

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**41st Day**

**Monday, March 31, 1969**

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

**COMMENT RE: ARTICLES IN STAR PHOENIX AND LEADER POST**

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would just like to rise on a matter of personal privilege. An article appeared in The Star Phoenix on Saturday, March 29th and an article similar to it appeared in The Leader Post of the same day. I would just like to quote the article:

Mr. Larochelle said he would bring bills for repairs to trucks as proof.

And this is in regard to an alleged stone-throwing episode.

He also asked Mr. J.E. Brockelbank, NDP Saskatoon Mayfair, if it was true that Mr. Brockelbank was present when a rock-throwing incident occurred during which truck windshields were broken. Mr. Brockelbank who is associated with the union involved said he was present but there was nothing wrong with his being there as all other employees involved were also in the area at one time or another.

I think this misconstrues what actually took place in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I was asked if I was ever in that trailer that was referred to as union headquarters, to which I replied that I had been there and so had all other employees at some time or other. I never at any time said I was present when the rock-throwing episode took place. So I wish to make that correction to the press. Other than the misspelling of my name, I would suggest the article is probably accurate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I am sure the press will take the Member's words into consideration.

**MOTIONS FOR HUMBLE ADDRESSES**

**HUMBLE ADDRESS NO. 4**

**Hon. D.V. Mr. Heald (Attorney General)** moved that a Humble Address No. 4 be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor recommending to His Honour

that Mr. David Melvin Keith of Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, be appointed the Member of the Public and Private Rights Board under Section 6 of The Expropriation Procedure Act, 1968, being chapter 21 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1968.

He said: I should perhaps say a word in moving this motion, Mr. Speaker. The Motion is necessary by virtue of the provisions in Section 6 of The Expropriation Procedure Act. Mr. Keith was appointed under subsection 12 of Section 6 which says:

Whereupon the coming into force of this Act for any reason a board under subsection 1 has not been appointed and the Legislative Assembly is not then in session, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint a person as the board for a term expiring not later than the day on which the next ensuing session of the Assembly ends.

The Act was proclaimed on December 1st, 1968 and Mr. Keith was appointed by Order-in-Council and now we seek to have his appointment confirmed pursuant to the provisions of Section 6 of the Act.

As all Members know, Mr. Speaker, this Public and Private Rights Board is sort of a limited Ombudsman and as such does not report to the Government. It reports to the Legislature and this is why a few days ago I did make available to all Hon. Members a copy of the interim report of the Public and Private Rights Board which showed that they were dealing with a number of cases. You will perhaps note in the report that they haven't been dealing with any new expropriations because the various expropriating authorities for the new year's work, I suppose, are just in the process now of getting ready to do expropriations, so there wasn't very much work for the Board to do during the first three months.

Mr. Keith at the moment is on a part-time basis. I discussed this matter with him at the time of his appointment and he felt, and I was inclined to agree with him that at least in the starting-up stages it would not be necessary to have a full-time Public and Private Rights Board. Now he has a staff that is full time and I'd just like to give you a little rundown on the people that are working for him.

He has appointed, which he's entitled to do under the Act – we don't appoint them – a director of the board and their office is in the Power Corporation building and this is a full-time man. His name is Mr. V. Fred Gallant and he receives a remuneration of \$725 per month and he has a secretary, Miss Elsie Scaba who receives a remuneration of \$356 per month. I think you might be interested in Mr. Gallant's background. He was in the last war, prior to that he worked for Canadian Utilities at Moosomin. He joined the army in September, 1939, went overseas in 1940, acquired his commission in 1942 and was discharged in

March 31, 1969

September of 1945. After the last was he was the manager of Picardy stores in Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton. He moved back to Regina in 1952 and worked with the Toronto General Trust Corporation doing property management and looking after farm estates. He did many farm appraisals at that time and he also did many appraisals for Western Homes Limited, a mortgage company investing in local housing mortgages. In 1958 he was asked to manage Argue Agencies, which was a real estate company set up by Western Homes Limited as an outlet for their money in Regina. Western Homes was sold in 1965 and the local office closed. At that time in 1965, Mr. Gallant joined City Savings and Trust and was manager of their local office until the end of November, 1968 when Mr. Keith asked him to join his staff of the Public and Private Rights Board.

Insofar as Mr. Keith is concerned, Mr. Speaker, he is a senior lawyer in the city of Regina. He has practised law for between 25 and 30 years. He has fairly large farming interests in the Rouleau district in the Province of Saskatchewan and it was the Government's feeling that Mr. Keith had the kind of unique background which would adequately qualify him to handle this job satisfactorily.

Now as I say if it gets shortly to be a full time job for Mr. Keith, of course we will have to make a different deal with him because we are not going to get his full-time services for \$12,000 a year.

I noticed in the Quebec Legislature the other day they appointed an Ombudsman and they started him out at \$30,000 a year. It was felt that for the first organizational period part-time services would be adequate, having in mind the fact that there is a full-time director of the board and a secretary.

We will keep this matter continually under review and if it becomes obvious or clear that in a month or two, or three months, it becomes necessary for Mr. Keith also to be on a full-time basis, then those arrangements will be made with him.

I would also say to all Hon. Members that in view of the kind of set-up that we have here, this Public and Private Rights Board doesn't really report to the Government, but if any Hon. Members have questions or have constituents who want further information about the board, I would think the proper procedure is for Members of course to deal direct with the board either by personal interview or by writing. You have the same rights to write to the board as any Member on the Government's side. It's not a question of Government and Opposition in this case.

This man and this board work for the entire Legislature and all Members of the Legislature and certainly I think all Members should feel free to contact the board at any time with any questions that they might have.

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, this appointment certainly meets with our approval. As a chairman of the Legislative Committee that studied expropriations in this province, it was one of the unique and I think one of the better recommendations of the Committee. The recommendation was unanimous I think because most of us on the Committee felt that there was a need for some vehicle through which those that were aggrieved could explain their grievance and could obtain a hearing. It was evident too that these people, citizens of this Province, who were involved in expropriations were frustrated when they couldn't be heard. When one questioned them about the advisability of going to the courts, you could see that courts seemed to frighten them and confuse them and confound them. They were not the type of people who were thoroughly familiar with courts and the way they operated.

I think the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) in making reference to this man's position as an Ombudsman might call him the Ombudsman of Expropriation. I think this would be accurate.

David Keith is known to me and I think all Members would agree that he has the personality and the experience and the patience to carry out the intentions of the Committee, the recommendations of the Expropriation Committee. Every Member of the Legislature should encourage him to meet those who feel they are aggrieved face to face when trying to solve an expropriation problem.

In these difficult situations the public has rights which cannot be denied. The private citizen has rights which must be recognized and protected and I think the Public and Private Rights Board member offers a common meeting ground for those seeking a solution to expropriation problems.

I certainly support the motion.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTIONS

### SASKATCHEWAN FLAG SELECTED

**Hon. Mr. Thatcher (Premier):** moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Heald:

That this Assembly confirms the recommendation of the Saskatchewan Flag Selection Committee contained in its report to the Government dated March 26, 1969, namely, that a flag of the proportions of three by length and two by width, consisting of two horizontal bars, the upper green, the lower yellow, with a Prairie Lily occupying the half nearest the staff, and with a shield of the Armorial Bearings of the Province of Saskatchewan occupying the upper quarter farthest from the staff be adopted as the Provincial flag.

**March 31, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak on this item, except to say that I think the Committee worked long and diligently in choosing a Provincial flag. It is not the one I would have chosen, and I can't say that I'm excited about it. I wonder whether the flower on the design can be drawn by school children. However, since the majority of the Committee went along with it, I think there should be a free vote. It is not a party matter and I rather hope that the Legislature will decide to adopt this particular flag.

**Mr. E.G. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I think the Assembly is probably aware that there have been some minor changes in the design to the one that has been passed around on the small cards. Would it be in order, Mr. Speaker, to have the new design brought in and displayed for the information of the Members?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, if there have been any changes made and I presume on authority of the Committee, then certainly I think it would be in order if anything meaningful is to be said on this motion, and I consider that the Member was speaking to the order when he was speaking and not to the motion.

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, as . . . may I continue?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, go ahead.

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee involved in the selection of the flag, I would like to make a few comments. For the record I would like to briefly review the work of the Committee. I think that first the task of the Committee should be clearly understood by the Legislature. We were asked by the Government to consider the matter of selecting a design for a distinctive flag for the Province of Saskatchewan, not to designate a certain design as the official one for Saskatchewan, that will be a job for the Legislature.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there's little doubt that Saskatchewan needs a flag. All other provinces in Canada have a flag. The world is getting smaller and our province and all provinces, I believe, are certainly becoming more important. We are proud of our province and on official occasions, both inside and outside of Saskatchewan, we require a distinctive flag to identify ourselves. The Jubilee flag was selected by a competition several years ago for a specific purpose. It was well received and was a popular flag with the people of Saskatchewan. Our Committee felt that a competition should be held so that all Saskatchewan residents would know that we were looking for an official flag and would have an opportunity to make a submission. Many perhaps wanted a chance to enter the official flag contest who had not entered the contest for a Jubilee flag. Arrangements were made, however, to have the Jubilee flag entered in

the competition. The Committee felt that the success of the competition would depend largely on the publicity it received and in this regard I would like to thank the news media. I think that the Committee did a very good job. In addition to the publicity through the news media, an extensive campaign was carried on to publicize the competition to all educational institutions, commercial art firms, individuals and others who might be interested in making a submission. The response to the campaign was extremely satisfactory. We received well over 4,000 entries and by far the greater percentage were of high quality.

I would like to pay tribute to the many school teachers who obviously encouraged their students to enter the contest and to the other individuals and groups who helped make the competition a success.

When the competition closing date was reached, the Committee faced a rather formidable task. Committee members realized that all individuals have certain color and design preference and to pick a flag suitable to all would be almost impossible. At first consideration was given to obtaining outside help in making the selection, but where do you find a professional flag selector? There appears to be really no such person.

The Committee certainly represented, I think, a cross section of our economy and were probably as competent as any group to make the selection. We represented many areas in the province. We were made up of farmers, merchants, professional people and I think we represented a good number of the ethnic origins in the province. By my rough calculation and I may be out a little here but I believe we had two Ukrainian people, two German, two English, one French, one Irish, one Welsh and three Scottish members, and of course we represented both sides of the Legislature.

Now the actual selection of the flag was one in a series of votes. The 4,000 entries were first reduced down to about 800 which were displayed as you will recall in Room 225. By ballot the 800 were reduced down to about 165. Further ballots reduced these 165 down to 120, 120 down to about 27, then the 27 down to the 11 prize winners. The 11 prize-winning designs were then reproduced by a commercial firm in the city here so that the Committee would not be influenced in a final decision by difference in quality of workmanship. A series of ballots were then held in the 11 winning flags, which resulted in a reduction to six, then down to three and finally one flag received a majority of the Committee votes.

I would, for the record, like to stress two points to the Legislature. First of all the method of voting used made it possible for every member of the Committee to have an equal say in the selection, and secondly, the flags that were being considered were displayed anonymously at all times and no member knew at any time who any of the entrants were until after the

**March 31, 1969**

final selection was made.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the business of the Committee was carried on in a high plane at all times and in a non-partisan manner. The Committee worked hard and were always co-operative and I would like to thank them for this. It was often difficult to arrange meeting times for the Committee, because we had to defer to Crown Corporations, Public Accounts Committee without complaint. On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Clerk and his staff for their excellent co-operation. The holding of this competition involved a terrific amount of work and this was largely done by the staff of the Legislative Assembly office. Each entry had to be acknowledged and recorded and the other great number of jobs done, and I am sure that all members of the Committee greatly appreciate the assistance of the staff of the Clerk's office.

The artist who did the final art work on the 11 winning flags was a Mr. Laverne Roy Dick and I am sure that Members will agree that he did a very excellent job.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should mention that the competition had a very valuable secondary effect. I am sure that many hundreds of young people in Saskatchewan became more aware of their province and its symbols and I am sure that these young people benefited by it. The entries were, of course, of a very great variety. I might say that a very large number included the Prairie Lily in some form or other and this would seem to indicate to me and to the Committee that many of the entrants wanted the Prairie Lily on the flag.

The winning entry of course was not the personal choice of each Committee member. In fact it didn't happen to be my particular personal choice either and the winning entry I am sure would not be the personal choice of every Member of the Legislature. However, the Committee did consider all of these 4,000 entries carefully and a majority of the Committee did select one particular flag as the winner and I would recommend it to the Legislature.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell very long on the topic of the flag. I want to concur with everything that the Chairman of the Committee has said.

First of all when we entered this contest, when we received all the flags, to throw a Committee into 4,000 flags was quite a problem. If you were to put them on the wall of this Legislature, I am sure it would cover all the walls below the galleries and then you start from there and start trying to select a flag.

I want to say that I feel the same way that the Chairman

feels in that a large number of designs had the Prairie Lily on it. I'd say 40 per cent in a rough estimation. There was a greater number that had the coat of arms. A lot of them expressed the green forest and the wheat fields and so on. When you try to put all these together, I think that the design that was selected was as close as possible to what the people were trying to say in the contest. We had quite a few grain bins, we had a few beavers in the designs, we had a few Prairie chickens, we didn't have any gophers and we had a few fleurs-de-lis and so on, but it still pointed out the interest that was taken in this contest. I think every member of the Committee did his best. I know this is not the first choice of every member of the Committee, but I think it expresses pretty well what the people were trying to say in the contest. I want to say that I enjoyed working on the Committee. It is the third Committee that I have worked on since I have been a Member of the Legislature and I feel that whenever there is a serious problem a Legislative Committee is the best way to handle it. I have been on the Highway Safety Committee and I think that we have done quite a bit in that regard. The Expropriation Committee worked for two years and I know it has produced good fruit. Any time I see a committee formed to deal with a problem, I am with it because the people that are on the committee do make a careful study of the situation and I think they usually come up with a fair answer. Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I want to thank you for the time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask a question before we put this thing to a vote. First of all I would like to congratulate the Committee for the hard work they did. If we are going to have a free vote on this, however, I would like to see the top three flags put beside this one. I don't know if this is practical, but I would like to see them displayed. Otherwise if it goes to a free vote, you are either going to have to vote for it or against it and I am not sure if that is what you want to do, if I understood the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) correctly when he said it would be a free vote of the House.

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a very few comments on the flag. I want to say that this is the first Intersessional Committee that I have had the opportunity to serve on. I was impressed with the interest and sincerity of all the members on the Committee who really considered this a task of some importance and some meaning to the Province. They did their very best to come up with the kind of design that would satisfy the people of Saskatchewan. In relation to the specific flag I want to say that I don't think this flag completely satisfied every member of the Committee or perhaps any member of the Committee. In trying to analyze it we came to the conclusion that



March 31, 1969

there were several very important ingredients that should be contained in a Saskatchewan flag. For example, we felt that wheat should be demonstrated as the stable industry of our province which of course contributes so emphatically economically. We felt that the forest had to be demonstrated as the northern third of our province is made up of forest and contributes a great deal to not only the scenery but also in the productive economy of our province as well. There was a feeling that the sky of the Prairies was an important element that should probably be demonstrated in any flag of the Province of Saskatchewan. It was also felt that our sunset which is widely recognized and known across Canada and perhaps across North America for its beauty would be important. We felt that the Saskatchewan lily which is our flower was another important element that had to be shown on the flag if possible. From the entries there seemed to be a marked indication that the coat of arms of Saskatchewan should be shown on the flag. It would be impossible of course to try and place all of these qualities in any one flag. It would become more like a sign board than a flag, and a flag if it is going to be accepted must be simple. Therefore in trying to reduce these various qualities that the Committee hoped to show on the flag, an attempt was made to show as many as possible; the green represents the forest, the yellow represents the wheat, the lily and the coat of arms. Unfortunately two of the other very important qualities, the sunset and the blue sky are missing. However, I think it would be impossible to show everything. I personally would not have selected this, but I think it certainly is a very good compromise. It is the kind of a flag that I think does represent Saskatchewan and I think that it will be accepted over a period of time and in the years ahead to be a flag that all the people of Saskatchewan can well be proud of.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss in my duty in not saying a few words in respect to the flag. First I would like to thank the Committee for the arduous job they had in selecting a flag. I am sure if each one of us would have to make a decision here today or everyone in the province, we would probably have close to a million different ideas about a flag. It is essential that we have a flag representing the province and I thank the Committee for having selected one.

I would also like to mention to this House that Mr. Anthony Drake who was the designer of this flag is a constituent of mine. He is an English school teacher at the school in Hodgeville and has been in Canada for about two and one-half years. He is between 28 and 30 years old and he specializes in English in school. He is returning to England permanently this summer. I thought that this House would like to know who designed our flag and I think we should thank the Committee for selecting a very good flag.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South)** — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to precipitate any Provincial counterpart of the well-remembered flag debate which took place a few years ago in the House of Commons. I think citizens everywhere were heartily fed up at that time not so much with the length of the debate perhaps, as with some of the substance of the debate. At the outset I want to say that our Flag Committee members were of one mind in wanting to avoid a repetition of the excesses of the flag debate at Ottawa a few years ago. I think that it can also be said that everyone on the Committee tried to pursue his duty as an individual rather than representing any definite party or caucus viewpoint. What I have to say today, Mr. Speaker, is said as an individual. There is no other thought in my mind than to see the choice of a Provincial flag which is as far as possible representative of the spirit and the being and the history of Saskatchewan.

I want to make it clear that I am not violently opposed to the flag which we have before us and are asked to accept. I think it is a worthy design but I personally feel we could do better; and in a matter of this kind I think the decision should be for the best.

It is true to say, (I think all my fellow Committee members will agree), that not one of the ideas or the flags submitted met wholly with the approval of most of the members if indeed any one of the flags met with the total approval of any one of the members. However it was felt that the chosen flags would have to be accepted as they were and that ideas incorporated or suggested in any submission could not be combined. It is here that I respectfully part company with the Committee.

The Committee did however agree that the Provincial flag that was finally submitted could be altered somewhat as to the shade of the colors and the shape of the design. For example, it was unanimous that the Prairie Lily in the premier award needed to be changed in shape and color emphasis. It was felt that the two colors in the award should have different tones and of course this is the case in the design that you see before you this morning. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee would not have proceeded much further if they had accepted the proposition that other excellent ideas conveyed in several of the prize-winning flags could be incorporated in the final design and colors of a Provincial flag chosen by this Legislature.

Now the Jubilee flag, for example, displays the wheat theme in the form of a stylized wheat stalk. The red color exemplifies among other things the sunset skies for which the Prairies are so justly lauded. In my opinion, the Jubilee flag unnecessarily repeats the wheat theme in the coat of arms in the top right-hand corner. But notwithstanding this, the wheat stalk idea and the sunset shades are worthwhile and I think it is unfortunate that they are missing in the flag it is suggested we accept. But quite apart from all of this, the sweeping physical fact of the Prairies, I suggest, is the wide sky and its hue;

**March 31, 1969**

the color that the artist, Hurley, has so well set forth in many, many paintings. This is also, of course, entirely absent from the flag design before us this morning.

One of the designs submitted by the well-known Prairie artist, A.W. Davey, impressed many Committee members. It was thought, however, that the – I suppose I can only refer to it as the “potash color” – that surrounded the square in the coat of arms in this submission, and in fact the actual location of the square, were unacceptable. To my mind, however, the color concept in this submission was good and better really than in the flag we are asked to endorse. Now I’m not saying that it met all standards, perhaps, but in my opinion it was better.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the competition launched by the Committee wanted above all, to get ideas, to stimulate ideas, to awaken interest and to find how Saskatchewan citizens, both young and old, felt on the subject of a Provincial flag. This is why I was one that urged a flag competition. I believe that the competition achieved its objective. The response was very good, indeed. It showed that Saskatchewan people have a deep interest and that they want an effective and a descriptive banner that exemplifies the Province to the world at large. I think it has also revealed a considerable sensitivity and awareness on the subject among all age groups. For the purposes of the competition, I think it was a distinct success.

But I must emphasize that the Committee in inviting flag designs said that it was interested, not just in good art work, but in the simple ideas conveyed; and some excellent themes were suggested, or transpired although they were frequently not artistically presented in a very skilled fashion. They were in many cases, Mr. Speaker, rather amateurish. Yet in the opinion of Committee members they were often superior in the thought presented to many other more skilled and more technically well executed presentations. To make plain here again what I am getting at, it was not often the execution so much as the idea that impressed Committee members.

My feeling is that we could have awarded a first prize and the ten honorable mentions without having to accept, for the final design, one which exactly followed the premier award. As I pointed out the Committee in accepting the premier award has already really accepted the idea of altering to some extent both colors, and perhaps in part design, if you consider that part of the design is the flower. It would be quite in order in my opinion to ask the winning flag designer to consider modifications which would, in the opinion of the Committee, result in improvement.

The flag before us is the perhaps painful result of a number of ballots. In the winnowing-down process the Committee members voted on a stated number of choices without indicating the order of choice in these votes. It was only in the concluding ballots that the Committee did indicate preference in

a one-two-three order. The fact is that the earlier ballots – perhaps this was necessary and I'm not really disputing this – did reduce the number of flags by a straight preference without indicating any sequential form in the manner of balloting. I think perhaps we may have been somewhat rough and ready in the reduction of the total number of awards to the few flags that we finally discussed and voted on in the one-two-three order that I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I freely conceive that whatever method was used in effecting a choice of a flag by any group, and in this case as the Chairman has said, it is a lay group, although representative in many other ways (and a political group of course), would most likely not result in an unanimous choice. I want to say again that all Committee members in my opinion did their best as they saw it, especially in the light of the pressure to get a report to this session of the Legislature and in bringing this choice to you this morning.

If this flag is accepted by the Legislature, I believe it will not be a bad choice but simply not the best choice, and rather than presenting it at this time, I think further avenues of approach and consideration might have been explored. I am acutely conscious that opinions on flags differ perhaps as much as in other aesthetic considerations. I don't want to fight for my own case here so much as I want to suggest other lines of approach to the Members of the Legislature. In other words I am not so much interested in presenting a cherished or a stubborn view or bias as in getting a Provincial flag which best embodies to the greatest extent and degree the flavor, the color, the history, the traditions and the spirit of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add two points. I want to congratulate the Committee on their choice of the flag. I think it's a good one. I looked them over and even though it wasn't my first choice I do think it really is representative of what we want in a flag in Saskatchewan. I rise really to make two suggestions to the Legislature and to the Government. I think that what I am holding in my hand, this card showing the new flag, is a very nice idea and I would hope that Members might, if this flag is chosen, get some cards like this. I think of many ex-Saskatchewan people, I can think of a dozen or so of my friends that I would like to mail one of these to. It would be very, very interesting for people who have left Saskatchewan to have a copy of the new Saskatchewan flag. The other suggestion I am going to make, Mr. Speaker, is this. Today we, if we choose this flag, are choosing a flag for the next 50 years, 100 years or for an unknown period of time. It seems to me that this was quite a historic day for us as Members of the Legislature. I have a feeling that it would be nice for each Member to have an actual flag when the times comes, if this one is chosen and the new flags are made. I think it would be a nice

March 31, 1969

keepsake, a nice memento of the day that we chose a flag, a permanent flag for the Province of Saskatchewan. I certainly am going to support the flag.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. A.C. Mr. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word on the flag. I wasn't on the Committee but I think the Committee is to be congratulated for its efforts in choosing the flag. I think as I observed here that we can sum up the introduction of this flag as not opposed but not too greatly enthused and that seems to be my feeling of it also. I'm not going to violently oppose the flag. I do feel however and I think I should make it known to the Legislature that my preference — and I thought it should have remained as a Provincial flag — was the Jubilee flag, which certainly everyone accepted with great enthusiasm. It has come to be recognized over a period of years — at least in the minds of the people — as the Provincial flag and I rather regret to see this relegated into the past and to come out with this particular flag. I think that the impact of the Jubilee flag was evident in the Committee's work. In the eleven flags which I reviewed as the final winners, there was evidence of the impact that the Jubilee flag had on the design of many of them. I think it speaks well for it. I think that this is a take-off of the Jubilee flag. I say, I am not going to oppose it, but neither am I enthused about it because I think we had a Saskatchewan flag, something which the people had become accustomed to and which they were ready for. But as I say, I am not going to raise any flag debate on the matter. I am not enthused about it myself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I am the only Member from the Legislature that submitted a design, but I did, and I did it in a very crude fashion as my colleague mentioned about some of the entries because I thought the contest was all over when I got in here and I only had two or three hours to do anything and collect my thoughts. I did suggest the blue of the sky, the gold of the fields, etc., but I did omit the green emblem and I am not the least bit critical about failing to win at all. Frankly I don't go for straight lines, etc. etc., large bars, but I am quite prepared to accept what the Committee has chosen, Mr. Speaker. I think it does represent the main features of Saskatchewan from the pioneer days until now, acceptable in simplicity. In regard to the Jubilee flag to me it was always too still and rigid, lacking too much in any graceful lines. I for one, regardless of the entry, regardless of some of the ideas and feelings that I have about grade and curves, etc., am delighted with what the Committee has chosen. There could probably be a little variation in the setting of the lily,  
I

don't know, but I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to accept and support the Committee wholeheartedly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

## SECOND READINGS

**Hon. Mr. Boldt (Minister of Highways)** moved second reading of Bill No. 71 — **An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.**

He said: Yes, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act on second reading, I would like to point out that the Act presently requires a person to prove his claim for accident benefits under Part 2 of the Act by providing a certificate from a duly qualified medical practitioner. However, certain injuries are being effectively treated by members of the Canadian Chiropractic Association. If the treatment is carried out as a referral from a duly qualified medical practitioner, no difficulty arises in presenting a claim. Where treatment is carried out without a referral, the Act presently precludes that treatment as a claim except where the statutory conditions are waived by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. We believe that the present provisions unnecessarily limit an injured party in seeking treatment for an injury. We also believe that the Canadian Chiropractic Association has achieved a degree of professional status which should be recognized by allowing their members to provide certificates for claims involving injuries within defined areas. The proposed amendment recognizes these factors and therefore will benefit both the motoring public and the Canadian Chiropractic Association.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the House agree with this extension of the coverage of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. We are pleased to see that chiropractors have been included as acceptable for payment and authorized regarding certain types of injuries. This is a step in the right direction and we hope that the day will come when chiropractors will be included under other Acts as well, that they will be recognized for their training and qualifications as they are in other parts of Canada.

Many Members on this side of the House would like to see this principle contained in this Bill extended and they have expressed the wish that the entire coverage of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, particularly regarding medical benefits and indemnity for injuries should be reviewed and brought up-to-date. The very fact that the package policy has been rewritten

March 31, 1969

to update this aspect of automobile insurance benefits emphasizes the need for a review that has not been undertaken for some years now. I think that the cost of everything has increased and the present coverage is out of line with the present cost of medical care and salaries. I am prepared to say that I think as well, Mr. Speaker, that the increase in the premiums, the increase in the rates, surcharges which have been added because of accidents, the \$2 fund for licensed drivers under 25, and there are many financial aspects that have been added that would cover an extension of medical benefits and payments on The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. We welcome the inclusion of chiropractors. We think the principle is good. We would like to see it extended and we would like to see a review of the entire medical benefits Section of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

We will support the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

**Hon. C.L. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs)** moved second reading of Bill No. 67 – **An Act to provide for the Investigation into Damages resulting from the Use, Maintenance and Operation of Sewage Works.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill as the title denotes provides a method whereby cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities may deal with a person who has a complaint by virtue of pollution caused by a sewage system. I might say that within the past two years representations have been received from SUMA for legislation of the type and we think it is appropriate to bring this legislation in at this time because we are amending our regulations to The Municipal Water Assistance Act so that grants may be made from that Act toward assisting these various municipal corporations with problems of pollution. Insofar as the cities are concerned, they will receive their assistance from the Act which is before the House and sponsored by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy).

As everyone knows here there are many villages and towns in Saskatchewan which over the years installed these lagoon sewage systems and in many cases sufficient research apparently was not done prior to the installation. We have several towns today that are faced with lawsuits, others that have had judgments against them. The purpose of this Act is to assist persons who believe they have suffered damage to land, for instance, to have the question adjudicated upon initially by what we consider to be an expeditious manner. It is our hope that the municipal corporations will remedy the situation if it is found by the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission to be a situation that can be remedied merely by the expenditure of funds.

I want to stress, before going into any detail of the Act, that this Act is not in any way deemed to ultimately supplant the role of the courts. What we are doing under this Act is simply saying this: if a person has a complaint which he deems to be due for instance from the effluent of a sewage system, that person within one year of the damage occurring gives notice of his complaint to the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission and the Commission gives notice to the municipal corporation concerned. The Assessment Commission then meets and has power under the Act to summon witnesses and within 90 days of the conclusion of its hearing, the Assessment Commission makes a report to the Minister with copies going to the municipality and to the complainant. This report under the Act can point out the necessary remedies which should be taken in order to avoid a recurrence of this situation, or the Commission may suggest a monetary award over and above the necessary remedy and suggest to the municipal corporation that this monetary award be paid to the complainant.

If the complainant is not satisfied for example with the monetary award, he or she may within 60 days of the report of the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission take whatever proceedings the complainant deems necessary in our courts of law.

Now the reason for selecting the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission as the initial adjudicating body, I think are twofold. Firstly, this Commission has over a period in excess of 50 years established a reputation of independence and secondly, it has probably more knowledge than any other body in the Province of Saskatchewan as to the value of land and the damage done to land, for example, by an effluent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, you'll pardon my harsh voice this morning, I picked up a cold over the weekend. I would like to say that I do concur in the basic idea of this Bill. I see nothing wrong with this setting up of such a board to deal with these complaints because I realize that they are very real and they have been coming before the Government for some time.

I would like to point out one or two points which I think are possibly technical points, but they do have some bearing I think on the spirit of the Bill. There's one part that says that the Commission shall inquire into the complaint and not later than 90 days after conclusion of the inquiry. This does not set any length of time whatsoever on the inquiry itself. This inquiry as near as I can see could carry on over a period of years. This matter could be before the Board with no compulsion upon the Board to bring in a report and I think that this is something that possibly is not good, that the matter should be allowed to drag on for an extended period of time.

Another thing I would like to say is in regard to what the Minister (Mr. Estey) has just said that there may be times when a matter of correction is concerned rather than a matter of



March 31, 1969

monetary pay. But it does say that the complainant can bring the matter to court 60 days after the report is issued. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this report were brought out say in the wintertime and there was nothing that could be done at that time, it may be some months before the municipality involved got around to doing anything about straightening up the situation that was set out in the report, and this may or may not prove satisfactory. The complainant may be away in the wintertime and he has to make this, as I understand it, within 60 days, make application to come before the courts. I think these two things are definitely the principle of the Bill and as I'm mentioning them now I think possibly the Minister may be able to take a look at these two items. That 60 days is just not long enough in many cases for the complainant to have a full knowledge of what may come out of the result of the report. He might be able to have a look at this before bringing it back into Committee and I think that these two things are such that should be discussed in Committee rather than here.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to concur essentially with the remarks made by my colleague from Swift Current (Mr. Wood). May I say this with respect to the observations by the Minister (Mr. Estey), I do think that in some respects Bill No. 67 does assist the person in the type of grievance or complaint that the Minister described to the House. I personally was pleased to see the proposed Section 12 that allowed a time period of one year in which to start any possible action after the passage of this particular statute. However, my complaint with the proposed Bill is that it seems to be founded on what I consider rather unfortunate precedents of The Highways Act in dealing with arbitration of matters of expropriation thereunder. Essentially, Mr. Minister, my view of this Bill is that, although it does assist persons in as much as it establishes certain rights, by and large, this Bill assists far more individual rural municipalities, whatever the situation may be, with respect to the conclusion of a particular claim.

I think, Mr. Minister, respectfully this Bill is far too one-sided. It does not afford any form of reciprocity of action. There is no onus upon the final body on whom the responsibility may rest to act. It's based, as I say, on the concept of The Highways Act. I have long quarrelled with the provisions of The Highways Act. Speaking on this Bill, I particularly object, Mr. Minister, to Section 8 and Section 10 of the proposed Bill. Section 8 says for example:

Upon receipt of a complaint under Section 7 the Commission shall inquire into the complaint and not later than 90 days after the conclusion of the inquiry.

And it goes on. I think the observation by my colleague from

Swift Current (Mr. Wood) is accurate. The conclusion of the inquiry, if ever, obviously, it will come to a conclusion, but I must report, Mr. Minister, that my experience with people under The Highways Act has been that negotiations continue on for months and sometimes for a year or so.

Further though, the onus does lay on the complaint by Section 10 and that's the second Section that I have some objection with. The complaint must comply with statutory requirement of 60 days. I suppose this is an extreme case but what happens if during the winter months he is a fortunate enough person to be in Florida. The 60-daytime period may go by. His rights may be prejudiced. Forgetting about Florida, I think just the simple fact of not being fully conversant with the provisions of the law is a detrimental provision. Mr. Minister (Mr. Estey), I would quite sincerely recommend to you that when this Bill does come to the Committee of the Whole we try to institute some enforceable procedures or limits on the Crown or on the other authority whereby there is a degree of fairness with respect to the replies. I think they should be designed to be two things. One, time limits for the replies and for the investigation, reasonable time limits. I don't specify what specific dates. Secondly, I think there should be some degree of flexibility to allow the possibility of error for the person who may not be as conversant with the provisions of the law as perhaps he should be or has to be in this modern-day world.

I am going to support the Bill on second reading but with serious reservations respecting the question of the determination of the issue of the land value.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Estey:** — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the observations which have been made by Members opposite, I would like to say just one word. It is quite true that there is not in this Bill any time limit as to when the inquiry must be held and the reason for no time limit is that it would be most difficult in our opinion to set a time limit due to the fact that the Commission cannot really investigate damage to land when that land is covered by snow. And what, in this country, time limit do you pick, 180 days? My learned friends are well aware of the case which went to the Supreme Court of Canada regarding the fellow who sold loam in the wintertime and in the spring it was found to be a sandhill. There is just no opportunity to investigate the damage to the land for six months of the year in our province. So far as the 60-day provision is concerned, I will have a look at that but the reason for putting the 60-day provision in was to hurry up the particular municipal corporation and let them know that if they didn't take remedial proceedings with the financial assistance that's available, the lawsuit would be commenced and the 60-day provision was inserted in the hope that if a municipal corporation is dilatory, the complainant can start an action

**March 31, 1969**

in the hope that the municipal corporation will then get busy and remedy the situation.

Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say on this Bill at this time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. Mr. Heald (Attorney General)** moved second reading of Bill No. 70 – **An Act to amend The Companies Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill will enable the amount of the annual fee payable by Dominion companies to be prescribed by regulations. At the present time the annual fee for Dominion companies which is \$10 is fixed by the Statute itself. Now all other fees payable under The Companies Act by Dominion companies, for example, the fees payable for registration, for change of name, for alterations of capital, for amending objects and so on, are presently prescribed by regulations. This is the only one that is actually set out in the Statute itself.

Under this Bill all fees payable by companies, whether Provincial, extra-Provincial or Dominion, will be those prescribed by regulation. Fees under most statutes are of course prescribed by regulation and this Bill will put us in a position where under The Companies Act we will be no different than in all the other statutes.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Heald (Attorney General)** moved second reading of Bill No. 73 – **An Act to amend The Securities Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment really is a companion amendment to the next item that we'll be dealing with, which is a new Act for the Licensing of Trust and Loan Companies.

Under the present Statute the question of scholarship plans in trust are covered under The Companies Inspection and Licensing Act which is being repealed by this new Trust Companies and Loan Companies Act.

The effect of this amendment is simply to provide that scholarship plans in trust will now be under The Securities Act. This is the way it is in Ontario. That's the way it is in most of the provinces, and we feel that we can do a better job of controlling scholarship plans and scholarship trust funds by putting it under The Securities Act. We feel that this is the kind of thing where the public should have the protection of The Securities Act. So the purpose of this amendment is to put scholarship funds under The Securities Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Heald (Attorney General)** moved second reading of Bill No. 74 – **An Act respecting the Licensing of Trust and Loan Companies.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, basically this Bill is an updated and revised licensing act for the licensing of corporations carrying on the business of a trust company or of a loan company. A loan company includes any company which carries on the business of lending money such as mortgage corporations, finance and acceptance companies but does not include banks and credit unions.

This Act will replace The Companies Inspection and Licensing Act which has not been substantially revised since it was first enacted in 1936. The 1936 Act regulated trust, loan, finance and investment companies. Investment companies were removed from the Act in 1956 when The Investment Contracts Act was enacted. In 1966 trust fund companies were brought under the Act for the purpose of regulating the issue and sale of scholarship plans. As I've just indicated, trust fund companies are not included in this Bill because in the future scholarship plans will be regulated under The Securities Act which we have just amended. And as I say, in making this change Saskatchewan will be uniform with Ontario and other provinces that have put the sale of scholarship plans under securities legislation.

This Act, The Trust and Loan Companies Licensing Act 1969 will be administered by the Superintendent of Insurance who is given wide powers in order to provide effective regulation and supervision of these companies. There is a provision that any decision of the superintendent is subject to appeal to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench. The superintendent may refuse to grant a licence if after investigation he is for any reason of the opinion that a company should not be granted the licence. Where he grants the licence he may grant it subject to such terms, conditions or restrictions to which the licence is subject, or if the company fails to comply with any provisions of its act of incorporation or of any law to which it is subject, whether of Saskatchewan or of the province in which it is incorporated or of Canada.

The licence may be suspended or cancelled where the company has insufficient assets to provide proper security to persons from whom it takes deposits or borrows money in the conduct of its business. The licence may also be cancelled where the company has by any faulty, misleading or deceptive statements or in advertisements induced any person to borrow money or to pay excessive or exorbitant fees or expenses for a mortgage or a loan.

The superintendent may at any time require a company to provide information or material to him with respect to its business, or he may make or cause to be made an examination or inspection of the books and records of the company.

Every company is required to prepare annually and to deliver

March 31, 1969

to the superintendent a statement of the condition and affairs of the company in a form approved by the superintendent. The Act states the manner in which the assets of the company shall be valued and shown in its annual financial statement.

A company that fails to comply with any provisions of the Act is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$5,000 and each director who knowingly concurs in the offence is guilty on summary conviction of a fine not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been an increasing concern by governments everywhere to ensure the safety of the savings of the public and also to provide a measure of protection to persons borrowing money. This Bill is designed to achieve both of these purposes.

You will note that this Bill makes no reference to deposit insurance. This is because the matter is adequately dealt with in a 1967 amendment to The Treasury Department Act. Companies which take deposits carry insurance up to \$20,000 for each depositor. The insured companies include all trust companies licensed in the province with the exception of the two Saskatchewan companies, namely, Retailers Trust at Saskatoon and Mennonite Trust Company at Waldheim. Retailers Trust Company has never taken any deposits. The Mennonite Trust Company has a liability of only \$85,000 in respect to guaranteed investment certificates while the company's capital and surplus amounts to \$37,000. My advice from my law officers is that because of the small amount of deposits this company was not required to become a member of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation but all other companies are.

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** —Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Bill on second reading. I think it, of course, is a very good Bill and I think we must commend the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) for the updating of the old statutes and the improvements contained in this one here.

I wish to make one observation and that is my hope that the provisions of this Bill are vigorously enforced and prosecuted by the Department of the Attorney General or at least the Superintendent. Frankly, I would hope that the superintendent is a person who actively goes out and investigates and looks into all questions relating to trust and loan companies, so that the intention of the Attorney General will in fact be truly fulfilled, namely, that savings of people are not lost in some of the scandals that we have recently been hearing about in British Columbia and in Ontario and in other parts of Canada and North America.

I would hope that the superintendent, as I said, ranges with full vigor into the business of the companies, perhaps with a staff that is professional and qualified to examine aspects of

this.

One other observation that I would like to make. I would have liked to have seen this Act carry some amendment with respect to companies whose main object is not the matter of lending money or purchasing mortgages and chattel mortgages but whose main purpose or function is perhaps sale of chattels and the like. I am thinking of large companies, retail companies, that concern themselves with conditional sales and a variety of other forms whereby there is a form of loan being carried out. I know there are some present statutes that I think in some way cover this area, but my experience has been that by and large companies such as Hudson Bay Company or Eaton's – I'm not singling those two out – any of a number of that type, carry on an operation which in effect is almost similar to a loan department with rates of interest and the like. I think this is a type of contact with the public that individual people have on perhaps a more regular and a more frequent occurrence than any other dealings with loans and trust companies. I think that they ought to be thrown squarely perhaps under the provisions of this Act. I know there are some very serious problems because the memoranda of the company are usually designed on a different basis and they're probably Dominion companies, not Provincial. But I commend that to the consideration of the Attorney General.

One final third observation with respect to the general intention of this Bill. I think we have a pretty good insurance Act in the Province of Saskatchewan and I know one of the large problems with insurance companies is this question of constitution, namely, they are primarily Dominion companies registered here in the Province of Saskatchewan. But frankly I would hope the Government would look into the possibility of some legislation whereby the representations made by insurance agents to insurance benefits can be checked out so that the interests of the public are protected. My own personal view, and I am not speaking now for the Members on this side as a group, is that many of the insurance representations can amount to very often placing them almost in the position of being a racket. I think representations are made on insurance as to savings, that when they are analyzed in cold blood just simply do not hold out. I say the insurance Acts I think are good, Mr. Attorney General, but I feel that again we ought to try and have a sort of an ombudsman that will roam quite freely to investigate the representations made and act with vigor in this particular area. May I also say, ranging a little bit farther off the Bill and I only extend this far, Mr. Speaker, before returning back to order, I look forward to the day when the Provincial Government will work in unison with the Dominion Government to try and make some legislation whereby savings of insurance companies can perhaps be forced over to the development of the country generally rather than the development and interests of the individual insurance companies. I know this is now getting a little bit astray from the field, I'm not going to pursue that much further

March 31, 1969

other than to draw to the attention of the Attorney General those three concerns that I have.

Firstly, that the Bill be prosecuted with vigor; secondly, that we look into this question of retail companies that deal in effect in a loan-type of business; and thirdly, with respect to insurance companies and representations made there by agents so that we stop false and misleading representations as to savings and the like.

After having said that, may I say that the Bill is a good Bill. I will be supporting it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Heald:** — I would just like to make a very few short comments arising out of the observations of the Member for Riversdale. I think they were very good comments and very cogent comments and I would just like to deal with them briefly.

First of all he made the point about aggressive enforcement or prosecution of the Act. I certainly agree with him in that regard. I would remind Hon. Members that we have substantially increased the staff of the office of the Provincial Secretary with this object in mind. We now have a director of enforcement and we have an investigator. We also have an examiner of companies, who is doing a fabulous job for us, Mr. Earl Saunderson, who used to be with the Provincial Treasury Department for a number of years. Mr. Saunderson has been examiner of companies now I think for about three years in the Department of the Provincial Secretary. Some of the things that we have been able to get into, in particular, the Commonwealth thing, one of the things that Mr. Saunderson was able to get into was as a result of his knowledge and his expertise as an accountant and as an auditor. So I think that it is absolutely vital that when you get into these complex matters involving finance companies, and loan companies that you have somebody apart from your normal enforcement personnel who is able to read balance sheets, is able to determine or decide when a company is sort of overvaluing securities and when you get this house of cards like Commonwealth had at the Coast. I don't know whether you saw the Vancouver Sun or not, but they showed, well it is a complex of about 46 different companies. What you get is one company valuing assets in one of the subsidiary companies, overvaluing, and this is where you get into trouble. That's the deck of cards that has collapsed out there, so it is pretty vital that you have somebody who has the expertise in an accounting way and who is able to determine the validity of balance sheets. This is how we were able to blow the whistle on Commonwealth, through Mr. Saunderson because of his knowledge. So I would agree with the Hon. Member, I would assure him that we have substantially increased the staff in the Department and hopefully if it becomes necessary we will continue to increase it to make sure that this Statute which

hopefully we will be passing in the next day or two can be policed and can be enforced, because the best legislation in the world isn't very good if you don't enforce. I would agree with that point and we will certainly keep it in mind.

Secondly, he made the comment about other types of companies that are in the loan business in a very large way, such as the Hudson Bay Company and Eaton's and Simpsons and so on. There are problems as the Hon. Member for Riversdale knows about including them in this kind of an Act. I would remind him of course that they are subject to The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act. They are subject to The Unconscionable Transaction Relief Act and so the consuming public do have a fair measure of protection so far as the companies are concerned.

Then he got into a subject that is near and dear to my heart and that is the matter of insurance companies and I couldn't agree with you more about insurance companies. There is the constitutional problem as between the Federal Insurance Act and The Provincial Insurance Act. I have felt for some time that we should have probably fewer kinds of contracts sold by insurance companies. I know when they come to me, I don't buy any insurance any more, I don't suppose I am insurable but in the days when I was insurable they would come in with so many different kinds of policies that I was completely confused. I am afraid that I have a prejudice against high-price insurance investment contracts with low coverage, in other words a \$1,000 policy which costs you four or five times as much as a term policy might cost you, but it has all sorts of fancy investment privileges so-called built into it. I don't think that I am a sophisticated investor, but I am sure there are other buyers of insurance who are less sophisticated than I am and I tell you quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that half the time I don't have the foggiest notion of what the rights, liabilities and privileges are under these policies.

I can tell you that I am looking and I have some people doing some studies into trying to work out certain basic kinds of contracts that have certain basic privileges and rights in them that everybody understands. I think there are far too many policies being sold at the present time. I don't think that the people know what they are buying. I think in many cases the insurance salesman doesn't know what he is selling. I certainly agree with the general observations made by the Member for Riversdale. I hope that some time at a later date we will be able to go into this in more detail and perhaps come up with some real good amendments to The Saskatchewan Insurance Act which will provide the kind of protection and service that the members of the public of this province are entitled to. I certainly agree with your comments.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Mr. Heald (Attorney General)** moved second reading of Bill No. 75 – **An Act respecting Summary Offences Procedure.**



March 31, 1969

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are four simple principles involved in this Bill. Before I proceed to second reading I am advised by the Clerk that the message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor wasn't available when I moved first reading, so I would now beg to inform the Assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there are four simple points involved in this Bill. First of all, the question of intoxication in a public place. The purpose of the Section here contained in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Bill are to codify the authority to provide temporary custody for persons who are found intoxicated in a public place in lieu of proceeding under (a) Section 105 of the Liquor Act, or under subsection (1) of Section 140 of The Liquor Licensing Act, or under a bylaw with a charge, and (b) to authorize discontinuance of this procedure by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council if it be thought desirable in any area of the province.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last fall I issued instructions not to proceed with drunkenness charges in cases where it was a case of simple drunkenness. Now, if there was assault involved, or if there was creating a disturbance involved, of course, the police were instructed to proceed with charges much in the same way as they always have. But in the case of simple drunkenness where a person was drunk the instructions were to lock him up and have him sobered up and release him without charging him. As I indicated in an earlier debate in this House, we think this has been working very well. The police all over the province have agreed that it is a good thing. I listed about eight different benefits and advantages that we felt accrued as a result of this policy. It keeps the courts from being cluttered up and saves costs. I think it is better for the people and it hasn't resulted in increased drunkenness. It is better for the people because these people that are repeater cases of drunkenness – they have a problem, they are not criminals, but they have a problem – they need treatment more than they need to be put in jail for five, six or seven days. So we think this is a good thing and we are now putting it into the Act. The second part of it is to provide that, if there is a very bad situation in a particular area of the province and it is represented to us that this scheme or system is not working in a particular area or particular town, we have authority vested in the Lieutenant Governor in Council to exempt that particular area of the province from this procedure. There are one or two towns and the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) may know about a town and about a communication that I received from his constituency where they are concerned about this. They are not sure that it is working. I might tell the Hon. Member that I have suggested to them that they come and see me after the session and I will be glad to have him come with them, but we have this provision in here that, if there is a particular area or town where they don't think it is working, the Lieutenant

Governor in Council could exempt that area from the normal instructions. That is the first principle involved in the Bill.

The second principle contained in Section 6 (a) to provide in an Act for which the Attorney General is responsible the mechanics in preparing, issuing and using a summary offence ticket by the incorporation in this Act of the particulars similar to those set forth under The Vehicles Act for traffic tickets; (b) an authority for this procedure to apply to The Game Act, The Fuel Petroleum Products Act, and The Liquor Act, and (c) to authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make this procedure apply in respect of any offence under any Act, regulation or bylaw. So what we are doing here is making provision for a uniform traffic ticket which now applies to The Vehicles Act offences. We are putting ourselves in a position where we could make it apply to The Game Act, The Fuel Petroleum Products Act and The Liquor Act.

Now the third principle involved is to increase the fee for an information from \$1 to \$2. This is an information when a charge is laid. It has never been increased. These increases I would direct your attention to the fact that it increases the fee from 50 cents to \$1 for serving a summons. The fee of 50 cents for serving a summons was fixed many years ago when the salary of police officers was \$3,000 a year. They are now costing the taxpayers of the province over \$6,000 a year and we felt that this should be increased from \$1 to \$2 for the information. The hearing fee from \$1 to \$2, where it is two hours or less and \$4 where it is more than two hours. The other principle involved in the Bill is payment of fees by the Department to provide that where a Justice of the Peace finds an accused not guilty, and sends a report to our Department, the Department will pay the fee for swearing an information which is \$2 and the hearing fee which is either \$2 or \$4. Mr. Speaker, this has always bothered me and I think it would bother any lawyer, that all through the years in this Province, and all governments past are guilty of this I think. I think it was maybe just overlooked, but it has always bothered me that a Justice of the Peace only got paid if he convicted somebody. He didn't get a red cent if he found somebody not guilty. I think it is a very bad thing that a Justice of the Peace should sort of be paid by commission. So we are changing this. I think it has been an oversight over the years. I don't think much money is involved but at least now he is going to get paid when he finds an accused not guilty so he is not being penalized because he finds somebody not guilty.

Mr. Speaker, those are the four points of principle. We can go into detail when we go into Committee, but those are the four points involved in this Bill.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I say that I essentially don't have very much quarrel with the third and fourth points as I understood the Attorney General to describe them. I think that

March 31, 1969

points three and four are perhaps not as important or as difficult as the first two that are enunciated and that I am going to refer to in very simple terms hereafter.

I am primarily addressing my remarks now with respect to the initial comment – points one and two at any rate – made by the Attorney General. At the outset I should like to say that it is a laudable objective that the Department has with respect to the question of persons who have a drinking problem and viewing them as really being ill, either emotionally or mentally, rather than being criminal. I agree with the Attorney General that any attempt to deal with alcoholics or people who are so under the influence of alcohol to present themselves as continual nuisances before the courts in the form of penalty is really inadequate. They ought to be treated medically and from that standpoint, that's a laudable objective. However, regretfully, I do not agree with the Attorney General that we can achieve that laudable objective by what I still submit is essentially criminal code procedures or penal sanctions. I think that all we are doing here is facilitating and perhaps keeping the costs down on the part of the Crown with respect to any offence that occurs on the question of drunkenness from time to time in our cities. What I am really saying is that, as I read the Act, the true intent of it is essentially to assist and make more simple the powers of the courts and the powers of the judges in the administration and dealing with drunk people, rather than the objective as stated by the Attorney General and that is namely, some direct assistance for the rehabilitation of these individuals. I think that the rehabilitation of people who perennially get drunk and find themselves arrested by police officers and before courts of law, primarily lies in education and perhaps in an increased number of professional personnel associated with alcoholic bureaus and agencies of the Government, such as the one that has been established, and not to a Statute that I view to be primarily a penal statute. Accordingly, I must disagree with the Attorney General that this Act is really designed to treat more leniently the drunk person. My experience in courts of law has been that the individual who has been drunk and finds himself in jail overnight ends up paying a small fine and is out after about 12 hours or 24 hours at the most and really probably in effect the administration of this Act won't change that very much. The only thing that it does, probably, will be to save the requirement of coming before the court.

I secondly want to oppose the Bill, Mr. Attorney General, because I think it places far too much power in the hands of the police authorities of the Province of Saskatchewan. I think this Bill is the possible opening door to an abuse of police powers. We all know the Criminal Code Section relating to vagrancy. I am not as an experienced counsel as the Attorney General, but I can tell Members of the House that in my few years before the Bar, I don't think there has been as much an abused Section of the Criminal Code as the vagrancy Section. It is used as a quick and summary means of arrest, sometimes harassment of individuals, by police authorities. I think this

Bill opens up this possibility. I particularly, Mr. Attorney General, cannot find palatable with my concept of what British justice ought to be, when there is a Bill that talks in Section 3 that a person who, "in the opinion of the peace officer is intoxicated in a public place." I respect the police force. I think all citizens should. But, frankly, I do not feel that any person's right ought to be determined by a simple matter of opinion by a peace officer, who under certain circumstances may be provoked or encouraged to come to the opinion that a person is more readily intoxicated than not. Sub-paragraph (3) of the same Section contains an equally odious provision respectfully. Quoting from that Section it says that a person who is placed in custody, "may be released from custody at any time if in the opinion of the person responsible for his custody." Then it sets out certain provisions. Again, this is a provision that determines whether or not any individual of this country is going to be given liberty as a result of the opinions of a police officer. In effect it decides whether or not a person can be released from incarceration at the whim of a person who is neither judge nor jury nor prosecutor, simply an enforcer of the law. The effects of these two particular Sections, I think, place far too much power in the hands of police authorities. It puts the police officers in the position of being both the enforcer and the prosecutor and the judge and the jury and the person who finally decides ultimately when the freedom of the individual is going to be allowed again. I know that in practicality it may not amount to much more than 24 hours, but I for one wouldn't want to be on the other end of an observation or an opinion of a peace officer, that I was intoxicated, and therefore had to be incarcerated at his will. All through the centuries, as I understand it, we've always fought for the principle that an accused has a right to counsel and ought not to spend one second more in any jail than is absolutely necessary or is determined by a court of law. So therefore, when I read that provision and one other one, subsection (7), Mr. Attorney General, of the same provision, which talks about the question of a ticket and says that in effect a police officer writing out the ticket can use any figure, any expression or any device or combination, I think that the Statute is weighted far too heavily in favor of another principle that I always thought was important in courts of law and that is that a person who is charged with an offence under the Criminal Code or a quasi-criminal offence, such as this, ought to have that offence clearly spelled out and delineated for the accused. I as an accused person ought to know exactly where I stand with the offence and ought not to be subject to some deeming clause in the statutes. I ought not to be subject to an offence that may be described inaccurately, or somewhat vaguely by use of symbols and the like. That Section also, Mr. Attorney General, I find incompatible with what I consider to be long-standing traditions of the courts of this Province and of this country.

May I conclude by saying this. There are some provisions in the Bill that I find myself in support with. I also find

**March 31, 1969**

myself in support of the intentions of the Attorney General and the Government respecting alcoholics, but I cannot support this Bill which I think far outweighs these objectives as stated by the Government – and simply it comes down to this issue – because it has placed far too much power in the hands of the police, lends itself to the possibility of police abuse and frankly does not assist the question of people who have the problem of drinking, as I think it can be in the questions of education and other areas that I have briefly discussed. Accordingly, Mr. Attorney General, I have to make a decision as to whether or not the good outweighs the bad of the Bill and to my mind the bad points outweigh the good points. I must oppose this Bill in second reading.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — I want to support very briefly the arguments put forth by the Member from Saskatoon who has just taken his seat. It seems to me that this is a very dangerous Bill. Along with my colleague from Saskatoon, I recognize and I applaud and I appreciate the objectives which the Attorney General has in mind. At the same time I regret that the means he has chosen to achieve this objective are in such contradiction to what most people, I think, agree to be proper procedures and proper power for police authorities. This is a case in which it almost seems as if it had been suggested that the end justifies the means. This is a very dangerous path to follow. The Act as I understand it seems to me to be almost an open invitation to misuse of authority. It seems to be almost an open invitation to the action based purely on suspicion and perhaps on emotion which results in putting people into jail without recourse to legal advice. It's just simply poor legislation. I would hope that the Attorney General would heed the argument which the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale has put forth and take another look at this very objectionable procedure. I think we need to be concerned, Mr. Speaker, with a rising concern about police authority not in Saskatchewan particularly or especially, or alone, but all across the country. This is something which in itself, and I am not commenting on whether there is room for the suspicion or not at this time, but the fact that that feeling is there, is a hindrance I think to the maintenance of proper law and order, because certainly the maintenance of proper law and order depends to a considerable extent on the respect which people have for police forces. It depends to a considerable extent on the confidence which people have in the ordinary processes of law. I do suggest to the Attorney General that in taking the action which he proposes here, he is denying some people recourse to the proper processes of law as we have come to understand them as the rights of individual citizens.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I hope he will listen to

the arguments put forth.

**Mr. Heald:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an observation or two arising out of the comments of the Member for Riversdale and also the Leader of the Opposition.

First of all I would like to make this observation and of course this isn't an argument I suppose in favor of the Bill, but I would remind Hon. Members that British Columbia has been using this procedure with respect to drunks now for about two years and finds it to be working very well. I notice in the press of last week, Friday or Saturday I think it was, that the Attorney General of Manitoba was introducing a Bill similar to the Bill that you have before you now with respect to drunkenness so that we will be, if we pass this Bill, the third province in Canada that is proposing to deal with ordinary common variety types of drunkenness in this manner. The Member for Riversdale said that rehabilitation was the thing and of course I say amen to that, I couldn't agree with him more. I would also agree with his statement that you can't handle rehabilitation in this kind of a Bill, but what you can do is put the Government or other branches or departments of government in a position where they can work with the law enforcement process towards rehabilitation. This is precisely what we propose to do. I said elsewhere and I have officials now in my department working with the officials of the newly set-up Alcoholism Commission toward the end that, in the cities and some of the larger towns in the province where there is a fairly high incidence of drunkenness, there will perhaps be detoxification units right in the jails or right in the courthouse. There will be very close liaison between the police and our prosecutors on the one hand and the representatives of the Alcohol Commission on the other, so that when these people are brought in and are drunk and are put to bed, and they do wake up in the morning and they are sobered up, at least to some extent, they will then be put into the hands of the Alcoholism Commission people. What they need rather than imprisonment is therapy. There has to be a great deal of liaison between the law enforcement process and the Alcoholism Commission. We think that this kind of liaison will do the kind of job that everybody wants to see done. Now the Member for Riversdale said that in his experience these people are locked up and they get up in the morning the way it used to be and they pay the fine, \$5 or \$10 and within a few hours they were back on the streets. That may be true in the city of Saskatoon, it may be true in the city of Moose Jaw, it may be true in the city of Regina, but it is not true in the northern areas of the province, where the fines in the past were \$50, \$75 and \$100. These were the fines that were being imposed and the people couldn't pay these fines. Instead of paying the fine they went to jail for 30 days. This is the situation up at Kamsack, this is the situation up in the northwest area of the province where they were going to jail for 30 days. It doesn't seem to me to make very much sense to send somebody to jail for 30 days for being drunk when what he really needs is therapy and treatment. This is

March 31, 1969

what we are trying to do under this Statute. This is the object of the exercise in this Statute. Now insofar as the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) insofar as increasing the powers of the police, I can't agree, with deference, that this Statute increases the powers of the police in any way. No charge is going to be laid. Subsection 2 of Section 3 says that a person taken into custody pursuant to this Section shall not be held in custody for more than 24 hours after being taken into custody. In actual practice, I am advised that it is overnight. And in actual practice I am advised that in many cases it saves the life of the person involved because there are cases where in 40 below zero weather the person is out on the street drunk, not able to protect himself, and if it wasn't for the police that perhaps he would perish because of the fact that he is helpless. It is a protective measure more than anything else and this is the way it works in actual practice. There is no charge, there is no abuse of police authority. If there was going to be a charge here then I would be the first to agree that you couldn't rely on the opinion of the police officer. Mr. Speaker, the rationale here is somewhat similar to the rationale in our 24-hour suspension law, where we give the police officer the power to make a judgment. Some people were critical of that, but my answer was there as it is here. The police officer is making a judgment but there is no charge. I quite agree that, if there was a charge later on, if there was going to be a record, then of course the police shouldn't have the power to make this judgment. But the only judgment that they are making here is whether or not they should take the man in and protect him from himself. So I say that there is no danger or no undesirable precedent being set by giving the police this power. In most cases it works out to be protection, that's what it works out to. Mr. Speaker, we can deal with the details in Committee but insofar as I am concerned I commend this Bill to the Members of the Legislature. It's a good Bill, it has been working very well in practice for the last number of months. I am convinced that it will continue to do a good job and when it has worked in conjunction with the therapy phase, which is within the province of the Alcoholism Commission, I am satisfied that it will do a good job to help these people rehabilitate themselves.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South)** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister a question before he takes his seat? In how many places in the province, Mr. Minister, would it be possible to undertake the group therapy of which you speak, or to put it another way, how many locations in the province are there facilities where this group therapy or any real therapy for that matter could be applied?

**Mr. Heald:** — I think maybe it is too early to tell, Mr. Speaker, how many places — I would say the cities, and I would say places like Kamsack — it is a matter of doing a survey and I have my people talking to the Alcoholism Commission people along this thing.

**Mr. Davies** — Mr. Speaker, in most cases you will not have these facilities now when this legislation goes into effect.

**Mr. Heald:** — I think that's right. I think hopefully we will get the facilities where the need is demonstrated and I would think that where there are a lot of cases of drunkenness, those are the places where the priorities should be placed.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources)** moved second reading of Bill No. 77 — **An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides for a simple amendment to subsection 1 of Section 3 in which it removes the figure 3 and substitutes the figure 10. That's to raise the acreage mineral tax from 3 cents per acre to 10 cents per acre. The way the present amendment reads it may lead someone to believe that this is applicable to all mineral owners, but in the Act the subsection below this exempts the individual. This was brought in as Hon. Members will recall in 1967 exempting the individual or the farmers from the payment of the mineral tax, hence the mineral tax now is applicable only to corporations. The three major corporations, the large owners of minerals in the province of course, are the CPR, which owns 2.8 million; the Hudson Bay, which owns 1.2; and the Canadian National Railway. These three together own three-quarters of the 12.8 million mineral acres that the tax applies to. They will be paying 10 cents per acre, and on the 12,781,000 acres of mineral rights owned and controlled by the large corporations we will be assessing 10 cents an acre which will net us \$1,278,000 in taxes. This is approximately \$890,000 higher than they are paying at the present time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer)** moved second reading of **Bill No. 81 — An Act to amend The Treasury Department Act.**

**Hon. D.G. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) it is my pleasure to move second reading. We propose two amendments to The Treasury Department Act here, one, giving effect to the increase in the Provincial Auditor's salary to \$17,000 effective October 1, 1968; and two, removing the 6 per cent rate of interest ceiling for temporary loans to meet temporary deficiencies in the Consolidated Fund. Dealing with the first point, The Treasury Department Act establishes the salary of the Provincial Auditor. I believe the reason for this is to lend support to the fact that the Provincial Auditor is in effect appointed by and responsible to the Legislative Assembly. The present Act establishes the salary of the



**March 31, 1969**

Provincial Auditor at \$16,900, the salary which Mr. Clair Smith was receiving when he retired. Since June 13, 1967, Mr. R.C. Hodsman has been appointed Acting Provincial Auditor by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We are appointing as has been indicated Mr. Hodsman as permanent Provincial Auditor, effective October 1, 1968 at a salary of \$17,000 which will rank as a Class B Deputy Minister. Mr. Hodsman's salary, effective October, 1967 was \$15,200, so that this will give Mr. Hodsman an increase of \$1,800.

Now the second point, the removal of the 6 per cent rate of interest ceiling under present legislation, and that is subsection 1 of Section 35 of the Act, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may authorize the Treasurer to effect temporary loans chargeable to the Consolidated Fund in such manner and in such amounts payable at such periods and bearing such rate of interests not exceeding 6 per cent per annum. That's what it says now. The amounts borrowed are for purposes of meeting revenue deficiencies in the Consolidated Fund and may not be incurred for a period exceeding 12 months. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have borrowed under subsection 1 of Section 35 by way of a line of credit with the bank and also by the issue of Treasury Bills to internal funds. Up until February 15, 1968, the limitation on the rate of interest at 6 per cent was not a problem. However, on that date, the prime interest rate at all chartered banks rose to 7 per cent. The rate at which the Government could borrow from the bank rose to 6 ½ per cent thus exceeding the limitation under the Act. There have been several changes in the rate since that time and our current rate of borrowing at the bank is 6 ¾ per cent. At the present time it would be impossible for the Treasurer to borrow money at the rate of 6 per cent per annum. The removal of the interest limitation by the deletion of the words, "not exceeding 6 per cent per annum" will provide the Provincial Treasurer with discretion as to the rate that may be arranged with regard to temporary loans under subsection 1 of Section 35 of The Treasury Department Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General)** moved second reading of Bill No. 80 – **An Act to amend The Statute Law.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which we bring in at this time every session just about. It has to do with corrections and amendments, correcting mistakes that have been made in various statutes in previous years. I'll deal with each one briefly.

The first one has to do with The Education and Health Tax Act. In 1968 this Act was amended and one of the amendments was the repeal and substitution of Section 5 and in the process subsection 7 of that Section became subsection 8. In sections 22 and 23 of the Act there are references to this subsection as

subsection 7. These should as a result of the 1968 amendment read as subsection 8 which is now being done by this Bill. Then Section 2, subsection 3, that amendment merely corrects a spelling error, "of" is corrected to read "or". Then Section 3 of the Bill has to do with The Municipal Seed Grain and Supply Act. In that Section it says, "not exceeding 6 per cent per annum," and we get into the same kind of thing that we did in the last Bill. That subsection provides for a maximum interest rate of 6 per cent per annum and may be charged by banks and money borrowed by a municipality for the purpose of supplying seed grain and supplies to farmers who are unable to obtain these supplies from their own resources. The rate of 6 per cent is not realistic under present day circumstances hence this restricted rate is being removed so that money borrowed by municipalities for the aforementioned purpose will bear interest at the rate in effect at the time of each loan.

The next Section 4 deals with The Local Improvement Districts Act and this is the same thing, interest ceiling. The next one, Section 4(b) is the same, removing the interest ceiling. Now Sections 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have to do with the Department of Welfare and Section 5, The Child Welfare Act, a rationale for defining director in the proposed manner is to make it clear that there could be more than one director of Child Welfare in the Department of Welfare. The Department of Welfare underwent organizational changes during the past year. The Child Welfare and the assistance programs have been decentralized to a large extent. Many powers that were being exercised by one director for all the regions have now been assumed by the regional welfare administrators in each region. These powers are exercised in respect to all matters arising in the region administered by the administrator. This amendment is advisable to make it clear that there can be more than one director of Child Welfare.

Section 6 of The Blind Person's Act and it is a similar kind of an amendment under the reorganization and under the reorganization there is no longer a specific director of public assistance. For this reason it has become necessary to amend this Act so that a director of public assistance within the meaning of this Act can be appointed. This program has not been decentralized but the reference in the present legislation to the director of public assistance is no longer valid as no such exact position exists. For this reason the amendment is necessary.

Section 8 is just to correct the spelling error. Section 9, The Saskatchewan Assistance Act – the intention is to clarify that there can be more than one director of public assistance. In the past, prior to the reorganization of the department, one director made the decisions for the entire province. These powers are being given to the regional welfare administrators who will under the new reorganization assume the responsibilities of the director of public assistance for the particular region in which they are acting.

**March 31, 1969**

Section 10, The Corrections Act – due to reorganization changes in the department, the Corrections Branch as a separate entity no longer exists. Corrections has been integrated into the larger areas of programming and implementation. This program has not been decentralized but because of reorganizational changes it has been necessary to amend the Act and change the definitions of chief probation officer and director in accordance with the new reorganizational structure so this is just a reorganization.

Section 11 of the Bill, The Real Estate Broker's Act, Section 24 of The Real Estate Broker's Act provides for appeal of decisions of the superintendent to the Court of Queen's Bench, the words being deleted from subsection 1 of that Section could conceivably deprive a person from going to the Court of Queen's Bench in a case where he has previously appealed to the superintendent. This was never intended, Mr. Speaker, and the amendment makes it clear that a person has a further appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench. So these are fairly minor amendments and corrections as a result of things that have occurred in the last year. With that explanation, I would move second reading of this statute law amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I disagree with some of the amendments that are included in this Bill, as an example, Sections 3 and 4 where the change in The Municipal Seed Grain and Supply Act, and No. 4, The Local Improvements District Relief Act. These Sections here as I understand the Attorney General strike out the maximum of 6 per cent interest rate and makes it a higher amount. It doesn't specify what it may mean. The problems I see, Mr. Speaker, are that people throughout the municipalities, the farmers and others, wanting to get benefits under these Acts, they go to their municipality, they get a copy of the Act and look it up and they see what the Act says. But then too, another Act which they have no knowledge of, they don't really realize that it affects other laws, such as the statute law. They find out that The Municipal Act under The Seed Grains Supply Act doesn't mean what it says and they find that they have to pay more interest than what the original Act said and there is no indication in that Act of an amendment. I think these statute law Acts, when we use them, these Acts should only change the spelling, typographical errors and that type of thing. I think if it was going to be necessary to change an Act itself, it may be a small thing, but I think it should be done by an amendment to the Act so that the people, especially where it is dealing with the people throughout the country, so that those people will know when there are changes that there have been changes made. I know this has been done in the past on many occasions, but I think that it is the wrong principle to follow and I would like to see this practice stopped and amend the Acts necessary rather than amend them through the back-door method.

**Mr. Heald:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would agree in a general way with what the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) has said except to say this, that if we didn't bring in this Bill we would have had another eight or nine Bills to amend the statutes. I agree with you that where it gets to be something that is of substance then it shouldn't be done in this manner. But I really felt the advice that I received was that these were pretty inconsequential matters and most of them were just spelling errors. I agree in the case of the Bill you mentioned it was a matter of removing an interest ceiling. But I would be glad to give the Members assurance that in another year we will look at it very carefully and perhaps only take into this Bill matters that are typographical errors.

Debate adjourned.

### INTRODUCTION OF CUBS

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, before we go into Estimates, I would like to introduce to you the 40th Cub Group from Hillsdale district. They are accompanied by Mr. M. Welsh and I am sure each Member welcomes this group here this evening. We don't very often get a group of young people here in the evening and I hope that both sides of the House put on a good show for them.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.