

SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Second Session — Fifteenth Legislature
30th Day

Monday, March 21, 1966

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. F. K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, it is my pleasure to welcome and introduce a group of students from the Carrot River School seated in the Speaker's gallery. This is the first group of students from the Nipawin constituency. I am sure that all members here will wish them well. They will have a tour of the city of Regina, and I hope they will have a pleasant journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, on your behalf and on behalf of all the members of the assembly, I would like to welcome 75 students from Holiston School in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Sam Hawthorne. I am sure all the members here would wish them a very happy day in Regina and a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, could I, from this side of the house, second the introduction that the other member from Saskatoon (Mr. Link) has made and give the students with their teacher, Mr. Hawthorne, a welcome, seconded by us over here.

Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF CONDOLENCES

Mr. Speaker: — The house will recall that recently a resolution of condolence and sympathy to the widow of the late Rt. Hon. Paul Comtois, was passed. As instructed by the house, I transmitted it to her. I beg to inform the house that I have received the following reply:

Dear Mr. Speaker:

On behalf of my family and myself, may I thank you for your kindness in sending me a copy of the resolution embodying the condolences of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan on the death of my husband.

In these tragic circumstances, I have been deeply touched by this mark of your sympathy.

Yours sincerely,
Irene Comtois

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. Mr. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education) for second reading of Bill No. 48, **An Act to amend the University Act**.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the bill to amend the University Act and the discussion with respect to it have opened up what seems to me to be three areas that I should like to comment on. Two of those areas have to do with the bill itself, and to the possibilities and responsibilities which the university must undertake. The third area is that which is opened up by some of the Premier's remarks. I must say that in part at least the Premier was at his irrelevant best in these remarks. The problem with irrelevancy is that it invites and perhaps even requires some further irrelevance. So let me comment on all of those.

My reference first is in particular to the meaningless type of comparison in which the Premier indulged when he sought to attempt a comparison of university grants going back as far as 1944 to those of more than 20 years later. It is, of course, meaningless when you compare the grants of an institution which was in 1944 providing education for less than 1,500 students to those in 1965 when it is providing for some 11,000 students. It is also, I submit, inaccurate to do, as the Premier did on this occasion and on other occasions, to include in what the government is giving. To use his words, "We are giving" to the university some \$24,000,000, is inaccurate because of that amount some \$8,000,000 is a loan. I am not objecting to the idea of borrowing money for these high peak loads of university, but I do object to the suggestion that this is giving money to the university. If this is giving, Mr. Speaker, then the government, using the same kind of definition is giving \$50,000,000 to the Prince Albert Pulp Company. Nobody would suggest that that is the case.

As a matter of fact, we need to be aware in this matter of borrowing that we are incurring some obligations in the future. We know that last year some \$4,000,000 was borrowed with respect to the university. We know that this year another \$8,000,000 is to be borrowed for that purpose. This gives a total of \$12,000,000 in debts incurred in the last two years. We find that the bonds last year sold at an interest rate of something in excess of five per cent. When one also considers that there is another three per cent to be supplied for sinking funds, then it becomes plain that in the future years there is going to have to be some \$1,000,000 made available to the university in order to take care of this debt which has been acquired in the last two years.

The main test of grants over the years, whether they are the past 20 or the present is, of course, their adequacy. I want to submit that the grants over the past 20 years have been adequate grants. In case it is overlooked, you know they talk about the many buildings being provided for this year. I thought you might find it interesting to consider some of the building done during that period of 20 years, and with the exception of one of these years, paid for. Not all of these were paid for by the provincial government because included in the monies available were some sums the federal government gave, and some from other sources.

Let me just list those buildings, Mr. Speaker. The Medical College and the University Hospital, and an extension to the Engineering College, the Soils and Dairy Laboratories, the School of Agriculture, the Nurses Residence, the Betatron Building, the Gymnasium, the Virus Laboratory, two power houses, the Murray Library, a grant to the Memorial Student Union Building, agricultural buildings such as a grain elevator, a piggery, poultry facilities, the MacKenzie Art Gallery in Regina (which was largely paid for by an endowment but added to with public funds), the Biology Building, the Arts Building, the Medical Research Building, the Saskatchewan Research Council Laboratory, some improvements to existing building, of course, the Agricultural Engineering extension to the Engineering Building, the Food Services Building, Marquis Hall, extensions to residences, extensions to gymnasiums, the construction started on the Regina campus, the addition to the Chemistry Building, the addition to the Arts Building started, the addition to the Physical Education centre, the Linear Accelerator Building, the addition to Darke Hall at Regina, and numerous minor projects.

I read those, Mr. Speaker, only to emphasize what I said before. The tests of the treatment to the university is not to be found in any fantastic comparison of grants which were made 20 years ago for a university with a population of less than 1,500 to one today with a population of 11,000, but rather in the adequacy of the situation. It is a fact that while there was much left to be done so far as university construction was concerned, our university at the end of that 20 years was at least as well equipped to face the future as any university in all of Canada.

May I turn to speak more specifically with regard to the bill which is under consideration. Mr. Speaker, I welcome that bill as being at least a step in the right direction. It would be obvious to everybody I think, that with two campuses instead of one campus, that with both of these campuses growing, some change was needed in the administrative structure of the university.

This was needed for many reasons. It was needed in order to give the president and the staff concerned with the total university, time to deal with the problem of both campuses. It was needed in order to remove the president and the staff from direct day to day involvement with one campus in a way in which similar involvement with another campus was not possible. It was necessary to relieve the somewhat natural pressures which resulted from the president being so involved with one institution but not being so involved with another. It was necessary to remove some not unnatural suspicions that so long as such involvement did continue one campus could receive consideration which was not available to the other.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize at this time the need for planning on the part of the university and the government to meet the needs of our community. Our community is one, of course, made up of just less than 1,000,000 people. We have to recognize the needs of planning which is within the financial capacity of that community of just short of 1,000,000 people.

Many university courses will be central to all university education and must as a result be available at each of the campuses. On the other hand there are some courses, some highly specialized courses, which can be available at only one of these campuses. This choice of putting these courses at only one of these campuses is dictated by available finances, in part, also in part by the

March 21, 1966

lack of availability of staff. It is dictated, of course, in part by the student interest as evidenced in the number of students wishing to take those courses.

Now, I submit, that both the interest of finance and the interest of good education are best served by an arrangement which can provide for some division of specialities. We, obviously, cannot afford to waste dollars and cents. Just as obviously, and perhaps even more important we cannot afford to put avoidable pressure on one of our most scarce resources, namely that of university teaching staff.

Such an arrangement which provides that some courses will be available at one university campus when they are of a specialized nature but not at the other, does not need in any way to interfere with academic freedom to develop freely and fully within each institution. Such an arrangement can indeed provide for an emphasis in each institution which I suggest will allow for an even greater amount of academic freedom and autonomy. I think we need to bear in mind also that freedom and autonomy of the university campuses can be threatened by spreading too thinly our resources of money and staff over too wide offerings at too many institutions.

When, as will be the case, the location of opportunity at one campus rather than at the other is a handicap to students because of geography and the resulting added costs, then I submit it is cheaper financially and more satisfactorily educationally to remove these handicaps by financial assistance to the students rather than by undue duplication of facilities and staff.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the government of the university must provide for continuing machinery to consider the needs of the entire university community. To the entire university community I think we might also add the whole problem of post-secondary education. There are communities which must consider these needs, all the people of Saskatchewan, the university, the government, this legislature. All of these groups, each and all of us, are now concerned with the two campuses. We must be concerned with other campuses and other post-secondary institutions in the rapidly approaching future.

I would like to think for just a moment or two about those other post-secondary institutions. What we do about them or what we don't do about them, certainly does affect the university in the future. We have bridged some of the gaps between general education, trade education, and university education, but we have not bridged them all. What kind of institutions must we have in order to meet these needs? A few years ago in Ontario, there was a committee of presidents of provincially assisted universities and colleges of Ontario. They reported in June, 1963. They gave this advice in their report:

What we must do is face the obvious fact of specialism in our culture and the equally obvious fact that different aptitudes and interests in our population can provide our young people with a wider choice of institutions giving specialized training beyond the secondary schools.

I hope that the university and the government and the people of the province generally, are thinking about these post-secondary institutions which are not quite technical education, not quite university, but are one of the ways in which we can meet the needs, I think, of a lot of young people.

Just to add to the evidence in that regard, I quote from an article in a recent issue of The Canadian Forum, the writer being Dr. David Steaker, Dean of Men, at the new college in the University of Toronto. He puts the point very succinctly in talking about the post-secondary institution. He talks of community colleges. He says:

The community college overcomes the geographic and cultural barrier of distance from an educational institution. The unique feature of the community college is that it puts two years of vocational, general, and transfer courses at the post-secondary level within daily commuting distance.

There is some further interesting material and reference with regard to this matter in the special study on education by Dr. Andrew Stewart. He was commissioned by Alberta to do this study. He reported in January of this year. May I read from one of the examples in this report. If anyone wishes to look at it, it can be found on pages 174, 175 and 176. There is a summary of the West Kootenay Regional College, which is not yet in operation but which is well advanced in the planning stage. The report says:

The following quotations are taken from a recently published prospectus for that college:

Ideas, leadership and vision have combined in good measure to bring about a truly creative community achievement. It began in 1962, when Dr. MacDonald, President of the University of British Columbia, presented his report on higher education. He predicted that without more facilities thousands of able young adults would be deprived of higher education, and he recommended that two-year colleges offering a variety of programs of one or two years of education beyond grade 12 be established.

To give a brief summary of what happened, in December of 1963 a plebiscite was held by six school boards in the area to determine whether the citizens were interested. The people voted overwhelmingly in favor. In June, 1964, a college council was appointed. In January of 1965, a seminar was held in Nelson attended by university presidents, government officials, 400 citizens of the West Kootenays. In February of 1965, after a region-wide debate about higher education, a referendum was put to the people asking tax support for the college. The referendum passed by 72 per cent majority, and thus the college became a reality. The college lies in a 200 acre site in a bowl formed by the mountains of the confluence of the Columbia-Kootenay Rivers, has a library which is designed to accommodate initially 15,000 volumes, classrooms and laboratories which are located in five education houses, each of which seats 150 students. The requirements of the college for admission is graduation from high school; all may enter, not all may stay. It is suggested that most of the students may come from neighboring town. Two thirds of the initial enrolment will probably be degree candidates who at the end of their second year transfer to third year universities. It is expected to open in September, 1966, with about 400 full time day students and they expect the full time enrolment will in ten years' time reach 2,000 students. Approximately 30 faculty members are to be appointed during this year.

The program courses may be of some interest. They include general classes in the physical and biological sciences, in the

March 21, 1966

social sciences, in the humanities, and in the administrative sciences. They lead to third year study in such faculties as art, science, agriculture, architecture, medicine, education, and in commerce after they have finished.

It seems to me that if we are going to cope with our educational needs at the secondary and at the university level in the future then we have to give some very serious consideration to whether or not this kind of development is one to be very much considered in our own province.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest and appreciation the appointment of a committee and the anticipated study which was recently announced just over the weekend, I believe, by the president of the university. I want to express the hope that the terms of reference of this study and the resources available to the committee are adequate to include consideration of the whole field of post-secondary school possibilities and needs.

In addition we need, — and the Board of Governors of the university can meet this need, — some continuing machinery as to how Saskatchewan can share with our neighboring provinces the responsibility for specialized education in the prairies. This bill does, I think, provide this kind of possibility. More and more, those very highly specialized university functions must be considered in the light of regional needs and regional capacity. Again, both the interest of financing and the interest of education can be well served by regional agreements in some instances.

We have one good example in the province now in the form of the Veterinary College. It was the subject of many meetings and discussions for at least some five years before agreement was reached in 1963. We need, I think, a more formalized machinery for considering what regional applications can be made in the field of post-secondary education.

The proposed bill, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is one by which we can provide the essential direction for the university growth in Saskatchewan which we must have. Admittedly in the neighboring province of Alberta, a slightly different method has evidently been preferred. As I understand the proposal in that province it, if enacted, and I think it is before the legislature now, will superimpose on the separate university campus administrations another administrative, and in a sense governing body. It also proposes that there will be a coordinating council made up of representatives from the university campuses. In other words, you have not only two separate universities, but you have two other bodies which in some sense are set aside from the two existing universities, if the proposals are followed through.

To me, at the moment, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta proposal seems to fragment and to complicate in a fashion which isn't either entirely necessary and isn't entirely fully productive.

Which one of these forms — the one that is proposed in the bill here or Alberta's forms — will serve best the effective development of a fair and adequate university opportunity, I suppose, only the test of experience will really tell. One aspect of all of us in this legislature will agree on. The only valid measurement is the extent to which these opportunities are of high quality and acceptable availability to the young people and others of Saskatchewan who wish to use them. I think the proposed arrangement in the bill can serve Saskatchewan. Admittedly they may well

require adaptation in various ways in the future but pending that time, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill before us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a very brief note to the comments which have already been made. Mr. Speaker, I will support the bill. However, I take the position that the bill is barely adequate to meet the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in any university situation such as ours where there are two main centres or campuses, there are obviously two or three theoretically possible solutions to the administrative problems raised. One would be to have two completely separate institutions. A second would be to have two separate institutions with two separate boards of governors but having a Grants Commission or some like body to distribute funds between the two campuses. That solution is the one which, I take it, Alberta has adopted. A third one (and very roughly I name these in descending order of autonomy for the two university units which make up the complex), and a third possibility would obviously be to have one and each responsible for one campus. And a fourth possibility would be to have one board and one president and two vice-presidents or principals. The latter solution to this problem is the one which has evidently been adopted and which is incorporated in the bill.

I say that it is barely adequate because I feel that it will barely, if it does at all, meet the legitimate claims for freedom of action which are being put forward on behalf of each of the campuses at Regina and Saskatoon. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we would be wrong in this legislature if we did not admit that the desire for freedom of action, or autonomy as it is sometimes called, is a strongly held desire at both Saskatoon and at Regina. I will concede that to some extent the desire is one motivated by considerations which might appeal to a Chamber of Commerce in the sense of saying, “We’re just as big as that town” and “Why should we be in any inferior position?” and that type of argument, which perhaps doesn’t have too much relevance to an analysis of an educational problem. But also, the desire stems from a very real belief on the part of some people that a university can best operate if it is autonomous in the sense that it can develop its own programs and that multi-tiered universities spread over a wide geographic area are not a very successful solution.

When one looks across Canada one doesn’t find many universities which have split campuses, at least split to the extent of being as far apart as Regina and Saskatoon. This is the way the University of Alberta developed and they are abandoning it. This is the way the University of British Columbia developed, by having an affiliated institution at Victoria, and they are abandoning the pattern. Victoria has now been erected into a separate university as of course, has Simon Fraser. I am not aware of any example in Eastern Canada of a university which has a split campus in this sense of the word. A number of instances can be found in the United States and of course, the most notable one is the University of California which is a great complex which has

campuses spread up and down that State so widely separated geographically. But I am not sure that the University of California has been an altogether happy experiment. It has perhaps more than any other university given currency to this new word heard recently, the word "Multiversity" meaning a great complex which is characterized primarily by a top echelon of administrators divorced from educators. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we in Saskatchewan have reached those heights or depths, as you may wish to characterize it. I am saying that there are many who believe that a university which is multi-tiered and which has its academic head, as the president must be, at a distance of 150 miles from a large group of scholars, is one which will be rigid and which will not operate to the best advantage in developing educational programs.

I have said that this view was widely held and strongly held. I do not on that account think we should necessarily conclude that the experiment which this bill incorporates will fail. But I would urge upon the minister and upon any university people who may be influenced by him to give this experiment every opportunity to act in a way in which it cannot be alleged that there is any grudging delegation of academic autonomy to either campus. I urge them to act with speed in appointing a principal at Saskatoon, because while the president acts as president and principal of the Saskatoon campus, there will undoubtedly be a continuing feeling at Regina that the requests of this campus when considered by the president cannot be considered impartially vis-à-vis the Saskatoon campus while the man who is making the decision is also principal of the Saskatoon campus. I am not suggesting that that is in fact the case. I am suggesting that this belief will be held. So I am suggesting that speedy is a watchword in implementing the experiment and I am suggesting that there ought not to be any grudging delegation of academic autonomy. I am one of those who is prepared to agree that there are merits in having an administrative link, a financial link, at this stage in our development. I therefore, do not find myself in a position where I have to oppose the bill. But I regard it as a bare minimum in meeting the problem and I hope that it isn't too little and too late.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw the attention of the members to the fact that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak he must do so now.

Hon. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in replying briefly, I want to say that I am still convinced that at this phase of the development and the phenomenal growth of our university it is still fair to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to borrow considerable amounts for this capital expense. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) would blame us for referring to what was accomplished in former years by their administration yet they love to compare Liberal accomplishments of the 30's with those of the 40's and 50's I notice, at times.

I think the principle of specialization at the university, at the various campuses, is a very important one especially at this time in the development of our two universities. I think it would be to the disadvantage of the people and the young people especially of Saskatchewan if we were to try to duplicate all

facilities at each of the campuses. I think we can offer the people and the young people especially better university facilities in our province by specializing, especially at this stage of our development, — when you think we are less than one million people in the province, — than if we specialized in certain areas, certain expensive areas, at each of the campuses.

A principal at each campus with somewhat similar administrative structure at each should lead to a great deal of autonomy in the development of each of the campuses. I must say that from some reading I have done and some consultation with people from Ontario where they have 13 universities, I know they are in serious trouble at the present time. One of the problems they are facing is the competition between these 13 universities for very, very expensive equipment. I think it is nearly impossible, even for a wealthy province such as Ontario, to try and supply each one of the universities with the latest and the most expensive equipment, especially in the fields of science.

I would like to say to the house, — and I think you know we have taken some steps to study seriously post-secondary education in the province, — that the concept of the community college is receiving very serious study. I think it has much to commend itself in this province where we have a sparsely settled population, centred in various medium-sized cities. I must say to the house that this is receiving very serious study at the present time.

HON. A. C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved Bill No. 72 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act** be now read a second time.

He said: This is an act to amend the Saskatchewan Government Telephones Act.

Under the act, of course, as members know, the aggregate sum that may be borrowed by the Provincial Treasurer or by the corporation as set out presently may not exceed \$125,000,000. The government advance at the present time is roughly in the neighborhood of \$121,000,000 to the telephones. This bill permits further advances to The Saskatchewan Government Telephones. We are asking to raise the amount to \$150,000,000 from the present \$125,000,000. I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, just a word. I'll spare the house the alarmist speeches which used to be made by members opposite when they sat is the opposition benches every time there was a bill introduced to increase the borrowing limits of one of the crown corporations. I won't remind the house of the many times that members opposite have said that this was putting an intolerable burden of debt on the people of Saskatchewan. And when it was argued that this would all be paid for by the telephone users it was counter-argued by the then opposition that the telephone users were the same people as the taxpayers and that this was just another burden on the taxpayers. Members opposite used to argue that there was a limit to the amount of money that could be borrowed. I have never shared those views. Obviously there are some limits, but I have never shared the view that this province could not support two very vigorous and vigorously expanding utilities, the Power Corporation and Government Telephones. I acknowledge the necessity, if we are to have those utilities, of borrowing money, and borrowing large sums of money, and I have no quarrel with this

March 21, 1966

bill which increases the borrowing limits of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. A. C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 71 — **An Act to amend the Oil and Gas Conservation Act.**

He said: This, Mr. Speaker, is an act to amend the Oil and Gas Conservation Act. There appears to be some question whether under the present act, the Oil and Gas Conservation Act permits the establishment of voluntary units of operation. Most unit operations, as hon. members know, are set up by Order in Council after a public hearing by the Oil and Gas Conservation Board. The proposed amendment is to make it abundantly clear that the owners or any other other persons having an interest in an oil or gas pool or field may enter into an agreement of their own upon which terms and conditions the unit would be operated as a unit. A voluntary unit, of course, would be formed only after all of those interested in participating have formed a mutually agreeable agreement among them all. In the event, of course, that they don't agree they have the right to apply to the Oil and Gas Conservation Board for an ordered or a compulsory unit. That becomes known as an ordered unit when an Order in Council is passed.

So in brief this makes it possible for the industry to establish voluntary units if they are all in agreement. There is a clause setting up how they must register the agreement with the minister. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

HON. A. C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 73 — **An Act to amend the Mines Regulation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an act to amend the Mines Regulation Act. The Mines Regulation Act, as it was originally designed, was designed for hard rock mining. The present proposed amendments would revise the act having regard to the conventional mining and solution mining both of potash and of sale. It clarifies the words "mine" and "mining" in order to encompass the bringing in under the act of the potash and salt mines. It likewise clarifies or spells out more clearly the duties and roll of the mines inspector.

So Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. D. V. HEALD (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 75 — **An Act to amend The District Courts Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, these are amendments to the District Courts Act. The amendments provide that the Lieutenant Governor in

Council will have the power to require the present judges of the District Court to continue to live where they now live and will also enable the Lieutenant Governor in Council to determine the residence of new judges or judges hereinafter appointed, at the time of appointment.

Mr. Speaker, when we had judicial districts in the province under the old District Courts Act it was provided in that District Courts Act by Section 8 of the District Courts Act, 1953, that the place in the district to which he is appointed as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall direct. Now, when the District Courts Act was changed a few years ago and the judicial districts were done away with and each of the District Court judges was made District Court judge for the whole province, we set up judicial centres. But this Section, giving the Lieutenant Governor in Council the power to designate where the judges could live, was left out of the new act. The result is that in the absence of some provision for determining the residence of a judge, an appointee is not always willing to reside at the judicial centre at which it is considered he should reside in the interests of the administration of justice. An appointee can often be reluctant to reside at one of the smaller judicial centres. There hasn't been too much trouble about that but there was a situation a few years ago where a particular judge was appointed and ended up living in one of the cities in the province. There were a number of people in one of the smaller centres where the judge had been before, who felt, I think the whole community felt, that he should have probably lived in this particular district, in this particular centre.

Now, this act will provide that the Lieutenant Governor in Council can change the place of residence of an existing judge only with his consent. That is, this act doesn't give the Lieutenant Governor in Council power to move a judge at the present time without his consent. The act will also provide for the place of residence of a newly appointed judge being fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council either before or after the appointment. I would think that ordinarily it would be done at the time of the appointment.

The purpose of the last sub-section, I will go into this in more detail in committee, the purpose of sub-section three of Section A is to require that all of the present judges continue their present place of residence as without such a provision there would be nothing to prevent them moving to larger cities even though their duties are elsewhere. The way the act is at present time there would be nothing to stop the judge from North Battleford moving to Regina. I don't say he would do it but he could. There would be nothing anybody could do about it. There would be nothing to stop the judge from Prince Albert moving to Saskatoon. So the purpose of this sub-section three is to freeze them in their present position.

The last section of the act, of course, has to do with coming into force and I will explain that more in committee. The sub-section two of the act brings the first two subsections into force immediately and provides for subsection three coming into force on proclamation. We want to postpone the coming into force of sub-section three because this freezes the judges in their present position. We hope that a couple of judges will move in the next two or three months to the districts where they are carrying on and where their judicial duties take them. I refer particularly to Swift Current and to Melville. They were the last two judges that were appointed to District Court, Judge Moore headquarters his

March 21, 1966

duties in the judicial centre of Swift Current and Judge Deis is headquartered in Melville and they have every intention, I know, of moving to these centres. But if we brought into force sub-section three at the present time, the effect of it would be to freeze them in Regina and Moose Jaw which we don't want to do.

Mr. Speaker, with that explanation I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of the bill.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an opportunity to study the implications of this bill. In fact my colleague, the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is looking into this bill. However, I think it is relatively non-controversial. Let me put it this way. We will be seeking in committee to discuss the matter. If we stray into policy I'm sure the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) will still deal with the matter. Accordingly, so as not to hold up the house I will suggest that we will be supporting the bill on second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

MR. J. C. MCISAAC (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 76 — **An Act to amend The Town Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes the amendments for this year to the Town Act. I believe that most of them are straight forward. Generally speaking a number of them are similar to the ones we looked at this afternoon in the Village Act and the City Act. I might mention and perhaps this would be a good time to mention that my department intends to begin this year, at least, a consolidation of the City, Town and Village Acts into one act. An act which governs all of the urban municipalities would perhaps be easier to amend and easier to look after. Over the years the problem seems to have been that frequently an amendment was put in the Village Act which perhaps did not get in the Town Act and vice versa. I would hope, as I say, that such consolidation could possibly be done within the year. Possibly it could take longer than this. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that most of the amendments proposed here are non-controversial and accordingly I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I have very little comment to make on this bill. The minister (Mr. McIsaac) has told us that most of the sections are straight forward. I didn't notice any of them that weren't. I will not be opposing the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

MR. J. C. MCISAAC (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moved second reading of Bill No. 77 — **An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act.**

He said: Bill No. 77, Mr. Speaker, contains the amendments to the Rural Municipality Act. Here again from time to time throughout the year the officials in the department encounter various provisions that are perhaps not clear in their intent. In addition to this the SARM brings various provisions to our attention that need clarification or updating. Once again I feel that these amendments are relatively speaking non-controversial and can best be dealt with in committee. Accordingly, I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, again I have perused this bill and found nothing that I would object to too much, although we may have some questions to ask concerning the erection and maintenance and financing of hospitals. But I think this can be done in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

HON. G. J. TRAPP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 78 — **An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.**

He said: Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, it is a very brief bill, is to complement, I think, Bill No. 70, which transfers nursing education from the Department of Health to the Department of Education. This bill makes arrangements for this, such arrangements as are deemed necessary for the education of nurses and for education and training of auxilliary nursing personnel so that it really complements the former bill that has been introduced to transfer nursing training from the Department of Health to the Department of Education.

There is a further more lengthy bill on nursing education and later on it will be brought in. I beg leave of the assembly to move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart, the assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.