

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session - Twelfth Legislature**  
**41st Day**

Thursday, April 7, 1955

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

**MOTION OF CONDOLENCE**

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the Session, the Assembly took time off to pay tribute to former members who have passed away between the last Session of the Legislature and the beginning of the present one. Since the Assembly commenced its sittings there has been brought to our attention one member who had passed away but of whom we had no record, and since this Session began, another former member has died. I thought it might be appropriate to make note of this event now, rather than leave the matter until the Legislature meets again in 1956.

The two members to whom I have reference are, first of all, Mr. RICHARD FORSYTH, who was born at Camilla, Ont., on September 19, 1870, and who, in his early manhood, engaged in farming operations and ran an elevator at Crombie's Crossing in his native province. He came west in 1900 to farm in the Oxbow district. He quickly identified himself with the community in which he had established residence, and was elected as the first reeve in the rural municipality of Moose Creek No. 33. He resigned that position on being nominated Liberal candidate in the constituency of Souris, and was elected in the general election of 1912. He thus sat in the first Legislature to meet in this Chamber. He was defeated in the election of 1917 by the late Mr. W.O. Fraser. He left the Oxbow district in 1920, moving to Regina where he held several government appointments. He finally returned to his farm in 1938, and had been in failing health for some years prior to his death on June 21st of last year.

A splendid entertainer in his younger days, Mr. Forsyth was in much demand at social gatherings in his home district. As a farmer, his primary interest was in livestock. At one time he owned a large herd of Hereford cattle.

Mr. Forsyth is survived by one son, one daughter, a step-daughter, two sisters and a brother in Ontario, two grandchildren and five great-grandchildren.

Since the Legislature commenced its sittings, word has come of the death of Mr. JAMES PATRICK GORDON, a resident of Alameda for more than 50 years, who died on April 1, 1955, following a stroke while visiting his sick wife in the hospital at Brandon, Man. He was 78 years of age.

Born at Ballymena, Ireland, in 1877, he was educated at Marlborough Street College, Dublin, and came to Canada to settle in Saskatchewan

**April 7, 1955**

in the year the province was established. He served as school principal at Alameda, and at one time published the 'Alameda Dispatch'. For some years he engaged in the implement business, and acted as farm auctioneer and auditor. Later he operated an insurance and real estate brokerage office in Alameda. A member of the town council, and a director of the Alameda Telephone Company, Mr. Gordon was also prominent in Masonic circles until he left the district for Brandon, two years ago. Elected to the Saskatchewan Legislature for the constituency of Souris in the general election of 1921, he sat through one term as the sole Conservative in the House. Mr. Gordon is survived by two sons and a daughter.

I would therefore like to move, seconded by Mr. Danielson (Arm River), in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition:

That the names of Richard Forsyth who served in the third legislature and James Patrick Gordon who served in the fifth legislature, both as members for the constituency of Souris, be added to the list of deceased former members to whom the Assembly paid tribute on Friday, February 11, 1955, and the Clerk be authorized and instructed to amend the record accordingly, and that Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this Assembly, communicate the sincere regrets and sympathy of the Assembly, together with a transcript of the oral tributes to members of the bereaved families.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know either one of these two members. I have a rather hazy recollection that I met Mr. Gordon just once, but I am not so sure of that. Otherwise, these persons who have passed away, Mr. Speaker, were not personally known to myself. I regret that members of this House are passing as time passes on, and as time goes on they are leaving us one by one.

I have pleasure in seconding this motion.

The question being put on the motion (Premier Douglas), is was agreed to unanimously.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before we go on to Orders of the Day I have received two messages which may interest the Assembly. The first is from Glen and Fern Campbell:

“Please convey to Premier Douglas, the Douglas Government and the people of Saskatchewan, Glen’s and my sincere thanks for the beautiful tea service we received on March 23rd. It was indeed a memorial day in our lives and one we won’t ever forget.”

And another one from another member of the family:

“Members of the Assembly, thank you very, very much. I feel very highly honoured and ask myself, do I deserve it? — but a rose so willed

to the living is more than sumptuous wreaths to the dead.”

It is signed by Mrs. A.L. Campbell.

On the Orders of the Day:

### TIME ENQUIRY REPORT

The House resumed, from April 5th, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Heming (Moose Jaw City):

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Law (Time) be now concurred in.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take very much of the time of the House to deal with this very important matter; but I think perhaps it is only proper that, since the Committee of this Assembly has worked on it considerably, and since committees of the last two sessions also devoted considerable time to this problem, it is only fitting and proper that we do something about it at this time.

The proposal which came from the Municipal Law Committee is not a very difficult one. You will recall that a questionnaire was sent out to all municipalities in the province at the request of the Time Standardization Committee, last year. The results of that questionnaire appeared very confusing until it was transposed onto a map, but when that was done a pattern began to emerge which I think provides some possibilities of an answer to this vexing problem.

It was noted that not a single rural or urban municipality in the eastern third of the province disagreed with the proposition of Central Standard Time, and therefore, it has been possible to draw a map following municipal boundaries which separate that third of the province from the rest and it is possible to say there is perfect unanimity, so far as the questionnaire showed, in that part of Saskatchewan. The rest of Saskatchewan, however, showed a little different picture.

First of all, there are some fringe areas around the boundary where the picture is confused. In the vicinity of Weyburn, of the 8 rural municipalities there, 6 favour Daylight Saving Time, 2 Mountain Standard and the City of Weyburn, Central Standard, the town of Radville, Daylight Saving Time, and the town of Yellowgrass and McTaggart also dissenting. So that that presents a confused situation which, I believe, can only be settled by a decision of the electors there.

The rest of the province shows some dissent from the general picture of Mountain Standard Time. All rural municipalities reporting evidently favour Mountain Standard Time, with the exception of three, Warman municipality, Dundurn municipality, and one down here at Beechy, who favour Central Standard Time. The picture so far as the urban municipalities is concerned is one of a little more dissent. Of 334 towns, cities, villages in the western two-thirds of the province, 90 dissent from Mountain Standard

**April 7, 1955**

Time, so that there are about 90 pins indicating villages, towns or cities that are in favour of some other time than Mountain Standard.

The situation is complicated, however, by the fact that, although 90 is only a small proportion of 334, some of the largest urban communities are among that group. Saskatoon, Sutherland, Regina, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert all are among that group. The problem then is that the Committee felt it could not ask this Assembly to decide what standard time should prevail over that area. The Committee therefore felt that it was fair and democratic, if we are going to have uniformity of time at all, to allow not just the urban municipalities, but people of all municipalities in that area to vote on the proposition of Daylight Saving Time, Mountain Standard Time or Central Standard Time.

Various results could flow from that vote, but it is safe to assume, I think, that in this district in the Weyburn region, where the people appear to be divided between Central Standard Time and Daylight Saving Time, a vote probably would reflect a decision in favour of either of those two times; that the Weyburn area would, therefore, merge into the eastern zone as a result of a vote.

It is conceivable that the western zone might cast a decision in favour of Central Time, Daylight Time or Mountain Time, and, if it casts a majority vote in favour of Central Time, we would have achieved the ultimate objective of having complete uniformity over the entire province. If the western two-thirds casts a majority vote in favour of Daylight Saving Time (one hour in advance of Mountain Standard Time in the summer only), then you would have complete uniformity over the province during the summer months, and during the winter months you would have the re-occurrence of that line separating the two parts. On the other hand, if the western part of the province voted for Mountain Standard Time on a year-round basis, you would have a permanent line of demarcation somewhere in the vicinity of this red line that you see on the map, here. That would mean that the people of Saskatchewan would have to cope with only one time barrier in the whole province, the one to which I just referred. As it is now, of course, hon. members know that there is a time barrier around every city, town and village that adopts any other time than Mountain Standard. The people of every community have two times within their community, and to that extent it would represent a net gain in convenience to the people of Saskatchewan. It would eliminate all of these little time barriers around all these urban communities.

Then, of course, I think it is only fair to pay more attention to the marginal districts. It was not possible from the questionnaire to say where some of these municipalities stood. They either did not send in a return, or otherwise failed to indicate what their views were. The recommendation of the Committee provides that the vote shall be held in all of that part of the province west of this most conservative line, the one farthest to the east, and provides that individual municipalities or block of municipalities around that line may, by the results of their vote favouring (shall we say) Central Standard Time, be added to the Central Standard Time zone. In the event that one of those fringe areas votes for Daylight Saving Time, however, and at the same time the western two-thirds votes for Mountain Standard Time, you would have this result. In the summer you would have the line going down and including the marginal area into the eastern zone of the province and, during the winter, you would have the line going

down the other side of the Daylight Saving Time district in between the two major zones. That, of course, does not create a third zone; it does not create a third time barrier. It is important to note that there is still only one time barrier north and south of the province even if those results do occur, except that the time barrier would be on one side of the marginal area in the winter and it would be on the other side in the summer; that is, assuming that the marginal area adopted Daylight Saving Time while the rest of the province adopted Mountain Standard Time.

It is inconceivable, of course (at least I hope it is inconceivable), that the major two-thirds of the province on the west side would adopt Central Standard Time and these marginal areas adopt Mountain Standard Time. Then, of course, you would have the whole province on Central Standard Time with an island in the middle on Mountain Standard Time. I hope that does not happen; but anything can happen. The electors of Saskatchewan have behaved in a pretty rational manner in the last 10 or 15 years and I don't think we need to worry about something like that happening.

That presents the picture, Mr. Speaker, and I think that I would be remiss if I did not present to you some of the arguments which were used in the Committee in support of that proposal. It is sometimes said that the cities ought to have the exclusive right to determine the time that they shall keep for themselves, and I suppose it is equally true that individuals ought to have the right to say that they believe there are 11 inches in a foot, or that there are five quarts in a gallon, or any other quaint or erratic system of standards which an individual may want to adopt for his own personal use. But it is still right and it is still not undemocratic to say to the individual that, in his public dealings with his neighbours, in his legal transactions with his neighbours, he shall adopt a standard which is commonly adopted or accepted by the general run of mankind. To say that the cities have a fundamental democratic right to keep any time they want is, of course, to completely misstate the case. No municipality has any inherent right to pass laws regarding interference with any of the standard measurements of mankind. No municipality could declare that a foot shall be 13 inches or that a gallon shall contain five quarts, unless the power to do so was reposed in it by the authority that is properly in charge of that jurisdiction, and here in Canada, that jurisdiction rests with the provincial governments; and the provincial government, many years ago, did, by a specific section in the Municipal Acts, confer upon cities, towns and villages the power to pass these bylaws. So they do not have the inherent right. This Legislature has the responsibility for deciding that question, and the mere fact that the Legislature chose to delegate it to the municipal authorities does not change the fundamental responsibility for that matter.

This recommendation does not propose to abolish any democratic right at all; it proposes, instead, to repose that right in a larger constituency. Instead of allowing the individual municipalities to decide on an individual basis, it is proposing to allow, by this report, all the electors of the province an equal voice in deciding what standard of time shall be adopted for all legal purposes throughout the community. That may have been justified in the old days when municipalities were allowed this right; when people had to travel by oxcart or horse and buggy, they very seldom circulated very much beyond the confines of their own municipality or municipal boundary — and, of course, that is largely true of the cities today. Most people of the cities get up in the morning and go to bed at

**April 7, 1955**

night without ever going outside the boundaries of their city. Rural people however, do travel about more freely around the province and, therefore, have I submit, at least as great an interest in the question of standardization of time as the urban people have. It certainly concerns their work, and so on, more seriously than it does the urban people. This proposal, however, is not to take anything away from the ratepayers of the cities, but only to require them to admit their cousins from the country on equal terms in the choosing of the standard time which shall prevail.

There is one other thing I should mention before passing. The Committee, in recommending a zone for the Weyburn district, was guided by one consideration alone. For a small group of municipalities there, there appeared to be more disagreement than was apparent in any other part of the province. It may very well be that, since the present zone takes a bite to the east, with the city of Regina in the middle, that in drafting legislation or in approving legislation, the Committee may recommend that the Regina area be treated as a separate zone. It seems perfectly reasonable and logical to me. The reason that the Committee did not put it in the report was because the rural municipalities around Regina did not express disagreement as to their choice. It may be that, if the electors were consulted and given an opportunity to vote in that area, there is some difference of opinion, and a separate vote should be conducted in that area even as it is in the area just to the south of it; but there is no limit to the suggestion, I think, that could be received by the Committee for the erection of other boundary districts along that border, that time barrier.

There is one thing I want to say about this, and it is that the Legislature has had this matter before it on many occasions in the past, and so far no proposal has been brought forward which has won the support of any sizeable number of members of the Assembly. This report is in a little different position. Out of some 20 members of the enlarged Municipal Law Committee, I think (if I recall correctly), there were only two members who opposed the adoption of the report, and I was pleased that it was not regarded by the Committee as a partisan issue. I would hope that, if there is to be any real solution to this problem, it should be treated in this Legislature in the same fashion.

I think that this is only a report; this is only a recommendation. Next year, the Legislature would have to adopt legislation based approximately on the report, with refinements and additions as may be desired by the members of the Committee. The legislation, if it is drafted and presented and adopted at the next Session of the Assembly, would, of course, then go into effect and provide for a vote at some convenient opportunity after the legislation has been adopted. But I would earnestly submit to the House that this report is instructions to the next Legislative Committee only on general principles, and is not a finally worked-out programme or solution to this problem.

I would therefore appeal to members of the Assembly to express the same degree of unanimity that was found in the Committee, and hope that the report will be adopted.

**Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against the adoption of this report, for several reasons. I think there are a great many things wrong with the recommendations that are contained in this report.

I feel that a plebiscite would only point out the divergence of opinion regarding time preference that we already know exists, and I do not think it will settle anything really satisfactorily.

In the first place, I think there will be a great deal of confusion among the people who have to vote, as to what is actually meant by 'Mountain Standard Time', 'Central Standard Time', and 'Daylight Saving Time'. That would be a difficult thing to explain; I think there will be confusion.

Secondly, I do not like the compulsory feature that is outlined in the second last recommendation, because it states there: "The voter will be told (that is, on his ballot) what action will follow as a result of the plebiscite." Now, if a plebiscite is held, when the Government looks over that plebiscite, they may feel that there are certain exceptions that should be made, such as for certain cities, and I do not think it should be stated on the ballot at all what action will follow. It should be stated what action 'may' follow, and give them an indication; but the Government's hands should not be tied. They should have a chance to look at the results of the plebiscite and then, on their findings, decide what action will follow; but the voters should not be told what action will follow, because that would bind the Government.

Another thing I would like to say is that I sat on this Time Committee, as you know, and when the various delegations appeared, I asked every single delegation the same questions: "What is your problem?" . . . "Is it the cities going on fast time that is your problem?" . . . And without exception they answered, "No, we don't care very much what the cities do; the real problem is where there are two towns nine or ten miles apart, on different times. That is where the real problem comes in." It would seem to me that, surely, the municipalities, by mutual agreement, could straighten this problem out themselves, without, necessarily, action on the part of the Government.

Then I think the way the vote is suggested — that we only take the vote in part of the province, and that the Central Standard Time zone be not asked to come in on the vote. Why? Because they want Central Standard Time, and it is very evident that that is what they want. But by taking the vote in the other part of the province, you are weighting the decision towards Mountain Standard Time, because I believe that, if a vote were taken all across the province, it might well turn out to be in favour of Central Standard Time. But if you cut out all the Central Standard Time people and only have the people in the part that are asked to vote for Mountain Standard Time, you are weighting the decision, and I do not think that is desirable.

I would also like to say that I do not believe that many people in the rural areas actually appreciate the importance of fast time in the summer to working people. I mean people who work in stores and offices and banks, and so on. Farmers are out in the open all day long, and they can choose their time to come into the cities if they wish; but employees in offices or a bank or a store cannot choose their time. They have to abide by the time that is set by their employers, and that one-hour difference makes all the difference as to whether or not they can have a game of golf, or a game of tennis, or see a baseball game, or have an extra hour or so in the garden. The summers in this country are very

**April 7, 1955**

short and, for health reasons, it is very important that people who sit in offices and work in stores have an extra hour in the fresh air and the sunshine during the summer months. For health reasons this is extremely important, and I do not think that many people in rural areas just understand how important it is. I firmly believe that the question, as far as the cities are concerned, anyway, and I think more than the cities, is something they should be allowed to settle for themselves.

Some people have suggested that you could get around all this by saying that all we have to do in the cities is to open an hour earlier and close an hour earlier — start at 8 o'clock and close at 4; but that is completely impractical. Indeed I think it is almost ridiculous, because you would have all kinds of confusion. As I said, the employees cannot decide what time they are going to work. You would have one office starting at one time, stores starting at another time, schools starting at another time, and it would make for all sorts of confusion. What is more, it would not satisfy, or would not help, anything if we did that, because, if a farmer came in in the late afternoon to shop, he would still find that the offices and stores are closed. If we closed at four instead of five, or 4.30 instead of 5.30, he would still find they were closed, and I think he would be much more annoyed than he is now, because he is prepared for fast time, and I do not think that it really inconveniences him very much. That suggestion is impractical.

I had wished to move an amendment — I want to come back to the compulsory feature again. I feel very keenly that the ballot should certainly not state the results that 'will follow', but rather the results that 'may follow', and I would wish to move an amendment that:

“all the words after 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“the said report be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Law with instructions that the said Committee have power to remove the compulsory features of the second last recommendation by deleting the word 'will' wherever it occurs and substituting the word 'may'.”

I wish to move this amendment, but I realize that the House is very close to proroguing, and that this is just proposing draft legislation, and possibly can be dealt with at the next Session. I realize that it would be difficult for the Time Committee to meet right now; but I wanted to make my position very clear, that I feel this is a very objectionable feature, and that I am going to vote against the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Did the hon. member say that she was not now presenting the amendment?

**Mrs. Cooper:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make my position clear. Since the House is so close to proroguing, I think I had best leave it at this time. I think I can accomplish the same thing at the next Session.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the House ready for the question?

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one thing. I do not share the fears of my hon. friend in connection with



this last point that she has just raised, because, after all, I feel that this is a recommendation to the Cabinet, and, having sat with the Cabinet for a number of years, I know that they have intelligence enough that they are not going to put some arbitrary thing in there that may prove to be not what will be carried out in the long run.

I realize that this is a very difficult problem, but I think that the one step that should be taken has not been taken, and I would like to have seen this Committee recommend it to the Legislature. I would like to see this Legislature go on record as being in favour of inviting the Railway companies to be prepared to adopt Railway Time at different points from those they have at present. I think that would get away from a great deal of our trouble. One of the problems that was not referred to in the report, or in the remarks, is the confusion in communities because there are two times in that community — the railway time and the municipal time. I think that if we could agree to ask the Railway companies to change the time: say, instead of having it changed in Broadview, have it changed at Swift Current, and at Lloydminster, North Battleford, Wilkie, or wherever the divisional point is on the C.N.R.; I think that would then bring the whole province into Central Time, the same as it is in Manitoba. You see, there is no problem in Alberta. They don't have to worry there, because there is one time only in the whole of the province, and that is Mountain Time, and it is an easy matter to deal with; but what has confused us here in Saskatchewan is the two times, Mountain Standard and Central Standard over approximately half of the province; probably a third and two-thirds would be a more accurate description of it.

I am glad that the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) pointed out that it would be possible, under this proposal, to take areas that may favour Central and put them into a certain zone, such as he is proposing for Weyburn. Frankly, I do not see why the Weyburn area should have been selected at all as a special district. I don't think there is any more need for Weyburn. Frankly, I do not see why the Weyburn area should have been selected at all as a special district. I don't think there is any more need for Weyburn having a special problem, a special section devoted to it, than any of the others. I think it should have been dealt with in exactly the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that, insofar as I am concerned, I am not going to oppose this; but I am going to reserve my right as a member of the Government, to use some discretion on these various things. I take them as recommendations to be considered and not as anything which is binding upon the Cabinet. I think, too, that the majority of my colleagues in the Cabinet would consider it in that way: that we are not being bound at all; that you are asking us to prepare legislation along these general lines. However, I want to reserve the right to change any of these sections that we feel should be changed, and to bring to the Legislature, next year, when we present the Bill, our reasons for doing so.

In the meantime, I am wondering, when we know that the people from Moose Jaw east along the main line, for instance, are in favour of Central Time or Daylight Saving Time, if one of the first steps would not be to get the Railways thinking about this problem, about changing their time, because, even though we do adopt Daylight Saving Time or Central Standard Time in certain of these areas, if the Railways still continue to have their time change where it is not, we are still going to have the problem that we have today, and, until that is solved, you are going to have no real solution. You are still going to have the confusion that there is. Probably the railways should be approached after the plebiscite; but I think we could probably

**April 7, 1955**

have avoided the plebiscite if we had approached this thing by going to the Railways first, and getting them to change their time further west. I think we would have eliminated completely the necessity of having to go to the people on this question at all.

May I say, too, there is one dangerous thing about plebiscites. They do not necessarily give you public opinion. When you elect a council, for example, maybe 10 per cent of the voters turn out; I think our record in Regina has been somewhere around 15 or 16 per cent. Well, 15 or 16 per cent of the people are going to determine this question for the other 85 per cent. It may be democracy; but unless you get a good turn-out, we are not going to know what the people really want, and after we have put this into effect, we are going to have something which may be contrary to the wishes of the majority of the people. That is why taking a plebiscite of this sort at a municipal election can be a very dangerous thing, and can result in getting results which will not be much of a guide to the Legislature, the following year, to base legislative action on. However, the Committee have worked on it, and I feel that they have spent time, and in view of the fact that we have no alternative before us, I am going to support the Committee's recommendations. At the same time, I am going to reserve the right, both as a member of the Cabinet and in the legislature, next year, when this comes before us, to change any of these sections that I think are not in the best interests of the people as a whole.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate, but I do want to make my own position clear. It has always been my opinion, and it is yet, that this is a matter for localities to settle themselves, and, because of that, I am going to vote against the motion.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can add very much, but I think the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) hit the nail on the head when he suggested that we should have no laws that would allow local communities to interfere with measures on such things as time. It is not just a matter of the Railways. The difficulty is all over the province where communities side by side set up different times and dislocate the whole life of the people. When we talk about democracy, I cannot understand why a municipality, even a city, should have the power to interfere with a right that is the prerogative of the Legislature. And it is not really democracy; I think it is much more, say, the functioning of democracy to go to the people have the people decide, even if it is by a small majority. That is the way we should be guided — by the opinion of the people of say, a large area, not just the opinion of a few councils here and there, and local communities.

I am speaking for the northern area that I represent, not too far from Prince Albert, and I know the grief and the misunderstanding that has been caused by local municipal authorities setting up different times. I am certainly going to support the motion, and I am certainly going to try to acquaint the people with what the problem is, and then they will have the choice to decide what the consider is in the best interests of the province as a whole. I am certainly going to support the motion.

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, someone has mentioned the fact that the province of Alberta is in sort of an enviable position in as much as there are no changes of time running north and south in the province.

It is perhaps unfortunate that Saskatchewan is the province that has been chosen to make changes of time, and I would refer to the towns of Carlyle, Arcola, Broadview, Humboldt and Hudson Bay Junction. Being railway terminals, and the time has to be changed somewhere, these are the places that have been chosen by the Railways, many years ago. I believe the Railways have been approached some three or four years ago, but apparently have not been willing to go along with moving this time change farther west. I would agree with the Provincial Treasurer that they could be approached again.

Back in the 'thirties when a vote was taken in the cities, I always voted against Daylight Saving Time, but I have since changed my mind, and I rather like the daylight saving feature; but railway employees, as a rule, are against the change.

I do not think it is too much of a mental effort, say, if a person lives in the town of Pense or the area around there, and say, the city of Moose Jaw wishes to remain on Mountain time and Regina wants to stay on Central time or go on Central time in the summer, for the people of those communities to remember that one city is on one time and one is on the other, with government all support it. I recall going up to Saskatoon, two years ago, leaving here very early in the morning. I got to the town of Hanley, and I was almost out of gas. I pulled into a filling station at 15 minutes to 9 by my watch, but it was 15 minutes to 8 by the clock in the filling station, and I would have had to wait 15 minutes. I decided I could make the next town, Dundurn; so I started out, and when I got about 10 miles out, I had no gasoline at all. Later on, however, when I thought things over a little differently, I realized it was my own fault; but for the moment, I thought the difference in time was no good at all. As I say, later I realized it was my own fault: I should have filled up with gasoline the night before, or not taken the chance of leaving Hanley until I had got some gasoline.

Someone has brought up the matter of one town being on one time and another town being on another time and just eight miles away. It was said that people who are in the beer parlor in the one place can jump into their car and go and drink beer for another hour in the other town. I do not think that is a very serious situation either. I would not like to think that this is going to become sort of an urban-vs.-rural matter, and if we push this thing too far, that is exactly what is going to happen. Personally, I would agree with what the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) said, a few minutes ago. He feels the localities should be able to decide for themselves. I go right along with that; and eliminate any compulsory features that are in these recommendations. I think perhaps we could almost use a stronger word than 'compulsion'; we might almost use the word 'dictatorship' — and that is a thing I do not like to see.

I am strongly in favour of the municipalities using their own judgment; and I think it is more democratic for them to vote and decide which time they might want to adopt in the summertime. I intend to vote against the recommendations.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — I am against this report from the Committee and I am going to vote against it, because, to my mind, it does not solve anything. You have to have two times in the province of Saskatchewan in any case; and, as I listened to the member for Hanley — I did not listen to him

**April 7, 1955**

now, because I heard the same speech in the Committee . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He wasted an hour of our time, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — After all, when he gets through with these boundary lines of Standard Time and Mountain Time, he will have a more confused situation than there is now — much more confused. There will be more time variations between the municipalities than there are now if his scheme is put into operation.

The people of the province of Saskatchewan have accommodated themselves to this. I can go up through the country where I live, and go to Saskatoon, and outside of the city, I do not think there are any towns on fast time any more. They have accommodated themselves to suit the community in which they live. As a matter of fact, my own town tried fast time one or two years, and it did not work satisfactorily, and about four years ago, when we had been on fast time for about a week, they got together and threw it out, and we have never heard of it since.

I am going to vote against this, because I believe the people are taking care of the problem themselves, and I think one thing they resent is any interference in their daily way of living.

Here is another thing, Mr. Speaker. I have heard the mothers on the farm complaining very bitterly because they cannot get their children to go to bed when the sun is still high, which means they get to bed later; but in the morning they have to get up an hour earlier. The mothers complain about that, and that is the whole thing as far as I am concerned. You have farmed, Mr. Speaker, and you know that the whole process of farming depends upon long hours of work, and the farmers want to take advantage of the early morning hours in order to get their work done, and they do not like fast time. For those reasons, I am going to vote against this.

The question being put on the motion (Mr. Heming), it was agreed to, on division.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber a 12.40 o'clock p.m., and, being seated on the Throne and having Assented to several Bills, was pleased to deliver the following Speech:

**MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:**

“It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you and congratulate you upon the work you have done. I wish also to express my confidence that the approval of the programmes and plans presented before you will continue to provide services necessary to the growth and future development of our Province.

“I am pleased to note that you have approved payment for the cost of ‘work and wages’ and other emergency programmes made necessary by flooding and crop failure conditions last fall.

My Government will continue to take whatever measures are considered necessary to ensure that hardships resulting from these conditions are minimized.

“You have provided for a higher level of grants for education. Additional grants have been made available for municipal road purposes.

“Your decision to increase the supplemental allowances to needy recipients of Old Age Security pensions will be welcomed, as will the increases in Mothers’ Allowance payments and payments to foster homes.

“Arrangements have been made for Saskatchewan to be represented later this month at a meeting preliminary to a Federal-Provincial Conference. resolutions which you have adopted during the course of this Session will prove useful to my Ministers attending this Conference.

“Reports of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life have been placed before you. Additional reports delivered to the government during the course of the year will be made available to you. The work of the Commission has created widespread interest, and it is hoped that its reports will provide the basis for useful public discussion.

“You have approved legislation amending The Credit Union Act, The Municipalities Seed Grain and Supply Act, The Corrections Act, The Child Welfare Act, The Vehicles Act, The Provincial Lands Act, and The Farm Security Act.

“You have passed legislation revising and consolidating The Archives Act and The Cemeteries Act.

“Increased benefits have been provided under the Workmen’s Compensation Act.

“I am pleased to note that you took the time during this Session to extend suitable honours to the Campbell Brothers of Avonlea, 1955 Macdonald Brier Curling Champions.

“At the close of this Session, held in the Fiftieth Year of Saskatchewan’s history, may I commend to you the many plans formed for the celebration of our Fiftieth Anniversary by all our communities. I trust that you will join with them and contribute to the success of their endeavours, and make 1955 a year to be remembered by our pioneers, by our young folk, and by the many visitors who will be in our midst.

“I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the Public Service, and assure you that the sum of money voted will be used economically, prudently and in the public interest.

“In taking leave of you, I desire to thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of

**April 7, 1955**

the Session and to wish you the full blessing of providence as you return again to your respective homes.

The Assembly was then prorogued at 12.50 o'clock p.m.

(signed) Tom Johnston, Speaker.