

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature  
21st Day

Thursday, March 13, 1958

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

**NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM**

Moved by Mr. Thorson (Souris-Estevan), seconded by Mr. Johnson (Kerrobert-Kindersley):

"That, with a view to further removing financial barriers to higher education, this Assembly urges establishment of a National Scholarship Program in Canada which would provide annual awards to Canadian students of demonstrated ability to enable them to study at recognized universities, the cost of each program to be shared by Federal and Provincial Governments as follows: 50 per cent by the Government of Canada, and 50 per cent by the Provincial Governments, the share of costs allocated to each Province to be in the proportion its population bears to the population of Canada."

**Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, the motion under my name on the Order Paper deals with a certain phase of the problem of education, particularly higher education. It requests not only financial aid from the Provincial Governments but from the Federal Government, to assist university students to attend classes.

I do not think I need to argue the validity of the Federal Government's participation in assistance of this kind, because I think everyone recognizes certainly that, if it is a valid principle for the Federal Government to aid public and secondary schools, it is even more valid that the National Government should give assistance in the field of higher education. Certainly the whole community of Canada will benefit from the training and education of university students.

You will notice, also, that the motion suggests a formula which might be used in determining the share which the Federal Government

**March 13, 1958**

will pay and which the Provincial governments will pay. I want to say that I have no strong feelings about what formula is used, except that I think the Federal Government ought to contribute at least 50 per cent of the cost of assisting young people in attending universities, whether or not we ought to use simply the populations in the provinces in determining how much their share should be. I ought to say, I have no strong feelings about that. Yet I think it would be a fair measure of the need, and of the ability of the various provinces to pay.

There are many barriers on the road to improving the quality and the quantity of education in our universities. This motion seeks to remove only one of the barriers. It seeks to make it easier for students to attend universities and, undoubtedly, if we can achieve that, there will be other barriers that will be more difficult to overcome.

If you read through reports of the proceedings of the National Conference of Canadian Universities on Canada's Crisis in Higher Education which was held at Ottawa in November, 1956, you cannot help but be impressed with the fact that there is a crying need for more assistance from governments and from industry in the field of higher education. I have in mind that, if we make it easier for students to attend universities, the shortage and high-cost of university facilities, particularly in the matter of buildings and equipment, will become more and more apparent. Though it is not too apparent yet, I expect that, in the very near future, there is going to be a shortage of highly trained and effective teachers for our universities.

I do not want to leave the impression with this motion that there are not these kinds of barriers to overcome in the field of higher education. But I want to deal specifically with problems facing a young man or a young woman who wants to attend university and cannot, because of financial reasons. I think we ought to say, as members of this Legislature, that we value the potentialities and the worthwhileness of people who can take university education. I think we ought to say clearly and definitely (and back it up with concrete programs) to these young people that we are prepared to assist them in attending universities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how great are the barriers to higher education for a young man or a young woman? Of course, the majority of people are barred because of their mental capacities. I cannot help but think that there is no such barrier to entrance into this Assembly, because I am sure if there were, many of us would not be here today. However, the figures which were presented to The National Conference on Engineering, Scientific and Technical Manpower, held at St. Andrews, New Brunswick, in September, 1956, show that on the basis of tests and other tests, between 25 and 33 per cent of the population have the necessary capacity for a higher education. When you contrast this with the figure of only a little over seven per cent of the age group between 18 and 21 years who are actually attending university in Canada, it becomes perfectly apparent that the financial barriers to higher education are very serious. If you consider only those who actually seek higher education, it is estimated by responsible university authorities that at least half of those people are prevented from doing so for financial reasons.

What is being done then to overcome some of the financial barriers? I want to say something about the Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund. The members are, no doubt, aware that this loan fund was established by this Government in 1949 and the fund was given an endowment of \$1 million. The purpose is to use this money to provide loans for students who were attending university, a teacher's college, school of nursing, and schools of agriculture. The basis of providing the loans is that there ought to be need demonstrated by the student applying and that he ought to be able to demonstrate his ability to benefit from such education. The loans are made interest-free while the student is attending university or another school. They are responsible at not less than \$25 per month, at no interest rate, provided the student begins to pay off the loan immediately after he or she had completed the course. If these conditions are not met, then the loan has to be repaid with four per cent interest charged, from the date on which the student completed the course.

To date, 4,919 students have borrowed a total from this fund of \$1,428,000. This year, 1957-58 there are 679 students who have received loans to a total value of \$214,250, and of that 679 students, 361 were attending university and 277 were attending Teacher's College. The university group, this year, has loans outstanding of \$129,000; the Teacher's College group has loans of \$79,000. I think the Government of the province ought to be commended for recognizing the need of providing financial assistance to young people who can benefit from a higher education. I think it is clear that this Student Aid Fund is being used, and provides, at least, a solution to part of the financial problem facing young people. I submit that, commendable as it is, it fills only part of the need and it is not enough.

If we take a look at other parts of Canada, it is estimated that only about 14 per cent of the students in our universities receive some kind of scholarship or bursary. It is estimated by university people that in the United Kingdom, rather than 14 per cent, nearly 73 per cent of the university students receive some kind of aid through scholarships or bursaries. In the United States about 20 per cent of the students at private universities, and about 60 per cent at State universities receive scholarships or bursaries. And in all, in the United States, because in some universities tuition fees are held very low through public support, it is estimated that about 75 per cent of the students at university receive either direct or indirect financial aid. This is a pretty disturbing picture and shows quite clearly that Canada does not place as high a value on higher education today as does the United States or the United Kingdom.

I want to say something about why we need to assist young people to attend universities. Why should we invest more in the development of our human resources at university? Well, of course, you can argue this case on the basis of what benefit it will be to the individual students concerned. And certainly the young men, and young women who now attend Canadian universities have made frequent requests for more financial aid in the form of scholarships and bursaries. I want to mention the work

**March 13, 1958**

which the National Federation of Canadian University Students is doing in this field. This is an organization which represents nearly all of the students attending Canadian Universities.

Last fall, in October, the National Federation of Canadian University Students held a congress in the city of Quebec. There they met not only with representatives of students from each university across Canada, but also with representatives of faculty groups and administrative groups from universities. These groups, meeting together, passed a resolution making very clear their stand on this question. I want to read the resolution. It says this:

"Whereas the world is experiencing a dramatic scientific revolution; and whereas Canada's natural and industrial resources will play a leading role in the satisfaction of the needs of the underdeveloped world in all sectors of human activity, and whereas the shortage and increased needs of university-trained personnel within the framework of education, scientific research, industry and government, imperil the future prosperity of Canada; and whereas the National Federation of Canadian University Students, together with the university administrators and professors and some leaders of finance and industry are aware of the urgency of the crisis in higher education; and whereas the prohibitive cost of university training establishes, implicitly, as a prerequisite for admission, not qualification but financial status, thus eliminating, from our ranks thousands of your intelligent Canadians; therefore be it resolved that the following principles be adopted by our Governments and applied at the earliest possible date:

"Every Canadian student who has met the entrance requirements of a Canadian university is entitled to the receipt of an adequate scholarship."

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly, financial assistance to people who are qualified to study at universities will be of great benefit to them as individuals; but I don't think the students who are now in our Canadian universities plead for assistance simply because of what it will do for them. As a matter of fact, if we did establish a National Scholarship Program most of the people now in our universities who are making this plea will have graduated, and will not be able to benefit from it. I think they argue in favour of it because they are in a position to know not only what it will do for students, but what it will do for the whole of society. And it is mainly on the basis of this stake

that society has in training young people that I want to submit that this resolution should be supported by all members of this Assembly.

It seems to me that all of our rich natural resources in Canada will be of very little use unless we have the skill and the know-how to use them. If you take a look at the economic development of Canada, you cannot help but be impressed that here is a story and a record of the conquering of the world around us with knowledge; of conquering immense physical and climatic and geographic barriers. Think of the improvements that have been made in transportation; here in Western Canada, the improvements that have been made in the agricultural industry through research; the development of new varieties and new breeds, the development of pest killers and the like. Across Canada, you think of the research and the training and the knowledge that has been necessary in order to find ways of reducing the complex ores from our mineral deposits. You think of all of these. Necessary knowledge is required in the field of processing and manufacturing in our industrial life. It becomes obvious from this record that it is not enough for us to be endowed with just physical resources. You must have skill, and you must have knowledge on the part of the human population. It seems to me that there is no doubt that we are wasting, through disuse, our greatest resources when we do not develop and train the best brains of the country. And in this waste, I see a great danger for the future welfare of mankind not only in Canada, but throughout the world.

I think the matter is becoming more and more urgent; that if we continue to delay in breaking down financial barriers to education, we will all pay a very high price in terms of the cost of wasted talent and lost opportunity.

I do not want to make this plea just because we, in Canada, must compete with other nations, although, in the past few months we have become increasingly aware of how much we lag behind in the field of scientific knowledge in relation to other countries of the world. But, I think there is a great danger of being stampeded into a great rush toward scientific training and scientific development, simply because of the pressures to which Canada is susceptible in the world situation.

It seems to me that it is not enough to know that an individual has done better than another individual; that it is not enough to think that we, as a nation, do just better than another nation. What is important about an individual and what is important about a nation, is the fact that he or she and they have done not just better than someone else, but the best that they can do.

I want to emphasize that there is a great danger that we will put too much emphasis on scientific training in our universities and not enough on social sciences and on the humanities. And, in fact, this is apparent in Canada already, because, generally speaking, what assistance is provided to assist young people in attending universities

**March 13, 1958**

leans heavily in favour of science, and often leaves the social sciences starving and under-nourished.

I do not want to depreciate how important it is to know 'how' in the field of science. But, it seems to me infinitely more important to know 'why' we are concerned about scientific developments. No doubt in this age we live in, it is important to know 'how' to get satellites into outer space, and it is important to know 'how' to use nuclear energy, but science can never tell us 'why' we ought to use these things, why we ought to know these things. It is only when people begin to think about subjects in the field of humanities and the social sciences that we find some answer to 'why' these things should be done. No doubt the world today is becoming more complex, not only in the field of science and technology, but also in the field of social and human relationships. And there is a crying need in the world we live in, for more understanding of human behavior, the behavior of human beings not only as individuals, but as men and women in society with one another. Science is making it easier to communicate with someone on the other side of the world, and, at the same time, we find that it is becoming more and more difficult to make ourselves understood by neighbors close at hand.

Now if it is important to know 'how' in the scientific world, and if it is important to know 'why' we must increase our development in the field of science and technology. I submit that it is just as important when we know why, to also know how to progress in the social world. It seems to me that, because we don't know enough about ourselves we often waste our efforts through misunderstanding and through unproductive competition. I want to give one example. We are all aware that the Soviet Union launched its satellite into orbit before the United States could do it, and I think all of us have wondered why. I submit that it was not because the American scientists knew less about the technical problems of getting a satellite into outer space; and it was not because the Americans had fewer resources to do the job. I submit that the Russians managed to beat us, and to get the Americans, because there was too much misunderstanding, too much unproductive competition among the various American agencies and individuals who had to co-operate in this gigantic project of launching a satellite.

I think that more and more in our world we are going to find that it is not just enough to have scientific knowledge. We must also have some knowledge of human beings, and learn how to co-operate with each other. The world we live in, with scientific advances, with increasing labour specialization, with the more complex and interdependent social relationships we can look forward to in the future, demands that men learn how to cooperate effectively with each other. I submit that the people who will prosper and who will live at peace in the Twentieth Century are the people who learn that we can no longer afford the luxury of selfish, narrow-minded and wasteful competition. Our welfare depends on whether or not we can learn that competition is the law of death and that only co-operation is the law of life. It seems to me that if mankind insists on competing for the resources of the world with hatred in his heart in this age of automation, the sputniks and nuclear energy,

then surely man will perish within my lifetime. It seems to me that we must learn to live together by co-operating with each other, because the only alternative is to die together. The future belongs not to the people who are most competitive, who are most vicious and who are most aggressive and who are most determined to destroy their enemies. because such people will succeed only in destroying themselves along with those they hate.

It seems to me that the future can belong to all men if we can learn to capture the reality of our dreams. We can put to peaceful and productive uses the scientific wonders of the Twentieth Century. I have no doubt that we all want to live at peace. We all want to progress and to prosper. We want to co-operate, so that other men can progress and can prosper. 'Wanting to' is not enough. We must also learn how. It is not just enough to change the hearts of men. We must also change our minds."

I submit that no group can make a greater contribution to peace, to prosperity, and to the co-operative progress of mankind than those men and women who by nature are endowed with superior mental capacity and intellectual ability. It is our duty not only as members of this Legislature, but as members of society who are concerned about the future to break down all of the barriers to the training and the development of such people in our universities.

Therefore. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Johnson, the Resolution here submitted, as it appears under my name on the Order Paper.

**Mr. E.A. Johnson (Kerrobot-Kindersley):** — The mover of this Resolution has presented the case for it in a very capable and thorough manner. I am very pleased to be able to associate myself with the contents and with the moving of this Resolution. It has been my privilege, in the past, to have been a student of a university and to have, for a considerable period, been an instructor. This experience has given me a wide contact with the university and with people who attend the universities. It is for that reason that I have an especial interest in this Resolution. I am in wholehearted accord with the thoughts of the mover in that, in many respects, our sciences have outstripped our humanities; even though my particular field has been in the field of engineering, which is associated with the sciences. I am fully aware that many of the things we do, in this day, are inconsistent with themselves. We have made machines that are able to destroy us. We have not, however, found how we can live peaceably together in this bountiful world.

In looking at the function of a university I have observed these things: The University has a more or less dual function; it has a function to extend the horizon of knowledge and to ever push it

**March 13, 1958**

backward. It has a function, also, to pass that knowledge on to people who may be able to contact with it. In our own experience we can observe many of the benefits of university research. The mover has mentioned some of these. I would like to mention some more positive research accomplishments that would not likely have occurred if it had not been for facilities such as are provided by the university. I draw your attention to the existence of a cancer bomb, which was made to destroy — not people — but the harmful cancer cells in human tissues. This was accomplished through the brilliant work of Dr. Johns, in cooperation with other university people and other technicians.

I will also mention a further research that has been of benefit to us all, such as the production of new plant varieties and the research done in stemming the ravages of plant diseases. I will also mention little things that you may not have noticed and this pertains, more or less, to the field with which I have been associated — the development of an alkaline-resistant cement was accomplished by Professor Thorvaldson, who has been associated with the university. There has been much work in other technical fields, such as that of foundations building research and so on. We cannot omit, either, the valuable research done by economists and other technicians in that field.

We must continue to increase our support for universities for that reason. Now, of course, this knowledge is valuable in itself, but we consider that the main purpose of the university is to pass knowledge on and the recipients of this knowledge should be the maximum number because we find that in our ever-changing society the need for increased knowledge is, in itself, becoming more important.

The mover has indicated that the number of people graduating from and attending universities is unsatisfactory. I am very pleased that the mover has indicated there are important reasons for this, other than financial. However, this Resolution deals with the aspect of finances and in my opinion we must consider that in many cases the financial obstacles are of primary importance in preventing a greater attendance at the university. And, of course, in order to overcome financial obstacles we must point in the direction of increased financial aid, we have accepted financial aid for education — that is public support for it — throughout our public schools and our high schools. This should be extended into our universities, because the universities should be available to the mentally competent and should not limit its facilities only to those who are financially competent.

I think this Resolution is a good one because, as it indicates, a great share of this assistance in the form of scholarships and bursaries will be borne by the Federal Government. I think there is a very good reason for this. It is not only a matter of a lower government appealing to a higher government, but the students, themselves, must be mobile. I have seen many students graduating from our university and moving to a different part of this country, as a matter of preference possibly, or in order to find employment in the field which they have chosen.



I think that we cannot really inhibit, or try to inhibit, the movements of students, because I have observed that our university has benefited by students who have come to us and if we should prevent our students from moving out, the same principle would prevent other students from coming to our university.

Also I think there is another important factor here; people who are university students do not add to our social wealth until the time when they assume useful employment; until the time when a student graduates and assumes useful employment his education has been paid for by someone also. And, of course, he is happy to continue the cycle and it is something that we have accepted — that we shall pay for others. There are very few of us who have paid, actually, for our own education.

I think there is a valid reason for looking to the Federal Government for more financial aid to education. Consider the matter of property owners as contrasted to people who have a salary; the property owners, of course, pay a tax toward education; so do the salary earners, as it affects their property. However, the Federal Government often gets a very large proportion of the taxes paid by the salary earners in a higher bracket. I am mentioning this merely to explain that the cost of graduating a university student is mainly carried by the property owner, because the Federal Government does not always turn back the amount of money that should accrue to the provinces. I feel that this is another very valid and very practical reason why the Federal Government should increase its support, financially, for education.

I feel that this Resolution should find favour, even in the ranks of the Opposition. I was very interested, this past January, to listen to the radio broadcasts of the Fourth Liberal Convention and one of their resolutions that was proposed, I thought, was admirable for its progress toward the left, in that university education should be free. Possibly that day will arrive. I was interested, however, to observe, according to radio and press reports, that this resolution was watered down somewhat, to a proposition whereby there would be a floating loan as well as bursaries and scholarships.

I believe this Resolution will find support in the ranks of the opposition, as well as on this side. Mr. Speaker, if the Resolution is passed, and acted upon, it will benefit not only the individuals concerned but, as the mover has mentioned, it will benefit society as a whole by increasing our fund of knowledge and passing it on to a far greater number through the University itself.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to second the motion.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned.)

**March 13, 1958**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Gardiner (Melville):

"That this Assembly recommend to the Provincial Government that, before any basic change is made in the organization of Municipal Government in Saskatchewan, a vote of the people concerned be taken."

**Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, prior to the turn of the present century, the pioneer settlers of our province became somewhat concerned about the securing of a certain measure of local services with special emphasis on education; and under a special ordinance passed, by the Government of the Dominion of Canada certain powers were assigned to different groups of people in local communities which enabled those groups to perform certain local services. Those services varied according to the communities and the desires of the people living within those communities. As we advanced to the year 1905, when the province of Saskatchewan entered Confederation, provisions were then made, as in other provinces in the Dominion of Canada, for the organizing of local government bodies. Legislation was placed upon the statute books by the provincial government of that day whereby there became a Rural Municipal Act, an Urban Act, Town and Village Act, and later on a City Act. Those various municipal Acts set out powers granted to local governing bodies, if organized into definite units. From 1906 on to 1912 a large number of rural municipalities were officially organized as rural municipal units, along with some towns and some villages. These Acts assigned to the various local governments certain powers, certain jurisdictions, and assigned to those governments certain taxation fields.

When the boundaries were drafted for the local governments, with special reference to the rural municipal governments, there was no question as to whether or not the people living within those boundaries agreed with the boundaries as designed. In other words, there was no vote taken. The boundaries varied, and on the whole the average rural municipality consisted of some nine townships. As we went down through the years and a greater measure of science was applied to the tax base for taxation purposes, we began to find there was a tremendous variation in the tax base which constituted, by and large, the revenues that the municipalities would secure in order to render the services that they would be asked to render by the ratepayers whom they represented. As we went down through the years we find a greater variation in the taxable assessment. That variation took place based upon the type and kind of improvements that were undertaken within the area known as a municipality. Then we come to the year 1958, and we find a variation in taxable assessment ranging from a low of \$600,000 in a nine-township to a high of slightly under \$6,000,000 in a municipality of the same size. So today there is a tremendous variation in the services that local governments are able to render to the people whom they represent in the municipal field. This has caused some

study and some thought to be directed toward a question of a more equitable distribution of the municipal tax dollar for the purpose of getting a greater equity in the services which those municipal governments might render to their ratepayers.

As far back as 30 to 32 years ago some studies were given to this question, studies on behalf of the provincial government of the days and those studies have continued right up to the present time. In looking over the minutes of the S.A.R.M. convention we find that in March 1944 the late Hon. R.J.M. Parker, then Minister of Municipal Affairs, had this to say in his address to that convention:

"I spoke to you last year in regard to representations I had received in regard to the larger municipal unit. Many reeves and councillors have expressed their opinions to me that amalgamation should take place in some municipalities, and a change in boundaries in others."

A little further on in his address he had these remarks to make:

"Referring again to the cost, of municipal government, it has been heard that considerable money could be saved by the consolidation and reorganization of local government units. I am not convinced that a complete reorganization of rural municipalities in the province is desirable. There are undoubtedly a number of municipalities which lack adequate financial resources to provide the required services at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers."

So we can see that some 14 years ago the government of the day were also aware of the great variation in the ability of municipalities to meet the demands of their ratepayers. At the same convention, in 1949, among other things, I stated this: (I was referring to reports and consideration that was being given to the question of provincial-municipal relations, which at that time was under review by the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs group, and I had this to say):

"As soon as these reports are submitted and studied we are going to ask the executive of your association to sit in with us to study the reports. We are also going to ask the School Trustees' Association of this province to sit in with the Government and give us the benefit of their ideas. It may be necessary to go out into the district municipal meetings and place before them the recommendations and considered opinions of your executive and the executive of the School Trustees' Association."

**March 13, 1958**

Further on I stated this:

"I imagine you are all interested in a sound economic municipal unit, and of course you going to disagree as to what is a sound economic unit of municipal administration. However it does seem to me that if we move back into the Dominion field and ask the Dominion to reallocate taxation to provincial governments, and from provincial governments to municipal governments, the officials of the municipalities would first wish to see that they had a sound economic base, or a sound economic unit of municipal administration."

As we went down through the years, reaching close to the present time, and I refer to a resolution that was passed at a special convention of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, held in the Bessborough Hotel, Saskatoon, November 13, 1956. Dispensing with the 'whereases' the main resolution had this to say:

"Therefore be it resolved at this special convention of the S.A.R.M.'s that we instruct the executive to take an active part in the discussions of a conference, with a view of obtaining a final recommendation of the conference and its continuing committee; and at that time the plans so formulated be submitted to another convention of this Association for consideration.

"And that we request the Provincial Government to take no action on the recommendation until this Association has been given the opportunity to express its opinion."

The resolution was carried unanimously at the special convention of the S.A.R.M. They were dealing with the proposed Local Government-Provincial Conference that was held in December, 1956. At that conference of local governments, after three days of consideration by the representing of the local governing bodies attending, this resolution was endorsed:

"On December 14, 1956, the Conference, having studied matters of reorganization and reallocation of responsibilities and finance; and recognizing that the local government delegates are unable to commit their organization at the present time, endorses in principle the establishment of a continuing committee, representing all delegations present to study

reorganization and boundaries and reallocation of finance and responsibility, and requests each delegation to refer to their organization the question of their participation in such Committee, with a view to the appointment of this Committee, after consideration by the local government organizations at the earliest possible date."

Later on the various local governments appointed their delegates to the Continuing Committee; and the Continuing Committee, representing as they do local governments, have been in conference, giving consideration to the resolution that I have just quoted.

I suppose in the opinion of some the question of leaving a firm and sound economic foundation for the operation of local government might appear to be very simple. The Continuing Committee, as the result of the study they have given this question to date, are finding there are many complicated questions associated with an effort to build local government on a very firm and sound economic base.

I noted, according to the press the Chairman of the Continuing Committee, Mr. McAskill, made a statement before the School Trustees' Convention, dealing with the progress that has been made by the Committee to date. Mr. Speaker, having due regard for the history of local government, and having particularly due regard for the resolutions that I have quoted, first the one passed by the special conference of the S.A.R.M. in November 1946, and the resolution endorsed at the Provincial-Local Government Conference December 14, 1956 — having due regard for the Continuing Committee that is studying this whole question I would like to move an amendment to the motion, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Bentley:

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

"consideration be given to the report of the Continuing Committee on Local Government and consultation be held with local government organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their ratepayers."

The debate continuing on the proposed amendment:

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, this question of municipal and local government reorganization and allocation of finances is something which has concerned provincial governments in Saskatchewan during the past 30 years. I was surprised to come across a pamphlet that was put out by some Liberals, by the way, back in the 1920's, advocating a county system — now some 30 years ago. This is

**March 13, 1958**

not a new problem, but it is a problem which has been accentuated by the technological changes and the shifts in population which have taken place over the last quarter of a century. When the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life submitted their report, it was certainly something to which this Government felt it ought to give a good deal of consideration. As I pointed out at the time, the Government was not bound then and the Government is not bound now by the report of any Royal Commission, but a body of capable people who had spent a considerable amount of time, and had done a great deal of research into this complex and difficult problems, were deserving of the closest possible scrutiny of the recommendations that they made to the Government, to this Legislature, and to the people of the province.

It was for that reason that the Government convened in December, 1956, a Conference calling together the representatives of the various local governing bodies in the province, and at that time I made the position of the Government abundantly clear. Towards the end of the Conference, when the matter was raised again as to what the Government's position was, I reiterated the Government's positions and I would like to have the privilege, Mr. Speaker, with your consent, of quoting what I said on that occasion. This is on Page 74 of the proceedings of the Provincial-Local Government Conference, December 14, 1956:

"I can summarize the Government's position very well by quoting again from the statement which I made on the opening day."

I quote from the statement of the opening day:

"The Government itself believes that some kind of basic reorganizations, at least in the rural areas, is an essential and inevitable first step in meeting the problems of local government today. I went to make it abundantly clear that the Government will not embark upon a program of municipal reorganization unless this program is assured of the co-operation of the local governing bodies and has the widespread support of the general public.

"Once we are started upon the creation of a basically sound structure of local government the way will then be open for a sound and realistic strengthening of local financial resources."

I don't think it is necessary to read all of the long quotation; I think that covers the essential part. I also said this:

"In other words, what I have tried to say here for my colleagues and myself was that as a result of the work of the Royal Commission

and as a result of our own experience of trying to administer the affairs of the Departments, we are convinced that two things are necessary. First, some basic reorganization of our local government structure. We have an open mind as to what it should be, whether it is to be simply larger municipal units, or whether it is to be a modified county system, or a full county system. We think certain basic reorganization is essential. We think with that must go certain financial transfers and reallocations, so that strengthened local government will then have as a right and not as a charity, a right to the revenues necessary to discharge their responsibility. We think the two things go together.

"I want to say this, as far as the Government is concerned, as I pointed out in this statement, we are not pressing this matter of reorganization. We didn't need to call this Conference at all, and to ask for a lot of problems to be put on our shoulders. We can muddle along on the basis of our present type of organization. But we could not, in all conscience, having received these reports from the Royal Commission, which reports you will remember came in 1955, and having, as a result of our own investigation seen the situation which we have tried to describe to you over the past few days — we could not see that without placing the facts before you. We have done so. We have no intention of being arbitrary, or domineering, or shaking a big stick. If the local governing bodies of the province feel that we should let the status quo remain as it is, then we shall have to continue to do the best we can; and we shall carry out the commitments which I made to you on Tuesday, and we shall keep the commitments, so that as we get more revenue, particularly from development of resources, we will pass on part of that increased revenue to local governing bodies; but we feel it is only fair to tell you in advance that that will not solve your basic problems.

"Therefore, we feel that if we are going to solve our basic problems we have got to rise to this great occasion and decide here and now

**March 13, 1958**

whether or not we are going to tackle this problem — not that we are going to agree on details; but at least that we agree we are going to tackle it, and if so, what machinery we are going to set up for that purpose.

"I think that, in summary, is the position which the Government takes. We are prepared to go along with you as far as you want to go and as fast as you want to go; but you represent, as we do, the ratepayers, the electors and the taxpayers of this province. We cannot do the things they want done without your help; you cannot do the things the people want done without our help. Therefore, anything we do, it seems to me, has to be done together.

"Therefore, I think the thing to do now is to give each organization, each one of the governing bodies here, an opportunity to say what steps they think we should take now to go on from where we are; to make any suggestions they have in mind as to the best method of proceeding from here on, in the light of the information which has been placed before us these past three or four days."

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Will the hon. Premier please tell me from what page he was reading?

**Premier Douglas:** — I was reading from page 74 on to page 77. Mr. Speaker, I think that states the Government's position very clearly and very fully. We have never made any secret of the fact that we think that some basic type of reorganization of boundaries, or reallocation of finances and responsibilities are absolutely essential, if we are going to strengthen the local governments, and thereby strengthen democracy in our province.

I know, of course, that the Liberal party, for a long time, have been continuing their campaign of trying to create fear — fear that the Government is going to do something, — fear that the Government is somehow or other going to 'slip something over' on the people.

**Mr. Gardiner (Melville):** —: You've done it before!

**Premier Douglas:** — They would like to make this a political issue. As a matter of fact, the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) urged us the other day — he said the next time we go to the



country let the Government make this a political issue.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I still challenge you to do it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, this is not a political issue. This is a problem of how we may help to strengthen local governments. We have taken the position that any fundamental reorganization in our system of local government can only be done with the support and the consent of the people concerned. Not only, first of all, because in a democracy we have to do that, but secondly because any type of reorganization would completely fail unless we had the active and enthusiastic support of the people concerned. No Legislature or group of people, simply by drawing lines on a map, can bring about reorganized local government unless the people themselves are enthusiastically behind the plan, see the value of the plan and are prepared to co-operate in its implementation.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — It's been done before.

**Premier Douglas:** — Now, the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) who introduced this resolution, of course has been carrying on this type of campaign, of appealing to people's fears — and the Regina 'Leader-Post' has a report of a meeting which he addressed at Lemberg under date of November 2, 1957, and he is credited with saying:

"Wilf Gardiner, M.L.A. warned those in attendance that the people in rural areas of Saskatchewan would have to take a strong stand in the next two or three years if they are to prevent the Government's indicated stand to centralize control of local affairs.

"He said that Professor Baker had stated in his report to the Government that the Government should take an autocratic position with regard to the county and not give the people a chance to vote to voice their wishes."

**Mr. Horsman (Wilkie):** — That's correct.

**Premier Douglas:** —

"The county system would be hoisted upon the people of the province in the next two or three years unless the Opposition, in the Legislature, had the enthusiastic support of the people in opposing any such step."

**Mr. Gardiner:** — We have it, too.

**March 13, 1958**

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I was very interested that he was taken to task, not by any member of the Government . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — By the C.C.F. paper.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . but by the editor of the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' which could not even for one optimistic moment be described as a C.C.F. organ. This is what the editor had to say, under date of November 8, 1957, in an editorial entitled 'Standing Alone'. He said:

"Mr. Wilfrid Gardiner, M.L.A. had stated his views against the public reckoning of a speech of his that had been incorrectly reported in the Regina 'Leader-Post'. He reportedly told a rural audience in the Lemberg district recently that the people in the rural areas of the province will have to take a strong stand in the next two or three years if they are to prevent the Provincial Government's indicated stand to centralize control of local affairs.

"The county system" he said, "would be hoisted upon the people in the next two years unless the Opposition in the Legislature has the enthusiastic support of the people in opposing any such step.

"With all due respect to Mr. Gardiner, the truth lies elsewhere than in his remarks. What is the record (I am still quoting, Mr. Speaker, from that story) — what is the record? Two questions: reorganization and boundaries of municipalities and the allocation of responsibilities and finance, are now before a Local Government Continuing Committee. This Committee grew out of last December's Local-Provincial Conference in Regina. At that convention Premier Douglas said, first, that if any local administration wanted the status quo, the government was prepared to carry on as at present. Secondly, the Provincial Government would not consent to the setting of a Continuing Committee without full representation of all local government groups.

"If any group failed to endorse the idea of sending these questions to the Continuing Committee, Mr. Douglas said the Committee would not be set up. This is hardly an autocratic position with regard to the county system, to borrow a

phrase which Mr. Gardiner reportedly applied to the Government's attitude.

"Furthermore in this Continuing Committee highest places have been given to local government representatives, Mayor McAskill of Saskatoon is General Chairman. Mr. T.W. Garland, S.A.R.M. President in Chairman of the sub-committee on reorganization and boundaries, about which Mr. Gardiner is apparently most concerned. Mr. A.B. Douglas of McTaggart, representing Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, is Chairman of the other sub-committee.

"If such facts do not of themselves prove the weakness of Mr. Gardiner's charge against the Government, the words of Mr. Garland can be added. Speaking to a district meeting of executive members of the S.A.R.M. here last June, Mr. Garland said:

"'We have been assured that the report of the Continuing Committee will not be forced down our necks'."

"Mr. Gardiner, says the editor, cuts a lonely figure standing against the rest."

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Eight hundred trustees.

**Premier Douglas:** — The member for Melville thereupon took to himself the task of setting the editor of the Saskatoon 'Star Phoenix' right in a letter to the editor published in the 'Star Phoenix', November 30, 1957. He said:

"My concern in making the statement I did resulted from the remarks of individuals who, in the last few weeks, should know what is taking place. You will also remember, as I do, the threat from the Premier that the Government was not prepared to sit around and wait for two or three or four years with regard to a general change in the municipal system.

"My warning was given because of the statement of two people well known in municipal and school affairs, to the effect that consideration was being given to the establishment of two experimental areas that if the Government thought were successful, the rest of the Province would be organized."

Mr. Speaker, this talk of my 'threat' with reference to setting up areas in the province was no threat at all! During the

course of the Conference it was suggested that we might leave the report; to give ample time for everyone to study it; because we were quite agreeable, I said, if a Committee was set up to giving it ample time, but we would want some definition of ample time. The Committee, when it was set up, would have to keep in mind that we have before us applications from at least two areas in the province would like to set up experimental units. I noticed the member from Melville, the other day, made some reference to these larger unit areas, and said that the Government had been out trying to get interest stirred up in these areas but that the people had turned them down. Well, Mr. Speaker, that of course is just not in accordance with the facts. We have not tried, to get any areas interested; on the contrary we have had two areas in the province most anxious to set up some form of county system or modified county system. They have been urging the Government to introduce enabling legislation which would permit them to be set up. I think members opposite know some of the people who have been concerned in that regard.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would say one person.

**Premier Douglas:** — More than one, but if my friend wants me to name them, I will be very glad to name the people who have been concerned about this matter. It is no secret, for instance, in the Rosthern area there have been discussions between the four rural municipalities, the towns, villages and the school districts on setting up a county system in that area. And they have felt that the Government was dragging its feet somewhat in not introducing enabling legislation to allow them to proceed.

We have taken the position that we would prefer to have this matter canvassed by the Continuing Committee on local governments, along with the general situation, and that is what we are doing. Now the position which the Government takes is first, that we ought to wait until we have the report of the Continuing Committee. If the Continuing Committee is able to agree on the matter of reorganization, if they are prepared to agree on what would be a suitable size for larger municipal units, if they are able to agree on whether or not this ought to take the form of coterminous boundaries with the administration handling the affairs of the school district, and another body handling the affairs of municipal matters; or if they decide to recommend the full county system with one elected body handling both school and municipal affairs and all the other affairs of local government, they will make a recommendation to us. And at that time they will also, I assume, make their recommendation as to how we shall proceed to implement whatever their proposal are. They will, I assume also, make their recommendations as to how we should ascertain the wishes of the ratepayers. When one talks about a vote, it is a very glib thing to talk about. Let us assume that in trying to set up a larger municipal unit on the basis of trading area it is necessary to cut through a municipality. It may be that two-thirds of the municipality will be going into one area, and one-third of the municipality into another area. Now, exactly how you are going to take a vote to ascertain what to do is not easy. The two-thirds

that is going into area A may vote in favour of it and the one-third that is going into area B may vote against it. Now, the third that votes against it certainly cannot control the actions of the two-thirds that voted in favour of it — so the one third sitting out by itself doesn't belong anywhere.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Just like the Time question.

**Premier Douglas:** — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Continuing Committee, as one of the questions under study are looking into what is the best method of the wishes of the ratepayers in this regard. I want to say that this is no compliment to the representatives of either the Association of Rural Municipalities, or the Trustees, or of the Urban Municipalities, and the other groups represented on the Continuing Committee, to think that when they make their representations their representations will not set out clearly the method by which the wishes of the ratepayers will be ascertained.

I, for one, am perfectly prepared to believe that the organizations represented on that Continuing Committee will be just as concerned about ascertaining the wishes of the people as will anybody in the Opposition or anywhere else in the province. I think the representatives of the S.A.R.M., the Trustees' and the Teachers' Federation and other organizations, will be most desirous of seeing that any plans or proposals they put before their own organizations contain within them provision for sounding out the public, finding out what they want to do and carrying out a program which has the wholehearted support of the people of that area, have been hearing a lot during this Session about being alive to the changing times. Mr. Speaker, here is an opportunity for the Liberal party to keep alive and realize the changing times. Here is a great task that faces this province and this Legislature, and that is the task of local governments in Saskatchewan. When you get municipal organizations that run all the way from five townships to 55 townships; when you see the duplication of boundaries; when you see the wide differentiation in assessments and recognize that some type of reorganization has to be undertaken, I believe that the men who are serving on the Continuing Committee on Local Government are endeavouring to do a conscientious job, and I think that we in this Legislature ought to be helping them to the very best of our ability. I think we ought to have sufficient confidence in them to believe when they bring down the report, they will be the last people to suggest that the Government should put in any plan without having in it a stated method for consulting the people, and ascertaining their wishes in this matter. To say they won't do that seems to me a serious vote of non-confidence in them, and a serious reflection upon them. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am prepared to consider their recommendations when they come in, believing that they will have such a provision.

Therefore, as far as the Government is concerned and as set out in this amendment, we say that first of all we should wait until the Continuing Committee has completed its work, until it has made a report. When its report is available it should be studied by the Government and by the members of the Legislature. I believe that the Committee will suggest how we should go about implementing their plans, and how we should consult with the people concerned. If it doesn't, I shall certainly say now, on behalf of the Government, we shall have to ask them to suggest how we go about consulting with the people, to make absolutely sure that the wishes of the people are ascertained, before any plans are implemented.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall support this amendment because I believe this amendment is a vote of confidence in the Continuing Committee on local government, and expresses our faith that the organizations who are represented on that Committee speak for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I didn't want to interrupt the Premier, but I would just like him to answer a question. You mentioned these two areas that were trying out this larger unit; you said one was Rosthern. Could you tell us where the other one is?

**Premier Douglas:** — No, Mr. Speaker. I didn't say they were trying it out. I said there had been consultations. There was consultation with another group in the north-eastern part of the province.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Could you us the area?

**Premier Douglas:** — In and around Spiritwood. There have also been some discussions from the west side of the province up around Eston and west of there. I think we have had at least three groups, but the groups we have done the most work on are the groups I mentioned, the Rosthern group and the group around Spiritwood.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two comments I would like to make on this resolution and on the amendment. I was interested in the history of the formation of the rural municipalities as outlined by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). He pointed out — and I think it is correct — that when the municipalities were set up they were established as creatures of the Legislature. Nothing existed prior to those days. The purpose behind that move, of course, was to get some manner of local control and local organization into large areas of the province. He pointed out that at that time, when the municipalities were thus set up, the people in

that particular area did not, have the right to vote. I think he is correct; I don't think it was ever submitted to a vote, but I think I should point out that in those days conditions were different. I know when our municipality was formed, away back in 1911, before my time, there were very few settlers in that area. They were far removed from each other; they were, far removed from the Provincial Government. What they wanted was some local organization through which they could assess themselves to construct roads and build schools and help themselves to formulate a program of self help. For that reason the municipality was set up, but it was asked by these people that the Department do something in that regard; and it is true they were set up with probably six to nine townships per municipality.

I think it is true to state, today, that there are great variations in the tax assessment of the municipalities, as the Minister pointed out. Some municipalities, today, are considerably larger than others. Some municipalities are in richer areas and when we look into the financial problem of the municipalities, today, I don't think there is anyone but what would agree that we must take a serious look at the problems that are facing the municipalities. If it is in the best interest to enlarge some municipalities then that case should be presented. I know our municipality was a small one and we it would be better if we amalgamated two and made one. We did this because we could proceed to purchase bigger machinery, construct better roads and have a larger tax base more revenues and thus operate better as a larger municipality. The councils held joint meetings, the ratepayers were invited to attend and it was a mutual consent of the people themselves that we amalgamate the municipalities. It has worked out remarkably well. But, there wasn't one who came to those people and said: "This is the boundary which we are drawing up." It was a move initiated at the local level, and consented to at the local level. The wishes of the local people were obtained and then we asked the Department to amalgamate the two municipalities.

When we speak, today, of the problem of municipal and school and local districts, we are considering the whole provincial problem. I think, today, that the School Trustees are vitally interested in reorganization. The municipal men are vitally interested. It is not a question as to whether we merely make some municipalities larger. It is a question beyond that, as I see it, of moving toward a basic reorganization of local government. I think, as the Premier rightfully pointed out, it is a move to get some economic base whereby these local governments, as so set up, would have some basis of taxation, better security and greater assistance in carrying out their responsibility.

Then you come to the question of the teachers' viewpoint regarding, the county system. If we should set up the county system we would take a large area that will incorporate several municipalities, two or more larger units and put them under the administration of one Board. Should that be done you come to the effect the teachers think

**March 13, 1958**

that system will have on them. They say: "We are not too much impressed by the county system. We are afraid that if you put it into the hands of municipal men, the schools will suffer as a result." I do not say that they are justified in that stand, but there is concern in the teaching profession in regard to that. Then they say: "We do not mind coterminous boundaries, if the larger unit is the same size with the same boundaries as the larger municipality; we do not object to that. They want a separate Board that will have the responsibility of raising the finances for education. They do not believe that they would receive just consideration if it is left in the hands of municipal men, because municipal men are basically concerned with construction of roads and transportation and the problems of the municipality; and therefore, they feel that education might suffer as a result.

In some of the county systems in Alberta that I have visited, that fear does not seem to be well founded. The schools are being looked after quite well under the county system.

Then you come to the question, not only of the position of the teachers, but the position of the trustees themselves. I do not see any reports coming out from Trustees' Conventions where they come out, wholeheartedly in support of the county system; and I do not see any reports coming out of Municipal Conventions that think that the county system would be the answer to the problems that we are faced with.

Now no doubt, as the Premier pointed out, these are grave problems that must be given a lot of study. I think the appointment of the Continuing Committee of Local Government to look into this matter with the Government and make a complete survey is in the right direction. I have no doubt in my mind that a good deal of hard, basic work is being done. There is no doubt in my mind that some reorganization is essential in this modern age. I do not think anyone will disagree too violently with that statement.

Nevertheless, there is apprehension in the province. You notice it in talking to teachers. You notice it in talking to trustees. You will notice it in talking to municipal men as well. There is apprehension as to what system of local government will eventually be set up. Thus you get into all of the pros and cons of the county system and the pros and cons of coterminous boundaries. Then you have trustees asking themselves: "What will be our position under this larger set-up? What will be our rights and our privileges in regard to education in this larger set-up?" These are natural questions that the people are asking. There is apprehension; let no one think otherwise. Not that the people are against forward moves; not that they are against reorganization, but there is a great deal of discussion about reorganization without the people knowing what particular steps will eventually be recommended. I think it is only right that the legislature should



at least be in a position to give the commitment of a vote to the people of the province. When the Continuing Committee makes its final report and it is submitted to the Legislature or to the Government, the Government will be guided by the recommendations of that report. Why can it not assure the people at this time that any arrangement that is made — and there will be a radical departure from the present set-up. I would think, because all indications are to that end — that before this radical departure is made local authorities will take the opportunity to make the ratepayers conversant with the change. I think that we can avoid a great deal of apprehension in the process if we can say this to the people; "It is not our policy to ram something down your throats; we believe this is good, therefore, we believe you should have it."

I do not think it is the intention of the Government, at this stage, to do so. But I do not see any reason why we cannot assure the people that these major steps that may be taken, which will have far-reaching consequences, which will, in, some instances, disturb the relationship in many areas — not only trading centres, as the Premier mentioned, but the relationship of the local schools, the relationship of the larger units and the relationship of the municipalities themselves — that these steps will not be taken without their consent. Surely we can say to these people: "We live in a democracy; we believe that the people are conversant with the problems that we face and we can trust their decision."

Every four years the Government goes to the people. It puts its fate in the hands of the electors, because they can intelligently vote on the issues of the day. Well surely then, we can carry this down into the basic reorganization of the municipalities, which affects every ratepayer in the province. We can say to him that we have confidence in his judgment and in his voting ability, and the choice will be his.

The Premier was very careful in stating this — that we will make no move unless he has the approval of local governing bodies. That's fine; but the approval of local governing bodies would be the approval of the executives of those bodies — not necessarily the rank and file.

**Premier Douglas:** — You shouldn't stop there. You have to finish the Sentence.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Without the approval of the local governing bodies — that is your statement, Mr. Premier, as I understood it.

**Premier Douglas:** — And the widespread support . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — And the widespread support —

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . of the general public.

**March 13, 1958**

**Mr. Gardiner (Melville):** — How are you going to do that without a vote?

**Mr. Cameron:** — How are you going to assess the widespread support of the general public unless you take the issues to them? And unless you give them the opportunity through a plebiscite or otherwise, how are they to express their approval or disapproval?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — There is nothing here that is going to tie our hands in any way — nothing whatever. The only thing that this Resolution asks and I will read it to you:

"That this Assembly recommend to the Provincial Government that, before any basic change is made in the organization of Municipal Government in Saskatchewan, a vote of the people concerned be taken."

The amendment strikes out all reference to the vote of the people concerned, and says this:

"That consideration be given to the report of the Continuing Committee on Local Government and that consultation be held with Local Government organizations regarding the best method of the wishes of the ratepayers."

Consultation will be held with local government organizations — that is the people you are going to consult regarding the wishes of their ratepayers. That is as far as you say you are to go.

There is only one way to ascertain the wishes of the ratepayers and that is to ask them to give an expression of what they want. The only way that can be done is in a vote. This was evident at the Trustees' Convention, the other day; and I am sure you will see it at the Municipal Convention coming up. You accuse us of playing politics with this — it is not a matter of politics. This Resolution was on the Order Paper, I think, two weeks ago — long before the Trustees' Convention came to the city. I noticed in the press that the Trustees' Convention has a similar resolution, asking that their executive submit any of these changes to the people concerned. I think they are right in demanding that.

So for us to circumvent that and say that we will not go along with giving a committee of the Legislature that we will submit it to a vote is certainly contrary to the wishes of the people. It is adding to the apprehension in the province, today, and many people I have spoken to say they would go with the idea of locking, into larger municipal units, even to the boundary or the county system, if they were assured that when the facts are placed before

them they would have a vote as to whether we will enter one or not. If we can give them that reassurance we can get far greater co-operation from the ratepayers in every area of the local governments, it will immensely aid rather than hinder us, in arriving at a basic set-up for these local governments.

That is why I am for the Resolution — because I think its effect is a reassurance to these people; they are the ones concerned. They are the ones that it is vitally going to affect in their very daily lives. They are the ones who should make the choice themselves, after all the facts are laid before them. I think it is sound. I think it is right. I think in all justice to the people we should do this. For that reason, I am going to vote against the amendment, and support the motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question just before he sits down.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does he not feel that if the local governing bodies are consulted, they will be as anxious as he and I are to consult these people by means of a plebiscite or anything else, to ascertain their wishes?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, Mr. Premier, I think they will. I think they will be vitally concerned. But as I said, there is apprehension, because after all, the step must be taken here in the Legislature. The final move must be made in the House by the Government. They make the recommendations. I am saying that, while they will make careful recommendations, and what they consider may be acceptable to the people, as you pointed out, there are many, many complications that won't be acceptable. Since you must make the decision as Government, I think that we should give assurance that a vote will be taken. That is all I am asking.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak once again in this debate, I would like first to correct one or two impressions on this important matter. I would like first to correct one or two impressions that have been left due particularly to the address of the Premier. In speaking, this afternoon, of course, over the air, he made reference as he said to his final address on page 74. Well, I have before me the words that I read in my previous address, on page 89, which must be later than those of page 74, where he made, and I believe it is born out by the words he used — I believe a threat to the people of that convention with regard to the question of time. They were exactly the same words that he read out of the newspaper clipping that I expressed to my people in my constituency not very long ago, and I want to take the opportunity now of once again reading those, along with other things that he said in these later pages,

**March 13, 1958**

pages 89 and 90 of the report.

I am going to repeat the lines which I read on the previous occasion, then add one or two more paragraphs that I did not read on that occasion, to show further the views of the Premier and what the views of this Government are that do leave in the minds of many people of this province the fear that was mentioned by the previous speaker; the fear that this Government will take the step I believe they are contemplating, whether it was said by the Premier or not, without recourse to a vote of the people of this province, and without giving the people the proper opportunity to express for themselves their desire with regard to the basic change in the set-up of our municipal system and our governmental system in this province. This is what I said in the previous address:

"Now, I don't know what is meant by 'ample time' and certainly I agree with Mr. Egnatoff that we have had 25 years, which is reasonable ample time. With the Royal Commission sitting on this question for four years, and we have had the report in our hands since October, 1955, and if those connected with local government haven't read it, that is their responsibility — not mine.

"Now, what do we mean by 'ample time'? I want to make it clear that the Government certainly cannot have its hands tied while some of the Committee, of which it is not even a member, proceeds to exercise what it considers 'ample time', because the process of reorganization is going on all the time. There are larger municipal units that have been set up. We have requested some other groups now to set up still more. We have some groups suggest that they would like to set up a Canada Council, or two or three in the province, and certainly the Government and the Legislature could not be asked, to refrain from acceding to these requests, during the period the Committee is looking into this matter."

Now, he goes on; (He was referring to the one Committee that was suggested) and he goes on in further reference to that type of Committee:

"Now, in pointing out these weaknesses, I am certainly not speaking against the four Associations concerned in setting up a Committee if they want to. That would be a fine thing for them to do, if they want to set up a Committee

to study any questions they want; to study the material from the Royal Commission, or any other material which we could give them. We would be glad to give it to them. There is nothing to prevent their doing that, but this specifically states, of course, that this Committee is going to start out, without any basic premise as to whether there is need for reorganization or not. So they are going to start exactly where the Royal Commission started in 1952."

Before proceeding to read the next paragraph, I would say this, that when I spoke on the last occasion, I read the Report of the Royal Commission, and then I read the report from Prof. Baker's address, in which he stated that at no time had the people in any of the discussions in the rural areas of this province suggested reorganization of local government in the individual meetings that were held with the people of this province. This was a dream of certain people on the Commission, or the Government of this province, and not of the people. It wasn't something that came out of this meeting with the people of this province by the Commission; it was something that was arrived at through other suggestions from other quarters.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question. Does he mean that there is no feeling in the province that there ought to be any reorganization — is that what he was saying?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — There definitely wasn't at that time. It was suggested by Prof. Baker. It was never mentioned.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does my hon. friend think there is no need for any reorganization?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I am not mentioning that. I am reading the statements of your Commission, and if you'll sit down and listen, then you'll know what you said.

"I want to say that if the four associations concerned want to set up such a Committee, we would certainly give them our full support, but I would not be optimistic of too early results."

(That is what he thinks of the real Commission set up by the rural people of this province to consider this matter of organization). The Commission head himself said that those people had not considered it, or hadn't asked for such a change at the time he met with them out at public hearings, but here he says he doesn't want to give them time now to consider this matter, because he would not be optimistic of

**March 13, 1958**

too early results. In other words, he doesn't feel that that the rural men in this province are in a position to sit down and consider these matters, and then make a decision.

"I would certainly not be prepared to commit the Government not to proceed with any reorganization in areas where ratepayers are asking for it, until such a report was submitted."

(A definite threat!)

"But the feeling of the Conference is that if there is to be a committee of the Associations with us, giving whatever technical assistance we can, then that, of course, will be your decision. And we will give you whatever help we can."

Then we find the other proposal — a committee on which the Government would have representation, represented by four individuals, as I understand it, on the Continuing Committee; the largest representation of any group in this province. The rural municipal men who are most closely aligned with the problem before us have three representatives, the Government have four, and I believe officials of the Government of this province also are in an advisory capacity, not only advising the Committee with regard to what was discovered by the Baker Commission, but I imagine also drawing up pretty well all the information that that Committee is going to discuss during the time it is sitting in this province. So not only have we a large group representing the Government of this province, Mr. Speaker, but we also have advisors who are hired by the Government of this province, giving the advice to this Committee as well.

So I am certain that when the Committee hands down its report, and I feel that the local organizations feel that the people of this province, when the Committee has handed down its report, should have the right to a say in whether or not the recommendations of that report are going to be accepted by the Government of this province, and made into law, because after all, all this Committee is going to do is to make recommendations to this Government.

I want to quote again from the address of the Premier:

"I would like to say, in the Committee that has been appointed — it may be too soon to expect, (that is, to expect the type of Committee that we have at the present time), but if we don't do it, I am sure that ultimately it will be done, and ultimately what has to be set up is a

Continuing Committee (this is speaking of the type of Committee we have at present), representing all the groups around this table, and that the delegates on it appointed to the organizations representing them around this table, appointed with full authority to proceed to draft plans on the major problems; one, the problem of the structure of local government, and two, the allocation of functions and financial responsibility and financial resources."

In other words, the Premier a few moments ago in his address, stated that this particular Committee was to tell them how this was to be done; what process was to be used to go to the people, but it does not mention that in the statement that the Premier made at that Conference, or in the reference. They are to recommend a possible change in the form of rural administration in this province, and secondly they were to recommend a change in financial allocation of monies as between the Provincial and municipal governments. Those are the two things that they are supposed to decide. No mention is made in that address or in the reference to the fact as to how this matter is to be brought before the people, and whether they are supposed to decide how the matter is going to be decided, in the final analysis.

I believe the Premier will agree that it will be the duty of the Government of this province to determine by what means, and by what way they are going to approach the people of this province. It would be up to the Government through the process of legislation to decide how that is going to be done and it will not be up to the Continuing Committee, as he made reference to in his address.

**Premier Douglas:** — It will be left to the legislature, in the final analysis.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — That's what I said — by legislation.

I would like to read to the members of this Assembly the motion which was passed this morning by 800 trustees, I believe, who attended a convention in this city. The majority of them are trustees of regions that have already been set up in administration with regard to the matter of schools in this province. I would think that if any group were going to take the stand that this type of organization should be set up immediately, at least from references from some people in this province — that if any group were going to take that stand, it would be the trustees of this province, but this morning this motion was presented to the trustees in convention:

**March 13, 1958**

"Whereas reorganizing local government is a very important issue and concerns all ratepayers, therefor be it resolved that before any area is formed into the modified or full county system, that the ratepayers in the area concerned be given a vote on the question."

This motion was passed unanimously, as far as could be seen at that convention this morning. I have no doubt whatsoever that when the municipal convention is held in this city next week, that even more so and more unanimously they will pass a motion exactly in the form that we moved it in this House some two weeks ago.

There was one other reference I would like to mention and that has to do with the attempt (and I call it an attempt) the Premier of the province made reference to certain statements I have made, and I am going to refer to a news item which appeared in 'The Leader-Post' following a discussion I had with the Saskatoon paper and others:

"The county system was a part of the recommendations of the Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. The three municipalities, along with the municipality of Warman have been exploring the possibility of establishing a larger administrative arrangement."

I might say here that this is one of the places in the province that the Premier said in his address here, and it has been said before, have been asking, as he suggests, for this form of reorganization to take place in their area. What do we find? The first statement is made by H.A. Baird, Reeve of Laird Municipality, north of Saskatoon:

"Practically 100 per cent voted against the county system in five meetings held on the subject."

Mr. E. Turner, Reeve of Duck Lake said three meetings had been called in his municipality to discuss the idea. "Ratepayers were overwhelmingly against any move for a change, particularly at present", he added. They quoted Rosthern officials as saying meetings called there showed a majority against such a move. Mr. Sam Carr, Secretary-Treasurer of Warman R.M., who was instrumental in an original movement to obtain some form or larger administration for the rural municipalities, denied the plan, still in the study stage, had been dealt a fatal blow by the reactions in the three municipalities. The three were interviewed in Saskatoon.



Here we find that the reactions of the voters in this area, or the people that were called together, were given an explanation — I imagine they were — I have no idea who was there to give them that explanation, but they must have been someone with information either given to them by the Government of this Province, or by the Royal Commission, or possibly by consultation with the Continuing Committee; I have no way of knowing. But they must have been supplied with information, and possibly even speakers, to go out and tell the people of this area about the county system or the change in the basic system in their particular area.

And what did the people say? I imagine there must have been many supporters of the Government across the way to sit in on those meetings, and even they, Mr. Speaker — if they were present, and I have no doubt they were — they were opposed to any basic change in the system of administration in their particular area. But still there are people that keep saying that the people of this area have requested a change in their form of administration, to set up, I suppose, some type of experimental unit to be put into effect with regard to our municipal set-up; to put into effect an experimental unit and then let the rest of the people decide afterwards whether they want to go into one. Or perhaps if the Government saw that it was successful, after a certain experimental stage, they might decide that the rest of the province should be put in, whether they wanted to be put in or not.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask how the Government could decide to do that?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Through your majority in the Legislature. After all, the Premier is not so inane as to suggest that the legislature of this Province is not controlled by the Party of which he is leader. If they so desire to put across the county system in this province; that unless we filibuster it up until the next election, there is very little chance of the Opposition seeing to it that the people of this province are protected, and that they are given the right to a vote if the Government are going to deny them that right.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What a chance!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that the Premier was good enough to read the editorial from the 'Saskatoon Star-Phoenix'. I am sure it is a very capable paper in this province. I don't read it very often; I never heard of the particular article being written until sometime later, and when I had, I wrote the letter that I was very pleased to write and I can say here, today that I am very proud at any time, as a representative of the people of my area, to stand up and discuss with

**March 13, 1958**

them any of the questions which have to do with the reorganization of municipal system; or any other question of government that might come before them. I am just going to make this as another quote from the letter that I wrote, and, that is:

" . . . the main point behind the argument of that particular paper was the fact that no member of this Legislature had the right to get up and say anything with regard to what was being studied by the Continuing Committee, and if the Premier of this province agrees with the editorial, as he was pleased to read it, if he agrees with the statement that every time a Commission is established in this province, that we as members should not take the opportunity and responsibility of speaking out with regard to matters concerning us here in this Legislature. If that is the attitude that he is going to take, according to the attitude of the 'Star-Phoenix', then I am afraid we have come to a very low ebb in the democratic system in this province of Saskatchewan."

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, he is trying now to transfer the statements from the editorial to me. The editorial nowhere said that a member cannot discuss something before a Commission or a Committee. This is just another one of those mental hallucinations . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I think if you study the editorial closely, you will see they have indicated they don't actually say it — but they mention in the editorial that this matter is before a Committee and that it should not be discussed around the country. Only yesterday, I was in the hall when the chairman of the Committee that has been established spoke, and I wasn't too proud of some of the statements that he made at that time again, more or less inferring that nobody in public life in this province has the right to discuss this matter — he said, bring it into politics. I don't believe a member of this Legislature, because he stands up and discusses a public problem in this province; that anyone, whether he is head of a committee; whether he is a civil servant, or whether he sits in this House, has the right — and I have had it said to me before by officials of the Government of this province at meetings in this province to get up and state that I am bringing politics into it, because I have a right to stand up and express my opinion with regard to it.

As long as I am a member of this Legislature I will take that right, no matter how many committees this Government appoints to go and speak with my people about the problems that are affecting them in the region and among the people that I represent. I am going to throw out the challenge here before this vote. Once again I'm going to throw out the challenge that, if the Premier of this province will take this matter to a vote of the people today — go to the country on this question, there won't hardly be a member of the present Government in this Province that would be returned to the other side of the House.

**Premier Douglas:** — Who wouldn't bring politics into it . . .!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you without saying any more, that I intend to vote against — I wasn't going to any more, Mr. Speaker, but I just want, to say one word in closing. I believe that politics is a very honourable profession, Mr. Speaker. I believe in the political principles that I follow, and that the members around me here follow on this side of the House. I hope that the Premier of this province believes in his, but I am certain that each one of us, and anyone in public life or close to public life, stands up and tries to insult those of us who are elected to represent our people with sneering references to politics, and bringing politics into public questions in this province; I would just like to know what we are here for, Mr. Speaker, if it isn't to discuss problems, whether they be political or otherwise; discuss problems whether we agree on them or not, and when people sneeringly refer to others in public life as daring to bring politics into a public issue, I am just going to say that any time I believe an issue is right, whether I am going to be accused of bringing politics into it or not, I am going to fight for what I believe, and I will continue to do that as long as I am a member of this Legislature.

I might say just in closing that, when you talk about bringing politics into public issues, here is the 'Trustees Magazine' with the biggest, C.C.F. ad I ever saw — the only political party advertising in the Trustees' magazine, and yet they will turn to us and say, "What are you doing, bringing politics into questions of this kind."

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be very pleased and very proud to vote against the amendment. This advertisement says:

"Teachers and students, as you go about your duties, you may be assured that the C.C.F. movement and, the C.C.F. Provincial Government has your interest in mind."

**March 13, 1958**

Teachers and students!

**Mr. McDonald:** — No Politics!

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — The Liberals can't say that, eh?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to vote against the amendment which refuses to the people of this province the right to know what course will be taken when this Committee hands down its decision to the recommendations of the Government of this province. I'm going to be very privileged to vote against that amendment this afternoon.

**Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, many well-known writers have been quoted, and at this point I think Shakespeare's words "Brevity is the soul of wit" would be quite fitting. Now, I am not speaking against reorganization of the municipal boundaries, or reorganization of local government. That is not what the motion calls for at all. The essence of this motion is regarding the procedure to follow before any changes are made, and so I will confine my remarks just to the motion itself.

One speaker did mention about the apprehension that is in Saskatchewan, regarding the question. I quite agree with him. In my area there has been considerable work done in regard to educating the people regarding this move. I think that is a good step to take. I know there have been very many meetings in my area with the ratepayers to acquaint the people with this proposed change, whatever that change will be. But I have in my hands here, a record of the votes that were taken and I would like to read these out. Five questions were given to the people in these meetings of the Laird municipality. No. 3 question was this: 'In view of this year's meetings and discussions on the county systems for municipalities, would you be in favour of such a move?' That was the question. One person said, "Yes" and 98 said "No" to this question. I would like to suggest that a real vigorous educational program has to be launched to acquaint the people of Saskatchewan with this proposed change. Definitely this is my stand — before any change is made, nothing short of a vote by the people be taken.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Elias:** — So, I cannot support the amendment, because it doesn't really promise the people a vote, and I will support the motion.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The debate is closed.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the main motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, you can't be speaking on the main motion. The amendment has not been passed yet. The hon. member could not have been speaking on the main motion.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I might say, on a point of order, that the Speaker asked whether I was speaking on both, as we do on both the amendment and the main motion in closing the debate, and I said I was.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought you were speaking on the amendment; I didn't know you were speaking on the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I understood the gentleman was speaking to the amendment.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, you asked when I stood up, whether I was speaking on the amendment or the main motion, and you made the announcement that when I rose to speak, that I was going to be the last speaker in the debate. I think for that reason, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I'm sorry the hon. member misunderstood me. I was at fault when I started to inform the Assembly that we were closing the debate, and I stopped in the middle of it . . .

**Opposition Members:** — That's all right. Go ahead, Ross, if you like.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on the amendment. Those of us who have lived in Saskatchewan for 30 or 40 years certainly appreciate a lecture from one who has been pretty closely associated with the old political machine in this province.

**Opposition Members:** — Get out of the gutter!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They cannot do anything without injecting politics . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**March 13, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They have never hesitated, Mr. Speaker, to use coercion and intimidation and bribery of whole communities, and he stands up and gives us a lecture on introducing politics . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Personal attack!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All questions are political in the proper sense of the word, but I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, this: that members of the Legislature should have opinions; should have opinions on a question, and it has been very noticeable that most of the hon. members opposite . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Order! Mr. Speaker, he's out of order!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . have no opinions on the questions of the county system of reorganization of municipalities at all. All they do is to raise all the difficulties, all the problems to run all the interference of which they are capable, and they are capable to quite a considerable extent in that line. I have never made any secret of my stand in this question, and with the development that has taken place here in this country in our province, in machinery, equipment, power, with the development in services required and desired by people, it is evident that the administrative machinery set up to suit an age that is gone, except for some of the relics sitting opposite, will not serve today — will not serve the purposes today. I make no bones about it; I take that stand. I think we need reorganization of municipalities.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's all you know about it!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — At the same time, I realize there is no use going ahead with reorganization of municipalities into a county system, or any other system, until the people generally, not necessarily 90 per cent or 80 per cent, but the people generally accept the idea that there is a possibility of an improvement. That is the heart of the statement made by the Premier.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, no, no, no.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . when they support the idea, and say to themselves, there is a chance — at least a chance that this might help the situation. As the member for Rosthern said (Mr. Elias), this motion is not really on the merit of the county system or the present municipality. But I did want to point out that my hon. friends opposite do all they can to prevent people from considering and looking at this problem on its merits.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's nonsense!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I'll go to any meeting with you, Brock, and discuss it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They have demonstrated that by the speeches they have made in this House and throughout this province. At the present time the whole question is being studied by the Continuing Committee, and it would be foolish to pass a motion now, while this matter is under study, saying that it shall be done that way, or it shall be done some other way.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're confusing the issue now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But the reason my hon. friends want to pass this first it is their usual . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — In the gutter again, Brock.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . program of sabotage, of trying to make political gain out of this thing — that's all. Those are the reasons why they take this stand.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Is this in order, Mr. Speaker?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment says, let us leave this until we get the report from that Continuing Committee. Let us consider it then. I could argue at some considerable length on the question of whether or not the people in a municipality are the final authority to determine the boundaries of the municipality. As an example, I might say there could be some part of the province of Saskatchewan that the rest of the people of the province did not like, but I don't think that by a vote of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, for example, the town of Lemberg, should be put out of the province of Saskatchewan. That wouldn't be fair! That is what they are suggesting here.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Don't go on . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . the people in an area can prohibit some of the people in that area from having the advantages of local government in its best form. That is what they suggest.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh, for goodness sakes!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — When you get that stupid, it's time you were out.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's ridiculous.

**March 13, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now that is also a revocation of the authority and responsibility of the Government and Legislature of this Province. It is not unusual to see these people wanting to get out of the responsibility as fast as they can.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — How about the time question?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — So, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly support the amendment, because I could not support the motion without the amendment at this time.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Now we get political!

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — I am very much surprised to hear a member of the Government, a Minister of the Crown, get up and abuse people, personally, individually and collectively. It is a sign of a very great weakness in his argument, if he cannot get up and refute the arguments that were put up on this side of the House without reverting to personal vilification and ridicule.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I take second place to no one in this province in my desire to do the best for the people in this province, and more especially the rural municipal people. I have some difficulty sitting here, and listening to a man tell those things to me personally and to us collectively. I don't think it is in the best interests of the decorum of this House. I don't think it is in the interests of democracy and he should be ashamed of himself. That is all I am going to say about that.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Sit down! Sit down!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I am not . . .

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Well, we knew you wouldn't be.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We have known the Minister's stand on this thing . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Who gave you the authority to tell anybody to sit down.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who gave you the authority? You haven't any more rights in this House than anybody else.



**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The member for Cannington has the floor.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, we have known the opinion of the hon. member who just sat down. We have known it since 1944. He doesn't need to get up here and tell me, or tell the municipal men, where he stands. He told us in 1945, just after he was elected. He said we were going into larger municipalities whether we liked it or not.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — And long as — sit down, sit down!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That statement is not correct. I did not tell the municipal people that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It is correct.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is not correct.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — As long as he was Minister of Municipal Affairs (and I sat in those conventions every year) he said, "Well, eventually you are going into larger municipalities." So he does not need to tell me or anybody else where he stands. We know that. But, the municipal people have also told him, 100 per cent, that they are not going into larger municipalities and the municipal people are the only people in this province, up to this time, that this Government has not been able to coerce or push around, or something else; and they still can't do it.

All we are asking in this amendment is that they carry out their promise — and I am speaking from memory now. When this Continuing Committee was set up, I remember quite distinctly that the gentleman who, at time was head of the Rural Municipal Association, said, "We will agree". This was after consultations. It wasn't his own private opinion; he consulted with the other members of his body, of his delegation, or whatever you want to call it. One of the stipulations he made before agreeing to serve on the Committee was that: "We go on to the Committee, but we do not commit ourselves to any form of reorganization." Now, that is one of the stipulations that he laid down. The other stipulation he laid down was that, after the Committee had reported, they have the opportunity to take it back to the municipal convention and have it ratified.

That is the history of the thing, and there is no doubt about it. But in the meantime, just the same as the other gentleman said, we have these voluntary fellows trying to set up

**March 13, 1958**

one, and the member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias) read the results. He read the results, and they picked out what, presumably, was the most favourable area.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Who picked it out?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Who picked it out? I didn't, I can assure you of that. Did you have anything to do with it?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — No, I didn't.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I didn't say you had. I said that I didn't, but somebody picked it out.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — You know who did.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — So what? So what? Who started the rumour about the one down in the other end of the Province? I didn't. It doesn't matter who set it up or anything else. The thing is this. It was in the paper (somebody read it out) here that they were attempting to set up an experimental one. Well, the municipal people and school people are very much concerned. After all, as you all know, I am in favour of the Larger School Units; but they shoved the Larger School Units down the throats of the people without a vote.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, my hon. friend surely knows that no Larger School Unit was set up without giving the people an opportunity to ask for a vote.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh, sit down!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who got the opportunity? Your Minister . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — All right, they had an impossible opportunity. It is all right for you to sit here in this House, but I happened to be out on the farm when this thing happened, and I want to tell you that while on the books, they had the opportunity, physically, it was an impossibility. It was set up in such a way that you couldn't beat it, because everyone on the voters' list, if they did not vote against it, they were counted for it. That is absolutely right! I think I know what I am talking about; and it was started up . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I must remind the hon. member that we are talking about municipal affairs, not schools.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — All right, I will. accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I got him off the track.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, we can easily get back on. You are off the track all the time.

**Premier Douglas:** — I don't have to be told to get back on.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — As far as municipal affairs are concerned, well, let's say your knowledge is limited. Let's keep polite, eh? Now, one of the speakers over there said something about the difference in assessments in our present rural municipalities. I admit, there is a difference.

I am going to make a comparison now with Large School Units, Mr. Speaker, because it is the only thing we can compare them with. The Larger School Units were set up to equalize the assessments, and they did it to a certain extent, locally; but there is a bigger difference, provincially, than there was in the smaller units. Our lowest assessed Larger Unit is somewhere around \$4 million; and the highest assessed Larger Unit around \$23 million — that is from memory. Well, all right. If you are going to set up your Larger Municipal Units you may even it out a little in local areas, but over the province you just can't change the province from the way the good Lord left it, and you are going to have, I think, just as big a difference.

There has been a lot of loose talk on this thing but the fact remains that the people who are most concerned should have the say. In your Committee, in your Conference Committee, and in all these things, the urban people no doubt have an interest in the financial end of this deal; and after all, this is a deal for reorganization and finances. It is a combined thing. The urban people no doubt have an interest in the financial end of it, and a real interest; but for the life of me, I cannot see how the mayor of some city should tell the people in my constituency, who are rural, what they should do for boundaries. I cannot see it. And that is exactly what you are doing.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It's an insult to every rural municipal man in the province.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — They are entitled to study the financial end, I will admit that; but they certainly are not entitled to make any decisions about boundaries.

**March 13, 1958**

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to larger units. I wasn't opposed to larger school units, and I am not opposed to this; but I am opposed to this Socialistic idea that somebody up higher knows better than we do; and it was mentioned all through the Baker Commission. It was mentioned every time that it came up — I don't know how many times; I have read it a great many times, but it said this: that the municipalities are the creature of, and responsible to, the Provincial Government, and if the Provincial Government sees fit, they should reorganize without a vote. I don't know how many times that occurred in the reports; but I have them all, and it occurred a great many times.

**Premier Douglas:** — It says Legislature, not the Provincial Government.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, all right, if you want to be technical. But we have sat in this Legislature long enough to know that that means the C.C.F. party at the moment, and it will as long as they are there.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We have been criticized for not making constructive criticism. Here is a constructive thing that is backed by all the rural people who are interested, and then you people say, "Well, because it was brought up by the Opposition you would destroy the motion and put in something altogether different." And I want to say to the rural men of this province (and there are a lot of them over on your side) that you are going against the people who elect you from the rural municipalities, because they voted 100 per cent, last year, against it, and I think they will do the same again this year.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask my hon. friend a question. Do I take it then, that he doesn't think the Government ought to consult with these local governing bodies?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Don't be ridiculous!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You certainly should! And you should allow them to vote on it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — And another thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

Since the Premier raised the question, I am going to repeat what I said the other day. You talk about taking the people into your confidence; you are too afraid to do it. In your last election there wasn't one paragraph in your program that said you were going to push the larger units. No speaker, to my knowledge, ever mentioned it from a platform, but you had not counted the ballots before you came out and said you were going to call a municipal conference, the main object of which was to put the municipalities into larger units. So you talk about consulting the people! That was your opportunity, but you didn't have the nerve to do it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I should give my hon. friend the information that almost at every meeting I addressed during the campaign, I said the Government was going to call a Provincial-Local Government Conference.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's right, but you didn't add the main purpose of which will be to put the municipalities into larger units.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but the members have become worried over it, and I don't think it is worth it. The need for some change, I think, is possibly very evident, and all we're arguing about is how we're going to bring that change about.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) a few moments ago, said he didn't think a vote of the people of the province would be too much of a solution; but this motion happens to read: "a vote of the people concerned be taken". I would gather that would be the people within that area. Personally, I don't know why a vote of the people within any specified area would interfere with the work of a Continuing Committee whatsoever. I think the Continuing Committee would bring in their report, and then through an education program, take it to the people of those areas. By so doing I believe that nothing else than a vote of those people interested should be the final say in regard to any change.

**Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words that I would like to say on this amendment. First of all, the question before us, and the question of the amendment, is not a question of whether we shall reorganize, or how we shall reorganize the municipal boundaries. Sometimes I was confused in listening to the speaker. At this point it

**March 13, 1958**

is absolutely of no interest to this House whether the hon. Minister of Mineral Affairs (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) is in favour, or what his stand is on the question of reorganization at all, as far as whether they should be reorganized, whether there, should be a county or coterminous boundary or anything else. The question is, should the people of this province have a vote on the question of basic reorganization, and that is the only question. No one has to be put on record at this point, or even have his or her mind made up, as to whether there should be any basic reorganization. If we do make up our minds at this point, and close them to anything else, we are certainly not doing the people of this province any service whatsoever, at least in my opinion.

Therefore, I think we should contain ourselves to the amendment that is before us, and I would like to draw the attention of the members of this House to the fact that, if they vote in favour of this amendment, they are voting to deny the people of Saskatchewan a vote on the question of basic reorganization unless this Government intends to wait until after the next provincial election and make this part of their little C.C.F. platform, and say they will be reorganized in such and such a way, and then ask the people "Are you voting for us or against us?" That could bring it to the people. But there is no other way, except by way of this motion. If you are voting for the amendment, you are voting for the people to be denied that vote, and I don't think that any type of sophistry or reasoning can deny that to the people who know about this motion, the people of Saskatchewan, who are interested in local Government.

I sat through the Conference. I was very happy that the Conference was called. I thought the Provincial-Rural Local Governing Bodies Conference was a wonderful thing. It was one that was advocated by our platform, and I know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) was very much in favour of it, and spoke on it many times. He thought it was something that was very necessary. But, Mr. Speaker, when we were talking about calling this Conference, it was for the purpose of examining the basic difficulties that our local governing bodies were experiencing, mostly in the question of finance. When I sat through it, it is very unfair to say that those people who were there, who represented the local governing bodies, were giving their consent to any type of reorganization, because they certainly were not. The briefs of the municipal people and their words were very much against any type of larger unit, whether it be county or coterminous reorganization. I was disappointed in that Conference. I was merely an observer, but I certainly felt the Conference was slanted unfairly in favour of Government views.

I can't put my fingers on what any Minister said to the effect that a county system was the only system or that a coterminous larger unit was the only system; but I certainly received that impression from that Conference, and I certainly received the impression that

this Government didn't think that the rural municipalities, as they are now constituted, were doing a good job on the local government level. That was my impression as an observer. Part of this impression, and part of this feeling of unfairness that I got, came from the fact that all the Government departments distributed nicely printed, and very nicely written-up booklets in a general way (in my opinion, at least) condemning the present set-up of local governments. The briefs of the other local governing bodies were not distributed to the observers at all. As a matter of fact, I spent about two hours trying to get a copy of the brief of the Urban Municipalities' organization. Now, that in itself, if this was going to be really and truly something more than a brain-washing, if it was really and truly going to be a Conference, was not fair. All the briefs should have been distributed and made available to all the observers, which is the only way anybody could truly judge.

Now, if this Government thinks that without taking a vote of the people of Saskatchewan they could truly assess whether the people are for a basic reorganization, I think that they are labouring under a terrific illusion. It was pointed out in this very House, just a few days ago, that this Government, and because of this Government, this Legislature does exactly what the C.C.F. convention tells it to do. The members of this House got up and said they were proud of the fact, and that the way they ran this Government was by doing what the C.C.F. Convention told them to do.

I give them all credit, for coming out and saying that, and believe that they were honest in their belief that that was exactly what they doing. But how can you possibly assess what local government wants, what all the people in the country want, by merely listening to your C.C.F. convention? It is not a fair criterion of opinion, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only fair way to know what our people do want is by a vote. I think, it should be after the Standing Committees submit their reports, and those reports have had a chance to be circulated. The Government can then go out and sell the report, sell their ideas, and propagandize everything they want to about those reports. They have that opportunity. All we are asking is a simple thing, a simple basic right: give the people of this province the right to vote on this issue.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak on the amendment, but in view of some of the remarks that were made, I would also like to make a few at this time. It appears to me that the principal reason that this motion appeared on the Order Paper is to leave the impression in the public minds that for some reason the Government was opposed to a plebiscite, but all that the amendment said is that there has been a Continuing Committee appointed, and that we are awaiting the report of that Continuing Committee.

**March 13, 1958**

The Premier has expressed his opinions at the Conference, and reiterated the same opinion here, that there would be no action taken unless the voice of the people was made known to the Government. We have a responsibility that the Continuing Committee be given at least an opportunity to report, in order that the Government may be advised as what form of action it should take.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite seem to take the attitude that somehow or other this Government wants to shove something down the necks of the people.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Nollet:** — I don't think there would be anyone any more reluctant than the Government at the present time, and in view of present circumstances, to shove anything down anyone's throat that is going to cost us many millions of dollars more. We're very much aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I dare say, too, Mr. Speaker, that we are just as much aware of the fact as they are — if this matter was put to a plebiscite anywhere in the province today, it would be turned down flat for the simple reason that the income of rural people is such that they cannot support any further improvements to rural services, much as we desire them.

The purpose of reorganization, Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, is merely to provide an organization that can give people better and improved rural services, and we're all conscious of the fact that it is going to cost more money. The hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Elias) whom I feel gave a very good contribution to the debate, and the hon. member from Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson) mentioned the larger units in the Province of Alberta. I believe he warned us that if we get into this larger unit, it is going to cost the Provincial Government, a whole lot more money. I believe he mentioned that in the province of Alberta, the government provides grants that amounted to, I think he said, 90 mills, but I was interested in the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the ratepayers were still left with some 55 to 60 mills to carry themselves. Those are the facts.

In view of this, is anyone going to be so ridiculous as to go out into the country and suggest that this Government is against a plebiscite, and is eager to put up all the additional money to make these reorganized units function, as they are intended to function, to improve services. It is useless to say, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has suggested, that the Government has said that municipal councils, as such, are a failure. That suggestion has never been made . . .

**Opposition Members:** — Oh, no!



**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . on the part of any member of the Government, or anyone on this side of the House, but we have, just as members opposite have, pointed out that the small units of Governments are not adequate to provide the kind of services people are demanding today, because we have moved ahead and there is an economic necessity that forces upon us this great problem of municipal councils, or anyone else. It is a problem that must be dealt with on the basis of a proper organization. We all recognize that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Better read your speeches, Toby!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — With reference to plebiscite, when I vote on this amendment, I am not saying that this Government is not against plebiscites at all. All we have said is that we are going to wait until we get the report of the Committee that is set up, and I think we must await that report.

Mr. Speaker, I will at, this time support the amendment and vote against the motion. I am not going to be put on the spot. The hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), I believe, thinks that politics is a kind of a 'free-for-all' — he has a right to do this but I am going to suggest to this House that one of the primary reasons that the motion has been moved is so that they could go out into the country and say, "This Government is against voting on this; they want to shove this down your throats, despite the fact it will cost millions of dollars more." I would suggest that the ratepayer at the lower level will take a good look at this whole question before we get into it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit a question? You said the reason we moved this motion is simply political, so that we could go out in the country and use it. Do you suggest that the School Trustees have the motive in mind? Do you suggest that the Rural Association have this same motive in mind?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I certainly don't, Mr. Speaker. But I know the mind of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). He can't ask a question in this House unless — regardless of that fact that he thinks he has a little halo around his head . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh, you're getting all steamed up, now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said he has no confidence in the local groups . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**March 13, 1958**

**Mr. McDonald:** — I would like to answer the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member for Wadena has a few words.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I have been asked a question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I was calling the hon. Premier to order at the time he was speaking, and he took his seat.

**Mr. McDonald:** — All right.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think much more needs to be said on the motion or the amendment. I think the ground has been fairly well covered. Some of the members opposite suggested that we could put it in our platform at the next election, if we want to get the 'feel' of the people. I agree that we could. At the same time I agree the same method is open to them. They can put in their platform that they are opposed to the reformation of municipalities.

**Mr. McDonald:** — But we never said that.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — They could put it in their platform that they are opposed to financial reorganization, or whatever shape or form they would like to bring it to the people. They can make it part of their platform and they can see whether the people will endorse it in their platform. They have their right to bring it to the people for a vote if they want to; so they can do it by their method, just as easy as we can. So I say they are free to bring it into their platform, if they wish to.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I promised the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) that I would read to him what he said. It is very brief. This is taken from his speech to the Municipal Convention, 1945. He said:

"On the question of a vote, I want to point out to you there was no vote taken when the present municipal boundaries were set up. Legislation is being prepared which will be introduced in the House, I believe, which will give the Minister power to endorse a map of the municipal boundaries."

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member did not read that quite right. I have it right here myself.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, I did, word for word.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Then it goes on: "How will we get this map?" On a point of privilege, because of the fact that he read a part of it, out of context, which gives a wrong impression. I want to read this:

"Legislation will also provide that when 100 electors in any of these designated areas by petition ask the Minister to set up that area of the municipality, then the Minister may have posters placed in that area giving the people a chance to discuss it, and if they want to give them a right to put in a petition by 100 electors for a vote — and they will get a vote if they want it."

**Mr. McDonald:** — I would like to point out, Mr. Minister, that the word is 'may'; it is not 'all'.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You're so far from the point, 'Hammy'.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

The question being put, on the proposed amendment, it was agreed to, on the following recorded division of 29 to 17:

### Yeas — 29

#### Messieurs

Douglas (Weyburn)	Brown (Last Mountain)	Willis (Elrose)
Brown (Bengough)	Howe	Berezowsky
Bentley	Douglas (Rosetown)	Neibrandt
McIntosh	Kuziak	Davies
Brockelbank	Williams	Meakes
Fines	Erb	Wood
Nollet	Johnson	Thorson
Cooper (Mrs.)	Dewhurst	Harrop
Gibson	Begrand	Thiessen
Sturdy	Stone	

### Nays — 17

#### Messieurs

McDonald	Loptson	Foley
Batten (Mrs.)	Coderre	Klein
McCarthy	Barrie	Weber
Horsman	Korchinski	Elias
Cameron	Gardiner	Nicholson
Danielson	McFarlane	

**March 13, 1958**

The debate continuing on the motion, as amended, it was, on motion of Mr. Coderre, adjourned.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.