

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session – Fourteenth Legislature**  
**34th Day**

**Tuesday, April 2, 1963**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**WELCOME TO NORTH BATTLEFORD GOLDEN JUBILEE COMMITTEE**

**Hon. E. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, it is my privilege and my pleasure to introduce a delegation from the better part of Saskatchewan, our Golden Jubilee Committee for 1963. Mr. Speaker, some of the uninformed members of the legislature wish to know where from. It goes without saying that this is the city of North Battleford, The Battlefords constituency. For those members who are unfortunate enough to represent constituencies that are not so well endowed, I can only extend my sympathy.

But we do, Mr. Speaker, have an invitation for you today from North Battleford, and I want to proceed now to extend this invitation and the best method I could use I believe would be to read a letter from our worth Mayor, His Worship Roy Dean.

Before I do so, however, I would like our gentlemen to stand up, and please put your hats on when you stand up, gentlemen. I would like to introduce them, starting on my left as I am looking at them, Mr. Cooper from the North Battleford News Optimist; Mr. Rorke, commissioner for our Chamber of Commerce; Alderman Sparrow of the city council; Mr. Bud Ham, the assistant chairman of the Golden Jubilee Committee, Rae's Jewellers, North Battleford.

Now, this is the letter from His Worship.

The Hon. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly.

North Battleford – the place to be in '63. This slogan is the theme of the Golden Jubilee celebrations taking place in our city during its 50th year. The city of North Battleford was born in this legislature in the month of May, 1913,

**April 2, 1963**

according to the citizens of our city who are preparing to officially celebrate the half century of its existence on the week of May 20-25.

During the week long festivities, we are setting aside one day to especially honor those people who are now contributing and who have in the past contributed to our growth development by offering their time and effort in the service of our political institutions, be they municipal, provincial or national in scope.

The North Battleford of 1963 has a population exceeding 12,000 people, and it is the fastest growing city in our province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it joins the cities of Saskatoon and Regina who are among the top five fastest-growing cities in Canada. It has become the trading and distribution centre of the great north—west. It also serves as the gateway to that wonderful playground of the north where the lakes are teeming with fish and the woods abound with wild life.

The rugged serenity of the outdoors each year lures thousands of tourists and sportsmen to our part of the province.

North Battleford can justifiably claim to be a progressive, forward-look community with a bright future. However, in celebrating our Jubilee in the city of the future, we cannot overlook the contribution of the past 50 years, those people who have unselfishly served our city at all levels of government. Accordingly, Thursday, May 23 (please put that date in your books, ladies and gentleman) has been set aside and will be specially proclaimed to spotlight the courage, foresight and efforts in the development of our community.”

They are still looking for a name for the day. I would like to offer a reward for someone to come up with a good idea at this time, whether it be called political day, or public service day. If anyone has an idea what such a day could be called, I would be pleased to have your suggestions.

These remarks are intended to explain the invitation which has just been delivered to each member of this assembly. We are also pleased to present each one of you with a memento of our city's birthday year in the form of a golden jubilee trade dollar. Incidentally, those of you who come up on that

day, and we hope all of you will, you can use that dollar in trade in any store that is co-operating with the Golden Jubilee committee in this city of North Battleford. I would be pleased to supply you with more of them if you would like to have some of them for barter when you go there. A dollar a piece. Full value. Not par. They are not even 92½¢.

Municipal government in this province is the creation of this legislative body. Your deliberations and those of your predecessors have greatly assisted and influenced the course of North Battleford's development. No doubt future legislation passed here will also have its effect on your city's destiny. It is for this reason that we feel that you, as members of the legislature should be part of our tribute to the democratic institutions of self-government and the people who make them function. We hope that each of you will accept this invitation and that we will be seeing you in North Battleford on May 23 next.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, we would like to thank you for granting us permission to extend this invitation to you and the members of the legislature in this manner.

Cordially yours,

I too would like to add my thanks for the privilege of being allowed to introduce this into the legislature before the orders of the day this morning, and I hope that all of you will heed this invitation. We will welcome to you to North Battleford if you arrive on the 23rd of May.

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier):** — Mr. Chairman, also before the orders of the day, I think we should let this moment go without some comment.

First of all, may I suggest to the Minister of Natural Resources, the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) some concerns and some warnings and some requests which ought to be issued at this time. Just in passing, Mr. Speaker, in case some members seem to be there is difficulty in knowing where North Battleford is – it is approximately 70 miles north of Biggar, and this will locate it reasonably well on the map I think.

This little token which has been given to us, I have, admittedly, only the opportunity to discuss it briefly with the Attorney General but he points out that there are

**April 2, 1963**

sections of the British North America Act which refer and confer rights with regard to coinage and that this may very well be ultra vires the federal legislation. In addition to that, we did pass an act the other day in this legislature relating to reading stamps and other similar devices and I am quite sure this would most unlikely stand the test of the courts with regard to that.

The concern that I have to mention, Mr. Speaker, however, is not anything of a near legal nature. It rather seems to me of a moral type in that I understand that the citizens of North Battleford were pledging themselves to grow beards and other things of this nature, and I notice that the member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) has so far failed to respond, and that somehow or other it seems to me the legislature ought to take action on such a matter of this kind.

Quite seriously I know that all members would want to join in paying a word of welcome and encouragement and good wishes to the city of North Battleford on this occasion. We in this legislature, while we have an interest in any of our communities which reach their stage of majority in terms of age or size have, it seems to me, a special interest in the community of North Battleford and its neighboring town of Battleford. You will recall that it was in that community that the first capital, not of this province admittedly but of the area of which this province is a part, was located. While, as the people of Battleford would tell me I am certain, that is not North Battleford, it is somewhat in the area and it extends our interest in regard to the area generally. May I just say that all of us would want to join in extending congratulations and good wishes to the city of North Battleford on its 50th Jubilee.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

## **SECOND READINGS**

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill No. 72 — **An Act respecting Magistrates' Courts.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the government has over the years been very much concerned with the matter of insuring the protection of people's civil rights. This government has a long record of upholding and bolstering the civil rights of its citizens. We were the first government in Canada, as you will remember, to pass the Bill of Rights, Fair Accommodation Practices Act, Fair Employment Practices Act, an act giving equal pay for equal for equal work regardless of sex. This government was the first in Canada

to start paying out of public treasury a defence counsel for indigent accused persons, and in every way this government has been in the vanguard of progress in the field of civil liberties. One area where people's civic rights is most commonly in jeopardy is in the area of the criminal courts. Hon. members will recall that years ago in Canada the criminal jurisdiction was exercised almost exclusively by justices of the peace, men without legal training, men often appointed on the sheerest caprice, political appointees, and persons who had not only no training in the arts of law but, in many cases no feeling for the rights of accused citizens.

I remember one time talking to a justice of the peace many years ago who told me that he – I asked him if he was very busy in his work and he said, yes he was, especially after a dance night. He always had two or three cases, and he said he remembered one case not long ago where a man was charged with consuming liquor in a vehicle and he said the prosecution established that there was some liquor in the vehicle, and that he was in the vehicle, and asked him to convict on that basis. However, he said the accused produced a witness to show that the witness had put the liquor in the vehicle and that the witness had not ever told the accused that the liquor was there, and that indeed the liquor was under a seat in a package that hadn't even been opened. And the witness was quite emphatic about the fact that the accused not only didn't know there was liquor in the vehicle but hadn't been consuming it at all, and he said, you know I almost had an acquittal there, but I happened to know this fellow's reputation and I knew there wouldn't be liquor in that vehicle without him drinking it, or at least planning on drinking it. And so he said, that's about the closest I have ever come to having an acquittal.

Well, when I think about the stories that go the rounds about the way that justice is administered by lay personnel with little experience and no training and no feeling for the rights of accused persons, and when I remember that this prevailed in Saskatchewan until a few years ago, and still prevails in many other provinces in Canada, I sometimes wonder why those who are concerned with advancing the civil rights of citizens do not make the magistrates and justices of the peace courts the prime target and objective in this campaign. Almost every province has magistrates who are untrained, almost every province pays their magistrates far too little to attract competent people to the magistrates' bench, and it seems to me that this is the most fruitful area for advocates of human rights and civil liberties to direct their attention, in Canada.

Saskatchewan has for many years been striving to build up the integrity and the public esteem for our magistrates' courts. Many years ago we stopped making appointments of laymen to these courts and restricted the appointments to

**April 2, 1963**

persons with legal training. I know the opinion is popularly held that lawyers are inclined to be perhaps less sympathetic to human weakness, perhaps because lawyers are always aware what the law is. Lawyers certainly aren't paragons of virtue themselves, they know as much about human failings as anybody from direct experience, but they are inclined to take a legalistic view of guilt and innocence. This is the argument that is sometimes put forth. Well, the administration of the criminal law is not in the real sense a sociological process so much as it is a legal process. The punishment or treatment of the criminal is the area where the sociologist and this type of approach needs to be applied. The matter of guilt or innocence, however, is strictly a legal question and does not admit of other considerations being brought to bear. Guilt or innocence must be determined by the strict interpretation of the statutes and the application of the facts to the statute

If we ever accept or recognize that guilt or innocence is to be based on some personal quality in the accused person, or based upon some supposed feeling and sympathy for persons as individuals, rather than on the basis of the strict application of the law to the facts, then you have departed from the rule law; you have substituted personal preference and personal prejudice and personal sympathy for the rule of law, and the strength of our British system of justice has always been that the laws are certain, they are firmly rooted in the common law, they are firmly rooted in the statute and in regulations that has been properly promulgated. The law is certain, that the law and what it is is available to every citizen and that it must apply to every citizen equally. When you depart from that principle and commence to apply some personal concept of right and wrong, to particular acts of offenders, then you are getting into the realm of totalitarian. You didn't have to have laws in Nazi Germany. Whatever the local gauleiter thought was wrong was punished, and eventually whatever the police constable thought was wrong was punished.

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — That's true today to a certain extent. That's true today in your deal.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And that deprives the citizen of the right which he is entitled to before the law. What you need to do, therefore, is have a tribunal which is admirable capable of determining precisely what the law is and ascertaining precisely what the facts are in reference to a particular alleged offence, and applying the one to the other. And that is a technical, legal question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who reflects on these aspects of the question closely will come to the inescapable conclusion that therefore the function of the courts is a scientific operation and not an operation in human sympathy or an operation in speculating about what is best for the person before the court.

Now it is an altogether different matter, of course, when it comes to punishing or treating or correcting or rehabilitating the offender. That is not a legal question strictly. That ought not to be primarily a legal question. When it comes to punishing, treating or correcting the offender, this is where a “welfare-minded” point of view must apply. This is where your sociological concepts come into play.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve this kind of administration of justice, it is important that we have not only well-trained lawyers administering these courts but that they be understanding, that they be experienced and that they be sympathetic, but training and knowledge in the law is the cornerstone of their fitness for that vocation.

In order to do that and attract that kind of people, it is necessary to demonstrate that a judgeship in a magistrates’ court is an important occupation and vocation. This is necessary not only to attract qualified and suitable people to the position. Indeed it is necessary in order to enable the court to fulfil its designated role — because the effect of a trial and a sentence or an acquittal is based very largely upon the respect of the citizen, whether he is an accused or whether he is just a member of the citizenry generally — for the tribunal that does the convicting and the sentencing. No one can feel that he has had justice if he has been convicted in a vacant outhouse in a little village where the trappings of justice are not apparent or manifest. The court must be therefore held in proper surroundings if its proceedings are to be respected by the convicted person and by the public.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to achieve these objectives, we have been improving the facilities available for our magistrates’ courts to sit. We have rented the best facilities that we could obtain in each community where the court sits. We have endeavoured to ensure that those symbols of public esteem for law and authority, the flag, the robe or gown on the shoulders of the magistrate are in evidence, no matter how small the community or how isolated the community where the court sits. We believe that to have suitable, qualified, trained persons we must pay them well. Saskatchewan has now for some years been increasing the salaries of magistrates more rapidly than salaries of other people in the public

**April 2, 1963**

service. In the last eight years magistrates' salaries have more than doubled in Saskatchewan and it is proposed under this bill to increase these salaries again by another 20 or 25 percent. This will make the salaries of judges of the provincial magistrates' courts the highest of any salaries in Canada paid to magistrates — \$12,000 — almost equivalent, almost identical with the salaries paid to district court judges.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we have always advocated that the appointment of judges should be rendered on a non-partisan basis. I notice that this proposal is being seriously discussed on public platforms, by bar association meetings, wherever lawyers meet, it has been urged that the appointment of judges ought to be demonstrably and evidentially placed on a non-partisan basis. In this province we have had some very fortunate choices for judicial office, but this does not diminish in any way the effectiveness or the rightness of the demand that a formula for appointing judges should be worked out to ensure that ability and qualifications should be given paramount consideration.

This province has not only given lip—service to the principle that magistrates should be appointed on the basis of merit, and ability, rather than political point sympathy, by the appointment of our magistrates.

I don't think I need to convince the house that we have appointed magistrates without regard to political persuasion, I don't have to convince members because members on both sides of the house know prominent citizens of all political persuasions, who have been appointed provincial magistrates in this province. I do mention it, however, to make certain that this fact is placed on the public records because future members of this legislature, looking back at the records of this time, may not realize that this has been the practice of this government or the conviction of this government that such appointments should be made on a non-political basis, on the basis of merit alone. And there isn't any member of this house that will dispute that assertion, not one. We hope to, and we expect to continue to make magisterial appointments on the basis of merit, qualifications, competence, in the future and that political considerations will be pushed aside in making these choices.

Saskatchewan is one of only two provinces in Canada that affords security of tenure for its magistrates. Ontario has provision in their act for security of tenure also; we believe that the provision of security of tenure in our act is superior to that found in the act in Ontario, although the provision in the Ontario act is a fairly creditable measure, Mr. Speaker.

We think that magistrates must have security of tenure if they are to perform their duties without fear or favor, and in a manner which is demonstrably free of political interference. We propose to continue this security of tenure provision, indeed this act augments it. As was pointed out by one of the members opposite last year, a number of our magistrates at that time were already beyond the age of retirement and were dependent on annual extensions granted by the government, and to that extent this group of magistrates did lack the benefit of the tenure provisions. By raising the retirement age to 70, however, this problem largely disappears, and security of tenure is restored even to those who are over 65 but under 70 years of age. And so we are extending the security of tenure provision in our act.

Saskatchewan is the only province that provides in its act that only trained lawyers may be appointed as magistrates. Indeed, it is advised that they must have at least five years of practice before they may be appointed, so that our qualifications for magistrates are the highest in Canada.

Many lawyers who might be eligible for appointment, or who might be interested in an appointment, are deterred by the fact that the very nature of private practice is such that the income earned in private practice usually reaches its maximum at about the age just preceding retirement. Indeed, income from private practice may continue well beyond the date of actual withdrawal from active practice. Those who have been able to spend a lifetime at it, becomes very remunerative just about the age of 70 and continues on after that time with little or no expenditure of effort. It becomes, therefore, necessary for us to provide some comparable compensation for those who accept magisterial appointments. We can't match those conditions, of course, Mr. Speaker, but we have tried to match it as well as possible by providing the best superannuation plan available for magistrates in the dominion of Canada.

Our plan corresponds roughly with the plan provided for judicial appointees. Ten or fifteen years service before retirement entitles the magistrate to a pension of half salary after retirement. Since retirement in Saskatchewan is 70, compared with 75 for judges, our magistrates will indeed be in a favorable position as compared to judges who receive two-thirds of their salary in retirement. This provision, I believe, will go far to encouraging persons, who might otherwise be reluctant to accept magisterial appointments.

When one considers that over 90 percent of all those persons who go to jail as the result of offenses committed, are sent there by the magistrates, about 99 percent of all the offenses punished are punished in magistrates' court, sentences

**April 2, 1963**

are imposed by magistrates because something like 50 to 60,000 citizens annually, I believe the government is justified in assuming that this is a very important cornerstone in the field of protecting the civil rights of our citizens.

It is for this reason, because our magistrates affect the lives, the security and the daily activities of such a large proportion of our people that we feel this service ought to be provided on the highest possible level. We want to make certain that no one appearing before him will suspect or imagine that he is in any way dependent upon or subservient to the day to day wishes of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need to assure the house that this government has never, directly, or indirectly, tried to influence a magistrate, or judge in the discharge of their judicial office. This, I am sure can be said without any real necessity of it being said, but I think it is important that we go further than that and that we establish the independence and the integrity of our magistrates, our judges of the magistrates' courts, so that no one will ever imagine that these people are in any way servants of the government of the day, so that it will be perfectly clear to everyone that these people exercise their judicial office in an air or atmosphere of absolute independence and impartiality.

**Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse):** — Agreed.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that I have made such a good impression on my friends opposite; I make these remarks . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You are going to talk yourself out of it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . because what we are doing here is protecting and improving and advancing the cause of civil rights and human liberties in the province of Saskatchewan. I move that the bill be read a second time, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I will be very, very brief. There are just one or two comments I would like to make. I was rather surprised and disappointed at the Attorney General introducing second reading of this bill, setting up magistrates' courts as such, should have taken the occasion to have looked back over the growth of the

province, and the part that justices of the peace played in the meting of justice in this province, and to take the occasion in this assembly to attempt to discredit them in the fashion in which he did. He said that the justices of the peace over the years were political heelers; they were appointed by the politicians; they didn't have the interest of the citizens at heart; they had no feeling for the accused. They even went so far as to tell us some justices of the peace almost got an acquittal. I have been one of those people in the opposition who have advocated these changes for a number of years because we are living in a complex society. The cases that come before the justices of the peace today are much more complicated cases than those that came before them 50 years ago, or even ten year ago. Therefore, I was one of those who advocated that we have legal talent and people who have ability in the field of legislation and interpreting the acts as magistrates in the courts.

We are in agreement with this legislation. I must however, pay tribute to those justices of the peace in those rural areas from 1905 on, who knew their people, who were appointed justices of the peace because of his outstanding characters, because of his integrity and because of his impartiality, and who could sit on these cases in a community, and brought respect for the law and order in that community.

It is true that they didn't have big fancy buildings in which to live and to hear cases and to have legal assistance to guide them. It is no aspersion that they lived in small villages, that the Attorney General thought was so bad, or that they held the court hearings in some back office, in an off street in the village.

That is why I rose in this debate, because I am one of those people who believe that these people played a vital role in justice for the people of the province over the years and on this occasion I should like to pay those justices of the peace over the years a tribute. I asked a question of the Attorney General not too long ago, what percentage of convictions were in the magistrates' courts. He said 9 per cent, It doesn't look as though there are many acquittals being given in the magistrates' courts, so then if you are to assess the justice meted out in accordance with the acquittals, by which he did with the former justices of the peace, then the same criticism is applicable to your present magistrates. Either they are most efficient, and the only one who came before the courts is one who has opposed flagrantly the laws of the province, or else there has been no acquittals.

Would you assume from this the magistrate didn't have any feelings for the accused, that he was out solely to get the convictions? Is that the interpretation we are to take? That is certainly the yard stick by which he measured the activities of the former justices of the peace.

**April 2, 1963**

I am disappointed with Attorney General of this province, that he should make this an occasion for an attack on so many of those worthy local citizens who played such an important role in keeping peace and order and dignity and respect for law in the communities throughout the province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is my duty to warn the house that the mover is about to close the debate. If any one wishes to speak, he must do so now.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, the fertility of the mind of the hon. member opposite who dredged up some imaginary grievance is beyond my comprehension. The hon. member opposite sought to read into my remarks some criticism of justices of the peace and the efforts that they have made in the past 50 years in their appointed roles. I just don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. member can so distract attention from the issue before the house as he did in his brief remarks.

Nothing was said, Mr. Speaker, in derogation of the justices of the peace, except that they didn't have legal training.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — It would be . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, the only thing that was said . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh! Oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . about justices of the peace in relation to magistrates was that they didn't have legal training. Well, if my hon. friend considers that this is a reflection on justices of the peace, then this just demonstrates how his mind falls into the first sink-hole at every opportunity, instead of addressing himself to the issue that is properly before this house.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in a position to know something about the work of justices of the peace, I made no reference or reflection in any way on the work done by justices of the peace.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — . . . sure did.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — You talked for 15 minutes.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I had no . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. members control their exuberance.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Sit down and we will vote for it.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Lying out of it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Surely if the hon. members opposite have any reply to make ought to reply to what I said, not to what they say I said . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly clear that this bill makes possible a higher standard of judicial administration than this province has had and I say that again. If my hon. friend wants to take that as a reflection on those who have served as justices of the peace, well, he will just have to do that. I say, and I say again, that this bill provides for a higher standard of judicial administration than prevails in any other province in Canada, or has prevailed in this province prior to the passage of this bill, and if my hon. friends want to feel that aggrieves the justices of the peace, then I hope he will say so without putting words in my mouth that I did not use.

Mr. Speaker, I have many friends who are justices of the peace . . .

**Mr. D.G. Steuart (Prince Albert):** — Not now you haven't.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . and they are the first to acknowledge that this represents an improvement in the administration of justice.

I challenge anyone to go back and look at the text of the remarks which I made on the second reading, and to find there one single thread of evidence to support the ridiculous allegations made by the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). If the hon. member is so bereft of arguments to reply to what I said that he has to invent statements and attribute them to me so he can reply to them, then I suggest that this simply proves that the opposition would like very much to bitterly attack everything this government does, even when they aren't able to find meritorious arguments to make that attack.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Point of order. I would like to refer to Beausiesne, page 107, I quote, section 34, subsection 2:

**April 2, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, or the chairman, after having called the attention of the house or of the committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if the member still continues to speak, Mr. Speaker shall name him, or if in committee the chairman shall report him to the house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have listened to repetitions and irrelevance for an hour, the opposition is ready to vote for this measure unless this member talks us out of it. How long is he going to continue this rambling? That is my point of order. He is wasting the time of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member has never been called for repetition.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — If that isn't repetition, Mr. Speaker, what is it?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in closing . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . his own members.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, that is an uncalled for insinuation against the propriety of the way in which you are administering this assembly. I think the hon. member should withdraw it.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Withdraw what?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may just finish my remarks, I want to just conclude by saying that if my hon. friend has anything, finds anything in the address which I just made which justifies the ridiculous diatribe which he engaged in, I will be indebted to him, but the same old story; my hon. friends made wild and ridiculous assertions, they get quoted in the press, the public won't know, the public will never know, Mr. Speaker, that those assertions are completely without foundation. They will assume that my hon. friends have some integrity and would only make these statements if there was some substance behind them. But the press will carry those statements, the public will assume that there was something was some justification for the statements, that there was some substance to the statement, and this is part of the tactics of my hon. friends: smear, innuendo.

**Mr. J.W. Erb (Milestone):** — The press . . . Sit down . . . Wow . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — That is all it is, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friends say: sit down, wow etc., Is this parliamentary, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, will you make a ruling on the point of order which I raised that the hon. member is irrelevant and repetitious, and if he is, the rules say that you should name him, if he won't cease speaking.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon . . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — He is boring us to death.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Any hon. member who closes the debate has the right to answer arguments raised. He does not have the right to raise new or irrelevant matters. I have to listen to the debate and try and decide whether he is answering the debate or whether he isn't. So I hope the hon. member will conclude his debate so that I may put the motion.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — It is obvious that the jewels which I am tossing out are pearls before swine, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Snedker:** — When did that side cast forth anything of value?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why don't you make your ruling now?

**Mr. Speaker:** — My ruling is that he was not out of order on the grounds of irrelevance.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — How about repetition?

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd moved second reading of Bill No. 76 – **An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the contents of this bill are reasonably well revealed in the bill itself, and they don't need any considerable elaboration, and I should not need to detain the house for any considerable length of time.

**April 2, 1963**

Hon. members will know that the impact of the changes proposed will be to increase the number of members from the city of Regina by two and the number of members from the city of Saskatoon by two as well. The situation which makes this change desirable and necessary if we are going to retain reasonable relationship between representation and population is, of course, the very considerable growth in population in both of these cities since the time of the last consideration of this section of the act. The proposal is further that the Regina community be divided into several constituencies, two of them being two member constituencies, and two of them one member constituencies. Regina south will be a one member constituency and Regina east and Regina west will be two member constituencies, and Regina north will be one member constituency.

I had distributed yesterday to the members of the legislature a map which showed generally the boundaries of these constituencies. I need not attempt to define them at this time.

It will be recalled, Mr. Speaker, that the general basis of representation which was accepted in the previous consideration of this act, was that there would be roughly 8,500 voters for a member in a rural constituency, 10,500 in a constituency which included a small city — those from the smaller cities will pardon the expression — and 12,000 from those which were entirely urban constituencies. As a matter of information, using the preliminary list of voters for the 1963 federal election, which is as close as we can get to a count, and making some attempt to estimate the number of voters who are 18 years of age but not 21, who consequently will not vote in the federal election but will vote in the provincial election, I can give the legislature some indication of the voting basis in these constituencies.

On this basis it is estimated that there will be something close to, perhaps a bit over 12,000 in the Regina south constituency, something close and perhaps a little over 12,000 in the Regina east constituency, something very close to 12,000 in the Regina west constituency, the Regina north constituency will be perhaps somewhat less than 12,000, between 10 and 11,000, and in each case it does get somewhat close to the basis of 12,000 which we had agreed should be a desirable base. With regard to Saskatoon there it will work out to between 11 and 12,000 voters per member. This, of course, is the situation on the basis of the 1963 federal enumeration, and since the communities are growing it can be seen that, while they do not already approach the quota of 12,000, it will be not long before they reach that particular part.

The second matter which might be discussed briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the proposal is to have Saskatoon remain as a single constituency on the multiple member basis,

whereas it will be noted that Regina is divided into constituencies. Now, this is a matter which admittedly is debatable and one on which the decision might have gone either way, and to have them both on the same basis. It is the suggestion in the bill that while we make the change in Regina to a multiple constituency community, we retain Saskatoon on the basis of the five members all being in the same constituency. It is true that the situation in Regina is a departure from what the situation has been in the province; the situation in Saskatoon is recommended as it has been previously.

There are differences which might be referred to which make the situation in Regina somewhat easier to deal with on a constituency basis. It is simpler to define constituency boundaries and to retain within each of the proposed constituencies a more complete type of community in the city of Regina. We have found some difficulty in trying to divide Saskatoon into constituencies which would still remain, all of them, more or less good community entities. Five, of course, Mr. Speaker, is only one more than four. We have a precedent in the province for four members in one constituency. I would have to admit that five is also just one less than six, and we will have a precedent for a multiple constituency where you have six members.

The situation is not without precedent in other parts of Canada, and it might be worthwhile what the situation is in some other provinces. This will be the first time in which we will have a five member seat. New Brunswick at the present time, I understand, has some five four—member seats and has at least one five—member seat. Prior to 1949, Winnipeg had a 10—member seat. Prior to 1959, in Alberta, Calgary was a six—member seat and Edmonton was a seven—member seat, so we are not in that sense out of line with what the situation was in part in neighboring provinces for a considerable period of time.

May I just return for a moment to the matter of the representation and the population relationship. On the 1959 basis, the city of Regina had about 12 percent of the population of the province and the members from the city of Regina represented at that time some seven percent of the number of members in the legislature. The city of Saskatoon had nearly ten percent of the population of the province at that time and its members represented just less than six percent of the number of members in the legislature. In total, the two cities had 21 percent of the total population of the province and 12.7 percent of the total of the population of the house.

The proposed situation, Mr. Speaker, would be that Regina, with 12.7 percent of the total population of the province, now would have some ten percent of the members of

**April 2, 1963**

the legislature. Saskatoon with 11.2 percent, 11 percent shall we say, of the province's population, would have some eight and one—half percent of the representation in the house. Or adding the two cities together, they would represent about 24 percent of the total population of the province and will have in the house some 18 to 19 percent of the membership of the legislature. In effect we have moved somewhat closer to a theoretically perfect representation by population. We do maintain, however, the situation wherein a city member does represent a larger number of people than those of us who represent rural constituencies. There is some argument in favor of this, in terms of the size of the rural constituency and the time required moving around so the member may meet his constituents and be familiar with their problems and situations.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, as the Premier has pointed out, the purpose of this bill is to give the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon two extra seats.

Now I think the opposition can agree with the principle involved in this legislation, but we certainly take the strangest possible exception to the method that is being used. To us, this legislation smacks of the old-fashioned type of gerrymander.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Regina and Saskatoon, on a multiple seat basis, have seven members. If you add the other city, Moose Jaw, there are nine members from the three major city areas. Perhaps it is not without significance, Mr. Speaker, that these nine members are all socialists. If the bill which is before us passes, the three major cities will have 13 members. In introducing the bill, the Premier was justifying this on a population basis. As far as Saskatoon is concerned, I don't think his figures are right because the constituency of Hanley is, in effect, a Saskatoon seat. That portion of Hanley, of course, was thrown in some years ago, to try and make the seat of the Hon. Attorney General a safe seat.

**Hon. R.A. Walker:** — That is not true.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It certainly is true. Mr. Speaker, it is not very difficult to see what the government is trying to do in this bill. My hon. friends see their political strength waning in the rural areas. They hope to add enough city seats, which they think they can win, to keep themselves in office. I think that such a tactic is going to be futile, Mr. Speaker, even if this bill is proceeded with. The people of Regina, and the people of Saskatoon, are just as fed up with socialism as the people elsewhere in Saskatchewan. They only await an opportunity to throw this administration out of office, whenever they get the

courage to call an election. As I said a moment ago, the opposition will support the principle that increased population gives our two major cities the right to increased representation in this legislature. However, I emphasize that we take the strongest possible exception to the method that is being used in Bill No. 76.

Now what precisely does Bill 76 do? It is suggested that the city of Regina will have six members, one to represent Regina south, one to represent Regina north, two to represent Regina west, two to represent Regina east. In other words, two of those seats will be multi-member seats. It is very obvious when you look at the map that the boundaries have been drawn to give the socialist every possible advantage in the city of Regina. Nevertheless, we would certainly agree that the proposal is an improvement on the way it was before, when the people of Regina were voting for four candidates. However, it still hasn't gone far enough.

But as to the city of Saskatoon, the proposal in Bill 76 is anything but fair. We think it simply can't be justified. This city will now have one multi-member constituency with five members. And as I mentioned a moment ago, it will really have six, because there is no way of getting around it Hanley today, virtually speaking, is a city seat. I can tell you that the people of Saskatoon take the strongest possible exception, those of them who live in the Hanley seat, that they are not going to be permitted to vote in the city seat. They see no reason why they should be required to cast a ballot in the Hanley constituency. I say, and the opposition says, that there are major weaknesses in the legislation as it pertains to the city of Saskatoon.

First of all, every Saskatoon citizen will have to vote for five candidates. If there are four or five parties running, this could mean a ballot as long as your arm. There may be 20, 25 or even 30 candidates on the ballot paper in the city of Saskatoon. Now, is there any hon. member who will say that such a situation is not going to lead to confusion?

Then, also, Mr. Speaker, there is the fact that when the members are elected, how can member, no matter how effective he may be, look after a constituency of 100,000 or more. We say he can't do it effectively. The government has admitted that it is not sensible to proceed in this way, by already dividing Regina. If it makes sense to divide Regina into smaller constituencies, why doesn't it make sense to divide Saskatoon? The Hon. Premier said this afternoon that it is a little difficult to find suitable boundaries.

**April 2, 1963**

Mr. Speaker, surely the third weakness of this proposal is that every city resident of Saskatoon will vote, not for one candidate, but for five candidates. Why should a citizen of Saskatoon have five votes, while each rural resident in this province have only one vote?

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party maintains that the city of Regina, the city of Saskatoon, yes and the city of Moose Jaw, should be divided into single seats the same way as the rural areas are now divided. We believe that every voter should have one vote in an election. We believe that every representative should represent one constituency.

The Premier mentioned briefly some of the things that are done in other provinces. I think the experiences of Alberta and Manitoba should be looked at by this legislature this morning, because they have tried in the past these multiple-seat constituencies. There is only one large city in Manitoba of course, Winnipeg; two large cities in Alberta, Edmonton and Calgary. What have they done in this connection? Well, they did have multi-member constituencies for awhile, but they were on a basis of proportional representation. The result was that each party had representation approximately proportionate to the percentage of the voters who voted for them. The system of proportional representation may have been awkward, but it was reasonably just and equitable, and it was democratic. Even that system has now been abandoned in all those three cities. In Winnipeg, the proportional representation system was first changed by dividing that city into three constituencies with four members each. That is what is now proposed in Regina. But Winnipeg soon found that even this wasn't satisfactory. Now you have in the major cities of Alberta and Manitoba, the policy of single member constituencies. They have all adopted such a policy — Winnipeg, Edmonton and Calgary. They have been divided into a number of single constituencies, each representative represents one constituency. In other words, Manitoba and Alberta have applied to these cities the same system of representation that is used in the rural areas. We think that is proper democracy. And this is the requirement of political morality and justice, and I use the words political morality, Mr. Speaker, advisedly. There isn't political morality in Bill 76 which is now before us.

My hon. friends may argue that under the present system the members from each city represent the city as a whole. This is emphatically not so. They speak for 43 percent of the voters — 57 percent of the voters voted against this administration in both Saskatoon and Regina in the last election. We are the ones who are now representing the anti-socialist vote in this legislature.

If the government refuses to divide these cities into single seats as they should do, surely if they have any conscience at all, at least they can do is follow their own example of doing in Saskatoon what they are doing in the city of Regina.

The people of Hanley seat, who are part of Saskatoon, should be lumped in with the others. Give Saskatoon six seats if you will. We would prefer to have them in single seats, but at least let us divide them the way you are doing in the city of Regina. We say, then, Mr. Speaker, that there is no excuse, there is no possible justification for the way that the cities are being divided up in Bill 76.

I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald:

That this house is of the opinion that the three cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw should be divided into single member constituencies.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been moved by Mr. Thatcher, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

That the house is of the opinion that the three cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw should be divided into single member constituencies.

Is the house ready for the question?

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think that motion is in order on a bill that is now up for second reading because this is not the time when such a motion could be effectively put into practice, nor in committee as whole would such a motion to amend the bill to bring this about be in order. Even a motion now that the bill be withdrawn and this provision be made in a new bill would be in order, but certainly not this motion. It is no amendment to a motion that the bill be now read a second time.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I had an idea that my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer, who doesn't apparently know the rules too well, might make this suggestion, and so I have citation that I would like to give you for your consideration before you make a ruling. Beauchesne, page 277-382, and I read the following.

**April 2, 1963**

It is competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill to move as an amendment to the question a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to our differing from the principles, policy or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution, or otherwise opposed to its progress, or seeking further information in relation to this bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges, and so on.

I suggest, Sir, that this ruling of Beauchesne gives us every right at this time to move the amendment which we have moved.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Minister of Public Health):** — On a simple point of order, the member has not moved any amendment. The form of that motion is not capable of being read as an amendment to the Premier's motion that the bill be now read a second time. And I would ask you to read it.

**Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats):** — I would like to say a word on the point of order. On second reading of a bill we are voting on the content of the bill, the principle of the bill, in principle; the principle of the bill that is presented to the house is quite simple. The principle of the bill is multi-representation in the city of Saskatoon and partial multi-representation in the city of Regina. Inasmuch as we are discussing the bill in principle, I would therefore consider that the member's amendment is entirely in order. Surely we can move an amendment which changes the principle of the bill. We don't approve of the principle. The principle is multi-representation in one seat and partial multi-representation in another seat, and to deny us the right to move an amendment to the bill is denying our rights to the privileges in this house, the democratic rights and privileges which we hold.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, citation 201 says that:

The object of an amendment may be to affect such an alteration in question as will obtain the support of those who without such alteration must either vote against or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the house an alternative proposition, wholly or partially.

This may be moved by moving to omit all the words after the question, after the first word ‘that’ and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate is not restricted to the amendment,

and so on. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called amendment does not comply with that rule.

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, could I have your ear for a minute. When the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) was speaking on a point of order, I don’t think that you heard one word that he said, and you should give us the courtesy of listening to the members on this side of the house when he presents a case.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I resent that statement from the member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt). I have to be here and listen to the members speak and when they are referring to motions and so on, I have to also at the same time to look after my book and turn to those pages. And if the member from Rosthern has any objections on the way I have conducted this Chair, then he can make a challenge in the proper manner.

**Mr. Snedker:** — I might do that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, go ahead and do it if you wish to.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Further on the point of order, I would draw attention to sub-clause 2 of the clause 201, page 169. It says:

A motion may be amended (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding certain words.

I submit that the amendment does none of those things.

**Mr. Speaker:** — This is one of those motions which is kind of a difficult motion. I agree that the citation read by the Leader of the Opposition on page 277 shows that the member has a right to state why they don’t agree, but at the same time, the motion should have read that all the words after ‘that’ should be deleted, and the rulings are quite clear that if the amendment is out of order in part, then the Speaker has the right to declare it all out of order, or he can if he wishes amend the motion. On these cases, where these are dealing with legislation and so on, I don’t think that I care to exercise the right of amending the motion, that this motion should have read that all the words after “that” be deleted and other words substituted therefor, so I believe for those reasons that I have to rule this motion out of order.

**April 2, 1963**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Could I ask you a question, Mr. Speaker? Did I understand your ruling to suggest that if we would re—submit it with this different wording it would then be in order?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The motion would have to be re—submitted.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, may I re—submit then? What is the right wording here? Would you pardon me? Could I have your indulgence for one moment, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is moved by Mr. Thatcher, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

That all the words after ‘that’ be deleted and the following substituted therefore: the house is of the opinion that the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw should be divided into single-member constituencies.

Order. I believe that no member wishes to rise on the point of order on this. I believe this becomes an alternative motion now. The motion moved by the Premier was:

That the bill be now read a second time.

This amendment moves:

That all the words after ‘that’ be deleted and the following substituted therefore: the house is of the opinion that the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw should be divided into single-member constituencies.

Is the house ready for the question?

Amendment negative on the following recorded division:

**YEAS – 17**

Thatcher	Cameron	MacDougall
Klein	McFarlane	Snedker
McCarthy	Gardiner	Gallagher
Barrie	Staveley	Erb
McDonald	Guy	Steuart
Danielson	Boldt	

NAYS – 28

Lloyd	Strum (Mrs.)	Semchuck
Johnson	Meakes	Perkins
Williams	Thurston	Thiessen
Brown	Wood	Snyder
Blakeney	Davies	Stevens
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Dahlman
Walker	Stone	Kluzak
Nollet	Whelan	Peterson
Kuziak	Thibault	Broten
Cooper (Mrs.)		

**Mr. Speaker:** — On a point of order. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think, should know that the members are not allowed to be moving around at all while the voting is being called. I hope the member will remember in future.

I declare the amendment lost. The motion before the house is:

That Bill No. 76 be now read a second time.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the second reading of this bill, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that this is just another attempt on the part of the socialists to maintain themselves in office by refusing to divide Saskatoon. This is a rather amazing thing. They have divided Saskatoon . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The house has voted on that and decided that. It is not debatable now.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I am talking about the bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The dividing of Saskatoon, Regina and Moose Jaw — the house has made a decision on that phase of the bill and it is not debatable.

**Mr. D.G. Steuart:** — I am attacking the bill, Mr. Speaker, because it doesn't do this. It refuses to do this in the bill. You mean then we can't debate this bill?

**Mr. Speaker:** — You can debate . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — We are being muzzled here.

**April 2, 1963**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The house has decided by motion, which was duly moved and seconded, that that part has now been settled and that part is not debatable now. That has been decided — whether they be divided or not.

**Mr. Steuart:** — But Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to speak on this bill. This bill refuses to divide Saskatoon, given them all five votes up there. I am rather hoping that in this debate we will wake some of those back-benchers up that come from the rural seats and they will realize their duty and they will vote against this bill on this basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Steuart:** — You are refusing to let me speak on this?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, I appeal your rule.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You had the right to speak on this before that motion was put.

**Mr. Steuart:** — This is still part of the bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You had the right — that motion was duly moved and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald). That motion was a debatable motion; members who wished to speak on it had a perfect right to speak on it; I didn't try to close anyone off, as the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Moosomin I think will agree. It was debatable. The vote was taken on it with no more debate. That is decided. I cannot permit a debate re—opened on a point already settled by this house.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. For heaven's sake, that amendment which we voted on a few moments ago took in all the cities at present except one or two — it took in Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw. Then that is a complete closure according to your rule. An absolute and complete closure. That can't be anything else. The same applies to Regina, the same applies to Moose Jaw . . .

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — On a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! One man in on his feet.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, there is some sense and some gleanings to some of these things. You just, of course, tell us to quit. That is what you ought to have done because if you ruled on Saskatoon, you ruled also on Regina and Moose Jaw. There's nothing to discuss here any more if your is good.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Hon. members are trying to make a case out of absolutely nothing. My point of order is this. The hon. member had plenty of opportunity to speak on this question at the appropriate time and he failed to do so. Now he wishes to speak on it again, and the question has been decided.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Some of them are sick, I think.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You are sick in the head.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Citation 149, Mr. Speaker, page 127 of Beauchesne says:

Besides the prohibition contained in Standing Order 35, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada that a member while speaking must not . . . (and then it lists a, b, c, down to k) . . . reflect upon the past acts and proceedings of the house.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is it not possible to debate this question of whether Saskatoon should be divided without reflecting upon the past action of this house in voting on that very question less than ten minutes ago. It is a well-known rule, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot debate matters that have already been decided. This matter has been decided by a vote in this house, and it is now beyond debate in this house, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say one further thing, Mr. Speaker. When members complain that this . . .

**Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — That's not the point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am, Mr. Speaker, . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Call him to order. He's exhausted his right to speak.

**April 2, 1963**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Will the hon. member for Arm River remain . . . Order! . . . The member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is on his feet speaking to the point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, it has been said on the point of order that imposing the rules of this house represents closure. Mr. Speaker, this is a well-known rule of this house and when hon. members cast reflections on the rules of the house by insinuating that the government is invoking closure, that is unparliamentarily, Mr. Speaker. That is unparliamentary.

**An Hon. Member:** — There is nobody yaps more than the hon. member for Arm River when he shouts . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** — If I might say a word on the point of order. The amendment which was submitted to this house and has just recently been disposed of called for the dividing into constituencies of every city which has a multiple representation in this house. Now I suggest that that was a blanket amendment. That was an amendment which covered all the cities which are covered in this bill. To deny a member the right to speak on each individual city is to deny us the right to speak on the principle of this bill. How do you know some member doesn't think, or does any member in this house know that some member, I or anyone else, doesn't consider that one city should have multiple representation and one city should be completely and entirely divided into constituencies. And it is our privilege to speak on this thing. The fact that there has been an amendment disposed of, the amendment covered every city that has multiple representation, not individual cities.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The amendment which was before the house was open for debate by any member whether he agreed or disagreed with the division of the cities, whether it be a multiple constituency or a single constituency. The amendment was duly moved and seconded; when I asked is the house ready for the question, they called for the question. The vote was put, so that part of this debate is settled.

**Mr. Snedker:** — We might just as well leave the house.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, we have no alternative but to accept your ruling although we don't think it is a very good one. However, I would like now to move another motion, seconded by the hon. member . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition will realize that he has spoken on this debate. A member can only speak once. If some of your colleagues want to rise . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I was speaking to the amendment. There is nothing preventing me from speaking on the bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, No. Order! Order!. The Leader of the Opposition rose on the main motion and spoke to the main motion and then moved an amendment, but he doesn't have the right to come back and move a second amendment.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — All right. My colleague will move it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is different in committee, but in the house as a whole you can only move one amendment.

**An Hon. Member:** — They make their own rules.

**Mr. Snedker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken to either the motion or the amendment. I, therefore, move, seconded by my colleague, my seatmate, the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, you've got a better one . . .

**Mr. Snedker:** —

That all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefore: all people living within the limits of the city of Saskatoon, including those now living in the constituency of Hanley, be enclosed in the constituency of Saskatoon.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if this house realizes that the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Stewart) still has the floor. He's been interrupted from all members on that side of the house on points of order. I just call that to your attention, that the member for Prince Albert still has the floor.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The point which was raised by the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) was well raised. But the member for Prince Albert lost his right on this floor when one of his own colleagues took it away from him. It is not my doing. It is the doing of

**April 2, 1963**

of one of his colleagues, so I cannot tell a member that he must get up and speak again because I don't know if he wishes to, but the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Snedker) in rising and taking part in this debate has cancelled the previous member's right.

It has been moved by Mr. Snedker, seconded by Mr. McDonald:

That all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefore: all the people living in the limits of the city of Saskatoon, including those now living in the constituency of Hanley, be included in the constituency of Saskatoon.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — That would fix Walker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to look at this motion for a moment before I give a ruling on it.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order. The ruling which your honor gave a moment ago with regard to the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Stewart), I take it, doesn't mean that he can't speak on this amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, if there is an amendment before the house he could speak on an amendment.

**Mr. Steuart:** — If I can get a word in edgewise, I'll decide.

**An Hon. Member:** — Would not you love to gerrymander.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I have looked at this motion and I must examine it to see whether it to re-open a topic which has been decided by this house already. I am of the opinion that it does not, that this is a new motion which gives a new reason for not wishing to proceed with this bill, so it is my considered opinion that this amendment as moved by Mr. Snedker and seconded by Mr. McDonald, is in order and is now open for debate. Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, during the campaign of 1960, the people that are in the Hanley seat, living in the city of Saskatoon, protested most violently and I am quite positive, if my memory holds me correct, that they phoned the Premier, Mr. Douglas at that time, and Mr. Douglas said then that he was not aware that people living in the city of Saskatoon would have to vote in the constituency of

Hanley and this included the portion of Sutherland and, I believe Cumberland. The Premier at that time assured the people in that area that this matter would be looked into after the election. I brought this out in the throne speech debate in 1961 and apparently nothing is being done about it. These people that live in Saskatoon are forced to vote in a rural area and they resent this, and I certainly cannot go along with the bill if this is not being corrected. Therefore I shall support the motion and not the bill.

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

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Mr. Speaker, I think the point expressed by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) was well taken. Here is a situation now arising where, for all intents and purposes, there are six seats within that city and if the intentions of the present Attorney General are the same, you have six member seats in the city of Saskatoon and in all probability one of the seats will be contested by a candidate who won't even be living in the Hanley district. The residence of the Hon. Attorney General isn't in Hanley anymore. Sure, maybe that is the seat he represents but his residence is out here in the hills at Lumsden. So here is a situation now where the people in the city of Saskatoon aren't going to have the opportunity to have their full six seats within the city because it is going to be called Hanley seat and contested by a fellow out here in the hills of the Qu'Appelle Valley. And so, Mr. Speaker, the way the whole bill is set up now, we can't for all intents and purposes discuss what we would like to discuss in the bill on account of what has gone on here a few minutes ago, so I want to go on record and say here that something will be straightened out whereby the people in Saskatoon will have the same chance to select their representatives as the people will in Regina under the terms of this bill.

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

**Mr. Steuart:** — I was up first. I thought when I came down I was going to have trouble with those fellows.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have finally got the chance to talk, I am being over-helped here, but I agree with this motion before the house. I still say that by doing it the way we are doing it, as suggested in the act, that we are disenfranchising thousands of people in Saskatoon and if we are going to go through with it, then the least we can do is put them all, all the people who live in Saskatoon in one constituency. I see no reason why the people that live in some parts of Saskatoon should be forced out of Saskatoon just to give the

**April 2, 1963**

Attorney General a safe seat – I don't think it will be a safe seat after the next election – but I think we are treating the people of Saskatoon very badly on two counts, whether you let me speak on this other or not, we are still treating the very badly on two counts.

I will support the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the house ready for the amendment?

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, when you bring a bill of this type before the house, naturally there are reasons for it. You are trying to re-arrange constituencies in Saskatchewan to suit the shift of population. But you are also, or ought to be, correcting errors that have been overlooked or made in the past and here we have an example in the city of Saskatoon that a portion of that city has been left in a rural constituency. As far as I know, this is the only area, city area, of any city in Saskatchewan that has remained in a rural constituency. Now, surely the people of Sutherland are not different than the people who live in the rest of the city of Saskatoon; surely they are no different from the people who live in north Regina or south Regina, or anywhere else, and if we are attempting to rectify some problems that exist because of things that have happened in the past, and trying to take care of the problem that has been brought about a shift in population, this is another problem that ought to be rectified at this time. And surely if the people of Sutherland haven't the same interests as the people of Saskatoon, then why are they a part of the city of Saskatoon. For the city fathers, in their wisdom, and the fathers of the town of Sutherland, when they amalgamated within the city of Saskatoon, surely demonstrated to all and sundry in the province of Saskatchewan that they thought their interests were similar, and they thought it was in their best interests to become a part of the city of Saskatoon, and they brought this about.

Surely we in this legislature are not going to be at odds to the wishes of the people who live in the that area and they have voted themselves into the city of Saskatoon, and in my opinion they have said to this house, now we are desirous of being classed as a part of the city of Saskatoon, and yet this house is going in directly opposite course to what the residents of Sutherland and all of the people of Saskatoon have wished to do. And I think that we are not following the requests of the people who live in that area, and I believe that this house would be wise, when this bill is before it, to put that portion of Sutherland that is now in the Hanley constituency back into the constituency of Saskatoon.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just sat down said something about putting part of Hanley constituency back into Saskatoon, and the suggestion has been made earlier that part of Saskatoon was put into Hanley constituency to help the Attorney General to get elected. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not true. No part of Hanley constituency has ever been part of Saskatoon constituency and that present boundary goes back to before the war and no change was made by this government to put any part of Saskatoon into Hanley constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the signal honor that has come to me in this debate. I don't think it has ever happened before in my experience in this house, which goes back something over 14 years, that four speakers of one party have all got up and advocated a private gerrymander to try to get rid of one other member of the assembly. I certainly appreciate the fact that I am such an object of interest on the part of the members of the opposition. Usually, Mr. Speaker . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — A very conspicuous one.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Usually, however, Mr. Speaker, oppositions make it their business to take on whole governments, not just to try to take on one government member. I, however, appreciate this. It isn't an honor that falls often to an individual member of this assembly.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that it is a disaster for the voters of Saskatoon to have to vote for five candidates — I am sorry, I shouldn't mention that because that has already been decided — but then it is suggested that this disaster should be inflicted on the good people of my constituency by having them put in Saskatoon. I find the logic of some hon. members passeth all understanding.

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that the people in these fringe areas outside the constituency of Saskatoon protested to the Premier, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said they protested to the Premier in 1960. Now, Mr. Speaker, if one is to measure their protest by the way in which they voted on election day, my hon. friend is quite mistaken because these people voted rather significantly in support of the government candidate at the last election. I think the percentage was something like 53 percent in a four way field, Mr. Speaker, and that isn't much of a protest.

**Mr. Mr. Nollet:** — That is what is worrying them.

**April 2, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — This suggests that they whole-heartedly approved of the government and its policy. I know that some hon. members opposite actually raised this matter with my constituents in the “fringe areas”, suggesting to them that they were being put upon because they were part of the Hanley constituency. Well, they gave their answer, Mr. Speaker, on election day last year. They indicated that they were pleased with this arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, it is suggested by the member for Qu’Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) that the Attorney General isn’t a resident there anymore. Well . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet** — Why don’t you pitch a tent out here, Bob?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — . . . I see some members opposite who don’t reside in their constituency any more, and they cannot claim that they are serving Her Majesty The Queen, and therefore have to leave their constituency. What they are doing is their own private business, living in Regina or living in Moose Jaw, as the case may be. As a matter of fact — and they all laugh — as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is well-known to anybody who looks at the Election Act that members of this assembly who take an appointment as Speaker or as a minister of the crown are regarded lawfully as continuing to reside in the place of residence that they occupied at the time of their election. And I remember a federal member of parliament who insisted very vigorously upon this right, notwithstanding that there was no provision in the Election Act to do so at that time.

**An Hon. Member:** — Willie King?

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — My hon. friend raised the matter and it was put in so that legally members of this house are — for election purposes — resident in the place where they were resident at the time of their election. Now it just so happens that this area that my hon. friends want to bandy about is the area where I happen to have legal residence. It just so happens, Mr. Speaker, that the people that he is talking to are my friends and neighbors and he is suggesting to them, or suggesting to this house, that I am not fit to represent them. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . some of your old friends after the last election . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, when I am no longer fit to represent those people, they will say so, Mr. Speaker, and when they so I will be proud of the fact that I have served them for as long as I have.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Sutherland have always been part of Hanley constituency since way back in antiquity, as far as I know away back before even the Liberal government was elected in 1934

...

**An Hon. Member:** — Back to the days further than that.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — My recollection is that even in the early thirties, and perhaps even far beyond that, Sutherland was part of Hanley constituency. The people of Montgomery Place have always been part of Hanley constituency when they settled there, they settled in the Hanley constituency. They weren't thrown into Hanley constituency by any action of this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is, should constituency boundaries be adjusted at all times to conform to municipal boundaries. Just to illustrate how foolish this motion is, let me remind my hon. friends that the boundaries of Saskatoon and the boundaries of Regina are altered every year. New areas are being added to those cities every year. Do hon. friends want to adjust constituency boundaries by act of this house every year? It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Even in Regina, the boundaries of the constituency don't coincide with the boundaries of the city. In fact, a part of the rural area near Regina is included in the city constituency, and part of the city unoccupied at the moment is in the rural constituency of Lumsden. This has always been the case, Mr. Speaker. No attempt has ever been made, as witness the situation at Saskatoon, to make constituency boundaries conform to municipal boundaries.

Indeed, as I go around the boundaries of my constituency, I find that three-fourths of the mileage around the perimeter of my constituency does not follow municipal boundaries at all. No attempt has been made in this legislature by any government to make constituency boundaries coincide with municipal boundaries. They don't follow municipal boundaries and never have.

I can understand my hon. friends in the purity of motive wanting now to make an adjustment here which they think would be in the interests of proper redistribution. Well, I must say that I personally had thought that this might be a time to make some boundary adjustments but I noticed that just before the house met the Leader of the Opposition went into great screams of anxiety in the newspapers, in the news broadcasts — This government is contemplating an adjustment of boundaries, and if they do, he said, this is proof that the government is trying to perpetuate itself . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the minister should keep his remarks to the amendment which is before us at the present time.

**April 2, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am coming to the reason, Mr. Speaker, why the government does not consider it advisable to adjust this boundary as proposed by my hon. friends.

One of the reasons is because the Leader of the Opposition demanded that there be . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, he is just talking about boundaries. I thought we disposed of that in the amendment.

**An Hon. Member:** — Wake up.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am out of order. If I am I am not aware of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The business before the house is the amendment, which was moved by Mr. Snedker, seconded by Mr. McDonald.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Exactly, and the amendment suggests a boundary change between Hanley and Saskatoon, and I am addressing my remarks to the question of whether or not the government should have made a boundary change. What I am saying is that the Leader of the Opposition said, just before this session, that if this government makes any boundary changes, it is proof that they are trying to perpetuate themselves in office, trying to salvage their . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I was talking about rural areas. We are talking about a city boundary.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — The boundaries of Hanley constituency are the boundaries of a rural constituency.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You are trying to keep part of . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. Walker:** — And so, Mr. Speaker, the government didn't give any further thought to any possible changes of the boundaries of this rural constituency.

But suppose this change was made. Well, my hon. friends are not interested in this change for any reasons other than they think it might defeat the present member for Hanley. But, Mr. Speaker, even without the suburban parts of Saskatoon,

which are in the Hanley constituency, the member for Hanley would have been re-elected three times now, and in every single one of those elections has had a majority in the purely rural area of Hanley constituency, apart altogether from the so-called fringe area of Saskatoon. So that my hon. friends don't need to think that they would be defeating me in my constituency if they change the boundaries.

And this isn't why the present boundaries are being kept, Mr. Speaker, because it isn't necessary that we keep these areas, these parts of Saskatoon, in Hanley constituency in order to influence the election results there. But suppose the boundary was changed, there are approximately 5,800 voters in the city of Saskatoon who are resident in the constituency of Hanley, out of a total of about 11,000 voters in the constituency. This would leave about 5,200, if the fringe areas were removed from Hanley and added to Saskatoon. This would be 2,000 fewer voters than the constituency of Arm River has got, the member for Morse, or Gravelbourg, and this would be too small a constituency to justify a member in the legislature and too large a number of voters to be divided up among the surrounding rural constituencies. So, Mr. Speaker, it isn't possible from any practical point of view to remove this number of voters from Hanley constituency, unless the assembly is prepared to make a general and over-all adjustment of constituency boundaries.

These people, Mr. Speaker, who I am proud to represent are not deprived of their franchise by virtue of sending their old neighbor to the legislature. In fact, each one of these voters, Mr. Speaker, represent one out of a total constituency of 11,000, whereas if they were a part of the constituency of Saskatoon, they would represent one out of every 12 or 13,000 voters. So that, Mr. Speaker, each of these people have a little more influence on the outcome of the election of their constituency than they would have if they were lumped into a larger constituency. So, Mr. Speaker, they are perfectly happy with this arrangement; any change that would be made would be made against their best interests. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would have to oppose that change. I have always upheld their interests in this house, and I will continue to do so.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I would ask the members behind the railing to please keep their voices down.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I will continue to uphold their interests in this house, and, therefore, shall oppose this motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**April 2, 1963**

**Mr. Thatcher:** — I think this whole debate indicates one thing very clearly. Redistributions in this house, or any other house, should be done by an impartial committee, and not by a political body which makes political decisions as this government has done.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the member stay specifically to the motion before us?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, this, of course, restricts us in a very unfair way. All right, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General stated that the opposition is opposing, or has brought forth this resolution for one reason, to try and defeat him at the polls. Of course, we will try and defeat him at the polls, and we likely will. But I can tell the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) that the opposition considers him about the greatest asset we have in this house, because every time he opens his mouth he makes Liberal votes. So when he makes the suggestion, I can tell you, indeed, Sir, that he is flattering himself. We want this amendment passed for one reason. Because we know that the citizens of Saskatoon, who live in Saskatoon, want to vote in the constituency of Saskatoon, and not in the constituency of Hanley. And I am quite sure if this matter is before the house much longer there will be representations made along these lines from the Saskatoon city council and the chamber of commerce, and so on.

The aspect, or the purpose of Bill 76, the main purpose of this bill, is to leave thousands of Saskatoon citizens out of the boundary of the city of Saskatoon, and we don't think that it makes sense.

As we are discussing this bill, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more appeal to the Premier. We say we should have single seats in both cities. Surely the time . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Excuse me. I just hadn't quite finished. I say, surely the time has come, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier to at least consider, dividing Saskatoon the way Regina is divided . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Thatcher:** — . . . or at least come to a compromise which can be accepted by the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member realizes that point has been voted on, and I have to enforce the house ruling.

**Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville):** — I want to say a word or two on this particular amendment. I think it is one that should receive the support of everyone in this house. I think it is a reasonable amendment and I think it is only reasonable to expect that the residents of the city of Saskatoon would sooner be represented by members from the city of Saskatoon, rather than be part of another constituency. I don't think that that needs too much argument. I think most of us here would accept the fact that if we were in the city of Regina, that we would want to be considered as part of the constituency of Regina, and so, also, if we are part of the city of Saskatoon, we would want to be considered part of that particular constituency in this house.

The Attorney General has suggested that because of the fact that this wasn't done many years ago is the reason for it not being done today, but Sutherland was not part of the city of Saskatoon many years ago, as he stated, when the boundaries were first drawn for the Hanley constituency. So that particular argument doesn't hold water.

One other statement that the minister made during his remarks, of course, was due to the fact that certain suggestions had been made from this side of the house about his residence, and I would just like to point out to him, with regard to that argument, that in passing the bill in this house, he said that a person could not lose his residence in his own constituency due to the fact that he had gone to the capital city as the cabinet minister or as a member of parliament. But he will also remember that in the discussion of that bill, the member must retain some form of residence in his own constituency.

Now, I am not aware of whether the Attorney General owns a home in the constituency of Hanley or not, or whether he has any residence there which would qualify him as a resident of the Hanley constituency or not, or whether he has ever voted in the city of Regina; once he votes any place else outside of this own constituency in a civic election, he is claiming residence in that particular point, and so I would suggest to the Attorney General that there are other qualification in this regard in the bill, and, of course, those qualifications were aptly held by the individual that he suggested here the bill was changed because of, and, of course, if the minister has a come in the Hanley constituency well then, he could still be considered a resident of that particular area, but if he has not, then the circumstances would be quite different.

**April 2, 1963**

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am qualified.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Getting back to the amendment, and to the argument that was used here by the minister I think every one of us in this house should realize that changing conditions, and conditions are going to continue to change in this province with regard to our city boundaries, I am quite certain that everyone here would want to see as these boundaries are changed that the people that are a part of the city of Regina be represented by the city members who, of course are going to have to be approached by city council at certain times to consider problems in relationship to the city as a whole, and since they are part of that city, they should have a voice in those particular matters.

And so I think it is very reasonable for this request to be made, that the city of Saskatoon be included in one constituency so that their problems can be dealt with as a whole, and not be divided between the various constituencies in this province. And I think the same thing can be said in relationship to any other city in this province; every city should be contained within its own constituency boundaries where those problems can be solved as a unit and not dispersed between two or three parts of the province, and not contained in the city itself.

So I think that the motion that has been moved is a reasonable one, and I should think one that the government would give serious consideration to accepting into this particular bill.

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

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — I just wanted to add one or two comments. I think that the Attorney General has adequately demonstrated that it has not been the custom for electoral boundaries or constituency boundaries to follow civic boundaries necessarily.

And we don't have to go further than the Saskatchewan federal constituencies to see this in evidence. And, indeed, we don't have to go farther than Regina city, where the Regina city federal boundary does not coincide with the civic boundaries in Regina city, and there are fully 10 or 15,000 people in Regina who are in the Moose Jaw—Lake Centre federal constituency.

**Mr. J.W. Erb (Milestone):** — You are not saying this is desirable are you?

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney:** — I am saying these constituency boundaries were drawn up by a Liberal government and it existed for numbers of years under a Liberal government, and if it was undesirable, it wasn't changed. That is what I am saying.

I want to comment on one or two other matters, and I agree with, I think was the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane), that the people in Sutherland are in fact citizens of Saskatoon. I don't think anyone doubts that; they vote in the Saskatoon civic elections, they cast their X's for the five or six candidates which are on the ballot in Saskatoon civic elections — they don't have a ward system there, the city is not divided for civic purposes — they feel that they are part of the city of Saskatoon for civic purposes. But this does not mean, based on our customs in the past, that they would be necessarily part of Saskatoon for electoral purposes. And I make the point in passing that Saskatoon has not felt itself desirable to divide up the city for civic purposes.

Now, the one point I really want to make is this, if this motion is passed, it will in effect dismember the Hanley constituency. If this were done, the Hanley constituency would have to be used in a truncated form, 4 or 5,000 voters in the next election, or, alternatively, we would have to have a general redistribution. Now, those are the only choices. You have either a pocket borough or a general redistribution, if this motion passed and if it were adopted.

Now, I think a general redistribution is perhaps not desirable at this time. Certainly the Leader of the Opposition has expressed this sentiment, and if we are not going to have a general redistribution, then surely, we should add seats to make as little change as possible.

The only alternative is to have Hanley a pocket borough. So what these people are advocating is either that Hanley be a pocket borough with 4 or 5,000 voters, or that we have a general redistribution.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh, no.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker — well these are the only alternative. There is no other alternative, if 4 or 5,000 voters are taken out of Hanley and put into Saskatoon, there is only two possibilities then. Either that Hanley stays in a truncated form, with 4 or 5,000 electors, or there is redistribution.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You say . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — There is no other logical one, I certainly say it, and there is no other logical way. Either of these is quite unpalatable

**April 2, 1963**

to me. I think the present situation, desirable or undesirable — I'm not now prepared to argue that — I just say it is better than any alternative. I am just saying that we can either leave it as it is, or have Hanley as a pocket borough with 4 or 5,000 voters, or have a general redistribution to add some more territory to Hanley or to split it up. And for my part, I think there is not time in this session, and it is probably not desirable in any case, to have a general redistribution at this time so close to the election.

Secondly, it is not desirable, not in any sense desirable in my view, to have Hanley operating as a pocket borough with 4 or 5,000 electors. I say that the present situation is more desirable than any of those and, therefore, I think that this house ought to vote down the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Call it 12:30.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You would like to call it 12:30?

The sitting was recessed at 12:30 p.m.

The sitting was resumed at 2:30 p.m.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't really know what I am going to talk about, and I don't think most of the members on the other side know what they are talking about either. All the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) has done is just carry on and pat himself on the back for his great victory in 1961. Well, I want to congratulate the member for his great victory in 1961, pardon me, 1960, because his friends had his agents up there trying to defeat him.

His chosen friends that he is prosecuting in the courts now, and the former Provincial Treasurer, previous to 1960, had agents out to try and defeat him. So, the man who sits there, the Hon. Minister of Health worked so that this gentleman over there, the Attorney General, couldn't sit in his seat. Yes, and if you want to have political insurance, start a new farm and go up to Hanley and visit them.

And you know that always, Mr. Speaker, when you start to pick on somebody, it doesn't matter what kind of a guy he is, you always attract some sympathy. Then the people of the Hanley district said this, "These dumb sons of the city coming in here to defeat Walker — we are going to vote for him in spite of the fact that he is a CCF", and he got voted in with a majority.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Would the hon. member care to tell us the authority for that statement he just made? What it is that he has to support that statement?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I congratulate you on your great victory, but not because you were elected for Hanley even with the fellows who tried to cut your throat, and that is what it was.

Everything that the CCF has done since I have come into this house, and they came into this house in 1944, in regard to this business we are dealing with now, the same business that has been used to hide the CCF votes in compact groups all over the province of Saskatchewan. I remember the redistribution in 1952. They came along and they took six miles off the Arm River constituency, from the meridian of the Saskatchewan River, and added it to Hanley. You know it gave them a little bit of a seat up there, and then they saw this town of Sutherland, and, of course, that had the effect, Mr. Speaker, of indicating to other sections of Saskatchewan, not for Hanley, that the rural people of Hanley seemed to want to go for this gentleman, or for the CCF. This new unknown grabber — and God help you if you try to get in for the rural seat of Hanley. You will never darken the portals of this house again.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is your station up there, and you have got to have that CCF section of Saskatoon.

And that seat in Saskatoon, that extra seat, you are going to have the same number as Regina now, when this bill is through, and I can sympathize with the gentleman sometimes, not because he deserves it, but you know, this business we are dealing with now, this is not confined to one seat in this province, or two or three seats, it has effect on the whole political situation in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Attorney General has, in effect, involved the province and caused extensive litigation in this province of Saskatchewan. They have been prosecuting people because they don't believe in them in a political way.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Will the — we are on the amendment which was moved by Mr. Snedker, and any court case is not relevant to this amendment.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I just want to remind him about it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — And why did he stop Fines from getting away back there? It was the same thing. Put a kickback team on the witness stand

**April 2, 1963**

and gave him an examination for discovery. That is what all the evidence you want to present . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — He might have blackmailed some of them.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, maybe Shumiatcher too. That is the only . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — What has that to do with it?

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . reason why he is on the stand today — that is the only reason. That has a lot to do with it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can go back to the early, early days of this country. You know, I would see John Macdonald, I think it was, who sat here with give Grits. That was a common expression by the old Tory leaders. Well, these farmers have had a large amount of patience in the last 19 years, and this is going to be 20 pretty soon, and that was the height of the CCF to draw up the boundaries for the constituencies and for themselves for political seats in this house.

Now, I am going to vote for this motion because I think it is the proper thing to do. I shall vote for it and I shall vote against the bill when it comes into committee because it is nothing else than a political trap. I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, that this city of Regina has been calculated and checked and double checked and formulated in certain groups and cells in this city, so you could have as many — you have four seats in this city. That isn't going to work because that hasn't any relation to the representation in this city. That is, by dividing it you are getting the greatest opportunity and advancing the greatest possible opportunity to satisfy your political ambitions in the city of Regina and to save your political hides in the city of Regina.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I think this is true, and it is the same in Saskatoon. Now why don't you go into Saskatoon and give the same treatment that you give in Regina?

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is what you are going to do, then you will be consistent for once in your life, and not a lot of cheap political opportunists like you are now, or Saskatoon members.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of all my breach of rules — I can listen but I won't listen.

**Mr. Erb:** — Mr. Speaker, I won't be long. The member for Regina (Mr. Blakeney), the Hon. Minister of Public Health, stated in his argument, that Moose Jaw-Lake Centre is a sort of a traditional pattern that has been followed, and that they are doing nothing amiss in treating Saskatoon and Hanley in such a similar manner.

He pointed out that this is a situation that existed since a Liberal government in Ottawa prior to 1955. Well, if this was a bad situation then, Mr. Speaker, it is a bad situation now; and I would hope that when a federal Liberal government is elected after April 8, that this situation will be corrected.

Well, this morning the Attorney General gave us a very lengthy discourse on the Act respecting Magistrates' Courts, and he pointed out how this traditional pattern had been improved over the years, and so forth. Well, if we are going to be consistent in this legislature, if we are going to have an eye towards improving what we consider to be traditional, then certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are not amiss in suggesting that this situation is no different. It certainly follows then in that it being traditional, we are viewing the matter with concern to make it a more effecting and more logical way of representation for the people.

And I suggest that the government now has the opportunity to bring some sense into this matter of city boundaries for provincial election purposes. The member for Regina, the Hon. Minister for Health, threatens us that Hanley will be a pocket borough of some 4 or 5,000 people. He said that this would necessitate a general redistribution. Well, I don't think that we on this side of the house accept this statement. Certainly, the genius that was portrayed this morning by the Attorney General can be very well put to work to see that no such general redistribution is necessary, with respect to putting that area of Saskatoon, which is now in Hanley, into Saskatoon proper.

I'm quite sure, as the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has stated, that the government is simply looking to garner as many seats as possible in the next election to save them from political submersion. And the very fact that the Legislative Assembly Act has come into this legislature at this time is an admission on the part of my former colleagues that their days in government are numbered.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it would be my opinion, if we are going to treat Regina as we are treating it, by drawing constituency boundaries, certainly this is exactly the same manner that we ought to treat Saskatoon, a city of similar magnitude, if we are going to be consistent on all counts.

**April 2, 1963**

Certainly, I don't think that there is any argument at all, inasmuch as the tradition has been in this province one of single constituencies, to now make fowl of one and fish of the other.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That is a point that has been debated and settled.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Hasn't been . . .

**Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City):** — Seems to me to be kind of amazing that the members of the opposition who live hundreds of miles away from the scene are more of an authority on what happens than those who live right on the scene.

Now, the point in question seems to be that people who are residents of the city of Saskatoon are annoyed because they can't vote for their members in the city of Saskatoon. Now, it is quite true that there was a small protest from a group in the Montgomery Place in the last election, which was blown up to some proportions by the Star Phoenix, but I think the election results, and especially from that area in Montgomery Place prove conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that they were satisfied, and I think most constituents want more service from their members and where they are going to vote, and they surely get wonderful service from the member that they have now; I think more so than any other member in the house, and besides that they always can call on the members from Saskatoon, which they do very often. In fact, we talking about having to serve a hundred thousand people. We in the city of Saskatoon are often called upon by constituents from Watrous, Humboldt, Rosthern, all around come in to do their shopping and very often come to see the members in Saskatoon because we are handy to get at.

So I don't think that is any point at all. I think the Minister of Health put this case perfectly. If we take this amount of vote out of Hanley, you are just going to cripple the constituency of Hanley, and it means a thorough redistribution job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the passing of the last amendment not only caught the opposition flat-footed, but it took some of the wind out of my sails because I had intended to say some things on the bill, but I am going to have to be content to leave my remarks to the amendment and say that I will not support it at this time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — In view of the wonderful service that the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) purports to give to this area of the city, how then does he explain the fact . . .

**Mr. Stone:** — Point of order. I was talking about the member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) and if the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) would listen closely he would understand what I was talking about.

**Mr. Foley:** — I was listening very carefully, Mr. Speaker, and he was mentioning that he was not only serving the city Saskatoon, but I think about five surrounding constituencies. I would just like to point out to him that one of his constituents saw fit to place an advertisement in the local Saskatoon paper several years ago inquiring as to the whereabouts of the Saskatoon members.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the house ready for the question? The motion before the house is the amendment moved by Mr. Snedker and seconded by Mr. MacDonald,

That all the words after the words ‘that’ be deleted and the following substituted therefore:  
all people living in the limits of the city of Saskatoon, including those now living in the constituency of Hanley, be included in the constituency of Saskatoon.

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

Amendment negative on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 17**

Thatcher	McFarlane	Horsman
McCarthy	Gardiner	MacDougall
Barrie	Staveley	Gallagher
McDonald	Foley	Erb
Danielson	Guy	Steuart
Cameron	Boldt	

NAYS — 28

Johnson	Meakes	Semchuk
Williams	Thurston	Perkins
Brown	Wood	Thiessen
Blakeney	Davies	Snyder
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Peterson
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Brotten
Willis		

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the house ready for the question on the main motion?

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Mr. Speaker, before putting the question, I would just like to say a few words on the main motion. I think that it wouldn't be wrong to say that the majority of those that have spoken in the house this afternoon have shown a great deal of objection to the manner in which Bill No. 76 has been presented to the members of this house.

I think the great majority of those that were prepared to get up at least and speak for their various constituents on this very important question have definitely left the impression that this act has not been drawn in a manner which is acceptable to the members of this legislature.

The only ones who have actually opposed the motion, at least in speaking to the motion, have been two or three members of the government itself, and there has been little defence of the motion from the back—benchers on the other side of the house.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — On a point of order. Surely the hon. member knows, it has been said often enough and ruled often enough in this house, that it is not proper for him now to discuss who supported the amendments, who supported the motion, or what was said, or what was done at that time, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that he would try to adhere to the rules of the house because the dignity of this house is in all our hands. We all benefit by preserving the rules of this house.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking about the speeches on the main motion. If the minister had been listening he would have realized that I was referring to the main motion which we are now discussing once again, after

having disposed of amendments. I'm not now dealing with amendments, I'm speaking about the main motion, and I think I am quite correct in saying that in almost every case, except for members of the government, that the members who have spoken have spoken against the method used by the government in this instance, to bring in a redistribution of constituencies. I think for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that it would be only fair to say that members in this legislature should have some rights in this particular instance, particularly when it comes to dealing with the question now of redistribution of constituencies in this province.

As far as I know, there has been no contact with the opposition, there has been no consideration given in any regard by the government, to consulting independent sources as far as the redistribution of the constituencies are concerned. As far as we are aware, there has been no contact with the people of the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, to find out whether they agree with the method that is being used to allocate constituencies in the various cities concerned, and I think surely these people should have some recognition when it comes to determining what is going to take place as far as the distribution of seats in these cities or any place else in the province.

There has been no indication that there should be, as there has been in many other cases, an independent commission appointed to consider the matter of redistribution in the province. There has been no indication that this has been given any consideration by the government, and so I think that it is quite fair for members in this legislature to suggest to the government of the province that they take back Bill No. 76, they withdraw it from the house, and re-submit it in a form that is acceptable to the members of this legislature, and so I am going to move, seconded by Mr. McFarlane:

That Bill No. 76 be withdrawn and re-submitted in a form acceptable to the legislature.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of order. In regard to the motion . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Beauchesne.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You can have all the Beauchesnes you like, but all the Beauchesnes will never compensate for the lack of some common sense. The amendment of the hon. member suggests that the bill be withdrawn and submitted in a form acceptable to this house. It has

**April 2, 1963**

not yet been tried whether it is acceptable to this house. He is making an assumption there which is entirely unwarranted, and I think this is just completely erroneous in that if the house is willing to give instructions for definite form, well this is a different kind of a thing, but this kind of a suggestion is in outer space, and I don't think it is in order at all.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You should know.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member . . .

**Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — I certainly do not claim to have any knowledge of parliamentary procedure, but I would like to say at this time that my impression of this amendment is that it is very definitely in the nature of an expanded negative. I think that exactly the same results could be achieved by taking a vote upon the votes that are before us.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I might just suggest on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that in an earlier discussion in the debate, the Speaker himself did suggest that one of the methods that should be used at a time like this was a request that the bill be withdrawn and that is why it was submitted at this time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If there is any further points on this point of order, I would be glad to hear any further discussions before I give my ruling on it, if anyone has anything further that they wish to offer.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — In seconding the motion, Mr. Speaker, I think we were quite on the point of order . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — We were just speaking of the point of order.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Yes, well I think, in speaking to the point of order, I would just like to suggest that I presumed we were in order taking your advice by resubmitting and asking that the bill be withdrawn.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friends consider Beauchesne as some subject for levity, but it is still the rules of this house, Mr. Speaker, section 202 deals with what kind of amendments are out of order. I am quoting from Beauchesne, 4th edition, 1958. It deals with the kind of amendments that are out of order, and subclause 12 of clause 202 says that:

An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to pass a motion here that this bill will be withdrawn is exactly the opposite to passing a motion that it be carried, and my hon. friends can have this same effect by simply defeating the motion when it is before the house.

The amendment which he is proposing, also fits under clause 14 of the same citation:

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negated is out of order.

Mr. Speaker, I can't see how the passing of this motion would not have exactly the same results as voting down the main motion, so, Mr. speaker, it is quite clearly out of order.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like to suggest to you that the arguments that are now being used by the Attorney General and members opposite are the arguments that the opposition have used on many occasions when private members' resolution have been introduced into this house. They have been amended by the government out of all existence. As a matter of fact, on most occasions a complete negative has been the result of the amendment, and, without exception, your ruling, rulings of your predecessors, have ruled that these amendments were in order, and I suggest, if this house is going to be consistent, then you have no alternative but to rule this amendment in order.

**Mr. Erb:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned a moment ago that this was out of order because it had not yet been indicated that this act was not acceptable to this house. I contend that this act was demonstrated to be not acceptable by virtue of two amendments already having been moved in protest to this act.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, on just a very narrow question, if I understood the motion moved by the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) it was not in the form of an amendment, the one I heard, and I would simply draw your attention to the fact that there is a motion before the house. No other motion can be entertained except the motion which amends the first one, and all you can do is frame your amendment in that form, and I didn't hear the member from Melville frame his in that form, and I would make that narrow point.

**April 2, 1963**

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I would just remind, on the point of order I would just remind the hon. member that just . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! You have spoken once on this point of order. The rules of amendment in the house, I think, are quite clear; if it is going to arise at an opposite conclusion, is in order, but I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs explained it quite well when he said this amendment, as proposed here, is an expanded negative. The same objective can be obtained by the defeat of the motion which is now before the house. I think the point raised by the Minister of Public Health, that this is not necessarily attached to the motion which is before the house, is also well taken, so I feel that I have no alternative but to rule this motion out of order.

**Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this Bill No. 76 has been discussed from almost every conceivable angle during this past two or three hours. I have not yet spoken on it and I would like to make a few comments before the motion is put.

This is a very important bill, Mr. Speaker, and I think that it should be considered very thoroughly. In fact, I think that it should be exhausted before it is finally dealt with.

Now, it seems to me that this bill embodies several principles. It embodies the principle of greater representation for our two major cities in the province; it involves the principle of a change to single—member constituencies to one area; it also involves the principle of retaining multi—unit representations for another area. This bill also, Mr. Speaker, involves both urban and rural voters.

But this bill contains a paradox, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, what is good for the goose is not good for the gander, and if this bill does recognize, as it does, that there is merit in converting the city of Regina to single or double members units, constituencies, . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! That part of the bill has been decided on a vote in this house.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Oh, no. This bill is very clear—cut, and the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) is only discussing what is in this

bill and neither you nor no one else in this house has any right to prevent him from discussing that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! When members of this house move a resolution pertaining to a certain part of the bill and the members of this house vote on that resolution . . .

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, he was discussing what is in this bill, and he has that right.

**Mr. Staveley:** — I was not discussing the merits or demerits of that bill, Mr. Speaker. I am really pointing out some principles that are involved in the bill, and it also apparently recognizes the merit of retaining the city of Saskatoon as a five—member constituency which is contrary to what I mentioned just a moment ago.

I find it very difficult to reconcile the difference of attitude as between the members from the city of Regina and the members from the city of Saskatoon with respect to this bill. Now, does this bill, in its present form, relegate the city of Saskatoon to the status of a second-class city, and if so I wonder if the hon. members from Saskatoon are prepared to accept this. Also I wonder if the government is prepared to accept this responsibility. It seems to me that there will be many recriminations if this bill is passed in its present form. I don't think that the government desires this, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that the Hon. Premier and his colleagues, prior to this debate, had not realized the great divergence of opinion or the ramifications of the public reaction to this bill in its present form.

It further seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this bill could much better be discussed in a less formal atmosphere with less restrictions on debate and it is for this reason that I now move, seconded by the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) the following resolution:

That all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefore:  
this bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Election.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been moved by Mr. Staveley, seconded by Mr. Foley:

That all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and the following substituted therefore:  
this bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Election.

April 2, 1963

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). One member told me this morning that this particular committee has not met for 15 years. If that is the case, it has an opportunity to perform a service at the present time. Very frequently, in this legislature and in other parliaments, contentious matters are referred to special committees. The opposition today has taken the stand that there should be single seats throughout the province. The government, on the other hand, has taken another position. Surely it makes sense that if members on both sides of the house got together in this particular committee, they might be able to hammer out a compromise that would be satisfactory to all concerned. I think there is merit in this motion and I hope that the government won't just steam-roller this whole bill through without giving it consideration in committee. I appeal to the Premier. He is not here, but to the minister to give this matter consideration before they just throw it out. It would only take us perhaps tomorrow to discuss it in this committee, and perhaps we could come to a compromise that would be satisfactory.

Amendment negative on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 17**

Thatcher	McFarlane	Horsman
McCarthy	Gardiner	MacDougall
Barrie	Staveley	Gallagher
McDonald	Foley	Erb
Danielson	Guy	Steuart
Cameron	Boldt	

**NAYS — 28**

Johnson	Meakes	Semchuk
Williams	Thurston	Perkins
Brown	Wood	Thiessen
Blakeney	Davies	Snyder
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Peterson
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Brotten
Willis		

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**YEAS — 28**

Johnson	Meakes	Semchuk
Williams	Thurston	Perkins
Brown	Wood	Thiessen
Blakeney	Davies	Snyder
Brockelbank	Turnbull	Stevens
Walker	Stone	Dahlman
Nollet	Whelan	Kluzak
Cooper (Mrs.)	Thibault	Peterson
Strum (Mrs.)	Berezowsky	Brotten
Willis		

**YEAS — 17**

Thatcher	McFarlane	Horsman
Klein	Gardiner	MacDougall
McCarthy	Staveley	Gallagher
Barrie	Foley	Erb
McDonald	Guy	Stewart
Danielson	Boldt	

Bill read the second time.

**SECOND READINGS**

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved reading of Bill No. 83 – **An Act respecting the Superannuation of Employees in Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Superannuation of Employees in Tuberculosis Sanatoria and Hospitals Act. The members may know that the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League, which has a long and distinguished history in the province, has a good number of employees and they have had a superannuation act which covered those employees and provided superannuation benefits for them. The League, the board of directors of the League, and the trade union representing the employees have been having a good number of discussions during the past several months respecting the superannuation coverage for employees and they have as a result of these discussions and deliberations agreed upon a form of superannuation act which they have referred to the government and asked the government to introduce into the house on their behalf.

**April 2, 1963**

This might well be the sort of a bill which could be referred to the Committee on Law Amendments since the government as such has no special interest in seeing the bill passed. However, I believe it has been a custom of the house to deal with these things directly, even though it is not a bill that represents the embodiment in a specific way of government policy. I may say that the government in a general way supports the provisions of the bill and we are quite willing and pleased to present to the house the bill which has been agreed to in the form which has been agreed to by the board of the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League and the union representing the employees.

In very general terms, the bill provides substantially higher superannuation benefits raising a maximum pension, for example, from \$3,000 to \$4,200. It provides for a retirement age of 65, the previous retirement age being 65 in the case of some employees and 60 in the case of some female employees. It provides for a higher level of contributions by employees. The present level is four percent, the proposed level is five percent, six percent and seven percent, depending upon the age at which the employee becomes an employee of the League. It provides for a number of other changes. The import of the changes is to make the superannuation act very similar to the superannuation act which used to cover public servants up until two or three years ago, until about 1960. Members may recall that there have, in the last couple of years, been some fairly major changes in the provisions of the Public Service Superannuation Act. These are not included in this bill which I am introducing. In general terms, this bill is patterned off the Public Service Superannuation Act of two or three years ago.

It was an act of the nature of the old Telephone Department Superannuation Act, those of the four percent type which were introduced back in the late twenties. That is the present act covering the League's employees and if this bill is passed the act will closely resemble the Public Service Superannuation Act of say 1960. The provisions of the act itself are, as is usually the case with superannuation acts, fairly detailed in nature. I think the details can best be considered in committee and, accordingly Mr. Speaker, I would move that the said bill be now read a second time.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, I was going to make a few remarks.

I am not opposed to this bill, I don't know too much about it, but I can't for the life of me see how every year we come in here, four or five bills come up on superannuation. Surely the government, with all their experts, and all their advisors, and all the rest, could sit down and run out a bill that will cover them all. There may be slight differences in them now, but they are basically the same, and if there are those slight differences, they could be ironed out. I don't

know how much it costs to get these bills out and how much it costs to run all the differences — but surely the basis principle of this thing goes through them all, and for the live of me I can't see why we can't have one bill. It just looks to me like lost motion.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Willis moved second reading of Bill No. 69 – **An Act to amend the Highways Act, 1961**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill which we have to amend the Highways Act gives us permission to enter into agreement with other provinces or the dominion of Canada to construct highways outside of Saskatchewan. Now, over the years, we have co-operated with the province of Alberta in the building of no. 17 highway, north and south of Lloydminster. The present location of no. 17 highway is mainly all within Saskatchewan. As the members know, I announced in the 1963 highway program that we were continuing the rebuilding of no. 17 highway south from no. 40 highway down to no. 14 highway and of this highway, approximately 35 miles in length, 20 miles will be in the province of Alberta and 15 miles in Saskatchewan. We propose to build it at a 50/50 split, with the province of Alberta sharing the costs of construction, and we will be maintaining the highway, and again when it is maintained the cost will be shared 20/50 with Alberta.

We haven't anything in our present act giving us authority to pay Alberta for her larger share of the building which will be undertaken this year, or to pay Alberta for the greater amount of maintenance which we will be doing on Alberta's side of this new highway in the future. This amendment merely gives us authority to enter into agreements with our neighboring provinces and to pay our fair share of this co-operative highway.

With this explanation, Mr. Chairman, I move second reading of this act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

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