

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Fourteenth Legislature
36th Day

Friday, April 13, 1962.

The Assembly met at 10:00 o'clock a.m.

FIRST READING

Hon. Mr. Davies moved for leave to introduce a bill to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, 1961, and moved that the said bill be now read a first time.

Mr. Thatcher: — May I say anything about it on first reading?

Mr. Speaker: — Not on first reading, on second reading.

Mr. Thatcher: — Can I say nothing about it on first reading?

Mr. Speaker: — No. Not on first reading.

Mr. Thatcher: — Well, may I say this, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No. You can't make any comments.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

Hon. Mr. Davies: — With the consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, later today.

Mr. Thatcher: — No, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No. You can't speak. Order! That is your privilege, but you cannot debate at this time.

Hon. Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, it will have to be the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — It will have to be Monday next.

April 13, 1962

On the Orders of the Day:

ANNOUNCEMENT — PEDDES' BEAUTY SUPPLIES

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — I would like to call attention of the members to a bottle that appears on each desk. It is Peddes' Mint Shampoo, made by a firm that has been in existence in Regina for 31 years and has nine permanent employees and three temporary employees. I offered my bottle to the Clerk, but he turned it down — he said he didn't need it. Apparently they manufacture a large assortment of beauty and barber supplies used in over 400 shops in western Canada, including Yellowknife, N.W.T. I thought I would give you just a brief explanation as to why these bottles are here.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the arrival of a son . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Wood: — . . . this morning at 3 o'clock. The young lad weighed 8 lbs. 15 ozs. I think that ordinarily, for a politician that could easily be 9 lbs.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I think this announcement which we have just heard dispels two doubts to assumptions which are sometimes held. Some people may have some doubts about the value of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and the trips which are frequently associated with this. I should think this serves to dispel any doubts of that kind.

Secondly, some people may believe that Friday the 13th is an unlucky day. Both of these, I suggest, are now banished forever. Seriously, I think all of us would want to extend our congratulations to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Mrs. Wood, to wish them well and to wish the new arrival exceedingly well.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF EXPERIMENTAL FARM

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with and before we leave this session at this time, I would like to draw to the attention of members of the House that one of our oldest institutions in this province, an institution which has benefited all the farmers immeasurably throughout the years, is celebrating this year its 75th anniversary. I refer, of course, to the experimental farm at Indian Head. I am sure that if the authorities see fit to celebrate the 75th anniversary during this summer, I would like to extend on behalf of the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency a very cordial invitation to all members and the people throughout the province to be with us during the summer, and to visit the experimental farm and to get familiar with the staff and I am sure if they do that they will receive a very courteous welcome and the day would be most enjoyable and profitable.

EXPLANATION

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to just tell the House that we could not agree with three readings . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . despite my words yesterday . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . because we do not think these are minor changes . . . No, Mr. Speaker, I am going to finish . . . because the Premier told us yesterday that these were minor amendments and they are not minor amendments. They are major amendments brought in the last day of the House . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member take his seat?

Mr. Thatcher: — I will take my seat when I get ready, Mr. Speaker.

April 13, 1962

Premier Lloyd: — That is an insult to the Speaker, and it is surely something that is unheard of in this House . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . your . . . to this House . . .

Premier Lloyd: — Will you be quiet for a moment? I am rising to suggest that the Leader of the Opposition has shown an unwarranted lack of regard for the rules of this House and an unwarranted lack of any kind of decency in his opposition to the Speaker's ruling which he has just attempted to display.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF TRUCKING AGREEMENT

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I should like to announce to the House that the government of Saskatchewan has concluded a reciprocity trucking agreement with the government of Alberta, signed yesterday, and it is the same type of agreement which I earlier announced to the House had been concluded between the provinces of Saskatchewan and Ontario, giving reciprocal benefits to the truckers in each of two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 67 — An Act to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act

Hon. Russell Brown (Minister of Industry and Information): — Mr. Speaker, this bill is providing certain amendments to The Power Corporation Superannuation Act. I am sure if the members have looked over the bill they will find that the provisions are about the same as the other superannuation acts which are presently in committee. I would suggest that they be considered in committee along with the other bills. I would therefore move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this is the bill to amend The Legislative Assembly Act which is being placed before the members

and which is based in part on recommendations of the committee which was established earlier in the year. The reports of this committee have been circulated to all of the members and everybody has had the chance to study them. I say that the amendments in this particular act refer only to the sessional indemnities paid to the members of the Legislative Assembly. The fact is, however, that the committee considered and reported on salaries of the executive council and others, consequently I think it would be fitting if I were to extend my remarks beyond the exact recommendations of the bill in order to indicate government recommendations in this regard.

The changes with regard to the others are provided for in the Appropriations Bill and will be discussable at least when the estimates are brought in.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that the recommendations of the committee were as follows: That the indemnity for the members of the Legislative Assembly be \$6 thousand per year; that the salary of executive council members be \$11 thousand; that the salary of the Leader of the Opposition be at that same level, namely, \$11 thousand; that the salary of the Premier be at \$14 thousand. The committee further recommended that there be an increase in the amount paid to the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker of \$500 each.

As the bill will indicate, the proposals there provide for the indemnity at the rate of \$6 thousand for the members of the Legislative Assembly with the usual added consideration for those who represent northern constituencies. The reason here is of course obvious, for persons in the northern constituencies do have a very larger area to cover and as a result have considerable added expense.

When the estimates are considered it will be noted that the government is further proposing the following: First that the recommended increases for the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker be put into effect. Second, that the Leader of the Opposition's salary be at the same level as that of members of the executive council. Thirdly, that the salary for those members of the executive council be at \$10 thousand a year — that is \$1 thousand less than the committee recommended — finally that the salary of the Premier be at \$13 thousand, \$1 thousand again less than recommended by the committee.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, just to make a few comments with regard to some of the basic reasons, in my opinion at least, why action of this kind

April 13, 1962

is warrantable. To begin with, I think no one who has watched the situation at all will deny the very far-reaching responsibility of each and every member of the Legislative Assembly. By the very nature of our office we do make decisions which intimately effect the lives of the people of our province. In addition to that we accept the responsibility of advising people on many problems arising out of their relationship with government; members themselves will know best of all how much time it takes them in this kind of consultation and this kind of giving advice to people in their constituencies. We interpret as best we can the problems of these people through the government to our respective political organizations. Frequently it is necessary for our members of the legislature to negotiate to some extent on behalf of their constituents; to accompany them on visits to Regina on their discussing problems which have arisen on various departments of government.

As one looks at this responsibility, and it is an increasing responsibility, I think it should become clear to all that there should be no barrier, other than the will of the people between capable individuals in the province and membership in the Legislative Assembly. I hope it is fully understood that no member accepts nomination or accepts membership in the Legislative Assembly following an election with the expectation of gaining financial advantage. I think secondly, along with this, goes the fact that no member should be expected to make a financial sacrifice. I am convinced that the people of the province do not expect members to make any financial sacrifice, but I know from the experience of some of my colleagues, both the private members and the cabinet ministers, and I am sure members of the opposition can duplicate this with the experience of their own group, that there are some indeed who do make a financial sacrifice because of having accepted the responsibility of a member of the legislature or a cabinet minister. This, I think, is perhaps not well understood by many people, but the time which a member spends in fulfilling his responsibilities exceeds by far and by many times that which is involved in just attending the meetings of the legislature. There may be some people who feel that all that a member does to earn the amount which is made available to him is attending the meetings of the legislature.

There are increased costs involved in doing this. There is an increasing complexity and an increasing extend of work. Some of the members, members who are teachers, members who are employed, have to leave their regular employment — some of them have to find persons

to carry on their work while they are absent, others have to just forego the income which otherwise would have accrued to them had they remained in their regular employment. The rate of remuneration which is foregone — the cost of finding someone to replace during the period has greatly increased since there was any move in regard to levels of remuneration before. Those others who are self employed, carrying on their farms or businesses do have to employ some extra help because of their absence while they are serving their constituents and the people of the province. The extent of this extra help, I know, goes beyond again the period of the legislature's meetings. The cost of this has increased.

Finally, as the report of the committee indicates, the increases which have been granted to members of the legislature and the cabinet ministers have not kept pace with the general increases in the province in persons who are otherwise engaged and remunerated for these other activities.

It will be noted that the sessional indemnity at the level of \$6 thousand places this indemnity in third place among the provinces of Canada. This needs to be looked at in the light of relative responsibilities which evolve upon the members of our legislature. Generally speaking, I think it can be substantiated that our constituencies tend to be somewhat larger — this because of the population distribution in the province of Saskatchewan — the kind of an economy which we have for the most part.

I think it is also true that our sessions tend to be longer than do the sessions in some provinces of comparable size. We have committees such as the crown corporation committees which are not common in other provinces. There is a very considerable amount of government activity, all of which adds to the proper demands on a member's time.

The salary of the Leader of the Opposition, as I intimated, is being recommended as at the level of a cabinet minister. This I think again, is the justifiable principle. It recognizes the importance that the inter-play and the debate of opinion plays in a democratic parliamentary system. This salary again, will rank third high among the Canadian provinces. The salary recommended for the cabinet ministers means that the only provinces who do not pay as much or more for cabinet ministers will be Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island. The level of

April 13, 1962

payment in Newfoundland is \$500 less than that being recommended here — the level in Prince Edward Island is much less, but I think one could hardly call the Prince Edward Island responsibility a full-time responsibility.

With regard to the Premier — the only provinces who do not pay as much or more salary will be Nova Scotia and Manitoba, who provide \$1 thousand less — Newfoundland which is \$2 thousand less and Prince Edward Island which is considerably less, but the same conditions pertain there.

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading to Bill No. 68 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak for more than a moment or so on this bill. It is of course government legislation proposed by the government and if it is passed it will be passed by the government. However, before this particular bill was suggested the Premier did come to see me and asked me to try and obtain the feelings of my associates on this side of the House. I want to say flatly that as far as I am concerned, and as far as the great majority of my colleagues, I and think we are without exception, well possibly one or two exceptions, in favour of the increases for M.L.A.'s. Now, I think if we want to get good M.L.A.'s into the House, we must be prepared to pay them a salary which is somewhere in line with what they can get elsewhere. I have found, in trying to get candidates for the Liberal party in the last election, going into constituencies in various places, I would have individuals tell me, well we would love to go into politics, we think we could do a good job in politics, but at that salary we can't afford to be in politics. If this legislature passes \$6 thousand for our M.L.A.'s I believe that is only worth about \$3 thousand on any other job, because any M.L.A. who is worth his salt must travel, not only around in his own constituency, but he must travel around this province making speeches and doing political work. Therefore, I think no M.L.A. need have any apology when it is suggested that the indemnity for M.L.A.'s be raised to \$6 thousand because at least half of that amount will go in car depreciation, car allowance, and car expense. So I say then, Mr. Speaker, that members on this side certainly support the principle of that increase.

Now as far as an increase to the cabinet are concerned, I think I can say that we would not have handled it in the same way had we been on the other side of the House. In the first place of course we feel that there is a larger cabinet possibly than is necessary. We think there is a good deal of merit in the system which they have in England. Over in England, as I understand it, there are a number of senior cabinet portfolios — six, seven or eight, and then some junior cabinet portfolios. Now I certainly think that in this House the senior cabinet portfolios merit the wage increase, whatever it is, even if it is the Culliton report. But I think maybe the junior portfolios where there is a small amount of work, there could be some question on that.

I think also, that if we were on that side of the House, we would have favoured an increase, but it would have been an increase, I believe the Premier has suggested \$2 thousand this morning, I think possibly the opposition would have suggested \$1 thousand. As far as the salary for the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I may say the leader didn't ask for it — the Leader of the Opposition wouldn't be concerned if this House didn't pass it, but the Leader of the Opposition thinks that he will probably take it if it is passed, because he thinks that maybe he does as much work as my hon. friend the colleagues opposite.

I think in a nutshell perhaps that is the position of this party. I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, this is government legislation, proposed by the government and if it is passed it will be passed by the government majority, with or without our support.

Mr. Speaker: — I must inform the House that the minister is about to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak he should do so now.

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I think that extended remarks on my part are not necessary. I am glad that we have been able to approach this matter which is a difficult matter for all concerned because we are dealing with ourselves in an agreeable and honourable sort of fashion. It is quite true, as the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to emphasize, I am not quite sure the reason for the emphasis, but I could make some guesses perhaps, that this is a government proposition and will be passed by the government. The government is of course, in this

April 13, 1962

as in other matters which are passed in this House, willing to assume its fair share of responsibility for the actions which we propose and which we support.

I am glad that when the Leader of the Opposition made this remark he pointed out at least general agreement with what is being proposed, as a matter of fact emphatic agreement insofar as the increase in indemnity to the members of the legislature. One could hardly have been more emphatic than he was in his support of that amount as being the proper or adequate amount for members of the Legislative Assembly.

I do want to say that if he can support that position then I think logic would compel anyone to support the increases for the cabinet ministers because as I pointed out, this recommendation does place the members of the Legislative Assembly in third position, so far as members across the country are concerned, whereas with regard to cabinet ministers again only two of the provinces, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island do provide a lesser amount — Newfoundland only \$500 less. So I suggest that if one wants to approach it fairly and logically, having in mind the fact that the cabinet minister puts his full time to this, comparing levels of remuneration outside of the cabinet, inside Saskatchewan, or comparing the levels of remuneration proposed for the cabinet with those paid in other provinces, one would have to say that the increases insofar as cabinet ministers are concerned are at least as warranted and probably more warranted than the sessional indemnity which all of us agree is warranted as well. As a matter of fact, if I recall rightly, I don't want to misquote him, when the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was speaking on the establishment of the committee he emphasized this very point of view.

Now the Leader of the Opposition has suggested that there might have been some possible modifications of this procedure so far as the cabinet is concerned. I am not going to argue the point this morning as to whether or not the cabinet is larger than necessary. I am satisfied in my own mind and the government is satisfied that there is at least a full-time job for a cabinet of the size which we presently have. None of them I assure you are under-employed and several of them, Mr. Speaker, I know are grossly over-employed in a way in which we would not expect people to be employed in any other occupation other than the government. So I have every reason for being confident as to the justification of the size of the present cabinet.

He also suggested that perhaps we could have scales — junior cabinet ministers. I agree it is followed in England and probably in some of the other larger jurisdictions. To my knowledge, speaking purely from memory, Mr. Speaker, it is not followed in the Commons at Ottawa, and I am quite sure that it is not followed in any other province of Canada. The reasons I think are pretty obvious. It is not just with the affairs of his department that a minister is concerned. A minister is concerned with the whole problems of the entire government. He takes his responsibility for them and he plays a part in them. It is true that the activities of some departments are less than the activities of others, but these ministers generally share a number of activities in addition to just that of their own department and share of course in the whole process of decision making and accepting the responsibility for them. I really can't accept as worth much serious consideration the suggestion that you could have two levels of payment for ministers of the cabinet.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that he didn't ask for the change insofar as his own salary was concerned, and that was quite correct; the Premier didn't ask for it either, may I say, as far as he was concerned. It is true that a number of members of the opposition did, and I appreciate the fact, make special comment at the time of the fall session, with regard to the general improvement which was felt to be desirable and necessary and warranted, and it was because of that, that a move was made to discuss the matter with the Leader of the Opposition early in this session, subsequently followed by the establishment of the committee, and their report and recommendation in the House.

In closing I just want to read a part of the statement of the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) who was acting as House leader at the time the committee was being discussed in the House. He said:

“I am one of those who believe that salaries in Saskatchewan are getting out of line, especially the salaries paid to members of the Executive Council and the salary that is paid to the Premier.”

I repeat again that the member, the House leader of the opposition, at the time the committee was discussed,

“I am one of those who believe that salaries in Saskatchewan are getting

April 13, 1962

out of line, especially the salaries paid to members of the Executive Council and the salary that is paid to the Premier. The Premier in this province has the biggest business in the province of Saskatchewan, and I think he deserves to be paid for it.”

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

By unanimous consent, the Assembly returned to Orders of the Day:

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly I would move, seconded by Mr. Thatcher, Leader of the Opposition,

That, notwithstanding the order of the House made this day, Bill No. 69 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act, 1961 be read a second time on Monday next, and notwithstanding standing order 61, the said bill be herewith ordered to be read a second time on Saturday next.

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

Mr. W. Ross Thatcher (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, if I could have thirty seconds now that I asked for earlier this morning I would appreciate it.

Yesterday the Premier asked me if the opposition would have any objection to certain minor amendments to the medical bill being passed in one day. Understanding they were minor amendments, we had no objections. When we saw the amendments we felt one of them at least was a major amendment. For that reason even though yesterday I told the Premier we didn't object to all readings today, I felt we had to take exception to it.

I tried to raise that on first reading and of course I wasn't within the rules, but I didn't want anyone to think I was going back on what I had agreed to do, so I tried to raise it again Sir, on the orders of the day. Again, quite within the rules, you told me to sit

down, and I am afraid Sir perhaps I was somewhat rude in continuing to speak, and I wish at this time to apologize to you. I certainly meant no affront and I thank you for your patience this morning in not taking other action. I think by and large I will have more to say in this debate tomorrow.

As far as the opposition is concerned on the bill which is now before us, we wanted one day to absorb it. We feel it is too important a bill to pass today without having a chance to analyze it and scrutinize it. We think that by tomorrow morning we will be prepared to go ahead with the debate. If we finish it fine, if we don't, we continue on Monday, but we will be quite prepared to go ahead with it tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: — The mover is about to close the debate.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would ask a question. In case one member of the House votes against this motion, does that still mean the motion is carried?

Mr. Speaker: — When I ask for leave of the Assembly, if one member votes against it, then it could not be proceeded with, but when I asked leave of the Assembly to present this motion, there was no objection taken at that time, so a majority vote at this stage will carry the motion.

Does any member wish to speak before the mover closes the debate?

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I need only to say a very few words in regard to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. He is quite correct when he said that I had said to him words to the effect that in my opinion the amendments to the bill under consideration were of a minor nature, and it is still my opinion that these amendments only confirm power or authority which was given to the government previously in the bill — they simply make it clearer.

I would like to add Sir, that all of us appreciate the explanation and the statement which the Leader of the Opposition has made as to what transpired earlier in the House.

Motion agreed to.

April 13, 1962

WELCOME TO GUESTS

Mrs. Gladys Strum (Saskatoon): — I would like to introduce the ladies in the gallery to the right of the members of this House. We have here the honour to entertain the CCF women's club of Saskatoon — the smartest, the best and the best looking group in Saskatoon.

Mr. McCarthy: — I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that as far as we are concerned they are on our left.

THIRD READING

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Larger School Units Act

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Mr. Turnbull, I would move that Bill No. 42 be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Mr. Gallagher (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I am in order speaking now on this bill, am I not? I am going to vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker, for some very good reasons. Most important of all, the minister on second reading or the bill tried to suggest that there is no motive in passing this bill — no motive to force unorganized areas of this province into school units or proposed school units by passing this bill. I can only say that those areas that are unorganized today in my area of the province, or toward the Yorkton area — Esterhazy, Lemberg, Neudorf area, because of the passing of this bill, are going to be deprived of the right to say whether or not they want to belong to the school unit or not.

Several times in the past few years, these two particular areas have voted against going into a school unit and after this bill is passed these areas are going to be forced into one of two units and because part of the area in the proposed unit is already in an organized area, these people are going to be unable to have a vote. I think this is undemocratic and I am going to vote against it.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 29

Messieurs

Lloyd
Meakes
Blakeney
Nollet
Kuziak
Cooper (Mrs.)
Strum (Mrs.)
Davies
Willis
Brown

Wood
Erb
Nicholson
Stone
Whelan
Thibault
Berezowsky
Kramer
Johnson
Perkins

Thiessen
Snyder
Stevens
Dahlman
Michayluk
Semchuk
Kluzak
Peterson
Brotten

Nays — 13

Messieurs

Thatcher
Klein
Batten (Mrs.)
McCarthy
Barrie

Danielson
Cameron
McFarlane
Staveley

Foley
Boldt
Horsman
Gallagher

The said bill was then read the third time and passed.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:50 o'clock p.m.