

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session - Thirteenth Legislature
11th Day

Thursday, February 27, 1958

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

INSURANCE RATES

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I told the members of the House, yesterday, that I would like the opportunity of announcing the new insurance rates, today. I am sure that all hon. members will be very interested to know that in Saskatchewan this year there will be no overall increases. This is the only province in Canada that will not be having an increase in insurance rates. If hon. members have read my press statement they will know that rates are up by as much as 30 per cent in other provinces.

I am not, of course, speaking of package policy rates. I am speaking of the license rate — that is what we sometimes call the compulsory rate. Now, Mr. Speaker, we find that there is one group of vehicles which have not been paying their fair share of the rates. I refer to the newer model cars. We find, for example, that 9 per cent of all the vehicles are models 1956 and later; 21 per cent of the total claims are paid for these cars. They have only been paying 14 per cent of the premiums, yet we have been paying out 21 per cent of the claims so it is very obvious that this group have not been paying their fair share.

We found too, that the people at the very bottom — those who have been paying \$4 have been getting their insurance very cheaply, also; and especially with the increased coverage which we announced, yesterday, in connection with the amendments to The Automobile Insurance Act, where the total benefits will be increased still further; and the increased costs of administration; so it was decided to make two upward revisions in the rates. Those people who have been paying \$4 this year will pay \$5. Now there are 20,000 approximately, of these vehicles, so that means 20,000 people in the province will be required to pay \$1 additional.

We have another group of vehicles, making up a total of 20,000 also — the 1946, 1947, 1948's — the owners of these have been paying \$8; these will be reduced to \$5, so that there will be a reduction of 37 1/2 per cent for this 20,000 people. Now, if you take those two groups — the 40,000, you will find that 20,000 will pay \$1.00 more, while 20,000 will pay \$2 less; so there will be \$40,000 less go into the fund as the result of the payments by this 40,000 people.

February 27, 1958

The 1949 and 1950 models — these people have been paying \$16 and their premium will be reduced to \$12. There will be a reduction of 25 per cent for them; and there are, in this category, 30,000 vehicles. The 1951 and 1952 models — there are 35,000 owners of these vehicles; they have been paying \$16 and their premium will be reduced to \$15, or a reduction of \$1. The 1953 and 1954 operators have been paying \$15, \$20 and \$25, depending upon the wheel base; they will continue to pay the same. The 1955 and 1956 vehicles — 27,000 of them have been paying \$20, \$25 and \$30, and they will continue to pay the same.

Now we come to the owners of 1957 and 1958 vehicles, the ones with the wrap-around windshield, the long fins and a lot of chrome, the ones that have been so costly — they have been paying \$20, \$25, and \$30; their rates, next year go up by \$10, to \$30, \$35 and \$40. Now that means, Mr. Speaker, there will be 18,000 people paying an additional \$1; 15,000 will pay an additional \$10; there will be a total of 86,000 who will have reductions of amounts of \$1, \$3 or \$4; and there will be 65,000 who will have no change whatever, and there will be 15,000 who will be paying the additional \$10.

The total revenue anticipated is \$3,101,000, whereas if we had left the rates alone we would have received \$3,135,000, so there will actually be a reduction of about \$35,000 in the amount of premiums received.

Now, we come to the farm trucks. The experience here has been quite good also, excepting for these very new vehicles. What we propose there is to provide that the very new trucks will pay \$10 — that is, the owners of 1957 and later models will pay \$10, as against \$6 last year. The owners of the 1955 and 1956 models — and there are less than 3,000 of these, I might say, in the province — they will pay \$8 — an increase of \$2 over last year. The owners of the 1952 and 1953 and 1954 models, of which we have 23,000 in the province, will pay exactly the same; and the owners of 1951 models — and there are 10,000 of those — will be reduced from \$6 to \$4, and the 1950 and earlier models will all remain the same as last year, and there are 45,000 of these. They will still continue to pay \$4. So it will be these 1,000 farmers who have been able to buy the 1957 and 1958 models who will have an increase of \$4, whereas great majority all pay the same, or will have a reduction.

The total, I might say, of income will be almost identically the same as it was last year. The same is true of the commercial vehicles. I shall not give all the details because we have well over 100 classifications, but the overall income will be the same. There will be some reductions where the experience warrants it, and

some slight increases in the case of one or two classes, where it is warranted. But the total overall premium will be approximately the same as last year.

For further information, hon. members may listen to the radio or TV tonight, when we shall have something further to say on it.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit one question. I didn't get the figure for 1953-54, do you happen to have that?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, the 1953 and 1954 is the \$15, \$20 and \$25.

Mr. Cameron: — The number of vehicles.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Of the 53's and 54's there are 38,000.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to bring up a matter of personal privilege.

The other evening in an address before the House, after I was no longer in a position to reply, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) made certain statements with regard to myself because of an article that supposedly had appeared in a Vancouver paper.

Mr. Speaker, I have here with me the paper from which the Minister quoted. The quote that he placed before this House supposedly made by the hon. gentleman who has had a long history in the service of this province, was never made by him as anyone can see by the article that appears in this paper. There are only about three paragraphs that appear in this article that have quotation marks around them. All the rest is the opinion of the writer himself; and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, only this last summer on the date of the opening of the new highway in this province — the Trans-Canada highway in this province, the gentleman spoken of took up the matter with the gentleman opposite, the Provincial Treasurer, and he categorically denied, before witnesses, on that occasion of ever having made the statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a man who is in this House to rise up in his place and quote something which an individual had never said — that was said by a reporter, and leave the impression with the members of this House; and then condemn another member in this House because of that article, I say this is a shame on the Legislature of this province that a name of an individual who has no right to

February 27, 1958

protect himself should be brought in to a debate; and I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the protests from across the way . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — It is a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. It is a point of personal privilege because . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of personal privilege. The hon. member is now dealing with a matter of someone altogether outside of this House. This is not a matter of personal privilege, and the hon. member has no right to proceed.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, the remark was made about myself and it was relating to this particular article.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has stated what was said, and has raised an objection. He may not continue to make a speech.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I am not making a speech, except that after the suggestion by the Provincial Treasurer . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . that he would resign, I think he should be asked for his resignation by this House.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I want the opportunity of replying. This article appeared in the Vancouver 'Sun' on Friday, August 3rd, and it is headed "C.C.F. finished, says Liberal Gardiner" on the first page and there are a few paragraphs; and then on page two there is some more. Now it is quite true there are not quotation marks around everything, but I think all hon. members know that when they are giving a press interview there are not quotation marks around everything, but rather on the part which they start out with.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, on the occasion the hon. member referred to, when his father — when I mentioned this to him it was out on the steps when we were walking out of the building the day of the opening of the Trans-Canada highway. I said to Mr. Gardiner: "I am going to go out to the opening in my Cadillac down here"; and I referred to this car and pointed it out. He said: "What Cadillac is that?" I said, "You should know; you are the one

who told the Vancouver 'Sun' that I had two of them." He said, "What's this all about?" I told them that it was when he was out in Vancouver he had given an interview with the press, and had stated that I owned two Cadillac cars — a statement which was entirely false. Mr. Gardiner stated: "I don't remember being out in Vancouver; I don't remember talking to them." Well, he was quite right, and I was sorry that I didn't have the paper with me, because when I went back and looked at it, the other day, I see that this statement was made, not in Vancouver at all, but in Ottawa. It has a date-line of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point this out — this is in quotes:

"Today most of the people who used to say that are making \$10,000 a year, he said; I haven't heard them talking about the big shots for a long time."

"The Agriculture Minister wouldn't mention names, but he was thinking of men like Clarence Fines, Saskatchewan Provincial Treasurer."

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He was thinking out loud.

Hon. Mr. Fines: —

"When he joined the C.C.F. party, Mr. Fines was a school principal who drove an ancient car and lived in a modest home and wore a threadbare suit. Now Mr. Fines is reputed to be the wealthiest man in Saskatchewan. He owns a lavish home, two Cadillacs and more than a hundred suits of clothes, but the fundamental question as politics in Ottawa sees it is that the socialist basic ideas have been proven unsuccessful."

Then Mr. Gardiner goes on —

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh no, it isn't Mr. Gardiner at all. It is just a reporter's opinion of what is taking place in Ottawa.

Mr. Danielson: — Who is making a speech now?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the Minister commenced to read this article — I wasn't going to read the whole thing because it is definitely a statement

February 27, 1958

by the reporter, and anything else is a direct lie, which has already been denied by the Minister — a direct lie, Mr. Speaker, and I will not withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Withdraw! Withdraw!

Mr. Loptson: — Resign now.

Mr. Gardiner: — I will not withdraw at all.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — You are shown up for what you are.

Mr. Danielson: — Resign now.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . your old man.

Mr. Loptson: — Now, there's a another one!

Mr. McDonald: — You're a great example — the Attorney General of this province.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I think I should ask for a withdrawal of the statement by the Attorney General.

Mr. McDonald: — He should be ashamed of himself!

Mr. Cameron: — Shame! Shame!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to lay on the table an Order . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a direct apology by the hon. Attorney General for the statement that he has made in this House —

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — I demand an apology, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I heard no comment from the Attorney General.

Mr. McDonald: — Oh, Mr. Speaker —

Mr. Speaker: — There was too much noise in this Chamber to hear anything.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mrs. Cooper and the Premier heard it.

Mr. Loptson: — We all heard it over here.

Mr. Danielson: — They all heard it.

Mr. Cameron: — ‘You should know your old man’ were the words of the Attorney General.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I still want personal satisfaction on this matter, and I demand a retraction from the Attorney General, and the Provincial Treasurer for the statement that he made in . . .

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Shut up!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I can’t very well ask for the retraction of a statement of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. Loptson: — You very conveniently didn’t hear.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE

Moved by Mr. Dewhurst, seconded by Mr. Brown (Bengough):

“That, in view of the continuing deterioration of the agricultural industry, this Assembly urge the Government of Canada to call a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference which would include representatives of farm organizations, and that the Provincial Government, either at such Conference, or directly upon the Government of Canada, be requested to press adoption of policies for agriculture including:

- (a) Parity prices for all agricultural products, using deficiency payments where necessary;
- (b) a comprehensive system of forward pricing;
- (c) National Marketing Boards for major agricultural products;
- (d) a program of full employment to maintain the domestic market for agricultural products;
- (e) Sale of agricultural products by barter arrangements, or in the currencies of the importing nations;
- (f) a program of national crop insurance; and
- (g) a national credit program to meet the needs of agriculture.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to present the motion to the Legislature today, which appears on the Order Paper under my name, I feel it is one of the more important Resolutions that will be on the Order Paper during this Session.

I have sat in this House now for the past 12 or 13 years. Every year in this legislature, we have presented a resolution on agriculture, asking for a better deal for our Canadian farmers and the farmers' wives and families, the people who live on the land and earn their living by working close to the soil. We have consistently, as I mentioned, pressed for increased income for agriculture. But so far, year in-year out, our plans and appeals to the Federal Government appear to have fallen on deaf ears. We have had

little or no response to help agriculture. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the reverse is true.

Agriculture is continuing, year after year, on the overall picture, to be going down-hill; to be getting less in proportion to the other segments of society. Therefore, the position of agriculture, as reached today, is that we are having an agricultural depression, while the rest of Canada, until recent months, has been enjoying an industrial boom.

Now it isn't possible for a society of any country to continue to carry on and be a healthy nation, if one half of society is sick and the other half of society is prospering. No father in a household would see half of his children suffering from malnutrition. But, that is what has happened to our agricultural economy, within Canada. While other segments have gone forward, agriculture is being starved.

In this Legislature, we've not only brought in resolutions every year, but we have had committees set up to study the agricultural problems — to bring in recommendations — to impress on to the Federal authorities, the need, the urgent need for something being done for agriculture. In 1952, we set up a special committee on farm implements, to discuss and find out why the prices of implements were rising as they were, and yet farmers' prices were not rising. We have here, the report of that Special Select Committee and, as has been mentioned on previous occasions, while we had good co-operation from some of the implement companies, we had other companies that, because they were located outside of this province, the head office, and they were outside of provincial jurisdiction, we could not subpoena them to appear before our Committee. We could only request that they would do so. As I say, some companies co-operated with us, fully. Other companies flatly refused to either come and give the information, or to make their books available to chartered accountants, or to send other people, who could give the information.

That report showed quite clearly that the profiteering in the agricultural machinery industry was little short of scandalous. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that over the past ten years, the prices that the Saskatchewan farmers have paid for the farm implements, had those implements been able to be bought at the same price that they were at the end of the war years, when we had come through the years of price control, the amount of money saved, or the difference between the cost of the implements, then, and what we've paid since, the farmers of this province have paid more than enough in excessive cost of farm machinery, to pay all the educational taxes of this province.

February 27, 1958

That is why, today, Mr. Speaker, the little farmers find it very difficult to be able to pay their taxes. On a percentage basis, the cost of taxes on a farmer's farm today, as an overhead cost, is a lower percentage today, than it was seven or eight years ago. But due to the fact that other means beyond his control have taken away his purchasing power, he finds, today, that his taxes have gone up due to the increased cost of equipment and services for municipalities. The farmer finds today, that the money he has left over, to feed and clothe himself and wife, and family, and pay his taxes, just doesn't go 'round. In other words, I say it is not that the farmers' taxes are too high, but rather that his ability to pay is too low.

In 1956 we also set up a committee — Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income. That Committee did a lot of valuable work in the Legislature here, Mr. Speaker — a lot of good information is in that report. I will not take the time and trouble, at this time, to quote from that report, but I would recommend to anyone who is interested to see what Saskatchewan's Legislature has tried to do for agriculture, to read that report.

Also, the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life that has been set up in this province in the past, has published their findings, and it showed quite emphatically that agriculture is not getting a fair break in Canada today.

Today, we find that we have a huge surplus of grain piled up. Each year the surpluses are growing more and more; continuing to pile up more and more. In 1957 we had some 723 million bushels of wheat in stock and carried over in stock. That is a 25 per cent increase over the previous year. And in addition . . .

Mr. McDonald: — How much?

Mr. Dewhurst: — . . . to this 723 million bushels, which was carried in public storage, we had on the farm, a farm carry-over of 319 million bushels. But in 1956 it was only 204 million, so the farm carry-over from 1956 to 1957 had risen by 115 million bushels.

Mr. McDonald: — How much?

Mr. Dewhurst: — The ten-year average of carry-over from 1947 to 1956, this is carry-over on farms — was an average of 83 million bushels, so you can see we're well above the average carry-over now on farms. Saskatchewan alone had, at July 31, 229 million bushels of wheat stored on the farms, or 72 per cent of all the Canadian wheat held in stock on the farms. So that is why the Saskatchewan farmers today are finding it very difficult. They are carrying a larger share of Canada's wheat surplus and carry-over.

Now, speaking in Winnipeg last fall, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Hon. Gordon Churchill — he was delivering a speech in Winnipeg, September, 1957 — suggested that progressively over the years, our acreage devoted solely to the growing of wheat, should be appreciably reduced. What is the fact as to whether we have been reducing our wheat acreage or not? Well, I have checked the statistics, and I find that, in 1941, we had under cultivation in Saskatchewan, in round figures, 35.5 million acres. But by 1956 the total acreage under cultivation had increased, in round figures by 5 million acres, to 40.5 million acres. In 1952, out of that 40 1/2 million acres — or the greater portion of that in 1952, we have 16,600,000 acres seeded to wheat. By 1957, the total wheat acreage had been reduced down to 12.7 million acres, or a reduction of 23 per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have reduced progressively our acreage sown to wheat over the past five years, from 1952 to 1957 — a reduction of 23 per cent.

Mr. Churchill also proposed that greater emphasis should be on diversification — that is, the farmer should raise more stock. But what do we find when we analyze the statistics on stock? We find that, in 1952, the number of cattle marketed in Saskatchewan was a little over 261,000. By 1957 that figure had risen from 261,000 to 561,000 — an increase of 114 per cent. The farmers of Saskatchewan had more than doubled the number of stock they had marketed in the past five years — the number of cattle. This is an all-time high, of marketing of cattle for Saskatchewan. At the same time, they have not reduced the herds on the farm. From 1952 to 1957, the basic heads held on the farm had increased by 35.2 per cent. This is also an all-time high now, for basic herds held on the farm.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have been doing all we could, as farmers, to try and turn our production away from wheat production to livestock. A few years ago we exported to Britain alone, over 700 million pounds of pork. Today those markets have gone. If we had those markets today, Mr. Speaker, and had we continued to develop other markets, because there are many more millions of people throughout the earth, that are hungry for the want of foodstuffs —if we had just that one market alone to Britain, more than we have now, it would mean that a lot more farmers could diversify from grain production into further livestock production. While, as I have mentioned, the cattle have greatly increased, hogs have been somewhat on a general pattern, more or less of a level picture.

This being the case it means that something must be done for agriculture. The cost-price squeeze on the farmers has become one which the farmers find makes it impossible for them to continue to carry on. If we take a 12 foot, self-propelled Massey-Harris combine, in 1946, the price f.o.b. Regina was \$3,214. Now,

February 27, 1958

according to the last information it is over \$6,000 — an increase of over 87 per cent, and at the same time; the price of grain has been dropping. You can take the fourplow tractor, the Massey-Harris tractor — the same story is true. A tractor you could buy in 1946 for a little over \$1,800 today, costs you over \$3,200. In 1946 you could buy that tractor for a thousand bushels of wheat. But today that same tractor will take over 2,400 bushels of wheat — over twice as much — pretty nearly two and one half times as many bushels of wheat.

After all, wheat has been the gold standard of agriculture. As went wheat, so went the rest of our agricultural economy. It isn't the amount of bushels you produce, or the amount of grain you sell, which matters to the farmer; it is what you have left over after you have paid those expenses. The Saskatchewan farmer has been greatly penalized over the past few years, through the lack of an agricultural policy to market our products.

How does agriculture compare in income, with other segments of our economy? Taking the seven-year average, the past seven years, from 1951 to 1957 inclusive, we find that the agricultural income per person (this is the farm net income) which also does not only include the cash he gets, but includes the inventory on the farm too, Mr. Speaker — and the inventory on the farm does not help him to pay his obligations or to pay his taxes, or to buy facilities, including for his family, but the total working force on the farm, including the farmer, himself and the hired help, the total income for farm workers was \$2,894, on the seven-year average. But when you take 1957 by itself, we only average, \$1,824 per farm worker. In other words, this past year, our farm net income is down by over \$1,000 as to what it is over the past seven-year average. On the other hand, if we take the average for non-agricultural workers, that is, workers in other parts of our economy, all other workers included, we find that the seven-year average was \$4,493 and the 1957 statistic is higher than the seven-year average. It is \$4,768. In other words, other segments of our society are continuing to improve their condition, but agriculture is continuing to go down and down.

When we ask for a parity price, what do we mean by a parity price? In my opinion, what I mean when I talk about a parity price, I feel that agriculture should have its fair share of the national income. If you want to take any three, four, five or ten years of agriculture and average out that period, and say, "Well, this is a parity", to me, Mr. Speaker, that does not mean a parity. It just shows the average of how much we have been fleeced over the last few years. To get a true parity, we've got to relate what the farmers' income is, to the rest of Canada as a whole.

We can take our Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the gross productivity of Canada. We can see that it has been going up, year after year but the farmers' portion of it has been steadily slipping. If we are going to have a policy, as the gross national productivity goes up, so should the farmers' income go up, in proportion to the amount that he contributes to the gross national productivity. It should be worked out to have a true parity so that at the end of the year, the figures for the farm workers' income would be comparable with other segments of our economy.

I have here in my hand a clipping from 'The Leader-Post' of February 21, 1958 where the hon. Alvin Hamilton, speaking at a meeting in Grenfell, said that parity prices (he was speaking of the Federal Prices Stabilization Bill) would ruin the small farmer. I think for any Minister of the Crown at Ottawa to stand on his feet on any platform, whether it be in Saskatchewan, or any place else in Canada, and say to the small farmer that parity price would ruin them, I think it is a most ridiculous statement. According to the article, the way it reads here, Mr. Hamilton's conception of parity is average price — no relationship whatsoever to cost of production, or to other segments of our economy whatsoever. His conception of parity is to take the price the farmer has been paid over a period of years, divide it by the base number of years which have been set up, and that is parity. Then, under their Bill, they're only going to guarantee 80 per cent of that, which gives you 20 per cent less than what we have been receiving. The farmers know that we have not been receiving parity. The portion of the province where I come from is a portion of the province which does have small farm holdings, and I am sure the farmers of my area will be quite interested to know that the Federal Minister of Northern Affairs believes that to give them a parity price would ruin them. If that would ruin them, Mr. Speaker, the present conditions will not only ruin them — it will absolutely kill them.

We either have equality, or we don't, and in my opinion, a parity price for agriculture is just equality and fairness. There is no such thing as 75 per cent of equality. You either have equality or you don't have equality. You either have a standard of living comparable to the rest of Canada, or you don't. The only thing that will give that to agriculture is to see that by subsidy or deficiency payments, or other methods they may wish to devise, that the farmer maintains his fair share of the national income.

We are not attempting here to lay down the formula by which the Federal Government should bring in a parity price. They have the information. I am sure that some of the agricultural experts they have in the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, can give them all the statistical information they need. I am quite sure that a lot

February 27, 1958

of those agriculturists in the Department a have a lot of statistics ready for them, if they care to use them.

So I am moving, Mr. Speaker, and it is seconded by the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown), the motion which appears under my name on the Order Paper. I move this resolution and hope that we can impress upon the Federal Government the necessity of doing something to help Canada's basic industry — agriculture.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this resolution is certainly something that is not new to this House. As you will recall, on many previous occasions we have asked for such a Conference from the former Liberal Government, and now I do not hesitate at this time to second a resolution such as this, asking the present Government, or whatever government we may have after March 31st, to call such a Conference for the purpose of discussing the serious problems which face agriculture at the present time.

One thing I can feel assured of is that if we do have a C.C.F. Government after March 31st, such a Conference will be called immediately. But, based upon the experience that we have had with the former Liberal administration, if a Liberal government is elected, the hopes for such a Conference may dwindle; and based upon the experience we have had with the present administration who have failed to convene such a Conference for the purpose of discussing these problems, the hopes may not be so great. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House will join with me in hoping that after March 31st we will have a government such as the C.C.F. for the purpose of convening such a Conference.

Mr. McDonald: — God forbid!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The former Liberal administration at Ottawa did suggest to the people of Canada that it had an Agricultural Prices Support Act; that it had an Act which made it possible for the farmers to have it better than they ever had it in the history of the agricultural industry in Canada. They had on their statute books as I suggest the Agricultural Prices Support Act. I accused the Liberal Government, when it was in power three or four years ago — I accused them in this House, and certainly there has been nothing to change my opinion since that date — I accused them, either deliberately with malice intent, or else ignorance of their own Act, of deliberately undertaking to break their own Act.

In that Act there were certain principles set out which had they been implemented, would have given agriculture a better deal than it had received in the past. In that Act they set out certain

stipulations as to how prices support should be arrived at. They stated in their Act, in describing prices under paragraph (a) and (b) of sub-section No. 1:

“The board shall endeavour to insure adequate and stable returns for agriculture, by promoting orderly adjustment from war to peace conditions and shall endeavour to secure a fair relationship between the returns from agriculture, and those from other occupations.”

Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that that was written in legislative terms, no such action was ever taken — that is, to endeavour to maintain a fair relationship between people in agriculture and people in other occupations.

In addition to this, they wrote in legislative terms this clause:

“To pay to the producers of an agricultural product, directly, or through such agents as the Board may determine, the difference between the price subscribed by the Board and the average price actually received.”

I suggest that on no agricultural commodity, in spite of the continual decline of the price of agricultural commodities, was there any such action taken. At no time did they ever pay the prices prescribed by the Board direct to the producer.

Following the election of last June 20, we had a new Government in Ottawa, and they scrapped the whole Agricultural Prices Support Act and they brought in their own Act — the Agricultural Stabilization Act of 1958; and I think the kiss of death was placed upon this Act by the former Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. James G. Gardiner, when he stated in the House that it was no better than their Act, that they had previously.

If that opinion is true, as expressed by the former Minister of Agriculture, it is certainly the kiss of death because the former Agricultural Prices Support Act did nothing for the agricultural industry and if this does not do any more, it won't be worth paper it is printed on.

Mr. Gardiner: — Not this year!

Mr. Brown: — But we had a commitment; we had a commitment from the party that sits in the House at Ottawa, when they were asking for the support of the people of Canada. The commitment which they made to the people was that they would ensure the farmer a fair and just share of the national income by maintaining a flexible price support program to ensure an adequate parity for agricultural producers based upon a fair cost-price relationship. That was the commitment made to the people and they stated in the House that this Agricultural Stabilization Act, in itself, fulfills the commitment to the people which they made in that particular pledge.

I suggest there are several basic weaknesses in this Stabilization Act. It is true that it incorporates one or two principles that we in the C.C.F. have been advocating for years; that farm organizations have been advocating for years. It does incorporate to a degree, the principle of forward prices, insofar as it does set the price forward, but it can under this Act, set the price forward for one year, and it is mandatory for the main commodities for four years. But it does not set the forward prices to the extent that we desire or as we think is needed, in the agricultural industry, and that is to set forward prices far enough in advance to cover the production cycle. In the case of cattle for example, that would be three years.

It does do (it goes a little further than that, Mr. Speaker) — it does undertake to set up a base period of ten-year moving averages which was only accomplished in the Bill after a vicious fight by certain members in the House of Commons, particularly the C.C.F. group; for, in the original form, the moving base period was only to be three years and at present it is ten years.

With those two, and I suggest they are strictly minor improvements over the other Act, there remains the general basic weaknesses in this Act; and the main weakness in the Act is the fact as far as we are concerned, here in western Canada, that it does not apply to our main agricultural commodity and that is wheat. Under this Act there is no provision by which the Federal Government can undertake to support wheat or coarse grains grown in western Canada, at any price whatsoever. There is no assurance, with this Act on the statute books, that wheat cannot go down to \$1 a bushel, or that it cannot go down to 75 cents a bushel. We have got no assurance for our major agricultural commodity, at all.

As a matter of fact, they expressly exclude wheat and coarse grains grown in western Canada from this Bill. If this Bill has any value at all, I say it is primarily for eastern Canada, and not for western Canada.

There is another basic weakness in this Act, and something which I suggest could have been remedied by the Federal Government if they had had the interests of agriculture at heart. They have failed to incorporate in this Bill any reference to the parity principle. I do not undertake to attempt to define what should have been put in this Act, but I would be prepared to take the words of the Prime Minister himself, if he had put them in legislative terms. When speaking in the House of Commons in respect to this Bill — not speaking to the Bill, but rather, speaking in the Opposition:

“Parity prices are the dollars and cents prices that give to farm products the same buying or purchasing power that they had in a selected base period, when the prices received by and the prices paid by the farmers were regarded in good balance.”

I would be prepared to accept that, if he had been prepared to write it into legislative terms and place it upon the statute books of Canada, and made it mandatory upon the Government to undertake to maintain that parity relationship between the things which we buy and those things which we sell. But because it failed to implement that principle of parity, I say that it is a real basic weakness in the Act.

There is a third basic weakness in the Act, and that is the fact that they failed to indicate how they're going to undertake to pay, even, the price support, that they suggest might be implemented to this Act — how they are going to pay them to the producer. Are they going to pay them on a daily basis? Are they going to calculate them on a daily basis, or are they going to take them on an average basis throughout the year? I say that is important — that such a thing should be incorporated in this Bill, to give direction to the Board. For, if it is based upon an average price, Mr. Speaker, how do they hope to maintain the purchasing power of these units of produce, throughout the year.

If they follow the practice that was established by the previous Government of taking the products off the hands of the processors at the end of the year, at a given set price, they do not necessarily mean support price direct to the producer. Until such things are incorporated in legislative terms, Mr. Speaker, those three main things incorporated in a bill such as this, I can see that we have no security at all, as far as agriculture is concerned.

May I repeat those three basic things which I say have to be included in an agriculture bill, if it is going to bring stability to our industry. First, it should be applied to all agriculture and its products, including wheat and coarse grains. The argument that

February 27, 1958

is sometimes used that, by incorporating wheat, coarse grains under a Bill such as this, is that it would, in some way, have some effect upon the Canadian Wheat Board. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the reverse is true. In the S.F.U. they made a strong representation to the Federal Government, that wheat and coarse grains be incorporated in this Bill. I suggest Mr. Speaker that with wheat incorporated under a Bill such as this, there would be even a greater necessity for the Canadian Wheat Board than there is at the present time. The Wheat Board, with a prices support bill under it, could more effectively do the job which it is supposed to be doing, and that is, selling our wheat abroad on the markets of the world.

But, where do we now stand, as far as wheat is concerned? I quoted figures here in the House yesterday, which indicated that since 1948, the price of wheat, the price of other agricultural commodities, has steadily gone down. They have steadily gone down in some instances, even in the last seven or eight months. I suggest that, if the Federal Government of today had been sincere in the pledges which it made to the people of this province, and which it made to the people of Canada, that it could have, under the former Prices Support Act, done everything it can do, under its present Act. If it had been interested in placing a floor under our agricultural products; if it had been interested in placing an adequate floor, it could have done it just equally as well under the Agriculture Support Act, as they can under our present Act.

I suggest that the future for the agriculture industry, particularly in western Canada, is indeed dim if we are going to expect that this Bill will bring stability to our industry. I suggest, Mr. Speaker that we have seen this continual decline in our agricultural prices. Unless something is done, and done fast to stop this trend, as I stated in this House yesterday, agricultural industry faces a state of complete chaos and possibly utter bankruptcy. I don't think that is over-stating the case, Mr. Speaker. But I feel that such a conference must be called, primarily for the basis of creating the means and the technique, by which we can accomplish and bring stability to the agriculture industry, primarily through the medium of an adequate price structure.

There has certainly been sufficient study made of the situation. My hon. friend from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) referred to the study which a committee of this Legislature made two years ago, in respect to this very important problem. A committee which brought back a recommendation to this Legislature that said that, in arriving at a price for agriculture products, it should take into consideration the parity principle as enunciated in that report, and was briefly this:

“That we take a base period of normal marketings and of full employment — the most recent ten years of full employment and normal export markets, and on the basis of that, arrive at an adjusted price today, which would bear the same relationship to our farm costs and to our farm prices, as it did in that most recent ten year period.”

You will recall that yesterday, in this House, there was tabled a reply to a question, which outlined the parity prices that we arrived at at that committee, for the main agricultural products. You will have noted, Mr. Speaker, that they are considerably higher than those we are presently receiving today. I can use just one example, and that is wheat. We are receiving in 1957, approximately \$1.50 for our wheat. In that reply that was tabled in the House, yesterday, it was suggested that that commodity, on a parity price in 1956, be even higher today. But in 1956 it would be \$2.06, and allowing for a five per cent increase in farm costs, would bring the price up to approximately \$2.16. Yet we are asked to take \$1.50 for wheat, which, based upon this recent ten years of full employment and normal export marketings, should be \$2.16 a bushel.

Mr. Loptson: — You voted against \$2 wheat, last year.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, I voted against no such thing.

Mr. McDonald: — You sure did!

Mr. A.L.S. Brown: — I am suggesting . . .

Mr. McDonald: — He changed his mind.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown: — . . . that this new parity price should apply to all marketings of agricultural products. And, if my hon. friend is prepared to introduce a resolution, asking for \$2 a bushel for all wheat marketed by the farmers of Saskatchewan, he can rest assured that he will have my support, and the support of those on this side of the House.

Mr. McDonald: — He changed his mind.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown: — In addition to establishment of a price for our agricultural products, we feel that such a Conference could, in itself, make a valuable contribution to our Canadian economy, by setting policies other than those directly related to price.

February 27, 1958

We suggest, for instance, that national marketing boards be set up for all major agricultural products. We suggest that through this medium, we could put our products on the market in Canada, or on the markets of the world, in a much more orderly and effective manner, than we are presently doing. I think that the Canadian Wheat Board has shown to us, very clearly, that it is in the interests not only of the agricultural industry, but in the interest of Canada that we have a National Marketing Board, and that this same principle could be applied to our other major agricultural products.

We suggest also that in this day and age, when unemployment is increasing, that we are through this medium losing our domestic markets. The purchasing power of the working people in the Dominion of Canada is going down, and that will have a direct bearing upon the returns which the producers; of agricultural products will receive. Therefore, we say, Mr. Speaker, that such a conference should impress upon the Government of Canada the necessity of maintaining full employment throughout the Dominion of Canada — not only for the benefit of these working classes, but so that at the same time it could maintain the domestic market for our agricultural products.

Further, we go on to suggest that, in this day and age in which it seems that our markets for our agricultural products are declining on the world market, and it has certainly been true of wheat — the present Government has done little to improve the situation over that of the previous Government. Therefore, we say, Mr. Speaker, that the new avenues of approach must be taken, to see that these foodstuffs reach the markets of the world, and reach the hungry people of the world. We say this can be done through means such as barter agreements, or the acceptance of currency of the country with which we are dealing. It is true a limited amount of this is being done, but we suggest that it be expanded to the point where we can be assured that we will have our proper share of the world's markets, and we will have a world market for all those surplus foods which we produce here, in Canada.

Yesterday I referred to the desirability of a crop insurance program. I suggest that time could be well spent, at such a conference, in hammering out a crop insurance program for the Dominion of Canada — a comprehensive crop insurance program which will adequately meet the needs of the farmers, particularly in western Canada; a crop insurance scheme which will assure to all farmers that they will not face the conditions they faced in years such as 1937, and in other years in which we had crop failures.

I suggest that the desirability of such a Conference is greater even today than it was, possibly at any time in the past. I suggest too, Mr. Speaker, that we can lose no time in arriving at a solution to these problems which face us at the present time. I say it is not only in the interests of the agricultural producer, but it is in the interests of Canada as a whole that we have a prosperous agricultural industry, and that we have in that industry, people who are prepared to work together for the purpose of assuring that the agricultural industry does expand and does develop.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion, moved by the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). But, I second it with the hope that such a conference will be forthcoming and, that if such a conference is not forthcoming, that the Provincial Government itself make direct representation to the Federal Government, asking them to undertake such a program.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

Moved by Mr. Gardiner (Melville), seconded by Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):

“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 be taken.”

Mr. J.W Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the motion that I have the privilege to move this afternoon, I am pleased to say that we can get back to the responsibility of the members of this Provincial Legislature in the resolution that I am moving, dealing with a matter that can be dealt with by the members in this Legislature in action here, and that we will not have to send this resolution to some other government that today does not exist in Canada, and will not until after March 31st.

During the last few years, we have had a Royal Commission sitting discussing the problems of the people of this province. Following the conclusion of the writing of their report, we had a Conference in December, 1956, to consider the proposals set down by that Commission to the Government and the people of this province. This afternoon I

February 27, 1958

am going to spend a few moments reading back some of the proposals made by that Commission — some of the statements that were also made, in December of 1956.

First I would like to read the No. 1 Recommendation on the fundamental reorganization of the municipal system in the province of Saskatchewan; and this is the recommendation of the Royal Commission:

“That the reorganization of the present municipal system into the modified county, or the full county system, as defined in this report, be undertaken by the Government of Saskatchewan under the constitutional powers vested in it by the North America Act.”

When the group of Saskatchewan officials and residents met in December of 1956 in this Chamber, the Premier made an opening statement to that conference, during which he said this:

“The Government itself believes that some kind of basic reorganization, at least in the rural areas, is an essential and inevitable step in meeting the problems of local government today. I want to make it abundantly clear, however, 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.”

That was the statement that was made, as I said, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of that so-called ‘momentous’ Conference.

Now, what do we find, just before we went home, in the concluding statements made by the Premier of the province. His statement is to be found on page 89 of the Report of the proceedings of that Conference:

“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 reasonably ample time, with a 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.” (A fine statement!)

“Now what do we mean by ‘ample time’? I want to make it clear that the Government certainly can’t 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 requests from other groups now to set up still more. We have had some groups suggest that they would like to set up a tentative county, or two or three in the province, and certainly the Government and the Legislature could not be asked to refrain from acceding to those requests during the period that a committee is looking into this matter.”

So, at the beginning of the Conference we have a direct statement from the Premier of this province that they will not take any action in this regard unless they feel they have the wholehearted support of the people of this province. Then, when the conference is drawing to a close, he told the same people that he thought they were taking too long, and he was going to move whether or not he had the support of the people attending that Conference.

We find in the remarks of the head of the Royal Commission a statement with regard to the meetings that were held around this province, meetings held with the people of this province, asking their views on the problems confronting as at the present moment. Here is what we have from Mr. Baker himself, in regard to those meetings:

“The second point that I want to make is that with minor exceptions, the Commission devoted its attention to problems which were given the highest priority by farm people throughout Saskatchewan, and by their leaders and representatives at the provincial level.

“The problem of rural roads and local government was the second most frequently discussed topic in all briefs submitted to the Commission. It was exceeded only by problems associated with markets and prices. At the community level, however, the question of rural roads and local government was the one most frequently raised, and most frequently considered.

(Remember that: “at the community level” — the level of the people of this province!)

February 27, 1958

“Furthermore there were few, if any aspects discussed at this Conference which were not raised by farm families in their submissions. The most important exception to this statement has to do with the question of reorganization.”

Mr. Speaker, this is the report from the head of the Commission. He says that for the rural people of this province, the people themselves, the most important exception, the fact that they had not discussed these particular matters, was with regard to the question relating to the present motion that I am to move before this Assembly.

“On this point it was made quite clear . . .” (and I want the rural people of this province to realize that the Commission felt about the average person out in the country, and possibly the municipal men) “on this point it was made quite clear to the Commission (I don’t know who by) that sufficient information was not available for farm people to give considered judgments.”

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is a fine way to speak about the people of this province — that they had not been given sufficient information so that they could be in a position to say whether they wanted a county system or administration, or not.

So we find that, in spite of that, and in spite of the fact that the people themselves in these community gatherings have not raised the matter of reorganization of local government in this province, we have a Commission — I don’t know where they got the idea or the suggestion from it — they didn’t get it from the people; maybe they got it from themselves, and in another way we might indicate, perhaps in our own thinking, or feel that perhaps the suggestion came from other quarters, with regard to the principle of trying to enlarge the municipal system of this province into a county or partial county system.

Premier Douglas: — As long as it doesn’t . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, we come to the resolution itself, which is requesting that the matter of the reorganization be left to the people. I am going to refer to another occurrence in our history, not very far back — the development of the larger unit school system in this province, when the Government of this province, without giving the people an opportunity of a voice in the matter, placed into effect 15 larger school units in this province without any recourse through a vote of the people in the initial instance. Finally, this question was raised in the Legislature

of this province by the Opposition, and following the battle that took place here, the Opposition finally managed to have the Government write into the Act an amendment which would make possible a vote to be taken of the people in the area where the larger school unit was to be established. So I think that we are only asking for a provision that has been given with regard to the larger units already, but that I feel should be given without any exception; it should be given without any petitions, because the reorganization as suggested will be probably the greatest change in the Government's system of this province that has been made since 1905. I feel that we should give the people of this province a right to a say in the form of government that we are to have.

In closing, and moving this resolution, I would just like to say this, and that is, there was reference in one of the quotations I read from the address of the Premier in closing that conference with regard to certain people and organizations in this province, desiring to form units, county units, or whatever they might be and desiring to enlarge boundaries. Well, this experiment has been tried during the past year. The people of one section of the province had meetings held with their municipal officials, and others, I would imagine, and when those meetings were held and the report given, in every case the great majority of the people that attended those meetings and heard this system explained to them, (at least I imagine that is what the meetings were called for) opposed the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, with regard to reorganization of municipal government.

So I say here, today, that I feel I am on very good ground in moving the resolution I read to you a moment ago, seconded by the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). I do so move.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise to second the motion which has just been read and moved by the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner). As you all know, I have been very interested in municipal life all my life, and municipal problems, and I am really pleased to be able to second this motion.

I thought, when we left the House last session that a motion like this would not have been necessary, because we had the assurance of the Premier, at the Rural Municipal Convention, and in this House. I believe he is on record as having said that if the enlargement of municipalities did not meet with almost the unanimous opinion of municipal men concerned, and good support from the rest of the people of the province, that he would have nothing to do with reorganizing larger municipalities. But since that time I find there has been considerable agitation going on, as the member for Melville mentioned, to reorganize and set up some sort of larger municipality, despite the fact the Premier said it wouldn't be done.

February 27, 1958

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member where this took place. This seems news to me; where did this take place — this agitation in an attempt to set it up. Would you just tell the House.

Mr. Loptson: — It was in the papers.

Premier Douglas: — But where . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Go ahead . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — No, I'm not answering questions. I have only a few minutes' time. I'll talk to you afterwards about it.

Now, It's a rather peculiar thing that, after the last provincial election — we had an election not so long ago — nowhere in anything I saw in the printed propoganda of the C.C.F., or in their speeches, was the word 'larger municipal units' mentioned. They never had them in their ten-point program that you're all handling over there; there wasn't a word about it. There was never a word about it said on the platform, and yet, they had hardly finished counting the ballots before they had come out with an advertisement that we are going to call a municipal conference, the main objective of which will be to enlarge the municipal boundaries.

I would suggest to the Premier that, when he calls an election next time, that he takes people into his confidence and tells them that if they elect the C.C.F. Government, they are going to do everything in their power to put the municipalities into larger units, and if he does that, and I think he could honestly do it, from the submission all his Ministers made at the first Conference, because they all said, in effect, that the municipalities weren't any good, probably never were any good, and would have to be reorganized. I would suggest the Premier, next time he calls an election, takes the people into his confidence, tells him what they have in mind, and make it a political issue — let the people vote on it. I think possible if he did that, Mr. Speaker, he wouldn't return a single C.C.F. member from the rural areas.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy: — It's very evident . . .

Premier Douglas: — We've heard this before.

Mr. McCarthy: — It is very evident that the thinking over on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, is a long ways away from the people who live on the farms, municipal men who have the responsibility of running our municipalities. That was very evident

in the vote that we took at the municipal convention last spring, despite the fact that there was a lot of pressure put on. The delegates there, and a great many delegates, are ardent C.C.F.'ers but they voted almost unanimously that they did not want a thing to do with this larger administration at this time.

I would just like, for a moment to take up some of the things of the municipal conference of December 11 to 14th, 1956. I have a program here which, as I say, I attended that conference. I also attended the conference which was held last year, and the program is here. I think possibly the word 'conference' was probably a misnomer, and I'll tell you why. Here is the program. It was called Tuesday, December 11, and the first day was more or less greetings from different people. I have no objection to that; they are all interested. The next day was taken up largely by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) telling us what a mess our municipalities were in. They even had maps there, showing how the school districts were; he had our own municipality up as a horrible example. But those lines he had drawn across there were for school units. Who put it there? Not the local people. When the people came down to set up those units, we told them they were wrong; that they were altogether wrong in their boundaries, but they would not hear of it; they wouldn't hear of it, so most of those lines were put on there by this Government. They weren't put on by the municipal people, and if they're wrong (and I don't think there's any doubt they are wrong) the report of the convention by the Minister of Education (Mr. Lloyd) — I just want to read you what he said. It justifies the fact that we said they were wrong, when they were doing it. Here it is:

“Some larger unit boundaries now need adjusting, and some areas are too large for proper administration. No major adjustment can or should be made until the future municipal boundaries are determined.”

That justifies the point that we made that if you are to adjust municipal boundaries and do it satisfactorily, you've got to take the people who are going to use the facilities into your confidence.

Now, let's take a look at our municipal hospital set-up. That is a different set-up, because the people who are going to use the facilities were consulted and they, in consultation with the authorities of the Hospitalization Board, set up boundaries that were satisfactory largely to the people who were going to use them. I don't think anything should be done with that thing without the consultation of the people concerned. That is the reason why I am pleased to . . .

February 27, 1958

Now, to get back to this Conference. As I said, we had the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), who took the first day. Why our friend over here didn't take it (the Minister of Municipal Affairs) I don't know, but anyway, right on down the line, all the Ministers had the same thing — the municipalities weren't any good; they probably never were any good; they had lost their usefulness and the only thing that would bring them out of the hole was to reorganize their boundaries. Nothing was said about giving any more money to spend, or allotting more money. The whole thing was — reorganize their boundaries! Well, we went along, and I know the Baker Commission said repeatedly, and I think it was repeated by some of these Ministers (I cannot remember just which one) “that seeing the municipalities were creatures of the Provincial Government and responsible to the Provincial Government, that the Government should forthwith go ahead and change the boundary to what they thought they should be.”

Now, I am sorry that the Minister of Mineral Resources is not in his seat, because I believe he went a little further than that this summer. He even threatened a municipality up in the northern part of this province that if they didn't put a road where he wanted it, they would take 33 sections away from that municipality and give it to some other municipality. I don't dispute that they have that power, but I do say that a Minister of Mineral Resources should not resort to those tactics in order to get a road built where he thinks it should be built.

Now, we go on down to the Wednesday, when we had the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd). Remember, this was supposed to be a conference, but we had these people here telling us what we should do, and how it should be done! Right after that we had the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) — he told us what should be done, and how we should do it. Then we had the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley), and he told us what we should do and how we should do it. All through the thread of the thing was that the municipalities had outlived their usefulness, and should be put into larger municipalities.

Then we came down and we had the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) — he isn't in his seat either, by the way. But he told us all about what we should do. By the way, in one of those agricultural districts that was set up after his Government came into power, the lines were drawn so that they cut through a number of municipal boundaries, and the municipalities and the people living there didn't have anything to do with that, either.

Then we had — just remember, there was no discussion at this time — these were just the Ministers telling us what we were supposed to do. I don't know — it was more of a ‘brainwashing’ affair rather than a Conference!

Premier Douglas: — Nobody said anything about brain-washing.

Mr. McCarthy: — Then right after that we had our good friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh), and I want to say this about the Minister of Municipal Affairs, whether it was because he was continually brushing up against municipal men and one thing and another, he was careful not to tell them that they were no darn good. Then on Thursday (remember, this thing started on Tuesday) and all Wednesday, when we got this wonderful instruction. On Thursday we came down and had the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) give us the financial set-up. In his speech he said (from memory now) there was no use of pouring money into these municipalities until they were properly set up; they were no good, and they would have to reorganize and then he'd give us some money. Then we came down to Friday, and of course the Premier was Chairman, and he spoke every time. Then we have the man who was responsible for the Baker Commission, Prof. W. Baker, and he told us all about why he wrote the report, and what we should do — a little more instruction. Then there was a very short time for discussion at the bottom of this page, and that's about the proportion of the discussion there was to the whole Conference.

Mr. Speaker, I think, in all fairness— and I think all the municipal men and farm men over there would agree with me, that the best municipal government we can get; the measure should be not the largest we can get, but the smallest we can get that is economical to operate. I would be the last one, and I think: anybody on this side would be the last one, to say there is no room for some changes in our municipal set-up. I'm sure of that, and I just want to say this, that if there are some places — and I think there are some places where adjustment of municipal boundaries would be of a benefit to municipalities concerned, and they should be allowed to do so. They should be helped to do so, and I believe there are some of those cases but certainly no bunch of planners sitting in this office, or anywhere else, should come down into this municipality and say to them, "Here are your boundaries — accept them."

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCarthy: — There are in this province a number of municipalities that are less than nine townships in extent. The ordinary municipality has nine townships, but there are in this province municipalities of less than six townships in extent; I think there are 84 of them. I would not suggest — I have some of them in my own district; as long as they're getting along fine on less than nine why should anyone tell them — why should anyone disturb them? But, on the other hand, if they think they want to amalgamate, then certainly they should be assisted to do so. Then we have 158 municipalities with the standard nine townships; then we have 45 municipalities

February 27, 1958

with 10 to 15 townships, and we have nine rural municipalities that are 16 to 55 townships. Now, when anyone talks about a municipality, they naturally think of a nine-township; we have various sized municipalities, and from the reports we get the fact that these larger ones up in the north that have been set up — I forget the size of them, but I did have it here — the fact that we have some, they are not in any better financial position than the ones tributary to a similar assessment than the nine townships are. It is a lot of baloney; there's a lot of socialistic-idea-roar from the top.

I was at this first Conference we had. The people who sat around that table (I think I have a list, of them here) yes, official delegates; in the first conference official delegates were the Saskatchewan Government. They were very prominent. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities — well certainly those people were entitled to be there, because they are the people that are going to be shoved around, if they are shoved around. Then we have the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities. Well, if you are taking in the financial set-up, certainly the urban municipalities should be there, but if you talk the reorganization of putting rural municipalities into larger units, I fail to see why the Mayor of some of these cities should come down and say to the people down there in our country, "Well, you're no darn good; you've got to get into a bigger municipality."

Then we have the Saskatchewan School Trustees. Well, I think possibly they were entitled to be there because they do work very closely, and are very interested in municipal matters. Then we have the Health Regions. Well, that's similar, but not so closely associated, and they don't make near the expenditures of money. Then we have the General Hospitals of Saskatchewan. That wasn't too bad, and at the time, every municipality in the province had an invitation to send two representatives as observers. I think probably that wasn't too bad a set-up, but what do we find when they called the next one? I don't think they got along too well with that bunch; we found out they ran into a lot of opposition so when they called the next Conference, here are the people who sat on that Conference. I'm not objecting to any of them. They are all good organizations; there were 18 of them, and out of — including the six they added 12 to the originals, and for why I don't know, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of those people who sat there, while they are good organizations, were not fairly closely connected with rural municipal business, and I doubt if some of them have lived in a municipality for some considerable length of time. For that reason they aren't familiar with the conditions as they exist in the municipalities at the present time. But nevertheless, they were there and they were sitting at the Conference table, and they were the people who took part in that Conference.

It was a peculiar thing that the rural municipalities did not get an invitation to sit in as observers. That was a bad omission, but I don't know the reason. I probably have some thoughts of my own as to why it happened, but it did happen. We saw Ministers of the Government and Deputy Ministers, and almost every class of people there, and yet we were discussing a problem which is very vital to the rural men of this province, and they didn't have an official invitation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on on this thing all night, and I hope sometimes I will tell you some more about it, but for the moment I take much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could speak . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I have already asked the question.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out there is no reason why he cannot speak immediately after the Minister.

FOUNDATION PROGRAM FOR EDUCATION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate from Thursday, February 20, 1958, on the proposed motion of Mr. Cameron:

“That, recognizing the growing financial crisis in education facing local school officials and municipal bodies, this Assembly requests the Provincial Government to consider the advisability of the immediate establishment of a Foundation Program for Education in Saskatchewan.”

Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, when the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) moved the resolution before us last Thursday, he pointed out some of the main problems which must exercise the minds of all the people who are concerned about education in Saskatchewan and in Canada. I think that most members of this Assembly will agree with most of the things

February 27, 1958

he said about these problems. He pointed out that two-thirds of the people who enter grade VII in our schools do not finish high school; that of the seven per cent of our young people who enter university, only five per cent finish. I think the most disturbing fact of all which he pointed out was that one-half of the people between the ages of 15 and 19 years do not attend school of any kind.

He went on to point out the financial problems which face local government officials; he noted that there is a rising student population which is putting a pressure on classrooms and creating a more serious problem in the matter of shortage of teachers.

It might also be pointed out that there is not only a shortage of teachers in numbers, but in the quality of their training. The worst part of all of this is that not only is the student population rising, but the costs of providing education are rising even faster. So that when we look ahead in the matter of discharging our responsibility for education, we face the prospect of rising costs and rising taxes.

Now his resolution asks us, I think, to endorse two guiding principles with regard to providing education and financing educational services. I think the first is this: that the provincial government should assume a larger share of the educational costs in the province; that more money should be made available for education from provincial revenues. I think when he makes that point, we must all agree, and I don't think it's news that the Government of this province also agrees. If we look back at the Budget Address in the Session of last year, we notice on page 20 of the Provincial Treasurer, (Hon. Mr. Fines) after dealing with of the problems of change which beset the people of Saskatchewan, he said this:

“It is scarcely surprising that some real problems have emerged from these changes. First, there is the problem of education. We face both a growing school population and shifts in population, resulting not only in changes in school location, but also in the educational needs of the children themselves. We face technological and social changes which have created an urgent need for higher standards of education, which must be met at all levels of the school system.”

Further on, on page 21 the Provincial Treasurer said again, on behalf of the Government:

“The principal increase in the province's budget will be for education.”

In the next paragraph he said:

“Moreover for several reasons I think we can reasonably expect that education costs will continue to rise. The Government is therefore pledged to substantial further increases in school grants as revenues become available.”

And that pledge made in the last Session in the budget Address was repeated again this year in the Speech from the Throne.

I think the second principle which the resolution seeks to have us endorse is this: that the Provincial Government should guarantee that a certain minimum standard of education is provided in all parts of the province, and that, where local resources are inadequate to finance this minimum standard of service, then sufficient provincial revenue should be made available to do the job. I think in essence this is what the member from Maple Creek means when he speaks of a ‘foundation program’. He pointed out that a foundation program implies a guaranteed standard and quality of service. This, of course, is what the Provincial Government does when it sets the curricula of studies for the public and high schools, and when it has supervision over the matter of teacher certification; and it is setting the quality and the standard of service in our public and high schools in the province.

The member from Maple Creek pointed out too that, to provide a foundation program in the field of education today, you need not only adequate buildings which are properly maintained, but you need adequate transportation to move children from their homes, to the schools and back. This too, is taken into account in the grants which the Provincial Government makes available to local school units and local school boards.

I think it is quite obvious that the cost per pupil of providing this guaranteed minimum service will vary a great deal, depending upon conditions, particularly things like geography, and climate and perhaps most of all, depending upon the concentration of population.

It is also true that the ability to pay will vary from place to place and from locality to locality, in the province, depending mainly upon the degree of economic development. I think the Provincial Government must and does, take into account these two important factors, if it intends to equalize educational opportunities and to guarantee minimum standards of service. It takes into account the fact that costs per pupil vary from place to place and that the ability of local people to pay also varies from place to place.

Now, the proof of this being done can be found if you examine some of the financial reports of the Larger School Units.

February 27, 1958

Take a look at some of them, and you will see that the assistance received from the Provincial Government represents a very large proportion of their total outlay for education. In others it is a much smaller proportion, and I want to put on the record some of the figures from the financial reports of the most recent that are available. If you take the Larger School Unit of Gull Lake, we see that its assessment amounted to \$12.5 million. Its total payments for educational services amounted to \$321,155 and its total receipts in grants of all kinds from the Provincial Government amounted to \$77,713 or 24 per cent of its total outlay in providing educational services.

My own school unit — the Larger School Unit of Estevan, we see that it has an assessment of \$17.1 million. It spent just over \$618,000 for education; it received in grants \$183,684 or 30 per cent of its total outlay. In the Larger School Unit of Nipawin where the assessment is \$14.4 million, we see that the total payments were well in excess of \$700,000 and its total grants were very nearly \$300,000 amounting to about 40 per cent. In the larger school unit of Meadow Lake, where the assessment is away down, only \$6.5 million, but where they had to pay out \$571,000 for education, they have received in grants \$384,000 or over, which represented 67 per cent of total outlay for education services.

What is being done in practice bears out what the Government proclaims it should do when it sets forth its policy: take into account varying costs and varying abilities to pay, to try to guarantee to all young people in the province a certain minimum standard of education, and to equalize opportunities to attend schools.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find that the resolution asks us to follow a policy that is already established.

I want to come back to the matter of finances, because I was particularly interested in what the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) said about the fact that even if we reach the point where the Provincial Government carries 50 per cent of the cost of providing education in the province, it will not be enough.

I was particularly interested in what he said about the matter of federal aid for education, and his words were these:

“We believe that the principle of federal aid for education is a valid one.”

He went on to point out, of course, why it is valid: that more than just a local community benefits through the provision of educational services — the whole community, the nation benefits from educating our young people. So we can all agree that we need more money for

education to meet what is often called the crisis of rising costs and rising enrolment, and a desire to give more and better educational services to our young people.

We also agree that the federal treasury should make a contribution towards the providing of education services. In view of this, I want to move an amendment to the resolution, seconded by Mr. Willis (Elrose):

“That all the words after the words ‘municipal bodies’ be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

“and the Provincial Government, this Assembly favours the establishment of a more comprehensive Foundation Program for Education in Saskatchewan, and reaffirms its stand that the Federal Government, as well as the Provincial Government, should assume a greater share of the cost of such a Foundation Program.”

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

MOTION FOR RETURN

Moved by Mr. Gardiner, that an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return (No. 19) showing:

- (1) Number of final exam papers written in each subject in grade eleven and grade twelve in Saskatchewan schools from 1930-31 to 1956-57.
- (2) The numbers of failures in each individual subject in each of the above years in the above mentioned grades.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, prior to the school year 1951-52, the records of examination papers written and the results of these papers were not compiled in such a way as to make it possible to answer the question, without a very considerable amount of work. I may say that we have the information for each year since 1951-52. Prior to that time, for a number of years all that was done was to keep a record of

February 27, 1958

a certain selected sample, which was deemed to be representative of various kinds of schools in the province, and if one goes back a bit further than that, even that kind of a record is not available to us.

It will be possible, however to obtain the information for some of the years. It would be possible to obtain it for all of the years, as a matter of fact, if the work were thought to be worthwhile. But as an example, to get the information for the year 1929-30, it would be necessary to examine some 10,000 files and extract from those files the information as to the students who wrote certain papers and the results on those papers. I would, as a result then, move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Hon. Mr. Brown:

“That all words after the word “of” in part (1) be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

“candidates in each subject of Grade XI and Grade XII in Saskatchewan schools for the school years 1929-30, 1939-40, and 1951-52 to 1956-57 inclusive.”

This would give the information for the years 1929-30, 1939-40, and then all the years since 1951-55. Even with this limitation it would probably take us at least a month before the information can be made available. Part (2) of the question stands as on the Order Paper.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was agreed to.

The question being put on the main motion as amended, it was agreed to.

SECOND READING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate from Wednesday, February 26, 1958 on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Walker:

That Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend the Statute Law — be now read the second time.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned, I was pointing out the method in which the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) presented the Second Reading of the Bill, showing that I felt he was very hesitant and very doubtful about the effects, and was somewhat uncertain himself

as to whether or not this was the proper time or the proper Bill at this time. I went on to show that a year before, when this recommendation was brought in and voted on in the Legislature, the Attorney General was one of those who had voted against this recommendation, together with five or six of the Cabinet Ministers, and some of the others. Then I recalled some of the statements that had been made from time to time, both inside and outside the Committee, by other members of the Government. I traced the history of the time question! It had been in Committee, I think, for three successive years. We had a plebiscite on it, brought it back to another Committee in the fourth year, and the Committee brought in the recommendation which resulted in the presentation of this Bill. I think I pointed out at that time that the ballot was so constituted when the plebiscite was taken that there was utter confusion, and the Committee which sat and assessed the findings of the ballot became more confused than before. You find if you assess the ballot in one way, it gives a huge majority in favour of Central Standard Time. If you look at the other part of the ballot, it will give a huge majority for Mountain Standard Time, so there was nothing but utter confusion as a result of the ballot.

Then I asked what information has been made available to the members of the Government, that today they are prepared to sponsor a Bill and support an undertaking, which last year they were so bitterly opposed to. Now then, if they have some fresh information that has caused them to change their position, we haven't it on this side, and I think if the members of the Government have additional information they should not have hidden it from the people of the province. Since the Opposition has no additional information, the people of the province have no additional information.

So, I question then why we should think that the people of the province are any more out in their thinking in regard to time than they were when the plebiscite was taken, or why we are to assume that they are more prepared to accept this Bill today than they were last year. What has caused leading members of the Cabinet today (I presume, this is the Government Bill, and at least the members of the Cabinet are prepared to support it) — to change their opinion during the past year. I thought at least for once that my thinking was perhaps correct, when I had at least five of the Cabinet Ministers thinking as I did. Am I to judge that your thinking today is correct and mine is wrong? Or am I to leave you to change your opinion if you so see fit, but to stay by my own because I see no evidence today that this will bring a solution to the confusion of time, any more than it did last year. I question what some of these members are going to do, in view of what they said last year.

February 27, 1958

I mentioned the member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), and I mentioned the member from Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) . . .

Mr. Kramer: — . . .the member, from Shellbrook.

Mr. Cameron: — I haven't come to him yet. The member from Kinistino, I noticed where someone was kind enough to send this press clipping from, I think, the Melfort constituency, in which they congratulated the member from Kinistino for his vigorous stand on the subject last year, and they criticized the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Willis) for his stand because they were opposed to this particular Bill. Then I noticed in this morning's copy of 'The Leader-Post' that the member from Shellbrook and the Premier have received a petition from the C.C.F. Committee in the constituency of Shellbrook, pointing out that they are opposed to this Bill, and they are pointing out to their member from Shellbrook that, and I quote: "We expect when the Bill comes through that you will vote as so directed by your constituency." How is he going to vote on this Bill?

Premier Douglas: — Why should you worry about that?

Mr. Cameron: — What stand is he going to take?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Don't worry about that.

Mr. Cameron: — What stand is the member from Moose Jaw . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — He's on the wrong side . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, you were with me last year, too. How about the member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming) — I call him the senior member, but meaning the longest term. He put up a vigorous battle, too. He said, "I represent the labour in Moose Jaw and every time we go into the shops we have to set our watch. Every time we come out of the shops we have to change our watch. What are the labourers of Moose Jaw going to say if I should support such a recommendation as this." So I say you people, if you have any additional information that will throw any additional light on the matter, then it should have been presented to this Legislature, because we have no additional information over what we had last year. The best we are attempting to do in to bring in some compromising solution, some hesitant approach, not knowing the direction in which we are travelling, and not knowing whether it is going to be accepted or rejected by the people, and because of that, have put no teeth into the Bill at all. In this Bill, all that we're attempting to do is to change the time in regard to the Government institutions and the statutes of the province. That is all. And that is within

our jurisdiction, if we wish to do so. Therefore we are not asking you, the people of Saskatchewan, to submit to it at all. You may so if you wish, but if you don't care to, it's all right, too.

Premier Douglas: — Do you want us to put them in . . .

Mr. Cameron: — They can keep their time at whatever they wish, because there's no penalty involved if you don't submit to the time that is set.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member can move an amendment, and we'll sit in Committee and provide a penalty.

Mr. Cameron: — I can do many things.

Mr. Lopton: — There's a lot you won't do . . .

Mr. McDonald: — It's your job.

Mr. Cameron: — I can see confusion in the province; everybody carrying his own watch; everybody going by his own time, and meeting his neighbour on the street, and saying, "What time have you?" He says, "I have three o'clock; what time have you?" "I have four o'clock". Then he says, "Well I'm going by sun time." The other fellows says, "I'm going by C.C.F. time."

Mr. McDonald: — There won't be many of those!

Mr. Cameron: — They've done away with the idea of taking Greenwich time, and set up their own system of time, and as someone remarked the other day to me, in the room, the Attorney General reminded them of the moderate Joshua who had stopped the sun!

Mr. McDonald: — He's tall enough!

Mr. Cameron: — I want to say, in this connection that I see no reason for changing the stand I had last year, and I see no reason for the people in the western part of the province changing their stand, and I see no reason for the people in the eastern part of the province changing theirs. Resolutions coming into the C.C.F. members, who have the say in the Government; letters that are appearing in the press, letters which our boys are receiving daily over this time question, makes it evident to me that the question today is just as much a controversy as it was last year, and that nothing has been solved. Nothing will be solved by this Bill, and for that reason, because of the bungling — because of the lack of energy behind it, because of the hesitant manner in which it is introduced; because

of the apologetic approach to it, and because of the stand of the Ministers and the other members last year against it, I see no reason for changing it, and I will not support the motion.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I feel something like some of the members opposite last year, when they expressed their opinion with time changes in Saskatchewan. If the Government were to force this legislation through by their numbers in this House, I doubt very much if any of them would be down to my constituency to take part in the next election campaign. Do people not realize that in the eastern part of this province, at 4:30 in the afternoon on Central Standard Time, it is dark. If we're going to put them on Mountain Standard Time you'll have the children in darkness before they leave school. Surely to goodness we're not going to have one time for Government Departments in the province of Saskatchewan, and some other time for the rest of the people. Surely the Government is giving the lead to the people of Saskatchewan to ask of them to follow the lead as laid down in the Bill.

All of the representation that I have received from all parts of the province with regard to this legislation has asked us not to implement what this Bill calls for that we are now discussing. The only representation that I know on behalf of the Bill comes from the hon. member representing 'The Leader-Post', and I just wonder if 'The Leader-Post' are now subscribing to C.C.F. principles . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Who's that — you?

Mr. McDonald: — . . .and they are the only people — the editor of that paper is the only person that seems to be supporting the Government on this measure. I have a file of correspondence several inches thick, coming from people all the way from the Alberta boundary to the Manitoba boundary, asking this Legislature not to bring in this legislation, or not to pass it. Some people might say there was some indication in the plebiscite that we should change our time system. I defy anybody to come to any concrete ideas from the plebiscite that was carried on in this province. I think it was the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who asked in Committee who had designed the ballot, and we were told that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) must accept that responsibility. I venture to say that the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) himself, who was the sponsor of this time question — I venture to say that, he didn't even understand the ballot, let alone anybody else in Saskatchewan. There were literally thousands of spoiled ballots. Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, it proves to everyone that the people of this province didn't know what they were voting for, or didn't know how to vote, because the ballot was so confusing. I am convinced that

if we were to put a ballot before the people, asking yes or no on this question, that we would have the great bulk of the people of Saskatchewan voting against such a change, and especially, the people in rural Saskatchewan.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support second reading of the Bill.

Mr. L.N. Nicholson (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak for just a moment or two on this debate, I happen to be one of the unfortunate people of this province. I am a person who lives in an area where some of them want one, and some want the other. I asked this Government, who sat in Committee last winter, to make a final decision to prevent enmity and the hard feelings between the different groups of people in the same locality. That is very important, Mr. Speaker — not to the city of Regina or any other city, because they go on the time they desire, and if a farmer wants to get to town to do business, he abides by their time. However, that is not true about small towns in this province.

I said last year I knew of a town that was boycotted because they decided to go on fast time, and the farmer population did not want it. Every little town in the province is having trouble today keeping their heads above water, because it is common sense that the better our automobiles are, and the better our highways are, the more people drive right by their local merchant, and on into the cities to the shopping centres. They certainly cannot afford to be boycotted over such an insignificant thing as time. I sincerely ask this Government to make a decision — I would like to see some teeth in it — a decision whereby we either change time, or stay on one time, but to make a decision that is hard and fast throughout this province. I don't think in 12 months that you will ever hear it mentioned.

I know of another instance where the schools stay on Standard Time and the town goes on fast time. The kiddies come home for dinner at one o'clock. I know of another instance in my constituency where the mayor of the town went up and down the street, and talked to all the business men, and decided they would go on fast time, because one of the larger towns were. On Saturday night there was a notice on the screen of the theatre by the farmers of the area that they would be boycotted, if they did. The result was that the entire mayor and council resigned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and members of this Legislature, this is not really worth an argument, as far as I am concerned, but we, as a legislature must put something on the books of this province that would — in certain areas of the province where this time break

amounts to something — do something about it to prevent the enmity and the hard feelings that have happened in these areas. I shall support the motion, even though I don't like it, as it is. I would like to see some teeth in it, but I will have to support the motion.

Mr. John Thiessen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, that report would lead me to believe that the Shellbrook constituency reported to 'The Leader-Post', and that is not true. The report that appeared in 'The Leader-Post' this morning was written by a person in the town of Shellbrook, without the authority of the executive; without the authority of his zone committee. The person who wrote that article is not the secretary of that zone committee, nor the president. I spoke to six or seven different groups this past winter, and they said to me something like the gentlemen who just spoke ahead of me: "Give us one time, for God's sakes, so we know what we are doing when we go into town — either one way, or the other."

To tell you where I'm going to stand, I'm going to vote in favour of the recommendation as put down last year by the Committee.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, as one who has had some association with the time question, having been on the committee of the Urban Municipalities Association, where this matter was discussed several years ago, I thought I would say a word about it. I can recall, I think it is six years ago now, the question arose by resolution in a convention of the Urban Municipalities Association; and one of the "outright type" resolutions, if I may refer to it as that, came before the meeting at that time — a resolution of the type which would be directly opposed to some of the resolutions received on the time question from rural areas. I rose to speak against acting on the resolution at that time, suggesting that we contact the Rural Municipalities Association before any final action was taken by the Urban Association. This proposal was accepted, and a Committee was set up. I was made chairman of the Committee. Another member of the Committee was Mayor Harry Nicholson of Estevan. A third member was Overseer of a village whose name I do not now recall. We had a number of meetings on this question. We attempted to do the utmost to contact three rural representatives, but not with complete success.

We did find, however, that to recommend any one step would hardly meet all of the viewpoints that were held in the province. We did, however, come down to the same kind of recommendation — not precisely the same recommendation that is embodied in this Bill today. I think frankly it is a compromise between the outright views on either side. But it does do this, Mr. Speaker; I submit it does achieve a kind of uniformity, which is presently lacking, and I think it is a step

perhaps, towards a more final uniformity in the years ahead.

Speaking for my own constituency we have, of course, many railroad workers that would prefer the enactment of a law which would institute one standard time throughout the province — in every part of the province. However, I am bound to say that we have had several civic votes on this question, and due to a failure of a sufficient number of people to turn out at the polls to register opposition to fast time, fast time has been carried, time and time again in voting in Moose Jaw on this subject. So that even there, we have a substantial difference of opinion, and I submit that the difference of opinion is practically everywhere in the province.

I think by this Bill we will at least end the hodgepodge of local times; will end the principle of local option, and down to some basic principle of uniformity and standardization of time. I agree and admit that it is not perfect, and will not satisfy everyone, but I do think it will do something to stabilize the time question: that it is definitely a step in the right direction.

Mr. H. Begrand (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this Bill, I made my stand very clear on the matter last year, and am very sorry that in my mind this Bill does not clarify or improve the situation at all. My own recommendation last year, and it is the same this year, I have had no occasion to, or reason to have changed my mind — I think the merit of this ballot — the ballot taken in 1956, and the result of that balloting is not an indication of the time feeling of the people of Saskatchewan. It was an extremely confusing ballot, and I repeat what I said last year that a portion of eastern Saskatchewan, which is now on Central Standard Time should have been left out — leave them alone with their time. If a ballot had been taken only in the other part of Saskatchewan, Mountain Standard Time would have carried by an overwhelming majority. I think, we all agree to that.

However, the whole thing was so confused on this ballot, that is what the people I represent resent very much. I don't feel Mr. Speaker, that I have any authority by my vote to impose a different time on the people of the Central Time Zone. They have had that time for a long time; they are happy with it the year 'round, and I do not want to interfere with their wishes along that line. Neither do I want to interfere with the wishes of the majority of the people of the other portion of Saskatchewan west of them.

Therefore, I am going to oppose the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

February 27, 1958

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill was very well discussed in Committee last year, but simply to reiterate some of the things that were said then, I feel that I should make known at least the feeling of my own constituency, and particularly the feeling of the mothers in this entire province — not only in my constituency. I would just like to read a few lines from one of the very many letters I have received on the subject, and I think this is quite typical of the reaction of most mothers.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member take the responsibility for it?

Mrs. Batten: — Yes, I do.

“ . . .for as you know”, she says, “it is mighty hard to put children to bed when the sun is still high in the sky, and then to get them up again for school and at times for week-day masses when they have to leave one hour earlier.

“We have five children ranging from seven to one year, so we know . . .”(and then she says): “not to mention the chickens.”

Now, that is the case. I don't think there is a farmer's wife or a farmer in this province who does not realize that neither children nor chickens, nor cattle (nor any other being that hasn't had the privilege of listening to the speakers in this House) realize that, because the Attorney General wants the time changed, everybody should change their routine of living, and it is very difficult to explain to little children just why they have to go to bed one hour earlier, no matter what the clock says.

This proposed legislation, and I understand the Attorney General's reasoning when he says, “After all, you don't have to set your clocks ahead of time; you don't have to abide by it — you merely have to send your children, according to this Act, to school; you have to attend to all the other business offices according to the time as proposed in this Act.” Well, that may be fine, but the suggestion is that you can be out of step with the Government offices, and with the schools in this province, and still carry on any sort of a decent life, and it is impossible.

It is a very sad thing that, in this civilized age we are governed by our clocks and there is no purpose in a clock unless it coincide, at least more or less, with that of everybody else in the community and in the province, and unless there is some certainty as to time, it is simply impossible to go on living in a civilized society. As far as I can see there will be no certainty with this Act. There will just be confusion compounded and confounded.

I can see that the railway workers in Humboldt certainly will not be pleased with having to change their time twice a day during the summer months. It will be of absolutely no assistance to them, or their families, to have to try and live according to the time set by the railway company, and the time set by the Attorney General of this province in their off-hours. I can see that the farmers are certainly not going to get any satisfaction, and in fact, nothing but a great disturbance of routine twice a year, every year as long as this Act is in existence. Therefore I will oppose it.

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think there has been any new material injected in this discussion that has not already been said in the Committee on Municipal Law — a Committee which was augmented by the members of this House with the express purpose of giving representation from all parts of the province. I want to say that if we had met ten times the number of times we did meet, I don't think we would have satisfied the members of that Committee any more than we are going to satisfy the members of this House, today.

There was a lot of adverse criticism on the plebiscite which was taken, but I think it clearly pointed up where the trouble lay in this province; it was in an area pretty well in a line north and south approximately, through Regina; and another line north and south through the city of Saskatoon. In that area there was considerable confusion, inconvenience and it seemed as though something had to be done to settle that confusion. Daylight saving, I think, was first mooted in around the 1920's, if I remember correctly. The city of Saskatoon had several votes. At first I was violently opposed to daylight saving, being a railroad worker, having plenty of daylight hours — I was opposed to it. But, after a trial, I thought I could not be selfish to those people who work until six o'clock. A few extra daylight hours in the very short good summer months that we have in this province are very welcome. I don't think there was too much complaint, as long as the cities, and only the cities, went on daylight saving time. The confusion and the complaints, especially from those fanatics who are opposed to daylight saving, began to build up when the small towns — some of them adopted daylight saving, while others, for various reasons, did not do so.

I say, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the end of the world is going to come about if we pass this motion, today. I think we can possibly learn something if we give this Bill a trial; and for that reason, I am going to support this motion.

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, with regard to this question of time, I feel that I am just as concerned about the children of the province and the effect a change in time may have on them, as the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten), and I do not think her fears will be realized. I have lived under the same time, and brought my children up under that time, and they seemed to get along fine. The real problem with children, I contend, as far as bedtime is concerned, has nothing to do with the clock; children just don't like to go to bed when it is still daylight, and what the clock says isn't responsible for this problem.

If we are going to achieve any kind of uniformity where such a divergence of opinion exists, everyone will have to give some and take some; and as this seems to be the fairest way. I am prepared to support the motion.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to express the opposition of the people in my area to any changes in time. I had representations from the Larger School Unit Boards and local boards, and also from various ladies' organizations throughout the area, asking me to oppose this Bill when it came up in the Legislature. I personally, whether I live in the city or the country, have always been irritated by the idea that there is going to be a change in time. It was always an extra burden to carry in your mind — when is this time going to change — is it this Sunday or next Sunday, or when is it going to change?

Premier Douglas: — A terrible burden; you have no mind to be burdened.

Mr. Korchinski: — The Premier's mind — there isn't very much of it left to be burdened — so I think he should keep quiet while I am speaking.

It seems to me. Mr. Speaker, there are just certain people in the cities — not all the people, but just certain people in the cities who have tried to impose their will on the rest of the people in the province. They are trying to say that they like to have a few extra hours to play, or to work, in a day. Now, our legislation here will not change the length of the day or the sunshine. It will still be the same length, and if anyone wants to play, because of extra hours of daylight, well, he can get up and play in the morning just as well as afternoon. If anybody wants to work in his garden, I believe that the morning is a better time than after supper. There are actually just a few certain people who have been agitating for this idea, to have the cities have fast time.

I don't think you will find very many people in the rural areas who agree with it. They have been obliged to put up with it. They have been suffering so long with it they finally said, "Well, let them have their way. What can we do about it? We can't do anything about

it. They are going on fast time, and we will just have to put up with it.” But there is no natural reason for it. You cannot make the day longer by passing an Act. If anybody wants to play, he can play in the morning as well as in the afternoon. So I don’t think that we should give in to individuals in the cities, and just to suit them, pass a special Act.

I agree there is quite a bit of confusion, because some of the smaller places go on fast time in the summer and others do not. There is confusion there, because almost everybody knows that the cities go on fast time; but some of the smaller places do, too. I know that the school superintendents have difficulties; they quite often come across a place that is on fast time; and they might be late to visit the school. That happens quite often. They are not sure whether certain places are on fast or slow time; they have to write and ask; and that makes extra trouble in their work.

But, as far as the country points are concerned, I don’t think they should have fast time; and as the eastern part of the province is concerned, I have had some experience in that part, because I lived there; I was born in that part of Saskatchewan. It is just too bad that the Saskatchewan boundary is where it is; but at the same time, you cannot pass a law here and say that they must have Mountain Time right down to the eastern boundary of Saskatchewan, because there is no sense to it, and I am sure that those people up there will be quite irritated if you try to pass a law telling them to go on a different time than they are on now.

For these several reasons, I am going to oppose the Bill.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — I wasn’t going to get up and say anything about this question of time, but in my simple little way, I am going to try and explain some of the problems that are going to arise from it.

First, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Government in presenting this Bill, is showing utter disregard for the small local governments or communities in the province. I will show you simple cases, where small communities are going to be put in precarious, or somewhat difficult, position due to the actions of — well, I would be inclined to say, somewhat totalitarian type of government.

Mr. Lopton: — More dictation!

Mr. Coderre: — Now, insofar as probably my constituency is concerned, it doesn’t matter much whether we have one time, or the other, but I am concerned to this point, of the lives

of many of the citizens of my constituency; because the Government has decided to put Bill No. 27 and put no teeth in it, that does not enforce any community to go on that time if they don't want to — so what is going to happen? All right, let us look at this situation: There is a part of a community that is on fast time, and we will deal with the question on a particular case, say the beer parlours. We have a man who is sitting there having a few drinks and feeling pretty gay, up to the hour of 10 o'clock fast time. So the beer parlour closes, and he finds he is up against it; he would like to have another couple of drinks. He gets in his car and whizzes to the neighbouring town, which is 10 or 15 miles, to get himself a drink.

The same thing applies — again showing the utter disregard of this Government, insofar as the smaller communities are concerned; we have the question of the businesses. You have one small community that goes on fast time and the neighbouring community is not. You still have the community where the farmer (and, after all, the small community is concerned with the agricultural people, more so than anyone) — you find that there is sort of a natural dividing line between two small communities. Again you will find there will be opportunity for particular areas to take advantage of the fast time — or at least take advantage of not going on fast time, whereupon people can go to the neighbouring towns to shop, which is detrimental to one community as against the other.

For these reasons. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I cannot support the motion.

Mr. G Herman Danielson (Arm River): — I would like to say a few words on this, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder what the people in the east side of the province, the one-third of the province in the fast time zone would say if we, on this side, tried to put a Bill through the House which would force Mountain Standard Time on that portion in Central Time zone at the present time. There is only one-third of the province in that zone. This Government is now going to force that same time on 450 miles of the province, clear to the Alberta border. I would say this, if this Government would take a plebiscite and leave Saskatoon and Prince Albert, and all the cities of this province out of that vote, then you would see what the farmers think about your fast time being in force all over the province.

You would find out — they have never had that opportunity up to this time, and they could certainly let you know. I received a letter, the other day, Mr. Speaker, from Kindersley, and it says this: I'm only going to read one paragraph of it:

“In our town of Kindersley, the town council called for a vote on the time question, before the Provincial vote was taken. Out of 500 votes cast, 375 were for Mountain Standard Time, and only 125 were for Fast Time, or Central Standard Time.”

That came from Kindersley. I could read a lot of them here, Mr. Speaker, because I have them.

Mr. Speaker, this Government, as I said once before, is influenced and controlled by the urban centres of province . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Nuts!

Mr. Danielson: — I repeat again, today, that this is a scheme to force the wishes of the cities of this province on all the rural part of this province.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The cities don't care.

Mr. Danielson: — They don't care?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They don't care what time the farmers go on.

Mr. Danielson: — The junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) — she was against what she said here, a year or two ago, and I admire her courage to come out and say so. They have fast time, now, and why aren't they satisfied with arrangements as they are at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They are; the farmers were dissatisfied.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, you are a farmer; I imagine in the late spring you can see the farmers working the fields, probably up until 11:00 o'clock. Certainly you see that every day during harvest time . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Eleven o'clock fast time?

Mr. Danielson: — Now, you keep shouting — you keep your big mouth shut. Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? It means that the farm wife at home has to wait for her husband or hired help to come in for supper until eleven o'clock at night, and even later, if it is a dry night. Now then, what about the children? She has to get up the next morning and get the children off to school, one hour earlier, and probably she never gets to bed before midnight. Now, that 's all very well for these gentlemen here who think they know everything. They are wise in the ways of the world, but they don't know anything about farming.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — This group over here have never done anything of benefit to the farmers. They have done everything they could to make it more difficult, and more awkward to operate a farm, and that is what they are doing now. Why not be generous with

February 27, 1958

the two-thirds of the province, instead of trying to force them to operate on a time they don't want, why don't you force Mountain Standard Time on the east part of the province, then you would only be troubling one-third of the province, instead of two-thirds. But you are going to do exactly the opposite, and force the time of the one-third of the province on to the rest of the province — the two-thirds which is at least 450 miles, to the Alberta border. That is what you are doing. That is exactly what you are doing. And there isn't a farm member in this House that doesn't know — even if he sits over there. I know something about the people's wishes in this regard, and how it is for the farmers.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — So do we.

Mr. Danielson: — You don't know a thing about it. You have been hobnobbing in your plush office in Regina too long. That is what you do. I would advise these wise men who sit on the front benches in this House to take some of their big motor cars that the Government of this Province furnishes for them, and go out in the country and talk to the farmers and their wives.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I am going tomorrow.

Mr. Danielson: — Get down to the grass roots — the grass roots feeling of the people; and don't listen to your Labour Unions and to your office workers, and all these fellows that sit in the city. They have that privilege now; let them continue that privilege. You have a holiday on Monday, you have a holiday on Wednesday — and by the way, Mr. Speaker, it is probably a good thing that there are mail order houses in this province to take care of the farmers' needs; they did a much larger business, last year, that they ever did before.

You can cater all you like to your few friends; and by the way, there is one reason — after the next election this Government will be composed of probably about 17 members from the urban centres of this province. This Government is looking out for these people and they are nothing but satellites for the urban centres of this province. Go back and check on all your legislation through the last 14 years and you will find that is so.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the Bill.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — To the hon. member who has just taken his seat, I appreciate that there a time when he was exceptionally close to the soil and operated a very substantial and a very fine farm. But he is now among those who reside in an urban centre . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, oh! Shame on you! Shame on you!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — City slicker!

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — The only reason that I rose at this time, Mr. Speaker, is to remind the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) whom I think inferred that certain persons in the cities were attempting to impose their will upon all of the people of the province of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Outside the cities.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Now, in order to keep the record straight of the ten cities, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan, eight of them operate on other than Mountain Standard Time — some the year around, some during the summer months. There is a total of 224 urban centres out of 486 that operate on other than Mountain Standard time.

Mr. Danielson: — In the east part of the province.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Of that number, 96 are outside of what we sometimes refer to as the Central Time Zone. This, then, is not confined to the wishes of the people in the cities. May I again repeat that eight of the 10 cities operate on other than Mountain Standard time; 126 towns in the province operate on other than Mountain Standard time; and 94 villages operate on other than Mountain Standard Time. So, if we just keep that mind when we are trying to consider ways and means of bringing about a measure of uniformity in time throughout the province of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. McDonald: — There's no connection.

Mr. Danielson: — No connection whatever.

Mr. McDonald: — You've been dreaming.

Mr. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to take part in this debate, but when I listened to my friends across the way weeping those large tears for the farmers; and as I counted them there was only one farmer and he is a retired one; who has any particular interest in the farmers.

February 27, 1958

Speaking of the grass roots, Mr. Speaker, I think that I feel closer to the grass roots in my constituency than my good friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

Mr. McDonald: — Which one?

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — I want to point out that having been a farmer . . .

Mr. McDonald: — He said he didn't know a farmer when he saw one.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — . . .having been a farmer, I want to point out that in the summer time my clock went ahead an hour, and that was true of a good many farmers in my area; and it is very true right now. True, I came from an area where we use Mountain Standard Time, and I think the people would have been very glad to have Mountain Standard time all the year around; but they are much more interested, Mr. Speaker, in getting a time that will be uniform over this entire province. I have talked to farmers and I have said: "What is your big grouse today, regarding this time?" They said, "Our trouble is that if we have a breakdown at five o'clock and phone Saskatoon for repairs, everything is closed in there."

Mr. Danielson: — That's right.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — They said, "Give us one time, so we will know where we are at and we will be happy." So I want to say, when I make that statement that I am speaking for the majority of the farmers in my area, and I think I can safely say that will be for the majority of the farmers in Saskatchewan. They want a uniform time so there will be no confusion. As was pointed out by the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Weber), there is a great deal of difficulty — I am sorry, the member for Nipawin (Mr. Nicholson).

Mr. McDonald: — You're mixed up.

Mr. Korchinski: — It's later than you think!

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — . . . and a great deal of confusion; and that kind of thing will be done away with. As far as the children being affected, do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that there is only a half hour difference from the time the sun rises in the eastern part of Saskatchewan, until it rises in the west side?

Mr. Gardiner: — That's not correct.

Mr. Danielson: — Where did you come from?

Mr. Gardiner: — You dreamed that.

Mr. Isaak Elias (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this time question. I notice the time is almost running out. The easiest thing in the world is to oppose and criticize, and I think one lesson we all have to learn, to contribute to the happiness of a community, is to give and take.

I find myself in the same predicament, I think, as the Government does. We cannot please everyone in this matter. I tried, during the last year, to try to find out from my constituents just what their wish was in regard to this matter. I did so by speaking to individuals, by speaking to secretaries, and to groups, and actually there was no uniformity. We live close to Saskatoon, and what Saskatoon does affects my community very much, so actually I am, as I said before, in the same predicament as the Government — if I vote for this motion I will be voting against the wishes of some of my electors. If I vote for it, the same thing. But the majority of my people said this, as long as we will have uniform time, they would be happy; so I will support the Bill.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything in connection with this Bill, but I think that, after listening to the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) I should bring up one or two points, and that is first of all, that in case you have these local communities who desire to serve the farmers of their area, say by later opening than six o'clock or five o'clock of their businesses, certainly they can do so, under the authority that is vested in them; municipalities can pass by-laws to extend the hours of opening and closing of stores, implement businesses, and others. There would be no difficulty there.

I do not think there should be less confusion in the future under this particular legislation than there has been in the past. In the past, there has been much confusion, as we all know. One village will be open at one time, and the next on another time; in one village you may have the stores close at one time, but the beer parlour is open an additional hour, say, because the proprietor is carrying on his business according to the time of the province. This will now not be the case. During the half year, in all parts of Saskatchewan, you will know that a certain time pertains, except I think in the case of railways. (Personally, it is unfortunate that all of the province of Saskatchewan is not the same as in the central area, because this kind of time would be satisfactory to everyone).

It is unfortunate that the people in the west would prefer to have Mountain time the year around; and it is unfortunate that the people in the east would prefer to have central time the year round. But, as was mentioned by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias), we have

February 27, 1958

a responsibility, as members here, to make certain decisions that, in the final analysis, will make the people as happy as they can be made. There are some advantages. I think, in having fast time in the summer time in this day and age. This is an age of speed; I don't think it is too difficult for people to get up, say those who live in small urban communities or cities, an hour earlier. That is what they desire, and the reason they want extra daylight as was mentioned by the hon. member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) is because, after their hours of work, or after their hours in school, people desire to get out and have a game of baseball, or participate in some kind of sports, before the sun sets. There is nothing wrong with that. As a matter of fact, I can recall as a child the expression, 'Early to bed and early to rise makes a man both healthy, wealthy and, wise'; and I am prepared to try it out, and go along with this Government Bill. I am not satisfied that it is going to satisfy everybody, but I am prepared to go along with this legislation and see what it is going to do; see how the people are going to react. I may say Mr. Speaker, that so far, I am one of the fortunate ones; I have not had one letter for or against this legislation.

Mr. Danielson: — You'll get some after this.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I shall support the motion.

(Recessed until 7:30 p.m.)

Resuming at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Frank Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, with regard to this subject of time, I guess I am the M.L.A. that the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) referred to, when he said I might, get shot . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He was just hoping!

Mr. Meakes: — That is just a personal hope. Last year, when I voted against the acceptance of the point I must admit that at that time, I had not been petitioned or requested by my constituents, or anybody within my constituency, but I took it for granted because I didn't want to have the time changed that nobody else did.

Since last year, I have brought up the subject of the change in time within my constituency quite a few times, including our annual constituency convention; I reported to my people that I had voted against the biggest part of the members on this side; there was no condemnation. In fact, there was no discussion. I couldn't seem to get anybody worked up to argue with me. In listening to the

discussion this afternoon, I would say that the members on your left have offered no solution to this; they have all got up and spoken against it, but they haven't said, 'You should do this, or you should do that'. I suggest, as has been mentioned this afternoon, it wouldn't hurt to try it. I certainly have no fear, now, of being shot because the people of Touchwood, I think, are fairly fair-minded, and in practically one year I have had three people speak to me in opposition to the change in time.

I just wanted to rise and clarify my position; and am going to vote for the motion.

Mr. A.P. Weber (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, before speaking on this I would like to correct the hon. member who just spoke previously (Mr. Meakes), when he mentioned 'to your left' he included us, but I would like to assure him now that we have intended to support this motion. However, we are not too happy with the Bill at the present time; and as has been mentioned, previously, we are in favour of putting some 'teeth' into it.

I happen to be from a part of the province where last year, in Committee, one of the hon. members as much as said that I had no right to speak on this particular Time Bill, because it would not affect us in our area. However, I must say that it does affect us, just as much as any other part of the province.

According to the people in my constituency, I found that they were in agreement with idea of having 'uniform time throughout the province to avoid the confusion that exists, today. I heard a lot of the remarks that were made, about the blue ruin that this Bill would create to the farmers of the province. However, being, slightly interested in farming myself, I find that time is no vital factor to the farmer, and that is knowing fully that weather conditions, seasons and conditions of the crops are the factors that affect the farmer. If the weather is right, he will go through the night combining, whether it is six o'clock, ten o'clock or two o'clock in the morning; it makes no difference to him. If he has a job to do and he can do it, he will do it, regardless of the hours of the day.

Another thing was the poor farmer's wife. Now, having been on a farm for a considerable part of my life, I must say this, that an hour sooner or later would not affect a farmer's wife in getting the children ready for school, because at any time, during the summer time, that I have been on the farm, the farmer's wife has been up three or four hours ahead of the time that she was required to get her children ready for school.

Now the thing that would affect farmers is the shopping hours in our small towns. In our cities, the people could care less; the time that is proposed in this Bill is in effect in the cities in any case, so that actually it only affects the people in our rural areas and, as I mentioned before, the time is no factor, as far as the farmer, in his own operations on the farm, is concerned. It does affect him when he goes to the town or village to get supplies or service. However, there comes a time — six o'clock at the present time — which is the hour the business places usually close up; so under this new set-up, they are going to close at five o'clock. But with the modern means of transportation available to the farmer, there is no reason why he cannot go to town at five o'clock, instead of six o'clock. However, if he should happen to break down — and he doesn't know whether it is going to happen at two o'clock in the afternoon, or two o'clock in the morning — the place of business closes up at a certain hour of the day, regardless of whether it is an hour earlier or an hour later; the farmer has the advantage in the morning by being able to get his repairs and, supplies an hour earlier.

In connection with the number of letters that some members have received, opposing this Bill, I can only say this, that the only time you ever get any letters from anybody in your constituency is when they are against something. They will never write and tell you that they commend you on what you have done; they only tell you if they are against something. I would be safe in saying this, that if there was a plebiscite held, today, across all of Canada in regard to time, it would not make any difference which time zone you were in, in the Dominion of Canada, there would be people against it. Actually, there would be people for it as well, and I feel that, as far as we are concerned, it is time that we took a definite stand in this, and got some uniform time throughout this province, to avoid all this confusion that exists at the present time. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there isn't any doubt that this time question is a vexing problem, and it is something that all of us have had to do some thinking about over a period of years. For a great many reasons now, we have had delegations from almost every provincial organization, who come at least once a year to present briefs. In those briefs there are usually a few paragraphs having reference to this time question. No two, of course, make the same recommendation. I have listened to meetings of the Farmers' Union, the S.A.R.M., the S.U.M.A., all discussing the time question and all suggesting different solutions. Each one has a solution that will suit their particular needs, but, of course, it does not suit some other group. The members of this House who were members of the Committee — which was set up as far back, I think, as three years ago,

and who listened to the delegations and the briefs that were represented, know just what a tremendous variety of opinion there is on this subject. That is still true, and there is no use trying to deny it. Next to liquor and Elvis Presley, I don't know of anything else on which you could get an argument on the street corner any faster, than to raise this question of time. The fact remains, of course, that the Government has to make a recommendation as to what they think is the thing which, while it may not please everybody, will at least please the greatest number.

It has been said that the plebiscite which was taken didn't make anything very clear. It is easy enough to criticize the plebiscite. The Government accepts full responsibility for drafting it and presenting it. I think if you sit down and try, yourself, to draft a plebiscite that would help people to express an opinion, you would have considerable difficulty doing much better. The fact of the matter is that, when you take the results of that plebiscite, and put it on a map, it still shows the same patchwork quilt. But the one thing it does show is that people were all asking for some uniformity. This question of uniformity was not so essential 25 years ago. People didn't go so far from home. Then, people were affected mainly by an area of 25 or 50 miles radius around their shopping centre. Now they go a greater distance. They go to the lake resorts on the week-ends, and they go in to the city, instead of just to their local shopping centre. Moreover, radio and television have become an important part of our social life, and for a certain part of the year, they change their time ahead and change back again in the fall. A great many people find endless confusion in that, because they find that they are on one time, and the radio and television programs are on a different time. There was some announcement made, last year, that the railroads might alter their time the first of April, and the end of October, and go on a different time in the summer than in the winter. If that comes about, and they follow the radio changes, then we would have even more confusion.

Now, I can understand the reluctance of some hon. members — I have the same problem in my own constituency. It is about the worst patchwork quilt you could imagine. Although all of my constituency is west of the point at which the time should change, nevertheless, central time abtains in many parts of my constituency — like the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy). The time changes actually at Arcola, but all the way over to Weyburn, the rural points stay on central time throughout the year. The same thing is happening on No. 1 Highway on the main line of the C.P.R., the time changes at Broadview but practically all of the towns between here and Broadview now go on central time, and there is endless confusion. I have heard complaints from people who start out from a place like Radville to go to visit someone at the sanatorium at Fort San and find when they get there that it is on central time, whereas they thought that, since it was west of Broadview, it would be on mountain time and got there too late.

February 27, 1958

I have had complaints from judges who start out to hear a case, and find that the particular community is on a different time. We get complaints from tourists who say they will come into a town and go to have dinner, and they might be told, 'it is only five to twelve and dinner isn't served until twelve and after', and so they hurry on to the next fairly large centre, to find that they are on a different time and the dining room is closed, because dinner-time is over. I think the one advantage of what is being suggested here, and I think that that advantage outweighs some of the disadvantages, is that at least we will be on the same time in every part of the province at the same hour of the day. If some of the people are going to phone to Nipawin, or to Lloydminster or to Shaunavon, or if they are going to call from there, they will know that if it is three o'clock in Regina or Saskatoon, it is three o'clock, then, in Estevan or Shaunavon, or in Lloydminster, as the case may be. I think that is some advantage.

I am not saying that this is the perfect solution, but it is going to give us a measure of uniformity we have never had before. The one thing I do find is that people are saying: "For heaven's sake, at least get some uniformity". In my own constituency I have two towns six miles apart, and the one farthest is on central time and the one east of it is on mountain time; and the farmers who live out in that area . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You've got that twisted; the one on the east side would be on central time.

Premier Douglas: — The one on the east is mountain time, and the one on the west is on central time, because it happens to be on a railroad that goes into Estevan, and Estevan is on central time, so they go on central time.

Mr. Loptson: — Weyburn is on central time.

Premier Douglas: — No, Weyburn is on mountain time. My hon. friend ought to get around.

Mr. Loptson: — It was on central time when I was there.

Premier Douglas: — This is the confusion. The farmers who go to these towns have to keep remembering that, although those two towns are only six miles apart, one of them is on mountain time and the other is on central time. The result is endless confusion. Members have talked about the reaction of the public; I know there will be some reaction for it and there be some against it. I went through my own constituency and held a series of meetings, last fall, at which I didn't make any speeches. I think it was an exercise

of restraint on my part and a great blessing to my constituents, when I just sat down and said: "Now, we are going to have a two and a half hour meeting, and you are going to tell me what you think about in general." The time question and the liquor question, and scores of other questions were threshed about while I sat listening and answering questions. In almost every case, people argued — some for mountain time and others argued for central time — but the one thing they did say was, "whatever you do, let's put us all on the same time." And that is what we are trying to do — to have the same time on any given day.

What I have found interesting in this debate is that those who are opposing the Bill have not suggested any alternative. I wasn't on the Committee, but I understand, last year, some of the gentlemen opposite moved in the Committee that we should be on one time, but the Government should pick the time. Well of course, that would be a, very simple solution because then if we picked mountain time, all the members from the eastern part of the province could vote against it; and if we picked central time, all the members from the western part could vote against it. Now they can all vote against it, which makes them very happy, indeed. But it, is not enough just to criticize. There has to be some solution, and I was hoping this was one problem that would not be approached purely from the position of trying to take some political advantage.

The one thing I was amused about in this debate is that the Opposition are concerned about the fact that there is no penalty in it. Now, after having said that, this is going to be a terrible thing, they then want us to have a penalty, if the people don't do it. Then they will be able to come in here and say: "Just like Russia; if you don't move your watch, why the Government will put you in gaol." Well, I don't think there is any need for a penalty, or to put 'teeth' into this Act. I think the people of Saskatchewan, given some lead in this matter, will be persuaded that this looks like a reasonable kind of arrangement. I think, generally, people will accept this way of solving the problem. After all, you can't put teeth in an Act to do this kind of thing. If the majority of the people of the province don't like this idea, there wouldn't be enough gaols to put them all in. But if, having had this put before them as a proposal, and we start working in this direction, I think generally, people will be persuaded that this is a reasonable kind of an arrangement and that it will suit the convenience of all concerned.

I say very frankly, Mr. Speaker, that, if after we have given it a reasonable trial we find it doesn't work, and is causing more inconvenience rather than resolving some of our present inconveniences, then there is nothing to prevent us rescinding and going back to the present patchwork chaotic system that we have at the present time, or to some alternative that someone else may

February 27, 1958

suggest. I am making an appeal here, not just to members of the Legislature, but to the people of the province, to give this a fair trial. We have a community of interest in Saskatchewan. We can't have that community of interest if we have this constant difference in time and constant misunderstanding with reference to the time the different communities are on. So my feeling is that, we should give this a fair trial. I think if everybody co-operates, we will find that we will come to like it. If we find we don't, then we will have no hesitation in coming to the Legislature and ask the Legislature to rescind it.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I have been on that Time Committee, I think, ever since it started, and I thought it was four years ago; the Premier said and he may be right, but it seems to me it was four years, anyway. As I remember it we started off with the now Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker) and we worked on it, and we didn't get very far. Then for some reason or other, he decided if we wouldn't play ball with him he wouldn't play ball, and then he loaded it on to a very innocent member over there, whom I don't think wanted it, or had much interest in it, but I guess he was the least rebellious, so he was the Chairman for a short time — I have just forgotten how long. Finally he threw it up and our friend over here — I suppose he was the least rebellious of the Ministers, so he got it. But it was a very interesting Committee to sit on, and I want to tell the Premier that I think we had almost every suggestion it was possible to pull out of the book in that Committee, and the Committee, which was Government-dominated, of course, voted every one of them down. So there isn't much point in us trying to bring in something, because every one of our suggestions have been turned down. Some of them I thought, personally, would have worked; they looked reasonable to me, but the Committee said: "Whoops — out."

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Which one? Which proposal was that?

Mr. McCarthy: — The fact of the matter is, we might as well face it factually. The people on the east side of the province want fast time; the people on the west side of the province want slow time. These five cities in the middle won't have anything else but fast and slow time; and it is a case of the tail wagging the dog; and the cities have got what they want. That is the factual part of it. As far as my own constituency is concerned, the people down there have been working on fast time since before the turn of the century, and all they want to do is to be left alone and not be disturbed, but apparently that pleasure isn't going to be theirs. I can sympathize with them. I have lived in that constituency for nearly 50 years; 45 years, I think, to be exact — more

than I care to count up, and I have got kind of used to that time and I like it. It suits our particular part of the province better than any other time.

But there is no point, and I think the members of the Committee will agree with me on that, that our representation — we had stacks of them that high, and we had delegations and everything else, but basically speaking a very short distance east of this city they want fast time the year around, and when you get up along probably an equal distance the other side of Moose Jaw, they all want slow time the year around. These five cities in the middle here — not one of them would give an inch — no, they want fast time in the summer and slow time in the winter, and they got it; at least if the Bill passes, and I presume it will. But I just want to say there is confusion now — anybody who sat in that Committee realizes the confusion that our present system gives us, but we are going to have a lot of confusion now. After all, the railroads aren't going to change their time; at least I don't think they will.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — How do you know?

Mr. McCarthy: — I don't know and neither do you, but I said I didn't think they would and my guess is just as good as yours. If they don't change their time — the reason that we have fast time further west in the particular area in which I live is because that branch of the railroad which the Premier mentioned, a while ago — that, particular branch of the railroad runs not to Broadview, but to Wolseley, so all the people along that line run on fast time.

If you do the way you are going to do now, you are going to be out of step with the railroad for half the year, no matter which way she goes, for that part of the country. So I don't think it is going to improve the situation. There was one system that I thought would have worked, but I am only one man and as far as I am concerned I am going to vote against it, because it doesn't suit our particular part of the country. It's wrong — the time is wrong for our particular part of the country and I have no alternative but to vote against it.

February 27, 1958

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that one of the basic features of our system of democracy is that governments should reflect the wish of the majority of the people in as many ways as possible.

I would like to say just a few words concerning my own particular area of the province, in the northwest; and I happen to have here both the copy of the Time Plebiscite, and also a copy of the actual vote in the constituency which I have the pleasure of representing, the Turtleford constituency.

First of all, before voting on a Bill such as this, I think we should be reasonably satisfied that the plebiscite is a true expression of the people in the area; and yet in the (a) part of this ballot, the people were asked, as follows: “Are you in favour of only one time, namely Central Standard Time, for the entire province throughout the year? Answer Yes or No.” Now, a good many people that I talked to, answered this part of the ballot, felt that the other portion was irrelevant and they did not mark it. I believe, also that a goodly number of people skipped the (a) part and went on to the (b) part, which gave them one of three choices: “Are you in favour of Central Standard Time; are you in favour of Daylight Saving Time; are you in favour of Mountain Standard Time?”

In the six rural municipalities partly or wholly within the Turtleford constituency, this is what happened. In answer to part (a) of the ballot, the rural result was, 438 voted yes; 1,234 voted no. In other words, in a ratio of three to one, they voted ‘No’ to “Are you in favour of only one time, namely Central Standard?” The confusion there, I believe, was that while a lot of our rural people in that area were in favour of a uniform time, they were not in favour of Central time, and, therefore, they didn’t know whether to vote ‘Yes’ for the uniformity, or to vote ‘No’ against the Central Standard time. So I feel then, that the (a) part of this ballot was confusing.

In the urban area, in answer to the same (a) part, they voted No — 379; Yes — 277, a relatively close vote.

Now what happened regarding the (b) part of the ballot in the six rural municipalities, wholly or partly within the area I represent? First, the rural result: "Are you in favour of Central Standard Time for your community?" One hundred and twenty-five voted 'Yes'. "Are you in favour of Daylight Saving Time?" Seventy-one voted 'Yes'. "Are you in favour of Mountain Standard Time?" Twenty-two hundred and forty-three voted 'Yes'. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in the six rural municipalities in question the rural vote was, in the ratio of 20 votes for Mountain Standard as opposed to every vote for Central Standard Time.

Finally, when we look at the urban results in this north-western part of the province, in these same six rural municipalities: in the small urban centres, 745 voted for Mountain Standard as opposed to 221 for Central Standard. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while I think there is some question as to how valid the results of the plebiscite were among the rural folks, there is no doubt that the great majority favour Mountain Standard Time the year round.

Also I believe that many of the hon. members on your right, if they conducted the same analysis, would inevitably come to the same conclusion. Therefore, it seems to me that, in passing this Bill, this Government is not reflecting the wish of the majority of the people of the province.

I have here a little summary of the plebiscite sent out from the Attorney General's office and he said this: "By lumping together the vote of each rural municipality and the cities, towns and villages lying within it, and treating each as a voting unit, a very clear picture emerges." Now I question whether that was a proper way of determining the voting unit as applied to this plebiscite. He goes on to say: "The solution is to legally establish the line where the vote broke, making Central Standard time mandatory east of the line and Mountain Standard time mandatory west of the line." The Bill does not reflect this thinking. He finally sums it up in the final paragraph: "Between the third meridian and the line proposed, including Regina, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert, the total vote was Central Standard — 24,000; Daylight Saving — 8,000; Mountain Standard — 38,000.

In other words, no matter how you look at the overall picture, there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that in the rural areas of the western part of Saskatchewan they are definitely in favour of a uniform time, yes; but they are also in favour of Mountain Standard Time the year around. I have received a number of letters from various organizations, Boards of Trade and School Units — I would like just to mention one. The Medstead School Unit in my area sent me a resolution reading as follows:

February 27, 1958

“That we, the Medstead School Unit Board, go on record as being opposed to any change in Time Zones in Saskatchewan and that we are also opposed to the imposition of Daylight Saving Time by that name or any other name.”

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that we should make known the wishes of the majority of the people in our areas, I will not support the motion for second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Douglas T. McFarlane (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, it is significant that again, this session, the number of the Bill which we are debating, which has turned out to be our most contentious piece of legislation so far, happens to be Bill No. 27. I think if we go back to our sitting here, last Session, a year ago, our most contentious Bill at that time was also Bill No. 27; and maybe we are setting a precedent in this province; and possibly next year when we sit again we will look at Bill No. 27 to see what is to be expected at that time.

Some of the older members here, tonight, have more or less given a review of what has happened during the last four years in Committee, discussing this certain Bill. As for myself, along with a few of us here, tonight, last year was our first year to have had the opportunity to discuss this certain Bill. Now, I was more or less surprised to hear the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and also the Premier suggest that the Opposition had never offered any solution. I think I can safely say that, during the course of those Committee meetings, there were suggestions made at that time. I think most hon. members will agree to that.

The pamphlet distributed by the Attorney General, a year ago, stated this, in the first paragraph:

“It is pretty apparent from the lopsided majority for Central Standard time in the eastern part of the province; and the equally emphatic majority for Mountain Standard time in the rest of the province, that complete uniformity of time would not be acceptable over large areas.”

Then, at this particular time, he is bringing in a Bill which we are supposed to endorse to more or less refute what he has said in this first statement.

I want to say at the outset that I am from one of the furthest eastern constituencies in the province; there is one further east than my own; and I think if we were to pass this Bill as it now reads, it would probably be more of a severe hardship on the eastern constituencies in this

province than it would be to those in the west. I have had very earnest representations over the past, and they feel very strongly in this regard. I can safely say that, during the course of the past year I have had more delegations concerning time than any other topic in this House; and down there they do not want to change. One member said here, tonight, that those of us in public life do not always get representations commending us for the stand we take. He said we are more liable to get representations condemning us for some stands we have taken. Well, it just happened that I had mailed to me a letter, not from my own constituency, but from the constituency of Kinistino. It was mailed to me yesterday morning; and along with a number of complaints, they sent me a clipping of the Melfort 'Journal'; under the dateline of Thursday, February 13, 1958, with a letter to the editor. The first letter is a letter of commendation. It wishes to commend the hon. member from Kinistino, (Mr. Begrand) for the stand which he took in the Legislature, last year, in regard to the Time vote. The second letter, Mr. Speaker — I don't want to quote the whole thing, because it is quite a long article. I will ask your permission to quote one little piece a little later on, but the second letter says this — and I was quite surprised that the hon. gentleman, so far, has not spoken on the subject . . .

Premier Douglas: — He spoke this afternoon.

Mr. McFarlane: — The letter is addressed to the Hon. C.G. Willis, Minister of Public Works, Regina, Saskatchewan, and it says this:

“We are, however, dissatisfied with the stand taken by you, Mr. Willis, as our representative in the Melfort constituency.”

Those letters are signed by the of North Star School District No. 1844.

There is only one thing I want to quote from this article, Mr. Speaker, and that is just to substantiate a remark made by the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper). I can quite agree with the member for Regina, when she said that possibly the time factor here did not affect her raising her family, because she said that she had lived in the city all the time. Well, I can quite understand her situation, but I want to assure the junior member that those conditions don't always apply in the country, and conditions in the country are quite a bit different now to what they were some years ago, in this respect — that we don't have as many of our local rural schools any more; we have centralization and

February 27, 1958

in a lot it cases a number of the children have to be transported over long areas to get to school; and I am sure you will appreciate this as much as other the members — the difficulty of getting them up earlier the morning.

To further quote from this, Mr. Speaker, with your permission just to explain that point I would like to read this part and this is written by the secretary of that school district. He says:

“Our School District lies entirely within the Melfort provincial constituency, with its western boundary following the same line an the western boundary of the constituency. After years of poor roads, hardship and frustration in our attempt to give our children an education to prepare them for a complex, modern society, we last year started transporting the high school students, by bus, to Kinistino.”

Now, this is what I would like to point out:

“A one-way trip to Kinistino is 26 miles from the far end of the route to where the bus is stationed. Some students must travel as far as two miles to board the bus. Due to overcrowded conditions in the local school, grades seven and eight were transferred to Kinistino Public on November 18, 1957, going on the High School bus on its regular route.

“Under these conditions, some of our District students must be awakened at 5:30 a.m. — that is Mountain Standard time — in order to get dressed, have breakfast, and as a rule walk over roads which are impassable to vehicular traffic. Nineteen students are involved in what been described above, and another 29 in grades I to VI in our local schools.”

I mention that, to point up a very great difference between raising your family under city conditions, compared to rural conditions.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member please read the part where he mentioned the difficulty in the winter, too.

Mr. McFarlane: — I would be quite pleased, after I am finished, to give you the whole paper, because I think it is addressed to you.

Hon. Mr. Willis: — Oh, but you should read it. You are reading part of it. Read it all.

Mr. McFarlane: — There is another thing I would like to mention here, Mr. Speaker. I think that this is a very clumsy piece of legislation. I see absolutely no reason why the Premier suggests to the people of this province that they go ahead and try out some piece of legislation, which can only add to confusion and ill feeling, for the next two years. The same thing was done in Bill No. 27, last year, and we know the results of that now. I see no reason why we, in this Legislature, tonight, should pass legislation which is ill conceived and clumsy, and has no ‘teeth’; because, after all . . .

Premier Douglas: — Do you want teeth in it?

Mr. McFarlane: — . . . it will only lead to confusion. It has always been easier in the past, to legislate rather than rescind. So, with these few suggestions, I feel, on behalf of my constituents and all those people in eastern Saskatchewan, that I have no alternative but to vote against this Bill.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the debate is closed, I feel that I should say a word on the question of time, having taken some part in the discussions of last year.

I would like to say, in opening, that on the occasion of belonging to the Time Committee during the Session of last year, I was responsible for moving a motion — or one of the sponsors of a motion — mentioned by the Premier with regard to time; and as a matter of fact, I think it was the most serious resolution that was moved in that Committee. It was not moved merely for the matter of embarrassing the Premier. As a matter of fact, I was invited to second the motion, asking for one time, by the young member from the constituency of Estevan (Mr. Thorson); and following the invitation it wasn’t carried out; a separate motion was made which he supported, which meant changing the clocks of our province twice during the year. At the time I was quite willing to support the ‘one time’ motion, if the Government had had the courage to bring it in; I would have been prepared to second the motion of our young friend for one time over the entire province.

Premier Douglas: — Which time?

February 27, 1958

Mr. Gardiner: — But since the Government has not had the courage, or is not prepared to take the courage, as it should, being the responsible Government of this Province — if the Committee had said to the Government, that they were prepared to stand behind either time that they chose, (after all that is what the Committee would say) — if they voted for a motion that said they were prepared to accept one time, no matter which time the Government chose, the Committee would accept that time.

So I say in that regard, Mr. Speaker, that because of the lack of courage and if the Minister in question had the courage to bring in an Act here, today, which, as other members have said, had some teeth in it, would mean more to the people, and the people would know that there was some leadership from the Government in this connection. But before sitting down on this particular subject, I would like to at least suggest to the hon. Attorney General, if this Act passes, as I have no doubt it will, that he pick another day except Sunday morning to have the clocks changed. I have had the unfortunate experience of preaching in a church on Sunday morning on the day the time changed, and everybody came half an hour late. They came just in time to hear my sermon. I also happen to be the Treasurer of the local church, and I can assure you, if we have the time changed twice at home, like quite often they in the cities, we might be missing some church funds at the end of the year.

So, if the Minister would — with many stores having a whole day holiday on Monday at many points, particularly in the cities, perhaps now the Minister could make the change on Sunday night, after church is over; and perhaps that would be of assistance to those who desire to get to church on time on Sunday morning.

So, with that suggestion I will just close by saying that, because of the fact that the original motion that I had agreed to support, in Committee, was not acceptable to the Government, I find it impossible to support the present motion, because it is only going to add to the difficulties that we have had in the past. It is going to mean that everyone is going to have to change their time twice during the year, which is inexcusable when the Government could have brought down a motion to provide one time for the people of this province, as they have been suggesting in their speeches here, tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to oppose the motion.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. member which time he wanted — was it Central or Mountain? Which was it to be?

Mr. McDonald: — Either one.

Mr. Gardiner: — Either time. You pick it out.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I assure you this will be the shortest speech made in this House, in this debate.

I just want to register my opposition to this Bill. I am sure that you go out in the western part of this province in spite of what the hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) has said, you will find at least 90 per cent of the farmers against any change in time. I am sure of that.

It seems to me, too, that there is a certain area through the centre of the province, running north and south, that want a change in time, including most of the major cities. The eastern part of the province are quite happy with the time they are on now — Central Standard. I am sure the western part of the province are happy on Mountain Standard time, and they want no change, and it does not seem fair to me that after the strong representations that you have had from the central area of this province, and by those representations you should force on the people of the eastern part of the province, and also on the west — something that they certainly do not want. I have lived in the western part of this province for over 50 years, and we have got along all right on Mountain Standard time. Certainly, I know there has been some confusion, but there was no confusion at all regarding time, until the cities took the notion to go on Daylight Saving. That is what caused the confusion in the first place — nothing else.

Mr. McCarthy: — That is what is causing it, now.

Mr. Horsman: — If they had stayed on Mountain Standard — Saskatoon, Regina and the rest of them — we would have had no trouble; the same as we had no trouble for 40 years or more.

I have had representations from the Farmers' Union, School Boards, and many other organizations in my area opposing any change in the time that we have now. So I could not pass up this opportunity, without registering my objections. I cannot support the Bill.

Hon. Mr. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), I started to re-read my speech of February 24 to see wherein I erred. Apparently the sentence I said which caused him all his anxiety was the opening sentence: "Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitancy that I make any statement about the effect of Bill No. 27." I may say, Mr. Speaker, that for going on nine years in this Legislature, or on some Committee of this Legislature, that I

February 27, 1958

have had something to say about time, and I over the years, have become more and more hesitant about doing it, because I feel that I haven't been altogether successful in convincing the House to agree with my views on the matter.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — This House, of course, knows that the proposal which I made to Legislative Committee last year, was that we might have two times in the province if we could settle on a boundary between them. The Legislative Committee disagreed with that because they said there was no feasible way of determining where the boundary should be, and the Legislative Committee brought in a report which was agreed to by a majority of the Committee, calling for uniform Central Standard Time in the summer, and Mountain Standard Time in the winter. That report I had some reservations on. At that time, I pointed out I did not support the recommendation of the Committee. This year, however, the situation is a little different. This year we are now faced with a situation where the Legislature has instructed the Government to proceed with this uniform legislation, and the legislation has been drafted in the very terms laid down by the Committee. The House has already spoken in this matter in principle. This legislation merely seeks to implement what the Legislature instructed the Government to prepare a year ago.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have listened to as many delegations, and as many representations on time as any hon. member. Various members have spoken of delegations and their views. The fact is that nearly all delegations preface their representations by saying, "We want this, or that particular kind of time, but if we can't have that particular kind of time, we want any kind of time, so long as there is uniformity between us and our neighbours."

Most people consider that the problem about time is to have uniformity; uniformity as between one community and another. This legislation accomplishes that end. I think it can be said — I said in my opening remarks, — that the results of the plebiscite were not regarded by the Committee last year in drafting its recommendation, and I think that is probably true. I think it can be said, however, that if the results do show anything, the larger vote in favour of the first question than there was in favour of Central Standard Time on the second question, probably suggests that a great many people are prepared to accept Central Standard Time, if necessary, in order to have uniformity.

Some criticism was raised about the terms of the plebiscite, and it was suggested that the first question was not clear. Well, the first question was something to this effect, and I got it down correctly from the hon. member when he was referring to it. I think it was this: 'Are you in favour of one time, namely Central Standard Time, for the whole province?' Now, it was said that the question was confusing, and the hon. for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) said the question would have been much clearer if it had not referred to Central Standard Time, but merely asked "Are you in favour of one time for the whole province?" Well, that's the kind of question which Adolph Hitler and gallop pollsters like to ask . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, no, no.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . if we asked the question, 'Are you in favour of one time for the whole province?' the answer would be 99.9 per cent 'Yes', because everybody is in favour of one time for the whole province. It is when it comes to choosing which time that most people, including the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) have difficulty in making up their minds.

Mr. McDonald: — And the Premier!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We've made up our minds. Our position is clear; it's you people who have not made up your minds.

Mr. Cameron: — You haven't decided on either one. You say, "We'll make you all unhappy" instead of satisfying anybody.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is so sure . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! If you have a question to ask . . .

Mr. Foley: — I asked if the hon. member would permit a question.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — If the hon. member wishes to ask a question, then I am certainly willing to answer it for him.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, just ask the question without . . .

Mr. Foley: — Well, why did you ask "Are you in favour of only one kind?"

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if you're going to have only one time for the whole province, obviously it has to be either Central Standard Time or Mountain Time. It has to

be one or the other. If my hon. friend had been here a little longer, he would know that the Committee of this House recommended against Mountain Standard Time for the whole province. That was ruled out by the Committee. The Committee said that there are two options, either to divide the province, or put the whole province on Central Standard Time. The Committee recommended unanimously against any attempt in this Legislature to put the whole province on Mountain Standard Time, and the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), and the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) will recall that was written into the reports of the Committee two years ago, and therefore the Government was precluded from asking the question 'Are you in favour of Mountain Standard Time for the whole province?' The only possibility which the Committee laid before the Legislature was either two time zones, or Central Standard Time for the whole province. That is why that question was asked in that way. It would be very easy to ask the question, 'Are you in favour of one time for the whole province' and get 100 per cent 'Yes' answer, and then you still haven't any results. You don't know which time they want.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is very derogatory of the intelligence of the voter to assume that he doesn't see the word 'Central Standard Time' in that question. To ask him if he is in favour of one time for the whole province, namely Central Standard time, is attributing mighty little sense as to the voters of this province. Certainly, the voters who read that question knew that they were being asked, 'Are you in favour of one time, namely Central Standard time, for the whole province?' If you are not in favour of Central Standard Time for the whole province, obviously you answer 'no', and my hon. friends apparently have a lower regard for the intelligence of people than I have, or my colleagues have.

Mr. Danielson: — You're making mighty little sense.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And considering the methods by which they get their votes, they are justified in having that low opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear if I did not make it clear in my opening remarks, to advise the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that was nothing weak-kneed or chicken-hearted about my proposal to introduce this Bill on February 24.

Mr. McDonald: — Chicken-kneed!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I felt, of course, that the Legislature might perhaps have grown weary of hearing me talk of time!

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I'm glad to talk of time — it's warming to the heart, to hear the 'Hear! Hear!' occasionally from the opposite side of the House, even if I have to sometimes use devious means to achieve it. But the hon. members ask on whose representation this proposal is made, namely fast time in the summer, and Mountain Standard Time in the winter. It is made on the recommendation of a Legislative Committee, on the recommendation of this Legislature. That is on whose recommendation this legislation on was submitted, and the hon. members asked, "How was that recommendation adopted; on what basis was it adopted?" I said in my opening remarks that we had not paid any regard to the plebiscite, and I think that is true. Members who sat on that Committee know we paid no regard to the plebiscite. This was a brand new proposal put forward by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) and the member for Estevan (Mr. Thorson) which was put forward, and adopted by the Committee, and then adopted by the House. It had no relation to the plebiscite at all, but I think it is significant, however, that this proposal meet with the approbation of a majority of the people of Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . and it can be proven in this way. Between 35 and 40 per cent of the rural area of this province is presently on fast time throughout the year . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Are you referring to area or people?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Rural people. 40 per cent of the rural population of this province are on Central Standard Time throughout the year.

Mr. McDonald: — Is that fact?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There's no doubt about that; if my hon. friend wants to look at the figures, he'll find that is so. In addition to that, eight of the 10 urban — large urban municipalities, or cities, are on fast time throughout the summer months, so that this proposal will coincide in the summer months with the time kept by the majority of the people of Saskatchewan in the summer months.

In the period of April to October, a majority of the people of this province are on fast time. More than 50 per cent of the population are on fast time during the summer months. When the cities revert back to Mountain Standard time in the winter, it is also a fact that more than 50 per cent of the population are on Mountain Standard time in the winter months. My hon. friends can sneer about majorities, if they like, for majorities haven't treated my hon. friends

February 27, 1958

too kindly for the last 12 or 14 years, but the fact of the matter is that we do recognize that majorities are entitled to some rights.

Mr. McDonald: — No wonder we need judges!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The majority of the population in this province are on fast time now in the summer, and a majority are on slow time during the winter. My hon. friends should have some respect for the wishes of the majorities in these matters.

Mr. McDonald: — We have respect for minorities, too!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It's so long since they've had one, they don't know too much about them.

Mr. McDonald: — Minorities have rights, too, you know; Mountain Standard . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Some suggestion was made, Mr. Speaker — I don't mind that horseplay talk here, but I do feel that the House wants to get on with the business, and I don't like to delay it. The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that we could have perhaps done the same thing as was done in the province of Alberta. In the province it should be borne in mind that, theoretically, to follow the lines of longitude from the North Pole to the South Pole, the boundaries between the Central Standard Time Zone and the Mountain time Zone lies between Winnipeg and Brandon; that is if the line went according to theory every fifteen degrees from the zero meridian, the boundary would be between Brandon and Winnipeg. The western boundary of the Mountain Standard time zone would be just a little this side of Calgary.

As most members know, while those are the boundaries in theory, they have never actually been followed in practice. They have always been bent in order to follow provincial boundaries wherever possible. The result is that the boundary between the Central and Mountain Standard Time zone was bent when the province of Manitoba was formed, to follow the west boundary of Manitoba, and then when the province of Saskatchewan was formed, and Manitoba was enlarged, it was bent to follow that new boundary, and very early in the history of the province it was bent to include five judicial districts in the southwest part of the province. That, of course, is a distortion of the line. It is not a following of the true boundary of the time zone.

Now, we could have done the same as Alberta did. We could have said that what prevails in the eastern fraction of the province will be extended over the whole province, because in Alberta, they took

Mountain Standard Time, which theoretically only covers the eastern half of that province, and extended it right to the Rocky Mountains. Now, if we had done that, of course, we would have had the whole province on Central Standard Time throughout the entire year. However, the Government and the Committee felt it was more proper to follow the wishes of the majority in the winter, and the majority in the summer.

Something has been said about cities dominating the situation. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be put clearly upon the records that there was no time that hon. members . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You're doing it, now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — My city slicker friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) can mumble in his hand as long as he likes, but he can't convince me that this is accommodating the cities . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Yes . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — As a member of this Legislature, I can say, and all hon. members who are on the Committee will undoubtedly bear out what I say, that we had no representations at any time from labour unions about this matter, nor did we have representations from the city. We had answers to inquiries, and to questionnaires that were sent out to cities, but cities and labour unions did not come forward and make proposals to the Committee.

Mr. Danielson: — They're on fast time, now.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's right, and they're perfectly satisfied with the arrangement they've got.

Mr. Danielson: — Leave them there; and leave the rest alone.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — This legislation does nothing for them — this legislation does nothing for them.

Mr. Cameron: — It just keeps them happy, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They are customarily on fast time in the summer, and have been for many years. What they had was legal; what they had was accepted by the overwhelming majority of their people, and they had no complaints.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . conformity . . .

February 27, 1958

Hon. Mr. Walker: — They never came to us, and asked us to put the whole province on their time. The people who came to us were the people representing farmers, people from rural areas, who complained that they did not have uniform time in their local shopping centres and in their favourite city, and they wanted a degree of uniformity. They said, “Our little town is on Mountain Standard time, but we go to the city once or twice a month, and it’s on fast time. Can we not have uniformity between these local communities and these larger centres, and thereby save ourselves a lot of inconvenience.”

This legislation is asked for to meet the demands of rural people; this legislation does nothing whatever for city people. Nothing whatever for them.

Mr. McCarthy: — How naive can you be?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It couldn’t matter less to people in Regina or Saskatoon what time the farmers keep 40 miles out from the city, or 10 miles out from the city. They don’t know and they don’t care, but it makes a good deal of difference to the farmers . . .

Mr. Loptson: — How do you propose to enforce it?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — It makes a good deal of difference to the farmer what time his shopping centre is on, because he goes there two or three times a month, at least. So I want to answer as emphatically as possible, that this is not done at the behest of the cities; that the cities have no interest in this proposal whatsoever . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — The farmers defeated it 54,026 . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Well, my hon. friends say that they made some proposals in the Committee. I happen to have the minutes of the Committee before me, and I find that numerous proposals were made to the Committee, including one by myself, one by Mr. Berezowsky, seconded by Mr. Meakes, and there were several proposals made, but I find one made by my hon. friends opposite, and this is it:

‘Moved by Mr. Thorson, seconded by Mr. Wood, that this Committee recommend to the Legislature that the whole province be placed on the same time zone, Mountain Standard time be maintained during the winter months, and Central Standard Time during the summer months.’

That was a clear-cut thing which a person could either agree with, or disagree.

‘It was moved then by Mrs. Batten, seconded by Mr. Gardiner, that all the words after the words ‘known’ be deleted in the motion and the following substituted therefor: ‘and that the time for that zone be designated by the Government’.

Well, Mr. Speaker if I ever saw political wishy-washy, that’s it.

Mr. Loptson: — It wouldn’t raise any . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — And my hon. friends opposite say they made proposals in that Committee. The only proposal they made was to avoid going on record — to try to avoid going on record as to what was the solution to this problem. My hon. friends are quite new in this House, and it seems to me . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . the other information that you bring in?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . Mr. Speaker, they should be given some credit for having acquired such political audacity in such a short time . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Don’t you think you’re on the wrong track?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . but certainly they have contributed nothing to the solution of this problem — nothing whatever.

Mr. Foley: — Have you?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact, it would have pained them very much to have put this thing in the position where they would say whatever was adopted, ‘we’re agin it’. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that, in a parliamentary democracy, the Government must accept responsibility for doing what is right, but it seems to me that the Opposition has some obligation to show that they have the qualifications to replace a government . . .

Mr. Loptson: — We’ll replace this one, any time . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . that if, at any time the Opposition is qualified and ready to assume power and administration, I would hate to think that in the — we have only one party capable of holding office . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Did the Attorney General adopt . . .

February 27, 1958

Hon. Mr. Walker: — If my hon. friends had presented their arguments regarding this Bill in such a way that it shows that they had some real views on the matter, and made some proposals, then we would be able to say that they are able to overlook any more little trifling dissatisfactions and complaints, and come out with something constructive. My hon. friends think they are in the happy position where they can now go to the eastern part of the province, and say, “We want you to be on Mountain Standard Time in the winter”, and they can go to the west side of the province and say, “We are opposed to you going on fast time in the summer”. Well, that is the kind of political dishonesty and chicanery that forever disqualifies my hon. friends from ever assuming power in Saskatchewan!

Govt. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The people look for some maturity — some political maturity across the way . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Do you call that political maturity?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — . . . Mr. Speaker, I only hope this is getting on the record at least — if nobody is hearing it — referring to what the hon. member said about there being no ‘teeth’ in this legislation. We are told there should be a penalty; that there should be a jail sentence, or a fine in this legislation.

Mr. McDonald: — Who said that?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh, my hon. friend has said it repeatedly.

Opposition Members: — Oh, no!

Mr. Cameron: — A piece of paper doesn’t mean anything.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I said when I introduced the Bill that we were not providing any penal clause in this Bill, and my hon. friends, complaining about that, criticized it — three or four of them, as they spoke. Well, as a matter of fact, the province of Alberta has a clause which provides for a penalty up to \$25 for anyone disregarding the provisions of this Act. Their Act, however, is a little different from ours, because their Act is a blanket Act which applies to the province, and does not purport to repeal inconsistent provisions. Ours, however, amends and changes provisions in the City Act, in the Court Officials Act, and all the Acts which have to do with the status of legal time. That means, in effect, that under Alberta legislation, you could be prosecuted for walking down the street with your wrist-watch at the wrong time.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There have been no prosecutions in Alberta . . .

Mr. Cameron: — It doesn't pay to be friendly over there.

Mr. Weber: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to retract that statement. It is absolutely ridiculous. I am quite sure no Act in the province of Alberta would ask for . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . and the people accepted it, too.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I will just read the legislation, and it will speak for itself:

“A person who violates any provisions of this Act, or the regulations made hereunder is guilty of an offence and liable in some instances to a fine not exceeding \$25.”

The Act says everybody in the province must keep Mountain Standard Time.

Mr. Korchinski: — That's for the mountain goats . . .

Premier Douglas: — My, that's funny.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, there have been no prosecutions, I am advised, in Alberta, but it can't be said, as my hon. friends have tried to leave the impression that this Act has no 'teeth' in it.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that's what you said.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — No, that's not what I said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McDonald: — Read it to us.

Mr. Cameron: — And bring the penalty in the back door . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — This is what I said:

“I may say that, in this province no attempt is being made to do what was attempted in the province of Alberta, namely to make it a punishable offence to keep your clock set at a different time that set in the Bill.”

No attempt is made in this province to make that an offence.

February 27, 1958

Premier Douglas: — They would have yelled if we had.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — But the Act is not without teeth. For example, if the Liquor Board orders that beer stores will close at 10 o'clock according to the time defined in this Act, and if the proprietor should open an hour later, by pretending he is on some different time, it will be no defence to him. The law is that the time will be Central Standard Time in the summer, and Mountain Standard Time in the winter. He can't defeat the prosecution by saying that he's on a different time than the rest of the province.

Mr. Weber: — He doesn't have to set his wrist-watch.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — No, he doesn't have to set his wrist-watch. As a matter of fact, if a store wants to stay open until seven o'clock when the rest of the community is on Central Standard time by pretending that he's on Mountain Standard time, he'll be in violation of the law, and he'll be prosecuted under the closing regulations and by-laws, so that it cannot be said that the Act is without 'teeth'.

Mr. Foley: — But it is confusing.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — But no attempt is made to make it a personal offence on the part of any person who, for personal reasons, chooses to keep some other time. That's what I said, and that's what I meant, and the Act, however, has got teeth and anyone who does defy it, or ignore it, will do so at his peril.

Mr. Foley: — Will the hon. Minister permit a question? In the 'A' part of the ballot, the majority favouring one time was 33,000. In the 'B' part of the ballot, the majority favouring Mountain Standard time was about 11,000. In view of that, how does the Minister justify coming out with this Bill for daylight time in the summer, and Mountain Time in the winter?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made my argument rather elaborately, and I don't intend to go over it again.

Premier Douglas: — Maybe we could give him a private lesson!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — We feel that it does meet the most urgent demands of rural people today, who say, 'For heaven's sakes, let's have one time in this province; let's have one time in one community and another. We don't care much what time it is, as long as it is uniform'. This does meet that demand, and if for some reason a better proposal comes along that seems to meet the needs of Saskatchewan, then certainly the Government has no ideological bonds with

this proposal, and will be glad to consider any modification or amendment. As a matter of fact, when the House gets into Committee, I would hope that my hon. friends opposite will put forward some constructive proposal to improve upon the provisions of the Bill. I am sure the Government would welcome any proposal that my hon. friends care to make, which they think would be superior to that contained in the Bill. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I will support it.

Mr. Speaker: — It is moved by the hon. Mr. Walker,

That Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend the Statute Law — be now read a second time.

The question being put, it was agreed to by 32 to 15.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 52 — An Act respecting the Esterhazy School District No. 804 of Saskatchewan and International Minerals and Chemical Corporation (Canada) Limited

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, this is simply a bill to ratify an agreement which has been entered into between the Esterhazy School District, and the company known as the International Minerals and Chemicals Corporation of Canada, Ltd. The situation is this, that in the town of Esterhazy, as a result of the very considerable increase in population, because of the potash developments, it was necessary to enter into a very considerable expansion of the school facilities. It was particularly necessary, since the old school burned down. This, of course, is a very costly sort of undertaking, one requiring immediate use of a considerable amount of capital. As a result, the Potash Company or International Minerals was willing to make to the Esterhazy School District, a substantial advance of capital against future taxes — an advance, I may say, without interest.

The arrangement is, that each year, some 50 per cent of the taxes of the property of the company will be credited against this particular loan. It is in order to make possible the advance payment of taxes, and the cancellation in this way, that this particular agreement is necessary, and this Bill ratifies the agreement. I would move the second reading.

(Referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

SECOND READING

Bill No. 53 — An Act respecting Commercial Agents — be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, the Commercial Agent Act, introduced at this time, will repeal the Hawkers and Peddlers Act, which dealt in a limited way with the same subject.

The Commercial Agents Act attempts a more comprehensive thorough-going control of hawkers and peddlers, or commercial agents, and it is hoped that it will provide a greater degree of security to the general public, in dealing with these people. It is proposed, for example, to institute a system of bonding of people, before they can get a licence.

It is proposed to set the fees payable to municipalities on a uniform schedule, based upon the size of a municipality, rather than on the present basis of whatever the whim of the municipal council might dictate. I may say that the breadth of the Act, that is the number of people who come under the Act, is left exactly as before. No changes have been made in the definition section of the commercial agent, except that 'commercial agent' has substituted for 'hawker and peddler'.

If this Bill 15 is passed there will be two classes of licences to be issued henceforth — that of 'commercial agent' and that of 'salesman of a commercial agent'. It will, in a case whereas commercial agent applies for a licence as a principal, employing agents, provides for the commercial agent himself, to be bonded and to be responsible for the salesmen whom he authorizes to act for him. Where the principal is not a resident of Saskatchewan, the commercial agent or salesman will be principal for the commercial agent, himself.

It is proposed to, as I say, set up a system of bonding, and I think every other feature of the Bill can quite adequately be considered in Committee of the Whole, when we are discussing the sections. Those, I believe, are the main principles of the Bill. So, with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I vote that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, there is something about this bill that I just don't quite like, and I'd like to let it stand, for the moment.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the hon. gentleman wish to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Coderre: — Yes, that's right. Adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

Bill No. 54 — An Act to Amend the District Courts Act — be now read a second time

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill which has the effect of reducing the number of District Court Judges of the Province so that the number will not exceed 16, upon the retirement of the present incumbents.

I may say that it has been pretty unanimously agreed by the Bar of this province, and by the Culliton Committee, even by the judges themselves, that there are too many judges — district court judges who haven't enough work to do.

Other proposals will be made later in the Session to provide some additional work for the District Court Judges, but the consensus of opinion is unanimous as far as I know, that there are too many of them. This will not result in any appreciable saving to the Provincial Government — only some \$2,000 — the size of the Surrogate Court judges' stipend, but it will result in a saving to the Treasury of Canada, of some \$25,000 a year, for salaries in addition to expenses.

It does not help us in Saskatchewan, particularly, except that it does remedy the present situation where the general public is becoming critical and a bit cynical about the amount of work attached to a judge's appointment. The judges themselves feel this sentiment. This Bill would not be necessary if we proposed to implement our major amendments to the District Court Act at an early date.

I may say, if I am permitted, Mr. Speaker, that there will be some major amendments to the District Court Act a little later in the Session, but since these further reforms require legislation at the same time in the Federal House, before they can become effective, it is proposed that additional reforms will be made to come into effect on proclamation. Since we can't be certain that the Federal Parliament will meet before July 1st, or any other date we might set, and a good deal of time might elapse before the other reforms can be effected, and in the meantime it may be that one or two of the present District Court Judges will retire, we want to have this reduction in the number come into effect so that no appointments will be made during the interval before the major Act goes into effect.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill be now read for the second time.

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly want to get into a debate on this particular proposed amendment at this time, and I have not had an opportunity to suggest to the hon. Attorney General that perhaps it would be much better to have all the amendments to the District Court Act debated at the same time. I think that might be the preferable way on second reading, if its — I don't know how many other people intend to take part in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, you probably realize I am not particularly interested in having the present Government appoint any District Court judges. But at the same time, I don't think that this thing can be debated all by itself. It is a larger picture — it's part of a larger picture of proposed judicial reform, particularly as it affects the District Court judges and the District Courts, and their boundaries in this province. It is, I think, of very vital importance and to me this is one of the points I would like to bring up in discussing a wider picture. But I think I would be wasting time, Mr. Speaker, by discussing it at this time, when it could be discussed far better together with the other Acts. That is just a suggestion to the hon. Attorney General; if it is fine with him, I would be prepared to ask leave to adjourn the debate on this reading until the other bills are in.

Mr. Speaker: — Is leave granted to the hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) to adjourn the debate?

Agreed

(Debate adjourned)

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, are we adjourning on the understanding that it will not come back into Committee — that it will not be called again until rest of the legislation has been made available?

Premier Douglas: — I doubt if we can give that undertaking. There are about 12 pieces of legislation. I don't think we can guarantee to have them all on the Order Paper at the same time. That is why the Minister in the Speech from the Throne debate, gave a fairly comprehensive outline of the judicial reforms he had in mind. So that we would not be discussing them by piece by piece, he gave a review, all at one time. So the members have, I think, a fairly good idea of what he has in mind and copies of the Hansard are available.

I think we can give an undertaking that we will not proceed on this item until some of the other legislation is on, but I don't think we can undertake to have all 12 on the Order Paper, because it is fairly important this be given assent at a reasonably early date. I wouldn't want to leave it to the end of the Session.

Mr. McDonald: — Well; I can agree with that, but when we have 12 other pieces of legislation coming in, all dealing with the court structure in Saskatchewan, I think it would be unwise for us to deal with this particular piece of legislation until we have had at least time to peruse the other 12 bills which will be brought before this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, if I may say something about procedure without exhausting the hon. members right to take part in the debate, I would say this, that this proposal is independent and separate altogether from the other proposals that will be coming in. This proposal would be brought to this House by the Government today, even if no other proposals were being made. Whether or not other proposals are being made, this proposal will be presented to this House for passing. It has no particular reference to the other — no particular relationship to the other proposals at all. That is why it is separated and they are dealt with by separate bills.

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, still speaking on the matter of the adjournment, I would prefer and I think it would be easier for this House to understand the debate and to take part in, if all the legislation were debated at once. But of course that is at the discretion of the Attorney General. However, in no event would I care to debate this, without having before me the other amendments to the District Courts Act — that particular Act. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General could agree to debate all at one time, it would be most desirable.

Premier Douglas: — To meet the wishes of the hon. lady member, we undertook to say that we will have all this legislation on the Order Paper so it can be read and perused before proceeding with this. We cannot guarantee that it will all be dealt with at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We cannot deal with more than one at a time anyway.

Mr. McDonald: — No, but we can deal with the principle.

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Public Health): — At the present time, Mr. Speaker, a child is made a ward of the Minister by a judge's order. Section 34 now provides that a child may be discharged from a wardship by an Order in Council. The purpose or intent of the amended sections would be to provide that a child may be discharged from wardship by a judge's order, if the child was to be returned to the parent.

Since the wardship is determined by a judge, in the first instance, it is felt that it should also be discharged by the judge. In this way, the Minister and Cabinet would be relieved of the judicial function, with its inherent pressures. Also a Court Order would be made meaningful to the parents. It is for that reason we wish to amend this section, so that the judge, in his order, returns the child to the parents rather than by Order in Council.

An Order in Council would still be required if a ward would be returned to society. If this ward were to marry, by Order in Council, we would return the ward this way. So with that explanation, I move second reading.

(Referred to Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 43 — An Act to amend The Rehabilitation Act

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Public Health): — At the present time, Mr. Speaker, a disabled person must be a resident of Saskatchewan, in order to come within the meaning of the Social Aid Act, in order to be eligible for vocational training. The intention of the amendment here is to enable us to give this vocational training to someone who is not a legal resident of the province, and which would be in his best interest not to send him back to the province from which he comes; but rather enable him to obtain the vocational training we provide in this province without becoming a legal resident, as specified under the Social Aid Act.

With that explanation, I move second reading.

(Referred to Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

Bill No. 44 — An Act to amend the Housing Act

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Public Health): — This is an addition or amendment to the Housing Act, Section 11; 11 (k) of this Act gives the municipality authority to build or maintain or acquire a home for the aged, the infirm or blind persons.

It is proposed that we make an addition to Section 11, 11 (1) which would enable the municipality to establish a board to administer these homes for the aged or blind, and so on. The reason for that is that municipalities have been requested that they be given authority to create such a board that would administer the affairs of these homes. Under the existing legislation, while the municipality can build the home and operate it, it cannot delegate the authority to a Board legally, to operate such. It is being asked in this amendment that this authority be given to the municipality to constitute such a Board which would, however, be responsible to the Municipal Council. We find similar arrangements in the Airport Boards, the Hospital Boards, and Library Boards and so forth. But we would like to spell this out in legislation.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading.

Mr. McCarthy: — Who operates those places now, in the absence of a Board?

Hon. Mr. Erb: — The municipality does. If the municipalities have set up a Board to administer it, they have done so; it is not with . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, I see!

Hon. Mr. Erb: — . . . not with any legal authority.

(Referred to Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.)

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