantially over-taxed, in the past year. All members of this assembly and the general public should be most concerned with the attempt to adopt a questionable procedure in the handling of public funds by the government opposite.

Insistence by the government to proceed with the supplementary estimates for 1962-63, as they are now constituted, would be most unwise, in my opinion. It will set up a most undesirable precedent in this legislature. Insistence on their part to steamroller these supplementary estimates through will be another example of extreme arrogance on the part of the government. It will also indicate complete disregard of the common and usual practice of accounting of public funds on the part of the government opposite.

**April 1, 1963**

I am certain the people of Saskatchewan will consider seriously such an attitude and such action when given the opportunity in a general election, to approve or censure the government opposite, and the current administration. I have no doubt as to what the results of that election will be, Mr. Speaker.

As a result of the apparent attempt to push this particular legislation, the supplementary estimates, through this house at this time, I certainly will be pleased to support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. L.P. Coderre** (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to rehash the budget debate as has been done by the hon. Provincial Treasurer a few minutes ago. But he did say something that this resolution as a question of lack of confidence on the part of the house. It may end up as such. If he really wants to know what a vote of confidence is, I would probably suggest that they go to the people of Saskatchewan on this subject alone and then they would know what a vote of confidence is.

He mentioned as well, a moment ago, that all expenditures must be approved and honored by the legislature. With this I quite agree, Mr. Speaker. But what we don't approve, and I say and I will say again, that I don't propose to be a rubber stamp to any of the methods that are used in trying to bring in such estimates. That is the reason why the hon. member for Moosomin brought in his resolution. For somewhat the same type of methods used in bringing in these votes into the legislature people in this country are now serving time.

Let's take for example the question of Brandon Packers. We have a Mr. Cox and other gentlemen who are serving four to six years by using the same type of methods. It is just a question of juggling the situation around. You may laugh. It is. You do the same thing, Mr. Speaker, for example under the Income Tax Act if you try do things not to show the true picture that you have under acts of this legislature.

If you would be an individual, would use these very same methods, you would be subject to prosecution under the Income Tax Act. But still because they are the government, a majority government, they can go ahead. You can see, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. member for Moosomin brought in this resolution.

Let's have a good honest look at it. I think they are just trying to pull the wool over our eyes. The government mentions a moment ago, or the hon. Treasurer said that the government should not be put in a straight-jacket. Well, the government handles the situation and somehow it appears to me that every member of this legislature is being put in a straight-jacket, with this type of method used. The Provincial Treasurer illustrated several cases in supplementary estimates where various or previous governments had voted – he mentioned something about bridges, about roads, about health programs and everything else – and we admit and agree that that is quite in order, that in every one of these cases the supplementary estimates are approved by the legislature or by proper authority, to some designated authority to receive that money. This is quite in order. And he went on with a whole list, he probably could have taken the estimates since 1905 if he wanted to, or supplementary, and read them off, and that is agreed and we will wholeheartedly agree with him. But you cannot vote something that is non-existent, and that is precisely the method that they have used.

Then he goes on and mentions the fact that in the budget speech they mentioned the fact that SEDCO would be brought into effect and everything else, and then the estimates come into the house, the bill comes in after, this is a case of putting the cart before the horse. That is exactly what they are trying to do to us. They brought in a vote for something that is non-existent.

**Hon. E. Kramer:** — . . . no horses on the payroll . . .

**Mr. Coderre:** — I want to know from the many of the cabinet ministers, Mr. Speaker, on that side of the house have not got up and given a satisfactory explanation to this house of why. We don't utilize supplementary estimates that are authorized – show to this legislature that methods used are proper. I don't know whether I'm right or whether I can be put out of the house for this – but this unsavory method has been used everywhere in this house.

The mention was made of a veterinary college, a grant to the veterinary college of \$1 million, or for a veterinary college. The grant to the University of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has been approved time and again, and the government has the right to increase that grant or decrease it as they wish, either in supplementary or out of the supplementary. This is proper and quite in order. But not so with the other vote which has come into the house.

**April 1, 1963**

Mention was made of the Buffalo Pound project, this has been authorized and the government of Saskatchewan is authorized to give grants to local municipal government, whether urban or rural, for such projects as they see fit. This has been authorized. Roads and bridges have been authorized in all cases. This vote, Mr. Speaker, that has been mentioned has shown the arrogance of the government of trying to bulldoze through the house something that has not been properly authorized.

Now, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should proceed with these estimates until they are properly brought in to this house and the resolution has been brought in by the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) definitely asks the government to have a good look at it and give the people of Saskatchewan good true accounting of what you propose to do.

I certainly will support this resolution.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, there were one or two comments I wanted to make. I don't propose to delay the house too long with respect to them. I really wanted to cover three areas. Firstly I wanted to agree with the hon. member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) that nothing is more important in legislative or parliamentary practice than the control of expenditures. And then I wanted to call to the minds of hon. members the procedures which are used to control these expenditures, and what are these procedures.

There are the procedures of the public accounts committee where we review the expenditures which have taken place, and there are the procedures of the committee of supply where we review those expenditures which going to take place, and these are the only procedures open to the house. Members discuss the expenditures that have been made in public accounts committee or the expenditures which are to be made in the committee of supply. The minister responsible for the departments is called upon to answer for the manner in which the expenditures are going to be made.

Now then, I want to point out to the hon. members what the Premier and other speakers have already pointed out, that each and every one of these procedures, each and every one of these methods is open to hon. members with respect to supplementary estimates in the same way and in precisely the same way as if they were in the main estimates. There is no departure whatever. And, as a matter of fact, I would ask hon. members, and perhaps the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) will be able to explain this if he winds up the debate, exactly how the parliamentary consideration of the SEDCO vote would change one bit if it were included in the estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year instead of the estimates for the fiscal year just terminated. There is



one change, we will consider it in a different year in the public accounts committee. I am at a loss to understand how this in any way affects the control of hon. members with respect to this expenditure. With respect to discussions in committee of supply, the discussions will take place at the same time, they will be discussed in the same way, probably on the same day, and they will be approved by parliament, by this legislature in the budgetary resolution and in the appropriation bill on the same day. There will, in fact, be no change whatever in the amount of control which the members of this house will have with respect to that vote, whether it be in the supplementary estimates for the concluding year or whether it be in the main estimates for the forthcoming year. I think this point needs to be made clear because there are suggestions, not very clearly articulated, that somehow this is going to affect the control which hon. members will have, their right to question and to exercise all control open to an individual member of this house of a particular vote.

Now I want then to turn to two other things. Firstly, I am trying to grasp what is improper, in their view, in including these expenditures in a supplementary expenditures. Now I know that some of the confusion is caused by the fact that supplementary expenditures frequently cover expenditures which have been authorized by special warrants, by Lieutenant-Governors warrant in our jurisdiction. Now, clearly, if these expenditures had been made by Lieutenant-Governor's warrant, if the SEDCO expenditure had been made by Lieutenant-General's warrant, then obviously the control of this legislature would have been prejudiced since they would have been faced with a fait accompli. Such is not the case with respect to the vote which is before this house.

Now I have heard members from time to time suggest that it is proper to use supplementary estimates only with respect to matters which have been dealt with, matters which have been the subject of a Lieutenant-Governor's special warrant or only with respect to emergency matters. Now I think this is incorrect. I think the authorities which have been quoted today have made it clear that it is incorrect, I will, however, want to refer to one or two of my own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, reference has already been made to Durell, and Durell makes clear that it is quite proper to use supplementary estimates for expenditure newly imposed on the executive by statute. And I think the authority quoted by the hon. member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher) made this clear. He quoted Erskine May. I have before me the well-known book on constitutional law of Wade and Philips, and this is a book on general constitutional law but I found a quotation which I think is apt under the circumstances.

**April 1, 1963**

Except when a supplementary estimate relates to a change of policy for a new service, the policy of the service concerned can only be debated insofar as it is brought into question by the excess.

Now here is clear indication that supplementary estimates can well relate to a change in policy or a new service. This is Wade and Philips.

I have the same put even more succinctly in the book 'The Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons' by Sir Gilbert Campion. And I may make this point now, Mr. Speaker — the book that hon. members were quoting from opposite, and I will acknowledge that Durell is an authority, is a book published in 1917. There have been changes, I admit subtle changes, but changes in our approach to parliamentary procedures since that time, primarily I think because of the fact that parliament sits over a much longer period of time and the time limits which are inflicted in Durell's treatment of this problem, as well as other problems, simply do no longer apply. Now I want to refer to Sir Gilbert Campion in his book on supplementary estimates and he deals with the matter rather briefly.

He talks about supplementary estimates under two headings:

Firstly the most usual kind of supplementary estimates are those presented at the beginning of each session in respect of the estimates of the previous session. They are, frankly, due to underestimating, and that cannot be entirely avoided as our financial system requires the estimates to be drawn up months in advance . . . Secondly the other kind of supplementary estimates is sometimes called an additional estimate and provides money for some new head of expenditure arising in the course of the same financial year. An estimate for a new service must be submitted for consideration by the committee of supply not later than two days before the committee is closed.

And then he quotes a standing order of the House of Commons in that regard, and he goes on. Now here is a clearer indication that supplementary estimates of the type called additional estimates are to provide for a new head of expenditure arising in the course of the same financial year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all of the speakers have more or less conceded what I have already said. There has not been a violent disagreement in this debate, although, Mr. Speaker, I have heard it at other times, that there is something

improper about a supplementary estimate that does not provide for an emergency item, or which does not provide for something covered by special warrant. I take it that these ideas are completely laid aside and we can take it that the authorities establish that it is entirely proper to have a supplementary estimate that does not deal with an emergency, that is not something that is a result of or a validation of a special warrant but is in fact something that arises under a new head of expenditure, not emergent in nature which has arisen during the year.

All right, if we can take that as given and if anyone wants to enter the debate and quote from authorities otherwise, other than shaking his head, I think all the house would be grateful if he would.

Now the next point is this, given that it is proper for supplementary estimates to be introduced which are under a new head of expenditure, is there anything improper about this particular SEDCO one? Now then, the argument has been used that this item is improper because the money would not have been spent during the fiscal year. This is the best I could take from the hon. members opposite, that this provided for a grant and a grant of money to a body which would not spend the money before the end of the fiscal year. It is in existence before the end of the fiscal year, but that is not entirely relevant as a matter of fact since . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh! Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I want now to deal with that point. When the supplementary estimates are brought in, in our legislature it is perfectly clear that we only have six or eight weeks to deal with supplementary estimates, regular estimates, with legislation. Obviously we have to bring these things in simultaneously. It is not possible to wait until a statute is passed before one brings in supplementary estimates, but mind you the bringing in of supplementary estimates is not asking the house to act. It is only asking the house to consider and the house acts when they deal with the budgetary resolution or with the appropriation act. And by the time the house would deal with those budgetary resolutions or with the appropriation act, SEDCO, the corporation would, in all probability, have been in existence and is in fact in existence well before the house is called upon to deal with the resolution or with the act. Now, to come back to the point that I was dealing with before the interruption . . .

Is there anything in precedent which suggests that a grant which is made at the end of a year to a body must be spent during that fiscal year to be proper? Now I think that, if this is the proposition, this is really a remarkable proposition. And it has not been acknowledged in this house. Year in and year out grants, some of them

**April 1, 1963**

in regular estimates, some of them in supplementary estimates have been brought in and it has never, Mr. Speaker, been a requirement that that grant money be expended in the fiscal year in question. Year in and year out. And, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing another evidence of that today. The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) took no exception to the grant to the University of Saskatchewan with respect to the veterinary college.

Now, I think no one will suggest that this money is going to be spent in the year which has just been terminated. I think no one will suggest that the grant receiving body will have had an opportunity to spend this money, and yet no one, certainly not the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) is suggesting that this is an improper use of supplementary estimates, and I agree with the hon. member for Gravelbourg on this. There is no precedent in this house that a grant made to a body shall be spent in the fiscal year in which the grant is made. There is no suggestion that if it is not spent in the fiscal year, that there is something wrong with that grant, there is something unparliamentary about it. Now I could go through estimates and supplementary estimates back for a good number of years and find, more particularly with respect to school grants and with respect to the university, items included as supplementary estimates with no evidence submitted to this house that the money which went to the school boards or to the university in question was spent in the financial year in question, in respect of which the supplementary estimates referred. And no evidence was asked for, for the very good reason that it has never been accepted that this house must know that the money is not only disbursed but spent during a fiscal year in question. The house does not ask that it be disbursed. Our Appropriation Act, year in and year out, and I could quote last year's act if you like, make it perfectly clear that items that are included in the supplementary estimates do not have to be disbursed in that year, and I could quote last years appropriation act, which went through without demur from members opposite, which said that

notwithstanding anything contained in Section 57 of The Treasury Department Act, any of the said charges or expenses that have not heretofore been paid may be paid hereafter and any payments so made shall be charged to and form part of the expenditure of the fiscal year ending on March 31st, 1962.

And this is the Appropriation Act, which was assented to on April 14, 1962, making it clear that our practice in this regard is not one which requires disbursement in the year which the supplementary estimates refer to, much less the expenditure to be made by the grant receiving body during the year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the best I can make of their case over there. That they are saying, Ah, these supplementary estimates ought only be used with respect to emergency items, or special warrant items. Well, I think we can dispose of that on the basis of the authorities. There is no suggestion that this is accurate. The hon. member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher) has quoted Erskine May; I have quoted Wade and Philips and Gilbert Campion, and Durell himself makes clear – he doesn't make it as clear as some of the other later authorities but he certainly alludes to the fact that expenditures can be made with respect to new programs undertaken and certainly the practice in Canada is well-established. If some program of the magnitude of the hospital insurance could be introduced in mid-year in the province of Quebec, I think we can rest assured that there is no suggestion that supplementals are confined to emergency items.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — All right, if this is not a sound case, what is wrong with voting money for this new program. The best that they can come up with is that SEDCO was just created during the last days of the financial year. This is certainly no valid reason, certainly no valid reason. We know that the veterinary college is not going to be created probably until some months or years in the future. Now I can see that the grant receiving body is in existence but there is surely no difference in principle between a body which is in existence in February and one in March, only could there be a difference if there was in our practice something which suggested that a grant receiving body was improper unless the grant was going to be spent during that fiscal year, and I just suggest to you, far from this being our practice, the precise reverse is our practice, has been our practice year in and year out, and as I am glad to say, is acknowledged to be our practice by the hon. member for Gravelbourg, (Mr. Coderre).

Now, having disposed of that, I am at a loss to understand what is improper in making a grant to a body, wherein the grant is not going to be spent during the fiscal year in question. I say this, feeling that I have established that the rights of all the members to question the grant have been fully preserved.

I have pointed out to you that our practice with respect to the Appropriation Act has contemplated disbursement well after the end of the financial year, and it has done this, year in and year out, and I could go to all the appropriation acts if hon. members wanted to. I simply chose the last one because all members or all but one or two of us, were a party to passing this act without demur.

**April 1, 1963**

So if we have then said that there is nothing wrong with expending money which is not emergent in nature and there is nothing wrong with making a grant to a grant receiving body, which is not going to spend it during the year under review, and if there is nothing wrong with disbursing the funds after the fiscal year end, and all of these things have been done many times without demur by this house, then I am at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to find out just precisely why it is improper in the minds of hon. members opposite, with the appropriation for SEDCO. I think I have established that all the rights of the members are preserved, that all the precedent is that money can be spent for new programs, that all the precedent is that the money to a grant receiving body, does not need to be spent in the year under review, and all the precedent is that it does not in fact have to be disbursed by the end of the financial year.

Having, as I think, disposed of all the arguments, all the logical arguments which can be launched by hon. members opposite, and I admit I can't dispel some of the confusion in (say) the hon. member for Morse, (Mr. Thatcher) — I won't undertake that task — but as I say, having dealt with what I think are the logical arguments, and having found them wanting, I, Mr. Speaker, am unable to support the resolution.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion, the last member has revived my faith in the legal profession, in that usually they say that if you repeat something often enough, then maybe somebody will believe you, and I think the minister has tried to do that. He has repeated the same argument about ten times. He stated that he had somehow beaten down the argument of the opposition members. Nobody believed him, but he said that he had, four or five times, and if you are to be convinced by anything by repetition then I am quite certain everyone in the house should be convinced by now, because we have had repetition of the same argument over and over again by the members who sit opposite.

The first thing that he said in his address was that he would be the last one that would want to see any danger to the control of the legislature over the money that is to be spent. The previous speaker, I think, the Premier, got up and said that we have plenty of control through the public accounts committee. Well, the Premier knows better than that; he knows that the money has been spent a year and a half before; and what sensible person would stand up and say that you cannot spend money that you have already spent.

As well, our supplementary estimates, in the past, at least, in most cases, we have taken it for granted that the supplementary estimates are usually money that is either spent in

the year in which they are being presented for, or will be spent before the end of that year, so that then again, we haven't any control over the major items and supplementary estimates in spite of what the Premier and the Minister of Health have stated here this afternoon. That money in most cases will already be spent, and much of the money that is being presented to us in these supplementary estimates in smaller items has been spent, and I think that is why the custom has grown up. I don't care, you can read all the experts, or the opinions, of others that you want with regard to procedure, I think most of our procedure has grown up in the British Commonwealth through custom and what has taken place in the various legislatures, and that is why I stated last Tuesday that I felt that the method used in presenting the estimates was fraudulent and dishonest, because it has not become a custom in this legislature. And I would like to remind my friends that they didn't suggest I was wrong when I said that last Tuesday, and it appeared in the press the next day. But for some reason they went and threw my friend, (Mr. Coderre), from Gravelbourg out for saying the same thing on Wednesday. Now, either this thing was right on Tuesday, and if it was right on Tuesday, it must have been right on Wednesday, so in what manner my friends across the way could have him voted to be put out for saying the same thing as they agreed to the day before, and didn't object to, I can see no sense to actions of that type by this legislature.

And so I say here that I think that custom that has grown up in this house throughout the years is usually indicated when we come to supplementary estimates. But by and large they are for emergency expenditures, and members across the way will I think quite readily admit that in most sessions that we have sat here — I have sat here for seven or eight — and in practically every instance the majority of the money that is being spent have been for emergency expenditures and as the Minister of Health stated, under estimated expenditures. And some of those that we pointed out in natural resources the other night, the opposition was quite willing to agree with. For instance, some fire suppression, this was \$100 thousand spent that wasn't estimated because of an increase in forest fires in the province, I think that most members are prepared to accept that that is a reasonable expenditure to put into supplementary estimates. And we said at that time that we were not objecting to expenditures of that type, but when it came to capital replacements that had not been considered at all at the beginning of the year, and the only possible excuse for considering them in these, was the fact that there were increased revenues, as has been pointed out by the member for Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald), that the only reason these were put in was because there were increased revenues, and he has pointed out that the expert on procedure states that this is not an excuse for putting expenditures into supplemental estimates, and I think most people, and most authorities would agree that that shouldn't be an excuse when the

**April 1, 1963**

government decided at the end of the year that they are going to spend a lot more money on equipment, on capital expenditures within departments for the purchase of automobiles, for the purchase of other items, that were not considered at all at the beginning of the year, as a necessity to the program, and if there hadn't been the money at their disposal, would have never have been considered by the government at the end of the year either, and so the only possible excuse for these major expenditures on these supplemental estimates, is the fact that they took in too much money from the taxpayers of this province, and in order to try to hide it they have placed before the members of this legislature new expenditures. But when we say on this side that these expenditures have been hidden, I believe again that the Minister of Health has been wrong, because they are hidden. I just want to read you an item from co-operative development – further amounts required – co-operative association services. If you read that figure would you dream for a monument that that extra money would be used to purchase cars. I would take it to mean that it was probably some new service or some under-estimation of the operation of the department that was necessary for the carrying out of the work of the department. But, of course, we found out because we stopped to ask a question about it that it wasn't used for this purpose at all, it was for an expenditure that wasn't even conceived of except for the fact that the government had some loose money lying around and they thought they had better get rid of it.

And we could go right through these estimates, and if they had of been carried out in the usual manner, and possibly they would have been if there had been only \$3 million spent, but when it amounted to \$14 million, the opposition felt that there must be more than met the eye in the supplementary estimates, and so we began to question each item to find out just what the government was spending this money on, and we found out that it didn't meet the required custom as far as supplementary estimates in this house were concerned. And I think that is the important part, possibly most of us never heard of Durell before. I have heard of May, I had heard of some of these parliamentary experts but a lot of these other men probably we never heard of before, but most of us have sat in here for a few years and seen the custom in this legislature and that is what I think that we should be governed by, by the usual custom in this legislature and the rules should not be changed year in and year out because of the fact that the government has come into a surplus of revenue and so they decided they are going to change the custom in this legislature, of presenting supplementary estimates.

And so I think that the member for Moosomin,(Mr. McDonald), in presenting his resolution has done so, not only taking into account the information that he has given



us here this afternoon, which I am quite certain took a great deal of study, but he is also taking into account the fact that he has sat in this legislature since 1948, and he has never seen an example of effrontery that we have had placed before us in the supplementary estimates this session, and I think that is the main reason why members today say that there couldn't have been any other purpose, except a fraudulent purpose in drawing up the accounts in the way that they were, is trying to get by the members of this house, and get expenditures by that would not be properly explained to the people of this province, and so in closing I am just going to say that I would have to support the resolution because of the custom that has grown up in this house and because of the actions in this house at least in the seven years that I have been a member. I could not support the actions of the present government in bringing in the supplementary estimates as they have.

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane** (Qu'appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to go on record in associating myself with the remarks made by the members on this side of the house, especially by the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) when he drew the attention of this legislature, and the people of Saskatchewan, to the fact that it is getting to the point in this legislature, at least, where we seem to be in a position where the rules are being changed every year.

There was one question posed by hon. Provincial Treasurer to members on this side of the house, and I think he used the statement “what did the provincial auditors tell you?”. Well, I am going to ask the Provincial Treasurer “what did the provincial auditors tell you?” and more than that what did some of the other members of your staff tell you when you were presenting this type of estimate procedure to them.

The other thing I want to point out here this afternoon, is simply this – we have the evidence a few days ago of being asked to vote \$2 million to a company which at that time didn't exist, and if we had put up a fight, to try and prevent that expenditure going through at that time, we would have had to sit here all Friday night, we would have had to sit here all day Saturday, until midnight Saturday night, in order to do the job that we thought was in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. And now we are being told that the million dollars that is being voted to the veterinary college in Saskatoon, comes under the same type of category as the \$2 million that was voted to SEDCO. I am going to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely untrue, because in the first place the million dollars that is being voted to the veterinary college in Saskatoon, is only being done after this government was forced in to it by the members on this side of the house. If

**April 1, 1963**

they had had the courage to go ahead and set up, or vote a million dollars to a veterinary college, or to set up a veterinary college, this could have been covered under the estimates, not only this year, Mr. Speaker, but a year ago when the resolution was brought in this house, and it was only because there was \$14 million lying around that the people of Saskatchewan had to pay to this government by way of over-taxation, and this was another way they were going to try and hide it.

And then the other significant point about it, is this too, that in this house we have had an order on the order paper now for over a month, asking for correspondence between this government and the other two governments in western Canada, regarding the veterinary college. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had the answer that they had to get permission from the other two governments before this correspondence could be tabled.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That is a different debate. The house issued that order . . .

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Don't forget this, Mr. Speaker, that in the interests of clearing up this matter, maybe they could come in and give us at least their correspondences in this vital matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is, in my opinion, that is the difference between SEDCO and the veterinary college, and we could detect this when the hon. Minister of Agriculture was speaking on the budget because he sneeringly referred to it, he cast his sneers across the house, he said "you are going to have the opportunity to vote in estimates on the setting up of a veterinary college" and of course, it wasn't in the regular estimates, but in the case of extreme emergency, this is the procedure that they devised to bring it in.

Then, one of the speakers on the other side, this afternoon said, before any money is voted the legislature has a chance to vote on the money before it is spent. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. Because the two departments that have brought their estimates down now, the Department of Co-operation, the Department of Natural Resources, both indicated to members of this house of the gimmicks that were before us, because in both cases they had already spent, had the vouchers in for cars, in order to try and cover up and play part of this terrific surplus into their department, and both cases, the cars, according to them, have been bought and have been delivered, before the members of the legislature had a chance to vote on expenditure at all.

In my opinion this is something that is highly irregular, and I think it should be clarified right now. I think before any other estimates are brought into this house we should listen to the advice given to the members of this house, by the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) and see that this type of thing doesn't go any further, I suggest the time has come when we have to stop playing this game by new rules made every year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Snedker** (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I wish very briefly to associate myself with those words of my colleague, the member from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) and the resolution which he has submitted to this house.

I listened to the Provincial Treasurer wimble and wamble his way through a so-called rebuttal. I think he made a poor defence, a poor case, and all I can do is extend to him my sympathy.

**Hon. Mr. Walker** (Attorney General): — You've got it . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — I think it is generally recognized that supplementary estimates, are estimates which are brought in when a department has found for some reason or other, that it has over-spent the estimates which were voted at the previous sitting of the house, and I can understand this happening, particularly in the Department of Highways, for instance for in a particularly good year the department might be able to go forward with construction which they hadn't previously envisaged, but which was in the interests of people of the province, and therefore spend more money than they had asked for in their original estimates. The department would then submit supplementary estimates for an amount overspent and have them voted on by the house.

Similarly the Highways Department might find themselves caught by bad weather in an exceedingly bad year, where they had to undertake many emergency repairs, as has happened before in this country and thereby find themselves overspent in that particular department, that is in the department of maintenance. They would then bring in supplementary estimates and ask for a vote of the house to cover the increased expenditures which they had made.

Now, this is all understandable, but here we have the picture of the government, Mr. Speaker, bringing in a

**April 1, 1963**

supplementary estimate of \$2 million for non-existent organization. Not for something that had been done and over-spent, but for something which didn't exist. And I have to agree with the words of my colleague, who objected to this. I agree with everything he said in regard to this matter. Then we had the rather startling acts of the government, when this amount was objected to, last week and we came into this house and our members objected to the amount that was being spent, and objected to the method in which the supplementary estimates were being presented. Then exception was taken to remarks that were made, and you all know what ensued and what followed, then we adjourned for lunch, after lunch the committee on crown corporations was meeting, we went into the committee on crown corporations and the committee was immediately adjourned, and thereby the government indicted their refusal to conduct the business of the province of Saskatchewan.

Then we came into this house . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Those are debates which are concluded at the same session, and while I realize that in a debate like this, sometimes a slight reference is necessary, I can't continue to allow you to debate on what happened last week.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am all through with what took place in the crown corporations. I am now in the house . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, but what happened in the house last week, they were motions which were debatable here and we . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — Oh no, Mr. Speaker, they weren't debatable. A motion to adjourn the house isn't debatable. When we came into the house there was a motion to adjourn the house immediately presented and it was not a debatable motion. You said so yourself and I agree with you.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Can't debate.

**Mr. Snedker:** — It wasn't debated and it was voted on and the steam-roller of the socialist government defeated us. We wanted to do the business of the province but they refused to continue to do the business of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You tell them . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — Well, then they stalled the business of the house until such time as they could bring in the SEDCO bill and have it finalized through the various stages setting up an organization in which to put the \$2 million.

I don't know how one could describe that method without getting kicked out the back door, so I won't. Now, certain suggestions have been made by the Provincial Treasurer and he has tried to draw an analogy or a parallel between the vote to SEDCO and the vote to the veterinary college. I would draw the attention of the members of this house to the \$2 million which the Provincial Treasurer had in the supplementary estimates, and which he requests a vote on to go to SEDCO, was a vote to an organization, non-existent at that time, but the vote to the veterinary college of \$1 million was a vote in the supplementary estimates of the Department of Education, to go to the University of the province of Saskatchewan, and I suggest the University of Saskatoon, the university in the province of Saskatchewan, has been in existence almost since the inception of this province, in fact since 1905, and it would, therefore, be quite logical to pass a vote, and I would suggest legal to make a vote to go to any organization which is in existence, but I think it is most reprehensible and unethical to ask for a vote of money to an organization which was not in existence. And there is no parallel at all between a vote for a veterinary college at the University of Saskatchewan and the vote for SEDCO. I can't see where there is at any rate.

Then the Provincial Treasurer as good as intimated or hinted to us that we should vote for his entire budget, or if we didn't vote for his entire budget we were voting against the million dollars for the veterinary college. He thereby displays his misunderstanding, or his lack of understanding of parliamentary procedure, I don't think he wants to understand it, because he should know very well,

**April 1, 1963**

and he does know, that votes are presented to his house, one item vote at a time, and if a person wishes to vote against a certain amount of money being spent on a certain thing that is his right and privilege to do so. If a person wants to vote for a sum of money to go to a certain place or thing, that is also his privilege to do so. Just because you approve of something in the budget doesn't say that you have to vote for the entire budget, just because you disapprove of something in the budget doesn't mean you have to vote against the entire budget. That is the reason that accounts are presented to this legislature in the way that they are.

Of course, the Provincial Treasurer displayed the typical socialistic attitude to parliamentary democracy when he tried to scare members into voting for his whole confounded budget, or nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that concludes everything I wish to say in regard to this and I will support the resolution as my colleague from Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) has submitted it to this house, and these are some of the reasons that I intend to support it, there are other reasons but I think they have been very well outlined by the other members on this side of the house.

I will support the resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I've listened to this debate with considerable interest. I had heard what the hon. member for Moosomin, (Mr. McDonald) had to say, and I must say that I didn't see a great deal of substance to the authorities which he quoted, at least the authorities which he quoted did not uphold the case which he argued.

I'm very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan could not have seen the performance that occurred here this afternoon. I think that the effect of the debate this afternoon would not have been lost on any voters in Saskatchewan had they been here and could have heard it . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Right, right.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — We have heard arguments put forward without any authority or any support on behalf of those arguments from members opposite, apparently trying to buttress a simple case of pique over the fact that they were not

able to force the government into a position where it would have appeared to have a deficit next year larger than the deficit estimated by the Provincial Treasurer. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the authorities cited by my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Public Health, made it perfectly clear to any listener that there is really no substance to the complaint of the opposition. We have seen a situation, Mr. Speaker, where some hon. members in order to try to dramatize second-rate two-bit ideas are prepared to strike out against the very integrity of this house, in order to try to publicize such ideas. They have been prepared to put into jeopardy the dignity and the honor of this house.

Now we have an accusation that the government has been caught with its fingers in the cookie jar. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of a phrase that you can get quoted in the newspapers, and to the person outside this house who doesn't hear this debate it may appear, particularly if he is inclined to be a Liberal, it may appear that hon. members opposite have succeeded in making some kind of a case. The fact is, of course, that every single point of principle which they advanced has been refuted by the authorities. There has been no substance to the complaint at all. As the member for Melville, (Mr. Gardiner), one can't just ignore what he said, if for no other reason than for the strident and insistent tones which he used in saying it. The member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) says the rules are being changed every year. Every time the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley runs afoul of the rules, he thinks it is a new rule, just because he hasn't heard of it before, he thinks it must be a new rule. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley has over and over again flouted the rules of the house. He did it again here this afternoon — had to be called to order. But he is one of those members who, even though he is called to order, and is told that what he is saying is unparliamentary, he rushes through and tries to get it said before he can be stopped. Tries to drown out the voice of authority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this kind of parliamentary annihilism may get a little bit of publicity some time in the newspaper, but it is at the expense of the integrity and dignity of the house that it is done, and members should have a proper regard for rules of the house, wouldn't attempt to abuse the rules of the house and the dignity of the house in that way.

He says that his proposal, this supplementary estimate is to vote money for a corporation that doesn't even exist. Well, of course, it does exist. But then he says that the time he was called on to vote the money, it didn't exist. Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should

**April 1, 1963**

learn the rules of the house. The rule is that the money is not voted until the Appropriation Act is passed. All we are doing in committee is accepting proposals, which will be formulated into an Appropriation Act, and nobody ever suggested that the Appropriation Act was going to be passed before SEDCO finally came into existence. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) laughs. He apparently doesn't understand the theory of the rules of the house, the fact that . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Maybe you had better talk about the barnyard . . . because you don't know anything about anything else.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Now that we have had that weighty opinion from the member from Arm River, Mr. Speaker, I will proceed. The passing of a sub-vote in committee does not constitute any formal decision. It does not have any legal effect. It is only when all of these sub-votes together are incorporated into the Appropriation Act, which is passed at the end of the estimates, that there is any legal significance whatever to this voting of a sum of money. To say that the legislature was called upon to vote the money before SEDCO was in existence is to completely misconceive the theory and the nature of the transaction. The hon. member from Arm River, (Mr. Danielson) if he will stop and think about it, will realize that what I am saying is right.

Then, as the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, (Mr. McFarlane) said, it isn't like the vote to the veterinary college because we were in favor of the vote to the veterinary college, we advocated it; he said the government wouldn't have done it if we hadn't advocated it, and suddenly he got off altogether from the theory of whether it is proper to vote money that isn't going to be spent in the fiscal year, onto the question of whether the veterinary college is a good thing, and he never got back any more to the principle that he was supporting, which I took to be the principle that it was improper to vote money that wasn't going to be spent during the year for which it was voted — never got back to that principle at all. He got onto the argument that the veterinary college was advocated by the opposition and was accepted and adopted only reluctantly by the government. That just illustrates, Mr. Speaker, the kind of thinking that makes it possible to come up with this sort of resolution. Hon. friends opposite think that as long as it is a good piece



of Liberal policy, you can do it. That's no objection to it as long as it is something the Liberal party is in favor of, like the veterinary college. But when you try to do it with something that the Liberal party hasn't already committed itself in favor of, then you are running foul of the rules of the house. The member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley illustrated that fact I thought more clearly than I can state it by the way he conducted his debate here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Saltcoats offered to extend his sympathy and I can imagine that his sympathy would be equivalent to a tiny little drop of vitriol in a bottle after the contents had all been poured out. I am sure that we are on this side of the house will be grateful for his sympathy. I would be interested in knowing sometime what his definition of sympathy is, if he has ever heard of it. The hon. member says that his kind of expenditure should be reserved for unexpected expenditures. Well, even the authority cited by his own leader set out what the basis for supplementary estimates was and it was much broader than that. There is no authority for the statement that supplementary expenditures are for only unexpected expenditures.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to this debate, without having made any plans to take part in it. I thought I would be interested in knowing just how well members opposite could bolster the wild and reckless allegations and charges which they made in this house which they made in this committee, and I must say that the answers that I heard from my colleagues here at my side completely refuted every claim which they made. Their complaints were based on complete misunderstanding of the theory and practice of parliamentary government as the member for Melville as I have already pointed out, and the replies in my opinion completely answered the case.

I must say, however, that this is just one more instance, where charges about cookie jars will appear in opening paragraphs of news stories and reckless allegations that couldn't be substantiated will be quoted in the lead paragraph of news stories, if you read far enough down there may be some reference to the authorities which were cited, which completely refuted the claims. But the public will likely come to the conclusion, well, there was something to be said on both sides.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that any member of the public sitting here hearing both sides just couldn't come to that conclusion, there was just nothing to be said – there was just nothing to be said for these accusations

**April 1, 1963**

and charges and the rules, the precedents and the authorities were all on the side of the action which the government has taken. Indeed, without referring to the academic theorists on the subject, the actual precedents followed by this legislature were on the side of the action taken by the government.

But I suppose the theory is that if you throw enough mud, some of it will stick. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is just mud that has no real sticking power and wouldn't be credited for five minutes in a free and independent press in this province.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the house ready for the question? It is my duty to inform the house that the mover is about to exercise his right to close the debate. If any member wishes to speak he must do so now.

**Mr. C.B. Peterson** (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, I really didn't intend to take part in this debate but there is one thing that I would like to make clear, and that is that the accusation that we increased taxation on the people of this province to increase this fund to this amount, to this \$2 million, I certainly want to make this clear that this wasn't done because last spring, in February, when we brought down the budget, this was planned to be covered by taxation and we also planned a deficit budget of \$2 1/2 million. Now we certainly didn't plan to tax people more than what we had appropriated money for. This extra money did not come in from extra taxation. It came about because of the increase in the revenue from the federal government and from other sources by our education and hospital tax, and the revenue that came in because of the fact that the buoyancy of the gross national product was up more than what was estimated, and for that reason this money came in and for no other.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, can't we have some order. I realize that these noises are natural to my hon. friends but they are sitting in a legislative assembly and ought to conduct themselves with some decorum I suggest.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He was just . . . as you are.

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

It is my duty again . . . Order. It is my duty to remind the members that the mover is about to close the debate.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I will start at the bottom of the list and work up, and refer to the remarks that have been made by the speakers on the other side of the house. The last speaker, the member from Kelvington (Mr. Peterson), either he is awfully confused or I am. If this money didn't come from taxes, I don't know where it did come from, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps Santa Claus gave it to the Provincial Treasurer or perhaps he won a sweepstake. I don't know. What my hon. friend fails to realize is that this government imposed taxes on the people of Saskatchewan that brought in revenues of some \$20 million more than was needed to carry out the program that was submitted to this house a year ago. In other words, the people of this province were taxed \$20 million in excess of the program that the government placed before the people, placed before this session one year ago. My friend, the Minister of Mineral Resources is ridiculous as is the member for Kelvington, (Mr. Peterson). I can excuse the member for Kelvington; he is new in this house but this man came into the house at the same time as I did and I think he knows less than the day he came in here, and that wasn't much.

Now, I want to return to the Attorney General. The Attorney General said he hadn't intended to take part in this debate. It might have been a lot better for him if he hadn't.

**Mr. K.F. Klein:** — Don't waste your time on him.

**Mr. McDonald:** — He said that the other speakers had completely annihilated all the arguments that had been put forward by members from this side of the house. Then what was he doing in the debate. In my opinion he didn't add anything to it, other than confusion. And, of course, he is famous for confusion. All I want to say to the Attorney General is this. That if some private concern had endeavored to do in Saskatchewan what the government endeavored to do, and nobody else laid any charges against them, he and his department would have.

**Mr. Klein:** — That's a fact.

**April 1, 1963**

**Mr. McDonald:** — What would have happened? We would have had a court case, probably before a judge and jury, and very likely the charges would have been proven true, and somebody would have gone to jail. Here's what would have happened. But there is no way a government can be put in jail, you can charge a government all you like, but there is no way to get them before the courts, as we know them. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a court and a justice that will analyze the workings of this government and that court is the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and I challenge you to go to the country on this issue and let the court decide. Let the people decide. You won't do that because if you were to go to the country today, there isn't one of you who would get back in this house. Not one.

You will recall I said in this legislature during the special session that you didn't dare call a by-election in P.A. because you would get trimmed. People said, Oh, well, we will wait and see. Well we did – you got trimmed. And it wouldn't have mattered if you had called the by-election when you did, six months before or six months later, you would have got trimmed anyway. And if you go to the country on this issue you will get trimmed as well.

But in addition to that, there is a judge, there is a judge, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that every one of these people, when they stand up and vote against the motion will realize that they are being judged, and may God have mercy upon your souls.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Let us turn to the criticism of the so-called wizard, the Minister of Public Health. There were two things that bothered him. He said that this legislature had as much control over this expenditure in its present form as we would have had it if had come in as an estimate or come in as a supplementary estimate in the year 1963-64. This is not true, Mr. Speaker. And I will use as my authority Sir Winston Churchill. And if there is anyone in this house thinks they know more about parliamentary procedure than Sir Winston Churchill, they are welcome to that opinion. But I don't think that there is any recognized authority who would judge any person in this house on either side as a greater authority on parliamentary procedure than Sir Winston Churchill. And what does Sir Winston Churchill say in regard to supplementary estimates. Sir Winston Churchill's attack on debates and supplementary estimates – this is what he said, "the most worthless of any I have known in my career". In other words, Sir Winston Churchill

believes – they can laugh if they like, they sound like a hyena and I suggest that is what they are — Sir Winston Churchill has said that this is the worst form of dealing with expenditures of public funds, the worst form. Then the other thing that seemed to confuse the Minister of Public Health is that there is only one kind of supplementary estimate.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Oh! Oh!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — My hon. friends over there groan every time a point of order is raised, and it is quite a proper procedure. If they had any respect for parliament they would know that.

Now I just wanted to point out that in closing the debate I think for the member to bring new witnesses in the case is out of order. He is supposed to be dealing with the points that have been made. Now he is bringing new witnesses, and he wants to speak on it again.

**An Hon. Member:** — You don't like to hear it . . .

**Hon. Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. How can I deal with anything that was said in this debate without proving, and what is hurting the Provincial Treasurer is that I have proven the point, that the Minister of Health tried to make it a false point, and I will continue to do so. I am perfectly within my rights.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the rules of order are that the member closing the debate cannot introduce new material but to answer the statements raised is within the rules of the house.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other thing that seemed to concern the Minister of Public Health is this question of supplementary estimates and what they can be used for.

**April 1, 1963**

And he referred to this one proper use for supplementary estimates – for expenditures newly imposed on the executive by statute. And he convinced himself, but nobody else, that by putting a supplementary estimate in for 1962-63 that this rule covered that type of a supplementary estimate. It does no such thing, Mr. Speaker. What this house, and what the Minister of Education, the Provincial Treasurer, the Premier and the Attorney General apparently do not realize is that this house can bring in supplementary estimates during this session, not only for the year 1962-63 but for the year 1963-64 as well, and this is where the particular money ought to be voted. And this is the only authority that you have to cover this particular expenditure. You cannot justify bringing it in as a supplementary for last year. It should be as a supplementary to the main estimates that are before this house at the moment. Then the Minister of Health went on to say that a change has been made since this particular document was produced down through the years. This is true, Mr. Speaker, we know that from time to time we change our own house rules, and we are masters of our own house. But I want to suggest to you that there are certain basic principles, there are certain basic principles that this house or no house has the right to deviate from – and this is one of them. The proper procedure for disposing of public funds. You cannot deviate from those laid down procedures unless you are prepared to accept the guilt for doing so.

Now I want to move to what the Premier had to say in this debate. He said because of long standing parliamentary procedure two members had been named in the house. This is true. Well, Mr. Speaker, from long standing parliamentary procedure the method of bringing this \$2 million before this house is an improper method. And I have outlined to the house the proper way to do it.

The Premier mentioned that I had a conversation with him with regard to the estimates and the supplementary estimates being withheld until this motion was dealt with by the house. That is perfectly true, Mr. Speaker, and will probably be out of order but I am going to attempt to keep within order. I requested of the Premier not to bring estimates and supplementary estimates before the house until the motion had been dealt with for one reason, that, in my humble opinion, year after year this legislature has eaten away at proper procedures, not only in estimates, but in public accounts as well and I for one am not prepared to sit in this house and let this house destroy procedure that was laid down by our predecessors. Another reason I objected to proceeding with committee of supply, this house is asked year after year to take under consideration the main estimates of any one department you want to name. After we have disposed of these main estimates, then we are asked to dispose with some supplementary estimates for last year. Mr. Speaker, the first order when this house goes into committee of supply should be the disposition of the supplementary

estimates for last year. And I think it is time we got around to doing things the right way. Then the Premier went on to say if the Liberals didn't like it, they could vote against it. But of course this is typical. The Liberal party and the Liberal members of the opposition put themselves on record here Friday last when they voted in favor of setting up this corporation. What we are voting against is a practice that has never been used in this house and has never been used in any other parliament that I know of to date. This is what we are opposing. It is not a sum of money, it is not a program but a procedure, and we are not prepared to stand idly by and see the rules that have been handed down from generation to generation, eaten away and destroyed and the rights of the people and the rights of parliament destroyed.

Now I want to refer to a few things that the Provincial Treasurer had to say during his remarks. I thank him for the complimentary remarks with regard to my effort when I introduced this motion. I hope it was meant in a serious way. It is true that the motion is a non-confidence motion. But I don't know of any other way that you can rightly deal with the particular matter that is before us. I believe that any person who is not going to vote for this motion, despite the fact that it is a non-confidence motion, will have to live with his conscience, I won't – and I hope they will consider that before they stand in this house. Speakers often attempted to justify their procedures and to destroy the arguments that have put forward. No argument has been destroyed, no evidence has been introduced by any one of the speakers opposite that has anything to do with the motion that I put on the order paper, and the authorities that I used to substantiate it. They have talked about special warrants – nobody asked them to cover this expenditure by special warrant. We asked them to put it in as supplementary estimates for the year 1963-64. They refused to do this. Mr. Speaker, what is going to be the net result. They also talked about having this surplus this year, and maybe a deficit new year. All they are doing now is to have a surplus in this department for 1962-63 to carry over into 1963-64 to spend it. The Provincial Treasurer said, we don't do this. Why, we are too holy for this. Just those rascals in Manitoba do it. Well, now he is asking the house to do it on this particular vote. A surplus from 1962-63 to be carried into the next year. He is doing exactly himself what he deplors in Manitoba.

Then he talked about bringing this into the house in the proper fashion. The legislation has been brought in, the supplementary estimates have been brought in to cover the expenditures. Mr. Speaker, this thing was backed in through that door with the cart first and the donkey behind it. That is how it got into this house.

**April 1, 1963**

And I said at the opening of this debate when I introduced this motion what they should have done was introduce the legislation, passed it, put \$2 million in your estimates or brought in a supplementary estimate for 1963-64. The proper procedure.

Again the Provincial Treasurer referred to Durell and other people to try and substantiate their case, and I want to go back to Durell, to the point I made when I was referring to the remarks of the Minister of Public Health. Certainly Durell tells that this type of expenditure should be paid for by a supplementary estimate, but they are in the wrong year. You are 12 months out. And if you bring a supplementary estimate in for 1963-64 for this matter, it doesn't have to wait until the next session to be considered. It can be considered by this session, and this is what should be done. So again, the arguments of the Provincial Treasurer do not hold up.

Then he talked about some people, if they have a windfall they want to hide it away. You know some other people get drunk and spend it with utter disregard of their family's needs, with complete disregard of the future, complete disregard of everybody. They get tight and spend the money. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hiding a windfall away or getting drunk and disposing of it, either one of them are bad and there are definite procedures that have been laid down on what should be done with this type of revenue; this government refused to do it. Therefore, any charges that have been made I think are warranted and I think they are true.

Then I want to refer for a moment about voting against these things. The member for Saltcoats, (Mr. Snedker) pointed out quite clearly that when a budget vote comes up, what you are doing, you are voting for or against a government program in a monetary form. This is what a budget is. And in many, many cases my friends opposite, those of them that were in this house when they sat in opposition, voted against school grants, they voted against any money being spent for highways, education, health, welfare, anything else, and I am not blaming them for it. Naturally they would vote against it. This is the reason we vote against budgets. We do not believe in the philosophy or in the distribution of money in the manner that you have done it. But when the estimates are presented to the house the total budget is broken down into expenditures for different departments and branches of departments. And we vote for or against them as we see fit. But for any person, especially in the position of Provincial Treasurer, to suggest to the opposition that if they are not in favor of this, then vote against it, this is not the question. We will have to vote against this so-called supplementary allowance because it isn't a supplementary allowance in the fiscal year 1962-63. You put it in a supplementary allowance for 1963-64 and I believe every member in this side of the house will support it. But don't ask us to do something that is not honest, because we won't do it.



Then the Provincial Treasurer referred to some of the things that Ottawa have done since the Tories came into power. Well, is there any person in this house that wouldn't admit that we have the greatest financial fiasco in the House of Commons at Ottawa today that has ever existed. And what has caused this? The root of this was for doing things that you are now suggesting as a precedent for doing. Do you want as big a financial mess in Regina as they have in Ottawa? Do you want to get in a position where estimates haven't been passed and they are two years old? Do you? These are no precedents. And for any person to suggest they are has little or no respect for this house.

Then they tried to use one Liberal action when the Liberals were in power in the House of Commons in 1955 as a precedent. Mr. Speaker, what happened in 1955? Again this is covered by Mr. Durell, when he said that supplementary estimates could be used to meet an unexpected emergency. They had a flood. And this money that the Liberals voted was to meet an unexpected emergency. Surely it isn't an unexpected emergency to grant the money to private enterprise in this province to try to bring us out of the doldrums? And I am . . . I beg your pardon . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You're in the wrong year.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Nuts, it was the wrong year! It was in 1955 and that is exactly when it was paid.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It was paid on . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I note, Mr. Speaker, that it is very close to 5:30 and I would like to wind this up before we call it 5:30.

The Provincial Treasurer had the audacity to say that the reason he didn't treat this money as it ought to have been treated, in the reduction of the public debt, was because next year which might be an election year they would have to go to the public with a deficit of \$20 million. In other words he wouldn't do what was honest because politically it would be bad. That is what he said. Then he said a vote for this motion is a vote against good things. What good things? To vote for a motion that condemns the

**April 1, 1963**

government for doing something that is wrong. What is good about that? I want to be honest with myself, but anyone that opposes this motion will be dishonest with themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat and let you put the question.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

MOTION NEGATIVED on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 17**

Messieurs

Thatcher	Cameron	MacDougall
Klein	McFarlane	Snedker
McCarthy	Gardiner	Gallagher
Barrie	Guy	Erb
McDonald	Boldt	Steuart
Danielson	Coderre	

**Nays – 28**

Messieurs

Johnson	Kramer	Semchuk
Williams	Meakes	Perkins
Brown	Thurston	Thiessen
Blakeney	Wood	Snyder
Brockelbank	Nicholson	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Kuziak	Thibault	Peterson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Michayluk	Brotten
Strum (Mrs.)		

The sitting was recessed at 5:30 p.m.

The sitting was resumed at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Semchuk moved second reading of Bill no. 82 — An Act to amend the Dental Profession Act, 1959

He said:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the most important provision of this act is the fact that it amends the registration provisions so as to facilitate the registration of dentists. At the present time there is no reciprocity with other countries, or even with other provinces, unless the dentist applying for registration holds a diploma with

a national dental examining board. Graduates of approved schools may now be registered only if they have passed examinations held by the national dental examining board, or by the University of Saskatchewan.

It will be provided by the amending act that every graduate from a dental school accredited by the council of dental education of the Canadian Dental Association, on or after January 1st, 1948, will be eligible for registration, in Saskatchewan without examinations. In practice this will include graduates from all seven Canadian dental schools, and most of the dental schools in the United States.

Registration requirements will be definitely relaxed for graduates of Canadian schools, since they will no longer be required to write the examinations held by the University of Saskatchewan for the national dental examining board.

Another amendment is intended to simplify the voting procedure in elections for members of the council, and another one removes the requirements that the college cause all rules, regulations and laws, to be published in two consecutive issues of the Saskatchewan Gazette. This kind of requirement, Mr. Speaker, is now obsolete, since the act also provides as in the case of all other professional acts, that all bylaws, rules and regulations, are to be filed with the provincial secretary.

Another amendment provides that where a dentist appeals to the court after he has been suspended or his name removed from the register, the trial will not be a trial de novo, but will be a trial based on the records of the proceedings held for the discipline committee. The provision when amended will be consistent with similar provisions in the Legal Professions Act and the Medical Profession Act. So, Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I move that bill no. 82, an act to amend the Dental Profession Act, 1959, be now read a second time and referred to the select standing committee on law amendments.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:07 o'clock p.m.