

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature**  
**35th Day**

**Thursday, April 12, 1962.**

The Assembly met at 10:00 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**QUESTION: PRIVATE MEDICAL INSURANCE SCHEMES**

**Mr. Franklin E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to ask the Premier or the Minister of Health, a question with regard to the status of the private medical insurance firms of the province. Under the present government plans will they be allowed to operate beyond July 1st, and if not, what action does the government foresee in closing them down?

**Hon. W. G. Davies (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think any action has been contemplated by any member of my department or myself, with respect to closing the plans down. Some of the plans are intending to operate on an enlarged coverage basis, and I understand they are offering to members of the general public a sort of an expanded policy. I can't give you the precise details of these, but we have no plan for closing the plans down as the hon. member has put it, and I would think for all intents and purposes after the application of the public plan, that these private plans will probably wish to operate in the enlarged coverage area.

**MESSAGE FROM LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR — FURTHER ESTIMATES**

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Lieutenant-Governor.

**April 12, 1962**

**Mr. Speaker:** —

FRANK. L. BASTEDO,

Lieutenant-Governor

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits Further Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the twelve months ending March 31, 1963, and Further Supplementary Estimates of certain sums required for the service of the Province for the twelve months ending March 31, 1962, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

REGINA, April 12, 1962.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd, that:

“His Honor’s Message, the Further Estimates, and Further Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.”

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lloyd.

Motion agreed to.

## **SECOND READINGS**

### **BILL NO. 63 — An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act**

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, this is an act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act, and the amending bill contains three or four major or relatively major changes.

The bill provides firstly for deferred pensions and by this, Mr. Speaker, I mean pensions which are payable to an employee of the public service, notwithstanding the fact what he is not in the employ of the public service when he reaches retirement age. The way this will work is that if an employee who falls within the general

qualifications has ten years or more of service with the government, he will earn for himself during that time a pension or a superannuation allowance which will be payable when he reaches the age of 65, and it will be calculated on the same basis as if he had stayed with the government as an employee for the full period, until he is 65. If I might cite an example; if an employee came to the government at age 25, and stayed with the government for 15 years, and left the government at age 40, he would earn for himself a superannuation allowance which would be payable when he reached the age of 65 years. This would be calculated on the basis of his period of service, 15 years x 2% of the average of his salary over the highest appropriate number of years, and that, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the second major change in the bill.

That is the change in the formula upon which the superannuation allowance is to be calculated. The present superannuation allowance is calculated by taking the employee's salary for the highest 10 years averaging it, taking 2% of the average, and multiplying this by the number of years service. If an employee had salary over a period of 10 years which averaged \$8,000 or \$160 then calculate the number of years service which he had, if I may suppose it as 20, then you would have 20 x \$160, or a pension of \$3,200 per annum — if my quick mental arithmetic is right. This indicates the manner of calculation, and members will realize how important in that formula the number of years over which the average is to be calculated, is. This act changes the formula by saying that instead of taking the average of the highest 10 years of salary, the average will be calculated over the highest 6 years of salary. It will be seen that in any period of relatively sharply increasing salary for public servants (and no one can tell when one of these periods will occur, as it did after the war, and as it may at another period of inflation) in any period such as this the employee gains a very substantial benefit by any shortening of the number of years over which the average salary is to be computed. This then is being shortened from 10 years to 6 years.

The third major change, Mr. Speaker, is in the provisions for the maximum pension, which is provided under the act. The present act provides that notwithstanding what amount of annual superannuation allowance an employee may be entitled to upon the basis of the calculation of the formula which I have just referred to — notwithstanding this amount, the superannuation allowance shall not be more than \$4,200 per annum. There is this ceiling of \$4,200 per annum. The act proposes that this

**April 12, 1962**

ceiling be raised, and it proposes that the ceiling be raised to \$6,000 per annum, but over a longer period of time. Five years I believe. At any rate it will increase the maximum superannuation allowance at the rate of \$30 a month, commencing on May 1, 1962. Thus the maximum salary will be \$4,230 on May 1, 1962, \$4,260 on June 1st and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the act also deals with the question of contributions by employees. There are, as you and hon. members will be aware, substantial benefits for employees in the changes which have been incorporated into the bill, which I have just outlined. I have not indicated all of the changes, but the three major changes which I have indicated; the incorporation of the principle of deferred pensions; the increasing of the maximum; and the improvement of the formula upon which superannuation allowances will be calculated; will be of substantial benefits to large numbers of public servants.

We have had discussions with the unions representing the employees who are covered by this particular act, and they have agreed that it would be in order, in view of the substantial benefits for employees, that the rate of contribution be increased by 1% of salary. The present rate of contributions are 5%, 6% and 7%, by which I mean an employee who joins the public service when he is under the age of 30 years, presently contributes 5% of his salary for superannuation purposes; if the employee joins the public service between the ages of 30 years and 40 years, he contributes 6% of his salary, and if he joins between 40 and 45 years, he contributes 7% of his salary. Those are the figures which are in the present legislation.

The new bill proposes that these figures be increased from 5%, 6% and 7%, to 6%, 7% and 8%; thus an increase of 1% in each case.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this covers all of the major portions of the bill, and refers to all the major principles which are referred to in or incorporated into the bill.

The one or two other minor matters, relatively minor at least, (they may be of some import to a particular public servant) the other one or two minor matters I think possibly can be best dealt with in committee.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading of the bill to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the minister a question? How long has there been superannuation for government employees in this province? When was this program started?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I can't be sure, but my recollection is 1927 — I think that is right.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — Is this different than liquor board employees? I notice in the changes in the liquor board superannuation it just dates back to 1944. The years before that were served in the liquor board, are not credited in the superannuation. Am I not right?

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — It seems we are getting into a difficult position, but just to answer the question, liquor board employees had no superannuation until 1944, but the acts are now essentially the same.

**Mr. Gallagher:** — If I may ask the hon. member.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think we will be closing the debate. I see the member for Saskatoon . . .

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Mr. Speaker, I haven't too much to say. I am rather disappointed that all these bills were brought in in the dying days of the session. There is quite a principle involved here, the principle of increased payments. It always appears to me that these pension plans are weighted heavily for the high salaried employee. I just wondered just what the low paid salaried employee was going to get for the extra 1% that he is going to have to contribute. I have not been able to quite figure it out, but I might be able to do that on the third reading. I notice the clause that limits the number of services that can be applied, 35 I think it is, which limits the low salaried employees for ever getting anywhere near the maximum amount, and I say I am a little disappointed that these come in in the dying days of the motions, but possibly I can get more explanation in committee.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as they have had negotiations with the different unions, they are reasonably happy.

**April 12, 1962**

I don't think they are happy about it.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 60 — An Act to amend the Saskatchewan Government Telephones Superannuation Act, 1955**

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour & Telephones):** — Mr. Speaker, the changes to this bill affect the employees of Saskatchewan Government Telephones, and are practically the same as the Provincial Treasurer has just outlined in his bill. I might mention one or two things that he did not.

One is that the investment power of the board is extended to purchase bonds for the superannuation fund in other ways than they have at the present time.

Another is that an employee of the Saskatchewan Government Telephones can transfer to the Liquor Licensing Commission, and take his pension rights and contribution with him, and start in as an employee with his rights protected.

One section that is not common to this or any other act will be that where the S.G.T. takes over an office, if the employees so wish, they can go with the Saskatchewan Government Telephones and pay back up to 10 years of their pension contributions, and become eligible for a pension at the time of retirement. That is the only change in this act that is not common to the others.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 60.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 61 — An Act to Amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act, 1958**

**Hon. C.C. Williams:** — Mr. Speaker, the changes here are just the same as the bills to which I just referred, and to which the Provincial Treasurer has referred. With that explanation I would move that Bill No. 61 be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 62 — An Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act**

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on referring to the remarks made on the previous bills, I could simply say “me too” and I would move Bill No. 62 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 64 — An Act to amend The Community Planning Act, 1957**

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, at the present time, as has always been in the past, there are certain responsibilities of a local council in regard to taking care of the rights of a the citizens in regard to community planning in their locality. There are certain rights that the majority of citizens have, and it is entrusted to the council to see that these rights are not infringed upon by individuals, and it is in the best interests of the community that the council be empowered to certain things in regard to community planning and the use of land. It is my feeling that these same rights and privileges accrue to the people of the province, and there are certain places in the province where there are rights and privileges of the people of the province that should be safe-guarded and taken care of by the government of the province, and this is the principle which is involved in this amendment to community planning act, as well as safe-guards in the amendment with regard to the rights of individuals and of municipalities.

With this explanation I would like to move second reading of Bill No. 64.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 65 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act, 1960**

**Hon. E.I. Wood:** — Mr. Speaker, this is an act to amend The Rural Municipality Act. I do not feel any of the amendments are controversial, in fact many of them are a repetition of what has already been passed in regard to the city and villages acts, and I think they were much discussed in committee.

**April 12, 1962**

I would move that Bill No. 65 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**Bill No. 66 — An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961**

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, this is an act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961, the amendments have in all cases been requested by the Federal Income Tax officials, and are considered by them to be necessary for the carrying out of the arrangements between the federal and provincial governments with respect to the imposition and collection of income taxes. The amendments suggested are all highly technical in nature, they contain no new principles, they deal with such matters as procedures to be followed in taxing members of the armed forces, procedures with respect to the taxing of the estates, so that there will be a certainty they will be taxed as individuals, procedures with respect to what happens when an employee from whom taxes have been deducted at source by his employer, moves from one province to another. In addition to these matters, the act either repeals or suspends Saskatchewan legislation which may affect the imposition of income taxes, such Saskatchewan statutes as The Railway Taxation Act, or The Succession Duties Act, The Travelling Shows Act, and some other statutes. As I have already indicated, Mr. Speaker, there are no changes in principle. The changes suggested are purely for the sake of facilitating the operation of the tax collection arrangements which this province was forced to make with the federal government, and which were fully explained at the autumn session of the legislature.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move the second reading of the Bill No. 66.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

**SECOND READINGS  
(Adjourned Debate)**

On the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Wood, that:

**Bill No. 52 — An Act to provide for the Establishment of Local Government Units to be known as Municipal Units or Counties**



be now read the second time.

**Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on this bill the other day I pointed out that this government had spent about one million dollars of taxpayer's money, in my opinion unnecessarily, in order to try and get these larger units into orbit. I also suggested that they had only lately adopted a policy that we, on this side of the House, have been advocating for years — namely that there should be no change in municipal boundaries without a vote being taken.

I am glad the government has at last decided to give the local people a vote. I hope this vote will be the means of giving all the rural people a meaningful vote. They are all ready to vote, but the way this thing is set up by vacant units here and there I am still not satisfied we are going to have a meaningful vote. I would like to see more time and thought spent on it, but it seems the government has come down off their high horse to a certain extent, and are going to give some sort of a vote.

Now, I asked to adjourn the debate the other day so I could have time to consider the remarks and also have a look at the amendments. Well, I have had a look at them, and I think this is greatest example, of socialist planning, perhaps I should say a socialist muddling. We were told a couple of weeks ago when the municipal convention was on, that this bill wasn't ready to put before the convention, and now we have it back two weeks later with nine pages of amendments. Now this is not an old bill we are amending — it is a new bill, and surely you could bring a new bill that wasn't ready a few weeks ago in here without nine pages of amendments. It is a very poor administration. If the session wasn't near to being prorogued I would suggest that you take the bill back and bring it in in some sort of reasonable shape. In my experience I have never seen a bill brought into the House in such a manner. I believe it was prepared with undue haste — to have a bill presented in such manner, in such an unbusinesslike manner, I believe it was prepared with undue haste — it looks like it to me.

This is a very important matter, Mr. Speaker, a very important one — because it is under these boundaries that probably our local governments, will be the boundaries for probably a great many years, and this matter deserves

**April 12, 1962**

a great deal of thought. I am not too sure that the government or the advisory committee are prepared today to go ahead. They have put a lot of work on it, and they have done some good work in the last six months or so. They have been working along the bottom lines, along the lines I think they should have worked to begin with, but I still don't think that if we were really prepared to go ahead with this thing at the moment I think if the government would consult their advisory committee they would tell them, that they are a long, long way from having defined these boundaries yet, and by the looks of this legislation, as far as I can see, I think the department is a long, long way from setting down on paper what they should have, in this bill, and what they want in it.

I think it has been handled in a very unbusinesslike manner and with undue haste. After all, we have had these boundaries for over 50 years, and while I know the Minister of Mineral Resources thinks they are no good and never were, I am of a different opinion. It would be sounder business to still postpone this for another year — give your advisory commission the opportunity to really do this job, and I think the minister would be the first to admit the boundary delay is still in a very great state of confusion, and I think whether he will admit it or not, that this bill has been brought in hastily and leaves a lot to be desired. I think when we are writing the thing we should be sure it is sound legislation. It is only just lately that you have got down to the place where you should have started at, that is consulting the local people as to what they want, and there is no hurry for it.

I have looked over this bill, and after wading through all the legal gibberish and got all the pieces in their proper order, I have come to the conclusion that some of these amendments are an improvement. There is still a lot to be desired in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go into that individually now. I think it can be better done in committee, and I will have something more to say at that time.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to add only a few comments on the discussion of this particular bill. I think we will agree with the member who has just taken his seat, that it is unfortunate that the bill has received the kind of amendment that is before the House at this particular time.

I do want to ask him to bear in mind, this is not only an extremely complicated bit of legislation, but that it has been subject to a great deal of discussion with representatives of local government organizations. Many of the amendments which appear at this time are as a result of the discussions which have taken place in recent weeks.

While there were discussions beforehand it was difficult to get down to really definitive sort of study by the minister, and that I think is some explanation of the extenuating circumstances of the amendments being brought in somewhat late.

I do want to comment with regard to one other aspect, however, that is the suggestion that we are unduly hurried in this. This is something different I must admit from the tone of remarks made not long ago in the legislature in which we were accused of delaying too long, and urged on every front to get on with the business of defining and in regard to the school units adjusting the boundaries. I submit the opposition can't have it both ways.

Mainly I want to make a comment about what the member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) suggested that there has been spent on this matter of changing boundaries, of changing structures of local government, a sum of one million dollars, because of the two commissions which have recommended in this way.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Four.

**Premier Lloyd:** — Four — either way you will. I point out this is an over simplification to the extent that it ends up with being a gross exaggeration of the actual situation. I think it is a most incorrect interpretation. Anybody who has read the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, will immediately recognize the tremendous amount of study that is given to problems in addition to just the one that has been mentioned here. This particular one was indeed a minor part of that study. It touched on all phases of the problems facing rural people in the province of Saskatchewan. It was an exhaustive and exceedingly worthwhile valuable study and report. The continuing committee did, of course, extend the period of discussion, and here again there is much in those reports if anybody wants to take the trouble to study them, in addition to just the comments on structure and size of local government units.

**April 12, 1962**

This one million dollars represents much more; I would like to submit it represents this sort of thing; it represents the greatest opportunity which people in this province have ever had to have a say about the conditions in our communities under which our local governments work. Never before in this province, and I submit, never in the history of any other province in Canada have people been given the opportunity to take part in making decisions about the future of local governments, as they have, as a result of the work of those two commissions in their very exhaustive effort to make it possible for people to say what they think and to back up their thinking with reasons based on their own experience. On that basis it has been a procedure which we on this side of the house think is useful. I repeat again of course that these commissions, particularly the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, did much more than just study local government size and structure.

Mr. Speaker, my main reason for rising, was to place squarely on the records of this house the position which this government has taken over a great many years on this matter of reorganization. Some members will refer to a journal of the legislative assembly, page 97, Thursday, March 13, 1958. I would point out that at that time a resolution had been placed before this house by the opposition suggesting that there should be a vote before any reorganization was taken. The position of the government at that time was that this legislature and the government should not say at that time that there should be a vote or that there should not be a vote, because of the fact that we had sitting a commission investigating this. We felt it was our responsibility to wait, without instruction, the determination of the commission and then make our decision at that point. This, of course, is clearly pointed out by the amendment which was moved and subsequently passed. That amendment said that "consideration should be given to the report of the continuing committee on local government, and consultation be held with local government organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their ratepayers". This government has consistently held that we would not say there would be a vote, that we would not say there would not be a vote, until that report was available; until there has been time for its study; until there had been time for its discussion with the representatives of local government organizations of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Government Members: — Hear! Hear!**

**Premier Lloyd:** — Now in further affirmation of that point of view, I want to read to the legislature a series of statements made by my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Douglas, speaking as the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. In 1956, speaking at the local government conference here in this chamber, Premier Douglas said this:

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

That, Mr. Speaker, was in 1956. In 1957, speaking before the S.A.R.M. convention, he is quoted in the *Star Phoenix* of March 13th in these words:

“Premier T.C. Douglas stated emphatically his government has no intention of embarking on any plan of municipal reorganization without the solid backing of local governing bodies, and the widespread support of the general public.”

In that same year, speaking in this legislature, reported in *Hansard*, volume 26, page 6, 1957.

Premier T.C. Douglas:

“Then assuming that the government, the legislature, and the provincial organizations are all in agreement on the proposals, we would then consult with the provincial organizations regarding the best method of ascertaining the wishes of their ratepayers. There is a very strong possibility that when these discussions are held, a plebiscite or a vote or something of that sort will be what the provincial organizations will recommend. How it will be taken, or by what method it will be taken, will be something for them to make suggestions to us about.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly and precisely what has been

**April 12, 1962**

going on in this province. The report of the committees, the discussion with local government organizations, acting as a result of these discussions.

Premier Douglas again, Leader-Post, March 19, 1958, speaking before the S.A.R.M. convention:

“I want to make it clear, without any shadow of a doubt that the government has no intention of forcing change on you if you don’t want it, Premier T.C. Douglas told rural delegates in convention in Regina, Tuesday.”

March 4, 1959, Star-Phoenix of Saskatoon reports S.A.R.M. convention:

“The Premier said his government remains convinced that some form of reorganization is essential and desirable if local government is to play its proper role in our society. However, he assured delegates of the provincial government would accept the wishes of the rural people.”

Premier T.C. Douglas, 1961 — Western Producer, March 23rd, S.A.R.M. convention:

“My plea is study this report, let us talk about it, let us sit down and reason together. If we do that we will have kept faith with those who have gone before and those who will follow us.”

May I submit, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who takes recognition of those statements made each year, can have no doubt as to the consistency of the government’s approach to this problem, and can have no doubts but what our approach in the past is entirely consistent with the procedure proposed in this bill.

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on what the Premier has just said. I think if this assurance was made to the municipal association, why should they feel it necessary for them to have a vote of their own. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities were not satisfied that they were going to get a vote. As a matter of fact, I think it was a year ago last December, when the Premier stated and it was recorded in the press, that a vote at that time was foolish. I am quite satisfied in my own mind that if

this guarantee had been given to the rural municipal association, they would not have gone out on their own and spent this amount of money in holding the election.

**Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question? Is he suggesting that these statements made by the Premier are false?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Boldt:** — All I was going to say here is that the Premier as late as last December, stated that a vote at that time was absolutely foolish, and had no bearing at all.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Where did you get that?

**Mr. Boldt:** — I have the clipping here on my file, I will get it for you later. I was looking for it but do not have the time to dig it up now.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals have made very clear our policy on reorganization, to the people of Saskatchewan. I believe the first grave mistake the government made was the setting up of the staff to the Local Government Continuing Committee. This staff to my mind was loaded with socialists endeavouring to force government policies down the necks of the Local Government Continuing Committee members, and with reasonable success. The second grave mistake the committee and the government made was to continuously refuse a vote to the people concerned, and they only changed their mind when the municipalities took it upon themselves to have a vote of their own.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . the fact . . .

**Mr. G.H Danielson:** — That is what broke your back.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Boldt:** — Then the third mistake the government made on reorganization was the statement contained in the press release of June 5, 1961. This statement of policy, concerning local government, was presented on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan, by J.H. Brockelbank, Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs. The report goes

**April 12, 1962**

on to say and I quote:

“When this has been accomplished throughout the province there will be coterminous areas for local government and both municipal and school governments will be operating within them. From this date forward the electors of any coterminous area will decide by vote if they want a change in form of their local government.”

Then he said, and I quote:

“We believe this program which provides for participation of local government representatives for careful study of boundaries, for dispensing information and for both as to form and structure of local government is practical and very democratic.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, the new Minister of Municipal Affairs apparently did not believe this could be very democratic, nor did this meet with the approval of the rural municipal association, and I shall quote from a press release of January 15, 1962, the new Minister of Municipal Affairs had this to say:

“The Minister recalled that in the press statement made last June 5th, the government proposed that the new boundaries would be made effective for school units, however, after further discussion the government agreed that the next step would be to select areas in which there is an apparent interest in the formation of counties or modified counties. Information would be given in these areas and a vote would be taken to decide if a county or modified county is to be organized.”

This is the important part:

“Boundaries of the rural municipalities involved will not be adjusted to conform to the newly-proposed boundaries until such time as the vote within the area proposed for a county or modified county is carried in the affirmative.”



This is the viewpoint of the new minister, and it does not agree with what was stated in the press release of June 5th. This statement is in agreement with the rural municipalities and with the Liberal opposition, and we congratulate the Minister of Municipal Affairs for the stand he has taken on reorganizations.

Now before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I do feel I should throw out a warning to the minister in charge and the government. In view of the very little enthusiasm for reorganization of the rural municipalities, I would caution the government to be very careful and to be sure not to further antagonize the rural municipal association.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't know whether the hon. member is reading from some quotation, reading his speech, or saying his own words. Are these supposed to be his own words and is he reading from some quotations?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Ask your own members . . .

**Mr. Boldt:** — I did my own speech, Mr. Minister. I would caution the government to be very careful and be sure not to further antagonize the rural municipal association. These are my words.

You should exercise every caution and co-operation in dealing with the matter. There is no doubt in my mind that politics have and will be involved in this matter, and here again the government should exercised every caution. By this I meant he minister should be very concerned that his deputy stays out of the political arena, regardless whether he calls himself a politician or an economist. He has no business appearing on public platforms and meetings sponsored by political parties of any kind. His duty as a civil servant is to see that neither the government nor the minister under whom he serves is subject to embarrassment, and finally I believe that until such a time as the government sees fit to announce financial benefits to the rural municipalities, I see no sign of enthusiasm for reorganization.

Mr. Speaker, the minister I believe has taken into consideration when drafting the bill, the principles and views expressed by the rural municipalities, and the Liberal party, and I shall support the bill on second reading.

**April 12, 1962**

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say very much on this particular bill, but I feel there are one or two comments that can be made with regard to it.

I do want to congratulate the government on one thing, and that is on accepting the recommendations (to agree at least) of the opposition that sits to your left, Mr. Speaker, and bringing in legislation which I am quite certain, in spite of the remarks and statements made by the Premier this morning, were not the true feelings or the true views of the government. The bill that is being presented to us is not the bill that the government would have liked to have seen brought into this House. However, because of the opposition of the people in the country, because of the opposition of the people of this province, the organizations that represent these people, such as our rural municipal association, because of their opposition to the actions of the government, and also to the leadership that has been given as well by the opposition to demanding that the rights of the people of this province to a choice of the type of municipal administration they are going to have.

For these various reasons the government has been forced into the position of bringing in the type of legislation which has been suggested on many occasions by members on this side of the House. I believe all of us have said, and possibly some of us may oppose for our own areas, changes that have been suggested in even the present legislation, but I do not believe there is anyone at any time on this side of the House that has ever said there should not be legislation which would permit changes in the municipal administrative system in this province, in any area of this province where the people felt that change was necessary. And so we say as far as the principle that is involved in this bill, of permitting the people of this province to make a choice as to the type of administration they desire for their own affairs, there can be no objections to it from either side of this House. The principle of enabling legislation to permit the people to have a right of say in their own municipal set-up is perfectly all right, and it is the type of legislation that should be brought into this House, but there are sections in this bill which we feel neither the people in the country, the rural municipal association particularly, approve of, and which we cannot approve of at the present time in the bill.

However, I feel we must leave and should leave these objections as to the technical operations of this act until committee. I can assure the government that this bill, as to the important problems that are involved in the bill itself, particularly relating to the type of vote and the decision that is to be made, or the type of petition, as to the decision that is to be made on a petition being presented. There are technical things involved in these various decisions that we feel are not correct in the bill as it stands, and if changes are not made which will permit a democratic choice of our people in this regard, then of course we will withhold our right to support this bill when it comes up for third reading.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put myself on record as supporting enabling legislation to provide the people with the right to have the administrative system of their choice in this province, but at the same time, to also reserve my right to oppose various aspects of the bill in committee, and to oppose the bill on third reading if certain adjustments are not made.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to take but a few minutes. After the Premier's bold attempt to save the face of the government a few minutes ago, I want to say a few words.

Four years ago speaking in this House, I attacked, and I don't deny it, I say again that I attacked, the composition of this continuing committee, because the majority of that committee were unsuited for the work they were called upon to do. Most of them were city people who had no conception and no real knowledge of rural conditions, and as such they were picked because they were good party men, supporters of the CCF party.

I was strongly denounced on the floor of this House by Tommy Douglas, and he doubled up his little rabid fists and he told us what a terrible individual I was to say anything about the choice of that committee. I want to point out to you that was just the start of the war, because afterwards the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) and the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) got up and supported me to the hilt. Other people commenced to ask questions. What are they trying to do to us?

**April 12, 1962**

There were no rural people on that committee and that was what started the war. It came out in the press and people commenced to ask questions.

Then this morning, the Premier has tried, and made a bold attempt, to save the face of the government. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the four ranking cabinet ministers were members of that committee, including the Premier and the other ranking cabinet ministers. I was at a meeting in Saskatoon when this matter was discussed, and a gentleman that lives close to Weyburn who was a member of that committee got up and told the people who listened to him that the government did not know anything of what the committee was doing. There were hundreds of people there, and I got up and asked him a question, "How many meetings of the committee had been attended by ministers of the government?" I got an answer, and I don't want to tell you what he said. But we came into the House a year or two ago and asked that question, and I was surprised to hear in reply to the question that practically every meeting, except one or two, had been attended by cabinet ministers. Now I am not referring to the sub-committee meeting. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the regular meetings of that committee.

Now then, every committee member or cabinet minister that sits on that committee, what did they do? They went up and down the length and breadth of this province, hired parish halls and church basements and every place they could get in, they carried a full load of what they call these experts with them, including the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs. He was the key brain in the whole set-up. This whole concept, this whole argument, the whole purpose, was to instill into the minds of the people that listened to them, that they should not vote on this thing, and here were four government ministers on that committee. You don't mean to tell us that they didn't know what was in that committee's report, this is the most ridiculous, the most brazen attempt, of trying to save the face of the government, that I ever heard of, or ever expect to hear of.

We have never said that we were opposed to larger municipal units, or reorganization. I have said too many times that there was a reason for changing municipal boundaries. I can tell them two or three places that I know of that there wouldn't be any opposition to enlarging the municipalities, it should have been done and will be done.

I think we should give credit to the new minister for granting the right to the people to vote on this very important matter that concerns not only the large majority of the people, but individuals, very much so.

I would say this, as the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said, don't be too much in a rush about this; don't antagonize the people more than they are now; don't try to ram anything down their throats, because they are just in the mood now to turn it down solid, and that would be too bad because I believe, and we on this side of the House believe there is place for improvement and place for reorganization of the boundaries which might be to the benefit of everybody.

I want to say again, insofar as the Premier is concerned, he is trying to put a face on a bad proposition which would be acceptable to the people and save his own face. In 1945 this gentleman that sits right over here, I was at the city hall when he spoke to the convention, I think it was the first convention he ever attended, and he was Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time, and he told us of the plans he had in mind and he said, I know you won't like this thing, but you are going to get it anyhow.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Oh, no.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh you did, and I repeated it on the floor of this House, you never denied it, never, and there were hundreds of people there that heard it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That is right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — So there we have the truth of the matter, there we have true dictator, and if I should say anything, I would say he has done more during the years gone past for disorganizing and destroying the municipal organization of this province than any other man in Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). I am very pleased that he gives credit to the new Minister of Municipal Affairs for the work he has done. This is the first time for a

**April 12, 1962**

long time that the hon. member for Arm River has recognized any good work, and there is still hope for his redemption if he tends to recognize some good work that is being done on this side of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is no hope for you . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I don't mind the hon. member for Arm River using me as a whipping boy all the way from 1945 to the present time. I have weathered it fairly well and if it is any indication of the future, I hope he continues as he has in the past, and that will be just fine. He has said a lot of things which certainly I didn't say, but that is entirely beside the point. I was interested when he said that a whole lot of the members of the continuing committee were unsuitable.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I didn't say so. The biggest number of them . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The biggest number . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All right. Which would be a majority of the members of the continuing committee on local government were unsuitable.

**Mr. Danielson:** — For that purpose.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All right, for that purpose. Now I have wondered if the hon. member would care to tell who or which of those members were unsuitable. Was it Stan Ferguson of Regina? Was he one that was unsuitable? Was it T.W. Garland that was unsuitable? Was it W.J. Irvine, Speers who was unsuitable? Was it G.H. Dawson of Neville who was unsuitable? Was it H.J. Maher of North Battleford who was unsuitable?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes I think he was . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — He has never been outside the city and has ever had any interest in rural problems.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All right, we have the information that the hon. member for Arm River considers Mr. Maher of North Battleford unsuitable to sit on this continuing committee.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The chairman was another one.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. John McAskill of Saskatoon; do you suppose he would consider him unsuitable? H.J. Partridge of Gull Lake, nobody says anything about that one; H. Greenwood of Rosetown, a reeve, a farmer, maybe he is unsuitable? Maybe they consider unsuitable A.B. Douglas of McTaggart.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I wouldn't put him on.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He says he wouldn't put him on. Mr. Douglas was unsuitable? It is very enlightening to find out what the hon. member for Arm River thinks about these people.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They have know that for a long time.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — George J. Hindley, a former councillor, trustee, in the association of farmers, one of the old settlers of the province. Maybe he was unsuitable? And of course to the hon. member for Arm River Mr. Trew would certainly be unsuitable just because his wife happened to be a CCF member of this legislature. That is the kind of a mind he has, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well you remind me about it now.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And then representing the hospital association we have E.S. Bourassa of Regina. Is he unsuitable? C.J. Fahlman of Kronau representing the Health Region.

The biggest part of these members were unsuitable for their jobs. The fact of the matter is . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — On a point of privilege. We had Tommy Douglas, Fines, Brockelbank and Lloyd.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**April 12, 1962**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is no point of privilege.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The people of the province . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I was just going to deal with that. I didn't mention the members of the cabinet who were members of this committee because of course my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has not control over that at all. He has been trying to control that . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You appointed yourself.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He has been trying but he hasn't succeeded as yet. I know if the hon. member for Arm River had been sitting on this side, he would have one good member on his committee anyway, he would have himself on the committee.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would stay clear of that. It would be my business . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of what the hon. members say about what they are going to do in regard to the second reading on this bill, they are just opposed to any progress, and have opposed progress all along the line, and I could go back into history and spend an hour or two on showing how they have been against any change when circumstances change. And now, the hon. member for Arm River says we shouldn't be playing politics with this, and I want to tell you that if anybody has been playing politics with this issue, it is in the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You have been playing politics since 1945.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I wish the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) would keep quiet. He made his speech a little while ago . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You are talking to me, talk to the Speaker.



**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And they never missed an opportunity in the last few elections, and on any occasion, to make as much political hay out of this question as they could. They don't care about local government very much as a matter of fact.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Are you accusing us of playing politics?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now they say oh, but don't be in a rush. You know they remind me of the kind of people who would never do things by halves if they could do it by quarters.

There is one thing you can say for sure, Mr. Speaker, you can never go too slow as far as they are concerned. The slower you go the better.

Now nobody can say we have been in a rush with this work. It has been under discussion for many many years, there has been more public discussion, more participation in the discussion by people all over the province, than on any other question I know. Nobody can say there has been a rush. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the bill, and it will be very interesting to see what my hon. friends opposite do about this.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well you wait and see.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources has prompted me to take part in this debate. When the Minister of Mineral Resources or any other government minister says that the Liberal party are against progress, and if he can take an hour or an hour and a half to substantiate his statement if need be, but he didn't substantiate them at all, he didn't even take a minute, or a minute and a half, and I want to assure the Minister of Mineral Resources, that the Liberal party have a greater interest in the progress of municipal government, local government, development of this province, than any person in this province.

**Government Member:** — That will take some recording.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the difference is this, we believe, and have from the very beginning, away back in 1945, when the minister who has just taken his seat, was advocating

**April 12, 1962**

larger municipal units, and destroying local government as we know it, we opposed it at that time, and oppose it to this day, unless people concerned have the opportunity to vote on it. It has only been the opposition of the Liberal party and of rural people especially, that have brought this government to their knees, and now they are going to be given the opportunity of voting.

The minister says we don't care about local government. Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can you get. There is the man who didn't care. If he had thought for one moment that he could have brought in larger municipal units in 1945, and shoved it down the throats of the people of this province, he would have done so. He and his government attempted to do with the school units, what they are now proposing to do with counties. They didn't have the audacity to bring in the type of legislation that is now provided for in Bill 42 in regard to larger school units, and I predict that it will only be a matter of a very few short years if the people of this province are unfortunate enough to have this government re-elected, until such time as we will have similar legislation with regard to counties.

The Liberal party has maintained a position right from the beginning on this question, and that is that local people should make these decisions; not the Minister of Mineral Resources or any other group, but the people who reside out in the areas that are most affected.

In the words of the Minister of Mineral Resources that the Liberal party would never do anything by halves that they could do by quarters. The Minister of Mineral Resources would never do anything by halves if he could accomplish his aim in one move. What he and his government would like to do, would be to destroy local government without ever consulting the people concerned. We are opposed to that.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Now this is permissive legislation as I understand it. There have been a lot of amendments brought into the House, and I want to make it abundantly clear that the Liberal party and myself have said time and time again that we believe there is some need for change in local government. Local government as we know it today, to all intents and purposes was set up away back in 1905.

Now the problems that existed in 1905 are not the problems that exist today. The type of government that could solve the problems in 1905 or 1912 or 1920 or 1925, is probably not the type of government that is necessary to deal with many of these problems today. We have said this but we have also said that the people concerned should make the decision not the government, but the local people.

This bill makes provision for local people to make this decision, and I am one of those that hopes that when this bill gets into committee, that there will be some changes made. I do not believe the bill is perfect by a long shot, but because the bill in essence does what the Liberal party have continuously asked to be done, then I will support it on second reading, but I will have many suggestions to make to this House in committee of the whole, and I hope for the sake of the people concerned, that is the people who live in the rural areas, that there will be amendments made when this bill is in committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the House ready for the question? I must inform the House that the mover is about to close the debate.

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) in the debate said he had never seen a bill brought into the House in such poor shape, in such a manner. I am not prepared to apologize for that, only in regard to my own inexperience as a minister. I can maybe apologize in that regard, but never, I don't think, has a bill been brought into this House with so much consultation with local groups or given people such an opportunity to voice their opinions in regard to it. It was just two weeks ago tomorrow that, or two weeks ago next Saturday, that we met with the local government council, and let them have a look at our bill as it was proposed to bring in to the House. I suppose the hon. member for Cannington would have been quite pleased if we had brought the bill in in the shape it was, with no House amendments to it. He would have thought it looked very good, it would appear we were bringing this bill in in good shape. However, we sat down, there was no coercion, we sat down and discussed this matter freely with members of the S.A.R.M., the S.U.M.A and the S.S.T.A. We took a good look at the proposed changes that were made, and we have incorporated a good many of them in this, and it is because

**April 12, 1962**

of these things largely that we are making these changes.

If you take our municipal act, our village act, our town act and city act, there are changes made from year to year, and these acts have been tried and have been on the statute books for many years, and yet there are still changes to be made every year. This is a brand new bill and did he expect to have it perfect right from the start, he is asking something that is not reasonable.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Nine pages on a new bill . . .

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — You cannot have it both ways, if you are going to take these people into consultation and ask their opinion on these things and be prepared to make these amendments, then you have to have House amendments, and I am not apologizing. It is rather unfortunate, I agree, and it is not going to be the easiest thing to handle but I apologizing that we have made these changes, and have brought this bill in in this shape.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — Another thing the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) had to say was in regard to a million dollars that he alleged had been spent in regard to the commissions that had been set up studying local government reorganization in the province. I am not prepared to accept his figures, but I am not going to dispute them either. It may be in that area, that we have spent a million dollars. If you stop to think about the six or seven million dollars, that are spent in this province each year on grants to municipalities for roads and other things, when you stop to think about the millions of dollars that are spent on grants to schools, and the money that is spent on social welfare and hospitalization, the hundreds of millions of dollars that are handled by local governments, is it only reasonable that over a period of years we spend a million dollars to try and see that the local government set-up is the best that can possibly be achieved in this province? I think a million dollars is a small amount to be spent for such a purpose. This is a big matter that we are dealing with.

I would like to say also that there has been some criticism levelled mostly by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) in regard to the alleged change in the government's thought in regard to these things.

I would like to say in the first place that there was a proposal that this legislation, that this change in the reorganization in the municipal field, be done without a vote. This proposal came from the continuing committee. It never at any time was espoused by the government during the early months after the time when the continuing committee went out and made their report to the people and discussed these things with the people, during all these months the government was entirely silent in regard to what their policy would be. The continuing committee made this proposal and I still feel there is a good deal of merit in this proposal. There are many people in the province today that are criticising the government, criticising me on the act, that we are going about this thing in this way. There will also be a piecemeal effect in the province of Saskatchewan in regard to local government. Instead of simplifying local government we will now have two added kinds of local government in the province of Saskatchewan. In the province of Alberta they looked at this thing, and decided when they went about it, they were not going to have a vote, and they proceeded and changed the boundaries throughout the province without a vote. There are a good many arguments that can be advanced in regard to putting these things in without a vote. I think the local government continuing committee had a good deal of evidence to support their stand in regard to this, but there are other sides to the question. I agree with you. The government in consultation with the people of the province and in consultation with the local government bodies, did decide that we would give the people of this province a vote, in regard to local areas where they wish to make these changes. As I say there are two sides to this question and in my opinion the best final solution of these things, is to have the type of government which the people of the area are in favour of. I think the government was right in finally coming to this decision that they would give the people of this province a vote in regard to this.

I want to make it very clear here that this is not my decision, there were a few bouquets handed around this morning, and I would like to take them, but I am afraid I can't. These decisions have been made in full and free consultation with the other members in the cabinet, and received their support just as much as my own.

There are some other things that have been said in regard to the deputy of my department. I want to make it very plain at this time that I have full confidence in my deputy. Dr. Brownstone, I think . . .

**April 12, 1962**

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — . . . is a very valuable man in that department. I feel we are fortunate to have such a man. It is true the studies he has made and through the work he has done in the past, his knowledge in certain fields have made him in demand as a speaker by certain groups and in different places throughout the length and breadth of this dominion. I am proud to let him go and take part in those discussions, and I think our department is fortunate to have Dr. Brownstone in that position.

**Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Wood:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that covers most of my remarks at this time in regard to this bill.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Would the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, any question should have been posed before the debate was closed. You had a chance to raise your point.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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