

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
28th Day

Monday, March 12, 1951

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

2/R REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The House resumed from Friday, March 9, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines: That Bill No. 73 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act — be now read the second time.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, this Bill that is now before us is, of course, one of importance to the people of the province, because it determines the basis upon which they will elect the people who will speak for them in this Legislative Assembly, and it certainly is of great interest to every hon. member here. The approach to this Bill, I submit, should be on the basis of what is in the best interest of the various people of our province.

I have looked over some of the debates that have been held elsewhere in regard to this matter, and it seemed to me that one of the best outlines of the attitude in which we should approach this Bill was stated by the late Rt. Hon. Mr. King, when he was Prime Minister, in 1947. I will read from his statement in that regard. Mr. King said:

“I submit that there is no higher trust imposed upon a House of Commons, under our constitution, than that of justly redistributing the constituencies. That trust is one which must be exercised not alone in the light of what is in the interest of the sitting member of the constituency which he represents, but in a wholly impartial and broadminded way in the light of what is most just and fair to the great body of the electorate.

“And may I say, with respect to a question like the redistribution of seats in the House of Commons on which the whole basis of our Government itself rests, that this Parliament is not merely exercising the function of legislating, but is exercising the function of the high court of parliament when it is expected to see that justice is done to all electors in the country.”

Now while that was said in regard to the Canadian House of Commons, it applies, I submit, Mr. Speaker, with equal force to this Legislative Assembly. The basis of my submission, this afternoon, will be that we, in this matter, are not only exercising the function of legislating, but we are exercising the function of a high court of parliament, where it is our duty to deal justly with all parts of our province.

Now, in regard to other people that have spoken on this matter — Mr. Bennett, who succeeded Mr. King as Prime Minister, also in his time introduced a Redistribution Bill. I will read just a few lines from what

March 12, 1951

he said in introducing his Bill in 1932. He spoke about the old contest in the House of Commons over the boundaries of the constituencies which represented the views of the Government of the day which had not taken place since 1903. In other words, Mr. Speaker, up to 1903 the Government of the day drew a Bill representing what they thought the boundaries of the various constituencies should be, and they introduced that Bill. It came down entirely as a government measure, and Mr. Bennett pointed out that that had not been done since 1903, and so he said the old contest, over the boundaries of constituencies, which boundaries represented the views of the Government of the day, had not taken place since 1903.

The reason I cite that, Mr. Speaker, is because from the time of Confederation until 1903, the system was followed which we are following in this House, today, of the Government drawing up the constituency boundaries and bringing them down in a Bill before the House. Then the only way in which that Bill can possibly be amended or changed to conform with the consensus of opinion of the whole House is by amendment in Committee of the Whole. And in this matter it is as much the right of members in one part of the House as in any other part to have some ideas and some suggestions to make as to the way the boundaries should be drawn. That system was followed, such as we are following here in this Bill, in Canada from Confederation right down to 1903. Then the other idea was accepted — that a Redistribution Bill should be introduced with a blank schedule, and that the members of the House of Commons themselves should decide on the boundaries to be written into that Bill.

It might be said, Mr. Speaker, that that is possible in this particular Bill, that when we get into Committee of the Whole House changes can be made. But anyone knowing anything about the problem of drawing boundaries for 48 constituencies, knows that a Committee of the Whole House is far too big a committee to deal effectively with that complicated problem, because if you change the boundaries in one place it may affect three or four other constituencies; and it is not something which you can deal with in a formal way by debate on the floor of the Assembly. As I said, Mr. Speaker, it was recognized in 1903 — 48 years ago — by the then government of Canada that redistribution was a matter which all parties and all members should be consulted on, in the drafting of the schedules giving the boundaries of the various constituencies. So they adopted the other system, and since that time Liberal governments and Conservative governments have followed that system of letting every member have some say in the matter, and not having it a matter of the government deciding on what the boundaries are going to be, and then bringing that down in a fixed Bill, and then all that the members can do is to endeavour to amend it in a Committee of the Whole House. As already stated, anyone who has had any experience will realize that it is almost impossible to make any real comprehensive change in a Committee of the Whole House.

It may be that the members on the other side of the House have been consulted about these boundaries. I understand they have. In view of the fact that the people represented by the 20 members on this side of the House have just as much right to have their wishes known and felt in the drawing of this Bill as the people represented by the 30 members on the other side of the House, I submit that the system that is being followed in this Bill is not fair to our people, and, after all, we do represent a very substantial part of

the people of this province. To be confronted with a Bill, which I suppose has been caucused and examined very thoroughly by 3/5ths of the membership of this House, and then the other 2/5ths having to accept it, is a different matter altogether from having that policy followed in regard to some other matters. In other matters, questions of government policy are involved, and, of course, the government must answer for them; but in this particular matter, it seems to me that it is a matter of all members being given a chance to take a part, and all parties should have a chance to take a real part in the matter.

I know it may be said, Mr. Speaker, that previous governments of Saskatchewan have followed exactly the policy which is being followed by the Government here, today. Well, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that argument could have been used in the Dominion House in 1903 against the government of the day adopting the policy I am suggesting. The other policy had been followed since Confederation, and when it was felt that that wasn't the right policy, the Dominion Government did not hesitate to depart from it; and in following the old policy that was abandoned in 1903 by Dominion Governments, this Government, I submit to you, is just about 48 years behind the times, and to say that other governments in Saskatchewan have not followed this more equitable policy, I do not think is a sufficient answer. We should at times try to make some improvement as we go along, and I intend, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude today, to place that suggestion in such form before this House that it can be acted upon.

Bearing out what I have just said, I might read from a speech made by the Hon. Colin Gibson when introducing the Redistribution Bill in 1947 in the Canadian House of Commons. He said:

“I have already stated that this Bill is in the form that has been presented for the past 44 years, it being left to the House to determine the boundaries of the constituencies, rather than have a Bill introduced containing the proposed boundaries for the constituencies.”

The way it was handled at that time down there, Mr. Speaker — the Bill was introduced, its schedules were blank and, after it had passed Second Reading, a motion was made on behalf of the Government that the Bill be referred to a Special Select Committee representing all parties of the House for them to draw up and adopt the schedules, and then they reported back to the House with those schedules in the Bill, and then, of course, that Bill is the one that was laid before the Committee of the Whole House for consideration, and at that time all members had a chance to deal with the schedules, but before that ever happened representatives of all parties had had a fair chance to discuss the matter.

A stand has been taken in this matter by representatives of the C.C.F. Party in the Dominion House. One of the outstanding members of the C.C.F. Party at Ottawa — in fact he is regarded as their authority in regard to parliamentary procedure — was Mr. Stanley Knowles, the member for Winnipeg North Centre. Here is what he said at the time this Bill was before the House of Commons, and I ask the hon. members on the other side of the House to bear this in mind, because he is — I think they will agree — the recognized authority on parliamentary procedure of the C.C.F. Party in the House of Commons, today. Here is what he said:

March 12, 1951

“It does not seem to me that this question is one which ought to be regarded as a Government measure. It is a matter relating to the House of Commons. It should be regarded as a function of the House of Commons, as a whole, to decide what method is to be followed.”

I draw your attention to that statement of Mr. Knowles: “It does not seem to me that this question is one which ought to be regarded as a Government measure”. In other words, in his opinion it should not be regarded as a Government measure. Mr. Knight, the present C.C.F. member for Saskatoon, said that in any scheme of distribution he believed “the principle of impartiality must be preserved”.

Perhaps I might, at the outset, anticipate some suggestion that might be made in regard to the way this system worked at the time of the last Dominion redistribution. I was a member of the Committee on Redistribution, and I was also a sub-Committee member when that Committee set up provincial sub-committees to deal with the various provincial boundaries. The sub-committee for Saskatchewan consisted for Mr. Diefenbaker, member for Lake Centre, Mr. Wright, the member for Melfort, and myself. I was so honoured, I suppose, because the only other Liberal member down there at that time was Mr. Gardiner. So I had to take a part in that very difficult job — and it was not an easy job to decide on these boundaries. I realize it is not an easy task. However, the three of us took it on and we discussed things in a fairly friendly way, and finally, at the end of our discussion, unanimity was reached. Saskatchewan was one of the provinces where a unanimous report was presented, signed by Mr. Wright, Mr. Diefenbaker and myself. I could read from Mr. Diefenbaker’s speeches indicating that it got down to a very small matter of about three townships that had been put on to his seat from Humboldt, that he was really dissatisfied about, and that everything else he asked for had been met; but I thought that probably what would be accepted more readily by the hon. members opposite as a true statement of what happened in that committee, would be what Mr. Wright, the member for Melfort, said, because, as hon. members know, there was some attack made on this committee report by Mr. Diefenbaker, when it did come before the House of Commons again. I have explained what happened in the committee, and then Mr. Wright spoke on the matter in the House, and here is what he said, on July 15, 1947:

“As the third member of this very contentious committee from Saskatchewan, who thought they had made a unanimous report . . .”

Well, we thought it was — because we all signed it.

“. . . I think it is my duty to say a few words on this subject. I agree with what the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) has said with regard to negotiations that took place in that committee: ‘They did not meet for a very long period, but, in substance, those were the agreements which were reached’.

“As I have said regarding the divisions . . .”

I am not quoting his whole speech, I am just quoting from relevant parts of it:

“As I have said regarding the divisions in the province of Saskatchewan . . .”

And I put this before this House — what happened there, when the sub-committee met, we had produced a proposed draft map. And here is what Mr. Wright had to say about it:

“As I have said, regarding the divisions in the province of Saskatchewan, the original map, as far as the population was concerned, was the best division made in any province in the Dominion. It was the best representation by population. There were no constituencies with under 40,000 and none with over 47,000 except the city of Regina, which was left the same as it was before.”

One of our difficulties was the difficulty that the population had shifted north; we had to move the boundaries of the seats north. Then, by the constitution, we were only entitled to 20 seats instead of 21. Some place we had to eliminate one seat, so Mr. Wright goes on to say:

“As regards moving population from the south to the north, that is quite right and the only seat that could be taken out was a seat in the south. We, in the C.C.F. knew that was a C.C.F. seat, but we agreed to it because it was the reasonable thing to do.”

That was the way this thing operated in the sub-committee. We got together and talked the thing over, and Mr. Wright says: “We agreed because it was the reasonable thing to do.” Then he goes on to say — and I am still quoting from Mr. Wright, who, incidentally, today is the National Chairman of the C.C.F. Party, and I suggest that they should follow the same practice and attitude in this House, where they are in power, as they profess to admire down in Ottawa:

“In the western portion of the province of the division between Swift Current and Maple Creek constituency ran, in the original drawing, north and south instead of east and west. We suggested that the natural way for the division to run was east and west, since both the railroads and roads ran in that direction and the constituency could be served better if divided in that way. The member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) agreed to that and so did the member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), and that change was made. There was a reasonable proposition made by the member of the C.C.F. Party, and Mr. Diefenbaker agreed to it and the change was made.”

And he goes on, I am still quoting:

“The other changes suggested by myself were largely, in fact all, changes which would make for the convenience of the people who were voting. In the original map the lines were drawn in township and range lines. In some instances those township and range lines did not take cognizance of the geography in the area to serve the convenience of the people across rivers where they would not have an opportunity of getting to the polls without going miles out of their way . . .”

March 12, 1951

Here Mr. Wright is still speaking:

“I made suggestions so as to meet the convenience of the people in various areas and the chairman of the committee” . . . (that was myself) . . . “agreed to them and those changes were made.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the way this thing operated when we were in office in 1947, and when I am speaking as I do today, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking as I acted when I had some power in such a matter, on the testimony of the National Chairman of the C.C.F. Party. He says that the suggestions that were made by him were accepted. There is no part of his speech there, where he said he made suggestions that were not accepted by myself as chairman of the sub-committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the way this Bill is introduced, is there going to be any real provision for that, when it is done in Committee of the Whole House, with the feeling that if you make a change at one place, it is going to throw several seats out, and all that sort of thing? It would be almost impossible to have that sort of give-and-take which the National Chairman of the C.C.F. Party in Ottawa said happened in the sub-committee. And so, as I have said I intend, Mr. Speaker, to give the Government a chance to follow that policy here, which their member down there, representing them on the Redistribution Committee, spoke about in those terms.

Now, to come to the Bill itself, I will discuss its actual proposals and as I do so it will be clear why the members of the Legislature as a whole should have a chance, speaking through a special select committee not too large to revise this whole matter could do so more effectively. In the first place, the Provincial Treasurer in moving second reading of the Bill laid down as one principle that of recognizing the idea that city seats should have a larger population in them than rural seats. This, I think, is a sound one. It has been recognized in Canada ever since we have been a nation, and it was recognized in every Dominion redistribution and, I think, in every provincial redistribution. There is a good reason for that, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of representative government is that different parts of the province should have a fair chance to express themselves in the Legislature, and should have fair consideration in regard to making the laws and influencing the government of the country or the province. People in the cities have different organizations — Boards of Trade, Chambers of Commerce, Trade Unions, and different other organizations where they can meet together easily, decide on things, discuss things, and affect public opinion. Then your big city newspapers go out into the country and do affect the public thinking on public questions. You do not have very much of the reverse — of rural newspapers coming into the city; and so, if rural membership is not going to be, proportionate to population, bigger than city membership, you would have, for some of these reasons, the city exercising a tremendously greater influence in public affairs than would be justified by the proportionate numbers. The way to balance that up, Mr. Speaker, is to give the rural areas a little bit better representation than the cities, so with that principle which was enunciated by the Provincial Treasurer we are in entire agreement.

The Minister said, in his speech — I think he said it more than once — that this Bill was based upon the principles of justice, equality and equity. Then in another place he said, “It was not from any thought of gaining political advantage in the re-arrangement of constituencies that the Government

had proceeded with the Bill". Then in another place, he said, "this has been a sincere redistribution attempt upon the part of the Government, based upon the principles of justice, equality and equity". And I see that was apparently regarded by the "Star-Phoenix" as such news that they even had it in a big black headline: "Justice, equality, equity, guided redistribution policy, Fines says". Well, if they had studied the Bill I am not surprised that they put it in black headlines, as I will endeavour to show.

If the Minister had just simply said, "this is a Redistribution Bill which we have carefully considered in government caucus, and we are introducing it now, for better or for worse", I would not have felt quite as I do about the matter; but, after hearing what the Minister said, and then having had a chance to examine this Bill, I tell you frankly, Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely astonished that the Minister had the sheer, unadulterated gall to get up and use those words in connection with this Bill. I tell him that, in all sincerity, and I think I will be able to satisfy any member who wants to look at this thing in an impartial way that to apply the words that were used by the Minister, of "justice" and "equality" and "equity" in regard to this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, is just a travesty of language.

One of the matters I would like to deal with first is the question of the way our friends in the north have been treated. We in the more settled part of Saskatchewan have always had the attitude that the people up there had very little in the way of newspapers, very little in the way of any other means of influencing public opinion or making their wants felt, and so people of all parties in the past, even the C.C.F. Party when it was in opposition, who would speak for them, as people living in the northern pioneer part of this province; the trappers, the fishermen and the prospectors, and so on. It was always recognized that they had interests that were quite different from the bulk of the people in the remainder of the province, and it was only fair to those people that they should have at least one member. That was the attitude of the C.C.F. The attitude of the Liberals was that they should have two people to speak for them in this House. I wonder, Mr. Speaker if the members who come down here and speak for those people out on our frontiers, which we are trying to drive back and where we hope to have wonderful development in the future; I wonder if the money spent on them wasn't as well spent, in accordance with best democratic principles, as to have a whole horde of inspectors and government civil servants running around there, and saying that, in effect, the people should not have the right to be represented in a direct and special way in this Legislature. I have never noticed that this Government has been very sparing in regard to inspectors and government civil servants running around the north, yet here they come bringing in a Bill doing away with this direct representation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I protest against that. I don't think it is just to those people. I don't think it is fair to them, and to apply in regard to something that takes away their right to be represented in this legislature, the terms of 'justice' and 'equity' and 'equality', as I say is nothing but a travesty upon the English language.

In regard to what has been done, we find that a seat has been set up called Northland. It takes in a part of the Athabaska seat, and it takes in a very large part of the settled area of this province — it comes right down to the city of Prince Albert. The Minister referred to the Northern seats as "rotten boroughs." Now, we know, Mr. Speaker, that that is a wrong term to apply to them; they were not rotten boroughs in the sense that the word was used in

March 12, 1951

Great Britain. There are just as many people in these seats now as when they were set up. There are far more than when the C.C.F. agreed (in their amendment to a similar matter to what I am speaking on today) that there should be at least one representative, and, today, I fancy there is at least double the population there.

I wonder why these seats are being removed, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but compare the attitude taken towards these seats with the attitude taken towards the city of Moose Jaw. The Minister said quite frankly that the city of Moose Jaw was really, on any equitable basis, only entitled to one member, but he said, in the light of history and all the rest of it, "I don't think the members would want to take away that extra seat from Moose Jaw." I have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker; but why wasn't the same principle applied to the people of the north? They have had representation in this Legislature practically ever since there was a Provincial Legislature. Does the Minister say they do not need, and should not have, representation here, as much as Moose Jaw needs an extra member? If that member was taken away from Moose Jaw, they would still be represented in this House. But no! Moose Jaw admittedly is not entitled to two members, but she is left with two because the members would not "like to take it away" — and I say, we do not quarrel with that; but I ask, why was a different rule applied to the people of the north? Was it perchance, Mr. Speaker, because Moose Jaw has shown itself to be a very strong C.C.F. seat — (somebody groans at that — well, it is true); and was it, perchance, because the two northern seats, in spite of everything the Government did, showed their disapproval of socialist policy and defeated both C.C.F. candidates in the deferred elections of 1948? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, had two C.C.F. candidates been elected from the north, I wonder if we would not have had the Minister saying that "justice" and "equity" and "history", and everything else required that we should leave them with their two seats. I think he would have said that, Mr. Speaker. But now he proposes to deprive those people of their direct representation here and says that that is just and equitable — compare that with what was done in Moose Jaw. If any member opposite in his heart can say that is fair and just, I would be surprised, Mr. Speaker.

And what did they do? Those people are still represented in this House, somebody may say. The people on the voters' list in Athabaska were 1,194; some 400 of those have been taken off and put into the Northland seat leaving about 800 voters there, almost entirely trappers and fishermen, lumbermen, prospectors and so on. These 800 people are thrown in with the southern part of the province, with people with the same sort of interests as most of the province has. They are thrown in with about 6,000 other people by being added to Meadow Lake, with 6,000 people whose interests are the same as those of the more settled part of the province. These 800 people, interested in fishing and trapping and their special problems are thrown in with 6,000 of different interests. Is not that in effect depriving them of real direct representation in this Legislature? I realize the Provincial Treasurer can probably bring forward all kinds of explanations of this, but the fact remains that he has taken advantage of the fact that they are in office today to deprive those people of any real representation in this House.

The same applies in regard to Cumberland, Mr. Speaker. The original voting population of Cumberland was about 1,134, and by this Bill there is added to that 1,134 trappers, fishermen, lumbermen, prospectors and so on, the 400 taken from Athabaska, bringing up the number to about 1,500, and these voters are thrown in with 4,500 people whose interests are those of the rest

of the population of Saskatchewan which is represented by the remaining 49 members of this House. Does anyone think that, by throwing that number in with three times their number who look at things exactly like the bulk of the population of Saskatchewan does, you have not really deprived them of any real direct representation in this House? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the C.C.F. have done so, and I am bound to say that, in my heart, I am quite satisfied that the Government opposite would not have done this if these had been two C.C.F. seats; but because these people have indicated that they will not swallow the Socialism which has been imposed on them by this Government, they are being deprived of the direct representation which they have enjoyed down through history in this province.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker that if, when the election does come and we have a chance, we will right this wrong. We will give those people the right to have somebody speak for them here in this House again. We will do justice to them.

The Minister referred to the seat of Rosthern which I am very proud to have the privilege of representing in this House, and which I have been very proud to have had the right to represent in the Federal House, ever since 1935. I am particularly proud of be able to represent that particular seat, because I think it is a real representative cross-section of the people of our province, made up as it is of people of all the great races that have gone to lay the foundation of this great province of ours. It is a real representative cross-section of our great province, and I consider it a great privilege to be able to speak for those people either in Parliament or Legislative Assembly. I am also very proud to be able to represent them because of their past association with the government of our country and with two great names that are associated with that government. It is not generally known that Sir Wilfred Laurier, (Wilfred Laurier as he was known then and leader of the Opposition in the Federal House of Commons) was elected to represent that area in the Federal House away back in 1896. Nine years before this province was set up that area elected Wilfred Laurier to sit in the House of Commons. Again, in 1926, that area also joined in electing to the House of Commons another of the greatest Canadians of our history — the Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, and continued to contribute to his election right up until the seat of Rosthern was set up and elections were held in that seat, in 1935. So I would not be human, Mr. Speaker, if I were not humbly proud to have the right to speak for an area and people that have that proud history so far as our country and our party is concerned.

The Minister said they had been very generous with me. Well, I can say to him that practically all that seat including the parts that have been added to Rosthern, I once had the great privilege of representing in the Federal House, and I will be glad to have the privilege of representing them in this House, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to renewing those associations with them, and so anything I say is not based on any dissatisfaction at having sons of my dear old friends again as my constituents. It is the political implications alone that I am going to say something about.

We have, for example, two polls taken off Biggar constituency, represented in this House by the Minister of Education — Langham town and Langham rural. Those two polls are taken off Biggar and added on to Rosthern. Could it be because Biggar was too large in population and Rosthern was too small? — because, the Minister said, “we are just trying to be fair about this

March 12, 1951

thing and get the population balanced”? Well, what is the truth about that? With these two polls, Mr. Speaker, Biggar would have had 8523 votes, and Rosthern would have had 9516. In other words, if these two polls had not been taken off Biggar and put in Rosthern, Rosthern would still have been a thousand larger on the voters’ list than Biggar. Yet, in spite of the fact that Rosthern was one thousand larger than Biggar, they take these polls off the Biggar seat and throw them into Rosthern and still further increase the disparity between them.

Or could it be, Mr. Speaker, that they were a little bit worried about the Minister of Education? I think they have good reason to worry about him. His majority was only 708, which means that there had to be a turn-over of less than 360 if the people voted in the next election as they voted in 1948, and the Minister would be beaten. If so, all questions of equity, justice and equality that the Minister talked about went — to use a phrase, that has become famous — “out the window” in order to give the Minister of Education a better chance by getting rid of a Liberal majority in those polls of 156. You can just imagine, Mr. Speaker, how important it must have been to get rid of a Liberal majority of 156, when you are on the thin edge of the precipice, like the Minister of Education.

Well, let it be, Mr. Speaker, if they are so scared of the next election that they have got to begin to even get rid of two polls to try and get rid of 156 majority — if things are so precarious with them as that. Of course, they are taking advantage of their power to put it through, I suppose; but let them not take the words “equity” and “justice” and “equality” into their mouths when they are doing a gerrymander like that. The members can laugh; they cannot answer that argument. There is no way in which it can be answered except on a straight basis of political expediency and gerrymandering. Now then, that is not the only seat where that was done . . . (interruption) . . . Well, after this Bill is through, if you can get up and read a tribute to the work you did such as I have read to you and which was paid to me by Mr. Wright, your national president, then you will have some right to talk.

Now, let us see what they did to some of the other seats in this Bill that is based upon “equality”, “equity” and “justice”. Take Melfort-Tisdale, a Liberal majority there of 30. They so arranged it that if the people vote in the next election as they did in 1948 . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — We will beat you by a thousand.

Opposition Members: — Nonsense. (continued interruptions)

Mr. Tucker: — Of course, Mr. Speaker, I can understand why, in a complicated matter like this that requires giving figures and examining them and when there is a Bill of this nature before this Legislature, members opposite should be so anxious to confuse the issue. Again it is a fact that they do not want to face the facts of this situation. They would prefer to indulge in their usual game of ridicule which, of course, is a reflection upon what they think of our people. Because I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province are heartily sick of the tactics of the C.C.F. in that regard. They want facts — not propaganda and ridicule. That is what they want from the people of this Legislature. And so, when I am trying to present a reasoned argument it would sound a good deal better if there were not an attempt to divert attention, such as we have just had.

Now, as I have said, we had a Liberal majority in Melfort seat that is now Melfort-Tisdale, of 30 and they have so drawn the seat now that if the people voted as they did in 1948 a Liberal member would not be elected. A C.C.F. member would be elected by a majority of 530 — and then they talk about “equity” and “justice”?

Let us take Athabaska, a Liberal seat, represented in this House by a very able member, Mr. Marion, a man who evidence has shown at all times is prepared to say what he thought was right and to speak for the people who sent him here. They abolished that seat altogether. Justice and equity! Equality!

Then Cumberland; I have already dealt with that, how they throw it in with Northland and put it in with a seat made up, as the rest of the province is made up; for the people who today are represented by the member for Cumberland will not have any real power to finally decide the course their member will take, because he will have to go according to the wishes of the majority. In Northland, too, the Liberal majority there was 231 out of 1,134 on the voter’s list, and they have so fixed it now that the Liberal majority, if the people voted as they did in 1948, would be 287, just slightly more. But that would be 287, Mr. Speaker, out of over 6,000 instead of out of 1,100. A fine Italian hand has been operating there, of course, as anyone can see.

Then we come to Shellbrook. Here is a seat that obviously is in great danger; 175 was the C.C.F. majority. It will only take 90 voters turning over and that candidate would be defeated if the people voted as they did in 1948. And so something had to be done to help the C.C.F. in Shellbrook out. And what did they do? They added enough territory to it so that if people voted the same as they did in 1948 the majority would not be 175, it would be 388. They would more than double the majority in Shellbrook. Justice, equality, equity!

Now, let us take Kelvington. There is a seat that is very important to the C.C.F. Party, represented as it is by one of their oldest members, the Government Whip in this House.

Mr. Loptson: — They take care of him.

Mr. Tucker: — Sure they will take care of him; they did try to in this Bill, if it goes through. I was surprised to see he got such a small majority, 352. You just need to have about 180 votes turn over and the member for Kelvington would be out of the House, if people voted as they did in 1948. And so he had to be fixed up; a desperate situation. So they adjust the boundaries of his seat so that he would have a majority, not of 352, but of 597. They almost double his possible majority if people vote as they did before. Justice, equality, equity!

Now we come to The Battlefords. There is a seat that is a sore point with the C.C.F. When our member (the late Mr. Paul Prince) died and the election was called suddenly in the dead of winter, it was thought the farmers could not get in to the polls; well, of course, they thought, “There is a seat that we are certainly going to snatch away.” But, they did not; we got a majority there in the by-election, of 138. But there was a seat that with a little bit of fixing up, they thought, “We can avenge that defeat of 1950. We can avenge it; wipe that off.” And so what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They so juggled the territory

March 12, 1951

around Battleford that if the people voted as they did in 1948 they would have a majority of 386 instead of the Liberals having a majority of 138. In other words, they so juggled the area around that seat that they take away a Liberal majority of 138 and replace it by a C.C.F. majority of 386.

Mr. Erb: — Wizard.

Mr. Tucker: — Wizard! Yes, I agree — the fine Italian hand of the Provincial Treasurer. I thank the hon. member for Canora. I could not think of the right word to use in that regard. Now, there is The Battlefords.

Then we come to Yorkton — 599 of a majority, a little better than some of the rest I have mentioned, but still not very safe, because you would only have to have about 270 votes turn over and he would be gone. So, they so operate on that seat that his majority will be increased to 704, if people vote as they did in 1948.

Biggar, I have already referred to. I would have thought that the Minister of Education would have absolutely refused to be a party to this thing. He did have a majority of 708 but apparently, Mr. Speaker, he thought that that was not quite safe; no he agreed to these two polls being put out of his seat so he will be a little bit safer. It just shows, when they do not think a majority of 708, is safe, what condition the present Government thinks it is in, what kind of a situation it is facing in the country. Because if seats which were only won by 708 of a majority by the C.C.F. are to be lost, Mr. Speaker, then this Government will not elect more than a third of this Legislature. There is an admission by the Minister of Education that he figures they are facing defeat in effect. Well, we thank him for that admission.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that generally when a Government is facing people who are dissatisfied with them, as the people are of this Government, no amount of such gerrymandering as this will save them when the people get a chance to deal with them.

Now let me deal with Watrous, represented by a Minister, and a very valuable Minister to this Government; but he only got elected by 139 of a majority. Well, it only needs 70 votes turning over and the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) will be out of this Legislature. So something has to be done for him; his is a more desperate case than that of the Minister of Education. So they get rid of a good block of voters where there is a good Liberal majority, and they throw them into Rosthern because they say, "The member for Rosthern will get elected anyway and so it will not hurt for him to have a bigger majority still as long as we save the Minister of Public Works." — And then they say "justice", "equality" and "equity". I bet they laughed about that when they did it, said "Give Tucker a good majority while we are at it."

Well, in any event, that is what they did about Watrous, Mr. Speaker. Here is Watrous, 139 of a majority if they voted as they did in 1948 and now with juggling people around, moving them around, not as free citizens with certain rights to be left where they were unless there is a good reason to change them, because they have had those associations established now for 13 years. No, in order to make the Minister of Public Works safe they just move them around, say "There you go, into another seat." And what is the result of

it? Well, the result is that the Minister, if the people vote as they did in 1948 (which I do not think they will), he would have a majority of 496 instead of 139; so that instead of 70 people having to turn over there would have to be 250, about three times as many, turn over. And so they have done what they could for the Minister of Public Works.

Then we come to Hanley. There is an interesting situation.

Mr. Danielson: — A hopeless case.

Mr. Tucker: — It is very interesting. They did something for him, but not as much as they have done for some of the Ministers, which is quite understandable. He had just 51 of a majority in 1948, according to the figures I have, and so they added and subtracted, fixed him up, so that if the people vote as they did in 1948 his majority would be 210 instead of 51. The hon. member for Hanley must rest a little bit safer, but I advise him not to be too confident.

Then Swift Current. Now there is a seat that something had to be done for: just 182 of a C.C.F. majority. It only took about 93 votes turning over and our genial friend would not have been here. And, of course, I know they would not want to lose him. Or is it perhaps that the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) is worrying where he is going to get elected and they thought maybe, since he had represented the seat of Swift Current in the Federal House, it might be safer for him to run in Swift Current than out there in the country. Maybe they are fixing the seat up for him. Well, in any event, they really improved Swift Current. That is what makes me think perhaps they were trying to get a safe berth, safe as possible in this unsafe world for the C.C.F.; because they increased the majority there from 182 to 417. They more than doubled it, if people vote as they did in 1948.

Touchwood, Mr. Speaker — this is a tribute to you, because apparently they are very worried about you. And, of course, if they had just restricted their operations to the Speaker, we would not have had so much to say about it; but they do value you, you will be glad to know, because I suppose you did not take part in these proceedings. As you know, your majority was 168, which must have given you some concern, because about 85 votes turning over and you would not have been elected. But they have so juggled this area that if the people voted as they did in 1948 you would have a majority, if an election were held now, not of 168, but of 413. Now that was really a tribute to you, Mr. Speaker. But, of course, I do not think it would be lost sight of that you were a member of the C.C.F. Party and would, of course, give an extra vote in this House if things came to the worst. I do not suppose that was entirely lost sight of in the drawing of the boundaries of these seats.

Now, just to sum this up, Mr. Speaker, what do we have? In this Bill, based upon the solemn assurance, with all the quavers and semiquavers and demisemiquavers of which the Provincial Treasurer is a master in this House, about “justice” and “equality” and “equity” — I cannot hope to initiate him, Mr. Speaker, he is a past-master and artist at that sort of thing; but you will recall how he gave them to those noble words. How have they been borne out in the Bill which has been presented to us? We have one Liberal seat abolished altogether, that is a good start from the standpoint of this “magician”, according to words of Government members: this “magician” that drew this Bill. One Liberal seat is brought from a category where it might be regarded as a strong Liberal seat to a close seat; that is the seat now of

March 12, 1951

Northland. One Liberal seat with a majority of 138, if people vote as they did in 1948, is taken from the Liberal column and placed in the C.C.F. column — The Battlefords.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tucker: — The Minister of Social Welfare says “hear, hear”. I point out to him it is not done by the vote of the people; it is done by the gerrymandering of his own party, nothing for which to be proud, Mr. Speaker, and yet he says “hear, hear”. And then, another Liberal seat, with a majority of 30, is put into the C.C.F. column by a majority of 530, as I pointed out. It may be that there is a Minister involved there. I hear that he is pretty shaky in a good part of the area which he represents and it may be that he is wondering just where he is going to find a safe home when the blizzard strikes. However, one wonders why they were so concerned to make that Melfort-Tisdale seat such a good safe seat as far as they could make it, Mr. Speaker. I admit that, with all they could do, they could not do very much with the people voting as they did in 1948, but they really did, as the hon. member for Canora said, “magical” work when they changed a Liberal majority there of 30 to a C.C.F. majority of 500. And then five seats — and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to note this, and say that the words of the hon. member for Canora are justified; five seats with under 200 of a majority . . .

Mr. Kuziak: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I never made that statement. Now you find out who made it.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, it sounded very much like your melodious voice, but if you didn’t make it . . .

Mr. Erb: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to say that I put the word in the mouth of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I certainly apologize to my hon. friend from Canora, but he generally makes these helpful interjections, so I naturally thought that it was him.

Now, this is a point where the fine hand of this “magician” was demonstrated more than anywhere I have read thus far. Five seats that went C.C.F. in 1948 election, and went C.C.F. with less than 200 of a majority. In other words, 100 votes turning over in each of those five seats would have elected members to this side of the House instead of to that side, it was that close.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — It depends which way they turned over; turn them over the other way.

Mr. Tucker: — Now those five C.C.F. seats with less than 200 of a majority have had their majorities increased by an average of 241. There was before, Mr. Speaker, an average majority in those five seats of 143. In other words, 74 votes on the average turned over in those five seats, would have elected five Liberals instead of five C.C.F.’ers. Now something had to be done, that was a desperate situation, five seats as close as that, in addition to these seats I have mentioned that they moved out of the Liberal column. But these were seats where the average C.C.F. majority was 143, and this “magician” so manipulated them that instead of the average majority being 143, if the people

vote as they did in 1948, it would be not 143, but 384. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when you say “magician” in regard to work like that you are not doing him justice, because you have to add “gerrymandering”. But it becomes truly amazing when he applied to himself the high terms of “justice, equality and equity”, for manipulating five seats like that.

In regard to those five closer seats with an average of less than 143, I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, by what a tenuous margin this Government is in office today, when an average of 74 votes in each of five seats would have defeated them. Those are the figures. But they had to fix it up, Mr. Speaker, because they dare not face the people with a situation like that.

Now then, in addition to that, I have mentioned Kelvington, where they increased the majority so the turn-over required now is 299 votes instead of 177. It certainly helped the hon. member out there. I spoke about Yorkton, where the majority was 539 before and now it would be, as I have said, 704. And then, there is the seat of Biggar, to which I have already referred. That makes up the 12 seats. Those are 12 seats, six of them very close, which were operated on by increasing the majorities very substantially provided the people vote as they did in 1948; twelve close seats adversely affected, so far as the people on this side of the House are concerned. And that is supposed to be a Bill drawn without care for political advantage. How could the Minister say those words?

Is it to assist in balancing the population, as he said? Well, let us look at that for a moment, Mr. Speaker. In these seats as they were before, leaving aside the northern seats, the lowest in number of people in the voter’s list is 7,930, nearly 8,000 — the lowest of them all. What is the situation now, Mr. Speaker? There are no less than 10 below that figure today. In other words, this Bill that was supposed to even-up population, the lowest before they started operating on it, outside the northern seats, was nearly 8,000 and today there are ten seats below that figure. And he does this juggling around in the name of balancing the population of the seats. Who does he think he is dealing with? Does he think that we cannot look at these figures, or something? Does he think he can put that over, on his own word alone? Well, of course, the Provincial Treasurer will find that he is up against facts. Perhaps it was to cut down the populous seats. Well, when he started operating, the highest was 12,581, Swift Current. That was only cut to 11,600.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Cutknife): — That is Prince Albert.

Mr. Tucker: — Prince Albert, yes, Prince Albert was the highest one, 12,581.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, no, 16,300.

Mr. Kuziak: — Oh, he has his figures all mixed up anyway.

Mr. Tucker: — The highest as the Minister has said, was 16,300, and that was reduced to 12,000. That is the biggest reduction of them all. The next highest was 12,581 . . .

Gov’t Members: — No, no . . . Melville.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The hon. members will have an opportunity to reply.

March 12, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — Melville, 13,998. That is cut down a little over a thousand in this operation, and the situation in regard to Yorkton is that it is cut down not quite 200 in population. Swift Current is cut down around 900. These larger seats admittedly are cut down slightly but, after all the reductions in those seats did not make it necessary to operate on these close seats I have mentioned in order to make those small reductions. And I point out to the Minister that, in regard to the smaller seats, he increased the discrepancy because, as I pointed out, before he started to operate one of the lowest was 7,990 and now there are 10 seats below that yet.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Your figures are altogether wrong.

Mr. Tucker: — Now then . . . the minister groans over this thing. I want to have this absolutely right. The lowest here is 6,653. It does not affect the argument very much, and actually the next one is, I believe, the one that I was using. There is little change now in seats of low population as compared with the situation before he started to operate — leaving out the northern seats. Well, the Minister can try to prove that if he wants. My facts remain, Mr. Speaker, that this thing is so operated on as to adversely affect 12 close seats, and in the five that were closest, where a turn-over in votes of a little over 70 (less than 80) would have defeated five of their members, he has increased their majority so that if people vote as they did in 1948 it would require a turn-over of not around 80, but nearly 200, in order to defeat those five members.

Mr. Dundas: — That is not very much.

Mr. Tucker: — No, my hon. friend is quite right, not very much. As I pointed out, when the Minister does this juggling of people around in an endeavour to save his party, upsets constituency boundaries without any reason except to try and save his party — I notice, for example, he is trying to find some minor fault with what I have said. I will be very interested to hear how he can explain why they threw two polls out of Biggar and threw them into Rosthern when already Rosthern was a thousand more than Biggar. It cannot be denied, Mr. Speaker, and you can take one case after another, that is the actual situation.

I realize that in this Bill there has been a very careful endeavour to operate on some of the closest seats that were won by the C.C.F., and make them a little bit safer, and the situation, of course, if that could be brought about, would be this. If these five seats had not been made quite a bit safer, and we could have persuaded about 90 others on an average in each seat to turn over, the situation in this House would be as follows: One Liberal seat abolished would bring us down to 20, and then the two seats given away by the C.C.F, or taken from the Liberals and put into the C.C.F. That brings us to 18. The C.C.F., 30 members today, with the two seats they have got from us by this manoeuvring, would have 32, roughly to our 18.

If this had not been done, and if these seats had not been made a bit safer, then of course the situation would be quite a bit different. There would be five taken off one side and added on the other, and, as we know today, that would put the C.C.F. in the minority. But if you add to those five seats that are so affected and that they are trying so hard to save by this manipulation; if you add to those Kelvington, which was also close, you have a definite Liberal majority, if people vote as they did in 1948, with a very small turn-over.

This Government then would be defeated. So I can see, Mr. Speaker, faced with the present situation, the philosophy that underlay this Redistribution Bill. The Minister may be able to get up and say, "Yes, we have increased the possible majority of this member and that member", as he referred more or less jokingly to myself: "Yes, we have increased their majority; they should be satisfied." But, at the same time, the purpose is as clear in this Bill as if it were written right in it. This is a bill to make a little bit more hopeful the chance of the C.C.F. winning the next election — not a great hope, Mr. Speaker, but a little bit more hope; to take the seats which they almost lost, where their average majority was 143, and to so operate that if the people vote as they did in 1948 they would have a little bit more of a majority to come and go on. In other words, the purpose was to operate on the close seats won by the C.C.F. and try and make them a little safer.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we suggest that to apply the words "justice" and "equity" and "equality" to that sort of thing is just simply playing with words, misusing the English language, and we do suggest that what I mentioned to begin with should be given consideration by this Legislature. In dealing with the important matter of the representation of the people in this Legislature, a party that is guilty of manipulating the voters as they have done in this proposed Bill is doing a violence to the very basis of democratic representative government. These boundary lines should not be interfered with unless there is some real over-riding reason, such as, perhaps giving another seat to the city of Regina due to their increasing population. We find no fault with that, I do not think too far was gone in that regard; but I do say, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a good deal fairer to have given that extra seat to Regina without taking it away from the people of the North. There is nothing sacred about the number 52. I say that two good members from the North to help co-operate in the development of the North land, would earn their pay from the people of this province over and over again. Why deprive those people of their historic right to be represented directly here just because it is felt just and proper that Regina should get another seat? Why should there not have been an attempt to deal fairly with everybody, unless it was that the two Northern seats were Liberal seats?

That will not please the people of this Province. I warn the hon. gentlemen opposite, if they looked into history they would find that every time a government tried to take advantage of its majority to perpetuate itself in office when it has lost the support of the people by an obvious attempt like this to gerrymander the constituencies it just meant their defeat was that much greater, because the people do not like that sort of treatment. They do not believe for a single minute, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer, who introduced this Bill, and those on the other side who helped him draw it are masters over them. They believe that they are their servants and it is their duty to listen to all the members elected here as to how they should be represented in this Legislature, and not just to a little over half of them, and a good part of that half elected by less than 200 of a majority on the average. And so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move this motion seconded by Mr. Blanchard, in reference to the motion now before us "that this Bill be now read a second time": —

THAT all the words after the word "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

March 12, 1951

“the order for the Second Reading of Bill No. 73 — ‘An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act’ — be discharged and a new Bill be introduced during the present Session of the Legislature, which Bill shall not include as introduced a detailed schedule of Constituency Boundaries, in order that said new Bill may be referred to a Select Special Committee for the purpose of adding such a schedule of boundaries to said Bill.”

Now, as I stated at the start of my remarks, the purpose of this Amendment is to provide that this particular Bill shall not now be read a second time, but that we express the desire that a new Bill should be brought in, in which the schedules of detailed Constituency Boundaries shall be left blank, that a Special Select Committee of this Assembly be set up which will have a chance to consider this whole matter, take the advice of all members on all sides of the House, and try to arrive at a Bill that will be fair to the people who sent us here, that will not represent the desperate desire of one party in this House to try somehow to win office by readjusting boundaries of constituencies.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — We have already won office.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, you hope to win it again, but it is, I think, a futile hope and this Bill indicates that the Government so regards it. A government that was sure of its position would not resort to tactics like this. It is an admission, Mr. Speaker, that the Government feels that it has to resort to tactics like this to save itself in office; and I suggest that when Ottawa found out that this principle, which is now being used in this House, of one party introducing a map of constituency boundaries and then, in effect, saying to the rest of the Legislature, “This is our Bill. This is our map, and all you can do is try to do something with it in Committee of the Whole,” when everybody knows nothing effective can be done — and when that was found not to be fair and just by our National Government back nearly 50 years ago, I submit we might very well follow their example and introduce the new principle in Saskatchewan of saying that this shall be a matter to be decided on and dealt with by all of the members of this Legislature regardless of party. And so, Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving the amendment which I have just read to this House, seconded by the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, before you put the question on the amendment I would like to say a few words. I am sorry I shall not be able to deal with what I consider to be the most interesting analysis of the Leader of the Opposition; and I want to congratulate the hon. gentleman on doing what was a terrific job in such a short period of time. To be able to grasp these figures as he has done and to get the significance away beyond the intention, certainly is quite a feat; but I cannot deal with that today, as I must stick to the amendment.

Now, may I, at the outset, Mr. Speaker, say that I am not surprised at the amendment, because, in 1932, when there was a redistribution in this House introduced by the Conservative Party, the Leader of the Opposition at that time (Mr. Gardiner) moved a similar motion to try to get this Bill

before a committee. I would point out, though, that out of the six Redistribution Bills that have been introduced in the province, five of them have been by the Liberal Party, and never on one single occasion has there been a reference to a sub-committee. It is only when the Liberal Party is in opposition that they believe that these things should be done.

May I also say, Mr. Speaker, that, this afternoon, we heard some of the historical background in the Federal House. It was in 1892 that the first big change was made. At that time, too, the Liberal Party was in opposition. The Liberal Party proposed, in 1892, that the Conservative Government should then appoint a committee to lay down fixed rules for the changing of the boundaries but, it was not expected that that committee would draw up an actual schedule of the districts. May I say, also, at this time the Conservative Party suggested that a Commission of judges should draw the boundaries, that it should be taken out of the realm of politics completely.

On that occasion, Sir Wilfred Laurier said:

“In some quarters the suggestion has been made that the duty of redistribution should be referred to a commission of judges specially appointed. In other words, that parliament should divest itself of its powers in this most important particular. Sir, I am bound to say at once, that this is a proposition which my friends and I would not favour, either upon this or any other subject. I am bound to say that we would not entrust to any this duty and privilege which properly belongs to parliament. Moreover, this proposition implies a singular want of confidence in parliamentary institution. It implies, that in a matter of this kind, the majority would never be able to rise above the low temptation of strengthening themselves at the expense of their opponents. On this side, we are not disposed, even with this glaring abuse of the power of the majority, to come to the conclusion that parliament should divest itself of its rights and privileges. We stand by the principle that the inherent power of parliament, must, on all occasions, be exercised by Parliament itself”.

That, Mr. Speaker, was Sir Wilfred Laurier, away back in 1892.

Now, may I say, also, that, at this time, Sir Wilfred made a statement which I do not think can be accepted by the majority of us today. He proposed in all seriousness that redistribution should be exercised in such a way as to leave undisturbed the equilibrium between the then existing parties. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that can be done. And may I also say that in 1903, this was the first time, in Ottawa, that a Bill had been referred to a parliamentary committee; and I would like to say that this device of reference to a parliamentary committee does not by any means make what my hon. friend is pleased to call a “gerrymander” impossible. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister, on introducing the Bill at that time said:

“The object of the committee will be to create the constituencies which will be allowed to elect the members of this House. In other words, we do not present to the House a scheme cut and dried which has to be swallowed holus-bolus by our friends and by the Opposition, whether they like it or not. We propose to invite our friends now sitting on the Opposition

March 12, 1951

benches to meet us in the committee room. We believe that if our friends opposite will meet us in this way we can prepare a measure which will at all events be fair to all parties.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is the very weakness in it. I don't think you want redistribution drawn in such a way that it will be fair to all parties only. I think what is far more important is that it must be drawn in such a way that it will be fair to the whole Canadian electorate, or, in this case, to the whole provincial electorate, and not just to political parties.

I might say that, on that occasion, the Conservatives accepted the amendment, or the principle of the House Committee, although at that time they evidently knew the Liberal Party, because the Leader pointed out that the fairness might not in the end be as real as suggested; and I would point out that the results were so bad that Sir Robert Borden nearly resigned. What did he say on that occasion? He said:

“I do not know of one important provision emanating from the minority which was accepted by the majority. It wasn't a conference, but simply a partisan committee upon which were four Liberals and three Conservatives. There were certain matters about which there could not possibly be any disagreement, but when we came to places where there could be a little carving, we soon found out what was the disposition of our hon. friends on the other side”.

So you see the Conservatives had a real grievance even when the matter went to a committee, so that the Committee system was not satisfactory in itself, nor has it been since.

In 1932, Mr. Bennett was the Prime Minister of Canada, and when he announced to the House that the parties were at work on their schemes — yes, he said, “schemes is the word I used and the correct word, too” — he was not exaggerating because some weeks after, when they referred to it, there were some dramatic episodes such as “maps torn up”, “threats” and invitations to “mortal combat” even; people like the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) down in Ottawa in those days, inviting others to come out in the back and they would settle this matter of redistribution that way. That was how well the committee got along. In fact, it was so bad that they had to appoint a committee of what they called the “older heads” of the House, and the proceedings there were terminated by decision of the Government and final bargains were struck right on the floor of the House of Commons and not in the committee at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come to more modern times, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the committee. I want to say to this House that I never saw such unfairness in reading quotations from Hansard as was exhibited here this afternoon. I had the Hansard here and was following the hon. gentleman as he read. He left out three lines in one place, and he left out more lines in another. He was referring to Mr. Wright, telling us how he hoped that the members on this side would be able to stand up and say as many nice things as Mr. Wright had said about him in Ottawa.

What did Mr. Wright say? Well listen to this. He quoted the parts that were read . . .

Mr. Tucker: — The C.C.F.'ers couldn't be entirely . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He quoted the parts my hon. friend read, and then he said:

“I will say this . . . (And this is on page 5786, if my hon. friend wants to follow it).“ . . . the Liberal Party in arranging the redistribution took one thing into consideration first, and that was the fact that they had to strengthen one seat, and they worked everything else around that.”

That was the seat of Mr. Gardiner, who had only been elected by some 24 votes.

Mr. Tucker: — He still said the other thing I read.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Of course he said it, but my hon. friend, quite nicely, left out . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I said I didn't read all his speech.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And then, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend tried to leave the impression with the members of this House that Mr. Wright was satisfied. What did Mr. Wright say, in concluding? —

“To sum up, are we going to continue this way of making the redistribution in Canada? I do not think it is fair.”

The hon. member of this House, trying to leave . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, he signed the agreement, agreeing to it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, I will say some more about that agreement in just a minute. I will say something about that, too.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman deliberately tried to give the members of this House the impression, this afternoon, that Mr. Wright, speaking on behalf of the C.C.F. group, in Ottawa, was satisfied with this system of settling this problem . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I did not say that at all.

Mr. Kuziak: — Sure you did.

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege, the hon. member said I deliberately tried to leave a certain impression with the House, and I want to say that the impression he says I tried to leave — that Mr. Wright was satisfied with this system of handling redistribution — I never tried to leave such an impression. I never suggested such a thing and the hon. member, when he says that, knows he is saying something untrue.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member is replying to the speech that was made by the Leader of the Opposition and he is reading from Hansard.

Mr. Tucker: — No, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member said that I was trying to leave

March 12, 1951

a certain impression and I am just correcting that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has the privilege, exactly the same as any other hon. member has, of giving his opinion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do is to show the House that Mr. Wright was not satisfied with the operations of the committee. Now, my hon. friend says he signed the agreement. He says that Mr. Diefenbaker signed the agreement, and he was proud of that fact, and that was one of the chief points he used to show that all parties could come to agreement. Yes, Mr. Diefenbaker signed it, and what did he say? Here is what Mr. Diefenbaker said:

“I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member for Rosthern had to say, and the recital he made in connection with redistribution in the province of Saskatchewan. First, may I say to him: at no time was there any consent. Finally, on the last day in the sub-committee — and the total period during which we ever met during that sub-committee, for all the meetings, did not exceed forty minutes — the hon. gentleman said, “Well, we will sign this as our report’.”

I can just hear him say it, too.

Mr. Tucker: — Of course, Mr. Diefenbaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — “When I demurred . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Imagine Diefenbaker signing something he didn’t read!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Diefenbaker continued:

“When I demurred at signing it as our report, he said, ‘Well, if you don’t, you will get everything we had first for you; either accept this as the report or we shall give you what we originally had for you’.”

Mr. Speaker, that is just exactly the same thing as holding a gun up to a man’s head and saying, “Now give me everything you have in your pocket, or else” — and then turn around and say that the hon. gentleman took it out of his pocket voluntarily and gave it to you.

Mr. Tucker: — Why don’t you read what your own member said about that, in supporting me?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has read the passages, this afternoon, that have suited him, and I propose to read the passages that suit me.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that Mr. Diefenbaker and the Speaker of the House of Commons had the same trouble that we on this side, and you, have:

“**Mr. Tucker:** — I rise to a point of order.”

“**Mr. Diefenbaker:** — Oh, no.”

“**Mr. Tucker:** — A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I sat down when the hon. member made a statement.”

“**The Chairman:** — Order. The hon. member for Rosthern is rising to a point of order.”

“**Mr. Diefenbaker:** — He has no point of order.”

and so, on and on and on and on, until finally:

“**Mr. Diefenbaker:** — I sat here, Mr. Chairman, and listened without interruption to the Minister of Agriculture’s waterboy in Saskatchewan. Now I want to continue.”

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has tried to give the impression, this afternoon, that this way of settling it in Ottawa was a satisfactory way. I want to say to you, this afternoon, that it is because I believe that this is something that affects the rights and the privileges of every member of this House that I cannot agree to this going to any Special Committee. I don’t think there is one member in this House but is affected by this redistribution. I want to say to the hon. members opposite that we are prepared to consider this in Committee of the Whole, to spend a week or two weeks on it, and we are prepared to amend these boundaries as we go along if they can convince us that these boundaries are not fair.

The hon. gentlemen have protested about what has been done in the north. Well, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am prepared to recommend to my colleagues that we put another seat in the north, if it is the wish of the hon. members opposite. I am prepared to do that, but I want it done right here in the open. I don’t want it done in any little committee with three or four members. I want every member to be able to stand up and express himself in this committee.

Then, too, I would point out this difference between Ottawa — even if it had been satisfactory in Ottawa, and I think I have quoted enough from Mr. Diefenbaker to show that he, at least, wasn’t satisfied . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — May I be permitted to ask a question? I just want to make sure that I understand the Provincial Treasurer correctly. Does that mean that if in connection with this Bill we suggest to the Government that they have another seat up north, you will vote with us on that question?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I told you that, if there is a desire on the part of the members. If some of my own colleagues, for example some of the back-benchers here, agree with the contention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am quite prepared. As a matter of fact, I have no objection at all. The only thing we are always worried about is this problem of expense, you know; we have had so much of this that we have to watch that all the time.

March 12, 1951

But Mr. Speaker, what I was just saying, is that even if it had been satisfactory in Ottawa, there is no reason why, in Saskatchewan, we need a committee of that kind. In Ottawa they have 10 provinces. They set up a general committee, then a sub-committee of each of the provinces, to try to get together to settle this. Now here we are just one province, and there isn't a member in here, this afternoon, who isn't affected in some way by this. We are all affected by it. It is the basis of representation for the next five or ten years, and so it is something that everyone should be interested in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal I want to say on the latter part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's speech, in reply to his statements, but at this time it would not be in order as the amendment is simply an amendment that this be referred to a committee, and I must confine my remarks solely to that; but I think from what I have said you will gather that I cannot support the motion that it be referred to a committee.

Mr. L.E. Blanchard (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I feel very proud to sit here in this House and represent the ‘rotten’ borough of Cumberland. It is a pleasure to come down here and represent the people who reside in that area.

Now, according to this new Redistribution Bill, as our hon. Leader here has mentioned they are throwing in an extra 4,340 votes, an addition, I guess possibly, of 1500 . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What has that to do with the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I draw the hon. member’s attention to the fact that we are now discussing the amendment, and the rule is that you must confine yourself to the amendment, and unless your remarks are going to be connected up with the amendment, I will have to rule you out. You will still have an opportunity to discuss the main motion after this amendment is disposed of. If you want to deal with your constituency at that time, you will have that opportunity.

Mr. Blanchard: — What was the hon. Provincial Treasurer talking about? Very well, I daresay I can speak on the Bill and it will be just as effective as now.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, you will remember the Provincial Treasurer referred to what took place in the House in regard to a particular Redistribution Bill in Ottawa. Now then, that had nothing more — it did not have as much to do with this amendment as what the hon. member for Cumberland has said. I would point out to Your Honour that, in supporting the viewpoint of my hon. friend here, he should have had some say in this matter with regard to his constituency. He has never been consulted, and I understand he is going to say now why his constituency should not be eliminated. That is a further reason . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — . . . why he should be . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Tucker: — That is a further reason, Mr. Speaker, why this should go to a committee. If the various members here can show good reasons why this map should not have been drawn as it is, it is a further reason for knocking this schedule out, and having the matter go to a committee.

Mr. Speaker: — In respect to your point of order, I might point out that when the hon. Provincial Treasurer was speaking he did confine himself to the question of whether this should be submitted to a committee or not.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to argue with you on this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No, you are not going to argue with me.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I know, you . . .

March 12, 1951

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The point is that I think we can expedite the matter very much better if the members will confine themselves to the amendment, because they have not exhausted their right to speak upon the question of whether this redistribution is right or not.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, if I am not intruding on the rights of my hon. friend from Cumberland I would like to express a few words in support of the amendment.

I think that it facilitates it much easier, at least we can get much better work on a Redistribution Bill of this kind by having it referred to a committee which could consult the members instead of all the members being gathered together, when, as you know, may speak at the same and you don't as a rule get very far. It is a small committee that usually gets really down to business and gets the opinion of the different members. I am very proud of what my Leader said, this afternoon. I think he expressed my opinion very well and very effectively. I think it is a very smooth piece of gerrymandering right through, but I am concerned about the fact that you are cutting out the seat in the north. I have no particular objection or quarrel about giving an extra member to the City of Regina if it is necessary; but I think, in the interests of the developments that are going up in the north country, that we should not eliminate any effective membership from that part of the province. If you look at the map, you have practically brought all the north country — all this large area — into one constituency, where the bulk of the population is here, by a about 10,000 and they would naturally control the vote of that constituency. Their interest is of very meagre concern; naturally, you get an agricultural representative down here, and he is not very much concerned about the Indians, the mines, the furs, and that kind of thing.

For that reason I support the amendment that a committee should be set up and this matter thoroughly discussed, that is the boundaries of the constituencies, etc. As it is, I haven't got an awful lot of quarrel about them because it is the prerogative of the government in power to see that they get re-elected if they can, and that just goes by natural instinct; and I have reason to believe that they have reason to believe that they are on rather shaky ground and this is the last chance they have to see that there is a possibility of getting back.

But I am concerned with the welfare of the north, and I think reconsideration should be given to giving representation to that northern country, even if you have to add an extra membership to the House, I think it should be left there. For all it costs it may pay off well.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I point out to the member that that doesn't apply to the present amendment. You are now speaking on the question of whether there should be a committee set up. I will have to keep the speakers on that.

Mr. Loptson: — I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, since the constituency of Last Mountain has not been changed in any respect, I can speak on this amendment in a non-biased manner, because I have nothing to gain by any change and everything to lose.

I think that if a Bill such as this could be drawn up in the first place by an unbiased committee which was interested in providing 52 seats in the province of Saskatchewan so that the people would have proper representation, then I would be all for it; but I am afraid that I can't see how an unbiased committee can be set up from the membership in this House, and because I cannot see how that can be done, I cannot see that it would be any use doing it. If the amendment had called for a committee perhaps of senior civil servants to draw up a Bill to present to this House that we might deal with, I think, then, the amendment would have considerable merit. I just want to express, briefly, my reasons for opposing the amendment. I don't think that a committee of this House would be any improvement over a committee of the Whole House. I want to point out though that in every case in which I have had any experience with Redistribution Bills, the government of the day that attempted any gerrymandering of the seats lost out in the following election.

Dealing particularly with the constituency of Last Mountain, I was defeated in 1934 by 24 votes. Before the next provincial election, the Liberal Party in power brought in a Redistribution Bill, and they fixed up the seat of Last Mountain to give them a majority not of 24, but of about 500 — and in the following election I was able to turn that upside down . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, you must speak on the amendment.

Mr. Benson: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know how we can stay to this amendment and discuss anything in connection with this Redistribution.

I am going to tell you that I am going to vote against the amendment.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the suggestion of the Provincial Treasurer with respect to the offer to make another seat in the north, and with that in view, I am going to try and confine my remarks to the particular amendment; but I mention that at the start, because you are going to have to consider that.

I think you will understand that I am supporting this amendment. I think it is much better, and I think that in the deliberations in this House in many respects it is necessary to have small sub-committees of the main House in order to get anything done effectively, then have the committee report to the House, and particularly with respect to the offer of the Provincial Treasurer. I would like to point out to the House that if there was another seat created in the province, it would effect the drawing of the boundaries of at least seven or eight constituencies, and probably the boundaries of at least half the constituencies in the northern part of the province.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McCormack: — And I think there is all the more reason, due to that fact, why there should be some committee of the House set up. I think you will realize how difficult it is, with 52 or 51 members in the House, to sit here and suppose you start with my seat, which incidentally, hasn't been changed. I am very fortunate. I have Manitoba on the east and the United States on the south, and the Premier on the west, and it is a

March 12, 1951

little difficult to try to make any changes there. But I think you will realize, particularly, in view of the fact that the Provincial Treasurer said that he is willing to consider the addition of another seat, that you are going to have to have some committee.

Now the only alternative is that it all goes back to the hon. gentlemen across there caucusing again for another week or so, or you are going to have some committee of the House. Now, if you start with this Bill and start out and take one constituency, what happens in the Committee of the Whole? You have not got a picture of the whole province. You are dealing with one constituency and you start doing a little patchwork here, and if there was an amendment made to every constituency as we went along, something taken off or something added on, you would have just utter confusion. I am willing to wager it would take us six months and then we would still have nothing. For that reason, and in view of the very interesting offer the Provincial Treasurer has made, I think that is all the more reason why the members of the House, including the member for Last Mountain, should support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few brief words on this amendment. I would like to point out to the members of the House that I think every member of this House is very much interested in this Bill. I think that if there is a committee of the House to consider this Bill that every member of the House will want to be on it, and certainly I would want to be on that committee. There is no restriction in the Committee of the Whole. The boundaries, as set out in the schedule to the Bill can be changed in Committee of the Whole provided, of course, it gets the support of the majority of the members of the House. This is the place to carry on the discussion — when we get into Committee of the Whole, here — rather than to have it referred to a small committee of the House with nothing to work on; give them a blank paper and their job is going to be tremendous.

Here we have a Bill that sets out the boundaries. It isn't going to meet with the approval of all the members of the Legislature, I take it from what I have heard, though I am sure that not very many members of the Legislature will have any cause for complaint. When the Bill is in Committee of the Whole every member will be free to introduce amendments and to suggest changes in the schedule and every member is interested. In my opinion this is the proper procedure and it certainly should go to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words on the amendment, and I would like, along with the members on this side of the House, to throw in my support to the amendment.

I think that we are showing very little consideration of the future of our province by reducing the membership in the north. I think that that is where our province is going to develop in the future, and I think that reducing that membership in this House, as the Bill proposes, is not right. I think we should increase the membership in the north, if anything.

I listened with encouragement to the Provincial Treasurer when he said that he was prepared, if the rest of the members stood behind him, to increase the membership in the north, and I sincerely hope that that does go through, because I think the future of this province to a large extent is in the northern part. Although agriculture is of vital importance in the southern part, I think that in the northern part the mining, fishing and fur industries are very important, and unless we give those people proper representation in this province we will not get the support that those industries deserve. I think there should be a committee as suggested in the amendment.

Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort): — I wish at this time to express my support of the amendment that was introduced by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and seconded by the hon. member for Cumberland. I must say that I regret that the hon. member for Cumberland was not given the opportunity to speak to this amendment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Egnatoff: — . . . because in my own mind I felt that he was coming around to that very subject. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of order. I would suggest that when the member states that the member for Cumberland was not given an opportunity to speak on this amendment, it is a reflection on the procedure of this House and on the Speaker of this House, and that remark should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: — I called the member to order at the time he was making that remark. Go ahead!

Mr. Egnatoff: — I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the boundaries of the constituencies as outlined in the Bill cannot be very well changed by a Committee of the Whole to begin with. In my opinion it would require a small committee that could sit around a table for many, many hours and give this very important matter the time and the energy it would require to arrive at a satisfactory solution.

I am very glad that the Provincial Treasurer has suggested that he would be quite prepared to support the idea of including an extra seat in the north. But I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in including an extra seat in the north (which would receive my support) you would be involved in a problem of changing not only the constituency boundaries of the north but the constituency boundaries pretty well all the way down, which will undoubtedly affect not only the boundaries of Cumberland constituency and Athabaska, it would come down to Nipawin, the Kelsey seat and the Melfort-Tisdale seat. Once you start changing these boundaries you would have to go all the way down. Now, I want to submit, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I point out to the hon. member that this amendment discharges this Bill entirely and provides a new blank Bill and gives, under the rule, a Committee to make an entirely new Redistribution Bill. So we don't need to discuss it in detail.

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is precisely what I was getting at. That is precisely what I was coming to, Mr. Speaker.

March 12, 1951

Now, I hope it won't be necessary for me to review everything that I have said to come back to that very point.

Mr. Tucker: — I think you had better — apparently he doesn't understand it.

Mr. Egnatoff: — My argument is this, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of the Whole would be too large a committee to deal with this problem in its preliminary stages and, therefore, it becomes necessary to refer this problem to a small committee, giving them a blanket schedule to work out. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree with me that that is not a task that can be performed by 52 people. But, naturally, each one of us would be more particularly concerned about the boundaries of his own constituency. For instance, undoubtedly you would be concerned about Touchwood. As for myself, I would be very much concerned about the nearly 900 Liberal votes which the present Bill has stolen away from me. I would like some of those restored. And, therefore, each one of us would be anxious to deal with his own particular area. I want to submit in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that the boundary of one constituency so closely affects the boundaries of other constituencies that this is a problem which could better be handled by a small sub-committee appointed for that specific purpose. Then that committee would bring in its report to our Committee of the Whole, and it is at that stage that the Committee of the Whole House would go at it. I feel, in all sincerity, that by adopting that course of action, we would be serving the best interests of all the people of this province and that is the only guide, the only criterion, which we should use in deciding what course of action to pursue.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negated by 27 votes to 15.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the motion that Bill No. 73 be now read the second time. Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Blanchard: — I may speak now on this Redistribution Bill, I suppose? Is that question in order?

What I would like to point out to you is this. I notice particularly in coming into the House here that the people of the southern part of the province know very little about the mining industry and the development of the northern part of the province. I might say that we don't grow a bushel of wheat in my whole constituency which covers practically the whole north-east quarter of this province. We are depending upon your wheat. You people are depending upon our copper. We could not do without the wheat and you could not do without the copper. If we did not have the copper you people that farm this southern part of the province would have to go back to the old days of sowing your crop and you would have to use the cradle for reaping the grain and the old flail for threshing your grain. Now, I am sure we all wouldn't want to go back to that.

If there is a relation between farming and mining then I don't know why we should not have a representative in that part of the country. We do know that the Manitoba Government at the present time is thinking quite seriously of appointing a Commissioner, a full-time Commissioner for the North. They are working on a basis of a salary and expect to go over the whole north part of the province of Manitoba with a fine-tooth comb to

look into possibilities of developing the north country. This Commissioner has to report directly back to the House in Winnipeg. I also think that we should be entitled to a representative of the north country, and we should not have to be represented by remote control as it would be with the voting powers 'way down in the extreme southern part of the constituency, as it was outlined originally, owing to the fact of any contribution this Government is receiving from the natural resources of the North. Now these are constituencies which have contributed to much of the provincial treasury. We could have a budget of \$70 million, instead of \$60 million, and we could do it without putting through any taxes whatever, or without any little credit funds from the Federal Government.

You would be surprised to see how fast news travels in the north country. I have a few words here from a location 600 miles north of Regina. I would just like to read a few words of it to you. It comes in the line of more or less of an inquiry just to show you that they are very much concerned up there about this Redistribution Bill. I will just read you portions of it here that might interest you. It goes on to say here:

“Is this Redistribution Bill the death struggle of the present Government? Are they crawling into their fox-hole? Are they trying to consolidate a few C.C.F. seats in a last feeble attempt to hold on?”

And it goes on to say here:

“You cannot help but admire the intestinal fortitude of the sponsor of this Bill in the last day of struggle, to get a little more time to recoup their losses and revamp their resources.”

Now that is what the writer thinks of that. It is the wording of the Regina Manifesto: this retarding of the development of the north country. And what he means by recoup their resources, he means that they are trying to recoup themselves, to hold on until such a time as they will have time to revamp their Regina Manifesto. And it says here:

“Speaking of resources, the people of the province are not proud of the way this Government is developing these resources.”

And it goes on to say:

“The people of the north are going to ask — the people of the north will want to secede and join up with the Northwest Territories or Manitoba and there is a movement on foot at the present time, owing to the fact that our Government has shown so little interest in the development of the mining industry of the north.”

I would hate to see anything like that happen, Mr. Speaker, it would give us all some very unpleasant publicity. I think it is altogether uncalled for. I don't see why we can't meet one another half-way in this proposition, why we can't have a member in the north. I know when I come down here I get my orders. We know that I am on the wrong side of the government. We know sometimes it is very difficult to get just what people would like. I will say that this past year the Government has done considerable for my people in the north, and I am grateful

March 12, 1951

to them for it. But from past experience I see that it does not do to compliment the Government for what they have done for us. As soon as we do that we become C.C.F., and they want to put a chair up on the other side of the House for us. I think that is altogether uncalled for. I think the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) meant well when he said that he would like to give credit where credit is due. So would I, but up until the present time, Mr. Speaker, there has not been very much said that you could tell with any interest to the people of the North.

You know what happened in 1944. They tried to experiment with the people of the North, tried to make guinea pigs of us. The people didn't like it, and in 1948 showed their dislike for it.

Mr. Speaker, if this Redistribution Bill goes through, this Government is going to get some publicity they are not going to like. I am afraid this might harm our province, and I can't do anything about it. This movement started before I came down here and I had nothing to do with promoting it at all. In fact, it did not come from the Saskatchewan side; it came from the Manitoba side, and I told them "For goodness sake! hold up on this. Wait until I see what this Redistribution Bill means, what it is going to do to us!"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is necessary to say any more. I have tried to observe it impersonally — I would welcome a larger population in Cumberland constituency or in the Northland constituency. But this constituency now is so large, so unwieldy, it would cost a fortune to get around it. It would take at least three months' time to cover that up to Manitoba, the way it should be done.

Now, I hope this will be taken into some consideration when this map is redrawn, and I surely hope they will.

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, there are just a few observations I would like to make in regard to this Bill. We have not had very much time to study it really as yet, or in any considerable detail. But, there are some thoughts that occur to me as I look at the map, and from what I know of this north country and the fact that the Turtleford seat is considerably affected by this changing of boundaries of these northern seats.

The thought that occurs to me at once is that the Northland seat, as it is presently constituted, is entirely too big for any one man to work and work properly. We recognize in this Legislature, and have always done, that a sitting member of a seat should have some idea or basis on which he can get around and see the people who reside in that seat. I believe my submission is very correct, Sir, when I say that there is absolutely no one person who, previous to an election especially, can go out and work that Northland seat, I don't care if he works with an aeroplane or however he does it, the way it is presently constituted, because it just simply runs from one side of this province to the other and takes in an area that is absolutely all out of proportion to what anyone can get over and even make himself acquainted with the voters.

The thing also that we notice here is that this seat now, instead of being truly representative of the large area it takes in, is going to be dominated by the agricultural vote just north of Prince Albert. There is the place that is going to make the policy for this seat, which those people in this small area understand very little of. And, I believe you are almost what you might call disenfranchising those people in that northern seat. If you will look at the map you will notice that the Shellbrook seat runs even further into this north territory and takes in a bunch of people who are entirely north of this same area that you include in the Northland seat immediately north of the City of Prince Albert. And in this Northland seat, I may say, there is actually a good number of voters who are right in the City of Prince Albert — everybody on the north side of that river. There are absolutely city streets in this Northland seat, part of the City of Prince Albert. I don't see myself that that is very fair to people who have absolutely diverse interests.

Now, as far as the new Meadow Lake seat is concerned, I can't see any sense or reason in the way this seat is laid out, except for the purpose of squeezing out the present sitting member in this seat. That may be done; I don't know. That will be a matter that will be found out a little later. But, again, you are taking in what used to be the northern part of the Turtleford constituency, with which I am very well acquainted because I have worked all that territory when it was in my constituency. It is predominately an agricultural area, with enough predominately-agricultural votes to upset the people in the north who have an interest entirely diverse and in many cases contrary to the interests of the people in the northern part of this seat. The big vote here now is going to be in the very large town of Meadow Lake and the well-settled agricultural areas which surround it. I don't think that is very good.

As far as the Turtleford seat is concerned, that has been very materially altered, and the only comment I have to make about that is that for a considerable period of time that seat has been just as it is. Of all highways that tap that country, the important ones run north and south, and we have been for a long time, through Boards of Trade and other agencies, working on those north-south highways. If there were to be power lines they would extend in much the same direction, so that throws everything out-of-bounds there. As far as I am concerned, personally, it doesn't make any difference to me. In fact I have really not been asked by the people to run in that seat yet so maybe they don't want me; they might want somebody else. But if they did — and just taking the supposition that they might — it would not make any difference because they are taking in, in the eastern part of this seat, a place where I homesteaded and ran a store for a matter of about 20 years. But as far as the voting is concerned, I can't say that I can make a charge that they have gerrymandered this very materially as far as votes or potential votes might be concerned. But they have created a very, you might call, "tough" district to work in, because the principal roads as I say run north and south there. The east and west roads are not so good, yet they have made this constituency run a long east and west and very narrow north and south. Those are my comments, Sir.

March 12, 1951

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I have no personal complaint to make with regard to my seat of Arm River. It is peculiar enough that the architect of this Bill did not really do any damage to that particular part of Saskatchewan, and I don't worry very much about it. The only thing is that he is trying to pick off a few towns that the member for Hanley has, but I am afraid it won't be enough to see him through. I don't think there is any hope for him anyhow.

The only thing I see really wrong with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is this. The title of this Bill is wrong, entirely wrong; it should be a 'Bill to relieve the Political Distress of the C.C.F. Party in Saskatchewan.' That is the only thing I see. And if we had the title right, we might be able to reorient ourselves to the real issues that appear in this Bill.

As a matter of fact, anyone can take this map and look it over and wherever there is a constituency that could be conceded now to the Liberal Party, whenever they can chop off a little corner they will throw it into a C.C.F. constituency to strengthen themselves, they did just that. And they had to take pieces out of their own constituencies that were predominately Liberal and add them to my seat. That is the pattern. And here we get into some places where, by gerrymandering and one thing and another, we have the proof of them improving their position to the extent that they might profit within that seat.

Now the only excuse for the whole thing, Mr. Speaker — and it is one that we have heard quite frequently in this House, I have heard it for the last 70 years: the only excuse is that somebody else did it before them. Well, if this was an old Conservative or Liberal Party we should not be so much surprised. But when this C.C.F. Party came in here, we thought they would do different from what the old parties did. They were not going to stoop down to these old methods and tactics of the old parties, they were going to be something better, be on a higher plane than any other human being in this province, and they were going to show an example for us to follow, to try and convert us to their method of doing things. Well, if this is an example of it, Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure that they are improving it at all. I think they are doing the other thing.

The Minister, of course, he is the one who gives them the guidance — he shrugs his shoulders. Sometimes I think we should have television in this House so we could see the antics and the contortions that he goes through in this House when he wants to emphasize some of the things he does that could not very well stand inspection or scrutiny. When he has resort to these sort of highfaluting terms of speech that give a convincing impression over the air, that this is something we will say that he has designed: "Equity", "Justice", "Equality". My, don't they sound nice over the air, Mr. Speaker! I think a Government like this needs a Bill of Rights in this province if they don't amend it again. But that is something that I can't understand.

After all, I would again suggest to the Minister that he takes his Bill and changes the title of it and calls it a "Bill to relieve the Political Distress of the C.C.F. Party in Saskatchewan." That is really what it is. It isn't a Redistribution Bill. It will just help simply to try and win the next election by any means or tactics that they can

possibly employ, regardless. In other words, the Minister has gone on the principle that the end justifies the means. That is just what he is doing. With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say any more.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words about this Bill although I do realize that an opposition is pretty well at the mercy of a ruthless government. When it does become ruthless, it stops at nothing, absolutely nothing, to achieve its desired ends. I must say that I did not expect a Bill of this type from a government that profess to be pretty well fine and pure.

I do want to voice objection to the Bill having made the Northland constituency so large. As was pointed out so very well by my hon. seatmate, it will be practically humanly impossible for any member to cover that constituency, even if he make use of the Saskatchewan Government Airways. I am objecting to the Bill on that ground, first of all, and secondly, on the ground that the northern part of our province, all hon. members should realize, is about the last frontier that is left to conquer. The possibilities of the northland are unlimited. I do not think there is a single member in this House who realizes completely the tremendous potentialities of that northland. And because of the tremendous possibilities there, in my opinion northland constituencies should have been either left as they were before, or, if any change had to be made, I want to suggest that a third constituency should have been created there.

As far as the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale is concerned, I do not think it requires very much intelligence to realize what the Government was trying to do. The Government seems to resent the fact that the people of the Melfort constituency defeated a Cabinet Minister, and the Government seems to be intent on somehow punishing those people. Ordinarily, constituency boundaries should follow natural geographic lines. And the northern boundary of the Melfort constituency did that very thing in following the Saskatchewan River. But here is the amazing part, Mr. Speaker. Just south of the river, in approximately five townships just south of the river, the people vote very solidly for the Liberal Party. Is it a mere coincidence that the hon. “magician” should have performed a neat little operation there, just cut off those five solid Liberal townships? That is nothing short of political gerrymander. That is nothing short, Mr. Speaker, of political robbery. That is nothing short of all the words that the Provincial Treasurer referred to in his speech the other day.

Not satisfied with performing that operation, Mr. Speaker, they thought they had better make doubly sure. There are some rumors that the Minister of Natural Resources may now be interested in that constituency, although the Chairman of the Workman’s Compensation Board has spent a great deal of time in that area during the past summer, going so far as to sit in rural municipal council meetings with a rural municipal council in an endeavour to try to find out what road grants and bridge grants they needed. The Minister of Highways will have to answer that when we come to his estimates. They took off the northern part of that constituency for no reason other than to rob that constituency of more Liberal votes. So they cut off three good Liberal townships on the north-east. These people who talk about “equality”

March 12, 1951

and “justice” and “equity” will indulge in such activity which almost could be described as corruption.

Not satisfied with that second operation, Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for them to add five C.C.F. townships. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a mere coincidence. This was not as a result of trying to follow any geographic boundaries on natural geographic lines. It was a most deliberate attempt to try to take away that constituency from whatever Liberal candidate happened to be in that area. The only saving feature of the whole thing was their inclusion of the town of Tisdale and their changing of the name of the constituency to Melfort-Tisdale. But, in my opinion, the people in that area, when they learn of the low and despicable tactics of the Government in performing this gerrymander, will resent it so much that, in spite of these Liberal votes that have been taken away, they will return to the next Legislature a Liberal member, because I do not think that the people approve of such action and I think the people there will adopt this attitude.

We have defeated one Cabinet Minister because we don't believe in Socialism, and if he dare to return to that area again, we will defeat him. And if the government wishes to put up any other Cabinet Minister, whether he be the Minister of Natural Resources or anybody else, we will defeat him, too. Of that I am fully confident. I feel that that will be the result regardless of who the Liberal candidate may happen to be up in that area. The Minister of Natural Resources needn't go up to that part of the country hoping to be elected. He needn't go to Kelsey hoping to be elected. But where he can go I do not know
...

Mr. McCormack: — You can't say, you would be ruled out of order.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I feel that, when this Bill does eventually get into Committee, Mr. Speaker, the Government will have to do either one of two things. They will either have to restore some of the townships which they have taken away, or they will have to go down in history as being the greatest gerrymanderers that had ever existed in this country.

Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, looking over this Bill and also the map, it strikes me as being a very strange change in our constituencies. The reason I say that is because the accepted trend throughout this province in change of population over the past number of years has been in a northward direction. To support that contention, I can read the clause in the speech from the Throne in which this Bill is mentioned. The clause says:

“Population movement since 1938 has resulted in a disparity of the number of electors that the members of the Legislature represent. Amendments to existing legislation will be introduced for your approval which will adjust provincial constituency boundaries and provide for more equitable representation.”

With the trend that we see in this province northward, this Redistribution Bill in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is in direct contrast to that, with the result that the Redistribution Bill is certainly for another purpose — not for the purpose of equalizing these populations, but rather

for purely political purposes. You look at the size of constituency of Northland. With the increased population, increased activity in the northland, I think as the hon. member for Melfort has just stated, that probably we should have an extra member in the north country, not a lesser number. They have created a new seat down in Shaunavon in an area where the population over the last number of years has certainly been reduced, and I think in this Bill there has been no regard paid to the change of population since 1938.

While I am on my feet I would like to say a word about my own constituency. I think probably if the constituency was cut up any more in the whole set-up, I don't know just where it is. The Battlefords constituency has been a constituency with the main centre in the centre; and I want to compare it with the Yorkton constituency down in the south-east corner. The Yorkton constituency left the city of Yorkton in the centre of that constituency, so that it is the centre to which all the people from that constituency come. What happened in North Battleford? We had a seat there in which it was very convenient for the people in the constituency to come into the city, and over the last number of years, regardless of what political faith the member happened to be, he either lived in North Battleford or in Battleford. Now look at it. North Battleford is stuck on the extreme north-west boundary of the constituency with the result the people 2½ and 3 miles north of North Battleford are not in The Battlefords constituency. No. 4 highway is a blacktop highway, 13 miles north, and after you go 2½ miles you are out of The Battlefords constituency. They have paid no attention to the means of travel into North Battleford. On the east side it now runs down to the river. This means that if the future experience is as the past has been, the people of Radisson, Borden and all these points are going to have to journey right back up to Battleford, where the bulk of those people go into the city of Saskatoon. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I think you are imposing a penalty on the people who have been taken out of The Battlefords constituency and you are imposing a penalty on those who have been put in. Therefore, I cannot see my way clear to support the Bill.

Mr. Benson: — Mr. Speaker, I tried to say why I was opposing the amendment a few minutes ago and gave the reason why I did not think supporting the amendment would have brought about any useful purpose. I now want to say what I think of the Bill. I don't see very much wrong with this Redistribution Bill so far as the bulk half of the province is concerned, but I do not think that the redistribution in the north is fair to the people of this province. It seems to me that it is a real gerrymander up in the northern areas, and I hope that when this Bill goes to Committee that the Government will accept amendments to various boundaries in the north where the members of the Legislature think the boundaries should be changed more in conformity with the needs of the situation. I am quite sure that, even though some of the vote has been changed so that it will apparently work to the advantage of the Government at the present time, when the election comes the Government will find that that change has definitely worked to the disadvantage of the Government. That has been the experience of the past. No matter how much seats were juggled, the people in those districts resented it. They don't like to be shifted around — and I think it is fatal for any Government to try to do so. I suggest to the Government that when this Bill is in Committee, they will

March 12, 1951

accept amendments to give the people in the north the representation that is their due.

I was very much surprised to see the way those two northern seats had been handled. Some years ago I made the suggestion in this House, similar to the one made by the present member for Cumberland, to select a Commissioner from the north who is completely familiar with their problems and give him a seat in the House, the same as any other member. Perhaps that suggestion is no good and perhaps they can elect their own member better, and have their representation by election better than any other way. But, I really think, because of the importance of the northern part of Saskatchewan to the province as a whole, that we should have at least two members speaking for those people and elected by those people from the North. I am going to tell my friends across the way that if they introduce any amendments to the Act that will put the boundaries of those northern seats back in a similar position to which they were before, I shall support their suggestion; but I hope that it will not be necessary for anyone on the other side of the House to move those amendments. I hope that the Provincial Treasurer himself will bring in a House amendment here, making a change in the boundaries of those northern seats.

We have been told, lately, of the tremendous value that northern Saskatchewan is going to be to the province as a whole; and to the Dominion, as a whole. Most of us who live south of Prince Albert know very little about that northern country, and I do not think that we should do anything — even though they have only a few hundred people in each seat — that would deprive those few hundred people in each of those seats of their right to representation in this Chamber.

RECESS

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, now that supper is over, I am in a better mood. At least, I am in a better humour. I am afraid the Provincial Treasurer, who is the “magician” of this Bill, when he extends the boundaries of Saltcoats constituency west to take in his friend from Waldron, may not please his C.C.F. friends up in my territory, around Saltcoats. For example, in the Churchbridge and Saltcoats area there is quite a nest of them. On the other hand, I sympathize with the member for Yorkton when these changes are made to take in this party from Waldron.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Who is this man?

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I think he knows the party I have in mind.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. gentleman I have no idea whom he is referring to, I have no idea whatsoever who he is talking about, nor have I any idea whatsoever about what this is going to do to Saltcoats constituency to make it a nice constituency for him. Who is the fellow?

Mr. Loptson: — He happens to be a hotel man and you know him.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I do not.

Mr. Loptson: — He is buying the goods from your Department.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is right, but I do not know him.

Mr. Loptson: — And he is probably a good fellow anyway; but that is the business he is in and I thought probably you were friends.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I do not know him at all.

Mr. Loptson: — In any event, that is what is actually transpiring, I feel sorry for the member for Yorkton because, as I said, the way that seat is now situated, I would not want to be in his shoes if I wanted to get the nomination, whatever may happen in the election.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You had better get together with your Leader.

Mr. Loptson: — I am just talking about the nomination. As a matter of fact it is not any C.C.F'er who is going to be elected there, I can tell you that, nor is my hon. friend from Waldron going to get elected in Saltcoats either. But before you can run for an election you have to get nominated, you see, and that has some bearing on this gerrymandering too — you can get rid of members that way. I was just wondering how my friend from Milestone feels about the additional Liberals that have been put into his seat. He might find a little difficulty there too, in order to try to make it difficult for the man from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. And now you may have a little trouble there too.

But getting down to the serious side. As I said before, I am rather worried about this redistribution for the North. On checking up on the activities in the North, as I have learned from my hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources, I think that this Government is making a serious mistake if they do not give proper representation to that area. As a matter of fact, in my opinion from a practical point of view, I think that the Flin Flon area is more entitled to a representative than Regina is to a third member here; that is, taking it from a development point of view. After all, we are on this side of the House and you are on the other side of the House and we are all looking forward to some real development in the North, especially after the next election; and we do not want to have to go out and say that you have deliberately boycotted or disfranchised those people, because some of them might vote for you — there are not many, but there are some. So, I would like to suggest that this Bill be withdrawn. It is going to very difficult to straighten it out after it is in Committee of the Whole. I would like to suggest that you withdraw the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — We have already disposed of the amendment.

Mr. Loptson: — I am talking about the Bill, that it be withdrawn. I am not talking about a committee — the amendment was for the appointment of a committee.

Mr. Speaker: — It was to withdraw the Bill.

March 12, 1951

Mr. Lopton: — The Government withdraw the Bill and straighten it out. I believe that they have come to the conclusion that it is advisable to have the two members from the North and that it would be better to withdraw the Bill now and straighten it out before it gets into the Committee of the Whole, because it would be very much easier to deal with it after it has been straightened out the way the Government really wants to do it. I think they have come to that conclusion, at least the Minister of Natural Resources is very serious about it and so is the Provincial Treasurer and I think many other members here have come to the conclusion that it would be advisable to have this amended and that the two-member seat be set up in the North. Now this is just a suggestion to make it more equitable and easy to deal with — that you withdraw the Bill and draft it including the two-member seat in the North, as it was before. It may make it necessary to alter some of the boundaries of the other seats, but it would facilitate the handling of it when it comes back into the Committee of the Whole. That is all I want to say.

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

Mr. W.T. Lofts (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I would like just to take a few moments in dealing with this new set-up, because I think every member on both sides of the House thinks I am standing out on a limb, I am not in my own seat.

When we are talking about the distribution of these seats in this north-west corner, it is not so much how they have them set because we will see that we win them anyway, no matter how they are. But as the Meadow Lake seat is set out now, taking away this north and mixing that north in with the agricultural district, I do not think it really is the same line of business, you may say. I think that that should be represented by a member who is more adapted to that particular area, such as fishing and trapping and, as you go further north, the same thing applies to Cumberland. I was very disappointed when you did away with those two seats, I would rather have seen the agricultural part of Meadow Lake put in Turtleford and forget about one of them or something like that, in order not to do away with those members up in the north country. We read in the papers and we hear on the radio about the prospecting and the mills and everything there, and now they are not represented by anybody. I think if the Provincial Treasurer can give this fair consideration and find out some way to put these members back in the North, it would be better for those people up there, and be better for us as a whole in the province of Saskatchewan, because naturally, as the member said, regardless of what side of the House we are on, we are interested in this development in the North; all of us are, regardless of our politics. I do not think that we should overlook the opportunity or pass something up by not having a member there. As I say, as far as the Meadow lake seat which I represent at this time is concerned, I am not accusing the Government of juggling if it has to get more votes; I think we are just as strong as we ever were. But, speaking of the North, I would surely like to see those two seats left there.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, before this debate ends, I would like to say a few words in regard to this Motion that is before the House. I would like to point out, in connection with Turtleford and Meadow Lake constituencies, referring to what the member for Turtleford had to say, that, extending from the Alberta boundary east there is quite a belt of forest and pretty well unoccupied land between St. Walburg and Loon Lake, and it continues on east between Glaslyn and Meadow Lake and on further east, and includes the area around Chitek and Penn and north of Leoville. That was a very natural division. A large part of it is in the Provincial forest and the result was that these two constituencies running north and south were absolute monstrosities when it came to the question of a member getting around those constituencies because of this large tract of unoccupied land in the middle, particularly in Meadow Lake constituency from Spiritwood, for example, around to the north and, was a very difficult trip to make. One of the objects of this Bill has been to make constituencies which are convenient for people to work, the candidates or the members of the political organizations: put together so that they can work those constituencies and serve them with the least possible trouble.

Some mention has been made of the Northland and I would certainly have no objection if the Provincial Treasurer sees fit to do something about that situation in the North. I think it is probably true that a great many people now living in Athabaska and Cumberland constituencies do not know that they have any representation in this House. I have been around the North and I know quite a bit about it, and I am pretty sure that it is very seldom that the hon. members get around their constituencies in that north land. So, actually, Mr. Speaker, if it is left the way it is now those people in the north will certainly be no worse off and actually they will not know the difference, because they never see their members now; and many of them, if you asked who was their member, could not tell you at this time after the election.

Mr. McCormack: — How come they vote for them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — My hon. friend from Souris-Estevan says, “How come they vote for them”. I would like to suggest to my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan that when election time comes around the Liberal “machine” gets the people going around and tells them (and when I say “tells them” I mean tells them) how to vote.

The hon. member for Melfort, I take it, Mr. Speaker, paid me rather a compliment this afternoon when he showed a considerable amount of disturbance at the idea that possibly the people in Melfort-Tisdale constituency might give me a nomination. I appreciate that compliment from him, but I doubt if that will happen. My farm and my former home was in what is the constituency of Kelsey . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — Not a chance.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and certainly I consider that as a priority insofar as I am concerned, if they want me to be their candidate. I am in the same position as the member for Melfort — I do not think he has been chosen as a candidate yet in the Melfort constituency, and I would suggest that he just watch his laurels to see that he does get picked for a candidate if he is interested in coming back here. Maybe I should say to him, “Enjoy yourself, it’s later than you think.” I noticed also that the member for Melfort, in counting up his votes in that constituency, said “They took 900 Liberals off me.”

March 12, 1951

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is right.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the hon. member ran as a sort of half-way coalition candidate and was supposed to collect the Conservative votes; and I think this afternoon, in his worried condition, he was counting in all the Conservative votes as well as the Liberal votes . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — That is right. They are all Liberal votes.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . so that he would have to revise his figures. The Conservatives in Melfort constituency are not going to be taken in by any ruse in the next election like they were in the past one, and the last thing he needs to do is to start counting up the Conservative votes as going for him.

Mr. Egnatoff: — You count the Labour-Progressive ones up, eh?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Melfort and I are neighbours . . .

Hon. Members: — Even in the House . . . Love thy neighbour as thyself . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am a “good neighbour”.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — As a matter of fact, by this map, he is handing me a bunch of Liberal voters and I do not know whether I want them or not . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am sure you do not.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and I am giving him some C.C.F. voters and he does not want them apparently.

Hon. Member: — You should get together.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I do not know whether we can get together and slug this thing out but, as far as I am concerned, I want to tell the hon. member that if the people in Kelsey constituency do not want me as their candidate and the people in Melfort-Tisdale do want me as their candidate, I will be happy to have a go at it there, even as it stands right at the moment.

Mr. Egnatoff: — It should be a good battle.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It will be a good one, too. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we ever had a map of constituencies in this province where the constituencies were set up after having given so much consideration to have them compact and accessible to the centres in those constituencies and easy to work.

Mr. Maher: — Except The Battlefords.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The member for Turtleford was talking about the highway in his old constituency going north and

south — that is the one that we gravelled, you know. Well, in his constituency on this map you have a very compact constituency . . .

Mr. Trippe: — Oh, it is all right. No kick.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . with part of one north-and-south highway and an east-and-west highway right through it, and by visiting St. Walburg and Turtleford and Glaslyn and Spiritwood, he can see practically everybody in his constituency. Those are the towns that the people come in to on Saturday night; just four towns and he will be able to see practically everybody in his constituency. We have made it very easy for him to work that constituency. But, of course, it will be equally easy for a C.C.F. candidate to work that constituency too, and I think probably that is what is worrying the hon. member.

A good many people, Mr. Speaker, have asked me about this name of “Kelsey”, how it came about. I would like to take just a few minutes and put on the record the reason for this name. I have here in my hand a book from the Library entitled “The Kelsey Papers”. Incidentally, Henry Kelsey was an explorer, and he was the first white man to come in from Hudson Bay to the prairies. He made his first trip in the year 1690. I would like to read just a short extract from this book; it is in the introduction:

“The next year, however, (1690), Governor Geyer had a harder task for Kelsey. ‘This summer’, he wrote, ‘I sent up Henry Kelsey (who cheerfully undertook the journey) up into the country of the Assinae Poets’ . . . (I think that refers to the Assiniboine Indians) . . . ‘with the captain of that nation, to call, encourage and invite the remoter Indians to trade with us’ . . . (that was with the Hudson’s Bay Company). In 1691 came ‘a letter from Henry Kelsey, the young man I sent up last year with the Assinae Poets.’ The Governor had sent Kelsey ‘a supply of those things he wrote for’ and had ordered him ‘to return the next year with as many Indians as he can.’ In September, 1692, Geyer wrote that Kelsey had come down ‘with a good fleet of Indians.’”

His job was to go out and to talk to the Indians and to get them to come to trade at York Fort on Hudson Bay. At that time the Hudson’s Bay Company had no inland forts at all on the prairies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to run over the journeys. Kelsey left Fort York on June 12, 1690; that is a long time ago. He arrived at Deering’s Point on July 10, 1690. Then he went on south-west to the Plains. Now there is some argument as to the exact location of Deering’s Point, but it is generally agreed that it is in the neighbourhood of The Pas, Manitoba. The book I have here is a paper on “Henry Kelsey, the First White Man to see the Buffalo and Grizzly Bear in Western Canada,” by Charles Napier Bell, who was the president of the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba. He says:

March 12, 1951

“Kelsey’s statement in the rhymed preface to his journal, part of the Kelsey collection, distinctly states that according to his best judgment the ‘neck of land’ he named Deering’s Point was 600 miles south-west of York Factory, which would indicate that when taken in connection with the Journal, Deering’s Point was on the Saskatchewan River or Cedar Lake, just west of Lake Winnipeg, and amply justifies the carefully studied conclusion that I arrived at in 1885.”

Again, dealing with the question of Deering’s Point, there is another extract in that connection which I will read in a moment or two. He left Deering’s Point and went on south-west to the plains, and there is not so much detail as to that 1690 trip, but he returned to Deering’s Point in July of 1691 and was away again on July 15th, apparently only having stayed there for a few days. Now, he went up the Saskatchewan River to the mouth of the Carrot River, and went up the Carrot River for about a three-day journey, which would not be very far, because they had difficulty on that river, probably about 28 miles up the Carrot River, which would just nicely bring them within the boundary of the Province of Saskatchewan. Then he left the canoes and travelled on foot south-west. He had six-days’ travelling then before he struck good going; that would be going through the heavy timber and the muskeg and so forth. I would like to just read what is said here about this journey up the Carrot River:

“When Kelsey, after receiving supplies sent to him by Governor Geyer, York Factory, left Deering’s Point on the 15th of July, 1691, to go into the country of the Assiniboines, he went with Indians in canoes up the Saskatchewan River to a point estimated by him as 43 miles, including one lake, where they portaged from one place to another through the reed-grown shallows. At this place he came to a rapid, shallow river, evidently the Carrot River, which he ascended, and on its bank, 28 miles up from its mouth, the canoes were abandoned and his land journey began. Within fair limits, the distance from Cedar Lake to the mouth of Carrot River is just about 43 miles, estimated daily by Kelsey.”

That, of course is an indication also, of the position of Deering’s Point.

Now, they had some fairly tough times on this trip. Kelsey describes the first 60 miles of the country he tramped through. His party likewise were practically starving. These are extracts from his diary:

“Having to eat only two or three wood partridges and one squirrel, and it was not until at a distance of some 91 miles travelling from the point where he left his canoe that he reached dry level land out of the heavy going through mossy land and muskegs, when he secured three pigeons and killed a moose and two swans.”

The ninety miles from that position on the Carrot River took him south and west and into the area which is now included in the Kelsey constituency.

He went on south-west and came to the Red Deer River which incidentally at that time, in that area was called by the Indians, (I do not know if I can say this), the Waskashreeseabee. Waskesiu is an Indian word for red deer and this apparently also is, in another dialect, an Indian name for red deer. He ascended the Red Deer River, crossed the Red Deer River at a point which apparently is not very far from the town of Porcupine Plains or Chelan; went south and was close to the Quill Lakes, because he spoke of the great salt plains, and went on farther south to the Touchwood Hills. He then made the return trip and landed back finally at York Factory in the spring of 1692.

It is interesting also to note the names that were used at that time in regard to some of the rivers. The Bourbon River was the Nelson River, the Michinipi (or Great Water) was Winnipeg Lake. Another name for Winnipeg Lake was the word which has distinct French influence in it; it starts "Oui" — Ouinipique Lake — Winnipeg Lake. Lake Pachegoia and Lake Cariboux were Moose and Cedar Lakes, and at this point Moose and Cedar Lakes were places where the Indians gathered every spring. I suppose they had their annual celebrations there; they got birch bark and made their canoes for use for the summer.

Now, recognizing the real work of exploration that this very early pioneer did, I think it is very fitting that this constituency which Henry Kelsey crossed probably four times on those two trips into the plains area of Saskatchewan should carry his name.

March 12, 1951

Hon. Mr. Fines (Closing): — I am not going to take much of the time of the House. I think we can best discuss the individual polls when we get into committee. I do want, however, to say that as far as the North Country is concerned, I am quite satisfied that when we get into committee we can discuss this and if the members, or a considerable number of the members, feel that we should have another constituency in the North, we will be quite prepared to do that. There is nothing hard and fast about any of these boundaries. If the Leader of the Opposition feels that we should put those few polls back into Wadena and take them out of Kelvington we are prepared to consider that. He talked a great deal this afternoon about how we are “fixing” certain constituencies. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was referred to as a “magician”, and I came to the conclusion that I am a magician if I have been able to do all the good things that I am said to have done for the members of this side of the House without hurting anybody. A person must be a magician to do that.

And you know, the Leader of the Opposition went through constituency after constituency and told us very frankly that we had improved practically all of them.

Mr. Loptson: — For the C.C.F. Party.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — For the C.C.F. Party. We had improved practically all of them, and yet only one or two of the Liberal constituencies were hurt in the process. Now, I think it is a remarkable feat, Mr. Speaker, that we were able to accomplish that. Now, what is the truth?

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say he had improved them all, I said he had improved 12 of the close seats, five particularly, held by the C.C.F.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, take the Kelvington seat which he mentioned. If it is improved, it is at the expense of Wadena, another C.C.F. seat. And the true situation there is that the constituency of Wadena was one of the large ones; it had 10,360 names on the voters' list, Kelvington had 8,711. We balanced them up and have 9,369 and 9,700; that is all that is done there. It is not a question of trying to help the hon. member for Kelvington; he does not need any help. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition, the last three years, has spotted every member in this House about 500 votes for the next election.

He pointed out that the people of Meadow Lake are not interested in the North country. I want to differ with him. I believe that every citizen who is worthy of the name citizen, in Meadow Lake, must recognize that the future of their whole town and community is linked right up with the future development of that great north country. The same is true of the people of Prince Albert. I do not know of any group of people in this province who are more conscious of the need for development of that north country than the people in the Prince Albert district.

Mr. Tucker: — So are the cities interested in the country districts. That does not prove anything.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was crying about taking off one little township from Biggar and putting it in Rosthern.

What is the truth of the situation? The truth of the situation, Mr. Speaker, is that there was a whole township added to the south end of Rosthern constituency, township 39. Now, if we had not taken Langham and the surrounding township, then the hon. Leader of the Opposition would have accused us of putting a jog in the south end of this constituency. Instead of that we have brought it right out straight.

Mr. Tucker: — You are too suspicious.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And, he wanted to know if it was because Biggar was too large. Well, I would like to tell him this. When I look at the two hon. gentlemen, there is not a great deal of difference in the size but surely the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not think that it is fair to leave the member for Biggar with 78 townships to look after while he has only 44 townships, the second smallest constituency in the province still. Even after we have added all of these polls, he still has the second smallest constituency. My friend from Saltcoats, I think, has the honour of having the smallest in actual number of townships.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, very frankly, that the question of votes in Biggar constituency does not enter into this at all. The sole purpose we had in mind here is trying to get for my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, a nice, square constituency, a constituency that is worthy of the hon. gentleman who now represents it, and who, I am sure, hopes to in the future. As a matter of fact, a couple of fellows were in town here from Rosthern the other day, and they said, “You can do what you like. You can put any polls, any townships you want in Rosthern constituency, Tucker is finished up there.” Now, Mr. Speaker, our little friend from Melfort is worried about what we have done to him.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I am not worried, not at all worried.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Actually, Mr. Speaker, what we have tried to do here is to iron out the situation. I have here the old map, and you will notice that the constituency runs north and south until you get up about five townships, and then it takes a jog over three townships to the east and then north. It just misses Codette. Well now, we have established the new constituency of Nipawin and according to the theory which is advanced by the hon. member for The Battlefords and one or two others this afternoon, we should have the main town in the centre of the constituency; that is what these gentlemen prefer. Well, here you have Nipawin, the main town, right in the centre. The people from Codette, the people from all this territory east and west of Codette, they do not go to Melfort; that is not their town, their town is Nipawin. What we have done here is to take the boundary of the rural municipality of Nipawin. That is the boundary line that is now the north boundary of Melfort-Tisdale constituency. Moreover, it is the same line that is continued right straight through to the Manitoba border. There are no jogs there. And whether or not those people will vote C.C.F. or will vote Liberal, no one in this Chamber knows.

My hon. friend from The Battlefords will remember Meota, for example. Meota used to be a very good Liberal poll, in fact, in the last general election; yet, in the by-election the results indicated that the people in that short time had switched their political affiliations, and

March 12, 1951

we had a very substantial majority. That is true of a great many polls in this province, so that I do not think the hon. member from Melfort need worry too much. He has a nice constituency there, one of the nicest, cleanest-looking constituencies in the province.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Hear, hear! It is clean all right, and we will win it, too.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and refer to these others — Shellbrook, The Battlefords, Yorkton — I am surprised that anybody would criticize what has been done in Yorkton. My hon. friend from Saltcoats has been given, as I said before, one of the choicest constituencies in the province now.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I was not criticizing what he had done in Yorkton; I was telling him what he had done to the member for Yorkton.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that he leave that for the C.C.F. people to worry about. Let them pick their own candidates. Let us not have the hon. member for Saltcoats doing it. He might have a tough enough time picking the Liberal candidate for Saltcoats.

I would just like to say though, Mr. Speaker, that in all these cases — take, for instance, the constituency of Yorkton — there was no thought of trying to give the hon. member more votes. He does not need them. He has a good surplus there now; he does not need any extra. But what we have tried to do is to make that constituency more workable. By taking out that north end of Saltcoats where the people simply could not get together with the rest of the constituency, we fixed up both constituencies.

Mr. Loptson: — They are just as badly off now.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, no, they are wonderful now! They can get right in to Yorkton on a good blacktop road.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, when we get this new constituency in effect, our hon. friend from Rosthern, if he is going to be re-elected, will never again be able to get up and say that he has not any blacktop in his constituency. We are putting him in a constituency where there is a good blacktop road, so that he will not have anything to worry about from now on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about your constituency. The obvious thing to do here, when Melville was too large a constituency, was to throw the west end of that constituency in with Touchwood. Now, I do not know how the voters were — I think about fifty-fifty in the best of my recollection; but it certainly did not make a great deal of difference. I think, Mr. Speaker, it was most unkind for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that we were doing this to save you. I am sure that you do not need any saving, you were saved long ago.

Now, the hon. member for Swift Current, Mr. Speaker, can look after himself. He is very handy, that man; he does not need any help. He did not need me to help him at all. Even the editor of the “Leader-Post” admitted that we had done a good job down the south-west of the province. In other words, what we have done is to restore the Shaunavon constituency so those people can get around winter or summer. Then, we have the two constituencies

left; what was the logical thing to do? The logical thing was to draw a line down from the river to where Shaunavon constituency starts. Well, there we have our hon. friend from Maple Creek. I have not heard him kicking much; I do not think that it hurt him any. The member for Swift Current had to take the other half of Gull Lake. Where else could we put them? We could not put them over in Gravelbourg or in Milestone or any place else. It was the logical thing to do, and so, Mr. Speaker it is on straight, logical grounds. The constituency of Gravelbourg is very much as it was before, extended slightly to give them more population.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take any more time to deal with the individual constituencies. I would like to say just this, as far as the northwest is concerned — Turtleford, Redberry, The Battlefords, and the former Athabaska seat. There were five constituencies there. Frankly, according to the population of 1948, three constituencies is about all that should be there. However, we have left four — one constituency has been eliminated.

The Leader of the Opposition said something, today, about population, and went on to say that there were more constituencies with a population of under 7,800 than there were before. I would like to point out that, under the old plan, the constituency of Gravelbourg had 6,653; today, the lowest is 7,400, and that is in Turtleford. Another small one is Meadow Lake, with 7,611; and another one in Redberry, with 7,700. The Leader of the Opposition believes that we have too many small constituencies, and there is a way to remedy it, and if he is really serious, I am prepared to bring in amendments to remedy it, and the remedy will be simply to cut one of those constituencies in the northwest part of the province. Now, frankly, I don't think we should do that. I think that is a part of the province that will expand in the future, and I think we should leave the populations probably a little lighter, in those particular constituencies. Now there are certain ones . . .

Mr. Tucker: — If I might interrupt my hon. friend there. I was not suggesting that there were too many small constituencies at all. I was dealing with the argument of my hon. friend that the purpose of this thing was to even out the populations, and I pointed out that there were 10 constituencies in the new list which were below 7,990; so that there was not much “evening out”.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that, when you bring the lowest up from 6,653, as Gravelbourg had, and 6,763 for Redberry and 6,700 for Nipawin; when you bring them all up to a minimum of 7,400 you have brought them up at least 800, which is approximately 15 per cent.

I would just like to point out that some of the constituencies have fairly large populations. Take the constituency of Shaunavon, the constituency of Maple Creek. These have populations of — Maple Creek has 10,115, but we all recognize that, and we anticipate that, as farming

March 12, 1951

areas are opened up in other parts of the province, that there will be still further shifts away, and so we have no apologies to offer for having a fairly large population in these particular areas, where we feel the population has shifted since this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything more. There is a lot that can be said. I think the Leader of the Opposition tried to make out the best case he could. I think he had a lot of fun, this afternoon. I don't think he was really serious . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I assure you I was.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . I think he really wasn't too serious. He had to put on some kind of a show of course. After all, that is his job and he is paid a salary for doing that. He had to show us that he had been studying this Bill and he had to try to prove that these boundaries were not built upon the principle of equity, equality, justice, and all these other things.

Mr. Tucker: — You can't say that without a smile now, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I can say without any fear of contradiction that of all the redistributions that have ever been introduced in this province, this is without a doubt, the fairest that has ever been introduced. I would challenge my hon. friend to go back to see what has been done in the past, and compare it with this, and I think, if he is fair (and I know he wants to be fair; he wants to practise being fair, Mr. Speaker; lawyers should practise being fair because some day they may be called upon to higher things); and I am sure that, if he will, he will then admit that this is a very fair job of redistribution.

However, having said that, I want to say to the members on both sides of the House, that this is not binding, it is not final. If there is any place where they feel that we can improve it, then I shall be only too happy to agree to any changes that will make the Bill more workable. And if it can be shown that, in any place, we have not been perfectly fair and equitable, we shall certainly take steps to correct it.

The question being put on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 73, it was agreed to on division by 27 votes to 14.

THE ELECTION ACT

2/R — Bill No. 72

The Assembly resumed from Friday, March 9, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn):

“That Bill No. 72 — An Act respecting Elections of Members of the Legislative Assembly — be now read the second time.”

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't very much further to say about this matter. I referred to the non-introduction by the Government of the single transferable ballot in this Bill, and I suggested that consideration be given to referring it to a Committee where witnesses might be heard in regard to the desirability of introducing the single transferable ballot in single member constituencies in Saskatchewan.

I realize that there would be no good purpose served by my moving an amendment to that effect, unless the Government were ready to agree to that amendment being carried, and also stood ready to co-operate in studying the matter. Obviously, there is no purpose in our moving such an amendment, if the Government is not prepared even to consider the matter, which was in its platform. Further, looking over the Journals of the House, the last time that this Legislative Assembly Act was before the House, when the C.C.F. were in opposition, I believe they moved an amendment advocating the application of the single transferable ballot to single member constituencies.

I take it from the fact that they have not introduced that in this Bill, that they have changed their minds on the matter. I would have wished that they had explained why they have changed their minds, because there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that many people in the province, who believe in this system, voted for the C.C.F. with the idea in mind that the C.C.F., if they did get into office, would carry out this policy of theirs. I think, in fairness to those voters the least they could do would be to explain, if they have definitely changed their minds, why.

However, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I have never been able to make up my mind definitely whether or not the single transferable ballot in single member constituencies was better than our present system, and so, not having any definite opinion one way or the other, unless the Government is willing to refer it to a Committee where some deep and careful study of these matters might be made, I would not be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to make any motion in the matter. I am quite satisfied, in view of the attitude of the Government, that so far as we know at this time it would just be a waste of time.

March 12, 1951

Mr. Speaker, the rest of the Bill, I believe can be dealt with just as well in committee as on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to inform the House that the mover of the motion is about to exercise his privilege of closing the debate. Anyone wishing to speak must do so now.

Premier Douglas (closing): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to prolong the debate to any length, except to make just an observation or two with reference to what was said by the Leader of the Opposition, the other day, when I moved second reading of the Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition chided the Government with having been guilty of breaking its promises to the people of Saskatchewan, and he talked a great deal about the fact that this party, which had always paraded its virtue and its honesty, was now almost as guilty as the Liberal Party of breaking its promises.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is almost the worst indictment that could be made of any political party, but, as a matter of fact, of course, the hon. gentleman was simply trying to find one black sheep that would keep his little black sheep from looking as black as it is, and, in this case, he was far afield in his accusations.

The C.C.F. Party did have, in the 1938 election, the single transferable ballot in its election platform; and I was one of the persons who helped to put it in that platform. We were defeated in the 1938 election. Our platform is not made by me or by a provincial executive or by the M.L.A.'s; it is made by the rank and file membership of our people in annual convention assembled. And in the year 1941, the convention decided to take it out of the platform, and despite the fact that, almost every year or every other year since, those who favour that type of balloting have brought it before the convention, it has always been defeated, — sometimes by a large majority and sometimes by a smaller majority, because there has been a growing feeling that it ought not to be put into the platform. Certainly, when we went to the country in 1944, it was not in the C.C.F. platform. Therefore, for my hon. friend to talk about the Government breaking its promise — if my hon. friend will take the trouble to look at the little card with the nine points on it, which was the platform on which we ran, he will find that every plank in that platform has either been fully implemented, or is now well on its way to be implemented, and that this province has never had a government that has as completely kept its promises to the electorate as the present Government, and that was amply demonstrated by the support which the people of Saskatchewan gave us in 1948.

Therefore, the question of the single transferable ballot is not a question of a promise being either kept or broken. No promise regarding the single transferable ballot was made in 1944 nor in 1948. That, however, does not detract from the worthwhileness of the suggestion, and I must confess that, something like the Leader of the Opposition, I have had times when I have advocated it and other times when I have been less sure that it had as many good features as I had hitherto supposed it had.

I think that there are two reasons why we, on this side, would probably not be prepared to introduce the single transferable ballot in the present time.

The first is that the single transferable ballot is something which requires a fairly widespread usage before it can be put into legislation for as important elections as the provincial elections are. My hon. friend talked, the other day, about a statement I had made at Bow River. As a matter of fact, he was quoting from his memory which sometimes gets a little confused with his imagination. I took the trouble to look up the newspaper report, and, of course, I had never said at any time that I thought the people in Saskatchewan were not intelligent enough to use the single transferable ballot. I was speaking in Bow River during the election campaign, and, as a matter of fact, at the very meeting, the returning officer had come and asked for a few moments of time and he had been going to the various political parties and asking for a few minutes of time, with a blackboard explaining to people how to use the single transferable ballot, and lamenting the fact that in previous elections so many ballots had been spoiled. And when somebody asked me what we thought of the single transferable ballot in Saskatchewan, I said we had never tried it, that there were a great many people for it and a great many people against it, and that my own frank opinion (not speaking for the C.C.F. Party, although it wasn't in our platform) was that it was something that ought to be tried out at municipal elections or school board elections or hospital elections, until our people became thoroughly familiar with that type of voting. The thing that impressed me when I was in Alberta was that, although they had had that method of balloting since the early 1920's, in 1948, 20 years old, they were still having a very large percentage of spoiled ballots, and they were still finding it necessary to have returning officers and deputy returning officers go to the meetings with blackboards, explaining to people how they should vote. Someone told me that in one of the university elections in our own province, they had used the single transferable ballot and had 16 per cent of the ballots spoiled. A university group is a group with a fairly high rate of intelligence. So the fact does remain that using a single transferable ballot is something that takes a while for people to understand. I think that in an election where you are trying to get the broadest possible expression of opinion from the people, if there are people how, because of hard work and the limited opportunities that existed in the lands from which they came or even in our own land in the early days, were not able to get a lot of education, to do anything that would disenfranchise them, that would negate their expression of opinion by spoiling their ballot, would be most unwise at this time.

The second reason why I, personally, would hesitate to recommend the single transferable ballot at this time is that, in the places where it has been used, it actually has not had the effect that it had been hoped it would have. Now, proportional representation, according to Corry and some of the others who have written on this question, cannot be used adequately until you get a seat with at least five or more members in it. With anything less than five, proportional representation will not give you a fair indication of the vote; but when you come to the single transferable ballot, I am not sure that it will do the things that some of us hoped it would do, in the days when it was being advocated so loudly on the prairies. Take as an example, in Alberta again, where it has been used now for some 25 years. In the last election there, I think the C.C.F. got 65,000 or 70,000 votes but they got only two seats out of the 50 or 52 seats in the Legislature; in other words, a little over 4 per cent of the seats with a much larger percentage of the popular vote.

March 12, 1951

That is, it had not had the effect that it was hoped which was that it would give a truer representation of members in the Legislature as related to the popular vote cast.

For those two reasons, on this side we do not feel that we ought to proceed with it at this time. That does not rule it out, of course. It simply means that this is probably not the best time or the best way to introduce it. I think if the municipalities were interested in trying it out in municipal elections where you are covering smaller areas, where there is more time for personal canvass, or if it were tried out in election of school boards or hospital representatives and so on — it might be a good idea to start it in smaller groups; but I think that to plunge the province into an election with a single transferable ballot at the same time that you are introducing the absentee vote, would probably cause a good many people to be disfranchised at a time when naturally you want the broadest possible expression of the people's will.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should proceed with the Bill as it is now drawn.

Mr. Egnatoff: — The hon. Premier pointed out that, in 1938, the single transferable ballot was a part of the C.C.F. platform, and he also pointed out that in 1944 it was not a part of the C.C.F. platform. I wonder how the Premier would reconcile his statement that it was not a part of the C.C.F. platform in 1944, with this quotation taken from the "Saskatchewan Commonwealth", dated May 24, 1944. It is on page 5 in the "Commonwealth", and is entitled — "Know what you are voting for", and I quote:

"The C.C.F. programme for Saskatchewan . . .

I would like to read this and get the Premier's reconciliation of his stand here tonight. I am reading now, from this article:

"C.C.F. conventions have also approved the use of the single transferable ballot to ensure that a member elected to any government body shall have a clear majority over his opponents, and not merely the largest number of votes cast".

Now either the Premier has a very short memory, or he was trying to mislead us.

Premier Douglas: — What is the date of that?

Mr. Egnatoff: — The date, Mr. Premier, is May 24, 1944. I wish you would check on this. Unless my copy is wrong, it says, "The C.C.F. programme for Saskatchewan — Know what you are voting for", and according to that it indicates that the C.C.F. conventions had approved the idea of the single transferable ballot and that that was part of the C.C.F. platform in 1944.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, after the speech by the Leader of the Opposition, the other day, I asked the provincial office to check the resolutions, and the information I have from them, after

checking provincial annual resolutions, or resolutions passed at the annual provincial conventions, was that the convention had taken it out of the platform of the C.C.F., and, certainly, in almost every year since then, or every other year since then, someone has brought it into the convention, or some group has brought it into the convention, only to have it voted down, and the C.C.F. convention, speaking for the people in the C.C.F. movement, have expressed the desire that that ought not to be put into operation. Personally, I have no strong feelings in the matter. If the convention felt, tomorrow, that it ought to be introduced, I would be prepared to try it, although I would have some misgiving that we were probably proceeding too hastily.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member was asking a question and I think you have answered it.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I had not finished my remarks. I was still speaking, and I am replying to my hon. friend at the same time.

On the other hand, if the convention came along and said, as they did. “We do not want the Government to introduce the single transferable ballot”, then I don’t feel that we ought to introduce it and I think that is quite as it ought to be. If the C.C.F people in this province who make our programme feel that it won’t give the best expression of the public will, then that, of course, is the point of view which I am going to follow. But that does not prevent us in this province, if we feel that is the type of ballot there ought to be, from trying to popularise it. I had not noticed any tendency to introduce it into municipal conventions. I don’t even notice that at municipal conventions, when they are voting, they use the single transferable ballot. I haven’t noticed it being used by any other public body. It doesn’t seem to me there has been any move in that direction. It is not the kind of thing that has been popularized in the province, and if my hon. friends feel strongly about the single transferable ballot, there are a dozen different ways it could be popularized, through teachers’ conventions . . .

Mr. Lopton: — The hon. member from Melfort just read an article contradicting the quotation that you made that it was not in your platform for 1944; that shows that you are on the wrong track.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend has never been on the track, so he would not know when somebody else got off it.

And therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that, with reference to this whole question of the single transferable ballot, I feel that those who are strong advocates — and we have them, in our own party, who are strong advocates of it . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — Well you say it wasn’t in your platform in 1944.

Premier Douglas: — My explanation is that I got my information from people who have checked the records, and the information was that it was not in the C.C.F. platform in 1944.

March 12, 1951

Mr. Egnatoff: — My information, according to the “Commonwealth”, is that it was.

Premier Douglas: — Well, then if that is correct, I say that the information I have is wrong; but certainly this is true — that in conventions subsequent to that, the C.C.F. convention withdrew the single transferable ballot from our programme and passed resolutions instructing the Government that the single transferable ballot should not be put into operation.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend asked the question, if those who feel strongly about it, both in our own party and elsewhere, want to do a service to this province, and feel that it would give a better expression of public opinion, I say the greatest service we can give is to try to popularize the single transferable ballot by getting it used at teachers’ conventions, trustees’ conventions, municipal conventions, and other public places, in order that our people may become familiar with that type of ballot. If it becomes popular and seems to give a better expression of public opinion, then I don’t think there is any doubt about it but that eventually it will be adopted into legislation.

There is only one thing more I want to say in closing. I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition, the other day, speaking about The Election Act said that the “sooner we have an election the better”, and I just want to remind my hon. friend, for the sake of the record, that he expressed that opinion. I also want to remind him of an old Chinese proverb which says, “it is later than you think”.

The question being put on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 72, it was agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o’clock p.m.