

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
30th Day

Thursday, March 20, 1952

The House met at three o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Yesterday, at 6 o'clock, the question was raised about the motion of the member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker). The question arose as to where the motion ought to be on the order paper, in view of the contention that the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) had not adjourned it.

In conformity with the hasty agreement which we made last night, it has been placed under "Motions." But I should draw to the attention of the House that I still think it was placed properly before. I do not wish to interfere with it now, but there is danger of setting a precedent. Attention was drawn to No. 17 of the Standing Orders of our Assembly, which says:

"That if at the hour of 6 o'clock p.m. on a Wednesday, or at the time of the adjourning of the Assembly, a motion on the Order Paper be under consideration, that question shall stand first on the Order Paper of the following day next after orders, which have a special precedence, to which a special precedence has been assigned by the Assembly."

And Beauchesne's citation, No. 27, page 63, of his 3rd edition says:

"If, at the hour of 6 o'clock p.m. on a Wednesday, or at the time of the adjournment of the House, a motion on the Notice Paper be under consideration, that question shall stand first on the Order Paper of the following day, next after orders, to which a special precedence has been assigned by standing orders, or order of the House."

That means it comes after those things which have been given special precedence by the House, which in turn means that it would go to the bottom of the Bills and Orders.

I do not want to get into a lengthy argument about it now, but it is something, Mr. Speaker, to which some consideration might be given. If there is any difference of opinion it could probably go to Standing Orders Committee of the House so that we do not start to set a new procedure that will upset our entire Order Paper, if this question should come up again.

March 20, 1952

Mr. Speaker: — I had better explain my position. You see when the hon. member got up to speak, there was quite a controversy going on, and then I distinctly said, “All right, to stop any more controversy I will accept the adjournment”, and I did not put it. I agree that I did not put it because it had already been asked whether the hon. member had leave to adjourn the debate; but there was such a controversy going on, and I do not mind saying that I am getting heartily sick of it, that I intimated to the member, and he accepted it, that, to stop any more controversy, I said, “I will accept your adjournment.” That is the position.

REDISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I am now moving reads as follows:

“That, in view of the fact Saskatchewan’s representation in the House of Commons will be reduced by at least four members if redistribution of Federal Electoral Districts is proceeded with under the pertinent provisions of the British North America Act and amendments thereto, and that such drastic reduction in the representation from any Province is against the public interest, this Assembly requests the Parliament of Canada to postpone redistribution and give consideration to requesting, by appropriate resolution, a constitutional amendment whereby no Province shall lose more than 10 per cent of its representation in the House of Commons following any decennial census.”

The first matter that I would refer to, Mr. Speaker, is as to the mention in the second line of “four members.” At the time that I drew this resolution I was not certain whether the provision in the constitution providing that after the division of the population of Canada by the unit of representation if that is done with all the provinces and does not bring the total representation up to 250, then the province with the largest remainder will be given another member, and so on until the member is brought up to 250. I had not, at that time checked to see whether Saskatchewan might not get the benefit of that provision and get another member. I have managed to check that myself, and I see also in the references to the matter being made at Ottawa that it is accepted that if redistribution is proceeded with under the present constitution we will lose not four members, but five. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the unanimous consent of the House to have “four” in this resolution replaced by “five.”

In regard to this matter, this is not the first time that Saskatchewan has been faced with a somewhat similar situation. After the census of 1941 if redistribution had been proceeded with then on the constitution as it then stood, Saskatchewan would have lost four members from twenty-one — after the redistribution of 1931 — if redistribution had been proceeded with the following census of 1941, we would have lost four members. I was then a member of the House of Commons and I drew it to the attention of the House of Commons and the government, in a speech which I made on February 8, 1943.

I will read from my speech what I said at that time. I said:

“If we followed strictly the policy of representation by population, we might be accused of being on unsound ground in asking the government to postpone the redistribution until after the war. We, however, do not do so. I have in my hand a table which shows that on one ground and another, apart from Quebec, no provinces after the next redistribution will be represented on the basis of population except Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia. All the other provinces are not and will not be represented on the basis of population owing to riders that were interjected for one reason or another, whereby they were given special protection.

“We ask that this measure be postponed until after the war because we have lost so many of our population on account of war conditions. In doing so we are not asking for nearly as much as other provinces asked for, and obtained in the past from a fair-minded Canadian people. This is the table to which I refer, and it shows in that table which I present to the House that if a change was not made in the constitution actually by virtue of the provision in the constitution that no province can have any less members in the House of Commons than it has in the Senate, Prince Edward Island would have four members, whereas on a strict basis of population she would only be entitled to 2, but Nova Scotia, on account of the one-twentieth rule, to which I will refer later, would have one more member than she is entitled to as would New Brunswick. But Ontario would have eight members more than she was entitled to on the basis of population, and Alberta would have one more than she was strictly entitled to on the basis of population.”

Following that there was a great support of that viewpoint on the part of all parties in the House of Commons, from Saskatchewan particularly; and also from Western Canada, and the government was good enough to accede to our representations that the redistribution should not take place until after the war.

The resolution in that regard is found on page 118 of a book issued by the King's Printer, called “British North America Acts and Selective Statutes, 1867-1948. It gives there the resolution that was introduced by the present Prime Minister, then Minister of Justice in the House of Commons on the 5th day of July, 1943. The recital there — I will just read part of it. It was recited:

“That whereas Canada has been at war since September 10, 1939, and hostilities may continue for an indefinite period, and whereas the census of 1941 was taken during the progress of hostilities, and whereas the effect of the enlistment

March 20, 1952

of the armed forces of Canada and of employment in the production of munitions of war has removed large numbers of the population from their homes to serve in and with such armed forces, either in other parts of Canada or overseas, or to reside temporarily in other parts of Canada, and whereas experience has shown that such readjustment may give rise to sharp differences of opinion as to the appropriate delimitation of electoral divisions, which differences it is most desirable to avoid while Canada continues at war.”

Based on that a request was made, a resolution was passed, that the British North American Act be amended to postpone redistribution until after the war. That was duly passed, but of course the question came up as to what had been brought out, that by virtue of the British North America Act due to this one-twentieth rule that the largest province in Canada, if the constitution were not changed, was going to wind up with eight more members than it was entitled to and Saskatchewan was going to have a reduction of four of its members.

That whole question is referred to in the “Government of Canada” by Dawson, Page 365. They point out there what I had pointed out in my speech, that five provinces were benefiting by the exceptions and only four were under the rule. So it was quite clear that something had to be done. So a further amendment was brought in to the British North American Act that, speaking generally, provided that the representation should be based, not as it had been hitherto on the Province of Quebec, but based upon the population of the whole of Canada. The only exception left was the exception having to do with the fact that no province should have less members in the House of Commons than it had in the Senate, which protected the representation of Prince Edward Island, which has four Senators and which on the basis of population, would not have more than two members and they continue to have four, regardless of what happens to their population.

That also provides an effective floor for the representation of the Maritime provinces which they are not going to have to use in this redistribution, because both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will benefit by this “remainder” rule to which I have already referred. In other words, their remainder is so large that although they would be brought down so New Brunswick would have to take advantage of this rule, she does not have to because of the remainder rule which I have mentioned. She will have 10 members in the House of Commons, but she is on the verge — if the population of Canada grows faster than that of New Brunswick, she is on the verge of having to perhaps be protected by that rule, because New Brunswick is entitled to 10 Senators, Nova Scotia is entitled to 10 Senators. So, no matter what happens to their population, they cannot have any less members than that in the House of Commons. As New Brunswick has 10, she has now reached the floor.

When Newfoundland came into Confederation it was agreed that she would have six Senators; on the basis of population she is given seven members in the House of Commons, and so she cannot have any less members in the House of Commons than six — the number of her Senators. We do not benefit in the same way by that rule, because although we have a far higher population than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, we have only six Senators, so our floor is only six, whereas theirs, as I have already stated — Nova Scotia and New Brunswick — is 10.

Now, following the amendment in 1947 to put the calculations of the number of members for the House of Commons for each province on the basis of population of the whole country, outside of in effect, Yukon, the North-West Territories, and Prince Edward Island, which was taken out of the general rule of population, the redistribution was effected and Saskatchewan lost only one member instead of four.

We are now faced — and one of the reasons why I spoke so strongly for something being done, was because I felt that our constituencies — there were 21 of them then — were already so large that it was very difficult for a member to represent them as they were then, let alone if they were going to be increased again much larger still. Then, of course, I felt because we are a farming province predominately, it would be unfortunate if because of that fact, and the relative growth of the industrial part of the country, we lost our influence so heavily in the House of Commons of our country.

That consideration does have effect within the provinces. It has always been accepted that within the provinces, size of constituencies should be taken into consideration and also that because farming people are not able to get together so readily as people in the cities, because they have not large newspapers to present their viewpoints as city seats have, because they have not got other organizations like Boards of Trade and Trade Unions to bring forward their views in an organized way, it was felt that to be fair farmers should have proportionately a little more representation in the House of Commons than larger cities. That has been recognized quite readily by the provinces when they have allotted the seats within their own provinces. As Your Honour knows, when a Bill like this is introduced in the House of Commons, it is introduced in blank and then sent to a committee and sub-committees of the provinces are set up to draw the boundaries of the constituencies for each province. So the members set the boundaries of their constituencies in each province. This idea of departing from strict representation by population has been done ever since Confederation. The farming districts have been — the population of their constituencies — have been on the whole much lower than the populations of the city seats.

Just to give an idea of that in the redistribution following the 1941 census, in Quebec there were several seats with slightly over 30,000 population in them. In fact, there were eight seats in the Province of Quebec, with under 35,000 of a population. They are able to do that because they are able, with the big cities but largely of Montreal, they are able to absorb a great deal of the population in the city seats, and have those seats very large, so that in that redistribution there were six seats in the Province of Quebec that had over 60,000 of a population

March 20, 1952

which enabled them not to make the rural seats of tremendous size, because as I have said there were eight rural seats in Quebec under 30,000. So that by making the city seats much larger they were able to cut down the rural seats to a reasonable size.

That happened in Ontario too. In Ontario there was one seat with only 18,000. Another seat 21,000. In Ontario as a whole there were 16 seats with a population of under 30,000. And then, as a result, they were able to divide the seats up by again having the city seats quite large. Welland, for example, had 93,000 in it. Hamilton East, 68,000. York East, 79,000. Spadina, 86,000. There were six seats in the Province of Ontario that had a population of over 60,000. They were able to do that again because they had the cities to give them the population, so as a result they did not have to make the rural seats unduly large. But our trouble in being a largely agricultural province is that we have no large city seats to give us the population to build up our membership so that we can keep down the size of our rural seats. If that is a good rule to apply in Canada within a province, one might think it would be a good rule to apply to a strictly agricultural province. If it is a good rule to apply to rural Quebec and rural Ontario, where it can be applied, then why should it not be applied in the whole country to a rural province?

Well, I think that the theory of that would be sound. The difficulty is, as everybody knows, it has been the feeling that the representation between one province and another based upon our constitution and based upon the relative size of the population, should not be fundamentally departed from. That has been a feeling pretty well ever since Confederation — that no province should permit that situation to be very largely departed from. The fact that Ontario, by virtue of the application of the so-called one-twentieth rule which said that if the province did not fall in population, more than one-twentieth as compared with the population of the country as a whole, because Ontario “benefited from that by having eight seats more than she was entitled to, was really the reason why I think it was possible to get the amendment through in 1947. So I am quite satisfied that the rest of the country will not stand for too great a departure from the idea of representation by population in respect of any province.

In connection with the overall situation, there is one thing that we can certainly state, and that is that the Maritime Provinces are protected by a very effective floor. If Prince Edward Island — if we were to be represented on the basis of Prince Edward Island, we would have 33 members in the House of Commons, but that is a special case. They have a very small province and you would hardly expect any province to be represented in our parliament by less than four members — the number of their Senators. I do not think anybody would think that we could expect to have — to be treated exactly the same as Prince Edward Island. But the other three Maritime Provinces are in a somewhat different position from Prince Edward Island. The thought has occurred to me that when any one of the other Maritime Provinces — take for example New Brunswick, if the time comes when she keeps ten members, not on account of population, but on account of this rule that you shall not have less members than members of the Senate, that it would be only fair then to any other province in Canada to say to them that your unit of representation shall not have to be raised any higher than one of a province like that which is benefiting by that floor rule.

In other words, if it is said that the unit of representation, say of New Brunswick, is permitted to fall lower by virtue of this floor than any other province that could benefit by that, should have the right to do so. However, that is a suggestion which I have not seen brought forward. It is something that I only put forward tentatively as probably something that might be studied as an idea that might give the benefit to all the provinces of what today three of them may, in the not too distant future, get the benefit from. It could be applied perhaps, and it might sometime, if we do not get the development that we all hope and expect we will get — if we do not get it, it might someday give us the protection that others may be able to have too.

I have said the population has not been regarded as an absolutely sacrosanct principle because of the minimum rule applied to Prince Edward Island and because of the fact that due to the one-twentieth rule even Ontario, the largest province was permitted to have her representation built up to the point where she actually had after the 1931 census, six members more than she was entitled to on the basis of population and would have had eight more after the 1941 census, as I have said, if the amendment had not been put through. As I have already said, within the province the idea of the absolute sacrosanctness of population has not been so highly regarded. So, I wondered whether it might be possible to say that in view of all these things when we have a reasonable minimum under present circumstances for Saskatchewan, that we could not ask that it be kept and set at 20.

However, that view was brought forward ever since it was clear we were going to lose a large number of members, and I followed the reaction to it in some very broad-minded Eastern publications and the attitude seems to be that we had an amendment to the constitution just six years ago and that a further amendment should not be asked for this time, just to save Saskatchewan from losing members, and Manitoba which is going to lose two. The feeling seemed to be to give a negative answer to that approach.

The next thought was — what would be a reasonable suggestion to which they might give consideration — and that is what motivated my moving this motion. If we cannot keep our present representation, which I would like to see, and which I feel has many arguments to support it, if we cannot do that, well, then, the next thing is to try to bring forward something that will minimize the amount of damage from our loss in population compared to the rest of the country. I thought that to suggest in any one census no province should lose more than one-tenth of its population, was not an unreasonable suggestion. If you have our province losing one-fourth of its entire representation in our parliament, it diminishes our influence there tremendously just at a time perhaps we need it as much as we have ever needed it, and it again will raise the size of our seats, our constituencies, by almost 25 per cent, and any person who has looked at the electoral map of Saskatchewan knows that those constituencies today are of such a size that it is very, very difficult for any member to do a good job to visit his constituents and find out their wishes and then representing them properly. If their size is now to be increased by 25 per cent, it is going to make it very, very difficult for Saskatchewan to be adequately represented in our House of Commons.

March 20, 1952

Our falling off in relative strength in the House of Commons is shown by the fact that we had 8.5 per cent of the members in 1931; 7.6 per cent in 1941; and 5.7 per cent in 1951. Now, the latter is due partly to the admission of Newfoundland, and we do not find any fault with that. We were glad to have Newfoundland come into Confederation and complete the vision of the Fathers of Confederation when they met to draw up the British North America Act. But there are the figures in regard to our falling off in relative influence in the House of Commons.

As I was saying, if we lose one-quarter of our members it is a very drastic thing. If one considers the amount of trouble we had in trying to draw a redistribution bill eliminating one seat in 1947, and the way members felt so upset about it when the seats were having to be enlarged even when it was a matter of eliminating one seat only, when they have got now — the committee dealing with Saskatchewan's redistribution — to eliminate five seats. It is going to be very, very difficult and it is going to lead to a tremendous amount of trouble, because every seat is going to have to be enlarged so much. On the other hand, if this is accepted — a one-tenth reduction — it will not be quite so drastic. It would be much easier to accommodate ourselves to our relative falling off in population as compared with the rest of the country. In other words, it will enable us to go through that situation from time to time, when we have to go through it with less difficulty. It does not affect the other provinces. They will still get the increase to which they are entitled.

As I was reading what has been said in regard to the last amendment of the British North America Act and the suggestion — which I think is right — that now that Canada, in regard to something that has to do with a solely Federal matter, has got the right to change her own constitution without having to make a petition to Westminster to do it, I am inclined to think that this change in the constitution to provide that notwithstanding anything that is already in the constitution, the representation after any decennial census shall not be reduced by more than one-tenth can be passed, I am quite satisfied, as I have studied it, by our own parliament, without recourse to Westminster.

So I am of the opinion this resolution should read as above written, and I am satisfied that that is in accordance with the constitution as recently changed, so I would like the unanimous consent of the House to rewording part of the resolution as follows:

“This Assembly requests the Parliament of Canada to postpone redistribution and give consideration to passing a constitutional amendment and so on . . . “

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I would very much have liked to have been able to move a resolution that we keep all our members and if somebody feels that we are likely to benefit more by passing a resolution by this legislature to that effect, I certainly would not oppose it, but I do think, and it is my sincere judgment from some knowledge of the attitude taken by the rest of Canada to that proposal, that is we ask for the whole thing we are likely to get nothing, and I am hoping that what we are asking for in this resolution is so moderate and reasonable that we

can say to our fellow Canadians and the rest of the country. 'This is a reasonable proposition to meet a situation which we find ourselves in, and therefore we feel that you should not be adverse to meeting us half-way in the matter.'

I feel that if we unanimously support this viewpoint there may be some chance of saving three of our members and losing only two instead of five. The effect of this also would mean that Manitoba, instead of losing two, would only lose one. I cannot think that when it does not interfere with the other provinces gaining all the members that they would get, I cannot see that they would begrudge the Province of Saskatchewan keeping 18 members instead of 15, and Manitoba only losing one member instead of two.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have laid the situation carefully before this Assembly because I know, that regardless of Party, our members in the House of Commons are going to try to fight to keep as much representation in the House of Commons for Saskatchewan as they can and I felt that this Assembly should help them in the most effective way they could.

Mr. Speaker: — You have heard the explanation given by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker), and it is requested that he be allowed to change the resolution somewhat in its form to what is on the Order Paper. Have we the consent of the House?

Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: — Then the resolution that is now before the House is the resolution moved by Mr. Tucker, seconded by Mr. McCormack:

"That, in view of the fact Saskatchewan's representation in the House of Commons will be reduced by at least five members if redistribution of Federal Electoral Districts is proceeded with under the Pertinent provision of the British North America Act and amendments thereto, and that such drastic reduction in the representation from any Province is against the public interest, this Assembly requests the Parliament of Canada to postpone redistribution and give consideration to passing a constitutional amendment whereby no Province shall lose more than 10 per cent of its representation in the House of Commons following any decennial census.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Gull Lake): — I think I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) ask to have the word "four" in the second line changed to "forty".

Premier Douglas: — "Four" to "five."

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I must have misunderstood him.

Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I am just going to be a couple of minutes. I was just listening to this resolution that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) brought

out and I was just wondering while I was listening to the hon. member speaking, what our friend, the Federal Liberal member for Maple Creek would be thinking about this. If you mind, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago he mentioned about splitting Saskatchewan wide open from gudgeon to end and I am kind of wondering what he will think about this, because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, he must be a great friend of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, and I think it would be a good suggestion, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition wrote a personal note to the Liberal member of Maple Creek and advised him as to what he has done in this Chamber. I thought I would just bring that to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, it is a very pleasant change for me to be able to get up in the House and agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker), and to support something which he is introducing. My experience in the main has been, especially this week with all these shamrocks on the members' desks, that everything I introduce, or have any part in introducing, the gentlemen opposite are "agin" it, like the Irish. Today, instead of the Opposition being "agin" the Government, the Government is supporting the Opposition, and I want to commend the Leader of the Opposition for introducing this resolution.

As a matter of fact I had thought before the session began, of introducing a motion dealing with redistribution, but there has been quite a lot of unfavourable comment in the press in days gone by about Saskatchewan Legislature probably interfering too much, or concerning itself too much with Federal matters, that I was somewhat apprehensive lest we would be criticized for trying to tell the Federal Parliament how they ought to arrange their representation.

I also gave some thought to the possibility of approaching the Leader of the Opposition in seeing if we might introduce a joint resolution, but I think the way it has worked out is very much better. This matter affects the Federal Government primarily, and the Leader of the Opposition, who supports them, has introduced this resolution. Therefore no one can think that it has any political motive behind it. He has introduced it and we, on this side of the House, are only too happy to support him in his representation.

I am not sure as I go along that I shall point out that probably in some minor ways we may not agree to the exact method he suggests, but I certainly would not move any amendment, as I think that would be unwise. The main thing about the motion to me is that sentence which says that "such drastic reductions in the representation from any provinces is against the public interest, and therefore this Assembly requests the Parliament of Canada to postpone redistribution."

From there on we might debate as to whether it would be better to have it restricted to a reduction of 10 per cent, or whether there is some other formula; I do not think that is the important thing. I think maybe the Opposition will agree. The important thing is that this present redistribution proposal shall not be proceeded with, until the whole matter has been more fully considered, and some of the things that the Leader of the Opposition has drawn to the attention of the Assembly

have been fully taken into consideration by those who are considering this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know there will be those in some parts of Canada who will criticize this resolution, and who will say: "Well do you not believe in representation by population?" After all "Rep by Pop" has been a slogan in Canadian history for 30 years, and it has always been considered to be one of the basic principles of democratic government. I am not going to argue against representation by population, but I am going to make two points which should be kept in mind when one talks about representation by population. The first is that we have not got complete representation by population now, as the Leader of the Opposition quite properly points out. In 1915 we had an amendment to the British North America Act (I believe Section 51A), which provided "that representation of provinces in the House of Commons could not fall below the number of Senators which they had in the Senate."

Now, what position does that put us in? As all hon. members know, the representation in the Senate was 96 at that time — 24 for the Maritimes — 24 for Quebec — 24 from Ontario and 24 for all of Western Canada. That left six for Saskatchewan. That means, for instance, that New Brunswick, with a population of a little over half a million, has 10 senators where Saskatchewan, with 832,000 people had six senators. It is rather significant that when Newfoundland came into Confederation with a population of 361,000 which is less than half of our population, they were given the same representation in the Senate as Saskatchewan had, namely, six senators. The use of the number of seats in the Senate as the floor for the representation which a province would have in the House of Commons immediately departed from the principle of representation by population.

As the Leader of the Opposition has quite properly pointed out, if the population should drop, or even if the population does not drop, if the population of other parts of Canada goes up proportionately, New Brunswick cannot go below 10; Nova Scotia cannot go below 10, and Prince Edward Island cannot go below 4. You get the situation, for instance, Prince Edward Island with a population of 98,429 (which is not much more than there is in the constituency of Welland, Ontario) is entitled to four members because they have four senators. They cannot have less members than they have senators. The average number of persons represented by a member in Prince Edward Island is 24,607, whereas the average number of persons represented by a member in Saskatchewan will be 55,449. That is quite a difference.

When anyone says that this motion introduced by the Leader of the Opposition is departing from the principle of proportional representation by population, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the principle was departed from in 1915, when Section 51A was introduced. As it is now, the number of members cannot drop below the number of Senators to which provinces are entitled to have in the Parliament of Canada.

I think the second thing that should be taken into consideration when we are talking about representation by population is the fact that some consideration should be given to the number of people which a member can properly serve. Again some recognition has been given to this principle. For many years the area of the Yukon in the North-West Territories

March 20, 1952

has been entitled to a number, because the area is so vast. But the population in 1951 census shows the population for that area is 9,096 persons. That means a member from the Yukon represents 9,000 people while a member from Saskatchewan will represent 55,000 people. Now, I am not complaining about that, Mr. Speaker, because I say even if you only represent 9,000 people, if they cover 205,000 square miles, which is what that person has to represent, that is certainly a man-sized job for any individual.

We cannot adhere strictly to population. There is a great deal of difference between representing 50,000 people in the heart of Toronto, where you can speak to them all by radio, or meet them all in about a week of meetings in school houses and community centres, and representing 50,000 people scattered over a tremendous area. I quite support what the Leader of the Opposition has said with reference to the areas which they have to look after. I was just noticing the areas which they have to cover. During the periods in which I was a member of Parliament, I represented a constituency that covered something over 10,000 square miles. Any person who starts out to service a constituency that large, and do justice to the people whom he is endeavouring to represent, has to make it practically a full-time job.

In the last redistribution, the average constituency in Saskatchewan went up to 11,898 square miles, and if the present redistribution goes into effect, we think it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 15,885 square miles — almost 16,000 square miles. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that that will be the average for all the seats in Saskatchewan. If they take out of that the city seats and urban seats, there will be rural seats that will be 20,000 square miles or more. As the Regina Leader-Post pointed out (and it was reprinted in the Ottawa Citizen which had been drawing attention to this situation in Eastern Canada, because we have people down east who have recognized the unfairness of this situation), that if this redistribution goes into effect there will be rural constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan that will almost be as large as the entire province of Nova Scotia. In other words, they will be trying to represent an area that is almost as large as the Province of Nova Scotia, which will be represented by 12 members.

Now, I know that you cannot have one member for every so many square miles, but certainly if the men and women who are elected to the House of Commons are going to be able to do an effective job, the area which they must cover will most certainly have to be taken into consideration. I submit the fact that already this has been taken into consideration with reference to Western Canada. We are not only speaking of course, for Saskatchewan, which stands to lose five seats under the redistribution proposed, but Manitoba, which will also lose two seats.

I notice the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix made some reference to the point which I am discussing now. In an editorial on January 2 of this year, the Star-Phoenix said:

“The Commons has not hesitated in the past to abandon the pure theory of misrepresentation by population to avoid obvious injustice.

When the populations of some of the Maritime Provinces became so small in relation to the rest

of the country that they were in danger of losing a large number of representatives, the House agreed to an arrangement whereby no province would ever have fewer members in the House than it has in the Senate.

This provision protects the position of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.”

An editorial on the 16th of February says:

“It may be argued that the protection accorded Prince Edward Island is quite justified that the people of that province are to have a voice in the House, which their regional and provincial status demands.

But if this is so, the same consideration should certainly be given to Saskatchewan, which already has constituencies far larger than the four Prince Edward Island seats put together.

It is, we think, the responsibility of our western members to demand that such a consideration be given. Their first aim ought to be an appointment of a redistribution commission, including experts in such fields as geography, economics and sociology, with the authority to go beyond the bounds of mere statistics in fixing constituency boundaries.

Failing that, we think they must press for some other method of protecting the political voice of the people they represent. Their cause will be one which is amply justified by the history of redistribution in the past, and by the current predicament of the prairies.”

As has been pointed out, there is a good precedent for postponing redistribution at this time. It was postponed before. I remember when the amendment to the B.N.A. Act was introduced to postpone redistribution because at that time it was felt that it would work unnecessary hardships on certain provinces. When it went to Westminster, if I remember correctly, the government at Quebec cabled the British Government, objecting to the constitutional amendment because the Province of Quebec had not been consulted. Neither the Canadian government, nor the British Government paid any attention to that objection, taking the ground that the representation in the House of Commons was a matter for the Parliament of Canada to decide. I am quite convinced that the Parliament of Canada could once more, if it chose to do so, postpone the redistribution legislation. I do not think the provinces need to be consulted at all, but I do want to say that certainly as far as this province is concerned, that if the Federal Government wants any expression of opinion from this province, I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan wholeheartedly will support any introduction of an amendment to the constitution of Canada, that would permit of a postponement of redistribution until this whole question has been thoroughly investigated.

March 20, 1952

The proposal of the Leader of the Opposition is that after we have postponed this, we should give some thought to a constitutional amendment whereby no province will lose more than 10 per cent of its representation in the House of Commons, following a decennial census. Well, I think that would help; that would at least put the brake on. I rather like the suggestion which was made in the House of Commons March 10th of this year, by Mr. Hazen Argue, the member for Assiniboia. He suggested that redistribution should be postponed and that a Royal Commission should be set up to look into the whole question of representation by population, taking into consideration that some provinces, by virtue of the number of senators they have (by virtue of Section 51A) have a floor and therefore cannot lose any more members; that that Royal Commission should take into consideration what brakes or floor should be put under other provinces who might or who have lost population; that that Royal Commission might give some thought to the matter of area, and what area a member can properly cover and can properly represent. I think a Royal Commission could do that, probably much better than it could be done by a committee of the House of Commons.

I was rather impressed by some articles, a series of articles which appeared in the Star-Phoenix by Mr. N. Ward, of the University of Saskatchewan, who is, I understand, quite an authority in political science and on the question of redistribution. He makes the point (I need not bother the House with reading it), that it is very difficult for a parliamentary Committee made up of people who are farmers, workers, business men, doctors, teachers and lawyers, but who have no particular training in this field. He argues that with the atmosphere of political views and political interest to be served, that a parliamentary committee is probably not the best group to work out a formula for determining the principle on which redistribution shall be set up. That formula can probably be laid down better by a commission who would study the whole question, having in mind the problems of different parts of Canada, and having in mind some of the questions which I have raised in the last few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, why is it so necessary that this redistribution legislation shall be postponed until this whole question is studied? The Leader of the Opposition, in his motion says that "it is against the public interest". That sums it up for me. It is against the public interest of the people of western Canada to have a redistribution bill proceeded with that will reduce the representation of the people on these plains by seven members in the House of Commons. Let us make no mistake about it. The story of western Canada has been a story of the growing power and domination by one geographical area in Canada over the rest of Canada. I am not being local in my outlook, but the fact does remain that that area of Canada lying between the Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains has been, and is rapidly becoming more so, the step-child of Confederation.

First of all, there has been tremendous industrial concentration in the central area of Canada. Many people will tell you that that was an accident of history, and that it was because central Canada started into industrial development earlier than the rest of Canada, that industry was concentrated there. Mr. Speaker, that is only partly true. It has also been a matter of deliberate design. For instance, the central provinces of Canada have no coal; have no cheap fuel. The whole

story of industrial development throughout the world has been for industry to move to where there is coal, but not in Canada. In Canada what we have done is deliberately, over a period of years, moved the coal to industry. In order to move the coal to industry, the government of Canada in the past 2 years has paid in coal subventions and subsidies \$57,890,000. That means the coal coming from western Canada and the coal coming from the Maritime provinces into central Canada has been and is subsidized. In 1950, it was subsidized to the tune of \$4,125,000 and as I say, a total of \$57,890,000 in the last 24 years was paid by the taxpayers of Canada to enable cheap coal to get to central Canada. As a result, industries developed in the central region.

During both the first and second World Wars, Federal money was used by the governments to set up war industries. The great bulk of those war industries were set up in central Canada, and laid the basis for future industrial development there. As I pointed out the other day, the same thing is happening now. I have the defence contracts here that have been let from November 20, 1950 to January 31, 1952. What do we find? We find that for the three prairie provinces, the total amount of defence contracts we have had is less than 7 per cent, and in Saskatchewan's case, less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent. If you take all four western provinces right from the head of the Lakes to the Pacific Coast, the total amount of war contracts they have had has been 10.7 per cent. In other words, almost 90 per cent of all the defence contracts given since the present rearmament programme started, have gone to central or eastern Canada. I say that the whole development of Canada in the past 50 years has been to help central Canada to grow economically or industrially. We have been the losers thereby.

The Leader of the Opposition and myself used to listen to members from the central provinces talking about the farmers of the west wanting Wheat Boards and guaranteed prices. But not many people realized that a subsidy is paid to eastern farmers on their feed grain. They raise stock and each year the Government of Canada, out of the taxpayers' money, pays the freight from the head of the Lakes on coarse grains that go east to fatten their hogs and prepare their livestock for market. In the past 10 years, \$138,912,000 has been paid out by the Government of Canada in that way — almost \$140 million paid to subsidize the stock-raiser of eastern Canada. When anyone talks about how much the west gets, let them not forget that almost \$140 million of a direct subsidy to the eastern Canadian farms is paid. When the western farmers take hogs to market, and ship them down east to the market, the freight is paid on them and they are sold in competition with the farmer whose feed was subsidized.

Now, turning to the question of freight rates. I do not wish to labour the point that the Saskatchewan representative, Mr. N.A. MacPherson, who appeared before the Transport Board and before the Royal Commission, has pointed out repeatedly while freight rates have been allowed to increase over 70 per cent since 1948, this is only a permissive increase. The railroads are permitted to raise rates, but they do not have to raise them. In central Canada where they have competition with trucks and canal boats, they have not raised the rates the full amount that has been permitted. They have to compete there, but out west and in the Maritimes where there is not the same competition, we have got the business, and we have had taken from us all that the traffic will bear.

March 20, 1952

The west has had to suffer in the past few years — same thing has been true on a number of points. The cost-of-living index has gone up 70 points, but the initial price to a farmer actually has gone down; prices of some other livestock commodities have gone down. The settlement on the five-year pool, instead of being 25¢ a bushel as we expected, turned out to be 8 1/3 cents a bushel; the St. Lawrence Seaway, which will cost anywhere from \$700 million to \$1400 million is being proceeded with; the South Saskatchewan River development project — a Royal Commission is set up to investigate it.

The west has known for years that we have paid for the protection of the industries of central Canada. Many years ago, Mr. Norman McLeod Rogers, a very brilliant economist, who later became Minister of Labour in Mr. MacKenzie King's government, stated in a brief that Saskatchewan alone paid some \$29 or \$30 million a year in extra tariff which was for the protection of eastern industry. Mr. Speaker, if that were measured today it would probably be two or three times that amount. Most of us remember that after the war was over, in our own province, the co-operatives, the Wheat Pool, the Boards of Trade, all got together in the "Buy British" campaigns that were put on each year, because we recognized that if the farmers of Saskatchewan are going to sell their grain and their livestock products to Great Britain, Great Britain in turn must be able to get Canadian dollars to pay for them, and the only way they can get Canadian dollars is to sell British goods to the people in Canada.

For a while we had quite an influx of textiles coming in. We had quite an influx of British cars. What happened? Eastern industry immediately said: "This has got to stop" and the pressure was applied, and we have seen those goods gradually being pushed off the Canadian market. Mr. Speaker, you and I are not being parochial in our outlook when we say that the west needs strong influence and a strong and commanding voice in the Parliament of Canada. Our economy, in the economy of Canada has become very much like a cow — with its head in the west and its hind-quarters in central Canada. We feed it and somebody else milks it! There is a good deal of objection being taken to that, and the people of this province, I think, will support us. They will support not only members of this House, but will support the Leader of the Opposition and will support the Federal members of parliament, if they stand up and object to this iniquitous and inequitable distribution bill.

I like the phrase that was used by the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix in an editorial. I think the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) says he wants to take it as read, but I thought he would be so pleased to have him and me and the Star-Phoenix all agreed for once, that he would be cheering. This is what the Star-Phoenix said on March 12th of this year:

"The Prime Minister has introduced a bill authorizing Parliament to proceed with redistribution on the basis of the 1951 census of Canada. The introduction of the bill does not mean that the government has irrevocably made up its mind to proceed with redistribution on the basis of laws that exist at the present time. This bill is merely the first step in getting the matter before the House of Commons

“Nevertheless, we think it is ominous that the Prime Minister is bringing down the bill, and has invoked the authority of the constitution as justification for proceeding now. The bill is not being brought before the Commons because the government wants to bring it, Mr. St. Laurent intimated, but because the Constitution imposes on the Commons the duty to carry out redistribution as soon as the census is completed.” (This sounds very much like saying, “Stand up, boys, and take your medicine.”)

Well, I think that is right. I think we have a right to say to our Federal members ‘it is true that the Constitution says there shall be are distribution, but in days gone by you have changed the constitution and we are asking that you amend that Constitution now, and that you amend it in order to give you an opportunity either a Committee of the House or a Royal Commission, to study the whole question, in order to iron out and remove some of the inequities which we have demonstrated to lie therein’. I think we should expect of our Federal members that not only will they speak for this, but that they will speak strongly. This will measure their actions even more than their words. I think any Federal member will be justified in saying to his political party: “I shall oppose this redistribution bill.” I would like to see him go further. I would like to see them say to any of their political parties, “I will not remain in a political party that betrays western Canada, and permits the passage of legislation that will diminish our authority and our voice in the councils of the nation.”

Hon. Members (Government): — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Federal members at Ottawa will know how strongly we in this Assembly feel about the matter and how strongly the people of Saskatchewan and western Canada feel about the matter. Western Canada has a case. It has a case for justice and equity, and has the right to expect that case to be heard, and in order for that case to be heard it ought to be properly and adequately represented in the Parliament of Canada.

I shall support this motion.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, as one who has always taken an interest in this matter of parliamentary representation, I would like to make a few comments on it. I hope I will be pardoned, Mr. Speaker, if I refer back some 16 or 17 years to a time when I submitted a proposal for a modification of the existing system of representation in the Canadian parliament. It received some publicity in the press, and as a result of that publicity, I was requested by some of the members of the parliamentary committee at Ottawa, who were at that time considering a revision of the Canadian Election Act to submit my proposals to them, which I did. I do not recall whether the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) was a member of that committee or not, but if he was he probably has forgotten about those proposals which were submitted some 16 years ago by myself. But I have always taken this matter of parliamentary representation as a matter of keen interest.

March 20, 1952

Now, in getting up to speak on this resolution, I want to say that although I am following my hon. friend on the opposite side of the House in this debate, much as he did follow me on Tuesday, I am not going to follow suit in every respect, in that regard. I must say that in this debate, following the Premier, as I do, I can sympathize with the position that my hon. friend was in last Tuesday on the South Saskatchewan dam resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in any consideration of this problem of representation, we always have raised in our mind the question of representation by population. That was a dogma which was borne and became established in the 1840s and 1850s in this country. Those who have a recollection of their early Canadian history will recall that the Act of Union (I believe it was called) of 1841 established a United Canada, consisting of the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and that in the parliament that was created under the Act, 65 members were apportioned, or allotted to each of the provinces, irrespective of the population of the provinces. In the beginning, the province of Upper Canada had the smaller population, and they welcomed equal representation with Lower Canada, in that parliament. It was not many years later until Upper Canada — that is, Ontario — had more population than Quebec, and then was borne the cry of representation by population.

Ontario demanded more than the 65 members, which she was allotted under the Act of Union, and as a result, when Confederation was being considered at the conference at Charlottetown and at Quebec, and in view of the fact that many of the leading delegates in favour of Confederation were representatives from Upper Canada or Ontario, it was only to be expected that they would write in to the resolutions into the minutes which later became the British North America Act, a strong recognition of the principles of representation by population, and so in the early drafts of those resolutions, you had it clearly and specifically stated that the representation of each province would be proportional to the population of that province, in relation to the province of Quebec.

The early draft of those resolutions also contained provision for the drawing of constituency boundaries within the provinces by an independent tribunal of judges, who would have in mind the making of the constituencies of approximately equal population. That was the high-water mark of the cry for rep-by-pop as it was called. Now, before those resolutions even came into existence as the B.N.A. Act, there was some receding from that position because by 1867 they had dropped out of the resolutions the proposal to have the constituency boundaries within each province defined by a Board of Judges. They had also receded further from that position by putting in a provision in the Act that no province's representation should be diminished by reason of a drop in population of that province, by more than one-twentieth in proportion to the rest of Canada. So they immediately commenced to back-track on that pure principle of representation by population. The history of Canada since 1867 is full of instances where the pure principle of representation by population was abandoned and modified.

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) referred to the amendment which was passed, I believe, around 1898, or early in the present century which placed a floor under the representation which each province would have in parliament, equal to its representation in the Senate. Then you have the case of the Yukon, which my hon. friend also referred to, in being given one member when they were not legally entitled, in proportion to population, to any more than about 1/10 of a member.

Then you had official recognition by the leaders of the two main parties in the House of Commons, that population was not in itself a sole criterion to be kept in mind, in drawing redistribution. You had the statement by Sir John A. Macdonald, to this effect in 1872, when he was introducing the Representation Bill of that year. He said:

“While the principle of population was considered to a very great extent, other considerations were also held to have weight, so that different interests, classes and localities should be represented, that the principle of numbers should not be the only one.”

That viewpoint was echoed by a Liberal member of the House of Commons in 1896 or 1897 when Sir Wilfred Laurier was introducing his Representation Act. George Casey spoke the Liberal view on that matter as follows:

“It has always been our principle that exact equality of population was not so much a desideratum as the keeping together for the political purposes of those who are naturally associated for municipal and other purposes. In other words, to limit constituencies within county boundaries.”

And so you have recognition by both of the parties at Ottawa that population is not the final and only arbiter in this matter of representation. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it has also been recognized in this province in the apportionment of seats between urban and rural communities, and so you find that the rule of representation by population has been a rule which has been more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

In 1943 a disastrous result to Saskatchewan and some of the prairie provinces was apparent if population alone was to be the deciding factor. We had the situation where Saskatchewan would lose several seats. I quote from the Prime Minister, Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent, who then was Minister of Justice, speaking in the House of Commons, in July, 1943, on Page 436 of Hansard, as follows:

“Now the census of 1941 established that the population of the province of Quebec was 3,328,814. Dividing this by 65, gives us a quotient of 51,213. According to that general rule, the representation of provinces, according to population would be as follows:

(He lists them, and lists Saskatchewan with 17).

There was a threat of loss to the province of Saskatchewan, if the constitution had been followed as it existed at that time. And that problem was met by a proper amendment to the Canadian Constitution. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the request which is going to Ottawa from this House, that special cognizance of these circumstances should be taken into account and that the proper amendment should be made to the Constitution to prevent that eventuality which we now anticipate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that it should be recognized that the principle, if any, involved in this matter of representation, is not so much that numbers shall be satisfied, but that interests, the general principles of justice, should be followed, and as has already been said in this debate, the principles of justice require some amendment to the present rule for arriving at our representation.

So when my hon. friend opposite said that public opinion would never allow us to depart from the rules of representation by each province according to its population, I submit that we have never followed that rule, and if he will go back over his earlier remarks, he will recall having said that “there were five provinces out of nine that were governed rather by the exceptions than the rules — that only four provinces in 1943 were governed by the rule”; that the rule of representation by population is, as I say, more honoured in the breach than the observance.

I suggest that we ought to consider some revision of the resolution — that we ought to consider asking that a new basis of representation should be established; one which takes into account other factors than population. As a matter of fact, that is what we have been doing for the last 70 years. We have persistently and consistently adopted amendments to our constitution to take into account other factors than population, in determining our representation. We have not only done it as between provinces, but we have done it consistently as between rural and urban areas.

Now, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out the disparity of the unit — the urban unit as against the rural unit was accomplished by taking away from cities, within a province some representation, and giving it to rural areas within the same province. I thought he was going to come to this conclusion when he said that there are some provinces where there are not enough cities, where there is not enough urban population to adequately provide for the rural areas — I thought he was going to come to the logical conclusion that some adjustment must therefore be made between those provinces which are predominantly urban, and those provinces which are predominantly rural. Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, where there are only one or two urban constituencies out of 20, it is impossible to adjust them enough to provide for adequate representation of rural areas, and there is no use of ignoring that fact. The only logical solution to that problem is to recognize that as between provinces we must depart officially from the rule of representation by population. Something which we have been doing by temporary expedients from time to time, ever since Confederation, but the Act of 1947 — the Representation Act of 1947 went back almost to the high-water mark of 1866, so far as recognition of that rule of representation by population is concerned.

The Representation Act of 1947 wiped out all those crutches and helps that were put in during the 70 or 80 years since Confederation, to ease the inequality that straight representation by population had imposed upon us, and we went back almost to the high-water mark of 1866, of giving to provinces just exactly what representation they were entitled to on the basis of population.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I be so bold as to suggest to my hon. friend that it would be advisable to consider changing this resolution? The last two lines of it proposes to set a ceiling of 10 per cent on the amount which the representation can be diminished in any one decade. I, for one, am confident that the trend of lost population that came about in this province during the depression, and the years of the war has been arrested. I am confident that Saskatchewan will move forward with the rest of Canada — at least as rapidly, and possibly more so. But suppose that we do maintain the same rate of growth as the rest of Canada for the next 10 years; we will still have to lose the other 10 per cent at the end of 10 years. This proposal that my hon. friend submits to this House provides that at each census the decrease shall be limited to 10 per cent; this year we would lose two, but then 10 years later, assuming that we keep abreast of the rest of Canada for those 10 years, we would still lose another two members. So I suggest this is not the right way to approach the problem at all. I think the right way to approach the problem is to introduce the feature of area.

Some study should be made, Mr. Speaker, to set a maximum area which any member shall represent, and then when you reach that maximum area that is as far as you can go, in extending constituency boundaries, and when, if that is done, that province will simply have to be given as many extra members as necessary to reduce the average — the largest sized constituencies to within the maximum.

I submit there is another defect, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution. There are other provinces in Canada which have constituencies just as large, or almost as large, as is our MacKenzie constituency. There are constituencies in Ontario and Northern Quebec that are afflicted with this same problem. Of course, to raise the question, or argument, that our constituencies would be too large if this were done, they can always answer it by saying that if you divide them up right in Saskatchewan, you can keep them all down so that they are not any larger than some other constituency in Northern Ontario. They would have a perfect answer to our request for a revision of this formula.

I suggest that we are not attacking the problem in quite the right way, when we appeal simply on an argument which applies to us, and us alone; that we should make our appeal and our argument rather, on the basis that geographical area ought to be taken into account in fixing the maximum size of a constituency.

I want to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the motion, if no improvement along the lines which I suggest can be made. But I would hope that my hon. friend would consider allowing the debate to be adjourned on this resolution until he, or the people who prepared this resolution, could take into consideration those points which I have suggested. I think we would be in a much stronger position, Mr. Speaker, if we make our appeal to the Parliament of Canada on a basis

which is common to the other provinces, and that we make our appeal on the basis of a maximum size for constituencies; or that it be based, for instance, on a factor. Multiply the population by a factor determined by the area in which that population is distributed. I am sure we will be in a much stronger position, Mr. Speaker, to appeal to the Federal Government on this matter; particularly in view of the fact that, as I have already indicated, the Federal Government has always recognized other principles than mere population as a basis for parliamentary representation.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I will support the motion as it stands, but I would welcome some revision to take into account those facts.

Hon. John W. Corman, Q.C. (Attorney-General): — Mr. Speaker, I was out of the House for a few minutes and do not know if the one point I was going to raise was mentioned or not. I think we should express our approval of the unity that is being shown by our Saskatchewan M.P.s over this matter. I believe I am right in saying it is the first time in years they have been able to get together. They were not able to get together over the price of wheat, over health insurance, over pensions, over freight rates, and I think we should let them know that we are glad to see finally that they have introduced the spirit of “get together” for Saskatchewan, and I think, also, Mr. Speaker, they should be advised that we do not for one minute think that the reason they could not get together on the other points, but can on this point, is because their own seats are in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker: — I must inform the members that the mover of the resolution may exercise his right to close the debate. Anyone wishing to speak must do so now.

Hon. Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — I do not intend to say very much, Mr. Speaker, except to take the attitude that I feel that it is very, very important that it should be recognized that we are going through a situation whereby there is a tendency for farming areas to be depopulated. There is no question about that — it is taking place all over the country — taking place in the United States. It is not inconsistent with the stand we have taken, because in some places the population has been held by expanding industrial developments, but there is no doubt that there is the movement away from farming areas, and other provinces have managed to arrest that flow of population by taking it up faster than we have been able to do so by industrial development.

Now this is, I think, a passing phase with us. I hope it is; I think we will get the industrial and mineral development, and it will enable us not only to arrest the falling off in our population, but to have our population begin to grow again, so that Saskatchewan will begin to go forward again. I feel certain of that in my own mind, and so I do not think the suggestion is out of place that we should say that when we are going through such a drastic change at this time, that we should not be expected to bear the full brunt right now, but rather put the brakes on for this redistribution, at least, and see if, in the meantime, the trend will not be reversed.

Now, I would like just as much, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker) to come out for some such position whereby we could keep all our seats, but as I said, from an examination of the reaction of the rest of the country to that suggestion, I feel certain that if we were to ask for that, they would say, "Well, Saskatchewan is too insistent on maintaining her position, and not giving way to some extent, due to a relative loss of population" and the result would be that we would probably have to take the full reduction.

I do not think I said that we could not expect the provinces to depart from the base of representation by population entirely. What I meant to say (if I did not say it), was that we could not expect them to depart very drastically from that basic principle except on the basis where it has already been done, and if we were to open up some new basis at this time, before a tremendous amount of educational work had been done, I am afraid it would be asking for something that would be regarded as impractical by the rest of the country, and again we would not even save the number that we would save out of this proposal.

I am very appreciative, as the hon. members will remember, I said that if it was the feeling of the House that we should try to take a stand and hold our whole 20 members, I would stand along with the rest and try to uphold that viewpoint, but I felt that, before I drew the resolution, that that would be a mistake and by trying to hold the whole 20 we would lose the chance of perhaps holding 18.

I appreciate the attitude of the Premier, with his experience too in Ottawa, in realizing that that is the realistic view of the matter. It is not that any of us would not like to hold the whole 20, but a matter of what is best to do under the present circumstances. I appreciate the attitude that has been taken of appreciating that situation, and supporting that viewpoint, rather than say, "Well, we are going to stand out for the whole 20, regardless of whether we can hope to actually accomplish it or not."

I think the attitude we have taken is a realistic one, I think — I hope it will get results. I think it is more likely to get results than holding out for the whole 20. I was quite encouraged by the reception that this suggestion did receive in Ottawa. I was a bit afraid that it might be said we were weakening in our attitude. Instead of that, it was apparently received by a great many members as showing a very reasonable attitude on our part, and if that is the attitude of the people in the rest of Canada, then I think we are going to save something out of the situation — save three out of the five members which we might otherwise have lost.

So I do appreciate, so far as I am concerned, the attitude of compromise in this matter shown by the Premier and the members opposite, and I think it will reward us well in regard to this matter; at least I certainly hope so.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

March 20, 1952

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 18, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):

“That this Assembly regrets the unwarranted delay in proceeding with the South Saskatchewan River Dam Project, in the face of ample evidence of its practical feasibility, and urges that, in view of its economic and social value to the country as a whole, the Government of Canada proceed without further delay.”

Mr. Egnatoff (Melfort): — Mr. Speaker, I think in view of the very amicable manner in which the House has been getting along this afternoon, and in view of the contentious nature of this motion, I beg leave of the Assembly to adjourn this debate at this time.

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