

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Fifteenth Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

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

On the Orders of the Day.

Gordon B. Grant: (Minister of Highways) — Before Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend a welcome to the grade 8 students from the finest school in the province, the Grant Road School in Regina south. They enjoyed their visit here so much the last time that the balance of grade 8 from this school, numbering forty, are with us today under the direction of Mr. Gordon, the principal. We are very happy to have them with us today and we hope they enjoy their tour of the Legislative Buildings, following their visit.

Mr. W.A. Robbins: (Saskatoon City) — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to say a word of welcome to thirty-five students from King George School in Saskatoon, who are in the Speakers gallery, along with their teacher, Mr. Lockerbie. I hope their stay will be pleasant, and that they will find the sitting informative and educational, and that they will enjoy their tour of the Legislative Buildings.

QUESTION RE SHORTAGE OF NURSES AT MOOSE JAW UNION HOSPITAL

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw City) — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) whether he has been informed of a reported serious situation at the Union Hospital in Moose Jaw, relevant to the announcement that only emergency cases will be admitted to that institution, and that there is a desperate shortage of nursing personnel, and if so, whether the Department of Health, or the government, have any plans to assist the hospital to rectify the difficulty.

Hon. D. Steuart: (Minister of Health) — Mr. Speaker, I phoned the Administrator of the hospital this morning and I was in contact with Dr. Grunberg, who is in charge of the hospital division. I was informed that there was really no serious shortage of beds, the problem was shortage of nurses. I was further informed that he had taken this matter to the public, as much as he told me, to do something to obtain nurses, and also to advise the public that in Moose Jaw, and the area surrounding Moose Jaw, that they did have a problem concerning admissions to the hospital. He said he was sure the emergency would be over in twenty-four hours, as he put it. I offered any assistance we could give to them in obtaining nurses, and he said that if they felt we could be of help they would call on us.

I also contacted the Premier who informed me that as a result of this, we have, as the house is probably aware, attempted to recruit nurses, not only in other parts of Canada, but also in Great Britain, and that this morning he did again contact these people in Great Britain to point out that there were emergencies existing in the province, and asked them to step up their recruiting program for nurses.

I have also informed the hospital in Moose Jaw that if there was any way we could be of further assistance, even on a temporary basis, to call on us and they have promised to do so, but they have assured us that they think the immediate emergency, which was caused to some extent by some sickness, and some absenteeism, will be over in a short time and they will take advantage of the offer we have given them.

QUESTION RE HONORING THE DANNY FINK RINK

Mr. Walter Smishek: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Is it the intent of the government to honor in some appropriate way, Danny Fink and his colleagues, Ron Jacques, Ken Runtz, and Larry Lechner, the Regina rink that won the Canadian School Boys' Curling Championship, and if the government has not had an opportunity to consider this, I would urge they do so now that the Canadian Brier is over.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I may say that the government has been giving some consideration to the matter. No final plans have been arranged, but I can assure the hon. member that something will be done in this connection.

RESOLUTION NO. 2 — APPOINTMENT OF OMBUDSMAN

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) moved:

That this assembly recommends to the consideration of the government the appointment of a committee, composed of members of the legislative assembly, to conduct an enquiry following prorogation of the assembly and during the inter-sessional period into all matters relating to the appointment of a Legislative Commissioner or Ombudsman, in order to provide further means of redress for grievances of citizens against administrative injustices.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the possible establishment in Saskatchewan of an office of Legislative Commissioner or Ombudsman. The motion, as will be evident from reading it, asks that a committee will be established to conduct an enquiry into all matters relating to the appointment of a Legislative Commissioner or Ombudsman, in order to provide a further means of redress for citizens against administrative injustices.

The purpose of the resolution is, I think, reasonably obvious; it is to recommend for the consideration of the government the appointment of such a inter-sessional committee to study this matter. I think members will know that in recent years there has been a good deal of interest in the appointment of Legislative Commissioners, or Ombudsmen, to act on behalf of members of the public in following complaints in their dealings with agencies of government. The reasons for this renewed interest in the office of Ombudsman are, I suggest, not hard to find.

There has in recent decades been a major increase in the role which government is called upon to play in the lives of the ordinary citizens, and the great administrative agencies which have been erected to carry forward the programs which legislatures have enacted and given to the executive authority to administer, have provided a certain peril to individual liberty. As a result of these great increases in the activity of the administrative and the executive side of government, there has been created in all countries of the western world a substantial number of tribunals, boards, agencies, commissions, and like bodies carrying authority over the property and sometimes the liberty of the private citizen.

In general these agencies have acted with efficiency and with a proper sense of their duties to ordinary citizens. However, because of the very large number of decisions which they are called upon to make, and not only these agencies but government departments — and which affect the lives and the property of ordinary citizens, it is inevitable that there would be some decisions, and perhaps many decisions, concerning which ordinary citizens would have complaints. Such is the complexity of government today that all ordinary citizen with a complaint very often doesn't know where he should lodge his complaint. Professor Donald Rowatt, who is a professor at Carleton University, and I think now is down at the National University of Australia at Canberra, in an article in the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, has made a number of points with respect to this problem. He points out that the complexity of government necessitates discretion to be exercised by members of the executive, by members of the administration, by public servants, and as we have been warned by Dicey, a writer on political science and legal matters in England of the last century, wherever there is discretion there is some room for arbitrariness.

The ordinary courts of law do not provide an adequate remedy for people who have complaints against administrative procedures. Members of the legislature have neither the time nor the knowledge, nor the facilities, to follow up in a detailed way the complaints which citizens might lodge with them. Certainly, members of the legislature have no wish to be less than diligent in following up complaints which are lodged with them by citizens, but it is simply not possible for a member of the legislature, who is in most cases a part-time member, and in many cases does not live in the area where the head office of the administrative agency is, it is simply not possible

for him to follow up on these complaints which members of the public lodge with him in his capacity as a member. In any case, he doesn't have any real access to the documents, or other material, which would tell him the facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that our parliamentary system has on the whole done a good job in protecting the rights of the citizens over the many centuries which it has been developed, but it hasn't done so by the people who participate in the parliamentary system adopting any attitude of reverence for the past, or any attitude of opposition to all change. It has done a good job because those of us who work with the system, those who have gone before us, in any case, have looked out for new ways in which the system could meet changing conditions — in which the system could meet new threats to the liberty of the subject as they appear from time to time because of the onrush of events.

We have done in Saskatchewan a reasonably good job of protecting the personal liberty of the citizens. I think that many members might think that a better job could have been done, and I for one am not going to suggest that improvements could not have been made. However, there have been steps taken to assist the citizen in his dealings with the state, and I would like to mention only a few.

In 1947 there was enacted a Saskatchewan Bill of Rights, the first such Bill of Rights in Canada, which was designed to protect citizens against discrimination based upon race, creed, color or sex. This was followed in 1956 by the Fair Accommodation Practices Act, which was designed to prohibit discrimination in public accommodation. Similarly in 1956 the Fair Employment Practices Act was passed in an effort to eliminate discrimination with respect to employment. We recently passed the Regulations Act, which is designed to see that all subordinate legislation, this is a regulation contained in Orders-in-Council, Ministers' Orders, and similar orders issued pursuant to a statute, are readily available to a citizen, or at least to his legal adviser.

I think some people would find it remarkable, but I can assure them that it is sometimes true that it is even difficult for a lawyer to find out the law which governs the citizen as the same law which every citizen is presumed to know. Only recently we have had established a Legislative Committee to look into the problem of expropriation procedures, in the hope among other things that a procedure could be adopted which would offer the citizen more protection than the traditional crown expropriation procedures.

Some many years ago the Saskatchewan government enacted a law dealing with proceedings against the crown, which enabled citizens of this province to sue the crown in the right of Saskatchewan, without obtaining the gracious consent of the crown, the so-called Petition of Right, thus wiping away another archaic and anachronistic privilege of the crown which has existed for many centuries.

A good deal has been done in the field of Magistrates' Courts to raise the status of these courts, and to make more sure that they dispense justice in an impartial and even-handed way. By and large, our judges in the Magistrates' Courts are now trained lawyers, enjoy a salary and superannuation provision set by statute, and they have some measure of security of tenure.

I haven't by any means exhausted the statutory provisions which assist the citizen in his dealings with the state, and other members who turn their mind to it, would think of others. This is not to suggest that we can cease our quest for other ways of protecting the citizen against the government. Indeed, there is a good deal of material to suggest that in Canada we do a rather poor job of protecting the citizen against the state. This is why I am recommending to the house, that they give very serious consideration to the adoption of one more device to assist the citizens — that one being the device of Ombudsman, or Legislative Commissioner.

I should like to give the house what I hope would be a brief review of the office of Ombudsman, or Legislative Commissioner. Broadly, such an official keeps watch over the way in which government officials apply the laws and regulations to the public, and investigates complaints of private citizens against such officials. He doesn't have any power to over-rule officials — he is in a strong position to suggest that abuses might be corrected. He would report directly to the legislature, probably annually. He should be a person who has had a distinguished career in some field of public service, a lawyer, or a diplomat, or a parliamentarian. He should be a person of high personal reputation, and he should be possessed with wide powers of investigation and given adequate staff to do his job.

March 9, 1965

The history of this type of a parliamentary commissioner is one that goes back a long way. An official something like the modern Ombudsman was in existence in Sweden as early as 1714, and the office became enshrined in the Swedish Constitution of 1809. In some ways the early Ombudsman in Sweden was similar to the Lord Chancellor in England, who used to operate back in the 15th and 16th century as the Keeper of the King's Conscience, as it was sometimes called, but a person who dispensed equity or justice to people who were denied justice by the rigors of the rules of law. Gradually the Lord Chancellor's role became formalized so that he wasn't able to act on the basis of conscience, but upon pre-determined rules, and when this happens you simply get another court of law and this is what happened to the Lord Chancellor.

Other Scandinavian countries adopted the device much more recently. Finland introduced it in 1919, Denmark in 1955, and Norway in 1962. Professor Donald Rowatt, to whom I have earlier referred, in a paper, which as I say was published in the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, described the Scandinavian Ombudsman as follows:

The Ombudsman in the Nordic countries is a special parliamentary commissioner, whose job is to receive complaints from citizens who are aggrieved by official action — to investigate these complaints and if he finds they are justified, to seek a remedy. He may also conduct inspections and take up cases on his own initiative. He is appointed by and responsible to parliament, reports annually by a special committee of the house, and is entirely independent of the executive

New Zealand provided legislation providing for an Ombudsman in 1962, and this chap has actually been carrying out his duties in New Zealand for something over two years.

There has been a good deal of interest in the office in Canada, and, indeed, in some of the other British countries as well. A society of British jurists recommended a year or so ago in a report called the "Wyatt Report" said that an Ombudsman be established in the U.K., and consideration has been given to it in Ireland, in India, the matter has been raised in the legislature in Nova Scotia and in Saskatchewan. The Alberta division of The Canadian Bar Association has suggested that it be introduced into Alberta. The Glassco Commission suggested that it be introduced into the federal government machinery.

Professor Rowatt in his article outlined reasons why he thought there was need for an Ombudsman in the federal government of Canada, and he listed six reasons. He said that the administrative procedure in Canada is not adequately regulated to guarantee on any uniform basis the basic civil liberties of the citizens, either federally or provincially. You know we have a good number of tribunals in Canada but we don't have any uniform statute governing procedure before these tribunals as they do in the United States, nor do we have any general rules by which people may bring their problems, or bring their cases, before such tribunals for determination. Nor do we have in Canada anything like the first ten amendments in the United States Constitution, so-called Bill of Rights, which regulates the conduct of a good number of United States courts and tribunals.

The second reason which Professor Rowatt mentioned was that Canada's system of appeal was very limited. Rarely is there proper provision for appeal from the decisions of public servants, or those who act as judicial, or quasi-judicial tribunals. This is in marked contrast to the situation in western Europe where, for example, in France they have a whole structure of administrative courts to deal with judgments, for, indeed, they are judgments made by tribunals, which judgments affect the property or the liberty of the subject. Our courts in Canada have very little opportunity to review administrative decisions; our procedures for the judicial review of administrative or quasi-judicial tribunals is complicated and slow, and it is costly.

Fourthly, our parliament is limited in the extent to which it can control administration from the citizen's point of view. We know that parliaments and legislatures are partisan and they therefore find it difficult to make impartial inquiries in cases where individual citizens may have been caught between the wheels of the administrative machinery.

Furthermore, as I have already mentioned, members of the parliament and the legislature simply don't have the time or the facilities to do

a job of following up complaints. This is in sharp contrast to the United States, where members of legislatures, certainly, the Congress of the United States, have substantial staffs at their disposal who can follow up with the administrative organs of government, complaints which may be lodged with the Congressman by his constituents.

I think that many of us could instance cases where citizens have been caught in the wheels of the administrative machinery. One of the striking cases was a case of a sailor in Victoria, or at least Vancouver Island, by the name of Gordon Knott, who was discharged from the navy because his uncle was alleged to be a Communist, and members may recall that upon investigation it was found that there was some doubt as to whether the uncle in question was, in fact, a Communist, but there was no doubt at all that the fellow who was supposed to be a Communist was no relation to the sailor. There had just been a case of mistaken identity and there was no way that the sailor could bring this matter before an appropriate tribunal for examination.

Another weakness in Canada, in our system of law and government is the fact that our legal aid procedures are poor, compared with many parts of the world. A litigant who has no money in Canada is worse off than in most parts of the world. Now the Bar Societies have done a creditable job in many areas, particularly in the larger cities in Canada, but even with their efforts which are largely voluntary, a great number of citizens who have either legitimate defences to civil claims, or legitimate defences to criminal actions or legitimate civil claims, simply never get their day in court because they have not the money or the facilities to get there, and to put their case.

A sixth reason for considering an office such as Ombudsman, is the fact that, in my view, it is important for citizens to know that there is some protection against administrative, or bureaucratic injustices. I think it is healthy from a psychological point of view for the citizen to believe that there is one more avenue open to him.

I could, Mr. Speaker, elaborate more fully on the experience with the device of Ombudsman in various countries where it has been used, but in order to save the time of the house I propose to confine my remarks largely to New Zealand. I do this because New Zealand has a system of government more like Saskatchewan than do the Scandinavian countries, although all of them, or at least Norway, Sweden and Denmark are constitutional monarchies as are we, but New Zealand is a country which has a British parliamentary system; it retains the same principles of ministerial responsibility, which we have; it is not a large country; it has a system of welfare state legislation, which is much like our own. In many ways it is a rather good model for Canadian provinces, and I want to refer hon. members to the report of the New Zealand Ombudsman or Parliamentary Commissioner, Sir Guy Powles, (I don't know how properly to pronounce it but I believe Powles is correct).

His report has been submitted to the parliament of New Zealand covering the year ending March 31st, 1964. The report contains some general comments on the office of Ombudsman, as it is called in New Zealand. In his general comments, Sir Guy expresses the opinion that the office of Ombudsman has gone a good way to achieving the purposes for which it was established.

He points out that the office was not set up to find fault with the public service, or the administrative arm of government, and in point of fact it is a pretty valuable shield to the administrative arm of government when administrators are unjustly attacked. At the same time, members of the public are assured that allegations if they are reasonably supported by evidence, or by inference, they are assured that these allegations will be investigated.

Now, Sir Guy points out something which I think we all know, that when you get any large administrative organization, it is just in the nature of that organization to build in some defence mechanisms. Therefore, it is not good enough to provide that a senior official of a department will review the decisions of the junior official of the same department. Sir Guy has said that in some of the cases which came to his attention, decisions had been reviewed twice and three times, by senior officers of the department, but when he reviewed the facts and brought a new point of view to bear, he was able to convince the departments that their stand was wrong and that they ought to rectify a complaint.

This, it seems to me, illustrates one of the difficulties which we have to deal with in any large administrative organization, be it governmental or private. The superior tends to protect the subordinate, and quite

March 9, 1965

properly so in the ordinary course of events, from criticism from the public, but this protection can become over-protection and one of the defences against over-protection, would, I suggest, be an Ombudsman.

I could give the house details of the sort of cases which Sir Guy Powles dealt with in the course of his couple of years as Ombudsman. I propose not to do so, but rather to a little later on in my remarks to refer hon. members to material where they can get this very easily and simply.

Now, because of the amount of public discussion concerning the office of Ombudsman, there is building up a good body of material on the office and how it would work. Much of this is available to us because of the discussions in the Canadian House of Commons. The member for Red Deer, Mr. Robert Thompson, the Leader of the Social Credit party, introduced the bill in 1963, calling for the appointment of an Ombudsman. This fell by the wayside because of a procedural defect, but he re-introduced it in 1964. The bill has been the subject of a debate in the House of Commons on second reading, and the bill was referred to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections has done a good deal of work with respect to the office of an Ombudsman, and with respect to this material as it came before the House of Commons, I would refer hon. members to bill No. C7 of the Second Session of the Twenty-Sixty Parliament, which had its first reading on February 20th, 1964. The debate on second reading of that bill, appears in Hansard for Tuesday, March 17th, 1964. I would refer also to the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, numbered six, seven, eight and nine. Six covers September 1st and 2nd, 1964; seven covers October 1st, 1964; eight covers November 9th and November 16th, 1964; and nine covers November 30th, 1964. Members will, of course, know that these are available in the Legislative Library.

I would particularly draw your attention to the minutes of proceedings. number six, because here the House of Commons had before them Sir Guy Powles, the New Zealand Ombudsman, who was visiting Canada, and the questions which were put to Sir Guy and his answers in the informality of a committee, are here. Sir Guy's report to the New Zealand parliament is here, it is a very readable little document. It has forty or fifty pages of case studies, of the sort of case he deals with, and in twenty-five or thirty lines he just says what the complaint was and how he disposed of it. I think that anyone who reads these will reach the conclusion that some of these cases could have arisen in Canada and, indeed, some of them could have arisen in Saskatchewan. I'm not sure if they had arisen in Saskatchewan the persons would have had available to them the same sort of procedure for having their complaint rectified that the citizen had in New Zealand.

I believe that the material which we have, this material, and much more that I know I have been collecting for a couple of years since I developed an interest in this subject, and other members have doubtless collected, is available for examination.

I believe that the establishment of an office of Ombudsman, or Legislative Commissioner would be desirable in Saskatchewan. From the studies which I have seen I think that the creation of such an office would be of benefit to the citizens and would really do nothing to take away any rights from members of a cabinet, or members of the legislature. I believe that a check into the New Zealand experience would suggest that the cabinet do not feel that anybody is horning in on their prerogatives, or over-seeing their administration, and the members of the legislature, or parliament, as it is in New Zealand, do not feel that anyone is usurping their rights to pursue complaints lodged with them by their constituents.

Indeed, many of the cases considered by the New Zealand Ombudsman were cases which were referred to them by members of parliament. I know that many of the complaints that I have had, I wish I had someone who I could refer them to because I feel that the complaint had merit, that it is going to take a good deal of digging and it is going to take a good deal of digging by someone who has some hours to look at some documents, and some powers to require some answers that I couldn't either examine or require as a private member.

I appreciate, however, that this is a new idea, and will need consideration from hon. members. I don't think it is a partisan issue, I hope it isn't and I express the opinion that if it is a partisan issue, then the study of the establishment of the office will be futile. If the office is

not established with the consent of both sides of the house, it will not work effectively, and I certainly would not wish the office of Ombudsman to be established over the objections of the government, however unlikely that might be, or over the objections of the opposition, if the objection was determined and well-reasoned. It must enjoy some support from both sides of the house in order to do its job. As I said it is a new idea, and therefore, I do not introduce a motion calling for immediate consideration of establishment of the office, but I introduce a motion calling for a committee to study the establishment of the office. I would anticipate that the committee would review the material available, consider what particular problems might arise in Saskatchewan if we tried to establish an Ombudsman here, prepare a report which might be considered by the legislature at a later session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us have an obligation to keep our system of government working, and working well. Our governments, as I said earlier, are being placed under great strain because of the extra duties which they are being asked to assume. This is a time, in Canada certainly, neither for smugness or complacency, and I think that we have got to devote our attention to seeing that not only our system of government works, but that the public believe that it works. When any country reaches the position where the public loses confidence in its government, then it has reached a very dangerous position. Because of a variety of factors, which I don't intend to go into. I feel that there has been a decline in the confidence that the public has in government in Canada, and one of the things which has eroded some public confidence in government is the feeling that some injustices have gone uncorrected.

I don't suggest that the Ombudsman is going to solve all these problems, or even most of them, but I do suggest that it could solve some of them, and I do suggest that if it can, in fact, solve some of these problems, then we, as a legislature, have an obligation to examine into this to see whether or not it will offer some protection to the people of Saskatchewan in dealing with their government. Here, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it awfully clear that I am not talking in any partisan way about government. Accordingly, I would urge upon the house the most careful consideration of this resolution. I think it offers us the opportunity to take one more step in protecting the rights of citizens and enhancing the prestige of government in the eyes of the public, and of making our system a better system, a system which will serve the great and humble in a more equitable and more efficient way.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I take a good deal of pleasure in moving, seconded by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank)

That this assembly recommends to the consideration of the government the appointment of a committee, composed of members of the Legislative Assembly, to conduct an enquiry following prorogation of the assembly and during the inter-sessional period, into all matters relating to the appointment of a Legislative Commissioner or Ombudsman, in order to provide further means of redress for grievances of citizens against administrative injustices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member one question before he takes his seat. I followed him with a great deal of interest. One remark he made caused me some concern, however. He said that he as a member of the legislature certainly would want to use the office of the Ombudsman to secure a document and other things to take grievances to him. This is a new thought to me. I thought the Ombudsman was for the private citizen as such, and that members with their privileges in the house, would have the door open to them and would not require these services. I just want to get it clear, this was not your main aim, I hope, or one of the purposes of an Ombudsman would be for service to the members of the house.

Mr. Blakeney — Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the hon. minister's question. I am sorry if I left that inference. It was not meant to be left. I did not envisage the Ombudsman as being of any service to members of the house, other than as a place to refer persons, constituents, who come to them with problems that they simply cannot solve for them because they do not have the

March 9, 1965

facts. I would expect to refer them to the Ombudsman; I wouldn't expect to hear either from them or him what disposition was made of it in the sense of an examination of the documents. I would only expect that once it had been referred to him, it would be just the same as if the citizen had gone directly to the Ombudsman.

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some observations on this resolution, I might say that I enjoyed very much the remarks of the member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). I would like to make some remarks in some detail and, therefore, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS — SECOND READINGS

Mr. George G. Leith: (Elrose) moved second reading of Bill no. 06 — An Act to Confirm a Certain Bylaw of the Rural Municipality of Cory No. 344 of Saskatchewan.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey, Acting Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I don't think the principle in this bill is a good one — a principle by which a municipality gives to a corporation a fifty per cent reduction, or any reduction in taxation for over a period of years, provided they will establish an industry in their municipality. Now, the result of this kind of thing is that you have the neighboring municipality wanting the industry, and doing the same thing, and instead of fifty per cent, it is seventy-five per cent, and it spreads to other municipalities, so the result is not an advantage to any municipality, but only an advantage to industry by enabling industry to get out of paying taxes.

You can have the same thing spread farther than the boundaries of the province. We have had some outstanding examples of this kind of thing. The C.P.R. Hotel here in the province, in the city of Regina, paid no taxes until a few years ago. I believe they had twenty-five years without any taxes except local improvement taxes, but they made no contribution to the city whatsoever outside of the local improvement taxes.

Besides this angle, you also open up wide the door for any unscrupulous corporations to go to municipalities and try to work them for this and that and the other thing, and I don't think we should do this. I think it is better if they are protected from this kind of operation. I am sure that the question of whether or not this particular industry has to pay taxes to the municipality of Cory, is not the deciding question as to whether the industry was going to come there or not. Sure, it is something they bargained for and wanted to get, naturally, they want to bargain for all of the favors that they can get, but it would not have kept them away if they had not had this kind of an agreement, and I know that there are many people in municipal government who are strongly opposed to opening the door for this kind of thing for industry in the province of Saskatchewan.

I hope that when the bill goes to the committee, we will look very carefully at it. After we have heard the evidence that may be given to us in the committee, we will be in a better position to deal with it on third reading and certainly it may be quite possible that on third reading I may be voting against it, but I am keeping an open mind on the question now, but I do not like the principle that is in this bill.

Mr. Eiling Kramer: (The Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill, I haven't a great deal to say on this. I am certainly not an expert on municipal taxation, but the principles that have been brought into it by the hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) certainly gives some food for thought.

I also have a letter dated February 18th, from the Mayor and Council of the city of North Battleford, which I would like to present here, in which they suggest that they do not approve of this and are asking me to oppose any legislation in this regard, because they feel it is setting a bad precedent.

Mr. Speaker: — If the member has a letter he is going to have to table it.

Mr. Kramer: — Yes, I will table it, Sir.

An Hon. Member: — You don't have to table it.

Mr. Kramer: — Well, I think it is quite all right. It should be tabled.

The resolution from the council of the city of North Battleford says:

Resolved that no property tax concessions be permitted to incoming industries and commercial enterprises, moved by Alderman N.J. Winder, and seconded by Alderman H.L. Roberge.

Certified true copy of a resolution passed by the council of the city of North Battleford, the 15th day of December, A.D. 1965.

I take pleasure in tabling this, for the information of the house.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is bargaining for privileges and is going to throw municipalities, all urban and some rural municipalities into conflict and competition in an effort to secure any industries that may, or may not, choose to come and dicker with them. There will be a point of diminishing return, certainly every community wants industries and certainly it is a good thing for them to have them, but if an industry is going to come in and operate tax-free over a period of years, the advantages are all gone.

Therefore, I would seriously suggest that possibly we should take a good look at this precedent and every member in this house, without bias, should look at the possibilities that are moot in this procedure before we make a definite decision to proceed with this type of action.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the house — the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. Now if anyone wishes to speak they must do so now.

Mr. Arthur Thibault: (Kinistino) — I would like to say a few words. I would like to move to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION RE EXPROPRIATION COMMITTEE — IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution No. 7, moved by Mr. Whelan (Regina North):

That this assembly urge the government to give consideration to introducing a bill providing the procedure for the acquisition of land and the determination of fair and equitable compensation, as contained in the unanimous recommendations of the report of the special committee of the Legislative Assembly, appointed by resolution of the assembly, dated April 4, 1963.

Mr. R.A. Walker: (Hanley) — Mr. Speaker, the house was good enough to accord me an adjournment of this debate last Thursday and I wish to say a little bit about the matter before the question is put.

For the purpose of just briefly reviewing the background of this matter, I would remind hon. members that in the year 1963 an inter-sessional committee gave a good deal of consideration to this question. The mover of the motion has referred to the number of meetings that were held, the number of briefs that were heard and the amount of days that were spent by the committee in considering this problem.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that my experience has been common to that of most members when I report that one of the most common sources of complaint and criticism against not only this government but against local governments, is to do with the subject of expropriation and the compensation for lands so taken. The complaints are often quite bitter and quite widespread and for the most part — to a very large extent — the complainers feel a justifiable sense of grievance over some action that has been taken either as a result of deliberate policy or as a result of simple administrative inefficiency. These complaints are one of the major problems of a member

March 9, 1965

of the legislature, and I must say that under the procedures, being governed as they are by statute, there isn't very much can be done in the way of smoothing out or ironing out complaints arising out of this kind of thing.

Now, there are, of course, some ancillary matters other than the actual expropriation or the amount of compensation that cause complaint, matters which really fall under the heading of good public relations or bad public relations by the administering agency. Some of them really don't lend themselves to correction or adjustment. Sometimes we hear it said that the expropriating agency is proposing to put the public work in the wrong place, or that they are building it wrongly. I think we have all heard farmers who complained that the power line is going down the wrong side of the road. Sometimes we have heard it said that the power line could go down the other side of the road with less inconvenience to the expropriating authority and also to the land owner, and I must say that sometime. I have found that that is, in fact, true. So this isn't really a matter involving the fundamental problems of expropriation or compensation. It is really a matter of public relations between the expropriating agency and the land owner. There are many other examples which I won't take the trouble to enumerate.

After a good deal of study and consideration, the committee set up in 1963, reached the unanimous report and draft bill. One hon. member asked, since the draft bill was prepared by the committee just before Christmas of 1963, why it was not proceeded with by the legislature at the following session. Well, I think that the answer to that is a matter of no dispute and can be placed upon the record. The house knows, of course, that legislation before being placed on the members desks is by rule, by custom, drafted or redrafted by the legal counsel for the legislative assembly and that government departments sometimes prepare a departmental draft which is then forwarded to the office of the legal counsel for the assembly who redrafts according to his view of what is the proper draftsman ship. And that is as it should be.

I think it can be stated now that the draft that was prepared by the committee was reviewed by the government. The government felt at that time — I think rightly so — that since this draft legislation applies to all expropriating agencies, not only the provincial government, but to municipalities, school units, school districts, the university, and many other agencies, some twenty or so in number, that the government as a matter of policy, ought not to introduce legislation without taking sufficient time to consult the representatives of these organizations.

Now, this came before the government some time in January, 1964, just before the session of 1964. At the same time, it was referred to the legislative counsel in the hope that if consideration could be given to the draft bill, some work would already have been done on it. But I must acknowledge that I informed the legislative counsel when I sent it to him that it was not to receive priority over other material placed with him until such time as the government had an opportunity to consult with the municipal associations, both urban and rural, with the school unit associations and with other expropriating bodies, so that some representation could be obtained from them as to the appropriateness of the legislation.

Hon. members will recall that the last session of the legislature was under some pressure to commence a little earlier and to conclude its proceedings a little earlier, and I think everyone understands what I am talking about when I remind the house that the last session of the legislature was prorogued on the 19th of March, if I remember correctly. Only about a month after the usual starting date, for legislative sessions in the previous fifteen or twenty years. There was no opportunity to consult with these outside bodies to discover whether or not they favored or reacted favorably to this. Now it is true that the legislative committee did consult with these organizations but the legislative committee met with the organizations before a draft bill was envisaged. There was, therefore, no way for the legislative committee to consult with these bodies as to a proposed draft bill. The draft bill came into existence only after meetings with these bodies had been completed. So, Mr. Speaker, because of the intervention of the election and so on, it just wasn't practical or feasible to proceed with legislation as recommended by this committee last year.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in recommending at this time, that the house act along the lines of that committee's report, that that was an excellent committee. It made, what I consider to be, an excellent report, a report which should be a framework for future legislation. I make no criticism of the present government for not having implemented the report at this session. I recognize, very well, that the government, new

in office, has not yet had an opportunity to meet with all the people who would be affected or indeed, I suggest, that the government has not yet had an opportunity to consider how this legislation would affect their own departments, most of which have expropriating powers. I believe that the government is certainly entitled to take some time to study this report, to take some time to evaluate it and to decide what steps it will take as a result.

I am not saying that I think the government should proceed at the next session of the legislature, although I would hope that they might do so. I believe that this is a matter of so much importance and would represent such a significant advance in protecting the rights of the citizen against the cause, against arbitrary abuses of power, that people don't expect this sort of thing to be done suddenly, to be done overnight. Indeed if the government takes action within the next year or two — significant action — I think most people will be satisfied.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it wouldn't be appropriate to just briefly remind the house what some of the provisions were in the draft legislation. First of all, the legislation provided for the setting up of a public and private rights committee. This committee was to act as sort of an advance agent, an advance public relations agency for the expropriating authority. The committee was to be paid by the state, it was to be a small committee — perhaps only one person with a small staff — it was to hold hearings, it was to hear briefs from people who were objecting to proposed action being taken by the expropriating authority so that they might lay before the committee their complaints about the actual project, the actual plans for the project.

You may say that citizens of a community really have no way of assessing or judging the appropriateness of a particular project. Well, after some long years of representing members of the public in their complaints to governments, I have found more than once that the government has been wrong and that the people in the local community were right about such things as the matter of location of a power line, location of a highway, or of an interchange, or of a crossroad, or something of that nature. It is not unusual for the local community to be right about matters of this kind and it is, I think, a forward step to set up an agency expressly for the purpose of soliciting, inviting public representations as to the appropriateness of the project itself. This committee would have the authority to examine into the complaints and if there seemed to be some substance or merit to them, forwarding them back to the Premier or to somebody on behalf of the government, so that the top level of government may have a chance to review a decision made by some of the lower administrative echelons which may never have reached the knowledge of the government itself without that kind of hearing. So it was proposed to establish this board with no power to overrule the expropriating authority, no power to make determinations of policy, but with the power to hear and transmit what it hears to the government at no cost to the owner of the land.

One of the next most frequent complaints that I have heard is about expropriating authorities entering onto private land without any notice to the owners of private land. I am sure we have all heard complaints, from farmers and others, of trucks appearing in their wheat fields from nowhere, tractors, or even men walking about with transits and other instruments, through their fields, through their yards, driving stakes. And the owner of the land has no information at all as to what is going on or why.

Well, it is true that the expropriating authority, in most cases, must make some compensation for any actual damage done by this kind of entry. But the rights of ownership include, not in my opinion, just the right to be compensated but the right to be consulted before there is any substantial entry upon the land.

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Labour) — What were you doing the last twenty years?

Mr. Walker: — And so it is proposed that this act contain provision that the expropriating authority must, before actually entering upon the land, give to the owner a notice in writing, announcing an intention to enter upon the land and for what purpose and stating when the expropriating authority will expect to take occupancy of the land for the purpose of constructing a public work.

Now, of course, there are occasions where it is impossible to contact the owner, and so alternative provisions are made for substitutional

service of the notice in cases where it is not possible to effect actual notice. Most expropriating agencies assured the committee that they always did that as a matter of routine. But judging by the number of complaints which I have received and which I am sure all hon. members have received, about this matter, it didn't happen in every case. So it was proposed to make it mandatory that such notice be given.

Another cause of complaint about the present state of the law of expropriation is the multitude of procedures that exist for the taking of title, for the taking of possession, for determining the compensation to be paid, and for describing which forum or which board would hear the argument. So it was proposed in this act to make all that uniform so that the public would have access to a bill of rights, a single document, setting out all their rights in relation to any expropriating agency. It wouldn't then be necessary for them to go and consult a lawyer and for the lawyer to go and consult government departments to try to get copies of regulations and so on, provided in setting out the rules, but anyone who could get from the Queen's Printer, a copy of the statute, would have there a document which sets out the basic rights of the land owner, how he shall proceed to get compensation determined and paid, and how the expropriating authority must proceed to take title and to take possession.

Another source of complaint, I had it repeated to me just last week, was this kind of thing. I will just illustrate by referring to the case of two farmers in my constituency near Saskatoon who had a power line cross their land. It is one of these high voltage power lines with only eight or ten towers every half mile. Or maybe less than that - four or five every half mile. This particular farmer has three of them on his land and his neighbor has three also. The particular farmer who complained to me said that when the power corporation employee official came to see him to offer him compensation, he said, "Well, how much is being paid?" "Well, we pay \$40 per tower." I believe the figure was \$40 per tower. And he said, "Well, I guess I'm not going to get into a lawsuit with you over \$120, more or less," and so he took it. But the next door neighbor said, "No, I won't accept that. I want at least three times as much." And the power corporation official went back and they consulted a little more and they came back a few weeks later and they said, "Well, we'll give you twice as much." He said, "O.K. I'll take that".

Now, there you have two people who, within a month of each other, one received twice as much as the other. It strikes me that first of all it's a sound principle that public authorities ought to jealously protect public monies and ought to purchase public lands and rights-of-way as cheaply as possible, but at the same time, it seems to me that they ought not to be guilty of any kind of sharp practice in their dealings with the citizen. I believe it is almost on the verge of a sharp practice for a great or a powerful corporation or government department to more or less intimate that the only way you are going to get any more is by taking legal proceedings, by getting into a lawsuit with a big, multi-million dollar corporation. Then, in a later instance, in the same neighborhood, to agree to pay more without going to litigation over it. This sort of thing has two evils. First of all, there is the dissatisfaction it creates when people are meted out different treatment. Secondly, when it becomes known that you can get twice as much or fifty per cent more by simply stalling a little bit, it creates an atmosphere of delay in every project that is launched in that area in the future. Everybody hangs back. Everybody says, "Well, I'm not going to settle because if I settle and the rest wait awhile, they will all get more". The result is that it is very difficult for crown agencies sometimes to effect settlements, voluntary settlements, with landowners. They all hold back hoping to get more. This is a source of a good deal of public criticism when there is a long term delay in effecting payment of compensation for expropriating property.

So, I am pleased to note, that the draft bill provides that the expropriating authority must state in its initial offer, the amount which it is prepared to pay, and it is bound by that figure. It may not bend in negotiation or bargaining, or change that figure. If it does, it must pay all the costs of the owner from whom they are expropriating. In other words, the expropriating authority is given an incentive, or an inducement. Mr. Speaker, how many meetings are we conducting in this chamber at the moment? I realize there are some members to whom this discussion may be above their level of appreciation. But I think that the rules of the house require a certain standard of decorum even amongst those who don't follow the proceedings.

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Minister of Health) — You don't get here often but when you do, you drive everyone else out.

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that was intended to be a witty remark or just what it was, but I think that . . .

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Halfway.

Mr. Walker: — . . . I think that my participation in these proceedings has been as sincere and as constant as the participation of any hon. member on that side of the house, as Your Honor, I think, knows.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — So, Mr. Speaker, it was thought that there should be some incentive or inducement to the expropriating authority to make its initial offer its final offer. It was also thought that the expropriating agency has access to certain expert sources of information as to land values and that the expropriating authority should make the benefit of that information available to the citizens.

I think it can be assumed that most expropriating authorities, before taking land, before offering to compensate for the taking of land, do have some expert advice as to its value. This advice is obtained at public expense and since it is obtained at public expense, there is no reason why the information contained in this advice should be the monopoly of the expropriating body, why it should not be available to the citizen as well. So it is proposed that with this initial offer of a price, there must accompany the notice a document setting out the mode of arriving at the value of the property.

It is also provided in this statute that the proceedings are limited in time to two years. The expropriating authority may make its offer. The owner, if he is not satisfied to accept the offer, must bring his action within two years, to have the amount arbitrated. The present law is most unsatisfactory, I think, in the case of several expropriating agencies. I would point out, for example, the Department of Highways in such a situation as this. The time only commences to run against the department after the department has filed its notice after it has served its formal offer on the owner. But there is nothing in the act to say when the department may do that. The department may dicker, negotiate for two or three years before serving its final offer on the owner. At no time during that two or three years has the owner any recourse to any court of law or any tribunal to have the amount determined and to try to have the amount paid. This, I think, is a shortcoming which ought to be remedied and the proposed new act remedies this shortcoming. It sets a limited time period for negotiation and provides for only one offer by an expropriating authority. Then things must proceed according to schedule.

There are a number of other objections to the multitude of different provisions presently existing, but one of the most serious and significant, I think, is on the question of costs. There is presently no proper provision for the owner to receive costs where he takes the matter to arbitration. The Highways Department Act provides that the two figures are set out. The figure that the owner claims — the figure which the department offers. Then which ever one the final result is the closest to, determines who gets the costs. This does not accord with the ordinary practices in the courts. In the courts if the amount recovered exceeds the amount claimed, the winner receives his costs. This is the way it ought to be. This is the only just way to provide. Some acts make no provision for costs. They only provide for two or three dollars a day for the payment of the surveyor to survey the land and give a certificate as to the value.

Well, of course, the effect of all these provisions is, Mr. Speaker, that where the amount is under \$10,000 or \$20,000 the costs or the risks of costs are so great that there is really no accessibility to the court at all, for an owner in such circumstances. This, I think, should be remedied and the draft act provides that remedy.

Likewise there are a variety of provisions for setting out the rules, for determining the amount of compensation. Different acts make different provisions. Some are much more generous than others. I should perhaps say, some are much less generous than others, because none of them are really generous. One of the advantages of this act is that there will be uniform set rules for determining the amount of compensation in each case. It wouldn't matter whether it was a school district, a municipality, or the provincial government, the rules would be the same.

Another shortcoming of the present law is that there are such a wide variety of tribunals hearing these matters and determining compensation. Every district court judge, any district court judge may sit on such cases, and some acts provide for arbitration by other than district court judges. So there is almost an infinite variety of people who can adjudicate on these hearings. It is proposed in the draft bill to achieve greater uniformity by restricting the number of officers who may preside over these hearings, to two district court judges. All expropriation proceedings will be before either one or other of these two district court judges. This, it is believed, would make the procedure much more uniform and would make it much less difficult for landowners to understand the routines followed and to estimate the amount of compensation which they would get.

Then there were some minor matters. Some acts provide that when a body expropriates land, the mines and minerals go with the land. Some do not. In the draft act, it was proposed to make that uniform by excluding mines and minerals from all expropriations unless the mines and minerals were necessary for the works which were contemplated on the expropriated land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that in all likelihood, if the government picks up this recommendation and decides to proceed with it, the government may be influenced by the very wide effect which this bill will have, the wide variety of people that will be affected by it, and the government may probably, quite naturally would be, a little hesitant about completely revamping the law so far as it affects expropriation in every area of Saskatchewan at the same time. May I suggest a gradual or a piecemeal approach to the thing which should ultimately achieve the same result, but which would provide for some opportunity to get the feet wet without getting drowned at the first jump. My suggestion would be that the government consider applying this new act to one specific field first. Undoubtedly there are shortcomings. There are defects in the act. Undoubtedly, after a year's experience, it will be necessary to make changes. This will happen with the best intentions in the world. I think it would be unfortunate — if there are shortcomings in the act — if these shortcomings were permitted to adversely affect such a wide range of people as municipal officials, municipal bodies, school bodies and all of these other public and semi-public bodies. I think it would be much better that we find the “bugs” in the act by applying it first to one agency that does a fair amount of expropriating so that the shortcomings may be discovered before they have too widespread or before they have any disastrous effect upon other people in the community.

So, I suggest that this government can gain credit to itself by showing that it is sincerely and conscientiously interested in this problem. The legislative committee that approached this approached it in a completely non-partisan way. I think, it is fair to say that every member of the committee benefited by his attendance at those hearings, learned a great deal about this problem, I think we all did, and I think that nobody wants to make any political advantage, partisan advantage, out of this proposal. I think that the government will get a lot of credit if it commences to take steps to implement this proposal or something very like it without too long delay.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would wholeheartedly support the resolution and express the hope that other members of the legislature and members of the government will contribute to this debate and will give some assurance that the government is interested in this matter and will take some steps in it.

Hon. J.W. Gardiner: (Melville) — Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) and I regret that when the mover moved the motion that is under consideration, I was not present in the house, so that my remarks today are going to be brief on the particular motion that is before us.

However, I would like to make a few remarks about the work of the committee itself. I think here there is a great deal of unanimity and feeling with regard to the work of the committee itself, which sat reviewing the problems of expropriation by government and other agencies in this province.

I would like to say that I think that committees of this type have a great role to play in the legislative process. I know that each of us that had the opportunity of serving on that committee, as has been indicated by the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), learned a great deal through the exercise that we went through in considering the question of expropriation of property and I think, particularly considering the question of protection of the rights of the individual in relation to his property, in relationship to any action

that might be taken by government in this field.

I believe, because of the fact that the sessions were ones that were dealing with technical and in many cases, legal questions, that it was probably difficult for many of us on the committee at times, to follow the proceedings. We were fortunate in at least having one legal person with us on the committee, in the person of the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) and of course, we had much other advice in this field given to us by those that appeared before the committee during the time that we were in session.

As I remember, we spent between thirty and forty days in consideration of the problem which has been pointed out. We heard representations from many groups within the province and also from many individuals. Many people who felt that they had been harmed by actions under expropriation proceedings that had been taken under acts that existed up to the present time. I think that all of us, on both sides of the house, realized that there have been many problems and many actions taken by government, not only in the provincial field, but governments in the federal field in years gone by, and also in municipal fields, against individuals which most of us felt were unfair and that probably the individual did not have the opportunity to make the representation that we thought possibly should be made.

I don't think that this is a consideration or a fact that should be taken as a political fact. I think it is a problem that all governments have to face from time to time because of the complex problems that they have to face in getting land for various projects. Whether it happens to be the purchase of land for highways, which we all know is very important, which we know are being constructed for community purposes; whether it's in the construction of buildings, either on a municipal basis or a provincial government basis; whether it's in the construction of other improvements, whether civic or municipal, or provincial, we know that there are always going to be objections, many of them merited objections, by individuals as to the actions of the particular government in question. I believe all of us felt that by the time the sessions had been completed, that we had brought together quite a number of very good points which we felt would improve legislation as it exists at the present time.

Just before drawing my remarks to a close for this afternoon and asking for the opportunity to adjourn this discussion, there is just one comment that I would like to make and that is with regard to the proposition of the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) that he made before closing his remarks. I don't think it would actually bring about a solution to the problem to put this into effect, or the changes into effect, in one small avenue of operation in this field. I think it would just help to multiply the present problem. I would hope that if we are going to come to a solution to this problem, that we will do it in a fashion which will provide the same rights to all people. In other words, I don't think that the provincial government should be providing rights in the field of government in this sense that a municipality should not be providing, or any other government shouldn't be providing. We would be providing different rights to individuals and in other words making another new system of expropriation in the province of Saskatchewan. Instead of doing what we set out to do and that was try to get the system of expropriation in one act so that individuals in the province would know when governments came to take action against them they would know what their rights were. I don't think we could do this by going at it in a piecemeal fashion and I would ask at this time, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that I was unable to hear the remarks of the mover of the motion, I would ask for the right to adjourn the debate.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — REDUCTION IN POWER RATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution, no. 4, moved by Mr. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):

That this assembly requests the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing the rates of electrical power for skating and curling rinks, which are community owned and operated.

Mr. Eiling Kramer: (The Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, I have a few things I would like to say concerning this motion, now that we are back to the original motion after the amendment for a general decrease in the power rates across the province was defeated.

I believe that this is certainly going to be beneficial to the

March 9, 1965

sportsmen of the curling and the skating fraternities throughout the province. This, as has already been said in this debate, does cover a large cross section of people in many communities, as certainly curling and skating, junior hockey teams and so on, do embrace a very, very broad spectrum of people. I am not satisfied that it does cover as many people as I would like to see it cover in all areas, and I'll have more to say about this later.

I think, at this time though, it should be recognized that we have apparently reached some milestones. I am sorry that the annual report of the Power Corporation has not yet been tabled but I have in my hand last year's report, and I would say that the milestone that has been reached in power production and certainly in the plateau that has been reached to where extra profits can be made and made more readily, as has been shown and as I am sure will be shown, in this year's report. Last year, I would like to draw to the attention of this house, revenues totalled \$56,300,000, compared with \$51,000,000 in 1962, which was a good increase and it showed the steady upward climb in development. Net income after interest, \$5,500,000 compared with \$3,900,000 the year before. Number of customers billed was 298,600 including 201,600 electrical and 97,000 natural gas customers. A tremendous increase there, and certainly something that Saskatchewan people can be well proud of in their public utilities. Electrical energy delivery to the system last year again reached 1,927,000,000 kilowatt hours compared with the 1,646,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1962. An increase of 17 per cent. Natural gas purchased and produced last year totalled 49,000,000,000 . . .

Mr. B.D. Gallagher: (Yorkton) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) isn't a little bit off base here, giving us the figures from the annual report of the S.P.C. I think it is the resolution on the order paper that we are dealing with.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the motion. I am speaking about the Power Corporation which is under discussion. The motion suggests that the Power Corporation do certain things and I am proceeding to inform the house as to why these things are possible, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion is on the order paper.

Mr. Kramer: — Natural gas purchased and produced totalled 49,000,000 cubic feet compared with 43,400,000 cubic feet in 1962. An increase of more than 10 per cent in that particular period.

Mr. Gallagher: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — State the point of order.

Mr. Gallagher: — The member is continuing to talk about the Power Corporation. All the resolution says is that we request the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing the rates of electrical power to skating and curling rinks. It does not say anything else about the operation of the Power Corporation . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The motion itself as the member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) has mentioned, mentions the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the request that it reduce rates. Now, is it not right that we should look into the question of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to see whether it is a reasonable request that should be made and to do that, I think we have got to discuss something about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I think the member is quite in order in discussing the, insofar as he has gone now, the business of the Power Corporation.

Mr. Speaker: — What resolution did you say was on the order paper?

Mr. Kramer: — May I proceed, Mr. Speaker? I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted, that the position as of last year, and I am sure that the position will be much improved this year, in this constantly expanding and burgeoning corporation. I was saying that natural gas purchased and produced totalled 49,000,000,000 cubic feet compared with 43,000,000,000

in 1962. An increase of more than 10 per cent. Communities served with natural gas totalled 155 with 15 centres added in 1963. Here again, shows the upward and building trend. Head office building construction was completed and the building occupied. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is one more reason now that the heart and centre of the total corporation has been built, to create greater efficiency, it provides revenues for the suggestions that are outlined in the motion. Squaw Rapids Hydro electric station went on line with four to six units, four of the six units, operational adding another 134,000 kilowatts of capacity to the provincial system. The steel tower, 230,000 volt transmission line was constructed and energized between Beatty and Saskatoon.

I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that a good many curling rinks, through one thing and another, will be served, and skating rinks in smaller centres will be served from these new high lines which provide constant and sure source of power to the outlying communities. Underground electrical distribution systems were also expanded in that particular year. I am sure, also, we will see them expanded to a greater degree in this particular year.

One of the assets of the corporation, of course, is the natural gas and they increased their mileage by 311 miles of more pipe line including ten miles of 24 inch diameter pipe in the Hatton Many Islands gathering system, the largest diameter pipeline on the corporation's system. Thirty-five additional gas wells brought into production, now this has nothing to do with the corporation, but it does have something to do with the health of this company. I suggest that it is part and parcel of what we are discussing as to whether or not this company should be able to make these concessions. Now, Mr. Speaker, this did not all happen by accident. I think it is fortunate, this particular year and especially in our Jubilee Year, that we are able to proceed with and consider concessions to communities that are for the benefit and the culture of the communities. I would rather doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if, for instance, the S.P.C. had not been a public corporation, if this would have been possible. In fact, it would not have been possible to distribute this largesse to the people in the various communities. So this is an advantage of having these utilities under public ownership. I hope that all the hon. members across the way agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be possible if this had not been expanded under public ownership. Certainly, a good many areas in Saskatchewan would not have the benefits of either power or natural gas if it had not been for the foresight and the thoughtfulness of the people who engineered and planned and developed the blueprints that went into the construction and the building of this corporation. I would safely say, too, that this particular time, that this planning and successful building with the continual growth and expansion, successfully, did not happen by accident. I suggest that the recent general manager who is no longer with us deserves a tremendous amount of credit for bringing this corporation, Mr. Speaker, to the point, and I'm talking of Mr. David Cass-Beggs, for having created this tremendous institution for the people of Saskatchewan so that this largesse can be distributed to the people of Saskatchewan. And that curling rinks and skating rinks and I hope, other institutions in communities, will be provided with assistance in order that they might be able to bring more advantages and more culture to these various communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is true that these, as I said earlier, that curling rinks and skating rinks are going to embrace a good number of people in communities. There are other projects, other buildings, other institutions in communities, that also need a great deal of assistance, and that also have a rather rough time financing. I think when it comes to culture, little theatre, even community dances, public meetings, public discussions, in a good many of the smaller communities, the community hall is certainly a place that is always wanting and begging for assistance. Most of these community halls, Mr. Speaker, are in a run-down condition. They are always having trouble financing, just as much trouble as the curling rinks have and the skating rinks. I believe that there are other institutions too, I shall not go into those, but certainly I think that a good argument could be put up by churches and schools. I shall not go into that area. They, too, have a rough time financing. unless they happen to be in wealthy communities.

If we are, as has been suggested, in and out of this house, going to put more emphasis on culture, certainly the community meeting place deserves consideration. If these community halls were not in bad economic position, serious economic positions at times, they probably would be able to do a little more in establishing, renovating, furnishing, putting in more electrical appliances so that they could possible serve banquets and put on various entertainments, which would provide more culture to the various communities.

March 9, 1965

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move at this time, an amendment to the motion, as follows:

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word “for” the following words “community halls and”

This amendment is seconded by Mr. Nollet, the hon. member for Cut Knife.

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the house is on the proposed resolution moved by the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker)

That this assembly requests the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to consider reducing the rates of electrical power for skating and curling rinks, which are community owned and operated.

To which an amendment has been moved by the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) seconded by the member for Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet):

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word “for” the following words “community halls and”:

The debate continues on the amendment.

Hon. D.G. Stuart: (Prince Albert) — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan) for second reading of Bill no. 29, An Act to Provide Certain Exceptions to the Lord’s Day Act (Canada).

Mr. R.A. Walker: (Hanley) — When the house rose last Thursday, I was on my feet discussing Bill no. 29, and I do not want to go back over the argument that I made at that time, but I want to just briefly sum up what I consider is an area which may be a constitutional problem.

First of all, I think it is agreed by common consent that this legislature only has power to legislate on subject matters dealt with in the Lord’s Day Act of Canada, if the parliament of Canada has vacated that jurisdiction in favor of this legislature. In other words, the parliament of Canada, having passed the Lord’s Day Act, has occupied the field and the legislature cannot have jurisdiction. But Section 6, sub-section 1 of the Lord’s Day Act, says, and I just quote briefly from it:

It is not lawful for any person on the Lord’s Day except as provided in any provincial act or law now or hereafter enforced.

So that is the authority for the legislature to act. Now, how far does that authority extend, Mr. speaker? Well, it extends this far “to engage in any public game or contest”, so that the Lord’s Day Act of Canada authorizes the legislature to make exceptions to the provisions contained in the federal statute with respect to “any public game or contest”.

Now, the legislation which is before the house, purports to deal with “any public game, contest or sport”. Mr. Speaker, so far as sport is defined as a public game or contest then I don’t think we can question the right of the legislature to pass the statute. But anyone who examines the dictionary will see that the word “sport” includes many activities, which do not come under the heading of “public games or contests”. Now, it includes such things as I signified the other day, as hunting, and even dining and drinking, and other things too, which I don’t propose to enumerate to the assembly this afternoon, but I would say this, that if any city wanted to legislate to permit some of these sports, then the ladies in question would no longer be able to sing “Never on a Sunday”. So, Mr. Speaker, I say quite seriously that this legislation goes further than we are authorized to go by Section 6, sub-section 1, of The Lord’s Day Act.

Mr. Speaker, it may be said that this legislation is just a copy of a similar act passed by another province. That may be so, the statute books are replete with statutes that are unconstitutional — that are ultra

vires in some particular or other. We only have to remember the passage of The Margarine Act, some sixty years ago, or longer, that was observed, — obeyed — as though it were law throughout Canada for over half a century. It turned out it wasn't law at all, yet it was observed as though it were. So, Mr. Speaker, very large interests can be denied or can be advanced by a statute which is ultra vires and for many years it can be unknown, unrealized, unappreciated, that the statute is null and of no effect.

It may be no argument for the mover of the resolution to say that the statute of other provinces goes further than a public game or contest, and does include sport, because as a matter of fact, everyone, I think, knows that before a prosecution can be had under The Lord's Day Act of Canada, the consent of the Attorney General of the province must be obtained. I suppose it is just a practical matter for the Attorney General to take note of the fact that the Saskatchewan act contains the word "sport" whereas if there is any question of its constitutionality, he may simply refuse to prosecute, and perhaps a test case will never get before the courts, if the Attorney General refuses to prosecute over any one engaging in this class of activity.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we as legislators, ought to have enough respect for the law and for the Constitution of Canada and for the powers of the province so that we ought to try to pass legislation which we know is incontrovertible. We ought to aim to pass legislation which cannot be successfully challenged, either in practice or theory.

I would, therefore, ask, Mr. Speaker, that the mover give serious consideration to deleting that word, because it does raise all sorts of practical difficulties. It will raise questions which will haunt the Attorney General in the future for this reason, that he will have people coming along and asking whether or not "sport" includes drinking in the pub, and I am afraid if his petitioner brought along a dictionary they can out-argue him on that. Does it include hunting? I am afraid that if they brought along a dictionary, they can out-argue him on this. I don't like to see him in the position where he has to rule on a lot of dubious propositions and I think that this act would be much clearer, and much more meaningful if it was restricted to these two words "public game and contest" because I am sure, quite sure, that is all the mover has in mind by this legislation.

I think that if we are going to eventually open the door to include drinking in the bars, and Sunday hunting, if we are going to open the door to include all these multifarious activities which I have referred to, we ought to do it as a result of a deliberate decision made here, and not as a result of merely accidentally discovering in the future that the act passed in 1965 really meant more than the movers thought it meant. I think that the act would not suffer if it was taken back and if that word was deleted.

I want to suggest one other thing too, that the house really has no assurance that it is the intention of the government, at this time, to introduce or the intention of anybody to introduce provision for a plebiscite. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody wants to get technical about it, they can probably object to it being introduced in committee, because it does involve a new principle, and as proof that it involves a new principle, all Your Honor has to do is cast his mind back over all the people who have taken part in this debate. One after another got up and said "I will be opposed to this in principle except that some provision be made for a plebiscite". One after another said "I would support the principle of this bill provided incorporated in it was provision for a plebiscite", but no such provision is incorporated in it, and the mere suggestion in debate that perhaps it will be, doesn't necessarily make it in accord with the rules of the committee when we come to consider it. Because the house, whatever else may be said, the house is being asked to pass this bill in this form.

Now, Mr. Speaker, something was said by the Deputy Premier, and I thought he said it quite heatedly, that it was not going to be permitted that this bill go to the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers . . .

Hon. A. H. McDonald: (Deputy Premier) — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing, I said, "As far as I was concerned, I wouldn't support such a proposal". I am not in control of this house, surely this house is in control of what happens, whether this bill goes to the committee or whether it doesn't.

Mr. Walker: — Well, I hope that hon. members on that side of the house take note of those words, but when speaking — I am prepared to accept the Deputy Premier's assertion that he doesn't care whether it goes to that committee or the other committee.

March 9, 1965

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I didn't say I didn't care, I said I wouldn't support. I think it was the hon. lady member for Regina West (Mrs. Cooper) asked if I would support this proposal and I said no, and I won't, but I can't control this house, and I have no desire to do so. This house will decide what happens to this bill.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. member's statement and perhaps I didn't appreciate just what he said with too much acuity when he said it. I think if we want to have this bill, and I have detected a large number of speakers who said they wanted to have this bill heard by a committee whose practice allows the public to come before the committee, to make representation, that if a large number of members want this to happen, there are just two ways that it can be made to happen. If the bill passes second reading for someone to get up and move that it goes before the Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers; but this is a highly unreliable and uncertain procedure because this depends upon catching Your Honor's eye. Your Honor may not happen to see the member who has that in mind and it doesn't admit of an amendment at that stage, as I understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to resolve any doubts about this matter by asking the house now to say that the house would like the contents of this bill examined by the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers, so that these changes may be made before the bill comes back here to receive approval in principle, so that the principles that have been talked about in this bill can, in fact, be in the bill before we give it second reading.

So, Mr. Speaker, so that the house can make a formal decision on this question, I would now move, seconded by Mr. Dewhurst, (Wadena)

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

This bill be now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, just before I resume my seat, that a number of people have made representations to me in this regard, and I am sure that there are people who would like to come before a proper committee of this house, and express their opinions on this particular matter before the house makes a decision on the principle of the bill.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I now move the amendment which I just read in the house,

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the house is on the motion of the member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. I.H. MacDougall) for a second reading of Bill 29, to which an amendment has been moved by the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker), seconded by the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst):

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

this bill be now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers.

Is it the wish of the house to adopt the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The debate continues on the motion.

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words in this debate, I would like to indicate to hon. members that since the question of the constitutionality of the measure was raised the other day by one or

two of the members, I have had an opinion prepared by the officials of my department, the Law Officers of my department.

In the opinion of the law officers, the bill as drafted is intra vires. I would be glad to give my hon. friends a copy of the opinion and it is stated by the Deputy Attorney General: (Mr. Meldrum)

In support of my opinion, I would refer you to the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada, in the reference made by the British Columbia government to their Court of Appeal, and reported under the name of *The Lord's Day Alliance of Canada versus The Attorney General of British Columbia*, reported in 1959 Supreme Court Reports, at page 497:

The British Columbia bill which was held to be intra vires by the Supreme Court of Canada purported to make it lawful for the city of Vancouver to pass a bylaw to make it lawful — 'to provide for or engage in any public game or sport for gain, or for any prize or reward, or to be present at any performance of such public game or sport at which any fee is charged . . .'

So that the word which has been giving the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) some problems, or difficulties, he was worried about the word "sport", this was in the British Columbia reference and no particular point appears to have been made with respect to the addition of the word "sport" in the B.C. bill, and it was held to be intra vires.

The Supreme Court held that a bylaw passed under the proposed B. C. legislation would be a provincial law within the meaning of sub-section I of section 6 of *The Lord's Day Act*, and Chief Justice Kerwin relied on the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Council in *Lord's Day Alliance of Canada v. The Attorney General for Manitoba*. I won't go on to weary you with the full opinion, but the effect of it is that the words "or sport" does not cause any problem and was not found to be . . .

Mr. Walker: — Would the hon. member permit a question? Would you mind reading me again the wording used in the British Columbia legislation.

Mr. Heald — Certainly . . .

To provide for or engage in any public game or sport for gain, or for any prize or reward . . .

The point I was making was that the word "sport" was included and apparently caused the Supreme Court no difficulty, so to summarize, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of my law officers, this act is intra vires. That is the only contribution I wanted to make to the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to point out to the house, the fact that the mover is about to close the debate, if anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. J.W. Gardiner: (Melville) — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to weary the house with extended remarks. I regret that I was not present here for the opening of the debate the other day, and the fact that the debate was adjourned on that occasion gives me an opportunity to say something with regard to the bill that is before us.

I want to make it quite clear that the stand that I am going to take during my remarks is one that has been continually my stand on the question of changes in the *Lord's Day Act*, as far as our province is concerned. I have just been reading a few moments ago the editorial "Under the Dome" in the *Leader Post* which gave me some idea as to some of the arguments that were raised in debate the other day. I do want to say here that I don't intend to get emotional, but I think some of the arguments the other day reminded me of the arguments with regard to purple gas.

With regard to many of the other laws that we have on the statutes

in our country, and that is the fact that if we don't all observe them, we shouldn't have the laws. I think anyone of us will agree that there aren't many laws that we have on our statute books, that most of us probably keep day in and day out, throughout the year. I think probably one we could speak of would be the traffic laws of the province. I imagine the great number of us here in this house at one time or another received a ticket for an infraction of one of the laws on the highways. I understand that if we don't in this house, that there are places in Canada where the members and ministers quite frequently receive tickets for speeding on highways.

I notice as I go down the road there are very few people actually observe the speeding laws, and so I suppose that we should do away with those speeding laws, and let individuals do exactly what they like, I don't feel the fact that many do not believe that his act is proper, or that they should observe it, or that they don't observe it, is any argument for doing away with this or any other particular legislation that might be on the statute books in this province or in Canada. I suppose if we come right down to it, we could go as far as to say that perhaps we should take the Ten Commandments out of the Bible, because of the fact that most people don't observe them very strictly.

I say here today the fact that many people in many communities feel that they should be in a position of having athletics, or sports, doesn't indicate necessarily that this is right or that we should change the laws. It might possibly indicate that the people of that community are prepared to carry on, and the majority in that community are prepared to close their eyes and if they are prepared. to do so, then the community proceeds as they desire, and I think probably that would be what we would find with regard to any act whether it is on a dominion basis, a provincial basis, or within our own community.

However, with regard to The Lord's Day Act, there have been suggestions made that it restricts the right of certain individuals. Well, I am going to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that in making changes in The Lord's Day Act, as it is provided in this country at the present time, it will in exactly the same way affect the rights of many minorities who desire to have The Lord's Day Act remain as it is at the present time, with some protection given to those who believe in the Christian Sabbath. I believe that Canada is recognized as a Christian country, and through legislation we have recognized that we are a Christian country under The Lord's Day Act. The Christian church, generally speaking, accepts the Sabbath day, the Sunday as we know it, as the one day of the week that should be set aside for religious purposes, and so, of course, if we change the act to more or less indicate that this is not so, then we are going to affect many religious people who believe that they have a right to protection under The Lord's Day Act.

It has already been indicated in this house that by and large this isn't going to affect too many of our smaller communities. It isn't going to affect the right of our children to play sport on Sunday if they desire to do so, but it will at the same time protect to some extent at least, and in those communities where they desire to have protection, it will protect those people who feel that they should observe the Sabbath or the Sunday as we know it in our land, that they should observe it in what they feel is a Christian manner.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, when we closed for supper, I had spoken briefly on the act affecting the Lord's Day in the province of Saskatchewan, and I have just one or two comments I would like to make in closing my remarks. The first is that I find it quite strange to be bedfellows in a sense with some of those that are sitting across the way, because it was my friends across the way that did more than any other to make use of the Sabbath day for their own political interests. It was the former Premier of this province, the hon. Tommy Douglas, who more than any other person, made use of the Sabbath day for political purposes, and my good friend the senior member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) was another one, who day in and day out, through his political career made use of Sunday for political purposes.

I can state to him tonight that this is something that I accept as seriously as sports, or anything else, political activity on the Sabbath day. It is one of the reasons why I take strong exception at this time to changes in The Lord's Day Act in this province, because of the fact that

the Sabbath day was set aside for the church in this country. It has been misused for other purposes, other interests are coming in, to attempt to compete with the church for the use of the Sabbath day, and one of them is politics, which was brought in by my friends across the way when they came into politics in this province.

I want to say in closing my remarks that I don't believe that these changes are going to assist in any way, shape or form, the promotion of amateur sports in this province as has been indicated from some quarters. I don't think is designed to assist in any way, shape, or form, our younger people. In fact, I think it is just going to do the opposite. In both cases, because it is promoting more than ever another day for professional sport and another day that is taken away from the young people to have their own activities, and also for families to have their own activities. So, in closing, I just want to say that I intend to oppose the act and I will vote against it when the vote comes up.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, when I listened to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) before recess, my opinion of him was going up, but I was very much disappointed because it appears that the hon. member can talk about no issue without trying to make politics out of it. Maybe, if I knew more about Liberal politics, I would then believe that politics wasn't a fit subject for Sunday either. So maybe he is right in that.

He mentioned Tommy Douglas, who used to be our Premier and our leader, I remember Tommy Douglas debating with Walter Tucker, on a Sunday in a community where people were accustomed to having things like this on a Sunday. Was there anything wrong with it? Walter Tucker was wrong then as well.

This question that we are debating now, Mr. Speaker, is one on which there is a considerable difference of opinion, one on which there is a good deal of controversy, and I think it is one on which everyone has to make up their mind for themselves and vote according to their conscience.

This province was settled to a very great extent by a class of quite religious people who came from eastern Canada and from various parts of Europe. They brought with them traditions in regard to the Sabbath day, and among those people, certainly were my parents who were quite strict about the Sabbath day and had the greatest respect for it. Now, some of the younger members say "But times change". It is true they change, but let us take a look at how they change.

There are still a great many people in Saskatchewan, who have the kind of respect for the Sabbath which would be offended by any further opening up of the Sabbath day. Now, I just don't think this is either desirable or necessary. It certainly isn't desirable, and I am certain that it isn't necessary that we do things to offend substantial groups of people. In this modern day work is becoming scarcer, except probably for politicians, they seem to be kept busy, but there is more and more work being done by mechanical means and less and less for people, and the trend has been that work weeks are becoming shorter. The five day week is a common thing now. If we are going to solve the problems that are facing us in the future, they will have to become shorter yet, or certainly the work year, and the work life, shorter than at the present time. So, I don't think we are in such a pinch for time that we cannot afford to have one day set aside to be different. It actually won't do any of us any harm to have one day in week that is a little bit quiet, whether or not we go to church, even if we sit and do some thinking and certainly the world can do with a lot of people doing quite a bit of thinking about it.

Now the remark has been made that we cannot legislate morality. I know that is right, and no one would suggest that we should try to do it, but I don't think that our country, or our life, would gain anything, in fact, I think we would lose something if we open up the door anymore to making further commercial use of the Sabbath day. It is probably a good thing for us to have the one quiet day in the week when all unnecessary work is shut down. Now, I do hope that if this bill gets second reading, that the bill can go to the Law Amendments Committee so that people who want to make some representations can appear before the committee. Then after all has been heard on the question, we can make up our minds in time to deal with the bill when it comes back, buy anyway, on second reading, I will have to vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 9, 1965

Mr. H.D. Link: (Saskatoon) — [text unavailable] of Public Works thinks politics make strange bedfellows, I wonder how he thinks I as one member from Saskatoon feels about this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe over thirty members from both sides of the house have participated in this debate. Many of the previous speakers said they had not intended to participate, but nevertheless spoke very eloquently and at some length. Let me say then, Mr. Speaker, I had every intention of participating in this debate, and let me also say, Mr. Speaker, right at the beginning, that I propose to support this legislation.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say to those members in this house who advocated plebiscites, that as far as I am concerned there was a plebiscite on April 22nd, 1964, at which time, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan elected those of us who are in this house today. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province on April 22nd, elected us to carry on with our work and to use our best judgment in providing suitable legislation for them. If the decisions we make, Mr. Speaker, do not meet with approval of the electors, they will have the opportunity, I presume, to remove each and everyone of us from office when the next provincial election is held. That goes for members on either side of the house. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of Saskatchewan want us to assume the responsibility that is rightly ours. We may make the wrong decisions, but surely this is better than not doing anything at all. Besides, Mr. Speaker, we like the electors, have the right, I believe, to be wrong.

I am not in favor, Mr. Speaker, of plebiscites on a local level. However, I do not propose to get involved in that particular aspect of this act at the present time. It seems to me that this would really add confusion to an already confusing issue. I suggest to the members of this house, that if this is done, it would be as bad as the time question. I believe we in this house must make a decision, have the courage to either support this bill together or defeat it together and take the consequences together.

This is as I see it, not a political issue, and certainly not one that can be divided between the various political parties or religious groups. I would just ask the members on both sides what they think would happen, for instance, if a local plebiscite was held in Saskatoon, for example, and another plebiscite in North Battleford. Saskatoon favored Sunday sports, North Battleford didn't. Can't you see the extra traffic on the highway with hundreds of extra cars driving from one city to another, and knowing what our traffic record is at the present time, it seems to me our young people would be better off in their own community than to be driving down the highway in high powered cars. I suggest these local plebiscites might well add also to the trouble of our police force if in one community you have Sunday sports and one you have not. It seems to me we would be asking for a real headache in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the legislation for the following reasons. I believe I was elected to represent the youth of this province as well as the older people. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that thousands upon thousands of our young people are in favor of Sunday sports and as previous speakers have already indicated I believe our young people are far better off engaged in sporting activities than to be idle. As one speaker put it, busy boys are good boys. Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to those who for religious reasons want to keep the Sabbath holy, let me say at this point that there are many other people that are equally as devout but do not recognize Sunday as being a holy day. I refer, of course to Seventh Day Adventists, Moslems, Jews and other groups. Surely no one in this house would deny that these people are any less devout because they happen to worship on a day different than Sunday.

I will also support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in certain freedoms. Mr. Speaker, many, in this house, I am sure, believe that I should be able to go to the doctor of my choice. They would argue that the doctor should have the freedom to make his decision on how he would treat me. I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is the way it should be, but I also suggest that if my family or I want to attend a ball game, we should be able to do so. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this proposed bill that would compel me to attend a ball game. We do not in this house, Mr. Speaker, pass legislation that either compels people to attend church on Sunday or conversely forbids them to attend. I suggest, therefore, that we treat the people that are interested in sports in the same manner.

I propose to support this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because my constituency held a plebiscite in this regard and the majority were in favor

of Sunday sports. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I phoned one of my executive members in Saskatoon and asked this member to conduct a small poll at random in the city of Saskatoon just to help me make up my mind in this regard. Out of sixteen people contacted, only one was opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this legislation because I have four boys. They are very active young fellows and they are very interested in sports. Does anyone suggest that I should deprive them of the opportunity to watch a ball game on Sunday? I ask the obvious question — Why? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we already have Sunday sports in this province. The only thing unfortunately is that it is available only to those with better than average income. They are the ones that can afford to golf, water ski, go on trips in their big cars and so on and so on.

I believe by passing this legislation we will make available to those people with a modest income, some opportunities to enjoy a few hours of leisure with their wife and children, on perhaps the only day they have off from work. I suggest this bill may not be perfect, but I believe it is a step in the right direction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: (Premier) — I would like to take about one minute to express my own personal views on this issue. I think it is a matter of great controversy, but I can tell you that there have been few bills this session that I have received as much pressure from both sides. I admit very freely that I have some trepidation about this bill. I wouldn't want to see wide open Sundays in Saskatchewan. On the other hand, I think the intentions of the mover of the resolution is not to have wide open Sundays, I think as he has indicated there will be various plebiscites in the local communities and this will permit the people themselves to decide whether or not they want to have Sunday sports.

I think we are going about this legislation in the correct way by having members on both sides of the house make up their own minds. Certainly I would think if there are not members of the opposition who support this bill, it will be defeated, because there are a number of members on this side who feel very strongly that it should be defeated.

I say again, to my belief, that if the majority of the people in a community believe that they are entitled to Sunday sports and want it, I don't see how members of this legislature can seriously wish to prevent them from having them. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this motion.

Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife) — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Premier a question? Does this bill as proposed now, provide for a plebiscite? I took from your remarks that it did.

Mr. Thatcher: — My understanding is that such an amendment can't be moved in second reading but that it will be moved just as soon as we get into committee.

Mr. I.A. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, this is our intention and I will make remarks on this when I close the debate.

Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina North) — Mr. Speaker, many of those who participated in the debate thus far have indicated their desire that a plebiscite clause be included. I am glad to hear the sponsor of the bill say that this will be taken care of, and that it will become part of the proposed legislation.

Now why do we want a plebiscite or local option vote? I think the reason for this is that we would like to see the local community express an opinion that can be a guide for those in the community who are handling the legislation, the people responsible for the local bylaws.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Regina has expressed an opinion, and by a majority of 3,100 votes, they have said that they want Sunday sports. It has been argued that the issues weren't clearly stated, they weren't properly presented, but I maintain that those who voted in that particular civic election, had ample opportunity to pick up the issues on television or radio: both sides presented their arguments objectively and the people in the city

of Regina decided by vote. Some say that the ballot was not clear, but it has always seemed to me that when one loses an election, you are more liable to say that the ballot wasn't a clear cut indication. I maintain there has been a clear majority in Regina, and I will accept the majority of 3,100 in any election at any time, as a clear cut indication. I am sure all hon. members would accept this as a majority.

I feel that I am bound to represent, duty bound to represent, the people in Regina who voted by a majority for this particular type of legislation. I do agree that there should be some amendments when the bill gets into committee, and I am pleased to hear that the mover of the bill, the sponsor of the bill will be introducing these amendments. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support this bill in second reading.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a few brief observations in regard to this bill. I was very impressed with much of the debate that has gone before; I must say that I was disappointed in some of the remarks, and some of the material to substantiate different members' reasons for either supporting it or not supporting it. I don't think that the occasion that arose where some of the members said that it may make millionaires of some of the Legislative Secretaries or that there may be some shady characters in professional sports. I don't think this added anything to the substance of the debate, because I know that many of the young people today, use some of our professional athletes as their idols and because of that, I think that they take care of their bodies and make sure that they live a good clean life and I know many of the young people of Saskatchewan use our own Gordie Howe from Saskatoon as their idol, as far as hockey is concerned. I think I am fairly safe in saying the demeanor and the manner and the way that Gordie Howe has conducted himself over the years, would be a good influence for any young person.

Now the other matter that has concerned myself, and it has not been brought out so far in the debate, is the fact that throughout the province, many of our communities now are going outside the law and holding sports and contests on Sunday. I don't think this is a good thing for the young people of the province, because they know in effect this Lord's Day Act is being broken and I think that if we are going to teach our young people respect for the law, I believe the responsibility should be taken upon ourselves or by the local governments and see to it that if the local community wants to carry out Sunday activities, that the law is set up to provide them to do this legally. I think this will instil a greater respect in the minds of our young people for observing the laws of this province. So that would be one of the first points I want to make.

The second point that I would like to make, would be the fact that I believe in the freedom of local governments, the responsibility of local governments. The way many of our acts stand at the present time, the provincial government has complete authority. I believe that if the city of Saskatoon wants to conduct certain events on a Sunday afternoon or any other day of the week, they should have the authority to do so, or at least the council should have the authority to do so, by bylaw. Now, I think that if we are going to reach an age of maturity in this province, that we must give to the local governments the authority that rightfully belongs to them. So, in this case, I would be quite willing to let the local governments assume their share of the responsibility.

There has been some mention made in regards to a plebiscite on this matter. I think all hon. members know, that there are sections in the City Act and there are sections in the Town Act that specifically spell out the authority for passing bylaws, to conduct plebiscites and conduct votes so that the wishes of the people could be heard on any of these matters either pro or con. I would bring this to the attention of members of the house, but if they feel that these sections of the City Act and the Town Act are not enough, if they want them spelled out, then I think the mover of this motion has been agreeable to that extent that this could be spelled out in committee.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons that I have mentioned, not because I happen to be a member of the church board and have been for years, and not because of the church history of my own family, I can go back in years to that, but I, too, have raised four sons and I think because of the fact that they had a certain Christian atmosphere in their own home and because they

were real sportsmen, and because of the fact that they have always idolized other professional sportsmen, or been in contact with good sportsmen over the years, I don't think the fact that they would be allowed to participate or attend a Sunday sport event that is set up legally, I don't think this is going to affect the morals or affect their families in the future, and so, I have a great satisfaction at this time in voting for a bill that I think provides for many of the things that should be done in this province and done on a legalized basis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the house to the fact that the mover is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak, they must do so now.

Mr. MacDougall: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in rising to close this debate, I must say that this was probably one of the best debates we have had in this house in a good many years, because those that were opposed to it, were very definite in their views. Those that were for it, were equally definite in their views and there were a number of others that probably walked on eggs.

I made many, many notes of some of the remarks by members who opposed this bill. I want to point out a few things. The member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) said that the people who populated this province originally, had very definite views along the lines of Sunday blue laws but in this regard, I would like to remind him that in the very parts of Canada from which many of these people came, they have seen fit to allow charging for Sunday sports. And so I think that with four or five provinces, five provinces at the moment who have this type of permissive legislation (and that is exactly what this is) that we are just merely keeping in step with the rest of the country. I am not going to get into the moral aspects of this particular legislation because since it is permissive, and since members can vote in a free vote on this particular debate, I don't think it is necessary for me to go into this.

I do want to commend the last member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) who spoke, because I think if I had written his speech myself, I couldn't have agreed more with what he said. It seems that he hit the nail on the head, probably closer than any other member speaking in this debate.

I would urge the members who can support this on both sides of the house to get up and support it because as I indicated before, I intend to bring in an amendment to allow for plebiscites when it gets into the Committee of the Whole. There are probably some other points that would need clarification but I think that we can work these things out in committee and again since we have agreed to this, I think that probably the members can now feel more free to support the bill on second reading.

We are not bringing in anything new, really. In this bill, we are simply allowing sporting organizations to charge for their performances. We are doing exactly the same thing now, but most of the time, it is contrary to the law or they do it by silver collection and as anyone who ever played any sport at all knows, it is difficult to finance these organizations. I can say this, that in my own city of Estevan, we lost our baseball team because we could not charge people for coming on Sunday and the evenings were too short to allow for a full game, so the ball club folded up.

Personally I have had many representations from the hockey organizations across the province speaking out in favor of this legislation and they want, as far as I can see, to dispatch this thing at the earliest possible date. I was on a radio program the other day, just yesterday as a matter of fact, and there were fourteen phone calls came. As the member for Saskatoon pointed out in his case, there were sixteen calls made, and one was against. On this particular program there were fourteen phone calls came in; twelve were for and two were against. When we asked the parties who were opposed to it just what their reasons were, they could not really define their viewpoint on it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said on this thing in this house, for us to have a vote on it now. I don't think that sending it to Law Amendments would prove anything. I think we were sent here to legislate and surely we can make some decisions ourselves and I would leave it at that. I certainly support this motion since I made it in the first place.

March 9, 1965

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division and bill read the second time.

YEAS — 35
Messieurs

Thatcher	McIsaac	Asbell
Howes	Grant	Hooker
McFarlane	Cuelenaere	Radloff
Cameron	MacDonald (Milestone)	Blakeney
McDonald (Moosomin)	Gallagher	Davies
Steuart	Breker	Willis
Heald	Leith	Whelan
Guy	Bjarnason	Smishek
Merchant (Mrs.)	Romuld	Link
Loken	Weatherald	Snyder
McDougall	MacLennan	Pederson
Coderre	Larochelle	

NAYS — 17
Messieurs

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Dewhurst	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Cooper (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Pepper
Wood	Wooff	Boldt
Nollet	Broten	Gardiner
Walker	Larson	Coupland
Nicholson	Robbins	

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the said Bill no. 29 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers

Mr. MacDougall: — This was a motion this afternoon and it was defeated.

An Hon. Member: — No, it wasn't.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — No, the motion this afternoon was the subject matter of the bill. Now we are talking about something different; this is the bill itself; it has had second reading and I move that it be referred to the Law Amendments Committee.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, I think you have to have a seconder for the motion.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Oh, I'll get a seconder alright.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, write it out and send it up.

Mr. Walker: — No, Your Honor, I don't think that seconders are ever required for that motion. It is customary for the mover of the bill and, of course, it is open to any member of the house, equally, to move such a motion. No seconder is ever required for this motion, Your Honor.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, now, I'm not sure about this, but there is one thing that I am sure of and that is that the motion is in order. Whether it has to have a seconder or not, this is something that . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — We have got the seconder, if necessary, the member for Hanley (Hr. Walker), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Does it not need a written motion?

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Hell, this motion is never written down, never handed in or written . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm informed that it is a procedural motion and is put as is. It has been moved by the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank):

That the bill be referred to the Law Amendments committee.

Motion negated on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Whelan	Snyder
Cooper(Mrs.)	Nicholson	Broten
Wood	Kramer	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Walker	Berezowsky	Brockelbank (Saskatoon)
Blakeney	Michayluk	Pepper
Davies	Smishek	
Thibault	Link	
Willis	Wooff	

NAYS — 31
Messieurs

Thatcher	MacDougall	Romuld
Howes	Gardiner	Weatherald
McFarlane	Coderre	MacLennan
Boldt	McIsaac	Larochelle
Cameron	Trapp	Asbell
McDonald (Moosomin)	Cuelenaere	Hooker
Steuart	MacDonald (Milestone)	Radloff
Heald	Gallagher	Coupland
Guy	Breker	Pederson
Merchant (Mrs.)	Leith	
Loken	Bjarnason	

RESOLUTION RE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution no. 6 moved by Mr. Whelan (Regina North) and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Hon. D. Heald (Attorney General).

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I adjourned this debate last Thursday, I believe it was, it might have been Friday, at least at a time when the tolerances for time were very slender in working our radio time. I did, however, want to say a few words about it.

I think that no one in the house needs to be reminded of the great problem which safety on our highways is becoming not only in Saskatchewan, but everywhere in Canada, and indeed wherever automobiles are used in any great numbers.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think there is no doubt that this is a difficult problem, because while everybody recognizes that automobiles are the cause of a good deal of slaughter on the highways, a great number of people resent restrictive traffic laws, and I think there is no doubt about this. We all know that a lowering of the speed limits would save lives. Nonetheless we are really not prepared to make this sacrifice as a community in order to save these lives. This makes the problem of traffic regulations a particularly thorny one — it makes it all the more necessary and desirable that if we as a legislature embark upon any proposals for a relatively stricter approach to traffic regulations in order to save life and limb and property that it is desirable that this approach be one which is supported on both sides of the house. It is very easy to enlist support for the proposition that our traffic laws are restrictive and that they are enforced in a pigheaded, unrealistic way or whatever else, whatever other phrase leaps to your tongue when you have been picked up for going 68 miles per hour on a perfectly calm summer day with visibility ten miles and not a curve in five miles.

March 9, 1965

I think the point I wish to make is that there is a good deal of merit in a common approach to this problem if we are going to embark upon a program of stricter traffic regulations or if we are going to embark upon a program of creating new offences, as was suggested by the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) in his remarks the other day.

I am by no means convinced that there is not a good deal of merit in what he said. But I know that it will be a subject of resentment by the motoring public, not what he said, but if new offences were created. I am not saying justified resentment; I am just saying resentment. Accordingly, if we embark on this there is a good deal of merit in doing it after we have more or less committed ourselves to it, on the basis of a study and committed ourselves to a bipartisan approach. I think that the wisdom of this was illustrated in the changes to the liquor laws, a decade ago or a little less when a committee did a good deal of work on this and arrived at a bipartisan approach and a staged and gradual change. I'm not suggesting that this is by any means a similar problem, but I am suggesting that some of the elements of it are there.

Accordingly, I think it is a pretty good subject for a legislative committee. I think that there is no split on party lines as to the need for highway safety and the need for saving lives. However, there are a good number of prickles in this sort of thing for the party in power, I think the hon. members opposite will appreciate this. Under these circumstances, I think that this is a good subject for an intersessional committee of the legislature. I express no particular opinion on the changes suggested in his amendment by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), although I think that the literature on the subject will suggest that no study of highway accidents can be anywhere nearly complete without some consideration of the association between the drinking of alcohol and highway accidents. So, I believe that his amendment is, accordingly, in order if the intersessional committee is to give this topic anything more than a cursory review.

I think all members will agree that it is a serious problem. I think, on reflection, members will agree that not only is it a serious problem, but it is the sort of problem that a legislative committee can perhaps do something with. There are lots of problems which don't lend themselves particularly to study by a legislative committee. I rather think that this is one that does.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will not be opposing the amendment of the hon. the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and I will be supporting the motion.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might move the adjournment of this debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION RE ROADS-TO-RESOURCES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution no. 5, moved by Mr. Radloff (Nipawin)

That this assembly urge the government of Canada to extend the current Roads-to-Resources Program.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: (Cumberland) — Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate Thursday. The reason was that I thought that the motion did not cover some aspects of the situation as I envisaged it and I thought it might be well to do a little bit of research as to what the real needs of the north are at this time. I also wanted to think over as to why this kind of motion had been brought in, because we had a program that had been underway for some time, and I know that it was coming to completion in the near future and I was wondering why the government was concerned about having an extension.

Now, I would like to, first of all, mention that as we go into the records we find that the government of Canada entered into agreements with the provinces of Canada for a resource development program of building roads, to the tune of some \$150,000,000 — half to be paid by the province and half to be paid by Ottawa. If my information is correct, this program was to start in 1958, and is to end sometime March, 1967. The minister

can correct me if I am wrong.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere: (Minister of Natural Resources) — . . . 1966.

Mr. Berezowsky: — 1966? That makes it even worse. If that is the case, then I will say that the reason I think, for bringing in the motion is that somewhere along the line we have not carried out the program in each year to the extent that we should have done. I think the minister, the hon. member for Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere) did mention this the other day. He mentioned that probably both governments were a little bit to blame. Probably the weather was to blame. But I do think there was some blame last year in not carrying out this program, because when I look at the records I find that there was an appropriation in the Department of Natural Resources, for some \$659,000 and my knowledge of what has been going on is that not very much of that was spent.

For example, to illustrate — the Cumberland House road project, which is part of that vote, was hardly touched last year. Only a few hundred thousand, I think it was, from the previous year that was spent. Certainly, not very much was done on the Hanson Lake road last year. There was a crew working there but they were not very active. I'm not blaming the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere), but if there has been a slowdown in these operations, I must blame the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan who put a freeze on a lot of the expenditures that should have been made in this province.

I recollect quite well from the press that the road from La Ronge north towards Reindeer Lake was completely stopped and the people of La Ronge were quite angry about it. The member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), I think, was quite angry about it. They did ask the ministers of the crown to meet with them and they did have a meeting and I am glad to see that this road is now again in operation. So I think a large part of the blame as to why this \$4,000,000 or whatever it is, that has not been spent, is on hand and has to be spent very quickly, is the fault of the Liberal government which sits opposite, because of the freeze in the construction of these very important roads.

Now, I would like to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that it is rather strange to get a resolution like this from the Liberal government because over the years, when I was in the legislature here and we asked the opposition at that time (which was the Liberal opposition) to support us in trying to get some favorable consideration from Ottawa for this kind of program, we were never so favored. It was not until we had a Conservative government in Ottawa that we were able to get this kind of program for Saskatchewan and for the rest of Canada. So it is rather surprising that now they are requesting the Liberal government in Ottawa to extend the time to complete these programs.

I, of course, am for the motion. I hope that we do not have to divide on this matter. Mistakes may have been made by governments. I'm not going to say that the former CCF government did not make some mistakes. It probably did. We know that the weather, in many cases, stopped construction and held the crews up from carrying on the amount of work that otherwise should have been possible. So I am quite prepared to support the motion but I will have an amendment at a later time. I will explain why. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the importance of these northern access roads.

Now, the mover of the motion, the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) failed to tell the house why these resource roads were important, so I have to go back a little bit to the history of this province and point out why I think they are important. As hon. members will know, some years ago, the only access into the north was over canoe routes and where we had the larger rivers and larger streams, that is where native settlements existed. In order to get to these resources, the human resources in those areas, one used the canoe or boat and other watercraft and a bit of portaging and travel by land as well. But as the settlers moved into this province, and this part of Canada, we found that roads were very urgent. As a matter of fact, the first trails that were built were built for the Red River cart which was about three feet wide and the people moved over the hills and valleys and made trails and settled this area because we had resources here. Those were the first resource roads.

I think probably in British Columbia we have had the first resource roads, the road that was built in 1860 which was called the Caribou road. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you may have been over it. It is a lovely

March 9, 1965

road. I was there. It is an historical road and it was opened up for the purpose of mining. There was a rush in mining as you know near Prince George at Quesnel and this road was built in that direction. Those are some of the early roads in the west that were built to the resources of the area.

I think probably the first resource roads that I can think of is when we homesteaded up in the north, north of Prince Albert, and these are the roads into the forests. The settlers hewed out and cut out these roads and they used sleighs in winter and sometimes wagons in the summer to take out whatever was left of the forest. There wasn't much left, by the way, as we had had former Liberal and Conservative federal governments and most of the timber was cut out. But to harvest what little there was, we built roads into these areas.

Now, more lately, Sir, after the CCF government was in office, there has been a program of conservation and much of our forest resources were regenerated and had to be utilized. So it was necessary to get roads into the more distant areas to extract the timber resource of our province. That is, I think, the time that we began seriously to think about modern access roads. Then, of course, for some years, there had been talk about mineral wealth in the north. If I may spend a few minutes I would just like to point out, something about these resources.

We have a fairly good forest resource in the Pasqua hills between Hudson Bay and The Pas, in Manitoba. The Otosquen Road, which is one of the roads of the thousand or so miles that was approved by Ottawa, is a resource road through the Pasqua hills. It is mainly for the purpose of joining two communities, one in Manitoba and one in Saskatchewan, that is The Pas to Hudson Bay, and another reason would be to have a main road from which you could send out branches to extract the forest wealth of that particular area. This is probably the best area of forest that we still have. I am very happy that the former government completed that road. It is a good road. It is a scenic road, that many, many tourists travel over, and it is also a very valuable road for the extraction of the timber resources. Now, there are not too many lakes there. There are a few. I understand from Mineral Resources that these Pasqua hills are going to be developed for oil extraction from oil shales that are there. I am very happy about that. I have known about this resource for quite a few years. I think it was discovered way back at the beginning of the century by some of our geologists. Even if it is only ten or twelve gallons to the ton, there is a tremendous resource there and, of course, this road is very valuable if we are going to have the extraction of that mineral.

We have other roads. We have the Hanson Lake Road. There is a lot of pulp resource in that area, from the city of Prince Albert right on to Flin Flon, Sir. There is not much white spruce. As a matter of fact, one can't find too much white spruce because a lot of it has been cut off and a lot of it has been burned over so we have mostly black spruce and pine in the area. But it is a tremendous pulp resource nevertheless.

Then, when you enter the Precambrian region, past Limestone Lake, you get into an area which will have quite a potential for mining. There are mines there now near Denare Beach and Flin Flon as you know, Sir. There is a volcanic region between Limestone and Flin Flon which has every potential of being a very fine and excellent mining area. I am satisfied that this road, which was called the Hanson Lake Road or highway no. 106, will be a tremendous value for the extraction of these resources.

There is one resource there very close to the Hanson Lake Road which I would like to point out to the hon. members here, because I do want them to support the motion and the amendment that I am going to bring in, and refer to silica sands. There are, I would say, actually billions of tons of silica sands on the south shores of Wapawekka Lake. There is a deposit at Wapeau Bay which I understand has been staked by some Prince Albert people, that is anywhere from seventeen to thirty-five feet deep. This sand is about 99.5 per cent pure. There are other such sands right close to the Hanson Lake Road and I know people that have staked some. There is one deposit of about forty acres which is even better than that. When you consider that silica sands have a tremendous value. They go up to \$65 a ton, that is for the pure variety. If you took an average value of say \$20 a ton and if you consider the freight from that area into here about half of that, and these are very rough figures, you can see the tremendous mineral potential you have there in these quarries of sand where there are billions and billions of tons of silica. This is something we have not been talking about too much. I am sure the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) will agree with me that the Hanson Lake Road is very important to eventually take out this silica from that area.

Now, the Hanson Lake Road probably is most important at the present time and will be, for the tourism that exists in that area. You have just one maze of lakes, excellent lakes. There are creeks there with all kinds of varieties of fish. There are fish that have been planted by the government in the past, such as brook trout and rainbow trout. Then you have the natural species such as the northerns or jack fish and pickerel and others. I found out last year, just by watching, on two or three different occasions, the number of cars on that road. About every five or ten minutes there would be a car going by. Tourism use is the big value of the Hanson Lake Road or highway no. 106 as it is called at the present time.

Now, then when we look at the other main road that is under construction at the present time, and that is no. 2 from Prince Albert up towards Reindeer, or to Southend as we call it. Here again is a mining area. There is not too much forest there. Much of it has been burned over, Sir, but it does have mining possibilities, a good potential. I know the area very well because I have prospected in my time and I could tell hon. members considerable about the tremendous importance of the mineral showing in that area. I think you are going to have mining there. I think you will have something much bigger than the Anglo Rouyn mine, in course of time in that region.

You have the showings held by Consolidated Mining and Smelting down at Jo-Jay Lake and Jolu Lake. You have the Brabant Lake structures where some six million or eight million tons of zinc lead ore is found. You have other places where copper is found. You have Rottenstone which is only a small showing mentioned some time ago by me, containing about 400,000 tons of high grade ore. But there is every indication that in that region some big mines will be found.

I would like to point out, Sir, and to the hon. members, that in that part of Saskatchewan, beginning at Lac La Ronge, you have a kind of a triangle of volcanic rocks from La Ronge away up to Lynne Lake, back to Flin Flon, and from Flin Flon to La Ronge, you have that whole great area of land which has mineral potential. I don't say the mines are there now but I think they will be found. I am sure the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) will do everything with his incentives and I hope that we can develop some of those areas and find mines that are indicated.

I, therefore am glad to see that the road to Reindeer Lake is being constructed, that the government changed its mind. Because there was, as I said at the beginning, some indication that they were not going to proceed with the construction of the road to Southend. I think it is very important that it is proceeded with. I hope that you spend all the necessary money to see that there is a good road built there.

In due course of time, if we find it necessary, I hope that whatever government sits here in this house will build a road from near Southend up to say Stony Rapids, which is on the Fond du Lac, which is a part of Lake Athabasca, because although there are few commercial forests in that area, or silica sands there, yet on the north shores of Lake Athabasca and off the Fond du Lac, there again is a mineral area. The hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) mentioned the other day that twelve miles northwest of Stony Rapids they were working on developing a mine. I am very happy to hear that. That I think is at Axis Lake. I have been in that area and I was very glad to see that further development is being carried on.

We could have a road from the south of Stony Rapids but once you get on the north side, Sir, the question of building roads is a different question. You are getting into a mountainous area. There are hills there of solid rock, Precambrian rocks, granites, schists, volcanics and others that loom up to a height of 900 and more feet, some 1,000 feet and once it is 1,000 feet we call it a mountain. Therefore, the construction of roads in that area is going to be very expensive. I was not very excited when the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) announced that there was going to be a mine up at Axis Lake because I was wondering how they would bring out the ore. There is no road to the south. Even if you had a fairly high grade of ore there, the problem of transportation is going to be a big one. There is no road Alberta way towards Fort McMurray.

There is another showing up there that will make a mine and if the Minister of Mineral Resources, if he knows about it, and that is at a spot which is called Grandfather Lake, if I recollect correctly.

Talking about roads, I hope we get a road to Stony Rapids. I hope we will eventually get a road across from Stony Rapids to Uranium City

and beyond right into Alberta and to Pine Point. It is not very far from there to Pine Point or back to Fort McMurray. But this may come at some future time, for the reasons I have mentioned. There is a possibility, of course, that if we had an extension of an agreement with Ottawa that we could have a road across the north of Saskatchewan on the north side of Lake Athabasca from Lynn Lake down to Pine Point. However, we have not got that yet on our program. So we have not got it in our agreement.

There is another road, which is very important to the people of Saskatchewan, covered by the agreement with Ottawa and that is the road from, I think it is Green Lake, or Meadow Lake, down to La Loche. At one time there was some suggestion that we might be able to proceed with that road down to Lake Athabasca and from there to Uranium City. Of course, to do that you would have to cross about forty miles of water. But at the moment, I do know that some people did construct what you might call a winter trail. I don't think there is too much hope at the present time or in the near future of getting a road there such as I would envisage necessary.

Getting back to the main roads that we have. There are actually three. There is the Otosquen Road. There is the Hanson Lake Road or highway 106, and there is highway no. 2. It seems to me that at present and for some years to come, these roads are going to be very heavily used, Sir, by the tourists and by Saskatchewan people. As I said, on the Hanson Lake Road there is a car just about every five minutes in the summer time. Hundreds and hundreds of hunters and tourists come into the north. The same story pertains to the Otosquen Road and to no. 2 from Prince Albert north. I am sure the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) will agree with me that we should press not only for the extension of time so we can carry out and spend the program money, but we should also try to persuade Ottawa to give us permission to blacktop or oil some of these roads. Because, Mr. Speaker, hon. members will know that where you have no forest, out on the prairie, when you have dust the wind will blow it off the roads, but I will tell you, Sir, that in the north, when you get a dusty road such as we have on the Otosquen, or Hanson Lake, or no. 2 highway, when you have dusty conditions or dry weather, you just cannot see one hundred feet ahead of you. It seems to me that it is high time that we asked the federal government to allow us, in addition to grading and to gravelling, to also do some oiling or black-topping wherever this government feels it is necessary to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a motion. I am sure all hon. members will support this motion and will I be able to continue, Mr. Speaker, after I submit this amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, you can move the amendment and speak to the amendment.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, well then, I shall move the amendment, Sir. It was moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):

That the following be added to the motion:

and further that this assembly urge the government to request the government of Canada to include dust-free surfacing where traffic warrants under this program on the same basis of cost-sharing as now applies to grade construction and gravelling.

Some members may say, well this has not been the agreement in the past, that other provinces have not had such an agreement, so I would like to point out that I did some research and I find that in the provinces of Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island, the said provinces have an agreement with the dominion government under which you can not only build a grade, you can gravel the grade, you can also black-top it or make it dust-proof.

I find that in Nova Scotia only last year some forty-two miles of such road were built, a road-to-resources road which is being paved. I would suggest that we do not have to start paving all northern roads. Certainly, I do not want to wait and daydream, as the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) said the other day, and that is really what spurred me on, when somebody asked him in this house, what about paving some of these northern roads, he said, "Well, that is just daydreaming". Well,

I don't want to daydream — I want to see some action. I would like to see this government get a move on.

Hon. Gordon B. Grant: (Minister of Highways) — On a point of order. I did not use those words and the expression was not paving. I think the hon. member should use the correct words.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I marked it down on a slip of paper. I must have misunderstood what he said, but I marked down that he said “daydreaming”. However, I am quite prepared to accept his statement, Mr. Speaker.

But be that as it may, I do not think that people of this province and I am sure that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) would not want to wait too long to see that some of these roads were paved. I think the people of Saskatchewan would like to see some of our northern roads paved for the simple reason that it is at present a hazard to travel over these roads, as the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) knows. I hope he will have something to say on this amendment in support of what I have said.

I do not think I can add very much to what I have said. I could talk some more but I think the motion is a good motion. I think the amendment would improve the motion. I hope every member of the house will give it the support that it should have.

Hon. A.C. Cameron: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Unless the member is rising to a point of order, I haven't proposed the amendment.

The question before the house is on the motion of the member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff):

That this assembly urge the government of Canada to extend the current Roads to Resources Program.

to which motion an amendment has been offered by the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) seconded by the member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer):

That the following words be added to the motion:

and further that this assembly urge the government to request the government of Canada to include dust-free surfacing where traffic warrants under this program on the same basis of cost-sharing as now applies to grade construction and gravelling.

Debate continues on the amendment.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment. Is the debate on the amendment plus the motion

Mr. Speaker: — No, I ruled that the debate continued on the amendment.

Mr. Cameron: — Well, I am not sure, Mr. Speaker whether what I am going to say will be in order. I think it will be, speaking with the need of dust-free surfaces on these roads to resources.

In introducing the amendment and speaking to leading up to the amendment, I noticed that the member made the statement that the government had slowed down in their program of construction of Roads-to-Resources which, in his opinion, was a regrettable thing, and that if they were vitally interested in these Roads-to-Resources, why do they see fit to slow down in their construction.

I would point out to him that in the budget there was \$659,000 appropriated by the former government for the roads to resources program. I would tell him that if he looks at his supplementary estimates, he will see that the \$659,000 was spent plus an additional \$169,000. I don't know where he could draw the conclusion that there was any slowdown on the construction of the Roads-to-Resources, when we saw fit to include another

March 9, 1965

\$169,000, after having spent every cent of what was appropriated in the last budget.

Let me point out that in addition to this over-expenditure of \$169,000 over what was appropriated, the Department of Highways assumed the responsibility and they initiated a \$1,000,000 program in addition on the roads to resources in northern Saskatchewan, and that is now under construction. So instead of reneging on the \$659,000 and a slow down in that department, in that vote \$169,000 was allocated plus a \$1,000,000 more by the Department of Highways. So I think it would be wrong to attempt to mislead the house that there had been any slow down in the construction of these Roads-to-Resources.

I think this is a good resolution because I think that Roads-to-Resources are so essential if we are to develop northern Saskatchewan. If we are to go into these mineralized areas and encourage the mining industry to go in there and hunt out these minerals, explore and tap and develop them and utilize them to the interest of the province, it is essential that we have roads in the north by which we can accomplish this, I am confident that the money spent on roads to resources in the north will more than repay itself in the matter of development and royalties and taxes and other things that would come to the province as a result of the development of the north.

That is why I support wholeheartedly this resolution in support of roads to resources. I cannot however, see how I can support with equal interest, the amendment of paving these Roads-to-Resources. The federal government is carrying the cost not only of construction of the roads but the gravelling of the roads, so you have an all-weather highway. Taking what is essential as the basic step to get development into the north and then to add the cost of paving Roads-to-Resources, paving roads into areas where as yet these areas are inaccessible. Where there is no development, where there are no people to use them, it would be useless to pave them.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker on a point . . .

Mr. Cameron: — The mineralized areas . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — On a point of privilege, I may have used pavement, but the resolution or the amendment said, dust-free, and the hon. member should stay within that terminology . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I'll recognize, Mr. Speaker, that he was using the word pavement, to mean oiling or dust-free, it is slightly different, but it does add to the cost of these roads. When you think of all the highways in southern Saskatchewan that have been there for a great many years, that are still not dust-free, I think we owe some responsibility to these people in southern Saskatchewan to be certain that their highways are dust-free before we begin to dust-free the highway in the northern areas that are not even as yet settled.

I wanted to point that out, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say. This government has not been dragging its feet, this government has spent the appropriations plus \$169,000 more, plus a whole new program of \$1,000,000 initiated by the Department of Highways.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very pertinent resolution which is now before the house. I happened to be in Ottawa last week, and one of the matters I discussed with minister after minister was how important . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . recognize . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I thought you ruled that they must speak to the amendment, the hon. Premier is speaking to the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, I'm speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — That's the ruling that I made and that is the correct ruling, I think, according to the authorities.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, all right, Mr. Speaker, then if I can't speak, when we get to it, I'll point out what I was going to do.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regard to the amendment that has been moved by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and in connection with the remarks of the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). I think he said that last year there was \$659,000 voted and, of course, this vote was not the only Roads-to-Resources program. This was in the natural resources capital expenditures. This was "roads and air fields construction" which would include a good deal of other work besides the Roads-to-Resources program.

Now the Department of Highways, of course, in last year's estimates also had some money for this, and I don't know that it is segregated here in the vote in the estimates, but there was a vote in highways too. Then he mentions \$169,000 in the supplementaries this year. Well, that is Roads and air fields construction and some of it may be for the Roads-to-Resources program which we are talking about.

Now the amendment asks for putting a dust-free surface on some of these roads where traffic warrants it. I think that the northern members, like the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) know as well as some of us do, that some of these roads are very heavily travelled in the summertime. They travel through the forest where on most occasions there is no wind to take the dust away and many of them, I believe, by the traffic on them and through the gasoline tax, will pay for their building and for their maintenance.

Mr. Thatcher: — Why didn't you do it when you were the government then?

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — And . . .

An Hon. Member: — Oh, Oh . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Just bring in a mile . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — . . . Mr. Speaker, the most impolite person in this house is the Premier . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, when you talk . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — . . . and he . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . nonsense like that, it's hard to be . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — . . . is always interfering like this. I object to it and I wish he could keep quiet while other people make their speeches. He should have been spanked more when he was a baby.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — You have ruled that the amendment only is before us now, and so I can't answer the remarks made by the Premier from his seat, but I will get up as soon as we are back on the main motion, and deal with the question that he raised just now, but I do want to say that there is a great need, for example, the Hanson Lake Road, certainly the southern 100 miles of the Hanson Lake Road is in need of some dust-free treatment at the present time and the road from the Prince Albert provincial park to La Ronge, now this is not included in the Roads-to-Resources program, but this is a good example of a road that could do with a dust-free surface on it.

We should not always be measuring what we spend on these roads by the actual traffic count. Many of these roads do not carry as heavy a traffic as you will find between Regina and Moose Jaw, or between Tisdale and Melfort, or some places like this. They do not carry such heavy traffic, but the very fact that there are long stretches of road reaching out to important places, important from the point of view of development of the province of Saskatchewan, means I think that these roads should have a good deal of attention and certainly some improvement in the surface as soon as possible.

March 9, 1965

Now some places obviously, where there is enough heavy traffic, there should be pavement, a good permanent job of paving and in other places, an oiled surface would do. But let us stick together and ask for this. Now this doesn't mean that we are committed to do 200 miles or even 100 miles right away, but let us get it into the program so that bit by bit we can get some of these northern roads that need it, made dust-free.

Mr. A.R. Guy: (Athabasca) — Mr. Speaker, I have several comments that I will make when we get back to the main motion, but as for the amendment, I agree in part with what the mover of the amendment said, and also the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), but I believe that the amendment deals with the Roads-to-Resources themselves. I would like to remind the people opposite that they had twenty years to oil and pave the roads that will get you to the Roads-to-Resources. It's no use putting oil and pavement on the Roads-to-Resources if you have got 200 miles of poor gravel getting there and that is all we have got after the former government left office. It is all very well for them to sit across there now, nine months after they were kicked out of office, and then come back and say, "Why don't you oil the Roads-to-Resources". I want to know why didn't they oil the roads that were leading to the Roads-to-Resources. They had twenty years to do it, they sat there and did nothing.

An Hon. Member: — . . . started . . .

Mr. Guy: — I asked the Minister of Highways to rebuild no. 2 highway every year from 1960 to 1964 when they were let out of office and what did he say — "Not enough traffic on it". Then he stands up here tonight, the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) and says "Oh, the traffic shouldn't count". It doesn't count in 1965 . . .

Mr. Walker: — Don't strain yourself.

Mr. Guy: — But it sure counted in 1964 when they were the government. The member from Hanley, (Mr. Walker) gets back for one day, and we listen to him for two hours but he doesn't want me to speak for two minutes.

Mr. Thatcher: — He'll be away for another week.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, he'll be away for another week. So all I would like to say in regard to the amendment is that it is all very well to ask for oil on these Roads-to-Resources, and certainly we hope that day will come, and I am convinced that the day will come under a Liberal government, when we will have oil on these roads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — But first of all I would hope that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) will see that the roads leading to the Roads-to-Resources are paved and oiled in the near future, and again I am sure that this will be done in due course.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. I.C. Nollet: (Cut Knife) — Who is first? . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You're looking the wrong way.

Mr. Nollet: — I'm sorry, the hon. minister is a lot taller than I am, but I do want to comment on the observations made by the Premier.

It seems to me the hon. members opposite now have a stock argument, how much, how many miles did you build, or how many miles of road did you dust-free, how much did you do when you were the government? Well, I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that in 1944 . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — Oh, no . . .

Mr. Nollet: — . . . when we took over the administration of this province — yes, the hon. Premier leaves now . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — We heard this before.

Mr. Nollet: — Sit down and listen to the rest of it. When We took over the administration of this province, there was scarcely any black-top, or any dust-free roads. I can remember a little strip between Regina and Moose Jaw that was so rough that it would shake the head off the woodpecker driving over it in a car.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — And another little strip between North Battleford . . .

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — I want to correct the member for Cut Knife, (Mr. Nollet), he said there were hardly any miles of dust-free roads in the province in 1944, there were exactly 137 miles, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Yes, a little strip between here and Moose Jaw, and then a little strip running east of Regina that ended abruptly, and you would have difficulty in passing two bicycles on it it was so narrow, and as I say between North and South Battleford. This is all there was. The point I want to make is this: the fact is we have raised the standards of road construction. I can remember over the years our opposition friends then argued that we were building huge, expensive autobahns that we didn't need. The standards then were too high altogether to suit them.

The facts are because of increasing motor travel the public are demanding better roads to travel and more safe roads to travel on too. The concept of road construction is now with the modern techniques of road building that we must in fact surface roads, and this is a good business view point, too, from the point of view of constructing highways and looking to the future. Our gravel resources are not beyond limit, they are not beyond limit and one of the reasons that the Department of Highways wants to oil surface and hard surface is to make the best possible use of materials that will stand the traffic over the years and not be dissipated because of water erosion, because of travel erosion by traffic which occurs in the case of gravelling.

Then there is this other factor, that is particularly applicable to northern Saskatchewan and the bush country, that is the safety factor. I might say to the hon. Premier — the Premier is gone — to members opposite We constructed this road to La Ronge. This was one of Joe Phelps' projects. In fact he had it half built before the rest of us knew we were going to have it. True to form. It still remains to that same standard and at that time it was a great distance up to La Ronge. Since then we extended roads up to Ile a La Crosse, up to La Loche, but these roads are there now as the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) said, and they are gravelled roads.

I am surprised that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) — I hope to God for the sake and the welfare of the province, he is never a minister — he should travel that road to La Ronge from Prince Albert. The average American tourist will go up there once or twice, and if he isn't an ardent fisherman, he won't go there again. You choke with dust; it's a traffic hazard because of the bush; the wind cannot carry the dust away on a quiet day and it is a real hazard. Anyone of you who have travelled that road will confirm what I am saying, so there is a much greater need for oiling these roads from this point of view in the north than there is in the south.

From the safety point of view, as well as from the point of view of attracting tourists to the north this is important. The northern country has a tremendous potential for tourism. This is the last great frontier left on the North American continent where you get virgin fishing, and We can attract tourists in large numbers, give employment to the native population by getting people . . .

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Minister of Health) — What kind of fish is that?

Mr. Nollet: — . . . yes, to come to this, yes, and I expect to do quite a bit of fishing, too, Mr. Speaker, and I would also enjoy the safety of a dust-free road when I go there. At least I wouldn't want to be hacking up dust, you know, for two days and spoiling my fishing on that account.

March 9, 1965

So, it would be good business, it would be very good business to ask the federal government to include dust-free and oil surfacing, at least, and in some instances, where there is a possibility of heavy traffic as a result of all this mineral development that is going to take place, and I hope it does take place, that it will be necessary to have hard-surfaced roads to convey the ore from one point to another.

So, I am amazed and surprised that the hon. members on the government side of the house are apparently going to vote against what is a simple, necessary and practical amendment to the motion before us. I am sure that the impact of what I am saying has made some impression on the mover of this particular motion, and that he will go along with it, because we don't need to be political and obstinate on every issue. After all, when we sat on the other side of the house, the opposition came up with some good suggestions that the government approved . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, oh . . .

Mr. Nollet: — Well, the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) was one of the few who seldom came up with anything constructive, I must admit, and he said, Oh well, he admits this fact apparently . . .

Mr. Cameron: — I didn't think you would even consider that.

Mr. Nollet: — Well, I am amazed and surprised that especially the hon. member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has, I think, gone on record as being opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not go on record as being opposed to it.

Mr. Nollet: — Well, I am glad to hear that, I hope you go on record and stand in your place and vote for this amendment.

Mr. Guy: — On a point of order, I would like to say also that when the vote comes, I won't be like the member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer).

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member is completely out of order now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have an opportunity before very long . . .

Mr. Guy: — Why don't you sit down?

Mr. Nollet: — . . . to declare whether or not he is in favor of dust-free roads, Mr. Speaker, but he is going to have a hard time if he votes against this amendment, to justify his attitude amongst the people of La Ronge and the north. It is a good amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that all members will support it.

Hon. J.M. Cuelenaere: (Minister of Natural Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak briefly on the amendment. The hon. member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) stated that the \$659,000 that had been appropriated for Roads-to-Resources, covered roads and airfield construction. That, Mr. Speaker, is correct. He said that a large portion of that was for airfields and other roads, other than shareable Roads-to Resources. At least that is what I gather from the statement he made.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that of the \$659,000 that was appropriated last year, a total of \$612,000 was shareable, and . . .

An Hon. Member: — Was this the Roads-to-Resources program or was this for other roads?

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Under the item this is all the shareable roads provided for

in the natural resources budget.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — There are two programs, though.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — Mr. Speaker the entire amount appropriated last year was, as stated by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), \$659,000 of which \$612,000 was shareable, because if the hon. members will turn to the estimates of this year, at page 36, they will notice that the item is set out — the estimated reimbursement at \$306,250.

Now, in the highways program, the only amount that was set out was \$250,000 of shareable roads for the current year. Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out by the Minister of Mineral Resources, the whole amount that the Department of Natural Resources received during the current year has been spent, both the shareable portion and the non-shareable portion. In order to carry out additional work this winter, in order to permit more work next summer, we are currently spending a considerable amount of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking directly to the amendment, it states,

and further that the assembly urge the government to request the government of Canada to include dust-free surfacing.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that there is no one in the house would like to see dust-free highways throughout northern Saskatchewan, more than I do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cuelenaere: — I think it is common knowledge that I am interested in the development of La Ronge, I have been in the area since the road was constructed and I would certainly like to see that road dust-free. I would like to see the Hanson Lake Road dust-free. I travelled it last summer and it would be a wonderful thing. The only question mark I have about the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is this, that as I pointed out when I spoke to the motion itself, it is very urgent at this time that we extend both in time and amount, the current contract because we are now committed for an amount in excess of the amount provided for in the current contract. We are pressed as to time, and we will not be able to do all the work that is permitted under the \$15,000,000 allotted.

It is very urgent that we have an extension of the current contract and that we get some additional amounts. I don't know whether by going to Ottawa with an additional request for dust-free surfacing, this will make it more difficult to get an extension both as to time and amount of the current contract. But as far as I am concerned, all that the amendment does is to urge the government to request the government of Canada to include dust-free surfacing and as far as that goes, I am quite prepared as one of the ministers that may be in charge of Roads-to-Resources, to make that type of a request.

But I think that what is essential right now, is that we get, as soon as possible, an extension of the current contract and basically that is what the original motion asked. The original motion, even if it was passed, would not have prevented the suggestions and the opening of negotiations for dust-free surfacing. Now, as far as I am concerned and I think it is pretty well the attitude of many of the members, I am quite prepared to support the amendment insofar as it suggests that the government make this request. I for one am prepared to make that request, and I am sure that the government wouldn't mind making the request, but I wish to emphasize that I think what is important for us to do at this time is to obtain an extension of the current agreement, that is the urgent matter before the house and is what the main resolution intended to deal with.

Mr. Willis: — Would the minister permit a question, please? In commenting on his willingness to support the amendment to request the federal government to go along with our request and include dust-freeing in this program, I was wondering if the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cuelenaere) would consider speaking to the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and having him support the amendment too.

Mr. Cuelenaere: — I heard the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) speak as well as the ex-minister, the member for Melfort (Mr. Willis) and while he chided

March 9, 1965

the opposition for not having done anything towards that even in the nature of a request, he did not say that he was going to oppose the amendment, and I am sure that he would join me in being delighted to see some development of that nature in the northern areas.

Mr. Berezowsky: (Cumberland) — Finally smartened up.

Mr. Fern Larochelle: (Shaunavon) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support both the amendment and the motion. Because I do believe that Roads-to-Resources in the north are very, very important, and I would like to see them all black-topped, as well as the roads to the south.

I would take exception to the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) a while ago, when he referred to the construction of roads in 1934, and the construction of roads in 1964. I, for one, constructed roads in 1934 with four horses and a fresno. Now today we are constructing roads with thirty-yard Euclid earth movers. If he expected me to move as much dirt with a half-yard fresno as a thirty-yard scraper, I think it is an unfair labor practice, Mr. Speaker.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the roads of our province have improved very much in the last decade and I, for one, certainly would like to support the amendment and also the motion, because I am for better roads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the amendment. The amendment, I believe, in essence, Mr. Speaker, is that we request the federal government to give consideration on a shared program to dust-free the roads where the traffic warrants. I believe that was the intent of the amendment.

I believe that by asking for this amendment it is not asking the federal government to spend money on dust-freeing this year, or to commit the provincial government on dust-freeing this year, but it is to include that principle in the Roads-to-Resources agreement which the mover of the amendment pointed out was already enjoyed by some of the Maritime provinces.

At the same time we have in this province more roads per capita, by far, than any other province in Canada. We have over a third of all the surveyed roads in Canada, but less than ten per cent of the population to pay for the building of those roads. In this province we are still part of the dominion of Canada; we are one of the ten provinces, and I have no guilty feeling about asking the federal government to do something about roads in this province, because many a dollar has been spent by the federal government under one program or another in other parts of Canada.

We have heard recently that it is the intention of the provincial government to try and get the Prince Albert area declared a depressed area in order to get some help and some support for that area. Well, then if the north is a depressed area, surely the federal government should consider putting some money towards the program to dust-free those areas. For to ask for it may not be to get it. I can agree with the member from Shellbrook (Mr. Cuelenaere). He said to ask for it may not be to get it, I am sure that the member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) may ask his preacher to get him to Heaven, but he may not get the wish granted, and that is the same here. We may ask the federal government to do it, but we may not get it.

An Hon. Member: — Won't even get that.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I think that all members of the house could support this amendment and try to get some greater assistance for the roads into the north. When we talk about Roads-to-Resources that are dust-free, there are some in the north at the present time that are dust-free in the Roads-to-Resources program. The stretch running from Flin Flon to Creighton, a distance of about fifteen miles. So some of that road has been dust-freed but I think that it should be on a shared basis under the Roads-to-Resources agreement.

There is much more that I could say, Mr. Speaker, but I would be repeating what has been said by members on both sides of the house, so I will let that suffice at this time.

Hon. Gordon B. Grant: (Minister of Highways) — Mr. Speaker, one thing I have been impressed with since I came into this house is the ease with which members on both sides of the house spend other people's money, particularly when it comes to the Department of Highways. I find tonight that both sides have agreed to spend my money before I even get it.

The last speaker mentioned the road to Denare Beach as being part of the Roads-to-Resources. I doubt whether this is accurate, I don't believe that it is under the sharing program.

The hon. member from Cumberland stated I had used the word "day-dreaming" and while I deny that I did use that word in the earlier discussions, I suggest that the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) is doing a little day-dreaming tonight when he says that these northern Roads-to-Resources are ready for oil, and also that he can see no reason why they should not be oiled. If he spent four years as Minister of Highways and cannot see the reason why all these northern roads can not be oiled, I am just wondering how he spent his time over in the department.

Mr. Willis: — Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Guy: — Sit down.

Mr. Grant: — When I conclude, you may have some more questions. Last summer when I travelled between 10,000 and 12,000 miles on the roads in this province, the only major one I missed, and that was because of illness, or I would have been on that one too, was no. 102 to Lac la Range and if he considers that the Buffalo Narrows Road is ready for oiling, even after we . . .

Mr. Willis: — The Buffalo Narrows Road is not part of our Roads-to-Resources program.

Mr. Grant: — Well, I can name some others then. It has been suggested that no. 102, namely north of Prince Albert park, should be oiled . . .

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, no. 102, north of Prince Albert park is not part of the Roads-to-Resources.

Mr. Kramer: — Try again, that's three times now.

Mr. Grant: — . . . they are suggesting that we oil that strip north of La Ronge and leave everything between La Ronge and Prince Albert Park in its present form.

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, that was the suggestion of the member for Athabasca, not mine.

Mr. Grant: — I would like to carry on, I am suggesting that these northern roads, while they may have been built by the previous government, we are faced with rebuilding them at the present time, and there is a lot of work to be done on them before they can be oiled. I think we should be realistic about it. No. 102, while it may not be a Road-to-Resources, it leads to a Road-to-Resource, and this particular road is the one that the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Willis) mentioned was high in traffic count, I would like to ask him a question. Does he consider that this particular stretch of road lends itself to oil, considering the type of traffic it has, and if so, how long he would anticipate . . .

Mr. Willis: — In answering the question, the minister knows that this is on the program for re-grading this year.

Mr. Grant: — I didn't ask that, I asked him if he considered that this stretch of road lent itself for oiling, either now, or ten years from now.

March 9, 1965

Mr. Guy: — It was the way it was built.

Mr. Grant: — I'll get back to a Road-to-Resource, surely I will find one if I keep going. He mentioned the Hanson Lake Road where the traffic count is, I believe, in the neighborhood of 35 vehicles per day in the middle portion of that road . . .

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not mention that the Lake Hanson road had 35 vehicles a day; this was a municipal road which had 35 vehicles a day . . .

Mr. Grant: — Let me finish.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We can't permit the members to do this. I think the correct place for questions is after the minister has finished his speech.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — He can't remember that.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I was half way through a sentence, and I was interrupted. I was going to compare the Hanson Lake Road with the grid road he spoke of with a vehicle count of 35. Now we are not suggesting that this particular grid road, and I might mention that the vehicle count of 35 is the minimum, not the maximum, is to be oiled. By no means. You are comparing that road with the Hanson Lake Road which has a similar vehicle count, and you are suggesting that because we have taken in this grid road with the low vehicle count, therefore, we should oil the Hanson Lake Road. I don't think this makes sense at all.

The hon. member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) said that this was a simple and practical amendment. It certainly is simple but it is not very practical.

Mr. A.M. Nicholson: (Saskatoon City) — I was hoping, until the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) took part, that we could be unanimous in support of this amendment. I think that with careful reading it is clear. It is not an unreasonable proposal. We are told that we are to have important mineral activity in the La Ronge area, and the ore will have to move to Flin Flon. Hon. members who are familiar with the area know that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting have found it economical on privately owned and built roads, to make them dust-free, to move their ore from the mine to the smelter. If we are to have a large volume of ore moving over the Hanson Lake Road, I think it is logical that where the traffic warrants it that some of the road should be dust-free. It has been stated again and again, by members on this side, that we are not asking that the government make an appropriation for this year, or next year, but we are asking that in re-negotiating with Ottawa, it should be brought to their attention that this shared program has been now negotiated by two different governments at Ottawa, two different governments in Saskatchewan. We would like the new government in Saskatchewan to have some new ideas, and to have some additional suggestions for sharing. The federal government is also involved in sharing in dust-free roads in other parts of Canada, and I see no reason why this house tonight shouldn't unanimously accept the amendment, which has been presented by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky).

I am sure when the member from Prince Albert, the Minister of Health, (Mr. Steuart) and the Deputy Leader of the house, Mr. McDonald, (Moosomin) have a chance to take part, they will agree that this is a reasonable proposal and that the house should make the amendment unanimous.

Mr. Frank K. Radloff: (Nipawin) — Mr. Speaker, speaking in regard to the amendment made by the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) I think it is a good amendment, but premature, and very premature when you consider the condition of the other roads in Saskatchewan.

Now, true there are many roads dust-free, but when you consider the fantastic remarks of the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) regarding the condition of the roads, I would like to make some mention of a few roads in the Nipawin constituency, or roads leading to Nipawin. I would like to point out that Nipawin is a town of nearly 5,000 people, and after

20 years of NDP government we still do not have a dust-free highway leading from Regina to Nipawin. True, they are working on this road, but up until the present day we do not have . . .

Mr. Willis: — Point of Order, this is entirely wrong, we do have a dust-free road from Regina to Nipawin. We have had one for some years.

Mr. Radloff: — Would you like to go back to Nipawin with me? I can show you some . . .

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows this is not true.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member has a right to say whatever he pleases and that is that.

Mr. Radloff: — I would like to point out to the member from Melfort (Mr. Willis) that highway no. 23, east from Nipawin, which has a vehicle count of something like 700 to 800 cars a day, and to this day it is nothing more than a good grid road, and I am sure that the people from Kelsey would be pleased to hear the remarks of the member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) when he starts talking about making Roads-to-Resources dust-free, because in his seat he has many miles of highway which are not dust-free, and the vehicle count on these roads is much in excess of 100 cars a day. I would say the vehicle count from Crooked River to Carrot River would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 to 600 cars a day.

Mr. Willis: — Wrong.

Mr. Radloff: — I certainly agree that the Roads-to-Resources should be dust-free, but I think that the government has a responsibility to see that other roads are completed and roads which have a higher vehicle count are made dust-free prior to moving in to the Roads-to-Resources.

I, like the member from Cut Knife (Mr. Nollet) would like to go fishing on dust-free roads, but I can certainly show the member from Cut Knife — what were the words he used there — “roads that would shake the head off a woodpecker”. Well, I can show him roads east of Nipawin that would shake the head off a woodpecker any time, and this is a highway. I think that while the amendment is in good taste, and certainly something which the people of Saskatchewan voted for, I would like to see this government continue to work on other roads and make them dust-free prior to making this move.

I certainly would have supported the amendment as I think he has made a move in the right direction, however, there are other remarks which could be made regarding this program and I would like to adjourn the debate tonight.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION RE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS PROCEDURES

Hon. A.H. McDonald: (Minister of Agriculture) moved; seconded by the Hon. Mr. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources)

That this assembly endorses the recommendations contained in the Report of the Special Committee on Public Accounts Procedures tabled in this assembly as Sessional Paper no. 41 of 1964, and requests the government to give consideration to the early implementation of these recommendations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution it is not my intention to be controversial, and I hope we will be able to accomplish something this evening. Therefore, my remarks will be brief but there a few things I would like to point out, especially for the benefit of new members to the house.

The question of the Public Accounts Committee and the work of

that committee is not a new problem as far as this legislature is concerned, and most legislatures, I think, across Canada. This is the reason that in 1963 a committee was set up to study this problem and to make recommendations to the house. This committee was a committee made up of members from both parties in the house at that time, and consisted of the following members: Mr. Johnson, who acted as Chairman, who was the member for Kindersley at that time; Messrs. Brockelbank, Thiessen, Strum (Mrs), Berezowsky, Thatcher, McDonald and Gardiner. As I had the privilege to serve on that committee, I must confess that the evidence that was given to us and contained in this report certainly confirmed a lot of views that I had prior to the committee coming into existence, and it was a great pleasure for me to have served on the committee as I am sure it was for all committee members.

It was back in 1923 when the first Public Accounts Committee was set up in the province, and no sooner had that committee taken on this responsibility, than they began to wonder just what the work of the Public Accounts Committee ought to be, and in my mind from that day until the present day, there has been considerable confusion as to what the responsibilities of the Public Accounts Committee really are. All the members, I am sure, are now aware, having served on Public Accounts, either during this session or previous sessions, that if the Public Accounts Committee in going through public accounts were to find some of the problems that provincial auditors have been able to find, (at least not provincial auditors, but auditors in other jurisdictions have been able to find) it would only be by accident.

In my humble opinion, the make-up of Public Accounts, the book itself, is so large, so detailed, that if the average member were to find some expenditures for which there were no authority, I want to repeat, in my opinion, it would only be by accident.

It was the hope of the committee when it was constituted in 1963, that they could make some recommendations to this house in the hope that this house would adopt them and that we could change the make-up of the Public Accounts Committee, and, of course, the make-up of the Treasury as to pre and post audit. I would like to read to the hon. members one or two quotes from this document in the introductory remarks, and when Mr. Johnson, who I mentioned a moment ago was Chairman of this committee, moved the resolution setting up the committee, he said as follows and I quote:

There is disagreement within the committee, (that is the Public Accounts Committee) as to the scope, and this could only be expressed by saying that often the committee has not had an understanding of the sense of direction as to what its scope and function should actually be in the context of parliamentary scrutiny of the control of finance.

and I agree with that statement, and if I might be allowed I would like to quote myself when I spoke during the debate at that time.

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

I am not going to go into detail as to the reasons that the committee made the recommendations that they did and they are listed at the back of this report, I hope that all hon. members will acquaint themselves with this report, and will take the time to read it within the next few days.

I want to turn now to the recommendations of this committee and they are eight in number, and I might have some comment as to why those recommendations were made.

1. That an independent legislative auditor, responsible only to the assembly be appointed and to this end

(a) That the duties of the provincial auditor be changed to those of an independent legislative auditor, auditing the accounts of the government on behalf of the legislature after expenditures have been made and reporting to the legislature on the results of his audit.

(b) That the present duties of the provincial auditor in control over disbursements be transferred to the Saskatchewan Treasury Department.

In other words the committee have recommended that the pre-audit should be carried out by Treasury and the post audit by an auditor who will be responsible to this assembly and not to Treasury. I would hope that he could only be suspended from duties, or even fired, by this assembly, not by the government of the day. He would be independent of the government of the day, and be responsible only, I repeat, to the assembly, and I suggest that this is the position the provincial auditor ought to enjoy.

2. That the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee be a member of the opposition, while representation on the committee be based on the voting strength of the party in the legislature.

In other words, the government of the day would have the majority of the members on the committee, but the Chairman of the committee would be a member of the opposition. I have had some personal experience in serving as Chairman of a committee when the previous administration were in office, and I think this is a move in the right direction. If we are attempting to do the work that the Public Accounts Committee ought to be doing, rather than to be involved in a political argument in this committee, where, I suggest, there is no room for political arguments.

3. That the permanent heads of the departments be called as principal witnesses before the committee, at the same time it being recognized that any other persons may be called when necessary.

And here, Mr. Speaker, this house recognizes that if you are going to question the heads of departments in a Public Accounts Committee, or anywhere else, then the committee must sit in camera. I am one of those who do not believe that you can question senior civil servants in public. I note that the press have criticized the next recommendation, and it is as follows:

4. That the committee be held in camera.

I want to repeat the reason that it should be held in camera is so that civil servants can speak freely in this committee without that information being spread far and wide across the province of Saskatchewan. I want to repeat that there has been some criticism of this recommendation from the press, but I can assure the press that any information that comes out of the Public Accounts Committee and is reported to this house will be made available to the press, but I could not support for one moment the meetings of a committee of this type being held in any other manner, than in camera.

5. That an official verbatim report of the proceedings of the committee be maintained and submitted to the legislature as an appendix to the committee's report.

And here again, Mr. Speaker, the information would be made available to this house, or at least, parts of it, and this information once it is made available to the legislature would be available to the press as well.

6. That the Public Accounts Committee have not more than eleven members.

The expectation of your committee of 1963 was that in all probability the Public Accounts Committee would sit for longer hours and do more work than Public Accounts Committees of the past have been doing. There is a possibility in my mind that Public Accounts Committees even might be called in between sessions of the legislatures. This being the case, I think it is extremely wise to have a smaller committee and your committee after deliberation felt that the figure eleven would be adequate.

7. That the Treasury Implement or see to the implementation of recommendations or state in writing its reasons for not adopting such recommendations; Treasury to report, in either case, at the next session, and the Public Accounts Committee to review at each session its earlier recommendations and the Treasury's reports thereon.

In other words, the recommendations of this committee to the house would have to be acted on or a reason given to the committee at its next meeting for not having been acted on.

8. That the formal title of the Public Accounts Committee be changed to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the committee to be relieved of its duties for sessional printing.

because this is only a technical matter.

I want to say a few words about the difficulty of the implementing of the report. It will take three years to implement the report in its entirety for the simple reason that the public accounts will be available to the Public Accounts Committee a year from now. These public accounts have received pre-audit and post-audit under the old system. So the Public Accounts Committee meeting a year hence would, because of this fact, have to virtually take the same form as the Public Accounts Committee of this session. Because of the necessity of dividing responsibility that is centred in Treasury today, the pre-audit and the post-audit, the pre-audit being performed by the provincial auditor, there is some difficulty in dividing the present staff, attracting some new staff, and even if we were successful in getting this resolution through tonight, which I don't expect we will be, it is virtually impossible to have the mechanics to set all of the wheels in motion on April 1st next, so the Public Accounts Committee of two years hence will probably be a mixture of the old system together with part of the new system.

So we are going to have one more years, as I see it, with a Public Accounts Committee similar to what we have had in the past. The following year we would have a combination of the two systems, and in the third year we would be completely converted over to the new system, and, of course, this is going to cause some problems. It will cause some problems for the government, it will cause some problems for this legislature, and some problems for the Public Accounts Committee.

I see no other way to proceed, and no other way to bring this into effect at an earlier date than three years hence. It will be necessary, if this resolution passes this house, for some amendments to the Treasury Act to be passed at this session. Time is of the essence if we are going to do this, and I am hopeful that we will be able to make what amendments are necessary for us to carry on for the next year. I think perhaps another year we should have a new Treasury Act presented to the house, and if it is the wish of the house to adopt this motion, then I expect the house a year from now would be dealing with a new Treasury Act.

Mr. Walker: — A new Treasurer.

Mr. Cameron: — That is possible.

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — I don't know if there is much more I can say, Mr. Speaker, but I would ask every member of the house to acquaint themselves with this document, and to give consideration to all of the arguments as to why these changes have been suggested. Personally, I am convinced that we will have a far better Public Accounts Committee than we have ever had in the history of the province of Saskatchewan, and I think this is the main reason that we should give support to this resolution, but in giving our support, I want you to fully realize that we are going to have a bit of a mix-up in our committee for the next two years, and I think this is unavoidable. If we could make the complete change-over and have the new system in effect in two years, I would be very happy, but I am informed by officials in Treasury that this is not possible, so I hope the house will keep this in mind and are prepared to put up with a little inconvenience that may be with us for the next two years.

Mr. Walter Smishek: (Regina East) — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? In the case of a Chairman, you did suggest that there would be representation based on their representation in the house, in the committee. Now, the Chairman would come from the opposition. Would he be from that percentage of the opposition, or would he be a sort of a neutral person, and without a vote?

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — No, I presume the Chairman should come from the representation of the opposition. This is my understanding, I think I am right, that this is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. J.H. Brockelbank: (Acting Leader of the Opposition, Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker: I want to endorse the motion and the recommendations made by the committee, and I want to say quite a few things about it, so I am only going to make a very few remarks tonight.

I noted the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McDonald) said. that he wanted to see the provincial auditor responsible to the legislature. Well, as a matter of fact the provincial auditor is responsible to the legislature now and only the legislature can fire him. The problem is . . .

Mr. McDonald: (Moosomin) — Could I ask you a question for clarification? I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the government at the moment could suspend the provincial auditor until the legislature met, and this was what I was trying to get at. I would like to see this privilege taken away.

Mr. Brockelbank: (Kelsey) — Well, maybe that could be considered too, but actually only the legislature can fire him, and this is the way it should be, I agree, but the problem is that the provincial auditor, under the present system is trying to play two roles. First, to supervise the pre-audit that is made before the payments are made by the various departments, and then do a post-audit and have his own staff check on their own work. This, of course, can never work out to be the best, if you really want a job done of the auditing.

The other thing that I would like to say tonight is, probably we will all miss the Public Accounts Committee; it is quite a forum for political maneuvers and battles, but I don't think this is what it is intended to be, really. This is one of the main things. Instead of having it as a political forum — I don't think it is a very good one anyway — I think this is much better forum right here — the Public Accounts Committee a real good committee for watching the accounts of the government.

I think also, it should be remembered it is the custom where these recommendations are followed, that no minister of the crown is on the committee. They are private members of the house on the committee. So that, again you don't have people on the committee who are actually looking over their own work, and you add to this that the committee meet in camera, they are then a very dedicated committee, can be very dedicated to the work of checking the public accounts, as they should be checked.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.